

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

February 26, 2002

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Gary Haakenson in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North , Edmonds , followed by the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT Gary Haakenson, Mayor Dave Earling, Council President Jeff Wilson, Councilmember Michael Plunkett, Councilmember Lora Petso, Councilmember Dave Orvis, Councilmember (arrived 7:03 p.m.) Deanna Dawson, Councilmember	ALSO PRESENT Jared Carl, Student Representative
ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT Richard Marin, Councilmember	STAFF PRESENT Tom Tomberg, Fire Chief David Stern, Chief of Police Duane Bowman, Development Serv. Director Peggy Hetzler, Administrative Services Director Jim Larson, Assistant Admin. Serv. Director Dave Gebert, City Engineer Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer Sandy Chase, City Clerk Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst. Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EARLING MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER DAWSON , FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Councilmember Orvis was not present for the vote.)

2. **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

COUNCILMEMBER PLUNKETT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT EARLING FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Councilmember Orvis was not present for the vote.) The agenda items approved are as follows:

(A) **ROLL CALL**

- (B) **APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2002**

- (C) **APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #53790 THROUGH #53873 FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19, 2002 , IN THE AMOUNT OF \$95,287.39. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSITS AND CHECKS #4217 THROUGH #4310 FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 15, 2002, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$815,580.68.**

- (D) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO ESPERANCE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH SNOHOMISH COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT #1**

- (E) **AUTHORIZATION TO CALL FOR BIDS FOR LIFT STATION 1 RENOVATION PROJECT**

- (F) **REPORT ON THE GENERAL FUND AND OTHER SELECTED FUNDS FINANCIAL POSITION FOR THE PERIOD ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2001**

3. **PRESENTATION ON WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREA (WRIA) 8**

Will Hall, Principal Planner, Snohomish County Surface Water Management, described how Salmon Plans fit into Salmon Conservation Planning. The foundation for local actions has existed for a long time as cities, counties, non-profit and citizens groups have been engaged in activities to protect and restore habitat. In addition, the 1999 listing of Puget Sound Chinook salmon and bull trout as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) motivated a heightened level of attention to salmon habitat and water quality. Listing these species as threatened under the ESA gives the federal government discretion to undertake certain actions to protect and restore them. Thus, the federal government has imposed regulations that do not allow “taking” (harming) of these threatened species.

King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties formed a voluntary coalition of central Puget Sound governments, tribes, businesses, environmental groups, and citizens called the Tri-County Salmon Conservation Coalition. This group developed a model local government program to conserve salmon and comply with the ESA but also to maintain a healthy economic environment and allow cities and counties to continue providing local services. Following approximately two years of negotiation with the federal government regarding what would be appropriate and adequate to address the listing, a model program was developed that included immediate actions, salmon planning efforts designed to identify the most important and cost effective steps to provide long term sustainability of salmon, and monitoring to measure the results of actions.

Mr. Hall described immediate actions taken in the Snohomish County Salmon Program including widening critical area buffers, modifying road maintenance practices, modeling habitat restoration

projects, and citizen outreach and education. Snohomish County is also working on Salmon Conservation Plans and monitoring the actions taken.

Mr. Hall reviewed benefits of the Salmon Planning efforts including working together at the watershed level across jurisdictional lines, the ability to gain access to millions in State grants for local projects under the Salmon Recovery Act, the availability of funding to local governments and non-profit organizations (Waterworks Initiative), local and community input into the planning process, and linking local needs to federal recovery planning, Puget Sound Shared Strategy and state efforts. He explained projects that qualify for Waterworks Initiative funding must be local projects that benefit water quality or habitat and develop long term partnership arrangements, and requires leveraging of additional resources via matching or in-kind contributions with the goal of promoting long term community stewardship for water resources and habitat.

Mr. Hall displayed a map that illustrated the boundaries of Water Resources Inventory Areas (WIRA) and identified the Cedar-Sammamish watershed that includes Edmonds. He explained Edmonds' primary connection with salmon is where smaller streams and drainage enter Puget Sound. He described the ecological importance of these near shore areas to salmon.

Mr. Hall described WRIA 8 Planning efforts, a group of 27 local governments, including Edmonds, who jointly fund an effort to preserve, protect, and restore habitat to conserve and recover sustainable and diverse populations of salmon that can provide a margin for harvest. He explained King County is the "service provider" for WRIA 8 funded by the 27 governments. Groups that exist within WRIA 8 include the Forum (elected officials representing participating governments), the Steering Committee (a stakeholder group representing business, environment, government, and other interests), and technical, staff and outreach committees.

Mr. Hall described the four major planning products, 1) Reconnaissance Assessment (what do we know now) which has been completed, 2) the Near-Term Action Agenda (what can we do now) which is underway with comments due by March 26 to hilary.culvert@metrokc.gov, 3) Strategic Assessment (what do we need to learn) that is currently underway, and 4) Comprehensive Conservation Plan (what will we do in the future) which will be completed in the future. Mr. Hall referred to the table of contents for the Near-Term Action Agenda that was provided in the handout and the announcements of public meetings. He noted the Near-Term Action Agenda was also available on the King County website.

Mr. Hall described components of the WRIA 8 Near-Term Action Agenda that include habitat restoration and acquisition projects, regulatory guidance, research, monitoring and adaptive management, public outreach and education. The Salmon Recovery Funding (SRF) Board allocated over \$1.5 million to salmon habitat protection projects in WRIA 8. Additional funding is also available from King Conservation District, Waterways 2000, Cedar River Legacy, and state and federal funding sources. Projects on the 2002 priority list include a conservation area acquisition on Little Bear Creek and a culvert repair on Penny Creek. Mr. Hall referred to the contact information contained in the packet and encouraged Councilmembers and the public to contact the representatives with any questions/concerns.

Council President Earling commented he had an opportunity to hear this presentation at Snohomish County Tomorrow. That presentation, as with the presentation tonight, provided a great deal of good baseline information and was a good introduction for the City.

3a. Senator Paull Shin and Representative Brian Sullivan

Mayor Haakenson thanked Senator Paull Shin and Representative Brian Sullivan for their hard work, particularly with regard to the legislation they brought forward recently.

Representative Brian Sullivan provided an informational video tape regarding the process at the legislative level on the Brightwater issue. He provided copies of the tape for the Washington Tea Party group as well. Representative Sullivan explained that Senator Shin, Representative Cooper, and he began the legislative session with the idea of assisting Edmonds with the potential siting of the Brightwater wastewater treatment plant. As a consequence he developed HB 2340 and Senator Shin developed a companion bill, SB 6366. Representative Sullivan explained the purpose of the two bills was to save time in a short legislative session. He noted this legislative session was difficult due to the up to \$2 billion shortfall as well as serious transportation issues. Unfortunately, SB 6366 was trapped by a difference of opinion in the Local Government Committee. However, he was able to move HB 2340 out of Committee, into Rules and out of Rules to the Floor schedule. However, he was unsuccessful in getting HB 2340 scheduled for debate. He emphasized a bill was not dead until the legislative session was over. Efforts are underway to add the Eminent Domain Bill as an amendment to a Bill that is similar in nature. He cautioned there was the potential to win an amendment but lose on a bill when Representatives voted for the amendment but against the bill. He described his efforts to get HB 2340 scheduled for debate and the support of Senator Shin, Senator Farley, and Representative Cooper and other members of the House.

Senator Paull Shin complimented Representative Sullivan on his efforts. Senator Shin explained \$300,000 for the Edmonds waterfront park project was identified in the Senate Supplementary Budget. He explained they discovered, while pursuing the Eminent Domain legislation, that King County was actively lobbying against the legislation, and this was likely the reason it was not scheduled for debate. In addition, this is the first time the issue of questioning the legitimacy of Eminent Domain between jurisdictions has arisen and it likely will take a longer time to digest. He said if the correct bill to add the Eminent Domain legislation is not identified, a bill can be introduced in the next legislative session. He commended the Washington Tea Party group for their efforts.

Mayor Haakenson thanked Senator Shin for the funding for the Edmonds waterfront park. He inquired what citizens and other municipalities could do to keep the pressure on to get the bill passed as an amendment this session and to counter the information King County provided to stop the bill.

Representative Sullivan explained King County's lobbyists were very effective in their efforts to reach representatives. He explained efforts are being made to attach the Eminent Domain bill as an amendment but if leadership did not believe the attachment met the scope and object of the bill, any member on the floor could request scope and object. If the House Attorney agreed it did not meet scope and object, the amendment would be removed from the vote. Therefore, it was important to ensure the amendment met the scope and object of the bill it was attached to. He commented this had not been an easy session; due

to transportation issues, the legislature had not yet assessed or addressed the budget issues. He anticipated a special session would be necessary and, as a consequence, a continued opportunity to work on the Eminent Domain bill. He commended Development Services Director Duane Bowman and the Washington Tea Party for their assistance.

Senator Shin commented that in the legislature “you don’t get what you deserve, you get what you negotiate for.” He reiterated they were working on adding the Eminent Domain bill as an amendment to another bill.

Council President Earling noted the \$2.2 million for the Edmonds Crossing project was still in the House and Senate budget. He commented that when I-695 passed, it eliminated \$46 million in the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) budget for rail and track improvements. Due to that lack of funding, commuter rail in the north corridor has been delayed. He learned recently there were federal funds making up the \$46 million but that it had not been agreed to by either house in Washington DC and if it was, it would still require an appropriation. He asked the current status of that funding.

Representative Sullivan explained the south portion of the Sounder (Seattle to Tacoma) has been completed and is well used. Completion of the north portion is a critical element of the transportation link and would relieve congestion on the I-5 corridor. Although the \$46 million eliminated by I-695 was promised as backfill by the State, when the State budget was released recently, sufficient funds were not available for that project and it was moved to a federal line item although there is some debate whether those funds exist. He commented Representative Cooper, Vice-Chair of Transportation, has been working on this issue and assured the funds will be identified in the transportation budget. He explained the State’s share of the \$46 million has been reduced to \$31 million as Sound Transit has identified an additional \$15 million.

Senator Shin advised the \$2.2 million for Edmonds Crossing was in the House and Senate budgets. He reported Representative Cooper advised the House is ready to take a vote on a \$0.08 gas tax and forward it to a public vote. The Senate is considering a gas tax as high as \$0.09 via legislative action and not requiring a public vote.

Council President Earling thanked Representative Sullivan and Senator Shin for their work on the transportation package.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Al Rutledge, 7101 Lake Ballinger Way, Edmonds, commented he has attended WRIA 8 meetings and provided public comment. Regarding candidate interviews, he reiterated his suggestion for the Council to establish a process for interviewing candidates. Next, he indicated his support for the public to have an opportunity to vote regarding a bond issue for the Public Facilities District proposal for the Puget Sound Christian College. As a member of the Washington Tea Party, he urged the City to continue their efforts to oppose the treatment plant.

Bruce Nicholson, 9829 Cherry Street, Edmonds, expressed his support for Senator Shin and Representative Sullivan based on their actions, not their political party. He expressed his thanks to the Mayor and City staff, particularly Development Services Director Duane Bowman and Administrative Services Director Peggy Hetzler, for their efforts and for the leadership they provide.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, Edmonds, distributed a copy of the contract the City has with the Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development for the provision of tourism and promotional services. He highlighted areas of the contract such as marketing, tourism services, provision of overall marketing for Edmonds. He noted the Alliance agreed, via this contract, to provide for supervision of tourism dollars spent in the city as well as to do marketing for the city. He read from the contract, "the Alliance shall utilize all funds appropriated by Edmonds for, but only for, promotion of resources and facilities in Edmonds or the general surrounding area by advertising, publicizing, and otherwise distributing information for the purpose of attracting visitors and encouraging tourists." He noted the Alliance presented their work plan at the retreat, which by his interpretation, promoted 30-40 foot building heights, loosening architectural design codes, promoted bulkier and higher buildings, and promoted the destruction of the quaint small town atmosphere. He referred to a comment made last week (regarding a different topic) that the city could only contract with responsible parties, commenting this was an example of the City contracting with a party who has failed to act responsibly.

Councilmember Plunkett, Council representative on the Alliance Board, advised he would raise this issue with the Executive Board at their meeting on Thursday.

Councilmember Petso noted the contract also addressed funding provided via the Hotel/Motel tax fund. As the Council representative on the Hotel/Motel Tax Advisory Committee, she explained her understanding was the funds were being administered by the Chamber of Commerce for the Alliance pursuant to the contract. She pointed out the need to consider what the Chamber of Commerce was doing at the direction of the Alliance. Mr. Hertrich concurred with Councilmember Petso, explaining he checked with the Chamber; originally the monies were put through the Alliance to the Chamber and supposedly the only service they provided was to review the Chamber Work Plan. He was recently advised that the funds go directly from the City to the Chamber and the only service the Alliance provides, rather than providing the staff to coordinate the provision of these services, is to okay the plan.

5. PRESENTATION ON EXPANDED COUNTY DRUG TASK FORCE PROPOSAL

Police Chief David Stern explained several weeks ago he attended a Snohomish County Police Chiefs meeting where the Commander of the Drug Task Force presented a proposal for an expanded countywide Drug Task Force, and seeking the support of the Police Chief's Association. Chief Stern stressed this was in the proposal stage; it was not in final form and some changes may be made.

Chief Stern explained the proposal was to expand the traditional law enforcement and interdiction type of drug enforcement program and add prevention, intervention and education components. The Snohomish County Drug Task Force founded the proposal due to concerns with the expanding drug problem in Snohomish County. Snohomish County Drug Task Force will make a presentation to the Council asking for their support for this proposal prior to the anticipated November 2002 ballot.

Chief Stern explained the existing Task Force was formed via an interlocal agreement in 1988, there are currently 25 state and federal law enforcement personnel and three support staff who target upper and mid-level narcotics dealers in Snohomish County. The task force is run by a five-person Board of Directors comprised of the Snohomish County Prosecutor and Sheriff, the Everett Prosecutor and Police Chief, and one other Police Chief in Snohomish County. The current cost of the Task Force is slightly over \$501,000 annually with 55% funded via a federal grant. The remaining 45% is provided via matching funds from participating agencies in the County. Edmonds currently contributes \$8,174.

The proposal would implement a multi-facet countywide drug strategy that has drug enforcement, education, prevention and intervention components and would target mid and lower level dealers with the expanded portion of the Task Force. The existing Task Force would continue to target the upper level dealers. The proposal includes dividing Snohomish County into four geographic regions and providing coverage 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. The enforcement component would add 32 detectives, 7 sergeants, 1 lieutenant, 2 Washington State Patrol, 1 CPS representative, 6 prosecutors, 2 support staff. In addition, 16 intervention specialists, 4 support staff, 6 clerical, 1 EPA representative, and 10 health department workers who would work with schools, treatment providers, and drug court. He noted a facility to house the personnel would also be necessary. The proposal calls for the Edmonds Police Department to contribute one sergeant and three detectives.

Chief Stern advised the projected cost of the proposal was \$12 million annually. He referred to financial materials provided to Councilmembers, noting these were preliminary figures provided by the Task Force. Funding would come from an increase in the property tax levy of \$0.30 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation countywide as well as possibly from a federal grant to fund start up costs.

Chief Stern reviewed issues to be considered regarding the proposal including (1) who would manage the program and what voice would Edmonds have in the expanded drug task force, (2) who would fund election costs estimated to be up to \$600,000 (win or lose), (3) who would oversee and facilitate the hiring process, (4) what results could be expected from this type of program, (5) what would be the City's responsibility for the four positions the City would hire if the levy were not renewed in the future, and (6) what direct benefit would Edmonds derive from this proposal.

Mayor Haakenson clarified this presentation was intended as a "heads up" to the Council that this proposal would be forthcoming from the Snohomish County Drug Task Force and no action was required tonight. Mayor Haakenson asked whether Chief Stern would provide a recommendation when Snohomish County made their presentation. Chief Stern responded the issues he raised would need to be resolved before he would be comfortable providing a recommendation to the Council.

Councilmember Orvis asked whether the property levy increase would be presented to voters countywide. Chief Stern answered yes.

Council President Earling suggested when the Snohomish County Drug Task Force made their presentation, they tailor their proposal to the City they are addressing, for example, the estimated cost to home owners should reflect the average property value in the community.

Councilmember Orvis asked how the proposal would impact the current drug enforcement activity. Chief Stern advised the City currently had one detective assigned to the local Drug Task Force, which includes Mountlake Terrace, Lynnwood, and Edmonds.

Councilmember Plunkett requested Chief Stern provide responses to the issues he raised as well as his recommendation in the Council packet prior to the Snohomish County Drug Task Force presentation.

Councilmember Petso asked whether any consideration had been given to portions of this program that may already be in place in some communities such as prevention/intervention specialists assigned to school districts which may overlap with services provided by D.A.R.E. or youth services.

Councilmember Dawson commented funding would come disproportionately from communities with higher property values but less drug problems. Chief Stern agreed that was possible. Councilmember Dawson questioned whether there was a need for more officers for drug enforcement. Chief Stern answered not for the City of Edmonds alone, but pointed out it was difficult to measure the impact of other communities have on Edmonds from drug trafficking, resultant crime, etc. He pointed out narcotics did not recognize local, county or state boundaries. The biggest issue to consider regarding the proposal was the amount of impact it would have on the drug problem regionally.

Councilmember Dawson asked if the four additional Edmonds personnel would operate solely in Edmonds' boundaries. Chief Stern answered the proposal indicates the county would be divided into four geographic regions and personnel from the South Snohomish County would work primarily in that area although not exclusively in the City of Edmonds. He noted the existing local Drug Task Force worked in Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and Edmonds.

Councilmember Dawson asked if anyone had worked with the courts, particularly district courts. Chief Stern answered his understanding was that all individuals involved had been contacted but was not aware of the specific input. Councilmember Dawson asked whether there had been an increase in drug cases recently. Chief Stern advised the Snohomish County Drug Task Force indicated there had been a significant increase in drug cases, particularly methamphetamine and methamphetamine labs.

Councilmember Wilson noted the distribution of law enforcement personnel was based on population, which would place a higher proportion of new officers in the South Snohomish County area, but the greatest need may be in the rural areas in the northeast portion of Snohomish County. Chief Stern acknowledged this was a moving target, as dealers were impacted in one area, they moved to another. He acknowledged there was a rural component with methamphetamine labs due to the anonymity they may find in rural areas.

Councilmember Wilson suggested when the Drug Task Force made their presentation that they define how personnel would be assigned within the four quadrants to avoid placing a higher proportion of resources in an area when the problem existed elsewhere.

Councilmember Dawson asked whether any consideration had been given to increasing personnel in the Snohomish County Sheriff's Department rather than distributing officers into individual Police Departments. Chief Stern explained the intent was to take advantage of localized knowledge and personnel who worked within the local jurisdiction. He acknowledged the issues of who would oversee the task force and what control Edmonds would have had not yet been addressed.

Council President Earling suggested the presentation also address the formula for distributing personnel to cities. For example, he noted Edmonds with a population of under 40,000 was assigned four personnel, Everett with a population of 87,500 was assigned seven personnel, and Arlington with a population of 10,500 was assigned two personnel.

6. CONTINUED DISCUSSION REGARDING PARAMEDIC INTEGRATION

Mayor Haakenson thanked Councilmember Dawson for her attendance at the February 21 Medic 7 Board meeting. He recalled the intent at the February 21 Medic 7 Board meeting was to reach consensus on the eight issues he presented at the February 19 Council meeting. Reaching agreement at the Medic 7 level would have allowed the Board to proceed to the next step, vote on a motion to allow Lynnwood and Edmonds to hire eight paramedics in each city.

Before the Board began deliberation on the eight issues, the Lynnwood representative, Councilmember Don Gough, made the following motion, *"I move that the Medic 7 Board approve the hiring of eight Medic 7 paramedics each by the cities of Lynnwood and Edmonds consistent with the Medic 7 Interlocal Agreement and that transition costs for expenses, "fit-for-duty" medical exams, and training for paramedics for Firefighter I certification up to \$120,000 be approved from Medic 7 reserve accounts; and that the Medic 7 Board expressly approves both cities conducting with Medic 7 Paramedics other normal "employment procedures" in order to complete their hiring on or before March 31, 2002."*

Due to the need for Board representatives to brief their Councils before voting on the motion, Mayor Haakenson suggested discussion be continued to a special Medic 7 Board meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 28. Mayor Haakenson indicated the additional correspondence he received from Lynnwood Councilmember Gough was delivered to Edmonds Councilmembers Monday evening in preparation for tonight's discussion. That information also included a memorandum from the attorney for the Medic 7 Board. Mayor Haakenson asked Administrative Services Director Peggy Hetzler to provide her thoughts regarding the motion. He clarified he was seeking Council direction regarding how to vote on the proposed motion.

Ms. Hetzler explained last week Mayor Haakenson requested she review the proposed motion and provide her thoughts regarding the financial ramifications as well as from her viewpoint as the risk manager for the City. She identified the following issues that were not addressed in the motion:

- ◆ Remaining assets of Medic 7 – who would own the aid cars? Who would pay the insurance premiums on the vehicles, who would be responsible for the maintenance on the vehicles?
- ◆ Status of the cities’ annual assessment for Medic 7 operations – what would be the date of the final assessment payment, what would be the total amount of the 2002 assessment that the cities provide to Medic 7.
- ◆ Hiring Paramedics as employees – would the Paramedics be new employees of the City? Normally new employees are not permitted to bring accrued leaves with them. Are leave balances to be cashed out by Medic 7 or are the moneys associated with the balances to be allocated to the cities?
- ◆ Resolution of the two non-paramedic employees – would Edmonds have any benefit from the two employees and what services would they provide to the City?
- ◆ Status of the current interlocal agreement – a new Interlocal Agreement would be necessary to provide clearer indemnification language regarding City personnel driving a vehicle owned by another organization.
- ◆ How the \$120,000 would be allocated between cities and no discussion regarding resolution of the remaining Medic 7 cash reserves. Based on preliminary financial analysis, there would be at least \$300,000 in additional reviews that are not addressed in the motion.
- ◆ What continued level of support the City would be required to provide to Medic 7? If the City takes over the employees, there are still expenses associated with Medic 7 and there is no discussion regarding how those would be funded.
- ◆ Audit ramifications – Medic 7, as an interlocal agency is subject to audit by State Auditors the same as the City. Ms. Hetzler related a past experience with a joint Office of Information Technology operated by Clark County and the City of Vancouver. When the organization was dissolved, employees were allocated but equipment continued to be owned by the interlocal agencies for an extended period of time. The State Auditors were very concerned this represented an entity they could not audit because the interlocal agreement that established the entity did not address the current operation. As a result, the audit was very costly and there was a great deal of criticism because issues other than personnel had not been fully discussed and voted on by the two entities.

Council President Earling observed the main driving force of the motion was resolving personnel issues, but those could not be settled until the other issues had been addressed. Until a major portion of the issues was settled, he would not support the motion.

Councilmember Orvis agreed with Council President Earling, noting there were clearly several issues that needed to be worked out first.

Councilmember Petso commented she had difficulty discussing this issue because the materials she received last night were in an envelope labeled “confidential” and she was uncertain whether she could reference the materials. She suggested the issue be addressed at a Public Safety Committee meeting. She noted this was one of the most important services the City provided to its citizens and it absolutely must be right and agreement reached among all parties regarding how to proceed. She concluded it was worth taking adequate time to resolve these issues.

Mayor Haakenson explained the envelope was stamped “confidential” so that it arrived in that manner. He clarified the Council was free to address any materials in the envelope. He urged the Council not to forward this matter to the Public Safety Committee as it required the attention of the full Council.

Councilmember Dawson agreed with many of the comments that had been made, noting voting on this motion before answering the important questions was putting the cart before the horse. She cited important issues to be addressed such as what would be done with accrued vacation and sick leave and would it be funded by reserves and how will the non-paramedic personnel be addressed. She expressed concern with potential liability issues if Medic 7 continued to own the vehicles but were operated by City employees. She was concerned how cities would bargain with paramedics who were under the control of Medic 7 and questioned who would supervise the employees. She was uncomfortable with hiring Paramedics until all the issues had been addressed and was not ready to move forward at this time.

Councilmember Petso noted actions over the past several months indicated it was the City’s intent to put Medic 7 personnel and services into the Fire Department and phase out the Medic 7 operation over time. The February 25 memorandum indicates Lynnwood has a different vision and does not wish to discontinue the Medic 7 organization. She pointed out it would be difficult to make an agreement work until all parties were working toward the same objective. As a further example, the memorandum indicated a desire by Lynnwood to expand the agreement for the Medic Services Administrator to include all paramedic personnel. She was unsure if this placed paramedics in the fire departments and questioned whether this was the vision staff has been pursuing. She agreed with Councilmember Dawson’s concern with having City personnel operate vehicles owned by another organization, noting this may represent a financial risk that the City was not prepared to undertake. She concluded if the cities did not have a common vision, she was unable to support the motion.

Mayor Haakenson summarized the issues raised by Councilmembers were accrued leave, non-paramedic employees, liability of vehicles, bargaining units representing two different groups, and cash. Council President Earling commented a great deal more successful negotiation must take place before the Council could support bringing the project to resolution.

Lynnwood Councilmember Gough agreed with most of the comments made by Councilmembers. He recalled the cities exchanged information regarding a series of proposals in spring/summer 2001 and it was his understanding a series of discussion would follow. When he became involved in the discussion again in January 2002, one of the issues addressed in the memorandum was the lack of a complete plan and complete financial plan. He explained the purpose of his motion was to set a starting point for a series of discussion actions. He did not anticipate this motion would address all issues. He referred to Councilmember Petso’s concern regarding a common vision, agreeing that was a fundamental concern. He noted the policy of the City of Lynnwood, identified in June 2000, was repeated in the memorandum.

Mayor Haakenson asked Councilmember Gough if he would be willing to put together a complete plan and financial plan before the Board took action on his motion. Councilmember Gough acknowledged a complete plan and financial plan was a fundamental issue. He suggested the financial staffs of the cities address the financial issues.

7. **MAYOR'S COMMENTS**

Mayor Haakenson advised Dick Sly, a former Councilmember and volunteer Firefighter passed away. Mayor Haakenson noted Mr. Sly had been a great contributor to the City.

In response to Councilmember Petso's comment at the last meeting regarding the make-up of the Planning Board, Mayor Haakenson referred to a list of Planning Board members and their addresses, noting two members lived in the north end, three in the middle and three in the south end.

8. **INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL REPORTS/UPDATES ON OUTSIDE COMMITTEE/BOARD MEETINGS**

Council President Earling reported on the opening of the Everett station and urged the public to view it. He explained it was not just a train station, it was a multimodal facility that accommodated numerous modes of transportation including Amtrak, Greyhound, Community Transit, Everett Transit, Sound Transit, allowing riders to move from one mode of transportation to another. In addition, Everett has assembled a consortium of educational institutions that will begin offering classes this fall and eventually degree programs from Washington State University, University of Washington, Western Washington and several community colleges. There are also opportunities at the station for workforce outreach. He reported the facility was stunning from the outside as well as from the inside. He complimented the Everett Mayor and staff for their efforts to develop this project.

Council President Earling reported the State previously ruled Community Transit could not collect transit tax as a result of a provision in I-695. The Supreme Court recently ruled that the moneys should have been collected. As a result, Community Transit has lost over \$43 million over the past two years. He noted that because of an initiative that was crafted poorly enough that it did not accomplish what the drafter intended, transit services had been reduced throughout the State. In Snohomish County, a sales tax increase was passed by the voters that allowed Community Transit to restore most of the service that had been discontinued. Although he supported the initiative process, he hoped when initiatives were drafted, they would accomplish what the drafter intended to accomplish. He noted it cost millions to solve this issue in the courts and a great deal of transit service was eliminated that could have been continued to be offered.

Regarding the WRIA 8 presentation, Councilmember Petso pointed out one of the key benefits of the City's participation was the ability to access grant funds. She encouraged the City or non-profit groups to develop salmon related projects that were eligible for grant funds for presentation to the WRIA Board. She noted review of a project by the WRIA Board often put the project in an advantageous position to receive grant funding. She encouraged City staff and community organizations to contact her regarding funds available for projects.

Councilmember Wilson reported on the Port of Edmonds meeting he attended recently. One of the projects the Port is pursuing is State funding for a cooperative project between the City and Port on the

north bulkhead. He spoke with a Port Commissioner regarding a joint meeting with Port Commissioners and the Council to discuss common issues, long-term views, and how the entities could work together.

COUNCILMEMBER PLUNKETT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER ORVIS, TO EXCUSE COUNCILMEMBER WILSON FROM THE FEBRUARY 19 COUNCIL MEETING DUE TO ILLNESS. MOTION CARRIED, COUNCILMEMBER WILSON ABSTAINED.

Councilmember Plunkett commented one of the most important issues being addressed by the Alliance was the Buildable Lands Analysis. The goal of the Alliance's analysis was to give the Council and the public an opportunity to understand the economic benefits that could be derived from development on buildable lands in Edmonds including potential revenue to the City and potential economic stimulus in the private sector. The information was available in model form for one site but would be expanded eventually to all buildable lands in the City. In response to the Council's discussion regarding Hwy. 99 at the Council retreat, the Alliance intends to forward a letter to Mayor Haakenson stating if the City wished to invest resources and efforts in Hwy. 99, the Alliance would like to participate in that process.

Councilmember Orvis reported the Parking Committee was looking at areas where it would be appropriate to expand the 3-hour parking zones. He noted the advantages of 3-hour parking zones was that residents received special permits for parking and the 3-hour parking zone substantially mitigated problems with ferry commuter parking.

Councilmember Dawson reported the SnoCom meeting included election of officers – Mayor Haakenson was re-elected as Chair and Brier Councilmember Kaske was elected Vice-Chair.

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned a