

**CITY OF SHORELINE**

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

Monday, July 7, 2008 - 6:30 p.m.  
Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ryu, Deputy Mayor Scott, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember McGlashan, and Councilmember Way

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ryu, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Ryu led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclamation of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Month

Mayor Ryu read the proclamation declaring the month of July as Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Month in the City of Shoreline. Dick Deal, PRCS Director, Lynn Cheney, Recreation Coordinator, James McCrackin, Pool Manager and Recreation Coordinator II, and managers and team members of the Gators Swim Team accepted the proclamation and thanked the City Council for this recognition.

Lynn Cheney introduced James McCrackin, Coach Kate Trettevik, Dimitry Levin, and Leah DePaoli who are all permanent supervisors at the pool. Mr. McCrackin presented each Councilmember with a swim cap.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events. He announced that the City of Shoreline was rated the "Best Neighborhood" in the Seattle area by *Seattle Magazine*. He added that the City has been awarded additional funding for the Aurora Corridor Project by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Executive Board.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Way said she witnessed the fire district's controlled burn at a house on the east side of town. She said it was an impressive demonstration of "green" methods of extinguishing a fire. She said she is grateful to the Fire District staff. Mayor Ryu said she attended this event and it was amazing.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Bronston Kenney, Shoreline, discussed "upzoning." He commented that it is a battle between home and business owners versus those who want to change Shoreline for their own purposes. He felt that Pro Shoreline and Forward Shoreline advance these interests along with Councilmembers McGlashan, Hansen, and McConnell. He said they are advancing the interests of developers against citizens.

b) Maryn Wynne, Shoreline, announced various events that would take place at the 5th Annual Solar Fest. She noted that the event begins on Saturday, July 19 and will be located in the front parking lot of the Meridian Park School. She thanked the following local sponsors for their contributions and participation: City of Shoreline, Seattle City Light, Seattle Climate Action Network, Shoreline Community College, Shoreline Green Business Program, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, Northwest Mechanical, Shoreline Journal, and Cleanscapes.

c) Les Nelson, Shoreline, asked why the Council meeting was in this room. He noted that the agenda line wasn't working and the new telephone numbers would be put on Channel 21. He commented that people are saying the City doesn't want its residents to know what is going on. He felt the City should make more efforts to keep residents informed.

d) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, commented on Tent City III, which has been in Ridgecrest for a week at the Prince of Peace Church. He noted that Tent City III, which is self-policed and has a rotating council, will be there for 90 days. He said Tent City III is equivalent to an R-600 density. He said this is very impressive and would like to see how it works.

e) Debra Whitefox Marchant, Shoreline, spoke on behalf of "Green Borders," which is interested in green spaces around Shoreline homes. She commented that homes are very close to others. She hoped gardens would be able to survive in Shoreline. She said she would like to see more gardens, fruit trees, and saved spaces. She wants to see more play areas and encouraged residents to protect our spaces and environment.

Mr. Olander responded to public comments. He noted that there have been some problems with the phones and noted that there are multiple means of contacting the City. He added that residents can obtain information through the website and view the agenda planner, agendas, and the full staff reports. Additionally, he responded to Ms. Marchant and said there haven't been any recent changes to the yard setbacks for single family homes.

Councilmember Way also responded to Ms. Marchant and said "borders" is something that the Council can look into with their goals and possibly work into policies.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember McGlashan moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the agenda was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the Consent Calendar. Deputy Mayor Scott seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the following item was approved:**

(a) Resolution No. 279 Ratifying the Amendments to the King County Countywide Planning Policies

8. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Civic Center Project Progress Report

Mr. Olander introduced Jesus Sanchez, Public Works Operations Manager and Civic Center Project Manager, who provided a progress report on the Civic Center Project.

Mr. Sanchez presented what he described as a "snapshot in time" regarding the City Hall project. He introduced PJ Santos, Principal from Opus, Eric Nothdurft, Lead Architect from LMN Architects, and Nancy Henderson from Arch-Ecology. He said they will discuss the project and the guiding principles.

PJ Santos reviewed the guiding principles and building design for the City Hall Project.

Mr. Nothdurft stated that the building will be a four-story, 67,000 square foot building with leasable space, a parking structure, and council chambers. He reviewed the design and placement and stated it would be a West "L" design with parking and a public gathering space. He described the site with visual aids, noting there will be an amphitheater, a terraced plaza, glass doors that open into the council chambers, and public art on the building facade. He described the building on a floor-by-floor basis. He said the City Clerks, Planning and Development Services (PADS), the information counter, and the lobby are on the first floor. He noted that there is built-in growth space in the building too.

Mr. Olander said there was a thorough analysis done of who has the most direct public contact and the City departments were located accordingly.

Councilmember McGlashan confirmed that the seating for the Council has room for nine at the dais, which is enough room for the nine Planning Commissioners.

Mayor Ryu inquired if there is a Council work area in the Chambers. Mr. Nothdurft responded affirmatively and then described the Council Chambers. He noted that there is an audio visual control room, an executive session room, a rain garden, and public restrooms.

Councilmember Way asked about the executive session space and suggested it be called a "Council conference room."

Councilmember Eggen stated that there has been lots of public comment that the Highlander Room isn't favored by the public and the sketch for the Council Chambers is similar to it. He stated that the public prefers the Mt. Rainier Room because it is tiered.

Mr. Nothdurft highlighted that the dais will be curved and that tiered seating defeats the multi-purpose function of the room. He also stated that this room needs to serve as the back-up emergency operations center. He discussed accessibility challenges and ramps. He added that they have engaged a design-build A/V company and they have brought together a state-of-the-art system that allows for future flexibility. He added that the vestibule will have outlets for audio and video. He said the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor is mostly leasable space and conference rooms.

Councilmember Way said she is curious about the visual look of the rooms and the City staff cubicles. Mr. Sanchez replied that they have gone out to numerous sites and looked at several different designs. He said one preferred design includes transparent panels to let light through at different heights. He added that the panels will be made of 100% recyclable materials. Mr. Olander also stated that a key function of the building is to allow natural light to come in.

Mr. Nothdurft commented that almost all of the private offices are pulled away from the windows to provide as much natural light to employees.

Councilmember Way commented that she visited Kirkland City Hall and liked the fact that she could see all the way across the work areas.

Mr. Nothdurft stated that he visited the Chinook building and the glass panels make a tremendous difference. He noted that the 4th floor contains the City Manager and City Council offices, the City Attorney's Office, Finance, Human Resources, and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS). He said there are no doors into departments to ensure openness and accessibility.

Mr. Olander added that good signage is required for people to feel welcome. He noted that the Finance department has the most potential for growth.

Councilmember Way questioned the configuration of the departments and stated it would be nice to have Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services right in front on the 1st floor as the "face of the City." Mr. Olander reiterated that the City went through an exercise to determine what departments had the most public contact and they are situated accordingly.

Ms. Henderson outlined the sustainable features of the building design. She noted that this facility is striving to obtain a silver LEED rating, but there are some alternates in the plan to obtain a gold rating. She noted that a platinum rating is nearly impossible. She said the LEED program is broken down into five categories: 1) sustainable sites; 2) water efficiency; 3) energy and atmosphere; 4) materials and resources; and 5) indoor environmental quality. She

highlighted that the water from the green roof runs between the Council Chambers and building itself. She noted that most of the concrete will be aggregate and brought in from local companies.

Councilmember Way asked where the evergreen trees would be placed. Mr. Nothdurft responded that there are a number of trees going along the north border of the site and along the pathway that joins Heritage Park and the Interurban Trail.

Ms. Henderson discusses the interior LEED features. She discussed the benefits of the higher ceilings, the low-flow toilets, sinks, and gray water recycling.

Councilmember McGlashan confirmed with Mr. Nothdurft that a cistern isn't being installed, but a place for it has been reserved for one on the property.

Ms. Henderson commented that the LEED process takes a long time and only 30% of new buildings obtain silver certification.

Councilmember Eggen discussed heat retention and stated that narrowing a building creates worse heat retention and the tradeoffs are that there isn't solar power in the winter when it is really needed. He wondered if the design is taking precedence over function in this case. Ms. Henderson replied that the form of the building has less to do with energy efficiency because of the climate in this area. She added that the concrete will absorb some of the heat gain during the day.

Councilmember Eggen noted that the elevators are located far away from the parking area. He expressed concern about people with disabilities. Mr. Olander said this is an efficiency question and they are still looking at putting a couple of pullout spots for handicap drop-off. Mr. Nothdurft commented that it is more efficient to put the elevators together, and adding a third elevator would be quite expensive. Councilmember Eggen stated that the option of dropping off a handicap person is problematic.

Councilmember McConnell agreed that obtaining a platinum LEED certification is difficult, mainly because of the materials needed. She questioned if the City isn't going to be able to obtain certain points in the LEED rating system because the materials are not available.

Ms. Henderson concurred and explained that some of the credits for renewable materials such as certified wood are very difficult to get on any building.

Mr. Sanchez noted that demolition on the site started today and he expects it to be complete in the next two weeks. He explained the furniture acquisition process and discussed future project milestones.

Mr. Olander commented that he is very fortunate to have a great team that has balanced this project financially and environmentally.

Mr. Sanchez thanked consultants Bill Angle and Jim Napolitano.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) David Crow, Shoreline, thanked OPUS, LMN Architects, the City staff, and City Council for being open with this project. He asked if it is possible to get a summary of the mechanical systems, energy efficiencies, and natural gas boilers for public review. He said if natural gas keeps going up there may be other options available. He said there is public interest in the solar awning concept and wanted to know if solar shading can be used on the south side. He commented that the expressiveness of the water wall, rainforest, green roof, and the interpretive expression of Shoreline ideals is positive but wanted more of an integrated approach.

Mr. Santos said the goal emerging from the public process was that the building should be sustainable, but not for sustainability sake, but for a paradigm shift of the residents and citizens who believe in it. He said the architecture serves as an educational device. He said that he can get a summary of the items Mr. Crow requested.

Mr. Sanchez responded to Mr. Crow that the structure is designed with the solar voltaic concept on the roof, but at this point the awning would involve a redesign. He added that changes to the architectural structure are expensive and not within the budget. Mr. Santos added that there is a whole list of things that we would like to do. However, it is a matter of prioritization. Mr. Olander concluded that there will be solar voltaic on the roof and plenty of interpretive elements.

b) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, urged the Council to make sure the Council Chambers are versatile for the future. He asked that they take the time to consider the feel of the room. Mr. Olander replied that the City staff and Council paid lots of attention to ceiling height, Council desk heights, and subtleties.

c) Les Nelson, Shoreline, commented that this is a City Hall project, not necessarily a civic center. He inquired what the plans are for a civic center and if there will be any connections with other properties.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that he toured the City of Lakewood City Hall and they didn't build a large enough building. He also stated that their sloping floor and stationary chairs limit their flexibility.

Councilmember Way discussed study sessions and asked if there were any ideas for a different configuration. Mr. Olander replied that no solution has been found yet. He felt there is a value for having the Council come down from the dais for study sessions. Councilmember Way said you can't hear the Seattle City Council study sessions when they aren't using the dais.

## RECESS

**At 8:27 p.m. Mayor Ryu called for a ten minute break. Mayor Ryu reconvened the meeting at 8:45 p.m.**

## **9. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARINGS**

(a) Public hearing to receive citizens' comments on Ordinance No. 505, which adopted a Moratorium for Six Months on the Filing or Acceptance of Any Applications for Residential Development of Land within the Regional Business (RB) Land Use District Which Exceed a Density of 110 Dwelling Units Per Acre

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, noted that these interim regulations were adopted with Ordinance No. 505 on May 12, which puts a cap on density. He said this action is defined as a moratorium, which requires a public hearing. He said the options for Council after hearing testimony are to keep, modify, or repeal the moratorium.

Mayor Ryu opened the public hearing.

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said the moratorium reduces the density in the RB zone. She noted that this action is unfair to owners of RB properties. She said it places an onerous tax burden on residential properties throughout the City. She suggested it be repealed. She said if the density is reduced on residential property, the price of housing is increased and it diminishes the possibility of increased transit routes. She highlighted that the economic report says developers cannot install underground parking. She said this moratorium is contrary to the City's economic goals.

b) Bill Bear, Shoreline, commented that none of the City's infrastructure or environment was built to handle a density of R-110. He said that these incremental impacts and changes will cause catastrophic change. He suggested revising the moratorium to R-48 and extending it until the Comprehensive Plan (CP) has been fully reviewed. He urged the Council to stop the piecemeal changes.

c) Les Nelson, Shoreline, commented that the 2005 Comprehensive Plan clarifies that R-48 is the highest density contemplated. He urged the Council to continue the moratorium but revise the density to R-48. He noted that it would provide the amenities the residents want. He suggested they step back and do the planning in a thoughtful way. He also suggested that the City Council direct the Planning Commission to come back with amendments and their own ideas. He stated that there are regulations to protect commercial businesses on Aurora Avenue. He wanted a visioning process done with the residents included in it.

d) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said the real issue relates to the CB/RB fiasco. RB was meant to go up to NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that the Code was changed to be out of compliance with the CP. He felt that high density is the best use of land. He wanted the Council to do density-per-mile. He said this is really a commercial property downzone. He said that a plan needs to be in place for the support of density. He felt that the Council has to give the City staff direction in order to give the Planning Commission direction.

e) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, said there needs to be clarity about the relationship between the CP and the Development Code (DC). He said the documents that have been released assert the primacy of the CP. He also stated that there is a need for a working definition of the CP role. He said that the actions of Planning and Development Services (PADS) seem to run counter to an emphasis on the CP. He said the terminology is confusing and that soon PADS, if

the City continues on this downswing, may become a permitting department only. He concluded that planning is what this City needs.

Councilmember McGlashan communicated that the Council was given examples of current and past projects where the average density was R-110. Mr. Cohn concurred, adding that with the set of assumptions given, one layer of underground parking would be possible. Councilmember McGlashan inquired if the City is setting itself up for a lawsuit if someone builds at R-125 per acre and the City limits them.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, explained that the developer vests in the laws at the time they apply. He stated that moratoriums simply allow the City to take a break, so other owners can't vest differently. He said the fact that some in the past have enjoyed other rights doesn't expose the City to legal liability.

Mr. Olander explained that the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) appeals have to be considered; based on Growth Management targets the City is comfortable with R-110 because that reflects reality. He said it eliminates the fear of "unlimited density," but going significantly lower is risky with the GMHB.

Deputy Mayor Scott commented that the City does have contradictory CP and zoning codes. He read the introduction of the CP. He said he doesn't see where the CP states there can be densities greater than R-48. He commented that he can see how the public views it as a contradiction.

Mr. Olander stated that the CP sets out direction and vision. However, the CP becomes law through the development regulations, and if there is a conflict between the two the more specific shall prevail.

Mr. Sievers concurred and said the CP is the guiding document over the regulations and only the regulations allow you to do something with your property. He commented that the CP has primacy and is the overarching document, but the City relies on the DC. Mr. Olander commented that densities are not limited in the CP for RB.

Councilmember Way read the DC language and said it limits density to R-48. She continued and said RB calls out appropriate zoning designations and this is confusing to the average person.

Mr. Olander explained that this needs to be looked at on a community-wide basis because higher densities are required in some places. He added that one of the Council goals is to become a sustainable community, and to become one, the densities along the transit and major commercial corridors need to be reasonably high. He said lowering the density to R-48 can contradict the Council goals.

Mayor Ryu disagreed and felt the City has had experience with developers that have tried to get away with the minimum requirements in order to maximize profits. She felt the public is under the impression that R-48 is the maximum density.



Mr. Olander explained that the City must be careful about unintended consequences. He suggested referring this back to the Planning Commission and asking them to take a look at bonus and height densities. He noted that the City may be opening itself to an appeal by the GMHB.

Councilmember Eggen commented that he reviewed that in May 2000, Ordinance No. 38 approved a new DC where density in RB was no maximum. He stated having no maximum density wasn't mentioned in the staff report at that time. He added that not a single Planning Commissioner, Councilmember, City staff member, or public speaker commented on it.

Mayor Ryu commented that maybe due process was taken, but the density issue was not mentioned. She felt the intent of it was not correct. She said the Council is asked to make common sense judgments, based on where the residents want the City to be. She wondered if R-110 is something this City is comfortable with. She felt R-48 is the latest density that the residents knew about.

Deputy Mayor Scott commented that when he reviewed the CP and the process of its origins, it still doesn't show him how it respects the higher densities. He commented that R-48 seems to be the highest specified density in the CP. He added that the CP and zoning are not in sync. He said it is difficult to make decisions that are not in sync with the last public process.

Mr. Olander said there may be an approach that is acceptable and that would be to modify the moratorium or adopt a new one and hold another public hearing. He noted that another option is to ask the PC to look at a base of R-48 and a maximum of R-110 based on certain factors. He added that this gives room to incorporate some of the ideas the Council has been discussing, such as recycling and building placement. He said maybe the density gets to R-110 or higher, but it gets you a series of options with the incentives.

Councilmember Eggen noted that affordability is still another factor.

Mayor Ryu commented that "green borders" is a good concept. Mr. Olander added that it can provide strong incentives to build in the City.

Councilmember Way supported the suggestion about having a base density, incentives, and creative work with the PC. She urged the consideration of sustainability concepts. She pointed out that the DC highlights in 20.10.030 that the CP should be considered first.

Deputy Mayor Scott felt that R-48 is sufficient for CB and RB zones. He said the Council needs to have the CP review sooner so development isn't delayed.

Mr. Olander stated that next week's agenda includes potentially competing priorities in the Planning Commission Work Plan. He commented that staff is limited and if something needs to be put on hold, then direction needs to come from the Council to do that. He noted that if the moratorium is continued, then the development regulations will come back to the Council sooner rather than later.

Councilmember Eggen commented that there is an interaction with the visioning process that will be used in the CP. He asked if the visioning process was going to be a PC function. Mr. Olander replied that they will be involved, but it should focus on central community values.

Councilmember Way read LU-3 from the CP.

Mayor Ryu agreed that someone could utilize incentives and attain an R-110 density, and that R-110 is not necessarily the limit for her. She said as long as proper public process is followed and it's justified, she could support a higher density in some cases.

Councilmember Eggen felt the Council should charge the PC with the task of determining what criteria would trigger bonus densities. He felt recycling space is essential.

Deputy Mayor Scott suggested letting the creative energy of the PC flow towards working on the CP. He complimented the City founders and the public on the CP.

**Mr. Olander summarized Council consensus to continue the moratorium, but direct the PC to explore the concept of increased densities through development incentives, while maintaining a base density of R-48.**

Mayor Ryu asked if it would be helpful for the Council to give a list of suggestions to the PC.

Councilmember McConnell wanted a recap of when this R-110 was suggested by the City staff. Mr. Cohn noted that the R-110 partially came from the economic analysis for Ridgecrest. He added that the City staff also came up with R-100 to R-120. Mr. Olander added that this was done in response to a Council concern that RB had unlimited density.

Councilmember McGlashan felt that R-48 in RB and CB is too low of a starting point for density. He said it doesn't support the Council's housing or sustainability strategies and it just doesn't work.

Councilmember Eggen agreed. He stated that the question is how to get the quality workforce housing at a higher density. The options, he said, may include writing code and adding bonus features where quality development can occur.

Councilmember Way said the difference is that the City is not behind in its Growth Management Act goals.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that the City can say affordable housing and economic development is supported, but the regulations are against it.

Deputy Mayor Scott agreed, but stated there must be a process to get the City where it wants to go. He said they are always being faced with a continual fallback and public process needs to be there first.

Mayor Ryu said that following a public process, progress can be made. She said she is pleased the Council agrees that a process needs to be established.

MEETING EXTENSION

**At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Eggen moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 6-1, with Councilmember Hansen dissenting.**

(b) Continued public hearing and discussion of the 2009 - 2014 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, stated that there is no additional presentation because the Council has been reviewing the CIP and TIP over the last couple of meetings.

a) Bill Bear, Shoreline, said he has watched the Council discuss the Aurora Corridor for several years and it is helpful to understand that our cars are being subsidized by the Aurora Corridor Project. He said money is the same whether it is local, state, or federal. He summarized that we're taking money out of people's pockets to make sure we can drive.

Mr. Olander noted that the public hearing is closed following tonight's comments.

Councilmember Way wondered if there is a budget breakdown of the Roads Capital fund. She also asked about the \$3 million dollar grant and wanted to know where those funds fit into the budget.

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, said he can provide detail concerning engineering, project management, and design to the Council. Ms. Tarry replied that the grant will be added to the revenue side, but the City still has about \$46 million in grants to obtain.

Mayor Ryu said she met with King County Councilmember Ferguson and International Community Health Services (ICHHS). She said ICHHS is exploring the possibility of locating a facility in Shoreline because there isn't a public health facility here. She said she discussed a pre-development loan to possibly assist them in building one here. She added that there was a time when there was discussion about a housing trust fund, which is seed money to attract developments. She said it could be \$50,000 for predevelopment loans to encourage entities to operate in Shoreline. She asked where it would be in the budget if it was created.

Mr. Olander highlighted that first this would have to be explored for legality. He added that a loan to a nonprofit may fall under improper lending of City credit. However, a future housing project could be done.

Ms. Tarry added that this would have to be a General Fund contribution; she felt that REET funding probably could not be used for this purpose. She said it could be something to consider during the 2009 operating budget process.

Mr. Olander highlighted that in the past the Council discussed setting aside some of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for potential housing.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that the Council should be looking to put aside funding for human services because that is where most of the funding will be cut from King County.

Mr. Olander added that the Council has some flexibility in allocating some of the General Fund capital. He added that the City is faced with its own financial crisis and cutting general services. Mayor Ryu concluded that if the City can find \$50,000 and get a public health facility here, the investment will pay off. Mr. Olander commented that the easier and legal way to do it would be to do a contract for services, but it would still take operating funds to do it.

Councilmember Eggen inquired if there were any way that a city can guarantee the loan to allow a nonprofit to get the funds at a low interest rate. Mr. Olander replied that the idea raises some questions that the City staff will have to research.

Councilmember Way announced that the Cedarbrook School property will be surplus soon. She noted that it is not only a potential park property but also a site for development. She said it provides multiple opportunities for open space and a trail corridor.

Councilmember Hansen expressed concern about the suggestion of providing loan guarantees, noting that the City already has a loan program. He noted that the revolving Home Repair Fund is used for fixing peoples homes and he would like to know what has been going on with it.

Councilmember Eggen wondered if the new master planning process would encourage developers to buy the property and build a moderate-sized mixed use development with open space and a trail corridor.

**Councilmember McGlashan moved close the public hearing. Deputy Mayor Scott seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.**

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(a) Continued Discussion of the Proposed 2008-2009 Council Goals

Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager, reviewed the Council Goals. She highlighted that the Council goal-setting retreat resulted in 10 proposed goals. She said the Council directed the City staff to do public outreach and two community workshops were held. The comments from those workshops, she said, are unique and diverse. She stated that the City staff is looking for direction on whether the Council wants to modify the language. She concluded that there are only two new goals and the other eight are carry-overs from last year.

Mr. Olander said he heard lots of interesting comments and is committed to doing community meetings. He said he didn't see anything that suggested the wording should be changed.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said that all 10 goals are laudable, but the list should be reduced. She stated that the first goal could consume an entire year's worth of staff time and resources. She calculated that each goal will take a minimum of 80 hours of research and 800 hours staff time. She said there are regular duties to run the City. She noted that these goals are overwhelming in nature and consume staff time. She urged the Council to concentrate these goals into a more manageable work plan.

Councilmember Way stated that Goal H should include something to address disabled needs and services.

Mr. Olander said that would fall under the Human Services plan. Ms. Underwood added that she is concerned with adding a reference to the disabled and leaving off other groups that might need assistance.

Mayor Ryu commented that the City doesn't have a Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day event in the City. She wondered whether a health screening fair could satisfy the cultural diversity event goal.

Mr. Olander commented that the goals need to be more general and not too specific.

Mayor Ryu wondered if plastic bag recycling or styrofoam container ban would be too specific.

Mr. Olander stated that those are specific tasks which will be included in the entire goal.

Councilmember Way asked if basin planning should be included in Goal J.

#### MEETING EXTENSION

**At 10:30 p.m., Councilmember Way moved to extend the meeting until 10:35 p.m. Deputy Mayor Scott seconded the motion, which carried 4-3, with Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McConnell, and Councilmember McGlashan dissenting.**

Councilmember Way felt that since basin planning was discussed it should be added.

Deputy Mayor Scott agreed with the City staff that the Council shouldn't get too descriptive on the goals.

Councilmember Eggen agreed that addressing flooding is important, so perhaps it should be added to the goals.

Mayor Ryu commented that spelling it out under Goal J will show our regionalism and willingness to work with neighbors.

Mr. Olander stated that unless the Council thinks it has a particularly expressive value, then it probably shouldn't be added because it is something the City is already doing.

Mayor Ryu commented that adding it gives the City a boasting right.

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk