

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING**

Monday, August 19, 2002  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

**PRESENT:** Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmembers Chang, Hansen, Montgomery and Ransom

**ABSENT:** Councilmember Gustafson

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember Ransom, who arrived shortly thereafter, and Councilmember Gustafson.

**Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Grossman, seconded by Councilmember Montgomery and carried 5-0, Councilmember Gustafson was excused.**

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS**

City Manager Steve Burkett asked that tonight's agenda be reordered as follows: update on Aurora Corridor Environmental Process, 2002 Second Quarter Financial Report, City Hall Project Update, and Draft Work Plan for Council Goal #7. There was Council consensus to do so. Continuing, Mr. Burkett reported on the success of the Celebrate Shoreline event held Saturday. Next, he introduced two new staff members, Jill Marilley, City Engineer, and Julie Modrejewski, Assistant City Manager. He commented on the status of the City's grant application for the Interurban Trail bridge, noting that Shoreline was the first choice of eighteen cities to receive \$1.5 million in grant funding if the legislature appropriates funds. He noted the City's leverage of \$267,000 to get a \$3.3 million project, and congratulated Bethany Wolbrecht-Dunn and Wendy Barry for their efforts in acquiring the grant. Finally, he commented on the Sister Cities Association and said it will be discussed further at the September 3rd Council meeting.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hansen reported on his observations of Lynnwood traffic improvements as they relate to the installation of medians on Highway 99.

Councilmember Montgomery reported on the Association of Washington Cities Board Retreat. She said the Board discussed issues relating to finances and revenue, noting that members specifically asked the Board to support Referendum 51. She referenced Governor Locke's letter outlining the State's September 11<sup>th</sup> commemoration activities, noting his suggestion that cities organize similar events.

Councilmember Chang reported that the Korean-American community won the Shoreline Parade Best in Show Award for the second year in a row. He encouraged more groups to get involved next year to continue to improve the quality of the parade.

Mayor Jepsen also commented on the success of the parade. Then he mentioned the Brightwater Environmental Impact Statement and King County Executive Sims' choice of the Route 9 site as his preferred alternative. He said the Brightwater outfall would likely occur in the vicinity of Ballinger / 205<sup>th</sup> Street. He stressed the need for everyone to participate in the siting process and consider the potential impacts to residents and businesses.

Councilmember Hansen inquired about the number of pump stations that would likely be located in Shoreline as a result of the Point Wells outfall. Mayor Jepsen replied that the Point Wells scenario would likely require five portals to be located in Shoreline.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, said the facts contained in the Aurora Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) are inaccurate. He prefers a federal level EIS and said the Aurora DEIS should have included the entire project, not just the first 20 blocks.

(b) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, said a segmented approach to the Aurora Corridor DEIS is not appropriate. He inquired about how much money the City has invested in defense of the Aegis project and whether the City has sought a second legal opinion.

(c) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, asked about Deputy Grossman's e-mail regarding an alleged agreement between Aegis and the City. She asked whether the Council agrees that the "negotiated agreement" with Aegis is a good one. She noted Section 20.30.200 and 20.30.230 of the Shoreline Municipal Code and said appeals are not separated into administrative and judicial appeals. She added that the process is circular in nature and that Aegis should not have received permits according to the Code.

(d) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, asked for clarification on the Council's Capital Improvement Plan vote at the last meeting, noting that Councilmember Chang's concerns were not resolved. He questioned the accuracy of Mayor Jepsen's description of the vote and asked Council to provide the actual outcome. He said the MC at the parade on Saturday made biased comments. He commented on the RCW relating to appearance of fairness, and asked what constituted a citizen with standing, noting that Deputy Mayor Grossman's e-mail comments were slanderous. He expressed the need for a traffic signal at 170<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, noting that City records consider it a school crossing. Finally, he said City Manager Steve Burkett needs to explain his background and experience in his previous positions.

Responding to Mr. Poland's comments, Mayor Jepsen said the Aurora DEIS is a SEPA/NEPA document and therefore qualifies as a federal level EIS. He clarified that the Environmental Assessment is a federal level process and the EIS fulfils SEPA requirements.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the City was differentiating between a federal level EIS and Environmental Assessment as two separate processes.

Mr. Burkett said the City decided to do both processes simultaneously under SEPA and NEPA requirements with close consultation with the Federal Highway Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation.

Councilmember Chang asked about the difference between the federal EIS and federal EA. He asked whose decision it was to request a federal level EA.

Mr. Burkett said it was the result of a joint discussion with WSDOT and the Federal Highway Administration. He said the Aurora Project has had a much higher level of environmental review than other Highway 99 projects in Edmonds and Lynnwood. He said the FHA was part of the process, and was confident that there has been an adequate level of review.

Councilmember Chang said the federal EA includes a higher level of economic and social evaluation than the federal EIS.

Responding to Mr. Mann's comments, Mayor Jepsen noted that information on the Aegis issue is available to the public upon request. He said the City is trying to clarify many issues that have arisen under Aegis.

Mr. Burkett added that many cities, in addition to Shoreline, are trying to clarify issues relating to stream protection and stream definition.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the City had an agreement with Aegis. Mr. Burkett said there were no agreements with Aegis, but that Aegis was still in the permit process.

City Attorney Ian Sievers said the administrative appeal question raised by Mrs. Crawford relating to Shoreline Municipal Code 20.30.200 and 20.30.230 will continue to be litigated in court.

There was brief Council discussion about Mr. Crawford's question relating to Councilmember Chang's vote on the budget. It was noted that by the City Clerk that abstentions are only allowed by Council Rules of Procedure in limited cases and are treated as uncast votes. Councilmember Hansen said the only way to have a vote not count is to leave the room. Mayor Jepsen concluded that one must either vote yes or no, and silence is considered an affirmative vote.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

6(b) Update on Aurora Corridor Environmental Process

Mr. Burkett said the purpose of this evening's discussion is to update the Council about status of the EIS process, review EIS comments, and answer some questions raised tonight. He noted that some people requested an extension of the comment period, but the City does not plan to make an extension.

After introducing consultants working on the project from CH2MHill, Kirk McKinley, Project Manager, noted that the purpose of the discussion is to update the Council and address some of the comments they received in writing and at the August 6<sup>th</sup> hearing. He added that staff has not been able to review all written comments yet. He said the DEIS includes both the federal EA/NEPA requirements as well as SEPA requirements, characterizing the DEIS as two different processes within the same document. He gave a brief description of project, noting that alternatives, environmental impacts, short & long term consequences, secondary impacts, and cumulative impacts are part of the EIS.

Continuing, Mr. McKinley gave a brief overview of the three alternatives analyzed in the DEIS. He said Alternative A most closely matches the pre-design concept of 1999, Alternative B includes narrower sidewalks. Both alternatives include business access transit lanes, curbs, storm water facilities, underground utilities, and new signals. Alternative A includes business access, safety improvements, left-turn and U-turn lanes at signalized intersections and at 149<sup>th</sup> and 163<sup>rd</sup>, and a landscaping/amenity zone. Alternative B includes 7-foot sidewalks, no amenity zones or landscaping, but more breaks in the median for left and U-turn opportunities. He added that Alternative B includes new signals at 152<sup>nd</sup>, 165<sup>th</sup>, and 149<sup>th</sup>.

Paul Haines, Director of Public Works, asked Mr. McKinley to review how a build scenario would compare to a no-build scenario in developing a preferred alternative. He noted that the City is trying to capture as many significant consequences as it can in order to develop a preferred alternative.

Mr. McKinley then gave an overview of the alternatives and environmental analysis of the following elements: transportation, historical and cultural resources, water quality, air quality, visual quality, land use, wildlife, social impact, economic impact, hazardous waste, and noise.

## Transportation

Alternatives A & B are nearly the same in terms of transportation. Both improve traffic delay, cut-through traffic, accidents and property damage. Transit speed and reliability increase significantly under both alternatives.

## Historical & Cultural Resources

The width of the right-of-way is the primary difference between Alternatives A & B. The road will be closer to structures in Alternative B.

## Water Quality/Surface Water

Alternative A has less impervious surface than Alternative B due to the landscaping zone. Alternative B has a greater impact on the Boeing Creek Basin.

## Visual Quality

Alternative A has a more positive visual impact than Alternative B.

## Land Use

Alternative A would require 0.79 acres more right-of-way, whereas Alternative B would require 0.47 acres. Both alternatives have positive and negative effects on property values.

## Wildlife, Fisheries and Vegetation

Alternative A has less impervious surface, but the environmental effects of Alternative B can be mitigated through water quality facilities.

## Social

Both alternatives provide substantial improvements to pedestrian safety due to median and amenity buffer zones. Neither alternative negatively impacts minority or low-income populations.

## Economic

There are five fewer parking spaces provided in Alternative A than Alternative B. Alternative A reduces the City's property tax revenue due to right-of-way acquisition.

He then discussed the following DEIS mitigation measures:

- Traffic control/construction staging
- Agency & public service provider coordination
- Property purchased at fair market value per state law
- Temporary signage for business during construction
- Parking lot control

- Limited construction hours
- Sediment control, storm water detention & treatment
- Oil control facilities at 145<sup>th</sup> and 155<sup>th</sup>

#### Secondary and Cumulative Impacts

Mr. McKinley said the City was very conservative in developing the Cumulative Impact Analysis and used worst-case estimates of potential impacts. Comments gathered at the hearing concerned historical properties north of 165<sup>th</sup> that could possibly be demolished. He emphasized that the DEIS has nothing to do with sections north of 165<sup>th</sup>. He also noted that the DEIS did not take into account any of Council's 32 points in Resolution No. 156 concerning impact mitigation options such as taking a wider cross-section, making narrower sidewalks, and adjusting the centerline.

He then discussed the City's definition of the project and why the DEIS only included the 145<sup>th</sup> to 165<sup>th</sup> section instead of the entire 3-mile length. He explained the rationale for establishing the scope of the project, including the concept of logical termini. He noted that 145<sup>th</sup> to 165<sup>th</sup> has a high traffic accident rate, one of the highest pedestrian accident rates, and one of the highest volumes in the Puget Sound area. He added that the DEIS does not restrict other projects and stops short of the Central Subarea. He concluded that the DEIS does not preclude options North or South.

Mr. Haines said the City sought ideas from other agencies on logical termini before it could proceed with the environmental process. He said both WSDOT and FHWA reviewed the DEIS and found it adequate.

Mr. McKinley reported that 42 people testified at the August 6<sup>th</sup> public hearing and that 64 letters were submitted. He added that five written responses came from institutions, and that there were three requests to extend comment period.

Mr. Haines noted that language interpreter services and hearing impaired services were provided at the public hearing.

Mr. McKinley divided the public comments into three categories: general project comments, project design comments, and specific impacts. He said the final EIS will include all comments and the public hearing transcript. He categorized the comments as 18 statements of support, 14 statements in opposition, and 13 statements addressing the project termini issue. He said project design comments included eight letters about the need for more capacity or fewer signals. Six letters supported a modified sidewalk plan, and six letters suggested either no median or allowing more left turns. Five letters were received about business access transit lanes. Under impact mitigation, thirteen people identified business impacts, and eleven people discussed neighborhood impacts, including cut-through traffic, air quality, and noise. Nine letters discussed storm water effects on Boeing and Thornton Creeks, and thirteen letters discussed specific business impact mitigation.

He mentioned the upcoming environmental review schedule, noting that further discussion will follow in September regarding design features, cost-saving measures, recommendations, and alternatives. He said Council will get into the finer issues of design, including tree types, storm grate types, and specific landscaping recommendations, in 2003.

Mr. Haines emphasized that specific improvements and cost estimates will become more precise as time goes on.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, expressed dissatisfaction with the DEIS, noting it is inaccurate and that the Council is not serving the City well if it relies on it. He questioned the credibility of CH2MHill and asked who would be responsible for the DEIS when its flaws are discovered. He noted that a Plan C was addressed at previous Council meetings and favored keeping that option open. Finally, he said Shoreline does not need a transit lane due to the infrequency of Metro busses.

(b) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, said the Aurora EIS process only came about through the efforts of the Aurora Merchants Association. He said the City is not interested in the EIS process but was initially trying to issue a Categorical Environmental Exemption for the entire project. He said the issue will be decided in Superior Court, and expressed relief that the SEPA process will allow citizens the opportunity to make a fair case.

(c) Ken Meyer, Seattle, said that Aurora is one of only two feasible arterials people can use to transit the Puget Sound region. He said Aurora must be viewed as a major traffic corridor, not a suburban boulevard as the Council sees it. He disagreed with Mr. McKinley's proposals for the Aurora Corridor, citing inadequate analysis of the traffic problem. He added that the comment process was inadequate and requested an extension.

(d) Pat Crawford, Shoreline, expressed dissatisfaction with the DEIS and objected to the segmented nature of the project. She said it was irrational to divide Boeing Creek into sections and only include net runoff in the analysis. She said the DEIS does not include old pavement and the numbers are skewed to only show new pervious surfaces. She added that oil scrubbers are inadequate to address storm water problems, and emphasized that environmental impacts will be ignored if the watersheds are divided.

(e) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, said most business owners have not been contacted regarding the Aurora DEIS. He said merchants want to improve Aurora, but they disagree with the City's plan. He noted that the Chamber of Commerce supports a plan similar to that supported by the Shoreline Merchants Association, which will allow for better business access, visibility, improved traffic flow, and cost savings. He added the City will hurt its own revenue source by hurting the business community, and suggested cost estimates are too optimistic.

The Council then discussed the public input and the process. Mayor Jepsen noted that there will be many opportunities to review the comments on the Aurora DEIS.

Councilmember Ransom asked which institutions provided public comment on the DEIS. Mr. McKinley said he received comments from the Shoreline Fire Department, City of Seattle/King County Metro, Shoreline Water District, WSDOT, and the Economic Development Council.

Councilmember Ransom asked why the EIS did not mention the potentially negative impact of medians on business access, a problem he most frequently hears about. Mr. McKinley replied that several individuals submitted similar comments at the hearing and in writing.

Councilmember Ransom asked how the City was going to address the problem of lost business parking in the right-of-way. He said many businesses will lose their parking because of sidewalks. Mr. McKinley referred to pages 3-57 of the DEIS which includes specific mitigation measures for property and parking impacts. He noted that no property between 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 165<sup>th</sup> Street would be without parking.

Councilmember Ransom expressed skepticism about the Metro's ability to provide adequate bus service for the proposed transit lane, given existing transit problems. He also asked for clarification about additional impervious surfaces that were discussed earlier.

Mr. Haines responded that hearing testimony revealed several questions dealing with storm water runoff and impervious surfaces that must be specifically addressed before arriving at a final EIS.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about the inaccuracy of past estimates involving the amount of anticipated runoff. Mr. Haines said there would be a comprehensive approach to drainage basins that should be in place by early 2004.

Councilmember Hansen clarified that no buildings would be demolished or partially demolished under Alternative A, and that part of the 32-point plan includes decreasing the width of sidewalks as needed. He noted that the DEIS addresses net runoff of new impervious surfaces, but questioned whether it involved existing impervious surfaces. He said the City should have improved water quality if the storm water portion of the project is undertaken properly. Mr. Haines agreed and said the goal of the City is to have a better product than existing conditions. He noted that the City would get more information relating to water quality as time goes on.

Councilmember Chang said the DEIS property tax figure was irresponsible and that businesses can fail simply by reducing their amount of property. He expressed concern about the reduction in parking, noting that Shay's Restaurant will lose its parking under



either alternative. He asked whether the width of the sidewalk would vary along the corridor.

Mr. McKinley said the project design phase will include input from property owners and plans to utilize existing sidewalks. He noted that several businesses have recently built sidewalks that conform to code, including Seattle Restaurant Supply and Walgreens. Mr. Haines added that sidewalks do not include twelve feet of concrete, except for places where direct connections for pedestrians are needed.

Councilmember Chang expressed skepticism about accident rate statistics and said other statistics seem to contradict them. He also asked if the Interurban Trail could be used for a pedestrian safety buffer. Mr. McKinley said the State identified 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 165<sup>th</sup> Street as a high accident corridor and assumes that information is accurate. Regarding the Interurban Trail, he noted that it will not be lit at night, adding that pedestrian and bicycle activity would probably be minimized during those hours. He also noted that it is not parallel to Aurora Avenue on either end of the corridor.

Councilmember Chang said the merchants support sidewalks, but they want detailed information first. Mr. McKinley said there will be no detailed design until the environmental process is completed. He noted that the concept may change and the preferred alternative may not be selected until next year.

Mr. Haines said the City would do its best to evaluate options and help the Council arrive at a preferred alternative through subsequent meetings. He added that they are conforming to City policy regarding right-of-way acquisition and offered to review the process the City has adopted in compensating owners in acquisition situations.

Councilmember Chang referred to a Georgia DOT study regarding raised medians and felt the City should not be looking at studies done elsewhere, since Shoreline is unique. He estimated that 24 businesses may be lost in the three-mile corridor as a result of this project.

Mr. Haines said the right-of-way cost estimates for Phase 2 are about 3.5 times larger than Phase 1. He said the project includes many assumptions and that it is a long way from being designed.

Councilmember Chang expressed a desire to continue discussion on the right-of-way issue in the future.

Councilmember Montgomery said the vast majority of Shoreline citizens want the project to move forward, and expressed support of Alternative A, mainly due to the four-foot amenity zone. She also expressed a need for busses and wider sidewalks for elderly citizens. She said the aging community will be increasing in future years and that the project is in the best interest of the future of Shoreline. She noted that there could be some changes to the business community, but those changes would not be economically devastating as some have argued.

Deputy Mayor Grossman agreed with Councilmember Montgomery and said any report would include many assumptions. He said the long-term benefit is the overall improvement of Aurora Avenue. He noted that an influx of capital will create higher property values and more retail space. He agreed with Councilmember Chang in saying that some small businesses will have a difficult time making the transition, but this is mostly due to the natural cycle of business redevelopment. He said CH2MHill has a good reputation and believed the DEIS would hold up under scrutiny.

Councilmember Ransom asked if there were any studies about impacts to small businesses in other communities.

Mr. Burkett said they did not have any formal studies, although some comment letters claimed that businesses would lose revenue. He offered to look for more information.

Mayor Jepsen expressed the fact that the Council has a lot of information to digest. He noted some inconsistencies in testimony about whether businesses had been contacted about the DEIS. He also suggested that businesses look into what they are doing to address the storm water drainage problem on Aurora Avenue.

Mr. Haines said that public opinion numbers presented earlier were not meant to be an indication of how people voted but an indication of topics to be addressed.

#### 6(d) 2002 Second Quarter Financial Report

Mr. Burkett said the City has a good financial outlook, noting that expenditures were 8% less than projected for the first six months and revenues were up by 1.5% for the same period.

Finance Director Debbie Tarry discussed the major revenue and expenditure trends the City experienced through the Second Quarter of 2002. Her report included the following observations:

##### Revenues

- General Fund revenues were set at \$27 million when Council adopted the 2002 budget.
- After early first quarter results, projections increased approximately \$620,000, totaling \$27.6 million in GF revenues. Actual collections are at \$12.7 million after the second quarter, representing a 1.5% revenue increase over the projected \$12.5 million.
- Utility revenues and Parks & Recreation revenues are above projections.
- Interest income has dropped significantly due to a rate decrease in the investment market.
- Sales tax is stagnant, tracking slightly ahead of 2001, but not the same amount of growth the City has traditionally seen from year to year.
- There are increases in electricity, cable, telephone, and water revenues.

- The Shoreline Water District made both first and second quarter payments in the first quarter, but this revenue will even out in the third quarter.
- Parks revenue is up as a result of increased programming in Aquatics.
- Economic recovery in the Puget Sound region continues to fall behind the national economy.
- Interest income is below original budget projections -- the City has reduced projected revenue from that source from nearly \$559,000 to \$250,000 for this year.
- Gambling tax revenues continue to track below projections in the second quarter, but are somewhat better than at the end of the first quarter. All card rooms in Shoreline are down from 2001 activity.

#### Expenditures

- General Fund expenditures for the second quarter are 8% below projections, partially due to Council's agreement to use the Yakima jail system.
- Projected 2002 expenditures total \$26.5 million, \$.5 million less than the 2002 budget.
- The City is \$950,000 below projected expenditures at the end of the second quarter due to the jail savings and lagging King County billings. This will even out as time goes on.
- The Development Services Fund has seen revenues fall 5% (\$45,000) below projections due to the economy.
- The DSF is about \$8,000 below projections. Street Fund revenue is tracking slightly below projections due to the motor vehicle fuel tax.
- Street expenditures are ahead of projections, and projects that have lagged behind are more current.
- Some expenditures are based on historical trends.
- The projected total revenue of the Surface Water Fund will be below budget for the year by almost \$50,000 (2.1%) due to reduced investment income. The City has been tracking \$28,000 ahead at the end of second quarter, so there is a possibility of collecting the full amount by the end of the year. The City will continue to monitor this situation.

Ms. Tarry summarized the Second Quarter Financial Report on a positive note by saying that the General Fund is about 1.4 -1.5% above projections, which is good given the current economic climate. She added that expenditures are tracking with or closely below projections in most cases, and that the City will continue to monitor revenue sources. She noted the Development Services Fund as an area of concern, and said some changes in permit activity should be anticipated due to economic cycles. She added that the fund's accumulated reserves will ensure there is cash flow to maintain services through economic cycles. She concluded by stressing the difficulty of predicting the length of the economic downturn and its effect on balancing the budget.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, said the \$45,000 loss in permit revenues is partially due to the City forgiving Aegis \$17,000 in permit renewal fees. He said the City is not doing its job, and that everyone who takes out a building permit should be expected to pay. He felt regulations or not applied equitably and that the Mayor played a role in the fee waiver.

Councilmember Chang asked whether Aegis had been given a \$17,000 waiver of permit fees.

Mr. Burkett said he would check into it and follow up later with Council. He added that the City enforces the code uniformly and equally.

In the case of Aegis, Mr. Sievers said that a percentage of the initial building permit fee was due to extend the permit. He said Aegis asked to renew the permit and inquired about City policy with regard to permit renewal. He said Aegis was not able to continue with the project due to a stay, and therefore the extension fee was not charged. He said this policy would not apply solely to Aegis but to any project fitting the criteria.

Councilmember Hansen asked if there was a stay currently on the Aegis project, and Mr. Sievers answered that there was not a stay currently in effect.

Councilmember Ransom commented that the City is doing very well considering the economic downturn and difficulties in other cities and the business community.

The Council concluded the discussion by commending staff for their readable report.

#### 6(a) City Hall Project Update

Mr. Burkett introduced various issues associated with the City Hall Project. He stressed the principle of affordability and the fact that leasing space is the most expensive alternative.

Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager, introduced individuals from Olympic Associates, the project management firm recommended to manage the City Hall Project. Chris Edwards, Managing Principal, and Steve Paget, Project Manager, presented information about the company and the proposed scope of work.

Mr. Edwards presented background information on the company and its more than 47 years experience in the Puget Sound region. He noted the importance of project management's early involvement in the process. He said stop gaps are built into the project if the City chooses to dismiss Olympia Associates at any time. He introduced Steven Paget and outlined his company's scope of work, which includes the following:

- project coordination/organization
- in-house estimates
- constructability review

- programming
- design
- consultant and architect selection
- bidding and delivery process
- private/public partnerships

Mr. Paget reviewed the scope of services offered by Olympic Associates, emphasizing the use of risk management throughout the process. He said the company will manage the process, find out the City's needs and goals, develop a project charter, and carry out all work associated with completion of the project. He noted claims avoidance, cost control, and quality assurance as areas of specialty, and said the company employs mechanisms to identify potential risks and develop mitigation strategies.

Mr. Edwards identified risk management as the primary value of project management. He used the Shoreline Fire Department and Lake Forest Park as examples of projects that Olympic Associates managed. He said his company looks at the whole project in terms of scope, budget, wants, needs, ability to construct, ability to bid, and SEPA/land use regulations. He said he advised the City of Lake Forest Park to build new instead of renovating because of cost considerations.

Mr. Olander emphasized the importance of securing a project management firm from beginning to end to control the scope and cost of the project.

Deputy Mayor Grossman asked whether the firm had any experience in "deal structuring" or public/private partnerships. He felt the space requirements for the City could be an opportunity for some mixed-use development.

Mr. Burkett said the City is looking at that issue but it is not a significant part of a project manager's scope of work. He said the City may need to seek the advice of a specialist if it becomes an issue in the development of a particular site.

Mr. Edwards said his firm has experience in working with both public and private sectors. He said in most cases, a private client sees some advantage in a multi-use facility that may include another private firm or public agency. He noted that the Microsoft/Overlake Park & Ride project is a good example of such a partnership he helped facilitate with Sound Transit and WSDOT.

Mr. Olander added that all potential sites would be considered for partnering opportunities.

Councilmember Chang inquired about the site selection process and asked if the City would work with an architect and general contractor.

Mr. Burkett replied that the firm will choose the site based on criteria established by the Council, but ultimately the Council will choose the proposed site. Mr. Edwards said his firm would act as the City's representative to manage and facilitate this process.

Mr. Olander expressed support for a project manager approach because it is outside the architects' scope of work and can resolve potential conflicts between architects and builders.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the project management approach is merely adding an additional \$500,000 to the cost of a traditional architect/builder approach.

Mr. Burkett said there are several ways to get the job done. These include hiring staff, using an architect, or using a project manager. He noted the importance of staying within industry standards and projected costs, and said his evaluation leads him to believe a project manager is a good investment.

Mr. Edwards said the role of the architect in today's design business has changed. He said many architectural firms have lost the ability to provide construction services and the project management industry is simply filling that role.

Mr. Olander said the City is not duplicating but simply spreading out the tasks.

Mayor Jepsen said he would expect to see minimal staffing costs in a project management scenario because the City has hired representation. He characterized the agreement as a two-phase contract, noting that Phase 1 is the initial effort and Phase 2 is optional. He said it is important to hire a general contractor early in the process if a traditional approach is used.

Councilmember Hansen expressed support for the construction management approach because it functions as an independent party that will manage and mediate potential disputes.

#### 6(c) Draft Work Plan for Council Goal #7

Because of the hour, there was Council consensus to defer this item until the September 3<sup>rd</sup> Council Meeting.

#### 7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said the Aurora Corridor DEIS does not look at environmental considerations. She said the DEIS ignores the business owners that lease property and that the City will not fairly compensate them for right-of-way acquisition. She was disturbed by Deputy Mayor Grossman's comments as reported in the Shoreline Enterprise, and she stressed the Council's duty to protect the environment. She said the Metcalf project will encroach into the stream buffer by 100%, and she expects the City to protect stream buffers. She supported the elimination of two-way left turn lanes currently on Aurora Avenue.

(b) Ken Meyer, Seattle, felt the comment period for the Aurora EIS was too short. He commented on time limitations at the DEIS hearing and felt people should be allowed enough time to express their views. He felt the Council should not ignore late comments, noting other entities do not put such limitations on comment periods. He said the proposed sidewalk widths in the DEIS are a waste of concrete.

#### MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting for 25 minutes. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Councilmember Hansen dissenting.

(c) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, agreed with the previous speaker's testimony and expressed a need for better representation in the 32<sup>nd</sup> district. He asked if Mr. Burkett would like to make any comments regarding his previous tenure in Tallahassee.

Councilmember Hansen objected to Mr. Poland's comments and said he would not listen to degrading comments about Councilmembers, staff, or other citizens.

(d) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, opposed the presence of police officers at the meeting. She said even though politics are not always friendly, there is no need to treat the public like criminals. She reiterated her comments about appeals and commented that the mitigation proposed for the Aegis project does not follow the Code, since stream mitigation must be on-site and in-kind. She said mitigation on DOT property is not feasible, as there is no easement to park property. She asked why the City is withholding the stream inventory and said it was not using the best available science. She concluded that storm water runoff from the Aurora project will flow into Greenlake, Lake Union, and Ravenna Creek, and the people of Seattle should be notified of this.

(e) Tim Crawford, Shoreline, commented on the police presence at tonight's meeting and on the Aurora project. He feared that well-established businesses will be eliminated by the Aurora project and this should not be an option.

Councilmember Ransom said the Council was fully aware of Mr. Burkett's background and took that information into consideration when the City hired him. He added that Mr. Burkett was hired on the basis of his experience and performance in Fort Collins.

Mr. Burkett noted that he resigned in Tallahassee because he was no longer a good match for the City Council.

Deputy Mayor Grossman expressed disappointment with the tone of public comment. He said comments should focus on the issues and not degenerate into personal attacks. In response to Ms. Wacker's comments, he said the Enterprise article used his words out of context and said his emphasis was on the quality of the habitat, not just the size of stream setbacks.

Councilmember Montgomery said that rules of civility need to be enforced and public comments should not degenerate into personal attacks.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:18 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk