

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL AND SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING SUMMARY MINUTES

Monday, October 30, 2006  
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Spartan Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, and Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, McGlashan, Ryu, and Way

GUESTS: Chair Piro, Vice Chair Kuboi, and Commissioners Broili, Hall, Harris, McClelland, Pyle, and Wagner

ABSENT: Commissioner Phisuthikul

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:16 p.m. by Mayor Ransom, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Ransom led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Phisuthikul.

3. STUDY ITEM

(a) Joint Council/Planning Commission Discussion

The discussion began with introductions around the table. Chair Piro highlighted the proposed discussion topics as outlined on page 19 of the Council packet. Staff present included: Paul Cohen, Planner; Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk; Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director; Steve Cohn, Planner; Bob Olander, City Manager; Ian Sievers, City Attorney; Scott Passey, City Clerk; and Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager.

Following the format of the agenda outline, Chair Piro highlighted the Planning Commission's key accomplishments for 2005-2006 as identified through the 2006 Planning Commission Retreat, including updates to the permanent hazardous trees regulations, agreement to rescind cottage housing, and recommendation of a number of rezone applications. He pointed out that the Planning Commission's work has resulted in

a broad interest in housing issues as well as the Council's adoption of a Comprehensive Housing Strategy as a 2007-08 Council goal. He noted that the Planning Commission would like to form a relationship with the Cascade Land Conservancy in a more deliberative process, while involving neighborhoods and the overall community, with the aim of giving the City Council the best information possible.

Continuing, Chair Piro explained the changes made to Planning Commission meetings in an effort to provide enhanced opportunities for citizen involvement. The Commission moved its citizen comment period earlier in the meeting so the public can avoid sitting through long deliberations. It has also kept discussions open until a final decision is made to allow as much opportunity to call people back into play, ask additional questions, or get more information. He said this process gives the Commission the confidence that they are pulling together all available information before developing a recommendation.

Councilmember Way called attention to the three televised meetings of the Planning Commission which dealt with the tree ordinance and expressed her appreciation for the way they were handled. She said she heard lots of good comments from the public and hoped that more meetings could be televised in the future.

Mr. Tovar said although they haven't discussed this idea with the Commission specifically, television is a potential tool to reach a broader audience. He said there are cost implications of increasing television coverage, but noted that other outreach efforts are being explored and will be discussed later in the meeting.

Chair Piro said that given the nature of some forthcoming issues, it may be appropriate to televise some future meetings.

Responding to Councilmember Way's inquiry about whether the Commission could make its website more interactive, Chair Piro said the Commission could also look at that issue when there's an opportunity.

Continuing, Chair Piro discussed the work plan items that were identified through an exercise at the Commission's summer retreat. Commissioners were asked to come prepared to share with the group three work plan items they would like to see in the Commission's 2007-08 work plan. Through a "vote by dot" exercise, the Commission identified the following top work plan items:

1. Sub-area planning for special study areas
2. Town Center (Plan/Vision/Facilitate creation of)
3. Comprehensive Housing Strategy
4. Urban Forest Management Strategy
5. Develop a Bike-Pedestrian Strategy
6. Green Streets/Complete Streets (to fully accommodate walking & biking)
7. Study formed-based housing

Councilmember Hansen emphasized the need to considering a more comprehensive rezoning plan and integration of the zoning with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the Council has been asked to approve a number of individual projects, but it would be preferable to base decisions on a more comprehensive policy rather than on case-by-case basis. Chair Piro concurred.

Councilmember Way pointed out that there is a lot of community interest in what happens with the subarea plans for the special study areas. She said she is very interested in how the “charette” process plays out in Ridgecrest. She emphasized the need to keep the community informed and ensure there is enough time for public involvement in the process.

Commissioner Pyle noted that through walking along 145<sup>th</sup> Street down to Lake City Way and talking with people in his neighborhood (Briarcrest), there is a sense that Briarcrest is a “forgotten area” of Shoreline. He felt that an overall vision is something that could really improve that part of Shoreline. He said through neighborhood meetings and other discussions he is trying to get the neighborhood perspective and ascertain what they’d like to see done, as well as how the Planning Commission can draw them into the process.

Councilmember Way agreed that Briarcrest residents feel they are a neglected part of the City, and both Briarcrest and Ballinger are real hubs for change. She noted that these areas involve several different issues, including sensitive areas and Fircrest, so looking at these issues will not be a “one-shot deal.”

Councilmember Ryu noted that her business office used to be located on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Regarding the Town Center plan, she pointed out that the Gateway Center development was not quite what the Planning Commission had envisioned for that parcel. She said if the City embarks on the Town Center plan, it must realize that the environment has changed, including the intersection of NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street and Aurora Avenue N. She urged the Commission to pay attention to Aurora Corridor Phase 2 design, noting that medians, u-turns, intersections, and controlled access points in Aurora Corridor Phase 1 are having an adverse impact on businesses, shoppers, and traffic safety.

Chair Piro noted that the Economic Development Task Force explored some intriguing ideas relating to the town center concept, which involved potential redevelopment of school district and community college property.

Deputy Mayor Fimia pointed out that the process of determining what the priorities are involves checking and rechecking between the Council, the Planning Commission, the staff, and the public to ensure that the goals and work plan are in alignment. She said with that in mind, she will have some suggestions for items to include on the work plan that might help implement the stated goals. She also expressed interest in hearing what the Planning Commission feels the goals should include.

At this point in the discussion, Chair Piro invited Mr. Tovar to make a presentation on the roles of the Commission, the Council, and staff.

Mr. Tovar began his remarks by commenting that the proposal for a joint meeting with the City Council every six months is a good way for keeping communication flowing regarding work program issues, priorities, and direction. He pointed out that the time to have those discussions is when you don't have controversial "burning" issues involving two opposing sides. He concurred with the Planning Commission recommendation that these meetings be regular, predictable, and tied to the work program, priorities, and budget.

Mr. Tovar displayed a PowerPoint slide to illustrate the roles of each group and the interrelationship between the Council, the Planning Commission, and the staff. He explained that frequently the public incorrectly perceives that City staff makes the decisions and policies, when actually staff members are the administrators who carry out the regulations the Council adopts; the regulations are recommended by the Planning Commission. The City Council is the policy-making body, which is comprised of elected officials; City staff are the employed planning professionals, who administer the policy; and the Commission is comprised of citizen planners who are appointed by the Council and act as policy advisors.

In terms of prerogatives and obligations, Mr. Tovar explained that staff owes the Commission and City Council their best recommendation on what they think the policy choice should be. In cases involving discretionary permits, staff is obliged to follow the code and recommend approval, denial, or approval with conditions. In return, the Planning Commission owes staff an explanation of its rationale when it doesn't agree with the staff recommendation so that staff understands it if they're called upon to present that recommendation to the Council. He noted that the Commission does not have an obligation to agree with staff, nor does the Council have an obligation to agree with the Commission. He noted that the common characteristic among these three groups is a shared mission, which includes improving quality of life, managing growth, and ensuring what happens in future is as close to what we would like it to be as possible. He said while it is not totally within our control as a city organization, we much have a much better chance of shaping the future if we work as a team, each of us with our own respective role.

Continuing, Mr. Tovar noted that some citizens have expressed concerns about the perceived relationship between the development community and City staff. He pointed out that just because staff is less constrained it what it says to the development community does not mean that staff is on the side of the applicant or developer. He said the public needs to understand that staff's job is to talk to developers and explain the process, fees, criteria, and what their recommendation might be. He refuted the opinion that staff is closer to the developer than they are to the citizens, noting that "they're all our customers." He said the staff treats people equally, whether they're an applicant for a multi-million dollar project or the citizen next door who's concerned about that project.

He stressed the importance of finding ways to convey this to the public and explaining the respective roles of staff, Council, and Planning Commission.

Next, Mr. Tovar used another graphic to illustrate the difference between administrative, quasi-judicial, and legislative decisions and their corresponding level of public comment impact and discretion represented on a continuum spanning the three decision types. He explained that there is limited opportunity for the public to influence the outcome of administrative actions, but significant opportunity to impact legislative decisions, such as Comprehensive Plan amendments. In the middle lie quasi-judicial matters, where there is some discretion involved but not as much as with a legislative matter. Quasi-judicial actions are rigorously prescribed by criteria. Legislative actions allow for a lot of discretion on the part of the City, and therefore a large impact by citizen comment. However, in administrative actions there is little discretion, so the public has a right to know about it and can comment on it, but their ability to influence the outcome is very limited because it's largely prescribed by law.

Deputy Mayor Fimia clarified that although there is limited discretion regarding administrative actions, if someone sees a need for changes in the laws that guide those actions, then legislative changes can be made through a Development Code amendment. Mr. Tovar concurred.

Mr. Tovar brought up several recent quasi-judicial rezone proposals to illustrate the point that many people still do not understand the difference between the three types of decisions. He said despite the hearings before the Planning Commission and recommendations for approval, there were still citizens who construed the decisions as "changing the zoning" and "breaking the rules to benefit the developer." He said in every instance, the recommendation was to achieve compliance with the Comprehensive Plan land use map. He said part of the reason for this incorrect perception is that the City is achieving consistency with the land use map on a parcel-by-parcel, or project-by-project basis, and the public does not understand that. He noted that the zoning map shows a "quilt" of R-6, R-4, and R-12, and there seems to be no apparent logic to it. However, when you look at the Comprehensive Plan map, it becomes more coherent. He suggested that the Council and Planning Commission consider the subject of legislative rezoning, which would create more predictability and address rezoning on an area-wide basis.

Mr. Olander added that Shoreline's first attempt at amending the Comprehensive Plan zoning map in the 1990's was a major effort; hundreds of decisions were made to make the zoning map correspond to the Comprehensive Plan land use map. There were several areas, perhaps 20% of the total land area in Shoreline, that were more controversial than others, and those were set aside. Those are the areas the Council still needs to address.

Councilmember Way noted that she first got involved in the City in a case involving a short plat proposal involving a critical area, and that it was not a purely administrative action. She asked about the potential for the Planning Commission and Council to review clearing and grading proposals, since under the current code there is no real opportunity for the public to influence such matters.

Mr. Tovar clarified Councilmember Way's suggestion that the Planning Commission review administrative permits that involve environmentally-sensitive areas.

At this point in the discussion, Chair Piro suggested that the group proceed to Discussion item #5, City Council feedback to and dialogue with the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Hansen felt that most of the discussion points under item #5 have already been addressed. He disagreed with the suggestion that the City Council conduct the public hearings on rezone applications because such issues belong in front of the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Way inquired about the Planning Commission's specific changes to its public comment process.

Chair Piro explained that the public now has the opportunity to provide comment immediately following the staff presentation and applicant comments. Another change in the process is that after people have exhausted their allotted speaking time, they are asked to remain at the lectern to respond to questions from the Commissioners. The Commission also exercises the option to invite speakers back if they have follow-up questions. The Commission and staff are then allowed to reconsider what is being proposed in light of the public comment that's been received, and possibly revise or modify the recommendation based on the public input.

Councilmember Way said she appreciates the Planning Commission providing that kind of flexibility because she has been in that situation many times.

Commissioner Wagner noted that the Planning Commission has also changed the order of their agendas on numerous occasions to take public comment before the Director's report, which ordinarily precedes public comment. This gives the public an opportunity to provide input at the beginning and affords them the option of leaving if they don't want to sit through the entire meeting.

Chair Piro said there seems to be some interest in changing the Planning Commission bylaws to move the Director's report to a later point in the agenda.

Mr. Tovar clarified that the staff response following public comment is not a time for staff to argue or rebut something the public may have said.

Chair Piro added that it also allows the Commission a chance to see if there is additional information that may be needed to make a decision. He said the Commission tries to avoid delaying the process but it wants to make sure all available information has been reviewed so it can pass on the best possible recommendation. Sometimes staff is asked to do additional research that is not reconsidered by the Commission, but the Commission ensures it gets transmitted to the decision-makers.

Councilmember Way noted that prior to serving on the City Council, she went before the Planning Commission many times as part of the Paramount Park Neighborhood group. She said citizens perceive that the process is weighted in favor of the applicant/developer because the City takes a position, which often favors the applicant, and then it defends that position. The perception is that there's not much opportunity for the public to provide a rebuttal, whereas City staff always have the last word. She felt there should be some way to structure it so that appellants have a chance to respond if there's somebody that doesn't understand what is being said.

Chair Piro described the dialogue process and time allotted for public comment at Commission meetings. He said citizen rebuttal only plays out if a Commissioner asks to bring someone back into the conversation -- and it goes both ways. Sometimes a citizen says something that the developer/applicant will want to rebut, but if they've had their opportunity to speak, they're not really brought back into the process unless a Commissioner calls on them specifically.

Commissioner Pyle noted that an important part of the Commission's decision-making process includes reviewing the letters that are received prior to the meeting, as well as any minutes and recorded neighborhood meetings. He said it helps him when he can see the development of a particular concern through letters and documentation. It was his hope that any misunderstandings could be resolved between citizen, staff, and applicant prior to the proposal being brought before the Planning Commission for a recommendation. He said if citizens have opportunities to become educated on the policy and how the development regulations came to be, they would have a better understanding of the process and possibly have their concerns resolved in advance. At the meeting, if he hears anything new or different from the information he has received thus far, he incorporates that into his perception of the process.

Chair Piro commented that the current Commissioners are impressive individuals that come to meetings well-prepared and endeavor to understand all aspects of the various issues. He said they engage in a very good process of trying to absorb all of the information they receive.

Deputy Mayor Fimia was impressed with the civility of the joint discussion, pointing out that wars have been fought in many parts of the world over land use issues. She emphasized that prioritization will be an immediate short-term task. She suggested ways to organize the Planning Commission's work plan and offered five categories for consideration. First, she suggested that the Commission could review and recommend potential changes to the critical areas code that might be needed for the green streets demonstration under Council Goal #6, Create an "environmentally sustainable community." Second, the Commission could review and recommend possible changes to clearing and grading permits, which is an issue that some Council members are interested in revisiting. Third, the current code allow more tree-cutting than the general public probably wants, so the Commission could provide a recommendation on a tree retention ordinance. Fourth, the Commission could also participate in an analysis of formed-based zoning; this would likely constitute a major work plan item. She pointed out that formed-

based zoning has the potential for creating more predictable development and maintaining consistency in neighborhoods. Fifth, she suggested that the Commission could coordinate efforts with the Comprehensive Housing Strategy Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to ensure that the end-product does not come as a surprise to anyone. Finally, she asked for clarification regarding what role the Commission would play in a Town Center plan.

Mr. Tovar said there needs to be more discussion with the Council and Commission on this topic. Currently, some university students are working with staff on the inventory phase, but staff intends to ask for Council and Commission direction in the coming months.

Deputy Mayor Fimia emphasized the need to answer the following questions with regard to land use plans: “What is the problem we are trying to solve with these plans?” “Who needs to be at the table?” “What are our options?” “What are the costs and benefits of each option?” She expressed support for addressing the issue of area-wide zoning. She also suggested a work plan item that would address the concept of minimum density. She asked the group to consider what legislative changes must be made so that Shoreline gets the kind of development it wants on our key corridors and intersections. She pointed out that the City will never be able to support the transit system with such low density, single-story developments. She noted that discussions with the building community would be necessary in order to fully understand all the perspectives. She expressed support for the speaker series proposal and suggested that it be advertised as an event co-sponsored by both the Commission and the Council. She noted that all the stated plans depend on a community vision, so developing a vision is a high priority. She concluded by emphasizing the disconnection between land use and transportation; the City must ensure that its land use and transit goals are in alignment.

Mayor Ransom expressed concern about the term “Town Center,” advising that it is a “hot button” issue for some residents, so perhaps another phrase could be used. He felt the town center concept could still be pursued with using that particular term. He also suggested that the Central Subarea Plan (CSP), which covers Aurora Avenue from N. 175<sup>th</sup> Street to N. 185<sup>th</sup> Street, be revisited and adopted as a major design function. He also concurred with the Planning Commission’s emphasis on the Urban Forest Management Strategy, Bike-Pedestrian Strategy, and Green Streets/Complete Streets.

Commissioner McClelland noted that the Commission did not propose the name “Town Center.” Turning to a different topic, she elaborated on the process used to develop the Central Subarea Plan (CSP), noting her extreme disappointment that the plan was never formally adopted. She said the main question relating to this project was whether the right-of-way improvements would be built on the west side or the east side of Aurora Avenue. It was agreed that the improvements would go on the east side of the road, but there were some business/property owners in the “wedge” who were very opposed to the CSP. After a long process that involved much citizen input and the creation of a charette, in the end the process was attacked. She noted that the Commission recently learned that the CSP was not formally adopted as policy, but as a report. Had the CSP been formally

adopted as a subarea plan, we would have immediately adopted development regulations, and those regulations would have allowed us to require Gateway Center to be a mixed-use development. The CSP would have also precluded the present design of the Walgreen's drug store. She pointed out that Midvale Avenue would be very different had the CSP been adopted, because we would have development regulations that have the weight of law. She stressed the importance of analyzing every aspect of the CSP process, including the consultants, the public involvement, and the City Council's reluctance to adopt it as a subarea plan. She concluded by emphasizing that we must learn from this experience in order to move forward.

Chair Piro recognized Commissioner Broili and Deputy Mayor Fimia as the next speakers.

Commissioner Broili stated that he has been a strong advocate of an urban forest management strategy for some time. He drafted a document and forwarded it to the Parks Director, who seems very amenable to the proposal. He outlined his personal vision of a vegetation management strategy, pointing out that most jurisdictions view vegetation as an overall cash drain. He said if managed correctly and thought of holistically, vegetation management can actually be a positive cash flow. As a board member of the Northwest Natural Resource Group, the focus is on sustainable forestry, urban forestry, small landowner forestry, and considering ways to create an economic base that retains an old-growth forest function within an urban habitat. He concurred with Mayor Ransom that Urban Forest Management Strategy is a high priority issue. To further clarify his long-term vision, he posed "Why do you have to get into your car or walk 20 minutes to get to a park? We should be a City *in* a park." He said the process begins with a comprehensive, city-wide urban forest management strategy that looks at where we want to be within the next 75 to 100 years in terms of our vegetation and its functions.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said she studied the minutes regarding the CSP process to find out what happened, and it appears that the City was on track to adopt the plan. She stated that the Council gave direction to previous planning staff, but it never brought back the plan for adoption. She pointed out that the property owners and businesses actually arrived at a consensus as to what the CSP should look like; they were actually testifying before the Council in favor of the plan. She said despite some relatively minor changes that were needed before returning to Council for approval, staff never brought it back. She noted that staff said we don't have to actually pass the CSP because we can get the changes we want without it. So the Council never had an opportunity to vote on it, and it apparently never insisted on it. She characterized the CSP as a "terribly missed opportunity" that resulted from an error on the part of previous staff.

Commissioner McClelland concurred with Deputy Mayor Fimia's comments but noted that there is more to the story.

Councilmember Way expressed her appreciation to Commissioner Broili for his work on the Urban Forest Management Strategy and concurred that it's a step in the right

direction. Referring to Commission work item entitled “Address low impact development protocols,” she expressed her opinion that there are many opportunities to work toward “zero impacts” if old assumptions are abandoned and the right designs are implemented. She pointed to the CSP and Aurora Corridor Phase 2 and Phase 3 as potential areas in which zero impact design can be achieved. She pointed out that many years ago, the Innis Arden community had a vision to route Boeing Creek beneath the railroad, and they were able to achieve it. Unfortunately, there is a fish dam further upstream that fish cannot pass, so there is still work to do. She said she spoke to the Parks Director about her ideas to improve these connections to the Puget Sound, and the Alliance for Puget Sound is working on strategies for fixing these connections. She noted that the City Shoreline has a special responsibility to protect and restore its streams because it has a long stretch of shoreline, and there is funding available to communities to accomplish such projects. She said these zero-impact projects can actually undo some of the damage of the past, and the urban forestry management plan will also help the situation. Lastly, noting that it does not appear on the Commission’s list, she asked if the Commission would be able to address the issue of the King County Storm Water Drainage Manual, since it is a subset under Council Goal #6, environmental sustainability.

Chair Piro clarified that some of the more specific work tasks do not appear on the list, but obviously some of those are in play.

Councilmember Ryu stressed the importance of defining the community vision soon, because all other work plan programs depend on this overall vision. She suggested adopting a City slogan or marketing plan, such as “Green Shoreline,” or some other name that would easily identify the City and its values. She pointed out the many positive features that help identify Shoreline, such as public schools, the community college, and technology, calling attention to Shoreline Community College’s growing technology program. She explained that in order to fund the long-term sustainability that is needed, economic development is a crucial component. She expressed her opinion that businesses in Aurora Corridor Phase missed out on the benefits that the recent economic recovery provided because of a lack of emphasis on economic development. She concluded her remarks by encouraging the Council, the Planning Commission, and the public to work together to create a community vision.

Turning the group’s attention to agenda item #5, Vice Chair Kuboi felt it is important that the Council understand the Commission’s role and has faith that it’s doing a good job. To that end, he asked for Council feedback on whether it feels any changes are needed in terms of procedures, reports, findings, or recommendations. On one note, he believed that the Commission reports transmitted to Council perhaps do not, as clearly as they might, describe the rebuttal-type comments from staff that were mentioned previously. Councilmember Gustafson expressed thanks to the Commission for their work, noting that the Council takes their work and deliberations seriously. Despite the fact that they don’t always agree, the Council appreciates their support. He concurred with the proposal for conducting a joint meeting every six months, noting that such meetings are a

valuable time to exchange ideas and create an overall vision. He urged the Commission to consider the Council's adopted goals as it deliberates and prepares recommendations. He stressed the importance of economic development and concurred with taking a look at the issue of legislative rezoning, especially in relation to the subarea plans. Regarding subarea plans, he commented that the Council must take action ensure that the end-product resembles what was agreed upon. He noted that the City Hall project and surrounding area, along with Aurora Square, are two projects for which the Council is seeking input. These projects also tie into economic development and subarea planning. He agreed with the Commission's work plan priorities, including Subarea Planning, Town Center, and the Comprehensive Housing Strategy, and the Bike-Pedestrian Strategy, noting that they all rank high with regard to the City's future. He concluded by thanking the Commission for taking the time to meet with the Council.

Commissioner Wagner commented that one of the things the Commission must continue to emphasize is public education, which lies at the core of many of the public's concerns. She felt that if everyone could do a better job explaining the process, then people will take the opportunity to be heard when they can be heard. She has learned at planning conferences and by experience that many projects will not be fair for everyone, but the Commission must decide on a vision and "stick with it." She stressed the importance of getting a balanced perspective based on all the opinions expressed and deciding what is in the best interest of the community, not necessarily what is in the best interest of the "loudest voice." She felt the Commission has done a good job in trying to evaluate the perspectives that come from the public, but felt more work is needed because the perception is that we need to do a better job. She said she takes her job very seriously and feels the entire Commission does likewise.

Chair Piro expressed the opinion that the Commission is a group of very keen listeners. He added that it is always difficult when the Commission takes a different position than what is expected, but it's not because the Commission isn't listening.

Councilmember McGlashan concurred with the emphasis on public education because many people don't understand how government works until they have an issue with the Council, Commission, or staff. He commended the Commission for the manner in which it conducts its meetings and considers the issues.

Mr. Tovar suggested that staff return to the Council at a future date to recap the meeting, clarify and confirm areas of consensus, and request direction for future action. Following this, the next joint meeting can be scheduled for April of 2007.

Mr. Olander commented on the proposed speaker series as included as attachment F in the Council packet. He noted that the topics will likely address a broader community or regional dialogue that needs to take place. He pointed out that the projections regarding growth and density are very imposing, so he thinks the speaker series starts an important community conversation about how we're going to meet future growth. The series is intended to be a broader introduction to the community about some very broad topics the

entire region is confronting. He pointed out that staff is always open to other ideas and other speakers too.

Chair Piro reported on the success of the joint meeting between the Commission and the Parks Board when a representative of the Cascade Land Conservancy was invited to speak. He emphasized the need to widely advertise the speaker series in order to get maximum participation. He concluded his remarks by thanking all those who came out to the meeting tonight.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested that the proposed speaker series include an expert on transit/transportation, such as Breakthrough Technologies, since transportation is a key component of the land use equation. She expressed appreciation for the meeting and for all the comments.

Mayor Ransom thanked everyone who participated in and attended the meeting tonight, noting that it provides a valuable opportunity get to know each other. That alone, he said, helps up work together. He concurred with holding a joint meeting in April because the timing aligns well with the Council's next goal-setting retreat.

4. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:06 p.m., Mayor Ransom declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk