SPECIAL MEETING DES MOINES CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES May 13, 2006

The special meeting of the Des Moines City Council was called to order at 9:09 a.m. by Mayor Sheckler at the Founder's Lodge, 22030 Cliff Avenue South, Des Moines, WA.

ROLL CALL - Present: Mayor Bob Sheckler, Mayor Pro Tem Scott Thomasson, Councilmembers Dave Kaplan, Ed Pina, Carmen Scott, Dan Sherman, and Susan White (left the meeting at 1:10 p.m.). Also present were City Manager Tony Piasecki, City Attorney Linda Marousek, Chief of Police Roger Baker, Planning, Building, and Public Works Director Grant Fredricks, Harbormaster Joe Dusenbury, and Planning, Building, and Public Works Permit Technician Tina McVey.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Discussion and Potential Revision of the City Council's Vision, Mission Statement, and Strategic Objectives for Des Moines

City Manager Piasecki stated that the purpose of the discussion was to decide what, if anything, about the Vision, Mission Statement, and Strategic Objectives should be changed. It was stated that the current format was accepted by the last City Council at about the same time last year. The Council decided by general consensus to go through The Vision and Mission Statement as separate entities, then move on to Strategic Objectives where they would then go through each category line item by line item.

- **Vision**
  - Suggested changes:
    1. Insert the words "economically viable" before the word "waterfront"
    2. Insert the word "inviting" before the word "waterfront"
    3. Remove the word "safe"
    4. Modify to "A beautiful waterfront community" before the word "embracing"
    5. Insert the word "inviting" before "and safe"

  By general consensus of the council members, the Vision would be changed to "An inviting and safe waterfront community embracing the future while preserving our past."

- **Mission Statement**
  - Suggested changes:
    1. Remove the word "administration"
    2. Remove the word "We"
    3. Substitute the word "administration" with "stewardship"
    4. Modify to "To enrich the community with leadership and stewardship"

  By general consensus of the council members, the Mission Statement would be changed to "We enrich the community by providing leadership and services reflecting the pride and values of Des Moines."

- **Strategic Objectives**

(A) "Promoting Economic Vitality on a Citywide Basis."

1. Councilmember Kaplan stated that this needs to remain the first strategic objective to be listed. Mayor Sheckler stated that he did not see where anything on the current list had been completed as of yet, beyond the Comprehensive Plan (which is always a work in progress). Councilmember Sherman stated that there was really still so much to

accomplish with the Comp Plan that it should be left on the list of objectives. Mayor Sheckler and the Councilmember agreed by consensus that it should remain on the list.

2. *Councilmember Sherman suggested adding the bullet point "Review the Downtown Elements of Des Moines Comp Plan" and the council agreed by consensus.*
3. Councilmember Scott suggested that the phrase "Adopt and implement an economic development strategic plan" be modified to read "Implement the following economic strategies:" *Consensus of the Mayor and City Council was to modify the sentence to read "Implement the following economic strategies:"*

The discussion then centered on the formatting of the Strategic Objectives. Councilmember Sherman stated the format of the Strategic Objectives was dry and business like, rather than friendly and inviting. It does not give a sense of the City's available resources and does not seem inviting. Councilmember White stated she agreed in spirit with Councilmember Sherman. The ensuing discussion brought out that Council Members Scott, Pina, and Thomasson, as well as the Mayor felt that this section is supposed to represent the business plan or "road map" of the City Council for the City, and that it is usually dry in nature. City Manager Piasecki offered the thought that Councilmember Sherman was trying to express that the Strategic Objectives, as they are now, do not include "Values Statement(s)." The discussion then centered on whether "Value Statement(s)" should be included in this document or if they should become a completely separate document.

Major Discussion Points:

- formatting should be changed to be more reader friendly
- Strategic Objectives are supposed to be dry as it is the City business plan
- Is it a "to do" list for the department heads in reference to their department objectives
- This is a reflection of who we are and it makes us look boring, as it is
- This section of the document is compromised of broad objectives, not specific plans

At 10:10 a.m., Mayor Sheckler declared a ten-minute break to allow everyone to get back on track for the actual purpose of the discussion; what needed to be removed, changed or modified in the Strategic Objectives.

At 10:20 a.m., the meeting reconvened and the discussion on the intent and formatting of the Strategic Objectives resumed. It was the general consensus after all discussion that the format itself, which was changed last year to its current form, would return to its former incarnation which would list separate columns for "Objectives, Goals, Values."

4. It was agreed by consensus the phrase "business plan for Beach Park" should become "Master Plan for Beach Park".
5. Discussion on the ferry service statement was tabled until Councilmember White could update the council on the subject.
6. Discussed the term "marketing strategy" in the next bullet point which reads "Develop and implement a marketing strategy to promote the City throughout the region, state, and county." It was suggested that the City Council remove the phrase "marketing strategy" to "Develop and implement a strategy to promote the City …"
   - Council Members Scott and White both stated this could best be addressed by the addition of an Economic Development Position and that it should be added to the bullet points.

- Councilmember Scott suggested getting the decision makers from outside of the City to tell us how the market sees our City and what we should do to develop and revitalize not just Pacific Ridge, but the Downtown area as well.
- Councilmember Thomasson stated that we first have to figure out what is our goal; commerce at any cost, or do we have a vision of multi-use building which would combine shops and residences. His vision is to have something quasi-residential as opposed to strip malls.
- Councilmember Kaplan stated the City Council also needs to determine the practical aspects; what services to retain or remove, what level of services to give (do we remove some and give better service to others or do we keep all and give ok service to all?), and what services will be guaranteed to remain.
- Councilmember Thomasson stated that he did not think this could be in place for 2007 as the City Council has hard questions to answer in what services we provide and to what level. The City must make adjustments to give quality service to meet the needs of residents.
- Councilmember Scott asked for clarification on the economic points as she did not understand it as well they apparently did. Councilmember White stated that the new Council Members should be given a copy of the *Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy* which was created for the City by Ravenhurst Development and the rest of the Council concurred.
- Mayor Sheckler made the point that any type of discussion on an Economic Development strategy or an official Economic Development Position was such an involved subject that it could become the subject of an entire special meeting.
- Councilmember Sherman asked if Councilmember Kaplan could run a mini-retreat where he could get a professional like Martin Brown of the Governor's office to speak to the Council regarding governmental economics. By consensus, it was agreed that the City Council does not know enough about the details of economics on a municipal level and that having Mr. Brown coming in to explain how it works on a state level would be great.
- *It was agreed by general consensus that it would now read "Develop and implement a strategy to promote the City throughout the region, state, and country."*

7. *It was agreed by consensus that the rest of the bullet points should remain as they are.*

(B) "Preserve and Enhance the Livability of the City of Des Moines"

1. City Attorney Linda Marousek brought up the question as to whether or not "livability" was misspelled and suggested it be verified before approving it. Side note by Tina – either spelling is acceptable per Merriam Webster – Livability or Liveability
2. *It was decided by consensus to change wording to "Preserve, enhance, and celebrate the Historic Elements of/in Des Moines"*
3. *It was decided by consensus that all other bullet points were to remain as they are.*

(C) "Influence Regional and State Issues and Decisions ……"

1. It was decided by consensus that all bullet points were to remain as they are.

(D) "Provide Administrative Functions and Systems…."

1. General consensus removed "complete consolidation of the Community Development and Public Works Departments"
2. Consensus agreed to add the phrase "priorities of government and budgeting process"

3. It was decided by consensus that all other bullet points were to remain as they are.

At 11:45 a.m., Mayor Sheckler declared a 30 minute lunch.

<u>Discussion and Direction Regarding Revisions to the Marina Master Plan</u>

Mayor Sheckler began by thanking the City Council for working so hard to get through the Vision, Mission Statement, and Strategic Objectives so quickly. He also thanked Councilmember Sherman for taking the lead on the Municipal Facilities Committee. He then turned the floor over to Councilmember Sherman.

Councilmember Sherman began by explaining that the Committee had developed several alternatives for the Marina Master Plan Update. The Committee was asking for the Council's direction as to which one should be developed more fully for inclusion into the Marina Master Plan.

1. Plan 1 would have the Marina remain as is, with the exception that it includes the eventual reconfiguration of the permanent moorages. This would maintain the public sling launcher and space for vehicle/trailer parking, dry sheds and dry shed launcher. The main expenditure would be the rebuilding of the public launcher.

2. Plan 2 would have the Marina retain the in-water foot print as it is now, but would phase out the public launching and call for a new commercial building north of the Marina office. The Marina office itself would be remodeled to include restrooms and a new service area, with the addition of a new building for the maintenance activities. This would eliminate the open storage for small boats and the dry sheds in favor of more parking and larger sheds or open storage of large boats. It also allows for permanent moorage docs, and the reconfiguration of the boat dock, and the creation of a site for a marine hardware store, should the need arise when the restaurant lease expires in 2011. The main expenditures would be about the same as Plan 1, as the new commercial building would be expected to draw enough revenue to pay for itself.

3. Plan 3 would have the Marina undergoing major reconfigurations. It would provide for expanding the guest moorage and phase out public launching, build a new commercial building north of the Marina office, major reconfigurations of the upland area which would be most noticeable in the North lot. It would remove the dry sheds in favor of larger sheds or open storage for large boats and allow for future reconfigurations and inclusion of a marine hardware store, should the need arise when the restaurant lease expires in 2011. The major expenditure for this plan would be about $2-$3 Million more than Plan 1 or 2, but would maximize new revenue opportunities.

The City Council agreed that before this could be decided, these several questions needed to be answered:

1. What is the purpose of the Marina?
2. How much water is enough (for both revenue and resource purposes) and how do we use it?
3. Do we want to continue storing boats on dry land? If so, we need to rebuild the launcher. If not, we don't need the launcher.
4. How much and what space are we going to allocate for lease space?

These were their individual responses:

Dave Kaplan:

- Financial asset – must maintain facility
- Maximize revenues from marina to benefit whole City
  - Bring more general fund revenues
- New, unique businesses on marina floor – No direct competition with other downtown businesses
- Need to maintain Marina operating and capital revenue too!
- Supports expanded guest moorage
- Supports Boat repair yard expansion
- Use open/unused spaces to benefit marina and rest of City
- Change current uses that are not returning highest revenue

Susan White:

- Agrees with Dave Kaplan's comments
- Need to connect Marina and Beach Park
- West Marine is OK
- Boutique Hotel
- Walking promenade facility
- Passenger ferries – need parking – garage?
- Connect Marina to downtown
- Can be most incredible place in southwest King County for people to walk and shop.

Ed Pina:

- An attractive gem that brings people to Des Moines and downtown
- Develop to serve boaters and non-boaters alike
- Contributes to and is part of economic development in Des Moines

*At 1:10pm, Councilmember Susan White left the meeting

- Not too much retail on Marina floor – don't compete with downtown
- Unique services and businesses only
- Needs easy access to/from Des Moines downtown; i.e. shuttle bus or (as Carmen proposed) an elevator to upper street level.

Carmen Scott:

- Sling launcher probably should go
- Marina Park area – enhance along with edges of Marina – amenities for walkers to draw them in.
- Building on Quartermaster site
  - Restaurant
  - Hotel
  - Plaza on top
  - Parking underneath
  - Elevator as well as stairs to move people from Cliff Avenue to Marina floor.
- Expand boat yard

- Marine hardware store – if doesn't duplicate supplies and services available in area.
- Commercial building north of harbormaster office OK – one story only.
- Dry sheds – larger boat storage on cradles
- Need variety of interesting things to attract visitors
- Keep north parking lot intact for a year or two to see what the parking demand is once the Auditorium is up and running, even more so if the Dining Hall is repaired and in use.
- No added green space on Marina floor
- Recognize that the north parking lot also serves as a large Performance Platform with a fantastic view, and has quite a bit of value for that purpose, impossible to replace if gone.

Bob Sheckler:
- Would support Option 3
- Ownership belongs to the City and citizens
  - It's the City's and citizens' marina
- Expanded guest moorage – OK
  - Water more valuable than land in a Marina
- Commercial activities – should be water related
  - West Marine
  - Boater friendly restaurant
  - Hotel?
- Acquire house at Park entrance

Dan Sherman:
- A place for gathering
- No. 1 use – water uses
- Must support itself
- Don't over-commercialize or over-build
- Need facilities for boaters
- Internet cafe with wi-fi services
- Water activities – wind surfing, kayaking, etc. - using Beach Park as launching point
- People like to watch marina and water uses
- Ambivalent about getting rid of launcher and expanding guest moorage

Scott Thomasson:
- Purpose:
  - Access to shoreline
  - Gathering place
  - Place to store and use boats
  - Destination
  - General fund revenue producer
  - Parking for Beach Park
  - Achieve correct balance of above
- Guest moorage: Can we do what we have well? Do we need larger guest moorage? Can we fill what we have for the long run? How full would be a larger guest moorage?
- What was the original purpose?
- Not the City's "budget saver"

The City Council voted unanimously to accept Plan 2. Councilmember Dan Sherman stated he would take their answer back to the Committee and begin working on the next phase of the draft.

NEXT MEETING DATE - Regular Council Session, May 25, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT
At 2:45 p.m., the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina R McVey
Permit Technician
Planning Building and Public Works