

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, October 25, 2004
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 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.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reported on the status of various capital improvement projects, including Phase 3 of the Interurban Trail and the 3rd Avenue NW Drainage project. He also reported on the 22 volunteers who assisted in planting over 2,000 shrubs and plants at the Richmond Beach Saltwater Park to provide soil stabilization. He requested that Council amend the agenda to take the budget presentation after the consent calendar.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:

Councilmember Fimia reported on the success of the Chamber of Commerce auction event.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Ken Cottingham, Shoreline, urged the Council to read the 43-page traffic engineering report he produced on the Aurora Corridor project, which includes analysis of two main design options: 1) full median restriction; and 2) retention of partial two-way left turn lanes. He said the Council could use it to potentially refute Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) assertions regarding two-way left-turn lanes. He emphasized that the City could negotiate with WSDOT, as other jurisdictions have, in

gaining concessions on the project design. He said the City of Everett was successful in deleting raised medians from a portion of its Highway 99 improvement project. He urged the Council to come up with its own design and call on WSDOT to discuss what can actually be built.

(b) Rick Stephens, Shoreline business owner, said Mr. Cottingham's report exposes the fact that WSDOT's insistence on raised medians is not supported by accident data. He said the frequency and severity of accidents in Washington State continue to be lower than the national average. He said based on traffic volumes, the Aurora Corridor project would not significantly decrease the accident rate, nor would it increase traffic capacity. He asserted the project would create higher traffic volumes in adjacent neighborhoods. He urged the Council to reconsider the proposal to retain two-way left-turn lanes, which would reduce the cost and size of the overall roadway and yet still provide access for businesses to survive.

(c) Bronston Kenney, Shoreline, said the developer who plans to build on 8th Avenue NW has still not resolved several neighborhood concerns relating to stormwater drainage and quality construction. He alleged that developers want to build inferior-quality homes to the maximum densities possible, which detracts from neighborhoods and reduces property values. He said it is Council's responsibility to adopt broad policies to ensure that new construction maintains or enhances existing neighborhoods.

(d) Dale Wright, Shoreline, said that many of the statements made by merchants and other critics of the Aurora Corridor Project have been shown to be inaccurate or misleading. He said they do not talk about the goals of the Aurora Corridor, nor the benefits of improved traffic safety that raised medians will provide. He said based on studies in other states, raised medians and limited access can reasonably be expected to reduce traffic and pedestrian accidents by approximately 40 percent. He said critics have not acknowledged studies showing that converting from two-way left-turn lanes to raised medians will not have an overall negative impact on the adjacent business community. He said it disturbs him that critics insist that only their demands should prevail, particularly when the Aurora Corridor project represents the consensus of the community. He urged the Council to make decisions that reflect the interests of the overall community, not just some "self-interested, special interest groups."

(e) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, thanked the Aurora Avenue property owners who commissioned the Cottingham traffic report and encouraged the Council to study it closely. She said the report is "best available science" and reflects the concerns of many property owners, taxpayers, and drivers about the current design. She concurred that the proposed design would decrease traffic capacity and "permanently divide the City between City Hall and the business community." She said raised medians mean fewer opportunities to access businesses, asserting that drivers would likely drive through Shoreline on their way to more accessible businesses in Edmonds, Lynnwood, and Seattle. She said eliminating the two-way left-turn lane in favor of medians requires drivers to make inconvenient and dangerous u-turns to access businesses, which is not a reasonable approach for Aurora Avenue. She questioned whether the project is simply a

way to add sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping without increased traffic capacity or improved safety.

(f) Diana Stephens, President of the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, reported on the success of the Chamber of Commerce “Dollars for Scholars” auction event, which raised over \$43,000 for student scholarships. She then invited the community to participate in a Chamber-sponsored Halloween event at the Ballinger Shurgard Storage on October 30, and a blood drive on November 8 at the Shoreline Conference Center.

(g) Mark Mitchell, Shoreline business owner, noting that he lost over \$1 million in revenue last year, said that local casinos could no longer compete with tribal casinos due to the high tax rate. He said if Initiative 892 fails, local casino owners would likely request a property tax decrease in order to survive. He said the amount paid in local taxes is almost “obscene,” and that there is very little income from pull tabs anymore. He said with the high tax rate and the Aurora Corridor project’s impact on his business, it will be nearly impossible to survive.

There was Council consensus to suspend the rules to allow the remaining speakers to comment. Mayor Hansen asked that comments be limited to two minutes.

(h) Bob Mitchell, Shoreline business owner, encouraged the Council to support I-892. He said the City should not be overly concerned about losing revenue from pulltabs because it only receives 5% of the gross sales. However, the City receives 11% of the gross sales from cardrooms, so it would be more advantageous to focus on ways to increase that activity.

(i) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, characterized the Shoreline business community as having three distinct personalities, seen in: 1) the Chamber of Commerce; 2) the Shoreline Merchants Association; and 3) Forward Shoreline. She pointed out that although the City signed a \$25,000 contract with Forward Shoreline this year, it signed a \$30,000 contract with the Chamber of Commerce when the City first incorporated. She said the membership rolls of these organizations overlap, so these organizations must determine how they can work together as a single economic unit.

(j) Henk Kunnen, North City business owner, urged the Council to revise the road configuration in front of his business on 15th Avenue NE. He said the current configuration, which merges two lanes into one directly before a crosswalk, results in “road rage” and would likely result in additional traffic accidents. He felt the two-lane configuration should continue south beyond the pedestrian crosswalk.

(k) Larry Wheaton, representing Goldie’s Casino, said that raised medians on Aurora Avenue, as well as the impacts of the construction itself, would have a very detrimental effect on his business. He noted that Goldie’s employs 160 people and it paid \$750,000 in tax revenue to Shoreline last year. He asserted that 50% of his patrons access his business by making a left turn, which would no longer be possible under the

DRAFT

proposed design for Aurora Avenue. He urged the Council to possibly consider decreasing the tax burden or doing whatever else it can to help him stay in business.

(1) Mark Deutsch, Shoreline, noted that a broad spectrum of stakeholders who participated in both the Aurora Corridor and North City projects agreed that these projects would result in more “walkable” communities. He said the Planning Commission recently affirmed this idea by endorsing the Central Subarea Plan. He said it would be more appropriate to submit Mr. Cottingham’s report to WSDOT, since it made the determination that raised medians would improve vehicular and pedestrian safety on Aurora Avenue. He expressed concern about trying to adjust the project to meet the demands of those who are complaining “at the last minute.” He said the City should address the people who support Shoreline, not those who advertise their business as being part of Seattle. He concluded that both Shoreline and Seattle have implemented road reductions with good results.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Ransom moved to approve the agenda, taking the 2005 budget presentation and the North City discussion immediately following the consent calendar. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the agenda was approved as amended.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Gustafson moved approval of the consent calendar. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following items were approved:

**Minutes of Workshop Meeting of October 4, 2004
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of October 11, 2004
Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 11, 2004**

**Approval of expenses and payroll for the period ending
October 8, 2004 in the amount of \$575,499.62**

**Temporary Encroachment at N 152nd Street and Aurora
Avenue, Aurora Corridor Improvement Project, N 145th
Street to N 165th Street**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Presentation of the 2005 Proposed Budget

Mr. Burkett presented the 2005 Proposed Budget, outlining the adoption schedule, the key events in its formulation and the guiding principles for its development. He emphasized the principle of limiting the City’s dependence on unstable revenue sources

DRAFT

and using one-time revenues for one-time expenditures. He said the City enjoys an excellent financial position due to its balanced budget, adequate reserves, and low debt load. The proposed 2005 budget totals \$77.4 million, which primarily provides the same level of services as last year. The operating budget is \$35 million, an 8.7 percent increase from 2004, primarily the result of the 2005 budget including a \$4 million transfer from the General Fund to the General Capital Projects Fund for the construction of City Hall. Without this one-time transfer, the operating budget would have actually decreased from 2004 by \$1.2 million, or 3.7 percent.

Continuing, Mr. Burkett explained the various sources of the City's funds and compared Shoreline to other King County cities in terms of property tax revenue. Shoreline's revenue from property tax for 2005 is projected at \$6.8 million, or 9 percent of the City's total revenues (this includes a proposed 1 percent increase in the levy). Growth in sales tax revenue is projected at 3 percent for 2005.

He then moved on to highlight major operating and capital budget changes for 2005, including a \$547,000 increase in personnel costs, a \$458,000 increase in the public safety budget, the establishment of a Capital Facilities Repair and Replacement Fund (\$120,000) and payment of debt service for the Public works Trust Fund Loan (\$293,000). Personnel increases result from step increases for eligible employees, increases in health insurance premiums, and increases to the City contribution to the state retirement system. He explained several one-time budget allocations from General Reserves for the City Hall project, emergency and insurance contingencies, road surface maintenance project, an HVAC system for the police station, and a new roof for the pool.

He reviewing the recommended revenue and fee changes, including market adjustments for building permit fees and recreational fees, and a surcharge on the surface water utility. He then highlighted items in the 2005 Capital budget for facilities and parks, including City Hall, Spartan Gym upgrades, City gateways, Saltwater Pedestrian Bridge, the police HVAC system, and the pool roof. In the transportation budget he reviewed various projects, including the Interurban Trail, Richmond Beach Overcrossing, North City/15th Avenue, Aurora Phase I, the annual road surface program, Aurora Phase II, the Dayton Avenue/N 175th Street retaining wall, and the pedestrian and traffic improvement program. He concluded by outlining surface water projects, including Ronald Bog Drainage, 3rd Avenue NW, and other small projects.

Mr. Burkett then discussed possible future budget issues and long-range financial projections, which predict that expenditures will exceed available revenues in future years. He outlined his recommendations to implement a utility tax on the surface water utility, increase recreation fees by approximately 10 percent and enhance the city's scholarship program, and in 2006 implement a revenue-generating regulatory business license program and place a franchise fee of six percent on the distribution portion of Seattle City Light utility fees. He also recommended that Council consider a property tax levy lid lift in 2007. Despite the long-term financial outlook, the City enjoys a strong economic position due to its balanced budget, adequate reserves, and the fact that it has no General Fund debt obligations. It has accomplished all this while maintaining the

ability to improve its infrastructure. He concluded by thanking the Finance Director, staff, and City departments for their efforts in preparing this budget.

(b) North City Project

Mr. Burkett explained that staff has done further analysis of options for North City in response to the Council's decision not to award the bid for North City since the bids were higher than the engineer's estimates. He noted that the options assume a four-lane street configuration in the North City Business District (NCBD).

Councilmember Fimia clarified that several Councilmembers favor the four-lane configuration for the entire corridor and view the North City project as the work encompassing the entire length of 15th Avenue NE.

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, said his discussion of options in the North City Business District would not preclude any other options for the remaining corridor. He explained that the options analyzed by staff consider the original vision that the North City Plan was meant to achieve. This vision includes: visually narrow roadways; calm traffic through the streetscape improvements; buildings adjacent to the street; a sense of urban closure by placing parking behind buildings; creation of a pedestrian shopping district; wider, more contiguous sidewalks; buffered pedestrian zones with on-street parking and street trees; opportunities for pedestrian crossings; and encouragement of redevelopment of the area while preserving the privacy and safety of the adjacent neighborhoods. The options presented tonight reflect the fact that most of the opposition to the proposed project relates to the change to three lanes. These options proceed with the project in a four-lane alignment.

Continuing, Mr. Haines outlined the advantages and disadvantages of the three options as follows:

- Option 1: Utilizing existing design and stripe for four lanes. This option is largely the same as the original design but adjusts for a four-lane configuration. Staff estimates additional engineering costs of \$45,000-65,000 to ready plans/ bid documents for a bid process as early as January 2005. Staff believes this option has the best potential for moving the project forward quickly and economically, as winter/early spring is a favorable time to seek bids. The narrow lane width of this design may increase inconvenience to motorists accessing business driveways.
- Option 2 – Remove curb bulbouts and stripe for 4 lanes. This option modifies the design to be the same as the ultimate curb line envisioned by the subarea plan. It allows for more convenient turning movements in and out of business driveways, preserves tree and urban amenity zones, and maintains on-street parking. It is expected that construction would be completed prior to major construction on Aurora Avenue. This option also maintains Seattle City Light funding commitments. Estimated engineering cost to modify the plan is \$160,000-180,000, with a re-bid schedule estimated for March 2005. It includes narrow

DRAFT

lanes, removes some landscaped planters areas, and may require driveway ramps in part of the sidewalk zone.

- Option 3 – Reprioritize project as part of the 2006-2011 Capital Improvement Plan. Under this option it is not possible to predict whether there would be additional costs or modified plans. The disadvantage to this option is that schedule commitments may be disruptive to other entities planning on project construction. In addition, Shoreline would be required to reestablish itself as a budget priority for Seattle City Light.

Councilmember Fimia asked if Option 1 includes any major cost savings over the original proposal. Mr. Haines said the potential cost savings in Option 1 would be advertising the project in a favorable bid climate. Mr. Burkett said if the Council could agree on any of the scope reductions identified by staff, they could be put into the design and then rebid to see what the new costs would be.

Councilmember Ransom noted that staff identified “narrow lanes” in Option 1 as both an advantage and disadvantage because it achieves the stated desire for a four-lane configuration but reduces the width of individual travel lanes to approximately 10 feet.

Mr. Haines concurred, noting that while narrow travel lanes will achieve a “natural calming” of the corridor, they would be more inconvenient for motorists turning into business driveways. He said a 10-foot width is more conventional for an urban-level improvement in a higher density business district, whereas wider lanes would be better suited for an arterial. He clarified that the three-lane configuration had 12-foot center lanes and 14-foot outside lanes.

Councilmember Grace clarified that he requested this item be placed on the agenda tonight because of his desire to achieve a resolution before the Council’s time is dominated by discussions on the budget and Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, recommended Option 1, since it includes the most amenities, can be implemented quickly, and would achieve environmental and economic objectives. She said the project will fulfill the environmental objectives of achieving mixed-use density as required by the Growth Management Act, noting that underground utilities is critical to mixed-use development. She said the project is economic because thousands of people are depending on the infrastructure improvements to water, gas, sewer, and telecommunications. She said not taking the advice of the economic development coordinator is like “going to the doctor and not taking the doctor’s advice.” She said the staff proposal will meet the obligations made with utility companies and deliver an environmental and economically sound project that will show what a good neighborhood business district can be.

DRAFT

(b) Sally Granger, Shoreline, urged the Council to vote for the project, noting that it was put on hold because 700 people said they don't want a two-lane road. She said the letters of opposition as advertised in the *Shoreline Enterprise* only reference the two-lane configuration.

(c) Rick Stephens, Shoreline business owner, said that local businesses are very unhappy with the City's lack of understanding and inclusiveness. He said the City could resolve the North City project rather quickly if it met with the business community to work out the differences. He said the width of the sidewalks could be reduced in some places because the trenches connecting the ten-foot underground utility vaults are only four feet wide.

(c) Richard Johnsen, Shoreline, described the current difficulty of negotiating traffic using the left-turn lane in North City. He surmised that if 15th Avenue were changed to a three-lane configuration, it would likely create a "massive traffic jam." He wondered if the narrow lanes described in Option 1 would accommodate future Metro buses. He expressed a preference for a combination of Option 1 and Option 2, but felt the City should take more time to consider its options for the corridor. He also suggested that the City conduct a peak-hour traffic study.

(d) John Sims, owner of Frank Lumber, said he opposes the project because it has not been done with the businesses in mind. He said the Council has not been aware of the business or employment situation in North City, and the process went forward without their input. He said North City is a "great area the way it is now," and that the proposed configuration will make businesses leave North City. He said he would like the City to "say no to this and walk away from it before it's too late." He concluded that he is moving part of his business to Marysville.

Councilmember Ransom asked Mr. Sims which aspect of the project he feels would do damage to businesses in North City.

Mr. Sims said the overall plan, including the conversion to the two-lane road, has already done damage to businesses by keeping traffic from entering the business area. He said he has lost one-quarter of his business after 3:00 p.m. due to the lane reduction.

Councilmember Fimia asked Mr. Sims if he or other business owners would object to extending the sidewalks north and south on 15th Avenue (where there are currently no sidewalks).

Mr. Sims said the 1,500 letters submitted to the City reflect that people want sidewalks around schools; they did not necessarily comment on the North City project specifically. He said people do not think the business district is a problem the way it is.

Councilmember Gustafson moved Option 1 as proposed by staff. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion.

Mayor Hansen felt the Council should have an open discussion and refrain from making a decision on the project tonight.

Councilmember Gustafson spoke in favor of the motion, noting that Option 1 would achieve the City's goals and benefit the adjacent neighborhoods and business community in a variety of ways.

Councilmember Grace said it is critical for him to understand the extent of collaboration with utility companies as well as the costs of undergrounding. He asked staff to clarify whether the City is defraying most of the cost when it should really be shared among the various utilities.

Mr. Haines explained that all the utility companies have programmed improvements for the corridor because it is cost effective and convenient to coordinate with an entity (Seattle City Light) that already plans to underground utilities. He said the City can take advantage of a single road closure and potentially the same contractors, and the finished product would likely be higher in quality. He said the Shoreline Water District plans to upgrade its system regardless of the City's decision. He said the cost will show up in the City's contract, but Seattle City Light will reimburse the City for its costs, including the repairs associated with their vaults and conduits. He said the City would probably have to pay most of the costs to underground telecommunications lines.

Councilmember Ransom moved a substitute motion to eliminate curb bulbs at intersections and driveways (saving \$90,000), eliminate art amenities and plantings (another \$90,000 savings), and stripe for four lanes from 172nd northward. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion.

At Councilmember Grace's request, everyone withdrew their motions and seconds so that the Council could determine if there was consensus on any elements of the project. The discussion continued with no motions on the table.

Councilmember Ransom said one of the key differences among the Councilmembers is the weight to which they give the letters that were submitted. He commented on the 1,500 letters opposing the project, compared to the 150 favoring it. He said he received 140 personal phone calls against the project, versus 30 in favor of it. He said a conventional formula for determining public sentiment is multiplying the number of personal contacts by ten, which would mean that approximately 1,400 people oppose the project while only 300 support it. He felt this is a clear and convincing indication that people do not want the project. He said he and other Councilmembers consider such public input a "mandate," but some Councilmembers discount this input.

For the sake of discussion, Councilmember Grace asked Councilmember Ransom which elements he would support, and which he opposes. Councilmember Ransom said he could support sidewalks and undergrounding.

Councilmember Gustafson reiterated his support for Option 1, saying this is a great project and it is important to act now. He then left the Council table at 9:50 p.m.

Councilmember Chang expressed concern about the safety and efficiency of the design, noting the several accidents that have occurred. He wondered if the design would jeopardize the City's insurance status or make it vulnerable to litigation. He also asked if there have been attempts to reach out to the business community to determine if a compromise is possible.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, said the City's position is that the two-lane road with center turn lane is a safer design than the existing configuration. Mr. Haines added that he would not propose a design he felt might be flawed. He said he would follow up with the Council if he feels that refinements or adjustments are necessary.

Mr. Haines stated that at this point it has been a technical exercise to develop the options. The timeline would allow working with businesses once the option is selected.

Councilmember Chang expressed concerns about the cost of the overall project (145th to 205th). He pointed out that 87% of the Aurora Corridor project is funded by grants, but the North City Project is funded entirely by the City at a cost of \$9.2 million. Responding to Mayor Hansen, he said he would support sidewalks, undergrounding, and street lights.

Councilmember Fimia said she supports the stated goals of the subarea plan, which include the creation of a pedestrian-friendly main street for the North City community. She noted that although it is easier to build new than to retrofit, she is confident the Council could find a solution everyone could agree with. She agreed with Councilmember Ransom regarding public sentiment, noting that the Council should pay attention to the input that has been expressed. She felt the project could achieve the goal of safety while maintaining the functionality of 15th Avenue NE as a major north-south corridor.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting to 10:20 p.m. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Mayor Hansen dissenting.

Councilmember Fimia suggested the design might require a fifth lane for turning in some intersections. She felt it is unfair to the rest of the City to spend \$9 million in such a concentrated area when there are so many other unmet needs, such as sidewalks. She said the City's capital improvement plan proposes to only build 3% of the City's total sidewalk need over the next six years. She expressed strong support for sidewalks as part of the North City project, noting her preference for as much sidewalk construction along the corridor as possible. She said to be consistent, the entire corridor should be a four-lane configuration because the area is planned for more development and increased

density, which will require more capacity. She then pointed out the differences between the redevelopment of Aurora Avenue and 15th Avenue NE. Aurora Avenue is being widened, but 15th Avenue is being narrowed. Aurora Avenue will have raised medians, but 15th Avenue will have a center, two-way left turn lane. Aurora Avenue will include bus lanes, but 15th Avenue will not. She felt the City should take a consistent approach to both corridors.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen responded that comparisons between Aurora Avenue and 15th Avenue NE are erroneous because the traffic volumes are completely different. He said the real dilemma is deciding what should happen next and how to move the project forward. He said he supports the original three-lane configuration because safety was one of the main reasons for doing the project. He said taking out the curb bulbouts, street trees and other amenities means the project would no longer be worth the investment. He said if the project does move forward, it should be worthy of the investment and achieve the vision outlined by this community for the past six years. He pointed out that the project included considerable community input and business participation.

Councilmember Grace wondered whether rebidding Option 1 could really guarantee any savings other than those achieved through a more favorable bid climate.

Mr. Haines said some items could be removed from the project to achieve incremental savings in the tens of thousands of dollars. However, it is unrealistic to think the project could be scaled back by \$1-2 million, because the construction is fairly straightforward and doesn't include "a lot of bells and whistles." He clarified that staff has not really addressed the issue of reducing costs other than hitting the best bid window.

Responding to Councilmember Grace, Mr. Haines said the estimated cost for undergrounding utility lines is approximately \$1.8 million.

Councilmember Grace felt that a piecemeal deletion of amenities would do a disservice to the project and not achieve significant cost savings. However, he felt the City might achieve substantial cost savings from the scope reductions identified in the September 10 staff memo.

Mr. Haines pointed out that staff provided another memo that not only listed cost savings but included a proposal for achieving additional revenue via the Surface Water Fund.

Mr. Burkett noted that the September 10 memo identifies traffic signal alternatives that could possibly yield \$150,000-\$300,000 in cost savings.

Councilmember Fimia submitted the following proposals, from her September 27 memo:

- Delete the decorative stamping for asphalt and concrete (\$120,000);
- Support six to eight-foot sidewalks from 145th to 185th on both sides of the street and any adjacent streets;

DRAFT

- Allow for ten-foot sidewalks where vaults, traffic signals and upgraded crosswalks are needed;
- Undergrounding utilities;
- Four lanes from 145th to 185th, maintaining as much of the present infrastructure as possible;
- Enforcing speed limits of 25 or 30 miles per hour;
- Upgrade bus stops and access to stops;
- Limiting the project to about \$7 million, keeping beautification, lighting and landscaping; and
- most importantly, getting “buyoff” from the community

Mr. Burkett asked how staff will know when it has buy-in from the community. Councilmember Fimia said you know you have buyoff when there is 70% acceptance by the major stakeholders. She said the City is nowhere near that margin yet.

Due to the time, Mayor Hansen suggested that this item be continued to next week’s agenda, along with other items on tonight’s agenda. There was Council consensus to move agenda items 9(a) and 9(b) to the agenda for the November 1 meeting.

Councilmember Ransom pointed out that the costs of the project have almost doubled since it was first proposed. He said most people cannot afford such exponential growth in their personal finances, and the City cannot afford it either. He said if the project moves forward, the City will spend 30% of the reserves it has accumulated over the past nine years.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:20 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk