

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, July 14, 2008 - 7:30 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 7:30 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.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events. He highlighted that the first mile of the Aurora Corridor Project has received the 2008 Award for Excellence for the Best City Project in the State of Washington from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). He thanked the community and the current and past Councilmembers and City staff. He also announced that the City Hall has moved to a new telephone system and that the new main telephone number is (206) 801-2700.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Charlotte Haines, Shoreline, stated that basic economic studies show that supply and demand drives prices and that customers are needed to support businesses. She doesn't understand the Council's motivation for sustainable city goals, the need to encourage families for our schools, and the need to attract customers for our current small businesses. She asked how the Council can continue to deny economic development by limiting increased density. She said the homeowners are bearing the cost of increased taxes and levies for City services. She

predicted rising housing costs and businesses failing. Additionally, she felt residents would be unable to afford to live in Shoreline.

b) Sally Granger, Shoreline, stated that the City allows low income residents to delete the franchise fees from the bills of the garbage and natural gas companies. She said currently the City is charging Comcast customers \$6 per month and doubled the franchise fee because it's deemed an unnecessary utility. She urged the residents to petition the City, call the Finance Department, or write a letter to the City Manager.

c) Jim DiPeso, Shoreline, invited everyone to the Shoreline Solarfest. He said there would be many activities for children and adults. He also stated that the Taste of Shoreline will be there.

Mr. Olander clarified that the franchise fee went to 6%, not \$6 per month.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Mayor Scott moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Ryu suggested moving item 7(c) to 8(a), item 7(d) to 8(b), 7(k) to 8(c), making item 8(a) new item 8(d), and changing a word on page 45 on item 7(f). There was Council consensus to make these changes. Councilmember Eggen moved approval of the Consent Calendar as amended. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following items were approved:

- (a) Minutes of Special Meeting of May 19, 2008
Minutes of Business Meeting of May 27, 2008
Minutes of Study Session of June 2, 2008
Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of June 23, 2008

- (b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of June 27, 2008 in the amount of \$2,304,769.87 as specified in the following detail:

*Payroll and Benefits:

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
5/18/08-5/31/08	6/6/2008	24293-24493	7659-7696	36696-36704	\$391,229.00
6/1/08-6/14/08	6/20/2008	24494-24697	7697-7736	36866-36877	\$506,359.91
					<u>\$897,588.91</u>

*Accounts Payable Claims:

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
6/11/2008	36670	36695	\$67,602.91
6/12/2008	36705	36711	\$4,521.46
6/16/2008	36712	36726	\$47,902.11
6/17/2008	36727		\$2,885.99
6/17/2008	36728	36741	\$69,239.36
6/23/2008	36742	36775	\$969,233.24
6/24/2008	34572		(\$31.50)
6/24/2008	36776		\$31.50
6/24/2008	34634		(\$341.00)
6/24/2008	36777		\$341.00
6/24/2008	36778	36789	\$50,711.70
6/25/2008	36790	36825	\$30,412.95
6/26/2008	36826	36833	\$139,259.15
6/27/2008	36834	36865	\$25,412.09
			<u><u>\$1,407,180.96</u></u>

(e) **Ordinance No. 510 Amending the 2008 Budget for the City Facility Major Maintenance Fund**

(f) **Motion to Adopt the Environmental Sustainability Strategy**

(g) **Motion to Approve the Lake Ballinger Basin Interlocal Agreement**

(h) **Motion to Approve Mini-Grant Projects for Briarcrest Neighborhood Association and Richmond Beach Community Association**

(i) **Motion to Authorize the Participation in the King County Community Development Block Grant Consortium for the Federal Fiscal Years 2009-2011**

(j) **Motion to Approve a Contract with RW Beck to Develop the Thornton Creek Basin Plan**

8. **ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND MOTIONS**

(a) Ordinance No. 509 Authorizing the 2009-2014 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the City of Shoreline

Deputy Mayor Scott moved to adopt Ordinance No. 509. Councilmember Way seconded the motion.

Mayor Ryu discussed the possibility of appropriating \$50,000 seed money for a public health clinic.

Mr. Olander replied that the City staff has no objection. He recommended the City add it as a new project in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) or fund it with other grants to be identified at a later date.

Councilmember Hansen inquired if this means that something else in the budget will be reduced by \$50,000. Mr. Olander responded that there may be some unspent curb ramp funds that can be converted to it. He said there are opportunities but it hasn't been determined where the funds would come from. He said he is reasonably comfortable that block grant funds would be available for this.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned where unused block grant funds go. Mr. Olander replied that it is carried over to the next year.

Mayor Ryu asked how much of the housing trust fund the City had left in the 2007 budget. Mr. Olander responded that the funds are not in the CIP; it comes from the CDBG.

Councilmember Eggen wondered if there was any time limit on using CDBG money. Mr. Olander stated that there is a time limit but he would have to find out more about it.

Mayor Ryu moved to designate \$50,000 seed money for an exploratory study of a housing/public health clinic siting process in Shoreline. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 4-3, with Councilmembers Hansen, McConnell, and McGlashan dissenting.

Councilmember Way discussed City Gateways and signage. She suggested deleting the funding for them and allocating it to the Lake Ballinger Basin Plan. Mr. Olander stated that there is no appropriation for Gateway funding in 2009.

Mayor Ryu said she is intrigued by the thought of having funding for a basin plan. Councilmember Way wanted to find some grant funds for the Lake Ballinger efforts and have some reserve funds for it.

Mr. Olander stated that this is a no-cost funding agreement. However, when the basin plan gets funded it will be by a state grant and no local participation has been requested or required. He added that when the plan is completed it will probably identify capital projects. He suggested that the City not put any funding towards the plan until it is completed and fully identifies priorities and costs.

Mr. Relph echoed Mr. Olander's comments and stated that the next several months will be spent gathering data; it will be the end of the year before any information on capital will be put together. He stated this would be a good project for next year. He said the City will look at surface water projects on large scale later.

Mayor Ryu asked about the in-lieu-of fund on page 144. She asked if contributions from one part of the City be used for another part of the City.

Patti Rader, Senior Budget Analyst, stated that nearly \$159,000 is actually from three parcels from the Aurora Avenue Project and the funds are designated to be used on this phase of the project. She said some of the funds have been earmarked for specific areas, but a majority has not. She said \$50,000 has been set aside for 2011-2014 for anticipated in-lieu-of fees.

Councilmember Way requested the Council support a nomination of Ronald Place to begin the process towards landmark designation which would cost no more than \$10,000.

Mr. Olander explained that a study or designation is not a capital project in the CIP. He suggested just having discussion on this as a normal item under the regular budget. He stated that this was studied when developing the Aurora Corridor and it is in the environmental review. He noted that the State Historic Designation Office said the property didn't achieve landmark status and that the street could be vacated if the Council wished to do so. He noted that for years the City had planned to vacate that to retain businesses on Aurora Avenue and 175th Street. He noted that this project will be taking a significant amount of property and it might be difficult for the property owner to maintain his business there when the Aurora Corridor Project comes through. He strongly recommended against this, but it can be discussed at a separate time.

Councilmember Way read from the state document that stated it was eligible. She suggested that the City begin the process of nominating it, though not impacting the plan to vacate. She said if it isn't a part of the CIP, she would like the Council to discuss it in the near future.

Mr. Olander said the City staff can provide a background memorandum which will include detail of past efforts to help retain that business.

Mayor Ryu expressed concerns about the timing of this because she said once you remove a historic property it cannot be replaced.

Councilmember Way stated that the intent would be to include the Crest Theater and Ronald Place.

Mr. Relph stated that the Council has full control of the right-of-way and doesn't think there is a sense of urgency.

Mr. Olander commented that revisions to the red brick road may jeopardize our ability to vacate and his ability to redevelop the property. He said he has serious concerns about this.

Mayor Ryu wondered if the Council would consider a priorities list for items like this, so that this conversation doesn't happen over and over again.

Councilmember McGlashan reminded the Council that many of these things are funded through grant-specific projects and he doesn't see the point of prioritizing. He asked if it could be brought back as a study item.

