

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, October 4, 2004
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, Gustafson, and Ransom

ABSENT: Councilmember Grace

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exceptions of Councilmembers Chang, Fima and Ransom, who arrived shortly thereafter, and Councilmember Grace.

(a) **Proclamation of Arts and Humanities Month**

Mayor Hansen read the proclamation recognizing the social, economic and financial impact of the arts and proclaimed October 2004 as Arts and Humanities Month in the City of Shoreline. Vicki Stiles, Shoreline Historical Museum, and Ros Bird, Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council, accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for its support of the arts. They also outlined several activities going on in the community to celebrate the arts and humanities.

Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Chang and unanimously carried, Councilmember Grace was excused.

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

Tony Burt, Shoreline Police Chief, briefly commented on emergency preparedness related to the potential eruption of Mt. St. Helens.

Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager, reported on the following items:

- preliminary drilling at Ballinger Way NE and 19th Avenue NE for the Brightwater Project;

DRAFT

- new bus shelter crowns to be installed along Aurora Avenue;
- the clean-up of the pedestrian bridge over Interstate 5 at 195th Street;
- plantings at traffic circles and other landscaping treatments at various intersections;
- the Richmond Beach Volunteer project on October 16 to plant dune grass and other vegetation;
- completion of the Planning Commission public hearings on the Comprehensive Plan Update; and
- programs sponsored by the Police department and the Teen program.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor Hansen reported on his attendance at various events, including the Shoreline Solar Project and the north end mayor's meeting. He commented favorably on improvements made to the pedestrian path at Richmond Beach Saltwater Park, noting that the Richmond Beach volunteer project will be another opportunity to make additional improvements. He said the state might be moving closer to reaching an agreement on measures to increase state sales tax revenues. He also noted an Association of Washington Cities legislative agenda meeting regarding Brightwater.

Councilmember Ransom reported on his attendance at the Shoreline Solar Project and the Chamber of Commerce intergovernmental committee. He said the Chamber would host a candidate's forum on October 13, which includes candidates for superintendent of public instruction, state auditor, and state legislator. He noted that the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) and school funding would be major issues of debate. He also reported on the success of a motorcycle event sponsored by the Aurora Church of the Nazarene.

Councilmember Gustafson noted the destructive consequences of the 1980 Mount St. Helens eruption. He reported on his recent travels to Europe, particularly his experience at Normandy and Omaha Beach. He described the similarities and differences between the United States and Europe, noting the tremendous number of traffic circles in Europe. He felt there were certain features of European life that the City should consider adopting.

Mr. Olander noted that the Council materials include a response letter from Washington State Department of Transportation.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen reported on his attendance at the Chamber of Commerce Board of Director's Meeting and the SeaShore Transportation Forum, both held also in September. He also attended the National League of Cities (NLC) Community and Economic Development Steering Committee meeting and provided materials on economic development.

Councilmember Fimia reported on her attendance at the three public hearings on the Comprehensive Plan Update. She commended the efforts of the Planning Commission,

staff, consultants and the public to discuss the issues. She said the following issues were recurrent themes in the public hearings: environmental preservation; trees; recognition of Thornton Creek as a salmon-bearing creek; and surface water/flooding. She reported the Planning Commission decided to approve the Central Subarea Plan with the development codes. She noted that traffic circles work well in some areas, but not in areas with high pedestrian use.

Councilmember Ransom said he would return on Monday after attending the NLC Human Development Steering Committee meeting. He added that he has applied for the position of vice chair of that committee.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Charlotte Haines, Shoreline, provided photographs depicting the inadequacy of North City sidewalks for wheelchair users. She explained that the narrow widths, steep slopes and obstructions prevent wheelchairs from safely navigating the street. She encouraged the Council to consider accessibility for all people when it considers capital improvements or economic development. She offered the use of a wheelchair or scooter so Councilmembers could experience the challenge of navigating the existing sidewalks in North City.

(b) Sally Granger, Shoreline, urged the Council to reconsider the North City project, noting that economic development has been a goal of the City Council for years. She said 15th Avenue NE needs to be made a safer street, not a "speedway," with sidewalks that encourage more foot traffic. She noted that the restriping on 15th Avenue NE has made school access streets such as NE 168th Street safer. She said the 2001 five-day traffic count on this street was 3,329 vehicles; this year the count was 2,552 vehicles.

(c) Rick Stephens, Shoreline, said the City would not have an adequate economic development plan without the input of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce or the Shoreline Merchants Association (SMA). He asked how the plan was developed and how staff can ascertain the needs of existing businesses without consulting with them. He said a good process would involve all affected parties, including small and large businesses, home occupations, auto dealers, gaming businesses, the Chamber, and the SMA. He concluded that the City should take a broad-based, incremental, inclusive approach to ensure sound economic development strategies.

(d) Janet Way, Shoreline, commented on traffic circles, the death of Tia Townsend, and flooding on NE 175th Street. She noted the problems that traffic circles have created in eastern states such as New Jersey. She said the City has alleged in court that Tia Townsend caused her own death, and that the City should take responsibility, stop blaming the victim, and install a traffic light. She noted the devastating flood damage to homes on 10th Avenue and 11th Avenue, asserting that the Serpentine project has made the problem much worse. She said City staff failed to mention that the water pumped from the flooded homes is diverted to a creek. She said the City should look at

the impacts of its own actions and adequately address these issues in its Surface Water Master Plan.

(e) Jan Knudson, Shoreline, former Shoreline Economic Development Coordinator, encouraged the Council and community to create multiple partnerships in working toward economic development goals. She emphasized the importance of strategic partnerships with many entities, including Shoreline Community College, Shoreline School District, Economic Development Council of Greater Seattle-King County, Chamber of Commerce, Forward Shoreline, the North City Business Association, and the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council. She noted that each entity can play a unique role in attracting business and investment to Shoreline. She urged the Council to utilize all possible resources to unify the City through its economic development efforts.

Responding to Council, Mr. Olander noted there was a preliminary hearing on the Tia Townsend case; the actual trial is scheduled for April 2005. He said a more comprehensive briefing should take place in an executive session.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Non-human Powered Scooter Regulations

This workshop item was preceded by a discussion about Council direction at workshop meetings. Councilmember Fimia said if the Council is expected to provide a recommendation to staff in a workshop setting, she prefers that a vote be taken so it is clear which Councilmembers favor which options. Mayor Hansen noted that under the current practice, Councilmembers can always change their opinion when the final ordinance/resolution is presented. Councilmember Ransom felt it might be worthwhile to discuss this issue further since it is often unclear what direction is given to staff, and who supports which side. Mayor Hansen said in a situation where there is a lack of consensus, the Council usually identifies it, so in such a case the Council would not make a recommendation.

Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst, and Flannary Collins, Assistance City Attorney, provided background on the problems associated with the proliferation of motorized scooters in Shoreline, including the attendant noise and safety issues. He reviewed state regulations governing the use of motorized scooters, noting that scooters are treated much like bicycles, so there are generally no licensing, insurance, or helmet regulations. However, they are prohibited from use on bike paths or trails built or maintained with federal funding. He pointed out that similar devices, "mini-motorcycles," are not specifically mentioned in state law, but would be regulated much like regular motorcycles. He noted that mini-motorcycles would not be a legal use in most cities. He said the Shoreline Municipal Code includes a broad definition for public disturbance, and scooter noise would likely fit this definition.

He then described actions that other jurisdictions have taken to regulate the use of motorized scooters. Several cities have addressed scooter use in four primary areas: 1)

device definition; 2) identification of where the devices can be used; 3) identification of when they can be used; and 4) user responsibility. Most cities restrict use to streets with speed limits less than 25 miles per hour, and cities vary on where and when they can be used. User responsibilities relate to helmet and minimum age requirements and riding responsibly. He presented the Council with the following four options regarding scooter regulation in Shoreline:

1. Take no action
2. Increase enforcement
3. Adopt an ordinance regulating motor scooters; or
4. Prohibit the use of motor scooters from sidewalks, public trails, public parking lots, around public buildings, and in parks.

Mr. Seeger said the police department felt that legislative action is not yet warranted because the problem is not pervasive enough to justify an ordinance. He point out that the Municipal Research Services Center concluded that an outright ban on motorized scooters would violate state law. He concluded by recommends Option 2, noting that education, increased enforcement, and an incremental approach could solve the problem.

Councilmember Ransom wondered how motorized scooters differ from mopeds, noting that mopeds are usually less than a bicycle. Mr. Seeger said mopeds and electric-assisted bicycles are defined separately in state law and more closely resemble bicycles.

Mr. Olander noted that the City has asked state legislators to support this issue because it does not make sense in the long-term for individual jurisdictions to have different regulations. Mr. Seeger added that Representative Marilyn Chase plans to submit a bill during the 2005 legislative session.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed support for Option 2 and recommended that the City work with the State to address the problem. He also recommended involving the Youth Council, noting its feedback might be helpful in determining the correct approach. He felt the City could also use its media resources to help better educate the community.

Councilmember Chang noted his personal experience with scooter use in his neighborhood. He expressed support for Option 3, noting his concern about noise and safety. He felt the City should send a strong message to both minors and parents about the dangers of scooter use.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen encouraged the Council to review the MRSC publication and the ordinances adopted by other jurisdictions. He also supported the involvement of the Youth Council. He suggested putting the state legislation on Shoreline's legislative agenda, and then exploring an ordinance if the State does not address the issue this year.

Mayor Hansen shared Councilmember Chang's concern about parental responsibility, but felt imposing a minimum age requirement would simply create more law violators. He

avored taking no action at this time and working with the State Legislature and Youth Council.

Councilmember Fimia expressed her opinion that scooter use would proliferate if something is not done sooner. She noted that the noise and speed are two elements that make scooters attractive to youth. While she did not want to discourage scooter use entirely (since some may be using them as alternative transportation), she felt their misuse creates a public disturbance and a safety hazard. She supported acting now (Option 3) before the problem gets worse, noting that cities can lead by showing the State what constitutes a reasonable set of ordinances.

Mr. Seeger shared statistics suggesting that a percentage of adults use scooters as an alternative means of transportation.

Councilmember Ransom favored Option 3, noting that young children are recklessly misusing motor scooters at the skateboard park. He expressed concerns about their excessive speeds and about hazards to users and pedestrians. He also favored getting feedback from the Youth Council.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that motor scooter use is prohibited in City parks, so enforcement could address the problem at the skateboard park.

Councilmember Fimia wondered if the City could prohibit motorized scooters but allow electric scooters. Mr. Olander and Ms. Collins felt that restricting use to electric scooters only would effectively ban motorized scooters, thereby violating state law and running afoul of the MRSC opinion.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen concurred, noting that the MRSC opinion states that cities cannot require training or licensing, and cannot ban them.

Mayor Hansen summarized each Councilmember's position, noting that Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Ransom favor a draft ordinance.

Councilmember Gustafson felt there was consensus on allowing the Youth Council to come up with a recommendation that could be submitted to state legislators.

Councilmember Fimia felt the City should draft an ordinance to give people "something to react to." She felt another workshop could be scheduled to get Council, legislators, the Youth Council, and citizens to respond collaboratively to a draft ordinance.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt the Council should see how the issue plays out in the legislature before expending local time and resources. He felt it would be preferable to have a uniform state law rather than having many different laws throughout the County. He felt the City could still take action if the legislature does not respond.

Mr. Olander summarized that staff would work with the legislature; develop a public process that involves students and other stakeholders in the community; conduct enhanced enforcement of current regulations in City parks and trails; and continue to research a draft ordinance so that the City can act in the spring if the legislature does not take action.

The Council then discussed resources that could be used to educate the community and get feedback, including the newspaper, website, Channel 21, *Currents*, the school district, PTA, and the Council of Neighborhoods. Councilmember Fimia emphasized the importance of having a bicycle helmet law in Shoreline. Mayor Hansen noted that most scooter violations can be enforced under existing law. He stressed the importance of parental responsibility and judgment. He said he would inquire of the Suburban Cities Association to find out what other cities are doing about scooters. Mr. Olander said the Association of Washington Cities might be able to propose a bill to the legislature on behalf of cities.

(b) Economic Development Strategic Plan

Mr. Olander noted that this topic has already been discussed at two prior Council meetings. He emphasized the need for a strategic plan to provide Shoreline with economic vitality and the financial stability to ensure basic services and infrastructure. He said the proposed plan has been developed over the past several months and includes input from Forward Shoreline and the Chamber of Commerce. He said the goal is to get consensus and direction this evening and return the plan for adoption on October 25.

Councilmember Ransom, speaking for himself and Councilmembers Chang and Fimia, suggested the following additions to the proposed strategies:

- S1—“Continue pursuing growth in retail sales and increase family wage jobs and office development to ensure financial stability and economic vitality. (Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested “Continue pursuing growth in retail, family wage jobs, and office development . . .”)
- S7—“With work existing and new businesses to continue development incentives such as fee waivers, designated Planned Action areas, business relocation strategies, parcel assembly, grant and low-interest loan funding.”
- S8—to add more specificity to “help facilitate,” by adding “including options for paying for these amenities such as business improvement districts and neighborhood grants . . .”
- S9—add a reference to getting an inventory of areas where development might best occur.

He noted the importance of ensuring that the development permit process (proposed strategy S-3) is timely. He pointed out that over the years the City has drifted away from its goal of a “one-stop shop” process in favor of a protracted, sequential process. He noted that in the past the Council stressed the processing permits within 90 days of submitting a complete application.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that state law mandates that the permit process be completed within 120 days of a complete application.

Councilmember Ransom said it has taken over six months in some cases, and over a year in others, to complete the application process. He asserted that developers are often uncertain about what the City requires, noting the City has added additional requirements during the process.

Mr. Olander agreed that the underlying goal is a timely permit process, noting that the City has made great strides in streamlining the process to make it less sequential. He said the City strives to process permits before the 120-day deadline, but it does not exceed the 120-day requirement. He noted that applicants are instructed of all their requirements at a pre-application meeting, but if the application is missing necessary information or is incomplete in some other way, it stops the 120-day clock.

Mayor Hansen related his personal experience of working with the City of Edmonds to construct an office building. He said that the City of Edmonds “changed the rules” after first informing him of the requirements. He felt the City of Shoreline should be able to communicate all the requirements at the beginning of the process.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen agreed with trying to ensure predictability and the “one-stop shop” concept, but emphasized that predictability goes both ways. He said while developers want predictability in the permit process, the public also wants to be aware of what development is being proposed. He wished to ensure the public is adequately notified of what is happening so it is not “blind-sided” by a fast-moving development proposal. He asked for specific examples of when it has taken six to twelve months to submit a complete application. Councilmember Ransom said that various business people and developers have made such statements, although he could not personally verify the veracity of their claims.

Mayor Hansen commented that Shoreline Bank was ultimately satisfied with the permit process for the construction of its new building.

Councilmember Ransom noted that he and Councilmembers Chang and Fimia support strategy S-6, implementation of a low-cost business registration system. He said this would benefit the City by providing an inventory of the number and types of businesses in Shoreline. He said at one time the Chamber listed 350 businesses, and that there are an estimated 4,000 home occupation businesses operating within the City. He pointed out that small businesses have the best potential for growth.

Mayor Hansen wondered if the City could get such business statistics from State records. Councilmember Ransom indicated that the Chamber had some difficulty getting such information previously. He added that former Police Chief Turner indicated she would like to have an inventory of the type of businesses in Shoreline.

Mayor Hansen felt that many small businesses would be reluctant to register with the City, in which case their records would likely be available through the State.

Mr. Olander noted that the fire chief has expressed support for a business registration program.

Councilmembers Ransom and Fimia explained the rationale for their proposed addition to S-7, noting that existing businesses need to be reemphasized. Councilmember Fimia felt the City should try to repair the relationship between some businesses and the City. Councilmember Gustafson felt making a distinction between existing and new businesses was unnecessary.

Councilmember Ransom explained the rationale for changes to S-9, noting that the City needs an inventory of all potential development areas before it works with developers on proposals. He noted that the Edmonds Economic Development director is aware of all available properties in Edmonds.

Mayor Hansen wondered if the Geographic Information System (GIS) would provide information about available properties. Mr. Olander said it would probably show undeveloped or under-developed properties, but it would not show properties on the real estate market.

After additional discussion, Councilmember Ransom, again speaking for the three Councilmembers, proposed the following additional strategies:

- 1) Form a standing committee of the representatives of the public, neighborhood, existing businesses and Councilmembers to advise on strategic economic planning and implementation;
- 2) Identify a potential inclusive process for working with the State and stakeholders in the redevelopment of the Fircrest property;
- 3) Building on Shoreline's strengths to explore the viability of maximizing assets such as education, international and environmental bases; for example, developing an Education Center of the Northwest, International and Cultural Center, International District North;
- 4) Work to expand existing businesses, which is where the jobs are; and
- 5) Develop measurable goals that are clearly tied to the City's efforts and investments.

Councilmember Fimia added that the biggest concerns for these three Councilmembers are the lack of confidence 1) that what is proposed is a strategic plan; 2) that the plan reflects input from enough people; and that 3) the City's resources would be used efficiently and effectively under this plan. She made the following comments to support her point:

- The City Manager sent an e-mail stating that the Chamber of Commerce goals are the antithesis of pride in Shoreline.

- Two major business districts are now at odds with City existing capital development plans and have requested modifications.
- The owner of Frank Lumber was told his type of business did not fit with the plan and that he should go elsewhere or expect impossible demands should he expand.
- The requests for additional left-turn lanes off the Aurora corridor by established businesses have been ignored by the City Manager.
- Forward Shoreline was awarded a sole-source contract with the City, even after Councilmembers voiced concern that the City should facilitate a more inclusive process.
- The City Manager did not follow through and bring back a plan for the option to implement the Central Subarea Plan by doing demonstration projects with existing businesses. Instead, the Council never got to vote on anything and the City Manager brought in an outside developer rather than work with existing businesses per Council direction.
- Shoreline continues to get single-story, single-use retail development in prime commercial areas.

She concluded that Shoreline needs a more comprehensive, inclusive, and specific plan, noting that the proposed plan does not maximize Shoreline's unique potential. She proposed that the City form an ongoing standing committee comprised of different groups in the community, which would provide direction and oversight on economic development policies. She felt since the contract has already been awarded to Forward Shoreline, the City should wait to see what it produces before hiring an Economic Development Coordinator.

Mayor Hansen said the quote attributed to the City Manager and himself regarding Frank Lumber is absolutely false. He said Mr. Sims (owner of Frank Lumber) was told the City would be glad to work with him on his redevelopment proposal, and that he was encouraged to stay in Shoreline. Councilmember Ransom noted that Mr. Sims claims the City Manager made those comments at a later time.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen had several questions regarding the proposed changes to the strategies. He said the Council letter to the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) was not only asking for clarification about left-turn access, but was also asking to delete medians and include unsignalized crosswalks. He felt the City already has an economic development committee in the form of the Chamber of Commerce Economic Development Subcommittee, which he has been attending to get a sense of their issues. He felt the City and Chamber share many similar concerns. He expressed general support for changes proposed for strategies S-1 and S-7, but noted that Councilmember Ransom did not elaborate on changes proposed for strategy S-8.

Councilmember Ransom said the intent of changes to S-8 is to identify funding options, such as business improvement districts or neighborhood mini-grants. Deputy Mayor Jepsen said he could support the change since any business that wants to form a business improvement district can do so. Councilmember Ransom explained that an Aurora

business group wanted to form a neighborhood association, but was denied the opportunity to participate in the Council of Neighborhoods.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt that S-9 and other proposed changes are actually tasks, or actions, that would fall under the more general policy. He did not feel it was necessary to call out specific items, such as Fircrest and education/cultural/international centers, in a general policy document. He felt if those items are not identified as priorities in the Comprehensive Plan update process, then perhaps they should not be included. He noted the current process in the Planning Commission to obtain public input on the Comprehensive Plan update.

Councilmember Fimia stressed the importance of being proactive on the Fircrest issue, noting that the state will act unilaterally and Shoreline will not have an effect on the decision if it waits to respond. She said many citizens have mentioned Fircrest as a priority.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen felt that if Fircrest is a public priority, then it would be recognized as such in the Comprehensive Plan update. He also suggested that additional language could be added to strengthen proposed strategy 5d (work with existing businesses).

Responding to Mayor Hansen, Councilmember Ransom said he identified “number of jobs created” as a measurable goal, since this information is available from the State.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that the upcoming joint dinner meeting with Enterprise Seattle, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, and Forward Shoreline would present another opportunity to refine the plan.

Councilmember Fimia said the joint meeting is all the more reason not to approve the proposed plan since there will be additional input. She objected to the measurable goals identified in the Forward Shoreline contract, which include annual City sales tax collections per capita, annual dollar value of new commercial permits, and assessed valuation of commercial property as a ratio of total City assessed valuation. She felt such measurements could be affected by countless other variables. She recommended specific quantitative and qualitative measures that can be attributed to City investments in an economic development position or capital infrastructure.

Councilmember Ransom questioned whether the City’s investment in Forward Shoreline would yield the desired results. He noted that Forward Shoreline is mainly focusing on Aurora Square, but apart from that it does not seem to have any specific goals. He felt that specific things must be accomplished, regardless of whether the City hires an economic development coordinator or a consultant. He felt an economic development coordinator could focus on existing businesses but also work to attract new businesses to Shoreline with marketing tools such as a promotional video.

Mr. Olander felt that the specifics could be “fleshed out” in a more detailed work plan once the Council adopts more broad-based strategies.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed support for hiring an economic development coordinator. He felt it was not the Council's job to "micromanage," and that forming another committee would not be particularly useful. He felt the dinner meeting would provide additional feedback the Council could use to craft a general policy. He felt the Council's job is to provide general guidelines, and staff's job is to return with specific proposals that fit the general policy.

Councilmember Chang noted that the City has experienced the same poor economic growth for the past nine years because it has not changed its strategy. He suggested that a local coalition of Councilmembers, staff, the business community, and others could help create the vision, leadership, and direction for economic development. He felt this should be attempted before hiring an economic development coordinator, which he felt has not been very effective in the past. He also suggested that the City wait to see the results of Forward Shoreline's efforts. He stressed the importance of having specific goals, measurement criteria, and strategic plans to encourage Shoreline residents to shop in Shoreline.

Mayor Hansen concurred with Councilmember Chang's comments, but disagreed that Shoreline has had poor economic growth. He noted that sales tax revenues have significantly increased since City incorporation. He felt the best way for Shoreline to achieve economic growth is by improving its own infrastructure. He noted that the North City project is an example of a capital improvement project that will attract investment dollars. He felt the prior economic development coordinator was effective in promoting Shoreline as an attractive place to invest.

Councilmember Chang noted that most of the growth in sales tax revenues was the result of the development at Aurora Village, not necessarily a result of City action. He reiterated the importance of working together with the Chamber and other entities on a broad-based plan.

Councilmember Ransom noted that a past coordinator kept economic development very confidential and did not inform the Council what was going on. He supported forming an independent economic development committee so the system is kept open and all interested parties are actively involved. He said highly successful cities have very involved councils. He stressed the importance of involvement of the Chamber, noting that when he tried to attract 50 retail businesses to Shoreline, the first thing they wanted to do is talk to the Chamber.

Mr. Olander suggested continuing the discussion to the October 18 Council meeting since there were several unresolved issues.

Councilmember Fimia pointed out that sales tax figures for the past few years have remained relatively stagnant. She noted that there is a rift between the City and a significant number of businesses in Shoreline. She said the North City project could move forward as soon as the Council can find a compromise on a reasonable investment

figure. She did not feel the Council is micromanaging staff, but that Council is doing the appropriate job and being accountable. She said staff wants general language in the policy so it has as much leeway to operate, however, that approach has not been successful in the past. She felt Council needs to “take the reins in a little more” and see how Forward Shoreline and the Chamber work out before making a \$100,000 investment in a new position.

Councilmember Ransom felt that the square footage of retail and office space might also serve as a useful indicator. He noted that developers relate the amount of retail/office space they have directly to retail sales. He concurred with Councilmember Chang that the biggest growth to tax revenues came with the development of Costco and Home Depot, although revenues have now stabilized. He felt attracting another large company like Costco or an auto dealership would be difficult.

Mayor Hansen agreed that Costco and Home Depot have contributed greatly to sales tax growth, but those stores also replaced a dying retail development known as Aurora Village, which had around 60 stores. He said this kind of redevelopment situation would probably happen in Shoreline from time to time.

Councilmember Gustafson felt the City’s capital improvement projects, such as the Aurora Corridor, Interurban Trail, North City, and the Central Subarea Plan would contribute greatly to the City’s economic base and make Shoreline more business-friendly. He felt this is where the focus should be because businesses have already expressed an interest in developing in Shoreline if it completes these projects.

Councilmember Fimia emphasized the need to increase the quality of infrastructure in the entire City, not just on a few expensive projects. She noted that sidewalks and other amenities are infrastructural improvements that also attract people to Shoreline. She felt the City should take an incremental approach and not try to do too much too quickly.

On another topic, Councilmember Ransom wished to discuss the process for appointment of the new Planning Commissioner. Mayor Hansen said this could be discussed at next week’s dinner meeting.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Councilmember Fimia moved to extend the meeting to 10:10 p.m. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Councilmember Gustafson dissenting.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Janet Way, Shoreline, supported the ideas expressed by Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Ransom, noting that other Councilmembers should not “blockade” their positive suggestions for progress, proactivity, and collaboration. She agreed with Councilmember Fimia that the business districts are not happy with the City’s capital

improvement plans. She noted there is currently no public process for Fircrest, but there is a stoplight being installed at NE 150th and 15th Avenue NE, so it appears someone has an agenda there. She felt the City should adopt a more positive agenda and address the real needs in Shoreline. She confirmed that children are riding motorize scooters inappropriately at Paramount Park.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:08 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk