

**EAST BELLEVUE COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

## Summary Minutes of Regular Meeting

June 5, 2001,  
6:30 p.m.

Lake Hills Clubhouse  
Bellevue, Washington

PRESENT: Chair Bell, Councilmembers Halgren, Keeffe, Lemieux and Seal.

LEGAL COUNSEL: Carol Morris

STAFF: Ellen Miller-Wolf, Economic Development Program Manager  
Dan Hardin, Senior Planner  
Steve Cohn, Associate Planner  
Chris Dreaney, Development Review Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM. Chair Bell presided and led the flag salute.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by the Deputy City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. **COMMUNICATIONS: WRITTEN AND ORAL**

Chair Bell, on behalf of the entire Council, read an commendation for Michelle Murphy into the record.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Halgren moved approval of the June 5, 2001 agenda. Mr. Lemieux seconded the motion.

The following agenda items were added:

Unfinished Business

- (a) Lake Hills Clubhouse Fireplace Plaque
- (b) Community Council Insurance Indemnification

New Business

- (d) North-South Corridor Study
- (e) Eastgate I-90 Corridor Study
- (f) Robert Chatterton's Email Correspondence

Mr. Bell suggested the agenda be reordered, moving the Executive Session to follow Department Reports.

Motion approving the June 5, 2001 agenda as amended carried 5-0.

5. **COURTESY HEARING**

- \* (a) Lake Hills Shopping Center Rezone to amend concomitant agreement to allow redevelopment to a mixed use neighborhood retail center. The existing CB zoning will not change.

Chair Bell briefly reviewed the process, stating the staff report would be heard first, followed by Council questions and public input.

Ellen Miller-Wolf, Department of Planning and Community Development, led the staff presentation. She provided a brief overview of the application process, acknowledging the Community Council's interest in transmitting any concerns that may arise tonight for the Hearing Examiner's record and City Council consideration. The Hearing Examiner will hold his public hearing on June 6<sup>th</sup>. At the same time, an appeal of the SEPA determination will be heard.

Due to the timing of the Hearing Examiner's hearing, Ms. Miller-Wolf offered options for East Bellevue Community Council's input. She suggested that staff take careful notes to be transmitted to the Hearing Examiner. In addition, she offered that a transcript of Council's comments could be transmitted to the Hearing Examiner. And, thirdly, staff would request the Hearing Examiner hold his record open until June 11<sup>th</sup> in order to provide Council ample time to document their comments.

Dan Hardin, Department of Planning and Community Development, reviewed that staff's report and proposed Concomitant Agreement. The requested changes include an increase in allowable footprint from 30,000 square feet to 45,000 square feet for a grocery store use; an increase to the maximum allowable height to the CB zone limit to permit the construction of a two story building with sloped roofs; and, amendment to parking area improvements section with adoption of a master site plan and design guidelines.

Chris Dreaney, Department of Transportation, reviewed the transportation issues referenced in the staff's report. She explained the conservative approach employed in the traffic impact analysis, noting the following assumptions:

1. No internal trip reduction factors were used. For instance, many of the grocery store trips would typically be combined with the employee trips at the proposed office space; these trips have been counted separately.
2. The 2001-2012 TFP EIS anticipates that an additional 7,465 gross square feet of retail will be added to the Transportation Analysis Zone 214, within which the shopping center is located. The TFP EIS background traffic volumes without the project for the long term condition included this growth. Trips generated by the full 84,200 gross square feet of additional proposed shopping center were also added to the background traffic volumes. Therefore, trips associated with 7,465 gross square feet of retail space have been double counted.
3. The ITE Trip Generation Manual states that the rate for vehicle trips generated at a

shopping center is based upon the gross leasable area of the center. For the purpose of this analysis, gross floor area was used, resulting in a higher trip generation.

4. The relocated Lake Hills Library on the site would vacate its current location to the west on Lake Hills Boulevard. It is possible that site will remain vacant, due to environmental limitations. The existing library trips have not been removed from the background model, thus a portion of the library trips are double counted in this analysis.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Ms. Dreaney explained that GSF referred to gross square footage.

Responding to Mr. Seal, Ms. Dreaney clarified that the third bullet referenced industry standards for estimating trips generated by shopping centers. Nationwide data is based on gross leasable area.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Ms. Dreaney confirmed an additional 122 new PM peak trips projected for the redevelopment. The current number of trips was very precisely determined to be 706 while the new total estimated trips is now at 828.

Ms. Dreaney next reviewed the trip distribution and assignment. As part of the preliminary analysis of the Lake Hills Shopping Center site, the City modeled the traffic impacts of a possible redevelopment of the shopping center using the concurrency platform of the EMME/2 model. The City's model characterized the site as a retail, without accounting for the specific trip attractions of a grocery store within a residential neighborhood. As a result, the original computer-generated model showed that residences to the east of the shopping center would contribute only two percent of the PM peak hour shopping center trips. In addition, given the retail classification of the site, the model does not recognize the regional nature of the Department of Licensing, and some of the office uses. Some of those trips would come from a broader area, and would use some of the major arterials near the site. She compared the current level of service grading of the impacted intersections to projected levels of service, assuming redevelopment.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Ms. Dreaney confirmed that the current traffic analysis assumes no change to light cycle time. The operational analysis will occur when an actual project application is received.

Ms. Dreaney next reviewed the site analysis, explaining the desired improvements and tying them to Comprehensive Plan Policies.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Ms. Dreaney explained that in the operational analysis, site distance of 250 feet is measured from the point of view of the driver exiting the driveway. The standard varies according to the speed limit.

Chair Bell questioned the modifications to the trip distribution pattern, stating that he felt that the model had been tuned to match 1999 data. In response, Ms. Dreaney stated that there was an element in the model to accommodate response to delays, but that it was unlikely that any change

in volumes would make any significant difference in the choice of distribution for the grocery store. She explained that the distribution is working off of the network of streets and that those streets did not change from model to model.

Mr. Hardin clarified that the post project distribution is looking specifically at the 122 new trips created versus the past pattern. The reduction from 50% to 36% reflects the fact that there are other similar attractive shopping opportunities to the north.

Ms. Dreaney clarified that Figure 3 provides very specific percentages heading in each link of the network. Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7 depict distribution for the entire site inclusive of new trips.

In response to Mr. Halgren, Ms. Dreaney stated the Transportation Facilities Plan EIS assumed only that there would be 7,465 more gross square feet built on in this particular zone. She explained that the analysis added on to the existing 84,200 square feet. Total new construction is 112,000 square feet. Ms. Dreaney confirmed Mr. Halgren's assumption that the 20,000 square feet of demolished area was replaced with the 20,000 square feet of new construction resulting in the same trip generation.

Continuing to respond to Mr. Halgren, Ms. Dreaney explained Transportation's recommended conditions of approval. She stated the intent of the recommendation for installing signals at the specified intersections is to lay the basis for the authority to require such signals at any one or all of those intersections as found to be necessary through the standard and usual process. There must be a connection between the amount of impact and the amount of mitigation for a requirement to signalize an intersection. She stated the impracticability of adjusting signal response based on the amount of impact of the additional 122 trips generated and spread out over the network.

In the event that it is determined that a traffic signal is needed, Ms. Dreaney stated such an addition would go through the capital improvement planning process. She clarified the timeframe for retention of developer mitigation fees. The cost to signalize an intersection is approximately \$200,000. Ms. Dreaney stressed, in regards to this proposed project, no new signals are anticipated.

In response to Chair Bell, Ms. Dreaney stated that she anticipated approximately 1,800 additional trips on top of the 7,400 existing daily trips currently at the Lake Hills Shopping Center site.

Continuing to respond, Ms. Dreaney stated the reference to "reasonable limits" in TR-92 allows the opportunity to decide what is reasonable. She stated it is a policy decision. Ms. Dreaney further explained that issues of volume reduction measures were not within the scope of this analysis.

Again responding to Chair Bell, Ms. Dreaney stated there was a lot of data regarding shopping center trip generation, varying according to size. She speculated the lower rate of 5.66 or 572 trips applied to the proposed project is because not every gross square foot of the anticipated proposed shopping center will be of the same nature as the existing center. Ms. Dreaney

explained different trip generation characteristics and reasoning for the lower rate selection.

Chair Bell stated he could accept that argument if the 5.66 rate for shopping centers applied to Lake Hills current count. He expressed concern that the lower rate selection appeared to be optimistic rather than conservative.

Chair Bell next stated concern regarding the traffic count daily measurements along 156<sup>th</sup> south of NE 8<sup>th</sup> and just south of Main. It is typical to have 1,000 vehicles per hour traversing north of Main Street during an 8 hour weekday period. South of Main the hours of that volume is limited to 4-5 hours. He asked if consideration was given to the 1,800 additional trips generated and spread out throughout the day?

Ms. Dreaney explained that, for the purpose of the standard trip analysis, staff's consideration includes the PM Peak trips in order to design the signal and traffic control for those PM Peak hours. She acknowledged the importance, from the perspective of the neighborhood, of traffic conditions throughout the day, but, felt the options for change at Main and 156<sup>th</sup> were limited.

Chair Bell stated it was a quality of life issue for the neighborhood.

Responding again to Chair Bell, Ms. Dreaney stated the desirability of transit use to and from the Lake Hills Shopping Center. The City will require completion of the sidewalk system surrounding the Center that is transit supportive and encourages pedestrian use. She stated the intent of figure 5 was to provide walking routes to and from the schools. Ms. Dreaney stated that she felt it depicts adequate facilities.

Chair Bell stated that although a sidewalk exists along one side of 156<sup>th</sup> down to the Shopping Center, it is only about three feet wide with intermittent gaps. He stated concerns with the increase volumes in the daily traffic and adequacy of existing sidewalks.

Ms. Dreaney stated that staff was enthusiastic about exploring and communicating a transit connectivity to the Center with Metro.

In response to Mr. Lemieux, Mr. Hardin stated the proposed square footage for the grocery store is 45,000. He explained that the second level retail could possibly be other types of retail, such as a bookstore for example.

Council continued review of the staff recommendation.

In response to Chair Bell, Mr. Hardin stated the specificity of a 45,000 square foot grocery store is a result of much discussion and community concurrence with the need for an anchor grocery store. He stated he could not speculate the outcome if a grocery store did not locate at the Center, but, it is likely that this process could begin anew.

Continuing to respond, Mr. Hardin stated that wireless facilities if allowed, would need to be

added as a use. Land Use Code regulates height and screening.

Ms. Helland explained the reasoning behind keeping the language in this proposal consistent with the Kelsey Creek Concomitant in regards to wireless facilities.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Mr. Hardin elaborated on the noticing requirements for administrative conditional use proposals.

Mr. Halgren noted the inadequacy of employing the Blue Bulletin as a noticing vehicle. He reiterated his advocacy for project specific noticing.

In response to Mr. Halgren, Mr. Hardin stated the proposal did not contain a separate bank building. The proposed concomitant however still contains language related to the bank building because it may take a while for this redevelopment to come into fruition. It will become obsolete once the development is completed.

Mr. Halgren stated that Section 2 (J) was included in the original concomitant agreement in reference to the gas station which no longer exists. He suggested the appropriateness of eliminating references to the convenience store and gas station.

In response to Mr. Lemieux, Mr. Hardin explained that 10 feet of height in the pitched roofline would be used to screen mechanical equipment. Using a flat roofline would necessitate parapet extensions of approximately the same height to screen mechanical equipment. He stated that in a transition district the Code speaks to the use of the pitched roof form for compatibility with the surrounding community.

Chair Bell stated he was disturbed by the inference in the staff's recommendation that low income patron are not welcome. Staff seems to indicate that if the Center is left to decline it will attract a group of people who come to find low priced items and who will eventually move into the area. He pointed out the affordability of the Lake Hills area and questioned the intent of the redevelopment.

In response, Mr. Hardin noted that the Center's decline would have an affect on the community. It may not be intentional to lower property values by decline, raise property values by renovation, but, there is a relationship that occurs.

Chair Bell opened the courtesy hearing on the Lake Hills Shopping Center rezone.

James Eder, 15422 SE 7<sup>th</sup> Place, critiqued the proposed rezone proposal, basing his opposition on the size of the proposed redevelopment and negative traffic impacts. He asked the Community Council to deny this application.

Barbara Kenney, 16245 SE 31<sup>st</sup> Street, stated, while she appreciated the City's concern with the revitalization of the Lake Hills Shopping Center, she questioned the size of the expansion. She stated her concerns for neighboring property owners and impacts to traffic. Ms. Kenney

expressed concern that the process has been fast tracked and urged staff and Council to proceed slowly.

Pam Asheim, 710 155th Avenue SE, expressed her concern regarding the proposed height and proximity of public walkways to her property. Ms. Asheim noted the loss of privacy for her adjacent property if this project is approved as proposed. She questioned the status of grocery store tenant at the Center.

David Plummer, 14414 NE 14<sup>th</sup> Place, stated his opposition to the proposed rezone and urged Council to deny the application. He noted the scale of development is far too large for the site; traffic impacts caused by operation of the development violate provisions in the Traffic Standards Code; present zoning and provisions in current concomitant agreement provide ample latitude for redevelopment; and, applicant has failed to provide any compelling reason for the rezone.

Jane Paige, 245 Lake Hills Boulevard, reminded Council of her previous comments, noting the uncertainty of the inclusion of the Library or a grocery store. She stated concern with changing the concomitant agreement without such certainty.

*1* Vice Chair Halgren asked for any further public input.

*2* Hearing none, Mr. Keeffe moved to close the courtesy hearing. Mr. Seal seconded the motion, which carried 5-0.

Carol Morris raised several issues pertaining to the proposed rezone. She stated the potential for a violation to the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine, conflict of interest or actual bias in the manner this proposal was presented and partnered with the City. Ms. Morris raised issues of equal protection, perpetual zoning and creation of a master site plan amended by an administrative process outside the Community Council's approval/disapproval authority. She questioned the adequacy of staff's analysis of the rezone criteria and the City's ability to enforce the proposed concomitant agreement.

Mr. Halgren reminded staff of his previous request to review the background materials, minutes, etc. related to the current concomitant agreement. He asked that the historic background of the Center be made available to Council prior to this proposals return for public hearing.

In response to Mr. Halgren, Mr. Cohn stated the current Shopping Center area is 72,800 square feet.

Continuing to respond to Mr. Halgren, Mr. Hardin stated the government services included in the site proposal is the Department of Licensing. Mr. Halgren requested further information as to allowable government services.

---

*1* Chair Bell stepped down from the Table.

*2* Chair Bell returned to the Table.

Mr. Hardin explained that the provision for social services limited to those providing service to neighborhood was requested by the applicant. It was not included in the staff's recommendation. He also clarified the landscape envisioned for this project, stating it was similar to the current landscape requirements with the exception of the treatment for the pedestrian gathering areas and lid to the parking garage. Those two areas are different in this proposal.

Mr. Halgren next questioned the proposed height comparisons to adjacent properties, suggesting that, in addition to multifamily buildings across the street, staff also look to the closer single family homes to the south. He stated he was pleased that lighting would be directed away from the residential areas but was concerned with the 24 hour activities. Mr. Halgren stated his unease with the relocation of the Library, noting that, in his estimation, it would be a regional draw.

Mr. Halgren reviewed the zoning history of the Lake Hills area.

Again responding to Mr. Halgren, Mr. Hardin explained the intent of staff's recommendation supporting up to a maximum square footage of 5,000 square feet per computer and electronic uses so that no big box stores would be permitted.

Mr. Halgren questioned the advisability of limiting the square footage use to 5,000 square feet. Mr. Cohn stated the intent was to make minimal changes to the current concomitant. He stated the 5,000 square foot figure is sufficient for a Radio Shack type of use and effectively blocks the larger Circuit City type establishments.

In response to Mr. Halgren, Mr. Hardin stated he would return to Council later with the rationale for the height increase to 40 feet in light of the 35 foot proposal. He explained that the request for a height increase comes from the applicant. Mr. Hardin next postulated that when dealing with an existing building, the applicant may want to pop something up to emphasize the tenant entrance. Mr. Hardin stated that if the redevelopment caps at 157,000 square feet with the majority of that square footage in Building A, adding a second floor to the remaining buildings would be difficult, but did not preclude incorporating a design element to enhance the entry.

Responding to Mr. Seal, Mr. Hardin indicated that staff could look at the language describing the point of reference for the height measurement.

In response to Mr. Bell's inquiry regarding existing studies that support the need to redevelop by increasing size and changing zoning to maintain surrounding neighborhoods from decline, Mr. Hardin stated there are examples of this renovation approach to expand leasable area. It does not always entail additional construction. Renovation is inherently consumptive of resources which in turn is paid for by the leasable area. Mr. Hardin reminded Council that this is a private proposal and staff's review is not intended to specify the level of redevelopment.

Chair Bell stated his understanding that the 45,000 square foot usage was the cornerstone to the proposed revitalization to attract a magnet grocery store. He stated that a QFC will be locating at the Bel East Center and noted the failure of the Albertson's on 156<sup>th</sup> and NE 8<sup>th</sup>. In addition,

Chair Bell raised doubt that the current QFC at Lake Hills would remain beyond its present lease. In light of his above observations, he questioned the advisability of pinning the revitalization on a large grocery store.

Mr. Hardin stated that, generally, the trend in grocery stores that serve neighborhoods is that there is a size that works and several sizes that do not. From available information, staff has surmised that those areas above 30,000 square feet work best. If QFC has determined to move somewhere else, then a new tenant will have to be sought.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Mr. Cohn stated that staff had not yet researched the requirement for art in the project recommendation. He would get back to Council with an answer.

Responding to Mr. Keeffe, Mr. Hardin stated the Hearing Examiner would be provided with the minutes from the previous courtesy hearing on this issue along with staff notes of tonight's proceedings.

Mr. Keeffe was adamant that the Hearing Examiner receive a copy of the issues raised by Carol Morris for his record.

Mr. Hardin repeated the options for delivering that information to the Hearing Examiner previously discussed by Ms. Miller-Wolf.

Ms. Helland reviewed the differences between legislative and quasi judicial matters as it pertained to Community Council input. In the case of legislative actions, the Community Council makes comments directly to the Planning Commission and City Council. However, in this case, the Hearing Examiner will be creating the record for this action. Council should make comments available to the Hearing Examiner. The City Council will hold a closed record hearing.

Chair Bell differed with Ms. Helland's reading of the Code. He stated his reading that the City Council for quasi judicial matters would consider the record of the Hearing Examiner, the Hearing Examiner's recommendations, and the recommendations of the Community Council with jurisdiction in that area.

There was Council consensus to forward Ms. Morris's comments to the Hearing Examiner on the Community Council's behalf.

There was Council discussion on the manner in which to convey to the Hearing Examiner tonight's proceedings.

There was Community Council consensus to request that the Hearing Examiner hold the record open until July 5, 2001 when the approved the minutes of this June 5, 2001 meeting can be transmitted for the record.

In closing, Mr. Halgren, referring to the staff recommendation, stated the proposal did not appear to be compatible with Comprehensive Plan Policy LU-9 nor did it appear appropriate in scale to the surrounding neighborhood as called out in LU-16.

- (b) Traffic Standards Code Amendment to exempt neighborhood shopping centers targeted by City Council for redevelopment from the Traffic Standards Code analyses.

Laurie Gromola, Department of Transportation, provided the staff presentation. She stated the proposed amendment would exempt neighborhood shopping centers targeted by City Council for redevelopment from the Traffic Standards Code analyses. The proposed amendment is in response to the Lake Hills Shopping Center Redevelopment proposal. The City has been working with citizens in East Bellevue neighborhoods and the owners of the Lake Hills Shopping Center to develop a plan that revitalizes the shopping center. The redevelopment proposal is predicted to add new vehicle trips to an area which is already out of compliance with the Traffic Standards Code as set forth in Ordinance No. 4823, the TSC applicable in the Community Council areas. Ordinance No. 4823 allows for the one-hour peak analysis under Circular 212 methodology that when used to analyze level of service in Mobility Management Area 9 is out of compliance with the TSC. The concurrency standard is set at .85. Current analysis shows .908. The additional projected 122 trips for the Lake Hills Shopping Center redevelopment would further move level of service outside concurrency.

The language proposed for the TSC amendment assures that only the redevelopment proposals for neighborhood shopping centers would qualify for the exemption. Ms. Gromola reviewed the packet materials and reported a minor change to the exemption language. Exemption #9 previously stated "CB uses included as a component of the Neighborhood Shopping Center Redevelopment Project are not subject to this exemption." Due to the confusion at this statement, the statement has been rewritten to state "This exemption applies only to those uses that are include as a component of a Neighborhood Shopping Center Redevelopment Project and are permitted outright in the NB land use district."

Ms. Gromola reviewed the schedule for City Council consideration. The proposal will return to the Transportation Commission on June 14 and move forward to the City Council tentatively on August 6, 2001.

In consideration of the fact that this change to the proposed ordinance has only been just received by the Council, Mr. Keeffe moved to postpone this matter until the next regular meeting. Mr. Lemieux seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

Mr. Halgren moved for reconsideration of the motion to postpone. Mr. Lemieux seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

Motion to postpone this matter until the next regular meeting failed 0-5.

Chair Bell opened the courtesy public hearing.

Chair Bell noted that several citizens signed up to speak, but, due to the lateness of the hour were unable to remain.

Mr. Keeffe moved to continue the courtesy public hearing until the regular meeting of July 3, 2001. Mr. Halgren seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

- (c) Administrative Amendments to the Traffic Standards Code correcting inadvertent omissions created by Community Council Disapproval of City Council Ordinance No. 5081.

Carol Helland gave the staff presentation. She stated the proposed ordinance was an administrative fix to allow Traffic Standards Code applicability to Process III applications within the Community Council areas.

Ordinance 4823, currently in effect in the Community Council jurisdictions, does not make reference to Process III. The proposed changes would amend Ordinance 4823 to clarify that Process III applications would be included the TSC review. Under Section C, Transportation Demand Management, there is an administrative clarification, as the Transportation Management Program is no longer found in Land Use Code. Those provisions have been moved to the Transportation Code.

In response to Mr. Keeffe, Ms. Helland explained that ordinance numbering would be assigned at the time the proposal moves forward to the City Council.

Chair Bell opened the courtesy public hearing.

Hearing no public testimony, Mr. Keeffe moved to close the courtesy public hearing. Mr. Seal seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

Chair Bell stated the Council's strong consensus to proceed with the Amendments.

- 6. Resolution None.
- 7. Reports of City Council, Boards and Commissions None.
- 8. **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

- (a) Traffic Calming Project (150<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE from Lake Hills Boulevard)

Ms. Gromala made the staff presentation, reviewing current traffic calming projects along 150<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE. She explained the impetus for the project came from neighborhood complaints of cut through traffic and excessive speeds. She outlined the preliminary traffic calming proposal.

Responding to Mr. Halgren, Ms. Gromala described the traffic circles and speed humps proposed. 3

(b) Design Review JPC Office Building

Dan Hardin stated the applicant is proposing to construct a two story office building over parking at 2649 145<sup>th</sup> Place SE. The parcel is triangular in shape and currently contains a small vacant building. The site is zoned Professional Office and includes both single family and multifamily Transition Area Design District overlays. The site abuts Landerholm Circle and, due to proposed modifications to 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, the applicant is requesting to vacate a portion of 145<sup>th</sup> Place SE.

In response to Mr. Seal, Carl Wilson, Department of Transportation, stated there would be no entrance to the proposed site at 145<sup>th</sup> Place SE. The vacated area is a property swap for the property take to accommodate the improvement at Landerholm Circle. This vacated area will be used for parking and landscaping.

Responding to Mr. Keeffe, Mr. Wilson further clarified the proposed vacation.

(c) 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue Redevelopment Update

Mr. Keeffe reported on his meeting with Les Wagner. He stated the City would be advertising the contract on June 26, 2001 and be will awarding the contract on August 6, 2001. Mr. Keeffe reported the installation of two medians at 140<sup>th</sup>, north of NE 8<sup>th</sup>.

*Agenda Interruption*

**13. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Chair Bell stated, in light of the lateness of the hour, Ms. Morris was unable to remain. He stated that she would be contacting each Councilmember individually regarding pending litigation.

Chair Bell stated, by way of information, that the oral arguments for the appeal are scheduled for June 11, 2001.

*Return to Regular Agenda*

9. **COMMITTEE REPORTS** None.

10. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

(a) Lake Hills Clubhouse Fireplace Plaque

Mr. Keffe reminded Council of their previous letter to the City Manager requesting the repair of the Lake Hills Clubhouse fireplace plaque which to date has not been fixed. He suggested a second memorandum reiterating the previous repair request. There was Council consensus.

(b) Community Council Insurance Indemnification

Mr. Keffe suggested that Council make a formal request for the record to the City Manager regarding liability indemnification insurance for each Community Councilmember.

Chair Bell stated his agreement but would prefer that Carol Morris represent the Community Council on this request.

11. **NEW BUSINESS**

(a) Participation in the Voter's Pamphlet (EBCC)

Mr. Seal moved to approve participation in the 2001 Voter's Pamphlet. Mr. Halgren seconded the motion which carried 4-0.

(b) Adoption of Committee Appointment Rules

Mr. Halgren moved adoption of the Statement 'For' and 'Against' Committee Rules. Mr. Seal seconded the motion which carried 4-0.

(c) Its Your City Articles

Council requested the Clerk research the rotation of previous Community Council article responsibility.

(d) North-South Corridor Study

Mr. Halgren suggested a staff presentation. There was Council consensus.

(e) Eastgate I-90 Corridor Study

Mr. Halgren again suggested a staff presentation. There was Council agreement.

(f) Robert Chatterton's Email Correspondence

Chair Bell suggested the email from Mr. Chatterton be entered under Continued Communications.

# 307

East Bellevue Community Council  
Summary Minutes June 5, 2001

Mr. Halgren agreed to respond to Mr. Chatteron regarding parking regulations in the East Bellevue Municipal Corporation.

## 12. CONTINUED COMMUNICATIONS

Council asked that a letter be drafted to Carol Helland requesting clarification as to the period covered in the quarterly report.

## 14. APPROVAL SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. Keeffe moved approval of the May 1, 2001 summary regular meeting minutes. Mr. Seal seconded the motion which carried 4-0.

## 15. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Keeffe moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Seal seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Chair Bell adjourned the East Bellevue Community Council regular meeting of June 5, 2001 at 12:16 AM.

Submitted By:

Michelle Murphy, CMC  
Deputy City Clerk