

GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2005

PRESENT: Councilmembers Young, Franich, Conan, Dick, Picinich, Ruffo and Mayor Wilbert. Councilmember Ekberg was absent.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **Private Road Standards.** Gus Garcia, Associate Engineer, presented information on this amendment to Section 2B.020 of the Public Works Standards to allow for short private streets in developments meeting certain development standards.

There were no comments, and the public hearing closed at 7:05 p.m. and the next public hearing opened.

2. **Reduced Roadway Widths.** Gus Garcia explained that this ordinance amends Section 2B.060 of the Public Works Standards to allow for the use of reduced width public streets in residential development.

There were no public comments, and the hearing closed at 7:07 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA:

These consent agenda items are considered routine and may be adopted with one motion as per Gig Harbor Ordinance No. 799.

1. Approval of the Minutes of City Council Meeting of April 11, 2005.
2. Correspondence / Proclamations: a) National Public Works Week; b) National Safe Boating Week; c) Native Plant Appreciation Week.
3. Purchase Authorization – Speed Monitoring Trailer.
4. Amended Consultant Service Contract – Anchor Environmental, LLC.
5. Wastewater Treatment Plant Roof Repair – Contract Authorization.
6. Liquor License Assumptions: Thai Hut; Gig Harbor Chevron.
7. Approval of Payment of Bills for April 25, 2005:
Checks #46892 through #47017 in the amount of \$162,547.30.

MOTION: Move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.
Ruffo / Young – unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **Third Reading of Ordinance - Regulating Landscaping and Building Sizes in Select Districts in the Height Restriction Area Prior to Lifting the Building Size Moratorium.** Mark Hoppen, City Administrator, gave an overview of the regulations contained in the ordinance. He said that one issue that needs to be addressed is the 3,500 square foot limitation in the WR zone.

Carlos Moravek – 3880 Harborview Drive. Mr. Moravek said that he represents 18 units in the Edgewater Condos, and proposed that Council review the ordinance to allow homeowners to rebuild if their structures are destroyed. He said that he bought the condo with the confidence that it could remain there if it were destroyed. He said that if there is an exception for the proposed museum, it should be possible to have an exception for existing structures.

Les McCallum – 3559 Harborview Drive. Mr. McCallum said he just found out about the issue, and voiced concern that he could not rebuild. He asked if Council was picking on condominiums. He said that he had not been involved due to lack of notification, but would be involved from here on.

Mark Hoppen said that there were several considerations involved with rebuilding on the waterfront; zoning being one, and location in a floodplain being another. He gave a brief explanation of when these floodplain regulations come into play and who may be affected.

Carol Morris, City Attorney, explained that the city's zoning code has limitations on the percentage of a determined assessed value of a structure before rebuilding. The Shoreline Master program has a different threshold. She recommended to Council that if they wished to allow people to reconstruct, they should find out what currently exists and set that as the threshold.

There was continued discussion on floodplain regulations and the ability to rebuild under federal regulations. Rob White, Acting Planning Manager, discussed the square footage of the Edgewater Condominiums, and how the proposed ordinance would apply.

Jack Bujacich – 3607 Ross Avenue. Mr. Bujacich said there has to be a way to protect the property owners, adding that this ordinance creates non-conforming buildings. He referred to his dock, asking if it would be included as a building site on his own property, which would prevent him from building on the uplands under the proposed ordinance. He then said that discussing the grandfather clause in executive session was inappropriate, stressing that the existing property owners should be allowed to rebuild. He then said that the burden to provide open space is being placed on the vacant property owners. He recommended throwing out the ordinance until something better could be written.

Linda Gair – 9301 North Harborview Drive. Ms. Gair said that she is comfortable with most of the ordinance, but has to agree that there needs to be further consideration on the grandfathering of existing structures. She said that the city does need to limit the size of buildings, look at this issue by district, and protect significant structures.

Joe Puratich – 3421 Harborview Drive. Mr. Puratich said that he agrees with what was said by Jack Bujacich, and voiced concern that if the net shed or residence or burns, they could not rebuild.

John Vance – 3503 Harborview Drive. Mr. Vance asked if the intent of the ordinance is to protect homeowners from natural disaster or to move them out of their homes.

Councilmember Ruffo responded that he is a property owner and is diametrically opposed to the ordinance.

Councilmember Picinich said he has concerns with the ordinance, especially as it concerns the waterfront residential. He said that he thought it should be raised from 3500 to 4500 s.f., but also believes in the rights of the existing structures to rebuild. He said that he would be objecting to the ordinance until further consideration could be made.

Councilmember Ruffo said that the original intent was to keep the historic character of Gig Harbor, but the ordinance is taking property rights away. Even though it may be well intentioned, this cannot be done. He apologized for the process taking 18 months to come up with an ordinance is flawed beyond repair. He said that the time has not been wasted in respect to the amount of discussion that has come about, but said that his intent is to protect the property owners.

Linda Glein – 3106 Horsehead Bay Drive. Ms. Glein said she owns property at 3519 Harborview Drive and just learned of the implications of this ordinance on her property. She said that she agrees that the city needs to retain the character of the town without taking away property rights.

Chuck Carlson – 3505 Harborview Drive. Mr. Carlson said that the background information on the ordinance states that citizens were upset due to recent commercial development on the other side of Harborview Drive, adding that he is confused at how the ordinance got to where it is. He said that we all want to keep what we have. Mr. Carlson explained that he lives in the Millville District and he has no problem with the footprint of his unit, but unfortunately it is joined by a firewall to another unit, which puts the total structure over the limit. In commercial zones, structures are allowed to be joined by a firewall, and asked that Council extend this same allowance to residential. Mr. Carlson then commented on the lack of restriction of homes on the other side of Harborview, which may result in large structures. He suggested revisiting the entire downtown area.

Lita Dawn Stanton – 111 Raft Island. Ms. Stanton used computer software analogy to describe the ordinance as a “beta” version, driven by momentum. She said that the original intent to preserve the character and scale of the harbor has become impossible to achieve due to the narrow scope, and the lack of communication and clarity has produced an atmosphere of “procedural paralysis.” She asked Council to include a grandfather clause to protect the existing buildings.

Bill Morris – 3519 Harborview Drive. Mr. Morris said “If it is here, let it stay here.” He said that his residence is a 4-unit condominium that looks like one house and fits in

architecturally. Under these regulations, if the residence was destroyed he would no longer have the right to rebuild. He voiced concern that after all the testimony at the last meeting, staff has recommended no changes to the ordinance. He asked for consideration.

Walt Smith – 19216, Vaughn. Mr. Smith spoke on behalf of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Historical Society, thanking Council for the favorable consideration of the 35,000 s.f. limit in the C-1 Zone. This will make the task to raise funds for the museum much easier. He introduced Jennifer Kilmer, Executive Director of the GHP Historical Society.

Jennifer Kilmer. Ms. Kilmer said that the Historical Society understands that much of this ordinance is dictated by larger concerns. She said that they appreciate the consideration given to the needs of the Historical Society to store, care for, and display the city's historical artifacts.

Doug Sorensen – 9409 North Harborview Drive. Mr. Sorensen stressed that before you consider an ordinance to change something, you need to have all the facts. A current wetlands study is needed before a decision can be made as the wetlands are an integral part of density. He voiced concern with the difference in parcel maps and the problem of creating a non-conforming city.

Councilmember Franich asked for clarification on whether the current 3500 s.f. limit in the Millville District has already placed several of the condominiums in non-conformance. Mr. Hoppen confirmed that they have been in non-conformance for nine years. Councilmember Franich said that he supports grandfathering these structures. This began 18 months ago as a concern with the DB District and the B-2 side of the Finholm District, and since has turned into a Waterfront Commercial, Waterfront Residential and Waterfront Millville issue. He said that he would like to address the original issues and the proposed 6,000 s.f. limit in the C-1 zone. He said that he would have a hard time passing this ordinance without the issue of grandfathering resolved.

Councilmember Young explained that condominiums were not discussed during any of the meetings, so this proposed ordinance regulates single family residence the same as multi-family. He said that the way to address the concern is not by adopting a grandfathering clause, but by increasing the square footage limitation to a reasonable standard. That would limit the massive commercial and residential structures and allows the regular housing to remain. He recommended exempting condominiums and coming back at later with that standard. He said that the rest of the ordinance is fine.

Councilmember Conan said that he agreed with Ms. Stanton that this is a beta test and not the permanent solution. With the moratorium in place, nothing can be done, and this would allow the process to be opened up and to get moving in the right direction. He agreed that there are several areas that need to be addressed.

Councilmember Young suggested changing the 2000 s.f. footprint and 3500 s.f. overall limitation in the WR zone to 2500 s.f. footprint and 5000 s.f. overall. He then asked if

there would be a way to draft language to exempt condominiums at this time. Carol Morris said that this could not be done without bringing the ordinance back for a first reading and public hearing.

Mark Hoppen suggested deleting reference to residential zones and approving the rest of the ordinance. This would leave these zones status quo until they could be addressed. Councilmember Young voiced concern that someone could file an application for a 10,000 s.f. residence if this were to occur.

Councilmember Dick recommended that these types of residences be referred to as multi-family rather than just condominiums. Councilmember Young agreed, and added that he would like to refer all the residential zones in the view basin back to the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Ruffo asked what would happen if nothing were passed and the regulations went back to the status quo. Councilmembers discussed the possibility of unlimited size buildings being constructed in the downtown district. Councilmember Dick pointed out the dozens of hours of testimony from people concerned with that very thing happening. He said that we need to move forward and adopt something until further deliberation could occur on the other areas and concerns.

Councilmember Ruffo said that with the exception of a few mistakes, things have gone well, and he is afraid to pass bad law due to fear of what might happen. He said that a great deal of discussion has occurred regarding the Design Review process, and suggested that this is where the answer lies. He said that one of the buildings in question had been reviewed by the Design Review Board and was somehow built anyway. He asked why this occurred when there are review processes in place. Councilmember Ruffo then said that he is not in favor of passing more regulations or policies just to mitigate for what certain individuals should be held accountable for. He said that the answer lies with the function and expertise of the Design Review Board, not with more flawed legislation.

Councilmember Young asked what should be done about the applicant who doesn't want to go through the Design Review process, adding that there have to be standards in place for those applicants. Councilmember Young then pointed out that the BDR Building was approved by the Design Review Board.

Councilmembers further discussed the grandfather clause verses making the ordinance less restrictive. Mark Hoppen gave a summary of what could be built if the regulations are left as is.

Jack Bujacich – 3607 Ross Avenue. Mr. Bujacich stressed that there are height, setback, front yard, and other requirements to prevent a too large structure. He asked Councilmember Young to quote him the law making a grandfather clause illegal. Mr. Bujacich then asked why Council is considering passing a law that makes 90% of the properties non-conforming, adding that properties with docks would not be allowed to build anything because the dock is considered part of the footprint. He said that the

ordinance is putting so many restrictions on properties that the owners will not ever be able to sell. Councilmember Young pointed out that this is the reason he is trying to make the ordinance less restrictive.

Councilmember Franich asked Mr. Bujacich for his opinion of the proposed regulations on the B-2 side of the Finholm District. Mr. Bujacich said that he hadn't reviewed that portion of the ordinance. Councilmember Franich explained that currently the limit is 35,000 s.f. and the proposed language is 6,000 s.f. Mr. Bujacich talked instead about the Russell Building and the promise that you would be able to look out over the top of the building to see the water. He addressed the building on the hill and how it doesn't meet the city code, and then how the Luengen Building bothers everyone. Councilmember Franich asked him if he thought the proposed building size limits in the B-2 and DB Districts are a positive thing. Mr. Bujacich said that he could not answer that because he didn't study them. He was concerned with his waterfront area and the height and blocking of views that would ruin what we have in Gig Harbor. He explained that the condos went through the hearing process and after negotiations, lowered the building considerably so that you can look over and see the water. He said that his concern is to be able to keep what we have now. He agreed that there are good portions to the ordinance, but he is concerned when he hears that council wants to pass it the way it is and then work on adjusting it later.

Councilmember Young gave a brief history of how the 35,000 s.f. limit came about and made the following motion.

MOTION: Move to direct staff to bring back a revised ordinance removing multi-family structures from consideration, and to take suggested changes to the Planning Commission to regulate them. In addition, change the square footage limits in the WR Zone from 2000 s.f. footprint and 3500 s.f. total to 2500 s.f. and 5000 s.f. respectively.
Young / Dick –

Councilmember Young said that he would also like to see examples of properties from around the harbor to see how the new restrictions would apply. Councilmember Ruffo said that this direction to staff is still leading down the wrong path and that the whole thing needs revisiting.

Mark Hoppen summarized that he hadn't heard problems with the Waterfront Commercial, DB, or the B-2 Zones, but the concern lies with every zone that has a residence. Councilmember Franich said he would like to move forward on the zones where there are no concerns in order to remove the moratorium. There was further discussion on what portions of the ordinance could be passed without having to bring back the entire document for public hearing.

Mark Hoppen said that if Council wanted to exclude the residential zones, Sections 8 and Section 10, and 17.50.045 #3 would need to be removed from the ordinance. The consequence would be an at-risk area north of Eddon Boat to the C-1 area where the

Historical Society is locating. He recommended that Council take action on the motion on the table, and then look at passing the ordinance with the removal of those sections.

RESTATED MOTION: Move to direct staff to bring back a revised ordinance removing multi-family structures from consideration, and to take suggested changes to the Planning Commission to regulate them. In addition, change the square footage limits in the WR Zone from 2000 s.f. footprint and 3500 s.f. overall total to 2500 s.f. and 5000 s.f. respectively.

Young / Dick – four voted in favor. Councilmembers Picinich and Ruffo voted no. The motion carried four to two.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance 995, removing Sections 8 and 10 and Section 11, Subsection 3.

Young / Conan –

AMENDMENT: Move the substitute language in Section 11, Subsection 3 to exempt multi-family dwellings.

Dick / Conan – unanimously approved.

Councilmember Franich again voiced concern with the 35,000 s.f. limit in the C-1 zone. He said that there is no assurance that the Historical Society will build, and he would prefer they rezone to P-I. Councilmembers pointed out that it is a timing issue.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance 995, removing Sections 8 and 10 and Section 11, Subsection 3, and as further amended.

Young / Conan – four voted in favor. Councilmembers Picinich and Ruffo voted no. The motion carried four to two.

2. Second Reading of Ordinance – Terminating the Building Size Moratorium. No verbal report given.

Jeff Bucholz – 9805 Ridgeway Drive. Mr. Bucholz gave a history of his efforts to build on North Harborview Drive and the delays in obtaining a permit he had encountered over the past two years due to changes in the Design Manual, and the water and building moratoriums. He voiced support for the termination of this moratorium.

Councilmembers discussed the effective date for the building size ordinance just adopted, and to ensure that the termination of the moratorium become effective the same time. The City Clerk was instructed to publish the summary of the ordinance in the next edition of the Peninsula Gateway so that the moratorium is lifted as soon as possible.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 996, terminating the Building Size Moratorium to become effective at the same time as Ordinance No. 995.

Picinich / Franich – unanimously approved.

3. Consideration of Ordinance Extending the Building Size Moratorium. No consideration necessary.

4. Second Reading of Ordinance – Amending the Public Works Standards for Private Streets. Gus Garcia, Associate Engineer, presented background information on this ordinance to amend the Public Works Standards for private streets. He said that this is a result of situations in which the city has been asked to accept private streets for ownership after the homeowners realize the repair and operation costs are beyond their means. He recommended approval of the ordinance.

Councilmember Young asked for clarification for the requirement for the 4" thickness. Mr. Garcia explained that the intent is to create an incentive in which a private road and public road would be identical so that there would be no advantage to construct one versus the other. If the city were asked to accept a private road, it would be built to city standards.

Councilmember Franich addressed the letter from Wade Perrow, and asked for clarification on how this affects these properties and if there are others that might be similarly affected. He asked whether it would be a good idea to table this until the issue could be explored further. Mr. Garcia said there may be others that are affected in a similar manner, but the ability to craft an ordinance that would fit every situation would be daunting. He continued to explain that the property in Mr. Perrow's letter is vested.

Councilmember Dick said that the other issue is the narrowing of public streets and asked if there would be anything to preclude the city from accepting a private street that had been improved to the new standards. Mr. Garcia said that the City Engineer would assess the road and whether it would be fit to assume without considerable financial commitment. He added that the difference in cost to construct 3" of asphalt as opposed to 4" is miniscule.

Councilmembers further discussed the situation where a public street may be accessed from a current, private road that doesn't meet city standards. Councilmember Ruffo said that there needs to be exceptions to the 400' length standard.

Mr. Garcia described the current regulations in which private streets cannot be constructed unless they conform to the Public Works Standards of 57' width with curbs, gutters, sidewalks, planter strips and bike lanes.

Councilmember Dick said that it would be important to pass the public road narrow standards and then adjust the private road standards to accommodate that. Mr. Garcia said that the major differences that are recommended for private roads are the maximum length based on a financial obligation of the homeowners and a reasonable width. This makes it feasible for a residential community.

Steve Misiurak, City Engineer, addressed the need for exceptions to the 400' length standard. He said that there is a variance process in which the applicant must meet certain criteria. He then commented that another letter was received in regards to the ordinance that addressed impervious versus pervious surfaces in parking areas.

Mr. Garcia explained that he had talked to Mr. Perrow and had addressed his concerns.

MOTION: Move to table this ordinance on private road standards until the public road standards are brought back at the next meeting and that the public road standards be placed first on the agenda.
Dick / Ruffo – unanimously approved.

5. Second Reading of Ordinance – Prentice Avenue Street Vacation Request – Savlov. Mark Hoppen explained that this street vacation request is an example of the non-user statute and will serve to clear the title on the property.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 997 vacating a portion of Prentice Street.
Dick / Ruffo – unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Resolution in Support of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Historical Society Museum Project. Mr. Hoppen explained that this resolution came forward from the Parks Committee in support of the Historical Society in its efforts to develop the property at the corner of Harborview and North Harborview Drives.

Councilmember Franich asked for clarification on the restoration of Donkey Creek. Councilmembers explained that this was one of the goals as a part of the Donkey Creek Park plan. Councilmember Franich said that he has a hard time supporting this as members of the fishing community have voiced concerns over the culvert and the return of the chum salmon. Councilmembers stressed that this resolution does not commit to anything other than to show a cooperative effort.

Walt Smith – Vaughn, Washington. Mr. Smith clarified that the only thing that has changed is that now that the Historical Society has taken over the property, they are acting in complete cooperation with the city. Any improvements or lack thereof to Donkey Creek is at the city's discretion.

MOTION: Move to adopt Resolution No. 647.
Ruffo / Picinich – five voted in favor. Councilmember Franich voted no.

2. First Reading of Ordinance – Reduced Roadway Width Standards. Gus Garcia presented information on proposed standards for reduced width of local residential access streets. He said that the proposal has been presented to the Community

Development Committee, and then to the development community and public in an open forum. He recommended that this be approved at the second reading.

Councilmember Franich asked if the majority of testimony taken on this issue has been from residents or developers. Mr. Garcia responded that it was from developers. Councilmember Young pointed out that he himself has spoken in favor of the reduced width roadways as a resident.

Councilmember Franich said that his main problem with this is the possibility for the deletion of off-street parking on a major local road. He said that his main objective is to have safe streets where cars can pass and avoid the problem of someone blocking access for emergency vehicles. He said that the city wouldn't be as friendly without a place to pull off the road to look at a map, or to look at a house to find an address. He said he is surprised that staff has done away with the planting strip and the on-street parking; a radical change from the process the city has gone through for many years to construct the streets in a certain way.

Mr. Garcia explained that they were asked to consider how to feasibly and geometrically decrease the width of a public street while keeping it safe for motorized vehicles and pedestrians. By eliminating planting strips, they were able to save 6' and still maintain a pedestrian walkway guarded by a barrier concrete curb. At 25 miles per hour, it would be difficult for a motor vehicle to jump the curb and strike a pedestrian. Secondly, they did not compromise on the 11' travel lanes, making them 2' wider than emergency vehicle requirements. He said that on-street parking is not going to be deleted in every instance. He stressed that these standards are not intended for commercial areas, but specifically for a smaller, residential community.

Councilmember Franich said that if it is located in a dead-end development, its one thing, but when you are connecting major roads, as in the case of Edwards Street, it is different. He said that as traffic demands increase, roads like Edwards will be used more.

Councilmember Young stressed that the purpose of the reduced roadway width is to prevent people from traveling at 40 miles per hour through a residential neighborhood, using Fairway Estates as an example. Narrow roads make it more difficult to speed.

Councilmember Franich said that people are going to speed no matter what the road width, adding that he would like to see rolled curbs as an option. Councilmember Young discussed pedestrian safety concerns that are inherent with rolled curbs.

Mayor Wilbert asked if there were any further comments.

Carl Halsan. Mr. Halsan said that he was speaking as a resident, not a developer. He clarified that Edwards Street would not qualify under these regulations because it connects two collector arterials and this through traffic is discouraged in the standards. He then addressed the advantage of rolled curbs to the homebuilder to not have to pre-

determine the curb-cuts for a driveway. He said that you don't have to do that with rolled curbs, but it also makes them dangerous. He said that barrier curbs look nicer and more finished. He concluded by saying that this ordinance is a good thing.

Scott Inveen – 8617 96th Street. Mr. Inveen shared pictures of examples of streets. Carol Morris, City Attorney, reminded Mr. Inveen not to speak in regards to his current variance appeal with the City Engineer. He said that this had nothing to do with the appeal.

Mr. Inveen continued to say that the pictures illustrate how streets were constructed in the past before expanding to address EMS concerns. He said that the wider streets promote speeding and pedestrian accidents. He stressed that the narrower the streets, the slower the traffic which makes people drive more carefully, and which has been documented in reams of studies.

Councilmember Franich said that at the time those streets were built, there wasn't near the current traffic demand. He said that it is difficult to drive through the north end of Tacoma.

Mr. Inveen then said that the proposed streets are not actually skinny, they have widened them to 11' travel lines increasing them from 10'. He said that this creates more impervious surface. He asked Council to take that into consideration.

Councilmember Franich asked him about density. Mr. Inveen said that he agrees that there should be on-street parking, adding that he is not associating with density at all.

3. Pierce County 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Initiated Applications. John Vodopich, Community Development Director, presented the three, 2005 Proposed Amendments to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. He said that these three have been moving through the review process at Pierce County, and he has prepared a draft letter for Council consideration reiterating Council's previous stance on each proposal.

MOTION: Move to authorize staff to forward the attached letter to the Pierce County Council.
Ruffo / Picinich –

AMENDMENT: That Council recommend approval of amendment M-22 rather than opposing this amendment.
Young / no second. The motion died.

MOTION: Move to authorize staff to forward the attached letter to the Pierce County Council.
Ruffo / Picinich – unanimously approved.

4. First Reading of Ordinance – Accepting a Donation for the Purpose of Purchasing Equipment that will be used in Support of Senior Citizen Program. Mark Hoppen explained that an ordinance needs to be passed to accept this donation of funds gleaned by the Mayor. This will return at the next meeting for a second reading.

STAFF REPORTS:

Mark Hoppen explained that the following reports are for Council's review and no verbal report would be given. He then congratulated John Vodopich and Councilmember Franich for their effort in obtaining an additional \$500,000 in grant funding for the Skansie Brothers Park. He said that in addition, Representative Pat Lantz was successful in helping to this get through. This results in a total recoup of one million for the Skansie Brothers Park property acquisition.

1. Community Development - Incentives for Senior Housing.
2. Community Development – First Quarter 2005 Building Permit Data.
3. Community Development – Pump Station 2A Public Meeting.
4. Finance – First Quarter Financial Reports.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michael Perrow – PO Box 1266, Gig Harbor. Mr. Perrow said that he runs up to 70 miles per week and voiced concern with pedestrian safety issues around the harbor. He said he was almost hit in the roundabout, and suggested that when the flashing crosswalks are installed that adding a 4-way light in the center would alert pedestrians to whether or not the lights are functioning.

He continued to suggest that when the city develops parks, that there be more focus on maintenance and safety. He used the recently developed BMX Park to illustrate that nothing has been done to the road to protect pedestrians. He said that the cars don't stop at the intersection of Vernhardson and Crescent Valley, and besides almost being hit himself, he has witnessed kids on bikes almost being hit. He suggested a four-way stop or a curbed sidewalk off the roadway. He then spoke about the dangers of crossing Wollochet Drive from the Tallman Nature Park and the lack of painted crosswalks when exiting the Grandview Forest Park. He just said that pedestrian safety is his concern.

Mr. Perrow then recommended a shoulder or other non-paved path when completing the Cushman Trail to facilitate runners. His final comment was that the police officers don't wave when they are in their cars, which may affect public perception.

Mark Hoppen said that he forwarded the suggestion for soft-surfaces to Metro-Parks and they are working in conjunction on development of the Cushman Trail.

COUNCIL COMMENTS / MAYOR'S REPORT:


Councilmember Franich said that he noticed the pavers have been redone at least twice at the corner of Pioneer and Harborview and the grass is growing up and it looks unkempt. He suggested that stamped concrete rather than the pavers.

Mark Hoppen explained that this would be addressed quickly.

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9:45 p.m.
Ruffo / Franich – unanimously approved.

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Tracks 1 – 29
Disc #2 Tracks 1 – 16.
Disc #3 Tracks 1 – 3.



Gretchen A. Wilbert, Mayor



Molly Towslee, City Clerk