Mr. Olander stated that the 20-year Transportation Plan, 20-year Surface Water Management Plan, and the Long Range Facilities Capital Element has a priority array with everything

prioritized. He said items move from those lists and get placed into the CIP and TIP. Mr. Relph added that the City staff goes back to the master plans to help prioritize unfunded projects.

Councilmember Eggen questioned if the Council was going to create a wish list of unfunded projects separate from the CIP just in case capital funds become available. He stated that this is different than the formal CIP, so this should be a different topic.

Councilmember Way said it is her understanding that the Ridgecrest Commercial Center project intersection was something that could be prioritized, but it's on the unfunded projects list. She supported a priorities list.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 509 authorizing the 2009-2014 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the City of Shoreline the CIP as amended, which carried 7-0.

(b) Resolution No. 278 Authorizing the 2009 - 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the City of Shoreline

Councilmember Hansen moved adoption of Resolution No. 278 Authorizing the 2009 - 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Deputy Mayor Scott seconded the motion.

Councilmember Way wanted to know how the Ridgecrest Commercial Center and other unfunded projects get into the funded category. She wanted to know if there was a particular order they are applied for. Mr. Relph replied that the City has a strategy on how grants are approached. He commented that he wasn't aware of the exact schedule because they use different cycles.

Mayor Ryu asked if it was safe to presume that if the item is under the 2009 column, it is a "to do" item for the City staff to pursue funding. Staff responded affirmatively.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Resolution No. 278 authorizing the 2009 - 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the City of Shoreline, which carried 7-0.

(c) Motion to Adopt the Proposed 2008-2009 Council Goals

Councilmember Way moved to adopt the 2008 – 2009 Council Goals. Councilmember McConnell seconded the motion.

Mayor Ryu moved to amend Goal J, to read as follows: "J. Provide safe, efficient and effective infrastructure to support our land use, transportation and surface water Plans. Develop a citywide trail and bicycle connection plan; Expand local transit service; Update the Transportation Master Plan; Implement a Green Street Demonstration project; Provide leadership and advocacy at the regional level for sustainable land use, transportation and basin plans." Councilmember Way seconded the motion.

Councilmember McGlashan commented on her revisions and said that the terms “efficient” and “effective” in her revision mean the same thing.

Mr. Olander clarified that they do mean two different things.

Councilmember McConnell expressed concern that the Council has released these goals to the community and this language changes them a little bit. She felt the revisions were not necessary.

Councilmember Way noted that on page 121 there are plenty of things provided there by the public that support the amendments.

Councilmember Eggen added that our goals don't really mention the December flooding problems and felt it would be appropriate to add something.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that he had no problem with the amendments.

A vote was taken on the motion to amend Goal J, which carried 7-0.

Councilmember Hansen felt that there were too many goals and noted that they were supposed to be the Council major goals.

Councilmember Way stated that at the retreat she agreed that they should be reduced and suggested combining or eliminating some; however, there was consensus to have all of them.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt the 2008 – 2009 Council Goals, which carried 6-0, with Councilmember Hansen abstaining.

(d) Ordinance No. 507 Adopting the Annual Comprehensive Plan and Associated Development Code Amendments

Mr. Olander introduced Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services (PADS) Director and Rachael Markle, PADS Assistant Director.

Ms. Markle stated that the purpose of these Development Code (DC) amendments is to create a Master Plan Area (MPA) definition, to streamline the MPA process, and require Shoreline Community College (SCC) to apply for an MPA zone. She stated that the City staff proposes to change the single family institution (SFI) to Institution/Campus (I/C) for the Fircrest, SCC, and CRISTA Ministries properties. She noted that the amendments would only affect those three sites and would amend the DC and not Comprehensive Plan (CP). She said that this legislation would rename MP to MPA. She noted that the term of master plan is overused and has led to some confusion over the years. She explained that the term plan has the connotation of a guidance or policy tool, but a master plan is a development tool. She said the City staff is proposing that the zoning will be MPA and will have the designation of I/C or central public facility in the CP. She noted that additional changes to the CP include the deletion of land use policy 76 and 77 which are replaced by land use policy 75.

Ms. Markle continued and reviewed the DC amendments. She defined MPA, its purpose and what the criteria would be for approval. She noted that MPA is a Type C permit, essentially a site-specific rezone. She displayed a map which showed all the areas that would be governed by an MPA permit, if approved. She said that there would also be reorganization in the DC under the special districts section. Finally, she highlighted that under the proposed amendment, the Shoreline Transfer Station would be zoned MPA1 and SCC be MPA2. She explained that zoning and development controls would remain R-4 and there would be no expansion under their special use permit. Additionally, SCC would need to apply for an MPA permit to change this designation.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, felt this is an improvement. He expressed a concern about changing SFI to I/C because all of the areas are located near single family homes. He asked if this zoning designation would detract from the integrity of the single family areas. He discussed land use policy 43 and said he has been frustrated to hear that a master plan is a permit. He pointed out that a master plan is arranged in the CP then the owner applies for a master plan permit. He felt that the terms should be separated. He noted typos and revisions needed in the legislation.

b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, commented that it is a “no-brainer” to define a master plan area in the CP, then to have the corresponding legislation in the DC to clearly order people in those areas to seek a permit. She noted that the process is very clear to those defined areas. She added that this allows SCC, Fircrest, and CRISTA to apply for a process and create an MPA, then present it to the Council for a quasi-judicial decision. She commended the City staff for this proposed legislation.

c) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, suggested that the Council postpone this for one session. He explained that the criteria for a rezone in the City is already well established and fits the CP and goals. However, he said the problem with a Type C action is there needs to be a legislative part where the criteria is clearly defined. He explained that if the Ridgecrest was quasi-judicial, there should have been legislative criteria.

Ms. Markle addressed Mr. Lee's question and said the legislative process for Fircrest, SCC, and CRISTA was done when the CP was adopted. She highlighted that the CP outlines that SFI properties are encouraged to master plan. She highlighted that the legislative process and criteria to be used is under the CP amendments; if another institution or campus is added it would be a site specific CP change to the map and possibly the text. She said she appreciated Mr. Gibb's comments concerning redundancy and punctuation.

Councilmember Way also stated that there is a definition that shows up in two places.

Ms. Markle highlighted that that isn't unusual and that it is done for consistency so this can be found in both places in the CP and DC.

Mayor Ryu wondered if CRISTA was required to be state or publicly owned prior to going through the CP process.

Ms. Markle said it can be privately owned. She highlighted that when the CP was adopted, these were seen as campuses and there were special considerations and some special planning would be required because they are more of an institution/campus and less single family, but not necessarily an essential public facility (EPF).

Mr. Olander added that since the underlying zoning for SCC is R-4, it is an expansion of a non-conforming use. Therefore, if they get an MPA they have to apply for permits and obtain the proper zoning. This, he noted, benefits the institution and the neighborhood since the City knows what the cumulative impacts will be.

Mayor Ryu asked why this only included SCC, CRISTA, and Fircrest and not the rest of the school district buildings.

Ms. Markle replied that they could be added later through a legislative action by the Council.

Councilmember McGlashan moved to adopt Ordinance No. 507 adopting the Annual Comprehensive Plan and Associated Development Code Amendments. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Scott questioned if this legislation addresses only certain properties identified in the CP.

Mr. Olander noted that the CP originally designated these three as areas where it would be beneficial to have a master plan in place. Additionally, the criterion for EPF was added later because this term only came along with the Growth Management Act. He noted that EPF refers to airports, transfer stations, and anything the public uses that is essential for the community that cannot be precluded from being a part of your community. He added that EPFs are also eligible for master planning. He stated that if another one is proposed, like the King County bus barn, it may be designated as an EPF. He pointed out that something like this might be eligible for the Council to consider as a legislative action.

Councilmember Way asked what happened to Ridgecrest and its PLA 2 designation. She questioned if this means that Ridgecrest would not be under the master plan area. Mr. Tovar verified that Ridgecrest is a planned area.

Mr. Olander highlighted that there may be several areas that might be designated as PLAs in the City. There could be an array of these tools in special districts, he noted.

Councilmember Way also questioned why the City was considering Ridgecrest for the criteria of master plan. Ms. Markle explained that the tool and product doesn't look much different but the City staff decided to separate it out to avoid confusion and keep it its own separate item.

Mr. Tovar added that PLAs will be discussed as discrete zoning designations that don't necessarily need a master plan process. He noted that MPA primarily describes a campus-like setting.

Councilmember Way pointed out that CRISTA has multi-family development on it and asked why it isn't designated single family. She added that it is also going to be a multi-family area with high density so master planning it to a single family institution isn't necessary. Mr. Olander commented that this is why the terminology is being changed; because it's confusing and misleading.

Councilmember Way expressed concern about having the master plan in the DC and having quasi-judicial actions going on concerning CRISTA or Fircrest. Mr. Tovar commented that if it's an administrative permit there is no quasi-judicial action by the Council.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, explained that Councilmember Way is concerned about bringing outside information about quasi-judicial processes into the decision. He said the Council could know the history of site, but it isn't as important as what they're proposing to do and how it fits within the legislatively adopted criteria. He explained that the quasi-judicial part of the record is what was done at the Planning Commission level, and that the history of a site such as Parker's isn't important.

Mr. Olander commented that the City has been trying to do away with private properties initiating a master plan designation and the granting of specific zoning regulations to specific properties.

Councilmember Way stated that she would like to hear the concerns of the residents who are in the neighborhood; she expressed concern that the Council isn't getting that feedback from them.

Mr. Olander replied that all the Councilmembers need to do is disclose any conversations they have with residents for the record. He added that when the Council gets into the granting of specific rights there's no way to avoid a quasi-judicial process.

Councilmember Way replied that the Ridgecrest process was the model of a legislative process where the Council could receive unlimited comment.

Mayor Ryu said that page 153 denotes the designation of the Transfer Station and SCC as MPAs. However, there is no information concerning Fircrest and CRISTA.

Ms. Markle stated both Fircrest and CRISTA have to apply for an MPA permit in order to change their zoning under this process. She said that Fircrest and CRISTA are shown as institution campuses, and Land Use Policy 43 talks about them. They are formerly known as single family institutions and are encouraged to apply for an MP permit. She noted that a legislative process occurred when they were adopted as single family use.

Mayor Ryu asked if a CP amendment can be done if their use changes. Ms. Markle responded that that could be done and that there are a lot of different things proposed for Fircrest. She stated

that anything that was an existing use, or a clear public use, would fit under the MPA permit process.

Councilmember Hansen favored the changes, but he expressed concern about SCC. He said he is aware of longstanding issues there and felt education should be considered as a major goal. However, he asked about the proposed language that would prohibit the college from expanding.

Ms. Markle commented that the City already conditioned their last use permit for the student union building and stated that no more buildings will be allowed on the campus until an MPA permit is approved. She noted that there was concern that this was an unusual place to put that stringent requirement, but felt it was needed until the City could change the code. She stated that the Vice President of Administration at the college said they didn't have any capital projects coming up.

Ms. Markle confirmed for Councilmember Hansen that SCC has reviewed this and they have no problem with the language. Mr. Olander commented that SCC has been working on its own master plan for five or six years.

Mr. Tovar noted that 1.5 years ago the City met with several college representatives to talk about this general question and in crafting this, the City made it clear that they won't get a permit until they get a master plan. He noted that the college's attorney questioned the validity of the City issuing a permit which restricted the college from obtaining additional permits. He said SCC has contemplated this for some time and they know the City and the Council want to see a master plan. He said the City Council still has independent authority to say it meets the community interest.

Mr. Olander highlighted that the neighborhood is concerned about future traffic and runoff impacts, and the college understands the cumulative impacts of long-term growth.

Deputy Mayor Scott asked how the public's opportunity to comment is affected if this becomes an MPA.

Ms. Markle replied that the PC creates the record that would be provided to the Council. However, short of having a MP process this has been designed ad hoc which has worked out because the different entities have had several public meetings. Now, however, it would be official and the public would need to be invited and open houses would need to be held. All of the information from those would go into the application, be forwarded to the PC, then to the Council.

Mr. Olander added that notices to the neighbors would go out and the draft MP, the traffic counts, and the SEPA review would all be available for public viewing. He stated this is a formal process and it is better to assist public awareness at the PC level so the Council has the best possible record to review.

Councilmember Way felt there is a problem with the quasi-judicial process. She commented that typically the public wants to tell the Council about the problems and they aren't told that they

need to bring issues to the PC, so they don't. Consequently, all of the complaints aren't viewed by the PC and items are adopted by them. Then the items come before the Council and the record doesn't show any public testimony against, nor can there be any comments taken.

Mr. Olander stated it is important to work with the public to emphasize the importance of their testimony at the PC.

Deputy Mayor Scott felt the PC meetings need to be televised.

Councilmember Eggen commented that he isn't enthusiastic about quasi-judicial processes. He felt that considering a fixed record in the context of quasi-judicial hearings is a very confining constraint for a master plan process. He commented that the decision criteria on page 137 -138 needs to be adequate. He commented that he isn't ready to add his comments concerning decision criteria at this meeting.

There was brief discussion regarding postponing action on this item until a future meeting.

Councilmember Way moved to postpone Ordinance No. 507 adopting the Annual Comprehensive Plan and Associated Development Code Amendments indefinitely. Deputy Mayor Scott seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Mr. Olander asked that the Council provide suggestions to the City staff no later than July 28.

9. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Long Range Planning Commission Work Program Update

Mr. Tovar highlighted that the Council provided direction to the staff on items to include as Code amendments. Three of the amendments were from Councilmember Eggen and one was from the City staff. He highlighted that the City staff has a lot to do and this work program cannot be precise; it is an approximation. He noted that the visioning process is a two-phase effort that includes many elements, such as public hearings. He said October will focus on Community Vision month in the City of Shoreline. He highlighted that the Vision will drive the City's long-term planning work program. He questioned if the Council wished to have these four Code amendments added to the plan.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment. There was no wishing to provide public comment.

Deputy Mayor Scott moved to accept the four amendments to the Long Range Planning Work Program. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Eggen explained that the recycling space for multi-family developments proposal grew out of concerns that there is not adequate space in these housing developments to support recycling. He discussed bike racks/storage, electric vehicle recharging, and a proposal to revisit the parking requirements in the North City Business District (NCBD).

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Way moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Mayor Ryu commented that if there is retail and residential parking in North City there should be some multi-use parking. She hoped that business owners would allow residents to park on their lots at night when they are closed.

Mr. Olander said it might be advisable to develop some criteria for shared parking.

A vote was taken on the motion to accept the four amendments to the Long Range Planning Commission Work Program, which carried 6-0 (Councilmember McGlashan momentarily stepped away from the Council table).

Mayor Ryu inquired about the adoption and timeline of the Work Program. Mr. Olander replied that he would like the Council to review the work plan and give the City staff direction. He noted that there are a couple of things in the program that are mandated by law. He stated that the Shoreline Master Program has to do with the state land use and zoning overlay along the waterfront and it needs to be updated by 2010. He added that there needs to be a lot of work done on the Work Plan which provides guidance to the City staff and PC.

Councilmember McConnell moved to accept the Long Range Planning Commission Work Program. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Mr. Olander commented that the City also needs to get the Growth Management Act (GMA) targets complete so the City can do some meaningful analysis.

Mr. Tovar added that the Council is going to come up with two or three Councilmembers to work with the PC members to talk about scope, advantages, and costs. He suggested the group consist of three Councilmembers and three Commissioners.

Mr. Olander pointed out that there is a blank line in the staff report concerning DC amendments and the CB cap; however, he felt that this isn't going to happen given the changes that the Council has made to move in the RB direction. He added that the City staff is considering asking the PC and Council to reconsider an RB amendment for the James Alan Salon property, since there was an RB rezone.

Councilmember Eggen stated that he didn't understand Mr. Olander comments concerning CB amendments and didn't feel they would be timely until after the RB permanent regulations are in effect. Mr. Olander commented that they were considering bringing back an interim cap of CB of around 90% of RB.

Mayor Ryu stated that once the Council is done working with RB, they may want to look at CB as well.

Regarding compliance with GMA growth targets, Councilmember Hansen pointed out that the population in the City of Shoreline in 2000 was 53,296, and in 2008 the City is at 53,440.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt the Long Range Planning Work Program Update, which carried 7-0.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:13 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk