

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, April 19, 2012
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber
17500 Midvale Ave N.

Estimated Time

GROUP PICTURE AT 6:45 P.M.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER | 7:00 p.m. |
| 2. ROLL CALL | 7:01 p.m. |
| 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA | 7:02 p.m. |
| 4. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS | 7:03 p.m. |
| 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES | 7:05 p.m. |
| A. March 1 Dinner Meeting | |
| B. March 15 Regular Meeting | |

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes.

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT | 7:07 p.m. |
| 7. STUDY ITEMS | 7:10 p.m. |
| A. Comprehensive Plan Major Update – Capital Facilities/Utilities | |
| • Staff Presentation | |
| • Public Comment | |
| 8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT | 8:10 p.m. |
| 9. OLD BUSINESS | 8:12 p.m. |
| A. Planning Commission Annual Report to City Council | |
| 10. NEW BUSINESS | 8:20 p.m. |
| A. Utilities Acquisition Presentation | |
| 11. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS | 8:40 p.m. |
| 12. AGENDA FOR May 3 | 8:44 p.m. |
| 13. ADJOURNMENT | 8:45 p.m. |

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236.

This page intentionally blank

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

March 1, 2012
6:00 – 7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Conference Room

Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner
Vice Chair Perkowski
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Esselman
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Moss

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Other

Deputy Mayor Eggen

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Behrens

Chair Wagner called the dinner meeting to order and welcomed Deputy Mayor Eggen who then swore in new Planning Commissioner Easton Craft.

STUDY SESSION ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

Mr. Szafran presented the staff report for the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the meeting packet contained both the existing and proposed versions of the Transportation Element and Supporting Analysis. He noted that the goals and policies as well as the supporting analysis of the proposed version are being pulled directly from the recently adopted Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and they would replace the current versions in their entirety. Ms. Markle reminded the Commission that with the 2012 Update, all the supporting analyses for each Element will live outside of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Moss questioned if there would be data tables from the TMP in the Comprehensive Plan or would the Plan refer the reader back to the TMP to get the information, and she especially pointed to the Transportation Analysis Zones Table as an example. Mr. Szafran noted that the appropriate place for data tables to appear is in the supporting analyses. Commissioner Moss noted that a map showing Shoreline's SAZs and PSRC's TAZs appears on page 158 in the current Transportation Supporting Analysis section of the Comprehensive Plan but does not exist in the proposed version; the data is listed but not the map. Ms. Markle suggested that staff could add a map.

Commissioner Moss pointed out that the same information is repeated several times in the proposed Transportation Supporting Analysis. Mr. Szafran said he would check into this.

Commissioner Moss noted that the Transportation Element contains a number of acronyms that are not spelled out in other areas and questioned if staff was planning to create a glossary.

Commissioner Moss directed the Commission to the sentence in the second paragraph of the proposed Supporting Analysis under the heading Transit Agencies (on page 125 of the packet) that says “Two express bus routes serve the I-5/NE 145th Street freeway station....” and requested that it read “Two off-peak express bus routes” because the buses do not serve during the peak hours. Mr. Szafran pointed out that this language is being pulled from the adopted Transportation Master Plan and editing it is not within the Commission’s scope of work. Ms. Markle said staff would ask Alicia McIntire, the City’s Transportation Planner, if the change could be made.

Commissioner Moss referred to Policy T-6 (Implement the City’s Commute Trip Reduction Plan) and questioned if the City manages the CTR program for all employers that employ x number of employees or if the City just operates its own CTR for its employees as part of the State mandated program. Ms. Markle answered the City has both. Chair Wagner added that the policy language for T-6 could use clarification that it is referring to the CTR for all of the City’s employers and not just the City’s employees.

Commissioner Esselman referred to the maps in the current Transportation Supporting Analysis and pointed out that some streets are missing. She requested that good quality maps be used in the new document.

Commissioner Moss noted that in the data table on page 147 of the meeting packet, two columns (required right-of-way and planned curb to curb width) are left blank for N 175th St. She questioned if this was intentional. Ms. Markle said staff would find out.

The Commission discussed the last speaker in the Shoreline Speaker Series, Sara Schott Nikolic, who presented on equitable transit communities (transit oriented development). Chair Wagner asked if anyone had a good take-away message from the presentation that could be incorporated into the introduction of the Transportation Element or in a goal or policy statement. Commissioner Broili said Ms. Schott Nikolic spoke about multi-modal transportation and should be weaved into the language because it is a core component of any transit plan. Ms. Markle recalled that Ms. Schott Nikolic spoke about the concept of planning for people instead of planning around transit. Chair Wagner encouraged Commissioners to take notes on inspirational quotes they hear during the Speaker Series so they can discuss incorporating them into the Plan.

The Planning Commission took a 5 minute recess to look over the additional testimony that came in for the Shoreline Master Program public hearing scheduled later in the evening.

BRAINSTORM ANNUAL REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL

Chair Wagner reconvened the meeting and led the Commission into a brainstorming discussion about their annual report to the City Council. She reminded the Commission that the last time they sent a report to City Council staff provided a draft of the report and sent it to the Chair for editing. The Commission did not have much of a chance to talk about it ahead of time but expressed a desire to do so in the future. Chair Wagner recalled that the last report included a list of accomplishments and items the Commission wanted to bring to Council’s attention (the Commission’s opportunity to share their parking lot items). She asked the Commission to discuss what the purpose, structure and timing of the report should be moving forward.

Commissioner Broili said he thought a major advantage of the report is for the Commission to provide feedback to the City Council. Chair Wagner wondered if the Commission had any concern to voice about the workload and timing of the Commission's work plan with reduction in amount of staff available. The Commission agreed the report is an opportunity for them to explain to the Council what their parking lot is about. They decided to include their parking lot items, explain why they were added, how long they have been there and why the Commission still thinks they are important. There was agreement to place the items in a matrix and rank them in terms of importance in addressing them - short-term, mid-term, and long-term. It was decided to include current and new Commissioners in on the review of the report, since current Commissioners offer history and context and new Commissioners are tasked with carrying these ideas forward and might have new ideas to add.

The dinner meeting was adjourned at 6:59 P.M.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

This page intentionally blank

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 15, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner
Vice Chair Perkowski
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Moss

Staff Present

Rachel Markle, Director, Community and Development Services
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Community & Development Services
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Community & Development Services
Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Esselman
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wagner called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Wagner, Vice Chair Perkowski and Commissioners Craft and Moss. Commissioners Esselman, Behrens and Broili were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Markle did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No minutes were presented for approval.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – SMC 20.60.140

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the public hearing.

Staff Presentation

Ms. McIntire reviewed that in December 2011, the City adopted an updated Transportation Master Plan (TMP), which is the long-range vision for the City's transportation system. Amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan were also adopted at that time. Both of the documents direct the City to update its concurrency methodology for measuring transportation concurrency in order to assess the traffic impacts of growth citywide, as well as localized impacts resulting from new development. She reminded the Commission that the Growth Management Act requires cities to identify the transportation projects needed in order to accommodate growth and comply with the City's adopted transportation level of service (LOS), as well as a funding strategy to complete the projects. This is known as transportation concurrency, which requires that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements within six years.

Ms. McIntire advised that, in the past, the City has required developers to prepare Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) for proposals that generate an increase in traffic during the evening peak travel period, which is generally between 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. However, the current code does not require a TIS for uses such as churches, schools etc, that result in increases in traffic beyond the peak period. The proposed amendment to SMC 20.60.140(B) (Attachment A) would allow the City to require a TIS for developments that have their highest traffic volumes during times other than the evening peak period. As proposed, developers would be required to mitigate for traffic impacts associated with their development proposal through the City's State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process.

Ms. McIntire said the proposed amendment (Attachment A) also makes it clear that the detailed requirements of the TIS are outlined in the City's Engineering Development Manual. Items 1 through 4 summarize what is in the Engineering Development Manual as opposed to including all the detail in the code. She reported that the City is in the process of updating the Engineering Development Manual, and the new document will be published within the next few weeks. She said staff is proposing that the language be consistent with the Engineering Development Manual, which uses the term "Transportation Impact Study" as opposed to "Traffic Impact Study" because it includes bicycle, pedestrian and transit and not just vehicular traffic.

Ms. McIntire referred to SMC 20.30.350, which outlines the following three criteria that must be considered when reviewing Development Code amendments:

- *The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.* The proposed amendment is consistent with the new standards that were recently adopted in the Transportation Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.
- *The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.* By expanding the field of applicants that must identify the greatest impacts associated with their proposal and subsequently mitigate them, the proposed amendment would result in a process that further protects the public health, safety or general welfare.
- *The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.* The proposal is in accordance with the citizens' best interest.

Ms. McIntire advised that the City issued a SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) on February 21st, and the Department of Commerce was subsequently notified of the proposal. The DNS included notice for the public hearing, and was sent to the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) and other parties the City generally notifies. At this point, the City has received no comments in response to the SEPA determination.

Ms. McIntire summarized that staff recommends the Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the City Council.

Questions by the Commission

Vice Chair Perkowski said the proposed language in SMP 20.60.140(B) implies that only four of the requirements found in the Engineering Development Manual would be mandatory for a TIS. Does that mean the other requirements in the manual would be optional? Ms. McIntire said the intent is that, at a minimum, the study should include the items outlined in the Engineering Development Manual. Items 1 through 4 are merely a table of contents of what is included in the Engineering Development Manual. The Engineering Development Manual provides greater detail about what each of the items should include. Vice Chair Perkowski suggested that deleting “at a minimum” would make the language clearer. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

At the request of Commissioner Craft, Ms. McIntire explained that the TIS requirement is intended to ensure that intersections perform at LOS D or better regardless of what development occurs in the future. She said the TIS analyzes impacted intersections and determines if they will perform at the required LOS or if they will fail. Commissioner Craft asked if the traffic analysis requirement would only apply to projects near intersections that are already at LOS D. Ms. McIntire said this requirement would apply to all projects that generate 20 or more new trips during peak hour or during the peak hour of usage, regardless of an intersection’s current LOS.

Ms. McIntire said the TIS study area depends on the type of proposal and is determined on a case-by-case basis. Generally, they are talking about the first signalized intersection in all directions, but larger proposals can definitely expand the study area. Commissioner Craft questioned why the City would want to require a traffic study if an intersection is running efficiently. Ms. McIntire said the point is to prevent future development from making the LOS worse. She explained that it is difficult to pinpoint the exact point at which the LOS at each intersection would worsen. It is the applicant’s responsibility to figure this out on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Craft commented that it seems onerous and inefficient to require all developers to complete a TIS if their proposal would result in 20 or more peak hour trips. Ms. McIntire pointed out the proposed language is intended to address situations such as schools, where the major traffic impact would occur in the afternoon and could actually overlap with the peak period. She questioned how the City would mitigate the impacts if a TIS cannot be required. Chair Wagner recalled that the Commission recently reviewed a school master plan, and the majority of the comments were related to traffic, which peaked at about 3:00 p.m.

Public Testimony

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to participate in the public hearing.

Final Questions and Deliberations

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SMC 20.60.140 AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED BY STRIKING THE WORDS, “AT A MINIMUM” FROM THE LAST SENTENCE OF SMC 20.60.140(B). VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Closure of Public Hearing

The public hearing was closed.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – 20.60.140

Chair Wagner referred to the rules and procedures for the public hearing, which were presented earlier in the meeting, and opened the public hearing. Ms. Simulcik Smith announced that the following exhibits (desk packet) were received after the Planning Commission packet was sent out:

- **Exhibit 9** – Email from Planning Commissioner Ben Perkowski dated March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 10** – Comment letter from Boni Biery received March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 11** – Comment letter from Elaine and Robert Phelps received March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 12** – Comment letter from Wendy Zieve received March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 13** – Comment letter from Vicki Westberg received March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 14** – Comment letter from Sigrid Strom received March 13, 2012
- **Exhibit 15** – Comment letter from Ruth Williams received March 14, 2012

- **Exhibit 16** – Comment letter from Charles Brown received March 14, 2012
- **Exhibit 17** – Comment letter from Bettelinn Brown received March 14, 2012
- **Exhibit 18** – Comment letter from Jan Stewart received March 14, 2012
- **Exhibit 19** – Comment letter from Lance Young received March 15, 2012
- **Exhibit 20** – Comment Letter from Wendy DiPeso received March 15, 2012
- **Exhibit 21** – Email from Planning Commissioner Cynthia Esselman dated March 15, 2012
- **Exhibit 22** – Comment letter from Nancy Morris received March 15, 2012
- **Exhibit 23** – Comment letter from Patty Pfeifer received March 15, 2012
- **Exhibit 24** – Comment letter from Cecily Kaplan received March 15, 2012

The Commissioners indicated they all had an opportunity to review the new items contained in their desk packet.

Staff Presentation and Questions by the Commission

Mr. Cohen clarified that the proposed amendments are related only to the tree code. The “Tree City USA” designation and the creation of a Tree Board are separate projects. Regulating trees within the rights-of-way is also a separate topic. The proposed tree code amendments would only impact private properties.

Mr. Cohen reviewed that an Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) assessment was completed in April 2011, concluding that the City had not lost significant tree canopy over the past two decades. In light of these findings, the City Council directed the staff and Commission to review the current tree code to identify amendments that reform unclear and cumbersome language and adopt a policy for increasing tree canopy through voluntary programs. He referred the Commission to the proposed amendments (Attachment A) and the Commission and staff discussed each one as follows:

- **SMC 20.50.310(B)(1) – Modify the Exemption that allows for six significant trees to be removed in a three-year period.** Mr. Cohen said the current code allows property owners to remove up to six significant trees on a property in a 36-month period. Staff had originally proposed a provision that would have required property owners to notify the City of the number and diameter of trees to be removed. However, the City does not have a system in place to track tree removal, and implementing a tracking system would require a significant amount of staff time. He clarified that the problem has not been the excessive use of the provision, but the lack of ability to track tree removal throughout the three-year cycle. He said staff is now recommending that the regulation remain unchanged because violations have not been excessive, and property owners would be relieved from bureaucracy and permit costs.

Commissioner Moss asked if there is a simple way for property owners to provide information about the number and diameter of trees removed without it becoming an incredibly cumbersome process for staff. She agreed that requiring a permit could be problematic, but it would be helpful to start a tracking program by asking people to report to the City when a significant tree is removed. She suggested that perhaps the new Tree Board could provide recommendations about how this could be accomplished. While she cautioned against making the tracking process so onerous that staff has to

visit each site and make determinations, she felt a reporting requirement could help alleviate neighborhood concerns.

Vice Chair Perkowski questioned how the provision that allows for the removal of up to six significant trees could be implemented if property owners are not required to report to the City. Mr. Cohen pointed out that cutting more than six significant trees within a three-year period would be a code violation, regardless of whether there is a reporting requirement or not. Vice Chair Perkowski pointed out that the “six significant tree” provision would only be enforced if someone reports a violation, which would require neighbors to keep track of how many trees are removed. He said he does not support staff’s reasoning for eliminating the amendment that would require property owners to report to the City. He observed that if there are not that many trees being cut on private property in the City, it should not be a significant burden to implement a reporting system. Chair Wagner clarified that staff’s point was not that trees aren’t being cut, but that there were not a lot of code violations that exceed the six tree limit during a three-year period.

Mr. Cohen said if the Commission feels the reporting requirement is important, staff would need to put together a reporting system before the proposed amendment is forwarded to the City Council for adoption.

Commissioner Craft pointed out that SMC 20.50.310(B)(1) talks only about significant trees and does not address tree species. He pointed out that some native species of trees are more critical to the environment and the overall tree canopy in the City. If the Commission recommends adoption of a reporting system, it would also be important to track the species of trees that are removed. Mr. Cohen said the concept that some trees are more valuable than others has been discussed on previous occasions, and it was determined that it would be costly to administer a reporting system that keeps track of trees as they grow. It would also be difficult to decide the value of each species.

- **SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(e) through SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(i) – Remove non-active or non-imminent, hazardous trees as a category of the code because they would be part of tree removal.** Mr. Cohen explained that the designation of non active or non imminent hazardous trees can be easily applied to the majority of trees that are not perfect specimens. Staff spends a significant amount of time reviewing requests to cut hazardous trees, which involves reviewing arborist reports and conducting site visits, yet there is no permit fee attached to the requirement. He said staff recommends that Items 1.e through 1.i should be moved to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). Rather than debating with an arborist about whether or not a tree is hazardous, property owners could utilize the exemption that allows up to six trees to be cut in a three-year period. To remove more than six trees, a property owner could obtain a clearing and grading permit using the City’s existing provisions. He explained that there are currently no provisions for hazardous tree removal in the CAO. Instead, the CAO refers to the hazardous tree provisions in the tree code. If the provisions are removed from the tree code, they must be added to the CAO.

Commissioner Moss expressed concern that the City’s process for removing hazardous trees would take time, which might not be available if a tree poses an imminent danger. Mr. Cohen clarified that this proposed code amendment only addresses non active or non imminent hazardous trees, and imminent or active hazardous trees are addressed in a different provisions of the tree code.

Commissioner Moss summarized that moving Items 1.e through 1.i to the CAO would not impact a property owner's ability to remove a tree that poses an imminent danger. Mr. Cohen agreed.

- **SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(c) and SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(d) -- Allow active or imminent, hazardous trees to be removed quickly first with documentation and then require a tree removal permit after.** Mr. Cohen noted that the proposed amendment is intended to streamline the process for removing imminently hazardous trees. As proposed, a property owner would simply be required to provide photographic proof of the hazardous tree before it is cut. After it is cut, the property owner would be required to contact the City to determine, after the fact, if the removal would require a permit and/or tree replacement.

Commissioner Moss expressed concern that it appears the proposed language would only apply to the specific situations listed and not to all hazardous tree situations. For example, she suggested it would be appropriate to add language to address situations where a hazardous tree poses a danger to a structure. Mr. Cohen advised that the provisions in Items 1.c and 1.d in SMC 20.50.310(A) are intended to apply to all hazardous tree situations. He agreed the language could be clarified.

Vice Chair Perkowski asked if Items 1.c and 1.d would also apply to hazardous trees in critical areas. Mr. Cohen answered that the provisions would apply to all trees, including critical areas, and he agreed to check to make sure the CAO cross references the provisions for active and imminent hazardous trees found in the tree code. Vice Chair Perkowski expressed concern that the provisions in Items 1.e through 1.i could be weakened if moved to the CAO because the decision would be left to the discretion of the Director (SMC 20.80.030(H)(5)). Chair Wagner summarized that, as currently proposed by staff, SMC 20.50.310(A)(1) would only deal with active and imminent hazardous trees. The CAO would have a cross reference to the original generic tree code (SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)) for active and imminent hazardous trees, and it would also have its own section (SMC 20.80.030(H)) to address non active and non imminent hazardous trees. Any imminent or active hazardous tree can be removed, but the removal must be substantiated to the City at some point. Non imminent or non active hazardous trees outside of critical areas can be removed using the "six significant trees" exemption or by obtaining a grading and clearing permit. Non imminent or non active hazardous trees within the critical area can only be removed as per the process outlined in the CAO.

- **SMC 20.50.300(E) – Remove the provision that does not allow tree removal without a development proposal.** Mr. Cohen said this provision does not allow clearing and/or grading to take place on a property to prepare it for sale and/or future development when no specific plan for future development has been submitted. He pointed out that the City currently allows owners of existing residentially developed property to remove trees as per the tree code without submitting a development proposal or having plans to sell the property. He also pointed out that "development" is defined as "a permitted activity," which includes tree removal. As per the provision, a property owner cannot remove trees without a development proposal, but if the development proposal is to remove trees, it should be allowed. He said staff does not believe there is any benefit in stopping a property owner from removing trees, as long as code requirements can be met to protect and replant the site. He said he is only aware of one incident when this provision was violated in the past 15 years when someone removed trees in preparation for selling the property. In this case, the

requirements the City placed on the property owner to put the site back to together again were very similar to what would have been required if the site had been developed as a subdivision. He summarized that staff is recommending that this provision be deleted because it is contradictory and does not have a strong purpose.

Vice Chair Perkowski said a lot of tree codes, including the City of Seattle's, effectively prevent the removal of significant trees on undeveloped property. He disagreed with the idea that the provision does not have value. He said he cannot accept the circular reasoning argument as a basis for removing the provision. He expressed concern that if a property owner is allowed to clear a property without a development proposal, there would be no analysis of the benefits of potentially saving the more valuable trees. He expressed his belief that the code should protect the very large, mature, healthy trees, and removing the provision would eliminate that possibility, especially given their previous discussion about modifying the "six significant tree" exemption. Removing the provision is inconsistent with the goals identified in the Comprehensive and Sustainability Plans. He noted there were no public comments in support of removing the provision, either.

Mr. Cohen asked if Vice Chair Perkowski is suggesting that removing the provision would allow a property owner to remove all the trees on a property without approval by the City. Vice Chair Perkowski clarified that there would be no City review of the type of trees that are removed. A significant tree is defined as any tree larger than six inches in diameter. If the "six significant tree" exemption is amended as currently proposed, a property owner could potentially remove a cluster of very valuable trees. He reminded the Commission that the City's tree code does not recognize that trees have different values. He suggested that more changes to the tree code are needed to adequately protect valuable trees. He specifically referred to Lake Forest Park's tree code as a good example.

Mr. Cohen acknowledged that the City does not evaluate significant trees based on species, but that is true for all properties and not just undeveloped properties. Vice Chair Perkowski reiterated his belief that other sections of the code must be amended to better protect valuable trees, using a process that takes species into account.

Commissioner Moss said her interpretation of the provision is that it artificially limits undeveloped land. She asked if Vice Chair Perkowski's concern would be addressed if the tree code were amended to include language to protect landmark trees. Vice Chair Perkowski said landmark trees is only part of his concern. He recommended they step back and look at the tree code more comprehensively. Absent protection for landmark trees, he cannot support removing the provision. Mr. Cohen noted that the tree code does include provisions for landmark trees, and no changes have been proposed. Vice Chair Perkowski said the provision outlines a process for nominating landmark trees, but it is not a system for identifying landmark trees based strictly on size. Some cities have code provisions that prohibit the removal of exceptional trees on undeveloped lots absent a development permit review. It would be difficult to identify significant trees that should be retained without having a development proposal.

Mr. Cohen acknowledged that revising the proposed amendments will not address the concerns raised by Vice Chair Perkowski. However, he reminded the Commission that the current code

includes language and criteria that allows the Director the discretion to require more trees to be retained, allow more trees to be cut, or require more trees to be replanted.

Commissioner Craft observed that once applications for development and clearing and grading permits have been submitted, staff assesses the existing condition of the property, including significant trees. Vice Chair Perkowski is concerned about allowing a property owner of vacant land to remove trees prior to development because the City would not have control over which trees are removed and which are retained. He questioned if Vice Chair Perkowski is proposing that the tree code should delineate between vacant and developed properties. Vice Chair Perkowski agreed that is what he is proposing. He added that this is not an uncommon practice, and many cities do it.

- **SMC 20.50.360(K)(2) – Allow the Director the option to require tree maintenance bonds based on the scope of the project.** Mr. Cohen explained that the current code language requires a maintenance bond after installation of all required site improvements, including landscaping and/or tree replacement. Staff is concerned that this requirement could become burdensome to small property owners. He pointed out that other provisions in the code allow the Director discretion in how the code requirements are applied, and staff is recommending that SMC 20.50.360(K)(2) should be amended to allow the Director the option of whether to require a maintenance bond or not. He expressed his belief that the current provision is intended to apply to developers of large properties, in which case a maintenance bond would be appropriate.

Commissioner Moss agreed with staff's concern about the provision being burdensome to small developments. However, replacing the word "shall" with "may" would allow the provision to apply to large developments, as well. She questioned if it would be better to have an exemption that allows the Director to waive the maintenance bond requirement for single-lot, residential development. Chair Wagner reminded the Commission that the City's legal counsel has recommended that criteria must be provided wherever the code allows flexibility. Commissioner Moss pointed out that, in some cases, it may be appropriate to require a maintenance bond for very large, single-family lots. She suggested the language should remain as "shall" and then note that the Director may waive the maintenance bond requirement for single-family lots."

Public Testimony

Lance Young, Shoreline, said he was present to represent One World Outing Club and the Interurban Trail Tree Preservation Group. He observed that a lot of what is being discussed is how to allow more trees to be cut rather than how to preserve more trees. He said he has talked to numerous private residential property owners who have expressed a desire for flexibility to cut hazardous trees, but the vast majority also strongly desires a good forest canopy in the City. He suggested the Commission consider incorporating the guidelines for minimum tree coverage that were identified previously by Mr. Cohen. He pointed out that if he used the "six significant tree" exemption on his lot, he would be allowed to remove all of his trees within one year. He suggested that the majority of residential property owners in Shoreline could do the same within one to four years.

Mr. Lance referred to the example plan he previously submitted to the Commission, which would establish a minimum forest cover standard and also provide a significant amount of flexibility. For

example, it would allow a property owner to remove large trees in the front yard that block solar access and plant fruit trees in other areas to maintain the forest cover. He reminded the Commission that trees provide a significant value to the community. Not only do they clean the air, but root systems filter out heavy metal from the soil. They also provide sound abatement by cutting the wind flow through the neighborhoods.

Mr. Lance suggested that a solution to the Commission's concerns about tree cutting prior to a development permit might be to require people to register the trees that are removed as part of the "six significant tree" exemption. This would remove the obligation for City staff to issue a permit, but it would allow the City to track the trees that are removed. He questioned how staff knows that very few people use the "six significant tree" exemption if there is no tracking program. The registration could be free or a minimum fee could be charged. The City could also implement an education program as part of the registration process to provide information about the value of trees, how to trim them, and a list of resources. He reminded the Commission that a 2003 tree study recommended that an education program be implemented. The study also recommended that the City should plant up to 200 trees per year.

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was present to speak on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society. She agreed with the comments provide by Mr. Young, but she particularly wanted to speak to the proposed amendment to remove the provision that would not allow tree removal without a development proposal. She suggested that the provision was recommended in response to previous problems at the Bear Reserve. In that case, the key issue was whether or not a development had been proposed. She recalled that all the trees were allowed to be removed from a critical area without a development proposal. She expressed concern that eliminating this provision would open the door to allow clearing to happen again and again. There must be provisions to protect existing stands of significant trees, which are very valuable to the entire community. She reminded the Commission to reflect on whether or not the proposed changes are in line with the purpose of the tree code.

Final Questions and Deliberations

Chair Wagner referred to Mr. Young's comment and clarified that the reason it appears the Commission is focusing their discussion on how to allow more tress to be cut is because the proposed amendments are in the portion of the code that talks about how to manage tree cutting.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SMC 20.50 (TREE CODE) AS PROPOSED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.

The Commission reviewed the amendments and made the following amendments to the main motion:

- **SMC 20.50.300(E)**

Chair Wagner said she envisions this proposed amendment would apply to undeveloped lots, and would allow a property owner to remove numerous trees to make a lot sellable. The property owner could then sell the property, and a subsequent developer could, through the development permit

process, be allowed to remove additional trees. These multiple iterations could be more impactful than tying the clearing to the actual development process. She recalled Commissioner Craft's earlier question about whether the provision is consistent with what an owner of developed property would be allowed to do. Commissioner Craft pointed out that allowing a property owner to cut trees and then sell the property to a developer who would remove more trees as part of a development proposal would be detrimental to the goal of preserving the tree canopy.

Mr. Cohen said that, as per the provision, a property owner would not be allowed to remove any of the trees that are required to be retained for a period of 36 months, regardless of whether the property is developed or undeveloped. Commissioner Craft pointed out that, in the case of a subdivision, a new lot could be created and more trees could be cut. Mr. Cohen said that when a development application is reviewed, the number of trees required to remain on the property is based on the original cutting, regardless of how many lots are created. Commissioner Craft noted that under the "six significant tree" exemption, the City would have no recorded knowledge of how many trees were previously cut down. Mr. Cohen agreed this would be true in any situation for the six exempt trees. However, the City would have a record of permits to cut trees beyond the six allowed. Commissioner Craft summarized that a property owner would be allowed to cut up to six significant trees, and any additional tree removal would be addressed as part of a development application.

Vice Chair Perkowski said that if there were better protections in the rest of the code, he could potentially support the change. Because of the "six significant tree" exemption, he believes removing the provision would be detrimental to the City's tree canopy. He agreed that a developer would ultimately be allowed to remove trees to accommodate development, but he felt tree removal should take place as part of a development proposal. Once again, he suggested the Commission should conduct a more comprehensive review of the tree code. He referred to the recommendation he previously provided for potential code language, which was based on Lake Forest Park's tree code.

Vice Chair Perkowski said he believes the recent tree canopy study was a worthy effort, and the City got their money's worth. However, if the City intended to use the study as the major rationale for the tree code, it should have been much more comprehensive and provided more detail to support the findings. He said he cannot support using the study as the premise for saying that the current tree code is adequate with just a few minor amendments. He commented that even if the survey was adequate, it does not recognize the major issue of scale. He said it is inappropriate to look at tree canopy on a citywide scale and say that no additional changes are needed to the tree code because there is an overall tree canopy of 30%. Removing a large cluster of mature trees in one area will have impacts in that location. In addition, trees located near wetlands, streams, or Puget Sound are much more valuable and will have impact on a site scale basis.

Chair Wagner asked if Vice Chair Perkowski could propose alternative language to address the concerns he has raised about the proposed amendment. Vice Chair Perkowski said he could not propose alternative language at this time. He proposed that the provision be retained for now, and then the Commission could revisit the issue again as part of a more comprehensive review of the tree code. Once again, he reminded the Commission that numerous cities have similar provisions that work well.

In response to Ms. Way's comment about the Bear Reserve permit, Ms. Markle explained that, under legal advice, the City could not deny the permit based on the provision, as written. The trees were allowed to be cut after an appeal to the City's decision. She summarized that, even if the provision stays in place, the City has been legally advised not to use it to deny cutting on an undeveloped parcel.

The Commission discussed adding the words "and grading" in the first line of Item E. Mr. Cohen pointed out that this change was originally proposed because the code typically references "clearing and grading" together. Staff recommended the change for consistency.

VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI MOVED THAT THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE IN SMC 20.50.300(E) REMAIN, WITH INCLUSION OF THE WORDS "AND GRADING" AFTER "CLEARING." THE LANGUAGE WOULD READ AS FOLLOWS:

No clearing and grading shall be allowed on a site for the sake of preparing that site for sale or future development where no specific plan for future development has been submitted. The Director may issue a clearing and grading permit as part of a phased development plan where a conceptual plan for development of the property has been submitted to the City and the owner or developer agrees to submit an application for a building permit or other site development permit in less than 12 months.

COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Wagner asked for additional clarification about why the City Attorney advised that the provision would not be enforceable. Ms. Markle clarified that the provision would be enforceable in relation to a site plan for future development. However, applying the words "where no specific plan for future development has been submitted" to the reserve's situation would not be legally defensible.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(c) and SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(d)**

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE LANGUAGE IN SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(c) AND SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(d) BE COMBINED AND AMENDED TO READ:

In addition to other exemptions of Subchapter 5 of the Development Code, SMC 20.50.290 through 20.50.370, a request for the cutting of any tree that is an active and imminent hazard, such as tree limbs or trunks that are demonstrably cracked, leaning towards overhead utility lines or structures, or uprooted by flooding, heavy winds or storm events. After tree removal, the City will need photographic proof and appropriate application approval, if any.

COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR WAGNER MOVED THAT AN ADDITIONAL SENTENCE BE ADDED AT THE END OF SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(c) TO READ:

The City retains the right to dispute the emergency and require that the party obtain a clearing permit and/or require that replacement trees be replanted as mitigation.

VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Wagner felt the additional language would give the City more action in case a tree is removed that is not really hazardous. The provision would no longer specify that a property owner must provide photographic proof. Mr. Cohen suggested it would be useful to require a property owner to submit some type of documentation for staff to base their decision. However, he agreed that the documentation does not necessarily have to be photographic.

- **SMC 20.50.310(B)(1)**

Chair Wagner recalled that during a previous staff report, Mr. Cohen not only discussed that it would be administratively difficult to provide permits, but any type of registration process would be administratively burdensome. Mr. Cohen explained that staff would be obligated to verify each situation if property owners are required to notify the City whenever a significant tree is removed. Failure to notify the City of a significant tree removal would be considered a code violation, which would take additional staff time to administer. He recommended that the City could retain the reporting requirement and establish a permit and fee to cover administrative costs, or they could eliminate the reporting requirement altogether.

Chair Wagner agreed that if the City implements a reporting requirement, they must also recognize the associated costs of administering the provision. She reminded the Commission that the Community and Development Services staff level has been reduced, and their workload needs to be carefully considered.

Vice Chair Perkowski reminded the Commission that the Tree Canopy Study was used to justify the elimination of the reporting requirement. He noted that if the City chooses not to track the removal of significant trees through a permit system, they will be required to track tree canopy via a costly survey. Once again, he said the Tree Canopy Study survey does not adequately justify the proposed change.

Commissioner Moss said staff has recommended that periodic urban tree canopy assessments be done. She recalled that the last Tree Canopy Study was funded by a grant from the Department of Natural Resources. She questioned where the City would obtain funding to do a study that is truly adequate and addresses all elements of urban tree canopy and stormwater management. She said she understands that a reporting requirement would have associated administrative costs, but eliminating the requirement would require the City to conduct additional tree canopy surveys in the future. She said she would like the City to further explore options for tracking significant tree removal. She pointed out that the new Tree Board and the City's effort to become a "Tree City USA" will likely focus on educating citizens about the need to protect the existing tree canopy. She noted that the

cost of tree removal is significant, and an additional \$10 permit fee would probably not play a significant role in a property owner's decision.

The Commission discussed the need to differentiate between smaller, significant trees and trees that could be considered "landmark" trees. Vice Chair Perkowski said the proposal he previously submitted recognized that not all significant trees have the same value. It also addressed how the "six significant tree" exemption could be equitably applied equitably on both small and large lots. He said he is opposed to allowing the removal of up to six significant trees, regardless of their size or value, without some type of review requirement.

Chair Wagner said she would be opposed to requiring a property owner to notify the City whenever a significant tree is removed because it would place an administrative burden on staff. However, she said she would not be opposed to a provision where the maximum number of significant trees that could be cut in a three-year period is based on the size of the lot. For example, the provision could allow as few as three significant trees to be cut on the smallest residential lots and up to six significant trees on the largest lots. The provision could also require a permit to remove any tree that is greater than 30 inches in diameter.

Mr. Cohen suggested an easier and more equitable approach would to identify the number of significant trees that could be removed per acre. This number could be used to calculate how many significant trees could be removed from each lot based on size. Chair Wagner agreed this would be a good approach, but she felt they should place a cap on the maximum number of trees that could be removed from a lot, regardless of size. The Commission agreed that the total number should not exceed 6.

Vice Chair Perkowski pointed out that a "significant tree" is defined elsewhere in the code as any tree that is 6" diameter at breast height (DBH) or greater. Mr. Cohen clarified that "significant tree" is actually defined as 8" for conifer and 12" for deciduous trees. Vice Chair Perkowski suggested that the term "significant trees" should be removed. In its place, the language should make it clear that the provision only applies to trees that are between 6" and 30" DBH. Commissioner Craft suggested the provision should apply to all significant trees up to a maximum of 30" DBH. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Moss summarized that, as currently proposed, property owners would have to know their lot size to determine the number of trees that could be removed. However, no permit would be required and the property owner would not be required to notify the City of tree removal. The City would only get involved if a property owner cuts more trees than allowed.

Commissioner Moss pointed out that measuring DBH is open to interpretation. Some tree codes specifically state that the diameter should be measured at 4.5' above the ground. She suggested that identifying the exact location for where the measurement should take place would be a clearer approach. Mr. Cohen said DBH is already defined in the code as "the diameter of any tree trunk measured at 4.5' above average grade."

Director Markle questioned the value in requiring a permit to remove trees that are greater than 30” DBH if the permits are automatically approved unless the tree is located in a critical area. Vice Chair Perkowski said his intent is to create regulations for trees that are greater than 30” DBH. However, he recognized that this would require additional changes elsewhere in the tree code, and the proposed change is a good place to start. Commissioner Moss expressed her belief that the provision would also raise awareness that larger trees have more value and encourage property owners to retain the more significant trees when possible. By requiring a permit, a property owner would likely give more thought to how important it is to retain the very large trees.

The Commission discussed that language should be added SMC 20.50.310(B) to make it clear that a clearing and grading permit would be required for removal of any tree greater than 30” DBH or for the removal of more trees than specified in the table. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if the clearing and grading permit would require replacement trees. Mr. Cohen said that the clearing and grading provision would require replacement when tree removal exceeds the number or size allowed in the exemption.

The Commission discussed that the minimum cost for a clearing and grading permit is currently set at \$448.50 (3 hours of staff time). They expressed concern that the current fee may be too onerous for tree removal permits. Ms. Markle suggested that perhaps the fee schedule could be adjusted to allow the City to charge a sliding scale fee for tree removal permits based on the hours of staff time required to process the application. The Commission agreed that would be an appropriate recommendation to forward to the City Council.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that SMC 20.50.360(C) currently states that up to six significant trees can be removed per parcel with no replacement requirement, and the Commission is currently discussing the option of basing the number of significant trees that can be removed on lot size. The Commission agreed that that SMC 20.50.360(C) should be amended to be consistent with SMC 20.50.310(B)(1).

COMMISSIONER CRAFT MOVED TO AMEND SMC 20.50.310(B)(1) AND ADD A NEW SMC 2.50.310.B.2 TO READ:

- 1. The removal of up to a maximum of six significant trees (excluding trees greater than 30” DBH per tree) in accordance with the table below. (See Chapter 20.20 SMC, Definitions)*

<i>Lot Size in Square Feet</i>	<i>Number of Trees</i>
<i>Up to 7,200</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>7,201 to 14,400</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>14,401 to 21,780</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>21,781 and above</i>	<i>6</i>

- 2. The removal of any tree greater than 30” DBH, or exceeding the numbers of trees specified in the table above, shall require a clearing and grading permit (20.50.290 – 20.50.370).*

COMMISSIONER CRAFT FURTHER MOVED THAT THE TABLE IN SMC 20.50.310(B)(1) BE APPROPRIATELY LABELED AND THAT SMC 20.50.360(C) BE AMENDED TO BE CONSISTENT WITH SMC 20.50.310(B)(1). COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **SMC 20.50.350(D)(2)**

Commissioner Moss referred to the last bulleted item in SMC 20.50.350(D)(2), which identifies cottonwoods as having a significant water-retention function. She pointed out that the City of Seattle actually bans cottonwoods from their parking strips. While cottonwoods are great if they are near streams and water, there is some debate about their value in residential areas.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT SMC 20.50.350(D)(2) BE AMENDED BY STRIKING THE WORDS, “SUCH AS COTTONWOODS.” COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Wagner pointed out that the bullets need to be rearranged in SMC 20.50.350(D)(2). Commissioner Moss said there are formatting issues in other areas of the document, as well, where bullets have been used.

- **SMC 20.50.350(K)**

Commissioner Moss suggested that “shall” should be used instead of “may” in SMC 20.50.350(K)(2). She also recommended that additional language should be added allowing the Director to exempt individual single-family development from the maintenance bond requirement. Mr. Cohen pointed out that single-family development can include more than one lot, such as a subdivision. Ms. Markle pointed out that, through code enforcement, the City would still require that trees live, even if a maintenance bond is not required. Commissioner Moss said her intent is to not make it onerous for single-family parcels to develop.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT SMC 20.50.350(K)(2) BE AMENDED BY REPLACING “SHALL” WITH “MAY” IN THE FIRST SENTENCE AND DELETING “IF REQUIRED” FROM THE SECOND SENTENCE. SHE FURTHER MOVED THAT ITEM 3 SHOULD BE ADDED TO SMC 20.50.350(K) TO READ:

A. The Director may exempt individual single-family lots from a maintenance bond.

VICE CHAIR PERKOWSKI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **SMC 20.80.030(H)**

The Commission discussed that SMC 20.80.030(H) must be amended to be consistent with the proposed changes to SMC 20.50.310(A)(1)(c). They agreed that having separate language to distinguish between active or imminent and non active or non imminent would provide more clarity.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED TO ADD A NEW ITEM H TO SMC 20.80.030 TO READ: “FOR ACTIVE OR IMMINENT HAZARDOUS TREES REFER TO SECTION 20.50.310(A)(1)(c).” SHE FURTHER MOVED THAT A NEW ITEM I BE CREATED AND TITLED: “REMOVAL OF NON ACTIVE OR NON IMMINENT HAZARDOUS TREES” AND THE SUBSEQUENT LANGUAGE WOULD FOLLOW AS PROVIDED IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT. CHAIR WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. *(Note: The remaining items in SMC 20.80.030 would be renumbered.)*

Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTES TO SMC 20.50 (TREE CODE) WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED.

As per the Commission’s earlier discussion, Chair Wagner asked that the transmittal letter prepared by staff also include the Commission’s direction to the City Council to consider a sliding-scale fee structure for tree removal permits.

Closure of Public Hearing

Chair Wagner closed the public hearing.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Markle thanked Vice Chair Perkowski for his years of service on the Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Moss reported on her attendance at a recent Growing Transit Communities North Corridor Task Force meeting. She announced that the task force’s overreaching goal is to identify different types of topographies for the various types of station areas in the north corridor. Public hearings will be conducted in June.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran announced that Mayor McGlashan will be present at the Commission’s April 5th meeting to swear in the three new Commissioners. At that meeting, Ms. Redinger will be present to explain the Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission will also discuss amendments to the Development Code and elect new officers.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 P.M.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

**TIME STAMP
March 15, 2012**

CALL TO ORDER: 00:13

ROLL CALL: 00:18

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 00:33

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS: 00:39

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 00:45

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 00:50

PUBLIC HEARING ON DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – SMC 20.60.140: 01:00

Staff Presentation: 02:10

Questions by the Commission: 8:16

Public Testimony: 17:07

Final Questions and Deliberations: 17:46

Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification: 19:36

Closure of Public Hearing: 19:52

PUBLIC HEARING ON DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – 20.60.140: 20:00

Staff Presentation and Questions by the Commission: 21:59

Public Testimony: 1:18:18

Final Questions and Deliberations: 1:28:08

Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification: 3:11:25

Closure of Public Hearing: 3:12:37

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 3:13:10

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 3:13:37

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 3:14:45

DRAFT

This page intentionally blank

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Comprehensive Plan Update, Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements
DEPARTMENT: Planning & Community Development
PRESENTED BY: Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner
Rachael Markle, AICP, Director P&CD

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Study Session | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Only |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

On January 5, 2012, staff and Commissioners discussed the proposed process for the Comprehensive Plan Update and public involvement. Commissioners that were appointed since that time have been briefed on the proposed process and elements discussed to date: Community Design; Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Transportation; and Natural Environment. The subject of tonight's agenda item will be the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements.

In the current Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities and Utilities are separate elements. Staff's initial recommendation was to consider combining the elements as part of the update; however, after further study, staff believes it will be less confusing to leave them separated. The purpose of each element and distinction between them is included in the "Discussion" section of this staff report.

RELEVANT COUNCIL AND VISION 2029 FRAMEWORK GOALS

2012-2014 Council Goal 2: Improve Shoreline's utility, transportation and environmental infrastructure.

2009-2012 Council Goal 2: Provide safe, efficient, and effective infrastructure to support our land use, transportation, and surface water plans. (In 2008-2009, this was *Council Goal 10*)

2010-2012 Council Goal 7: Acquire Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline.

FG 2: Provide high quality public services, utilities, and infrastructure that accommodate anticipated levels of growth, protect public health and safety, and enhance the quality of life.

DISCUSSION

A Capital Facilities Element includes the types of facilities the jurisdiction considers necessary for development. A capital facility is a structure, street or utility system improvement, or other long-lasting major asset, including land. Capital facilities are provided for public purposes. Capital facilities may include: streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and police and fire protection facilities.

Approved By: _____ Project Manager  _____ Planning Director _____

A Capital Facilities Element consists of:

- (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;
- (b) A forecast of the future needs for the capital facilities;
- (c) The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;
- (d) At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and
- (e) A requirement to reassess the Land Use Element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the Land Use Element, Capital Facilities Element, and imbedded financing plan are coordinated and consistent. To support the Capital Facilities Element the individual facilities must be planned in six year cycles, which is how the City's Capital Improvement Plan is structured.

The Utilities Element consists of the general or proposed location and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines. No criteria or requirement is provided in GMA, the RCW or WAC for consistency evaluation of the general utilities included in the Utilities Element because they are not "deemed necessary for development." The utilities section of GMA requires a community provide adequate capacity to support planned growth. Effective comprehensive planning depends on how well the community has done its local utility planning; and on planning by public and private utilities, which may or may not be synchronized with local community plans or concurrent with the demands of growth.

Attachments A-H are similar to previous packets in that they contain goals and policies, and analysis sections of each element in both track change and "clean" versions. There is a necessary mapping component to these, as well as other, elements. Staff is working to update current maps, and they will be included in the draft version of the Comprehensive Plan, anticipated to be completed by the fall.

At the April 5th meeting, staff mentioned that they were still in process of determining the most efficient way for the Commission to group edit the individual elements, and later the document as a whole. The City Attorney has clarified that Commissioners commenting on each other's comments in Google Cloud, or other collaborative technology, would be considered discussion, and therefore, be a violation of the Open Meetings Act. Therefore, each Commissioner will either need to send comments to staff prior to the meeting and staff will merge the comments into one document to be reviewed at the meeting, or each Commissioner can submit their comments orally during the meeting. If the Commission chooses the former option, staff would appreciate having at least one full day to accomplish the merger. In order to maximize efficiency during meetings, grammatical edits should be sent directly to staff and these corrections will be incorporated into the document prior to discussion by the full Commission.

Please note that Commissioners are able to use personal devices for editing and other business of the Commission as long as staff are included in all correspondence so there is a public record.

NEXT STEPS

The next Speaker's Series event, focusing on Economic Development, will be held on Wednesday, April 25th from 6:30-8:30 in the Council Chambers. Rob Bennett, Executive Director of the Portland Sustainability Institute, will discuss EcoDistricts. This date is consistent with the scheduling of other Speaker's Series events in that it will be held on the 4th Wednesday of the month, a week prior to the 1st Thursday Planning Commission discussion of the related elements.

Commission will discuss the Housing and Economic Development Elements at the May 3rd meeting. Land Use will be discussed in June, including the Land Use Map. The only remaining Element will be the Shoreline Master Program (SMP), which will be based on the final document adopted by City Council. Their first study session on the SMP is scheduled for April 23rd.

If you have questions or comments prior to the meeting, please contact Miranda Redinger at (206) 801-2513 or by email at mredinger@shorelinewa.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A- Capital Facilities Element, Goals & Policies, track change version

Attachment B- Capital Facilities Element, Goals & Policies, clean version

Attachment C- Capital Facilities Element, Analysis, track change version

Attachment D- Capital Facilities Element, Analysis, clean version

Attachment E- Utilities Element, Goals & Policies, track change version

Attachment F- Utilities Element, Goals & Policies, clean version

Attachment G- Utilities Element, Analysis, track change version

Attachment H- Utilities Element, Analysis, clean version

This page intentionally blank

Capital Facilities Element Goals & Policies

Comment [gch1]: My only comment is that I did not see any mention of the need to build a new Police Facility as identified in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The current one is non-reinforced masonry and has not been retrofitted for Earthquake standards. The are in the process now of Identifying land and funding for a new facility.

Introduction

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW 36.70A.070 requires cities to prepare a capital facilities plan element consisting of:

- 1) An inventory of current capital facilities owned by public entities showing the location and capacities of those public facilities and identifying any current deficiencies;
- 2) A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;
- 3) The proposed capacities of expanded or capital facilities;
- 4) At least a six-year plan that will finance capital facilities within the projected funding capacities and clearly identify sources of public money for such purposes; and
- 5) A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities element, and finance plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

Capital facilities investments include major rehabilitation or maintenance projects on capital assets; construction of new buildings, streets, and other facilities; and land for parks and other public purposes.

Under the GMA, a capital facilities element is required to address all public facilities except transportation facilities, which are to be addressed separately under the Transportation Element of the Plan. Accordingly, this Comprehensive Plan contains separate Transportation and Capital Facilities elements. A Park, Recreation, and Open Space Element is also contained in this Plan. However, the discussion of finance for capital facilities, transportation, and park resources has been combined in one location under this Capital Facilities Element.

The City of Shoreline is responsible for providing facilities and services that are needed by the residents and businesses of the City for a safe, secure, and efficient environment. These facilities and services include, but are not limited to City-managed facilities, police and fire protection, parks, streets, water and sanitary sewer service, storm drainage service, and schools.

The City of Shoreline ~~provides few of these services directly~~ directly provides services for managed facilities, parks, streets, and stormwater drainage management. The City has established interlocal agreements or contracts for those services that it does not provide. In cases where the City contracts for services, the Capital Facilities Element describes those services. The costs of facilities associated with ~~these services~~ interlocal agreements or contracts are not included in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). ~~Only City-owned or operated city-managed and transportation facilities have costs associated with capital facilities expenditures.~~ The only capital facilities that have costs associated with them are those that are City owned or operated, city managed, and transportation facilities. Much of the data regarding water, sewer, and schools ~~costs~~, and projected needs are taken from other local

Comment [tj2]: Franchise agreement is the appropriate language for utilities

Comment [a3]: This is a confusing sentence. I do not know that my suggested wording is better.

service providers. *The following capital facility plans of these providers are recognized by the City of Shoreline as supporting the land use objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.*

Comment [a4]: Why is this italicized? Is there additional emphasis associated with these?

- *Ronald Wastewater District #64, Comprehensive Sewer Plan, April 2001 and June 2003 January 2010*
- *Shoreline Water District #117, Comprehensive 2012 Water System Plan, ENTER DATE 2001*
- *Seattle Public Utilities Comprehensive 2007 Water System Plan, November 2006 2007?*

This Element contains the goals and policies that address the City's infrastructure – both those capital facilities that are owned and largely operated by the City, and those that are provided by other public entities. Other services, such as electricity, natural gas, cable and telephone are part of the Utilities Element. The *Capital Facilities – Supporting Analysis* section of this Plan contains the background data that provides the foundation for these goals and policies. The Supporting Analysis section also includes the list of potential capital projects to implement the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Goals

Goal CF I: Provide adequate public facilities that address past deficiencies and anticipate the needs of growth through acceptable levels of service, prudent use of fiscal resources, and realistic timelines.

CF II: Add new goal to: Acquire Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline

- **Develop feasibility analysis and financial plan**
- **Negotiate acquisition**
- **Develop transition and implementation plan and schedule**

Comment [m5]: Mark, how should this be phrased?

Goal CF II: ~~Ensure that capital facilities and public services necessary to support existing and new development are available concurrent with locally adopted levels of service and in accordance with Washington State Law. SUPERSEDED~~

Comment [a6]: It seems like these should be part of a policy statement supporting this goal. If not, the bulleted statements need some framework. Policy suggestion: Develop and implement a strategy to acquire SPU. Elements of the strategy will include: A feasibility analysis and financial plan, an approach to negotiate the acquisition, a transition and implementation plan, and a schedule.

Goal CF III: ~~Provide continuous, reliable, and cost effective capital facilities and public services in the City and its Urban Growth Area in a phased, efficient manner reflecting the sequence of development as described in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. REDUNDANT~~

Comment [jef7]: Why delete? This is still valid.

Goal CF IV: ~~Enhance the quality of life in Shoreline through the planned provision of capital facilities and public services that are provided either directly by the City or through coordination with other public and private entities. REDUNDANT TO 1~~

Goal CF III: Promote city-wide utility services that are:

- consistent,
- high quality,
- equitable,
- responsive,
- forward looking,
- environmentally sensitive and energy efficient,
- locationally and aesthetically sensitive, and

Comment [bl8]: Not sure what you mean by this. Suggest deleting it.

- functionally and financially efficient.

Goal CF IV: Facilitate the provision of appropriate, reliable utility services.

Capital Facilities Policies

General

- CF1: ~~The City's six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) shall serve as the short term budgetary process for implementing the long term Capital Facility Plan. Project priorities and funding allocations incorporated in the CIP shall be consistent with the long term CIP.~~ BACKGROUND
- CF2: ~~Obtain and maintain an inventory of existing City-managed and non-City-managed capital facilities. This inventory shall include locations and capacities of such facilities and shall be updated every two years.~~ BACKGROUND
- CF3: Review capital facility inventory findings and project space needed for capital facilities ~~projects space~~. ~~This is~~ These needs will be based on adopted levels of service standards and forecasted growth in accordance with this plan and its established land uses. Update this projection every two years.
- CF4: Coordinate with ~~other~~ public entities that provide public services within the Shoreline ~~planning area~~ in the development of consistent service standards.
- CF5: Identify, construct, and maintain infrastructure systems and capital facilities needed to promote the full use of the zoning potential in areas zoned for commercial and mixed use areas. REGULATION
- CF6: Maintain and enhance capital facilities that will create a positive economic climate and ensure adequate capacity to move people, goods, and information.
- CF7: Identify future locations or land reserves for needed capital facilities.
- CF8: ~~Ensure~~ Negotiate appropriate mitigation for both the community and adjacent areas if Shoreline is selected as a the site for a regional capital facility, or is otherwise impacted by a regional facility's expansion, development, or operation.

Level of Service

- CF9: ~~Ensure~~ Analyze that Evaluate designated levels of service to ensure/confirm they are adequate to meet the needs of existing and anticipated development.
- CF10: ~~Ensure that capital facility improvements that are needed to meet established level of service standards can be provided by the City or the responsible service providers.~~ SUPERSEDED
- CF11: Identify structural and safety deficiencies in capital facilities based on adopted levels of service and identify the means and timing for correcting these deficiencies.

Comment [j9]: Is this still a policy of the City?

Comment [a10]: By eliminating this statement, are we eliminating Point Wells?

Comment [j11]: Are we still interested in developing consistent standards, or have we decided that it is not something we want to do? Is it a question of consistent standards or consistent application forms?

Comment [tj12]: what do we mean by consistent service standards? Different entities provide different services so I'm not sure what is meant by standard.

Comment [jef13]: Keep. This is not a regulation and should be kept. It is an important goal that special districts must consider when developing plan updates.

Comment [s14]: This might make a good goal statement

Comment [a15]: Doesn't the plan do this? Should our policy be to Establish levels of service for CF and utilities to ensure they are adequate.... Maybe I am misunderstanding this policy. Alicia nailed this one.jef

Comment [tj16]: What is definition of deficiencies – regulatory deficiency or less than desired

- CF12: ~~Minimize conflicts between level of service standards, capital improvement plans and service strategies for inter-related service providers.~~ REDUNDANT
- CF13: ~~Do not issue building permits for new structures if adequate water, sewer, surface water management and transportation services are not available at designated service levels at the time of development.~~ SUPERSEDED
- CF14: ~~Maintain a planning goal that adequate fire and police services are available for new structures at the time of development.~~ OBSOLETE
- CF15: ~~Promote the adequate provision of the full range of services e.g. parks, schools, municipal facilities, solid waste, telecommunications, etc. for new development at service levels that are consistent throughout the City.~~ OBSOLETE
- CF16: Work with all outside service providers to determine their ability to continue to meet service standards over the 20-year time frame of the Comprehensive Plan.

Financing and Funding Priorities

Do we want to add a policy about impact fees?

- CF17: Give highest funding priority to capital facility improvements that protect the public health and safety.
- CF18: Capital Facility improvements ~~which that~~ are needed to correct existing deficiencies or maintain existing levels of service should have funding priority over those ~~which that~~ would significantly enhance service levels above those designated in the Comprehensive Plan, or ~~which that~~ are intended to substantially improve the community's quality of life.
- CF19: Improvements ~~which that~~ are needed to provide critical City services such as police, surface water, and transportation at designated service levels concurrent with growth shall have funding priority for City funds over improvements ~~which that~~ are needed to provide general services or facilities to development at designated service levels.
- CF20: Consider all available ~~funding and~~ financing mechanisms, (such as rates, bonds, impacts fees, CIP funding, grants, etc.) for funding capital facilities.
- CF21: Evaluate proposed public capital facility projects to identify net costs and benefits, including impacts on transportation, surface water, parks, and other public services. For those projects where it is possible to increase the community benefit of the project and it is cost effective, assign greater funding priority to those projects that provide a higher net benefit and provide multiple functions to the community over projects that provide single or fewer functions.
- CF22: Utilize financing options that best facilitate implementation of the CIP in a financially prudent manner, ~~including the use of debt financing for large capital projects.~~
- CF23: Evaluate the costs and benefits of City or one of its utility providers to collect of surface water utility fees and street light maintenance fees, rather than County collection of fees. OBSOLETE

Comment [s18]: Aren't funding priorities a Council decision, and can be changed by future Councils. Do they really want to be bound by these existing priorities/should the priorities be deleted?

Comment [a19]: When we went through the TMP process, Council specifically removed funding policies when they were issues that would be addressed through the CIP, budget, etc. I think your policies are broad enough that they will not be too restrictive. Maybe title this section "Funding".

Comment [s20]: An impact fee policy will be added as an outcome of the TMP work done by PW staff, either to the Cap Facilities or the Transp element. I don't think we need an additional one

Comment [a21]: See Policy T50. Already adopted.

Comment [jef22]: Are these defined?

Comment [a23]: This seems like it has the same intent as CF18. Can they be combined somehow?

Comment [a24]: "funding" used twice.

Comment [j25]: This is more an operating policy. Is it one that should remain in the Comp Plan? Fits JEF

Comment [a26]: This is also similar to CF 18. See suggested combined language for CF 18, 19 and 21 policies at the end of this document.

Comment [m27]: Redundant?

Comment [a28]: Yes – redundant.

Comment [j29]: Who collects street light maintenance fees?

CF24: Encourage and assist neighborhoods to form Local Improvement Districts to finance local infrastructure development (e.g. sidewalks).

Comment [j30]: Do we still want this policy? YES

Mitigation and Efficiency

CF25: Maximize on-site mitigation of development impacts to minimize the need for additional capital facility improvements in the community.

Comment [a31]: Strike this policy and include LID as part of CFU20

Comment [tj32]: Agree that this option should be included with other general funding mechanisms. Or this should be included with Transportation section.

CF26: Promote the collocation of capital facilities (if viable) to enhance the efficient use of land, reduce public costs, and minimize disruption to the community.

Comment [a33]: Is the purpose for this to be on-site or funded by private development? Both?

CF27: Through site selection and design, seek opportunities to minimize the impact of capital facilities on the environment, and if possible, include enhancements to the natural environment.

Comment [jef34]: Our existing development reg's strive to mitigate impacts. Suggest deleting

Coordination and Public Involvement

CF28: ~~Ensure~~ Provide opportunities for public participation in the development or improvement of capital facilities.

CF29: Solicit and encourage citizen input in evaluating whether the City should seek to fund large community-wide capital facility improvements through voter-approved bonds.

CF30: ~~Request that~~ Work with non-City service providers to make capital facility improvements where deficiencies in infrastructure and services have been identified. Actively work with providers, to address deficiencies that pose a threat to public safety or health, or deficiencies in meeting identified service levels.

Comment [jef35]: Should be two policies

CF31: ~~Adopt~~ Critically Review updated capital facility plans for prepared by special districts or non-City capital facilities and service providers for consistency with this the Land Use and Capital Facilities Elements and review them for and identify opportunities for: collocation of facilities; service enhancements and coordination with city facilities and services; development of public and environmental enhancements; and reductions to overall public costs for capital improvements. Any improvements to City capital facilities planned as a result of coordination with projects identified in non-City capital facility plans should be incorporated in the City's 6-year and 20-year Capital Facility Plans.

Comment [s36]: Is it appropriate for the city to adopt the capital facility plans of non-city organizations? What happens when they are revised?

Comment [a37]: "for" three times.

CF32: ~~Work with facility providers to identify opportunities for co-location, co-use or consolidation of facilities.~~ REDUNDANT

Service Standards

City-Managed Capital Facilities and Services

CF33: The City of Shoreline ~~adopts~~ the following level of service standards to be the minimum thresholds to adequately serve new development, as well as the minimum thresholds to which the City will strive to provide for existing development:

Comment [j38]: Is it appropriate to adopt standards in the Comp Plan? Where should standards go?

Service/Facility	Adopted Level of Service
Transportation	As established by the Transportation Element and as provided in the Capital Facilities Supporting Analysis section.
Surface Water	Consistent with the requirements of the adopted Surface Water Design Manual and the capital facilities needs listed in Table CF-2 in the Capital Facilities Supporting Analysis section. level of service recommended in the Surface Water Master Plan
Parks and Recreation	As established by the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element and as provided in the Capital Facilities Supporting Analysis section.
Police	0.85 officers per 1,000 residents and a response time of 5 minutes or less to all high priority calls and within 30 minutes to all calls.

Comment [tj39]: Reference adopted Master Plans for Transportation, SW and Parks

Comment [bl40]: This should be consistent with LOS in the SW Master Plan that was approved by Council

Comment [d41]: No standard, based on amenities.

Comment [tj42]: This doesn't seem appropriate/relevant for capital facilities plan? How is # of officers or call time related to facilities?

Comment [j43]: Ask Police Department for standard

Non-City managed Capital Facilities and Services

CFU34: The City of Shoreline ~~shall~~ establishes the following ~~planning goals to provide targets~~ to guide the future delivery of community services and facilities and to provide a measure to evaluate the adequacy of ~~actual~~ services:

Service/Facility	Target Level of Service
Water	Consistent with fire flow rates stated in the Uniform Fire International Fire Code (based upon land use type).
Wastewater	Collection of peak wastewater discharge plus infiltration and inflow resulting in zero overflow events per year due to capacity and maintenance inadequacies (or consistent with current health standards).

Comment [jef44]: Land use should be used for planning purposes only not to determine flows at the project level.

Comment [j45]: Talk with Ronald Wastewater see discussion in analysis JEF

Water and Wastewater

CF35: Investigate ~~Promote~~ water reuse and water conservation opportunities that:

- diminish impacts on water, wastewater, and surface water systems,
- promote the conservation or improvement of natural systems.

CF36: Encourage the use of ecologically sound site design ~~in ways that enhance the provision of utility services through measures such as:~~

- ~~using drought tolerant vegetation in landscaping to reduce water consumption,~~
- ~~using native vegetation in places such as natural or buffer areas to reduce surface water or wetland impacts,~~
- ~~promoting solar orientation on site to reduce energy consumption,~~
- ~~reducing impervious surfaces or excessive run-off to maintain natural drainage systems, and~~
- ~~encouraging tree retention to prevent erosion and provide wildlife habitat, etc.~~

 REGULATORY

Comment [jef46]: Design of what?

Comment [a47]: For what? Construction of facilities? Private Development? In our outreach with the community?

Comment [tj48]: Agree with Jeff

Comment [jef49]: Not regulatory. Suggest keeping it makes sense

Surface Water

CF37: ~~Require surface water conveyance systems in all new development, including transportation facilities.~~ REGULATORY

CF38: ~~The City shall update, as needed, its storm water and flood hazard regulations and programs.~~

CF39: ~~Implement procedures and/or programs that to ensure encourage the proper maintenance of that public and private stormwater collection, retention/detention, and treatment systems are properly maintained.~~

Comment [a50]: Do we really need to say this? It is all mandatory at this point. Do we want surface water management systems that are in compliance with adopted City regulations? Agree already code Jef

Comment [tj51]: Agree with Alicia and Jeff. SW needs to meet adopted standards.

Comment [jef52]: Done.

Comment [d53]: Who is responsible for this?

Drinking Water and Wastewater

CF40: ~~Allow phased-in development of drinking water and wastewater services and capital facilities as indicated by the City's needs and to meet GMA concurrency requirements, in coordination with the various providers.~~ SUPERSEDED

CF41: ~~Support local efforts to minimize inflow and infiltration and reduce excessive discharge of surface water into wastewater systems in order to~~

- ~~reduce impacts on the wastewater system, and~~
- ~~enhance wastewater system capacity.~~

 REDUNDANT

Comment [bl54]: Maintenance of approved facilities is a requirement subject to code enforcement; the city can encourage proper maintenance with programs and inspections

Comment [jef55]: Already in code

Comment [jef56]: Keep not redundant

Suggested CFU18 (combines CFU 18, 19 and 21): Capital Facility and service improvements that are needed to correct existing deficiencies or respond to growth in order to maintain adopted levels of service should have funding priority over those that would enhance service levels above those designated in the Comprehensive Plan. Assign funding priority to projects that provide multiple community benefits and functions over projects that provide a single benefit or function.

This page intentionally blank

Capital Facilities Element Goals & Policies

Introduction

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW 36.70A.070 requires cities to prepare a capital facilities plan element consisting of:

- 1) An inventory of current capital facilities owned by public entities showing the location and capacities of those public facilities and identifying any current deficiencies;
- 2) A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;
- 3) The proposed capacities of expanded or capital facilities;
- 4) At least a six-year plan that will finance capital facilities within the projected funding capacities and clearly identify sources of public money for such purposes; and
- 5) A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities element, and finance plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

Capital facilities investments include major rehabilitation or maintenance projects on capital assets; construction of new buildings, streets, and other facilities; and land for parks and other public purposes.

Under the GMA, a capital facilities element is required to address all public facilities except transportation facilities, which are to be addressed separately under the Transportation Element of the Plan. Accordingly, this Comprehensive Plan contains separate Transportation and Capital Facilities elements. A Park, Recreation, and Open Space Element is also contained in this Plan. However, the discussion of finance for capital facilities, transportation, and park resources has been combined in one location under this Capital Facilities Element.

The City of Shoreline is responsible for providing facilities and services that are needed by the residents and businesses of the City for a safe, secure, and efficient environment. These facilities and services include, but are not limited to City-managed facilities, police and fire protection, parks, streets, water and sanitary sewer service, storm drainage service, and schools.

The City of Shoreline directly provides services for managed facilities, parks, streets, and stormwater management. The City has established interlocal agreements or contracts for those services that it does not provide. In cases where the City contracts for services, the Capital Facilities Element describes those services. The costs of facilities associated with interlocal agreements or contracts are not included in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The only capital facilities that have costs associated with them are those that are City owned or operated, city managed, and transportation facilities. Much of the data regarding water, sewer, and schools, and projected needs are taken from other local service providers. *The following capital facility plans of these providers are recognized by the City of Shoreline as supporting the land use objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.*

- *Ronald Wastewater District #64, Comprehensive Sewer Plan, January 2010*
- *Shoreline Water District #117, 2012 Water System Plan*
- *Seattle Public Utilities 2007 Water System Plan, November 2006*

This Element contains the goals and policies that address the City's infrastructure – both those capital facilities that are owned and largely operated by the City, and those that are provided by other public entities. Other services, such as electricity, natural gas, cable and telephone are part of the Utilities Element. The *Capital Facilities – Supporting Analysis* section of this Plan contains the background data that provides the foundation for these goals and policies. The Supporting Analysis section also includes the list of potential capital projects to implement the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Goals

Goal CF I: Provide adequate public facilities that address past deficiencies and anticipate the needs of growth through acceptable levels of service, prudent use of fiscal resources, and realistic timelines.

Goal CF II: Acquire Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline

- Develop feasibility analysis and financial plan
- Negotiate acquisition
- Develop transition and implementation plan and schedule

Goal CF III: Promote city-wide utility services that are:

- consistent,
- high quality,
- equitable,
- responsive,
- forward looking,
- environmentally sensitive and energy efficient,
- locationally and aesthetically sensitive, and
- functionally and financially efficient.

Goal CF IV: Facilitate the provision of appropriate, reliable utility services.

Capital Facilities Policies

General

CF1: Review capital facility inventory findings and space needed for capital facility projects. These needs will be based on adopted levels of service standards and forecasted growth in accordance with this plan and its established land uses. Update this projection every two years.

CF2: Coordinate with public entities that provide services within Shoreline in the development of consistent service standards.

- CF3:** Maintain and enhance capital facilities that will create a positive economic climate and ensure adequate capacity to move people, goods, and information.
- CF4:** Identify future locations or land reserves for needed capital facilities.
- CF5:** Negotiate appropriate mitigation for both the community and adjacent areas if Shoreline is selected as a site for a regional capital facility, or is otherwise impacted by a regional facility's expansion, development, or operation.

Level of Service

- CF6:** Evaluate designated levels of service to ensure/confirm they are adequate to meet the needs of existing and anticipated development.
- CF7:** Identify structural and safety deficiencies in capital facilities based on adopted levels of service and identify the means and timing for correcting these deficiencies.
- CF8:** Work with all outside service providers to determine their ability to continue to meet service standards over the 20-year time frame of the Comprehensive Plan.

Financing and Funding Priorities

- CF9:** Give highest funding priority to capital facility improvements that protect the public health and safety.
- CF10:** Capital Facility improvements that are needed to correct existing deficiencies or maintain existing levels of service should have funding priority over those that would significantly enhance service levels above those designated in the Comprehensive Plan, or that are intended to substantially improve the community's quality of life.
- CF11:** Improvements that are needed to provide critical City services such as police, surface water, and transportation at designated service levels concurrent with growth shall have funding priority for City funds over improvements that are needed to provide general services or facilities to development at designated service levels.
- CF12:** Consider all available financing mechanisms, (such as rates, bonds, impacts fees, CIP funding, grants, etc.) for funding capital facilities.
- CF13:** Evaluate proposed public capital facility projects to identify net costs and benefits, including impacts on transportation, surface water, parks, and other public services. For those projects where it is possible to increase the community benefit of the project and it is cost effective, assign greater funding priority to those projects that provide a higher net benefit and provide multiple functions to the community over projects that provide single or fewer functions.
- CF14:** Utilize financing options that best facilitate implementation of the CIP in a financially prudent manner.
- CF15:** Encourage and assist neighborhoods to form Local Improvement Districts to finance local infrastructure development (e.g. sidewalks).

Mitigation and Efficiency

- CF16:** Maximize on-site mitigation of development impacts to minimize the need for additional capital facility improvements in the community.

- CF17:** Promote the collocation of capital facilities (if viable) to enhance the efficient use of land, reduce public costs, and minimize disruption to the community.

- CF18:** Through site selection and design, seek opportunities to minimize the impact of capital facilities on the environment, and if possible, include enhancements to the natural environment.

Coordination and Public Involvement

- CF19:** Provide opportunities for public participation in the development or improvement of capital facilities.

- CF20:** Solicit and encourage citizen input in evaluating whether the City should seek to fund large community-wide capital facility improvements through voter-approved bonds.

- CF21:** Work with non-City service providers to make capital facility improvements where deficiencies in infrastructure and services have been identified. Actively work with providers, to address deficiencies that pose a threat to public safety or health, or deficiencies in meeting identified service levels.

- CF22:** Critically review updated capital facility plans prepared by special districts or non-City capital facilities and service providers for consistency with this the Land Use and Capital Facilities Elements and identify opportunities for: collocation of facilities; service enhancements and coordination with city facilities and services; development of public and environmental enhancements; and reductions to overall public costs for capital improvements.

Service Standards

City-Managed Capital Facilities and Services

CF23: The City of Shoreline adopts the following level of service standards to be the minimum thresholds to adequately serve new development, as well as the minimum thresholds to which the City will strive to provide for existing development:

Service/Facility	Adopted Level of Service
Transportation	As established by the Transportation Element and as provided in the Capital Facilities Supporting Analysis section.
Surface Water	Consistent with the level of service recommended in the Surface Water Master Plan
Parks and Recreation	As established by the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element and as provided in the Capital Facilities Supporting Analysis section.
Police	0.85 officers per 1,000 residents and a response time of 5 minutes or less to all high priority calls and within 30 minutes to all calls.

Non-City managed Capital Facilities and Services

CF24: The City of Shoreline establishes the following targets to guide the future delivery of community services and facilities and to provide a measure to evaluate the adequacy of actual services:

Service/Facility	Target Level of Service
Water	Consistent with fire flow rates stated in the International Fire Code.
Wastewater	Collection of peak wastewater discharge plus infiltration and inflow resulting in zero overflow events per year due to capacity and maintenance inadequacies (or consistent with current health standards).

Water and Wastewater

- CF25:** Promote water reuse and water conservation opportunities that:
- diminish impacts on water, wastewater, and surface water systems,
 - promote the conservation or improvement of natural systems.

CF26: Encourage the use of ecologically sound site design

Surface Water

CF27: Implement procedures and/or programs that encourage the proper maintenance of public and private stormwater collection, retention/detention, and treatment systems.

Drinking Water and Wastewater

- CF28:** Support local efforts to minimize inflow and infiltration and reduce excessive discharge of surface water into wastewater systems in order to
- reduce impacts on the wastewater system, and
 - enhance wastewater system capacity.

Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis

Background and Context

Capital facilities in Shoreline that are addressed in this section are placed in two categories: city-managed facilities and non-city managed facilities. City-managed facilities are defined as those that are owned and operated or managed by the City. Non-city managed facilities are defined as those public capital facilities that are not owned and operated by the City, or are facilities and services for which the City has an interlocal or franchise agreement, or services and facilities that are provided to City residents through independent districts. This distinction is relevant because, although the City has contractual relationships with some of these non-city managed service providers, the level of authority it can exert to ensure that a district's capital facility plan and implementation strategies are consistent with the City's vision and the goals and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the adopted development regulations is not as significant as it could be if the service was owned and operated by the City.

This element provides an inventory of both City-managed and non-city-managed public facilities and services. This includes surface water, transportation, park, recreation and cultural resources, police, fire, public schools, water, wastewater, and solid waste. Transportation facilities and park, recreation and open space are addressed in their respective elements of this Comprehensive Plan. Other utility facilities such as electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication services are discussed in the "Utilities Element - Supporting Analysis" section of the Plan.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Capital Facilities Element provide an inventory of public facilities, including their locations and capacities. The GMA also requires a forecast of future needs for capital facilities, and identification of the proposed capacities of new or expanded capital facilities, as well as facility locations if listed in the six-year plan.

For facilities funded by the City, the GMA requires the preparation of a six-year plan for financing new or expanded capital facilities. The six-year plan must consider financing within project funding capacities, clearly identify the sources of public moneys for these improvements, and ensure that these improvements are consistent with the Land Use ~~Plan~~Element. Finally, the GMA requires the City to reassess the Land Use ~~Plan~~Element or revise the adopted level of service if funding falls short of meeting future capital facility needs. The King County Countywide Planning Policies further state that capital facility investment decisions place a high priority on public health and safety.

This Capital Facilities Element will address the requirements of the Growth Management Act as well as help answer important questions such as:

- What kind of services and facilities does the community want and need to serve existing and future residents, and which services and facilities are most important?

Comment [sc1]: GMA requirement:
3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of:
(a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

Comment [jef2]: INCLUDE IN THE BODY

- When should these services and facilities be provided and how should they be funded?
- If needed in the near-term, where should such facilities be located?
- How can the need for new facilities be limited and their impacts on the community be addressed?
- What is the City's role in ensuring and providing services and facilities and how should the City work with other providers to facilitate good service?

Shoreline is served by an extensive system of publicly funded and operated capital facilities: from schools and parks to utility systems and transportation facilities. Many of these facilities, such as water towers and roads, help meet the basic needs of residents. Some, such as fire stations and flood detention ponds, make the community safer. Community resources such as schools and libraries foster learning and educational development, and help make the City a better place. Others, such as parks and museums, enhance the quality of life.

The community benefits from these investments on a daily basis. In order to sustain and improve on the benefits that the community currently enjoys, the City must identify how it and other public service providers can best maintain existing facilities, and create new facilities to serve the needs and desires of local residents.

Over the coming years, many public facilities will need to be replaced, refurbished, or expanded, and new facilities created in order to serve existing and new residents. Some of these facilities are provided directly by the City. In other cases, separate providers deliver services and plan for and fund capital improvements to meet the mission of their district or service area. A few of these facilities serve not only the needs of Shoreline but also the larger region.

All of these projects will be competing for limited public resources. For projects that the City controls, citizens must decide which projects will proceed, how to fund them, and then prioritize them. At the development stage, the community must clarify where these facilities (whether provided by the City or not) will be located and how to address the impacts of new or expanded facilities on adjacent areas and the community.

This Capital Facilities Element identifies how the community will respond to these capital needs over the next twenty years.

Existing Conditions

This chapter identifies the primary capital facilities that exist within the City. These facilities are listed as **City-Managed Facilities**, and **Non-City-Managed Facilities**. The facility, provider, and an inventory including the name, size, and location of each facility are provided, if the information is available. A brief description of services provided at the facility is also presented to explain the use of the structure(s).

In addition, if available, currently identified plans for expansion are provided as a part of the existing conditions information, including the type of facility, the proposed size of the facility,

and the location and timing of expansion. In some cases, this information may be unknown at this time or proprietary.

The City maintains a number of franchise agreements with utility providers allowing for the existence of support facilities (e.g., sewer mains) within the City's right-of-way (streets). Many of the services referred to in this Chapter are impacted by the City through franchise and interlocal agreements.

City-Managed Facilities and Services

This section addresses existing public capital facilities owned or largely operated and managed by the City of Shoreline:

- City-Managed Buildings and Facilities
- Surface Water Facilities
- Transportation Facilities
- Park and Recreation Facilities

City-Managed Buildings and Facilities

Current City-Managed Facilities

The City of Shoreline offices provide a wide variety of services and functions including; parks and recreation, development services (permitting), planning and community development, economic development, budgeting, customer response, surface water planning, and transportation planning. In addition, the City maintains a number of administrative functions including finance and human resources as well as the offices of the City Clerk and City Attorney.

The City of Shoreline "City Hall" and "Annex" currently provides occupy approximately 46,68466,400 square feet of leased office space, 21,000 square foot auditorium, and a 75 car elevated parking structure located at 1754400 Midvale Avenue N and 1110 N 175th Street. The City owns and maintains approximately 28,765 square feet of facilities to support the park system (includes Shoreline Center swimming pool, Richmond Highlands Community Center, numerous park rest rooms, and picnic shelters).

Planned City-Managed Facilities

The City is currently exploring options to construct a new City Hall facility. At the time of this report preparation (December 2003), the implementation of the City Hall project is a City Council goal.

Surface Water Facilities

The Surface Water Master Plan adopted in 2011 provides a detailed discussion of the surface water facilities in Shoreline.

Transportation Facilities

The Transportation Master Plan adopted in 2011 and Transportation Element of this Plan provide a detailed discussion of the transportation facilities in Shoreline.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

There are a number of public parks and recreation facilities within the community. These facilities are discussed in more detail in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element of this Plan and in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.

Non-City-Managed Facilities and Services

There are additional public capital facilities and services available to the City of Shoreline. These include facilities and services that are provided to the City through contracts between the City of Shoreline and private or public utility districts and entities, or between individual residents and utilities or district service providers. These include fire and police, wastewater, water, public schools, and solid waste facilities and services. Facilities and services such as electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications, which are specifically characterized as “utilities” by the Growth Management Act are addressed in the Utilities element.

Comment [jef3]: Need to keep CAP FAC and utilities separate

Police Facilities

Comment [sc4]: Aren't these city managed facilities? YES JEF

Current Police Facilities

There are three police facilities located throughout the City of Shoreline, a main police station and two neighborhood centers:

Police Station <i>Building owned by the City</i> 1206 N 185 th Street	Neighborhood Center Eastside Storefront <i>Space leased by the City</i> 521 NE 165 th Street	Neighborhood Center Westside Storefront <i>Space leased by the City</i> 630 NW Richmond Beach Road
---	---	--

Police services are provided to the City through a ~~five-year-to-year~~ contract with King County that expires 12/31/04. Services are provided to the City of Shoreline under the “City Model” police contract in two major areas:

City Services: staff is assigned to and works within the City. ~~In 2012, there are currently 48-52 FTE's~~ dedicated to the City including the two Storefront Officers noted below.

Support Services: staff is assigned within the King County Sheriff’s Office and is deployed to the City on an as-needed basis (e.g., criminal investigations and special response teams).

The City ~~also contracts for~~ has two Community Policing Specialists (i.e., Storefront Officers), that are assigned to the two Neighborhood Centers (West and East storefront centers). Storefront Officers are assigned to these locations on a full-time basis, working with the local residential and commercial neighborhoods and schools to resolve issues and problems affecting them. Storefront Officers do not answer 911 calls (except when available).

Emergency calls for service to Shoreline are managed through the King County “911” Communications Center.

There are no city-managed jail cells located within the City. The Shoreline Police maintain two holding cells at ~~precinct headquarters~~ their Police station on N 185th to detain suspects until they can be transferred to the King and/or Snohomish County jail facilities.

Planned Police Facilities

The City does not have any current plans to acquire or construct any additional police facilities. Police services ~~will are~~ be reviewed annually at the close of the five-year contract period.

Comment [tj5]: I thought there are preliminary plans? Perhaps they are beyond the time frame of this Comp Plan?

Shoreline District Court

Supportive of Police services is the Shoreline District Court (located at 18050 Meridian Ave N.), which is provided to the City through an interlocal agreement with King County. The District Court provides city-managed court services for the prosecution of criminal offenses committed within the incorporated City limits. The District Court serves several other jurisdictions as well. No known changes are planned for the Shoreline District Court facility or services.

Fire Protection

Current Fire Facilities

The Shoreline Fire Department serves an area slightly larger than the incorporated boundaries of the City of Shoreline. The Shoreline Fire Department estimates that the population served by the Department is 53,000. In addition to the Shoreline Area, the Fire Department provides fire suppression services to ~~the Chevron facility~~ (Point Wells) in Snohomish County on a contractual basis.

The Shoreline Fire Department maintains five stations located at 17525 Aurora Ave N, 719 North 185th St, 1841 NW 195th St, 145 NE 155th St., and 1410 NE 180th Street. The department also maintains five pumpers, three advanced life support units, three basic life support units, and one ladder truck.

Planned Fire Facilities

~~The Shoreline Fire Department recently completed construction of two new neighborhood fire stations and a training/support services/administrative facility. With these project constructed, there are no additional major upgrades projected for the next 15 to 20 years.~~

Public School Facilities

Public school services are provided by Shoreline Public School District #412. Within the District (which includes the cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park) there are 16 public schools, a bus barn and a District Office and Conference Center facility.

Current Public School District Facilities

School District #412 encompasses a sixteen square mile area, bounded by Puget Sound on the west, Lake Washington to the east, the Seattle City limits to the south, and the King/Snohomish County line to the north. The Shoreline School District boundaries include the cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. Residents of Shoreline are served by all District schools except Brookside Elementary School and Lake Forest Park Elementary School.

The School District operates one preschool/daycare center, 9 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, 2 high schools and 2 additional facilities located within the City of Shoreline. These facilities are listed in the table below.

Comment [sc6]: update

Comment [sc7]: update

Table CF-1: Shoreline School District Facilities

Name of Facility	Location
Preschool/Daycare Centers:	
Shoreline Children’s Center	1900 N 170th Street
Elementary Schools:	
Briarcrest Elementary	2715 NE 158th Street
Echo Lake Elementary	19345 Wallingford Avenue N
Highland Terrace Elementary	100 N 160th Street
Meridian Park Elementary	17077 Meridian Avenue N
North City Elementary	816 NE 190th Street
Parkwood Elementary	1815 N 155th Street.
Ridgecrest Elementary	16516 10th Avenue NE
Sunset Elementary(closed)	17800 10th Avenue NW
Syre Elementary	19545 12th Avenue NW
Middle Schools:	
Einstein Middle School	19343 3 rd Avenue NW
Kellogg Middle School	16045 25th Avenue NE
High Schools:	
Shorecrest High School	15343 25th Avenue NE
Shorewood High School	17300 Fremont Avenue N
Other Facilities:	
Aldercrest Learning Center	2545 NE 200th Street
<u>North City Learning Center</u>	
Cedarbrook	2000 NE Perkins Way

In addition to these facilities, the School District maintains a Transportation Center located adjacent to the Ridgecrest Elementary School site and a warehouse with a central kitchen located at Hamlin Park.

Planned School District Facilities

Generally, the School District can take the following steps to expand capacity at individual sites:

- Site a portable at an affected school. The District owns several portables for this purpose; if all are being utilized, the District could purchase or lease more.
- Alter/shift special program assignments to available space to free up space for core programs: e.g. gifted programs, special education, arts, activities, etc.

- Boundary adjustments: the areas from which individual schools draw may be adjusted; in more extreme cases, the district boundary could be modified.
- Expansion of affected schools (if feasible without eliminating playfields or parking).

~~The Shoreline School District does not have any specific plans for substantial changes to the Shoreline Center building.~~

Shoreline Center

The Shoreline Center is located at 18560 1st Avenue NE in the former Shoreline High School campus. The facility is owned by the Shoreline School District. The City maintains and operates portion under an interlocal agreement. It comprises approximately 209,000 square feet of enclosed space located on 35 acres of land.

The Shoreline Center accommodates several organizations and services, including the Shoreline School District offices, the Shoreline Conference Center, the Shoreline – Lake Forest Park Arts Council, the Shoreline PTA Council, the Shoreline Public Schools Foundation, the Shoreline Senior Center, as well as the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce. A football field, gymnasium and soccer fields are also located on the campus.

Comment [tj8]: worth mentioning they are operated and maintained by City Staff under an Interlocal Agreement

~~The Shoreline School District does not have any specific plans for substantial changes to the Shoreline Center building.~~

Water Service

The City of Shoreline is served by two public water utilities and maintains franchise agreements with each entity:

- Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), which serves the portion of the City located generally west of I-5
- Shoreline Water District (SWD), which serves the portion of the City generally east of I-5

Existing Water System

The water system provides water conveyance and fire flow service to hydrants, individual and multi-family residences, commercial customers, and fire suppression systems. This water is supplied by Seattle Public Utilities via the 60+-inch transmission main located along 8th Avenue NE. The Seattle Public Utilities’ primary sources of water are the Cedar and Tolt Rivers.

SPU is a direct provider of water to the geographic area generally west of the I-5 corridor, servicing about 58 percent of the City’s population. The other 42 percent of the city is serviced by the SWD, which purchases water wholesale from SPU.

Seattle Public Utilities (Water)

Existing Seattle Public Utilities Water Services and Facilities

SPU facilities in the City of Shoreline constructed through 1994 include approximately 606,000 feet of 1-inch diameter to 66-inch diameter pipe, 879 fire hydrants from 2 to 8-inches in diameter (785 ~~units~~ hydrants are 6 inches in diameter), and the following four major facilities:

Richmond Highlands Tanks at the Southwest corner of N 195th Street & Fremont Avenue N

Foy Standpipe at the northeast corner of Dayton Avenue N and N 145th Street

Foy Pump Station at the northeast corner of 5th Avenue NE and NE 145th Street

North Pump Station located east of 8th Avenue NE on NE 185th Street

The earliest portion of the water distribution system included 27,882 feet of waterline, which was built in 1933; the water system is now distributed throughout the SPU service area in Shoreline. In 1995, an estimated 2,640 feet of new pipe was built, generally to replace existing water mains. The water system has approximately 17,000 feet of 3-inch and less diameter pipe in addition to 2,907 feet of 4-inch pipe.

Planned Seattle Public Utilities Water Service and Facilities

The Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) has plans for numerous maintenance and replacement projects of existing facilities. SPU is examining system-wide land use, zoning and fire protection needs to determine where improvements should be made to support service levels.

Comment [tj9]: Not exactly accurate. Would this be the place to identify that the City is seeking to acquire the utility?

Shoreline Water District

Existing Shoreline Water District Services and Facilities

The Shoreline Water District's (SWD) administrative offices are located at 15th Avenue NE and NE 177th Street. The maintenance facility is located south of the administrative offices, at 15th Avenue NE and NE 169th Street.

In 1982, 27 cities, water districts and associations signed 30-year contracts to buy some or all of their water from SPU on a wholesale basis, and SWD was one of these districts. The contract signed by SWD in 1982 was effective until January 1, 2012. In November 2001, SWD was one of nine associations that signed a new 60-year water service agreement with SPU and their new contract now extends to January 1, 2062. This contract allows SWD to acquire all of its water from metered connections from SPU's Tolt Transmission Pipeline.

The Shoreline Water District system contains more than 92 miles of water main ranging in size from 2 to 20 inches. Transmission capability for the system is primarily provided by 12-inch diameter pipelines from the supply stations to various points within the service area. The transmission pipelines are located primarily along the major city transportation corridors. Some transmission capability is also provided by looped, 8-inch diameter pipelines in the heavily developed residential areas of the system.

The Shoreline Water District storage capacity is composed of a 3.7 million gallon reservoir, a 2.0 million gallon reservoir, and a smaller 400,000 gallon reservoir. Two booster pump stations are located on 8th Avenue NE, one at NE 160th Street and one at NE 185th Street. A supply station is located at 16th Avenue NE and NE 192nd Street.

Planned Shoreline Water District Services and Facilities

A comprehensive Water System Plan update was completed for by the Shoreline Water District in 2000-2012 with a revision occurring in March 2004. This Plan identifies numerous projects including: equipment replacement and maintenance at Supply Station 4, pressure zone improvements, main replacements, new booster pump station to increase fire flows, and continued monitoring of water quality.

Comment [tj10]: currently being updated. SWD has plans to renovate and upgrade their Administration Building review 2012 water plan update

Wastewater

Ronald Wastewater District is the primary wastewater service provider for the City of Shoreline, and in October 2002 the City executed a franchise agreement with the District to construct, maintain, operate, replace and repair the sanitary sewer within the City. The Highlands Sewer District, serves a small part of the City in the Highlands neighborhood.

Comment [tj11]: Worth identifying agreement ends in 2017(?) at which time the City will take over responsibility for wastewater.

There are three unsewered areas located within the city limits (1) along 23rd Avenue NE between N. 145th and N. 150th Streets – 12 lots, (2) along 23rd Avenue NE near Ballinger Way – 36 lots, and (3) along Corliss Avenue N – 9 lots. These 57 lots in addition to approximately 12 known lots scattered individually throughout the District with on-site sewage disposal systems are the total unsewered lots within the District service area. There are approximately 10 lots on septic systems located along 23rd Avenue NE just south of N. 150th Street. The Ronald Wastewater District is aware of two septic systems located in the Richmond Beach Neighborhood¹. Additionally, approximately four square blocks located between N 186th and N 190th along Corliss Avenue N, just west of the City of Shoreline Senior Center also are on septic systems.

Comment [j12]: You should definitely identify the 2002 Interlocal Operating Agreement here. This is a separate agreement from the Franchise, and absolutely should be mentioned.

Comment [jef13]: This area may have been annexed. Ronald WW must verify

Wastewater treatment services are provided by the City of Edmonds and the King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division (formerly Metro). King County DNR also provides gravity and pumped interceptor service.

Ronald Wastewater District (RWD)

Existing Ronald Wastewater District Services and Facilities

Ronald Wastewater District’s service area includes the entire City of Shoreline with the exception of the Highlands neighborhood. In October 2001, RWD purchased the portion of sewer system owned by Seattle Public Utilities known as the Lake City Sewer District. This area covers most of the I-5 corridor, along with the southeastern portion of the City.

RWD Facilities include a wastewater collector and interceptor system consisting of 14 lift stations and over 190 miles of sewer mains varying in size from 6 to 30 inches in diameter.

The wastewater collected from within the District is treated at two facilities, King County Wastewater Division’s West Point Treatment Plant and the City of Edmonds Treatment Plant, under contract arrangements. The Highlands Sewer District discharges wastewater flow into the Ronald Wastewater District system.

Planned Ronald Wastewater District Services and Facilities

A comprehensive sewer system plan was completed for the Ronald Wastewater District in September 2001. In addition, Ronald Wastewater District completed a comprehensive sewer system plan in 2003 for the Lake City Sewer District Area that was purchased from Seattle Public Utilities. Both plans identify numerous maintenance and improvement projects for existing facilities.

Comment [tj14]: Verify current update

The District maintains a 10-year capital improvement program for its original sewer system and the old Lake City Sewer District system. The Capital improvement program includes an ongoing infiltration and inflow monitoring and reduction program.

¹ The Ronald Wastewater District reports that these septic systems were “grandfathered in” as a contract condition at the time the District took over the ownership of the Richmond Beach King County Sewer and Drainage District #3, in 1986.

Highlands Sewer District (HSD)

Existing Highlands Sewer District Services and Facilities

The Highlands Sewer District maintains a sanitary sewer collection system that conveys wastewater from approximately 100 households in the Highlands Neighborhood to the Ronald Wastewater District.

Planned Highlands Sewer District Services and Facilities

There are no known changes to future provision of service within the Highlands Sewer District.

Treatment Facilities

Existing King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division (KCDNRWD) and the City of Edmonds Services and Facilities

King County maintains a system of interceptor sewers and three (3) pumping stations within the City of Shoreline. King County transfers the majority of the flows from within the City of Shoreline via gravity and pumping to the West Point Treatment Plant. The West Point Treatment Plant currently has the capacity to treat up to 133 million gallons of wastewater per day.

The majority of the wastewater flows in the District’s sewer pipes are generated by the citizens of Shoreline. Flows are also transferred from areas in Lake Forest Park, Highlands Sewer District and from Woodway, Mountlake Terrace, and Olympic View in Snohomish County through the District’s sewer mains into either King County or City of Edmonds interceptors.

A small area within the City of Shoreline (approximately 2,200 households) is served via gravity and pumping into Snohomish County and to the City of Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant currently has capacity to treat approximately 12 million gallons per day.

Planned King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division and City of Edmonds Services and Facilities

In response to increased growth in our region, King County is constructing a new regional wastewater treatment plant, called Brightwater. Construction started in 2006. Treatment plant start-up and operations began in September 2011, with the entire system scheduled to be completed in 2012.

Brightwater will serve portions of King and Snohomish counties and support our mission to protect public health and the environment. The new facilities will include a treatment plant, conveyance (pipes and pumps taking wastewater to and from the plant), and a marine outfall (at Point Wells).

King County has released plans to construct a new regional wastewater treatment plant to be located in north King County with the outfall to be located at Pt. Wells in south Snohomish County. This facility is intended to address expected shortages in system-wide treatment capacity. This added capacity will be needed by approximately 2010. This plant would eventually add capacity to treat up to 36 million gallons a day by the year 2030. It is assumed that the capacity needed to treat future wastewater flows from Shoreline would be accommodated by this proposal.

Comment [sc15]: update with Brightwater information

Solid Waste

Existing Solid Waste Collection Services and Facilities

The City of Shoreline currently has a ~~seven-year~~ solid waste collection contract with ~~Waste Management Northwest Cleanscapes, LLC. That expires in 2015~~ for residential curbside solid waste and recycling collection and commercial solid waste collection. Shoreline maintains an interlocal agreement with King County for use of the First Northwest Transfer Station. In addition to solid waste collection the City also operates a household battery recycling program and a composting facility for recycling city-managed and school district green waste. The City also sponsors two recycling events during the year for residents to recycle household items.

Planned Solid Waste Services and Facilities

The City plans to continue solid waste collection through contract services, and to continue its agreement with King County for the use of the First Northwest Transfer Station which was renovated in 2008, is being expanded and renovated starting in 2005. The City also plans continues to encourage recycling throughout the city by modeling it in all City-owned facilities and through such programs as residential events.

Capital Facility Issues

General Growth Projections

According to growth projections, which provide the foundation for the Land Use element of the Comprehensive Plan, the City of Shoreline could experience an increase of up to approximately 2,650 additional households over the next twenty years. This figure is based on the housing target allocated to the City by King County (see the Land Use Element for additional discussion of the City's housing target).

Comment [jef16]: Is this consistent with the LU element? What are the current projections.

For planning purposes, the projected growth expected over the 20-year period was allocated on an average basis over the 20-year period rather than allocated based on a year-by-year prediction that tries to factor in anticipated economic cycles. Growth will undoubtedly not occur precisely as projected over the next six-year or even the 20-year period. For this reason, the GMA requires that the Capital Facilities Plan be updated at least every two six years. This provides local governments with the opportunity to re-evaluate their forecast in light of the actual growth experienced, revise their forecast if necessary, and adjust the number or timing of capital facilities that are needed

Comment [sc17]: I don't think GMA requires this. It may be referring to the CIP update which is a city decision

This Capital Facilities Plan is expected to be updated annually as part of the City's budget process, thereby ensuring that the Plan reflects the most current actual statistics related to growth in Shoreline, and that City Managed capital facilities are slated for implementation upgrade in accordance with both the level of service standards and the City's concurrency policies.

Comment [sc18]: Is this still policy?

Levels of Service

Level of service is a term that describes the amount, type, or quality of facilities that are needed in order to serve the community at a desired and measurable standard. This standard varies, depending not only by the type of service that is being provided, but also by the quality of service that is desired by the community. A community can decide to lower,

raise, or maintain the existing levels of service for each type of capital facility and service. This decision will affect both the quality of service provided, as well as the amount of new investment or facilities that are, or will be, needed in the future to serve the community. Level of service standards state the quality of service that the community desires and for which service providers should plan. The adoption of level of service standards indicates that a community will ensure that those standards are met or can be met at the time development occurs. If such standards cannot be met, the community may decide to decrease the standard, determine how the improvements needed will be paid for, or deny the development. The Growth Management Act only requires communities to adopt level of service standards for transportation facilities; however, some communities may elect to establish service standards for City-managed capital facilities.

For many of the capital facilities in Shoreline, the City is not the direct provider of service. In ~~many the instances where the City does not provide the service,~~ the City contracts with either districts or other governmental entities to provide services for the City. As noted in the inventory, the only capital facilities that the City has direct financial and managerial authority for are city-managed buildings, transportation facilities (streets), and parks and recreation facilities. Because the City Public Works Department has planning, operational, and managerial responsibility for the City's ~~Surface Water Management System, with maintenance support through King County,~~ this system has been categorized as a city-managed capital facility.

Comment [tj19]: Not using KC for maintenance. Surface Water should be identified as a utility. IT IS BOTH A UTILITY AND CAPITAL FACILITY jef

Capital facilities such as water service, wastewater service, etc., are provided through a public or private utility, district, or through a contract for services with another agency. The City may recommend levels of service or "service goals" for these capital facilities and services, but it does not have ultimate authority to affect these services directly, except in its agreements to pay for services. The City may establish minimum levels of service ~~standards~~ that it wishes to use as a guide to inform service providers of the level of service desired by the community, and then it may coordinate with the service provider to reasonably provide that level of service.

Levels of Service Standards – City-Managed Facilities

The City of Shoreline has identified level of service ~~standards~~ for the city-managed facilities and services listed in Table CF-2. These standards should be met and facilities in place at these minimum thresholds in order to serve new development adequately.

Table CF-2: Level of Service Standards for City-Managed Facilities and Services

Type of Capital Facility or Service	Level of Service Standard
Transportation	As established by the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan: <u>LOS D at the signalized intersections on arterials and unsignalized intersecting arterials within the City as the level of service standard for evaluating planning level concurrency and reviewing traffic impacts of developments, excluding the Highways of Statewide Significance and Regionally Significant State Highways (I-5, Aurora Avenue N and Ballinger Way). Intersections that operate worse than LOS D will not meet the City's</u>

	<p><u>established concurrency threshold. The level of service shall be calculated with the delay method described in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual 2010 or its updated versions.</u></p> <p><u>A supplemental level of service for Principal Arterials and Minor Arterials that limits the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio to 0.90 or lower, provided, the V/C ratio on any leg of a Principal or Minor Arterial intersection may be greater than 0.90 if the intersection operates at Level of Service (LOS) D or better. These Level of Service standards apply throughout the City unless an alternative Level of Service standard is identified in the Facilities and Service subelement of the Transportation Element for intersections or road segments, where an alternate level of service has been adopted in a subarea plan, or for Principal or Minor Arterial segments where:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •<u>Widening the roadway cross-section is not feasible, due to significant topographic constraints; or</u> •<u>Rechannelization and safety improvements result in acceptable levels of increased congestion in light of the improved operational safety of the roadway.</u> <p><u>Arterial segments meeting these two criteria are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •<u>Dayton Avenue N from N 175th Street – N 185th Street: V/C may not exceed 1.10</u> •<u>15th Ave NE from N 150th Street – N 175th Street: V/C may not exceed 1.10</u> <p><u>LOS E at the signalized intersections of the arterials within the City as the level of service standards for evaluating planning level concurrency and reviewing traffic impacts of development, excluding the Highways of Statewide Significance (Aurora Avenue N and Ballinger Way NE). The level of service shall be calculated with the delay method described in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual 2000 or its updated versions.</u></p>
<p>Surface Water</p>	<p>To ensure proper management of surface water runoff, to protect and enhance the natural environment, and to meet regulatory requirements, surface water capital improvement projects will provide the following services:</p> <p>Flood Protection: Prevent or minimize structural damage and flooding of principal, major, minor, and collector arterials, enhance public safety, and reduce property damage.</p> <p>Water Quality: Meet NPDES regulatory requirements to protect water quality, particularly the requirements of the</p>

Comment [jef20]: If this is restated from Transportation element suggest deleting and refer to TMP

	<p>NPDES Phase II municipal stormwater permit.</p> <p>Stream Habitat: Prioritize to protect and preserve existing habitat in accordance with applicable regulations, especially those related to anadromous fish species and enhance habitat where feasible.</p>
<p>Parks and Recreation</p>	<p>Maintain the Citywide geographic service area for Regional Parks</p> <p>Maintain the Citywide geographic service area for Large Urban Parks.</p> <p>Maintain the geographic service areas for Community Parks. However, as future development occurs at Hamlin Park, Shoreview Park, Ballinger Open Space, and Bruggers Bog Park, look for appropriate opportunities to address community park deficiencies including amenities such as sports fields, picnic facilities, playgrounds, nature preserves, recreational trails, and outdoor education areas.</p> <p>Explore opportunities for an additional recreation facility in the eastern portion of Shoreline.</p> <p>Maintain existing geographic service areas for Neighborhood Parks but add additional neighborhood park amenities, as desired by the community, to the following sites: Echo Lake Park, Shoreline Park, Hillwood Park, Richmond Beach Community Park, Boeing Creek Park, Shoreview Park, Richmond Highlands Park, Cromwell Park, Twin Ponds Park, Hamlin Park, and Paramount Park, <u>Kayu Kayu Ac Park, South Woods.</u></p> <p>Partner with appropriate school sites to provide neighborhood park amenities to adjacent communities.</p> <p>Continue exploring opportunities for new neighborhood parks in areas not serviced by a neighborhood park amenity.</p> <p>Natural/Special Use Parks. While a target level of service does not specifically apply to the natural/special use parks category, future opportunities should be taken to acquire sites with water access and walking/biking trail potential, as noted as a high priority through citizen participation.</p>

Comment [tj21]: Check

Comment [tj22]: Check with BLandau. LOS was defined differently in SWMP

Comment [jef23]: These work. The regulations that implement them further clarify

Comment [tj24]: Should include Kruckeberg Botanical Garden

Comment [m25]: Maureen will update this list.

Level of Service Standards – Non-City-Managed Facilities

In addition, the following planning goals are established to provide a *target* to guide the future delivery of important community services and facilities and to provide a measure to evaluate the adequacy of actual service.

Table CF-3: Targets for Delivery of Non-City-Managed Facilities and Services

Type of Capital Facility or Service	Target Level of Service Standard
Wastewater:	Collection of peak wastewater discharge plus infiltration and inflow resulting in zero overflow events per year due to capacity and maintenance inadequacies (or consistent with current health standards).
Water:	Consistent with fire flow rates stated in the adopted Fire Code (based upon land use type <u>for system planning and actual use at the project level</u>).

Comment [tj26]: Need input, but may need to revise level of service to include flow rates that meet the current land use designation.

Adequacy and Concurrency

According to the GMA, public facilities and services shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is first occupied without decreasing the level of service described in the Comprehensive Plan. Adequate public facilities and services, such as water, sewer, and surface water management ~~service~~, are required to serve development. Additionally, the GMA mandates concurrency for transportation services to ensure that transportation improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development or that a financial commitment is made to complete the improvement within six years.

Water and sewer service providers have demonstrated the ability to meet current demand at the service levels established in the Comprehensive Plan. The City uses the ~~King County Surface Water Design Manual~~ most current Department of Ecology stormwater manual to assure that new development meets the established service standards for surface water management and requirements of the current NPDES permit. The City ~~is currently working~~ continues to work with all non-City-managed service providers to determine their ability to continue to meet these service standards over the next 20 years under the Land Use Designation Plan identified in *Figure LU-1*. If the City determines that water and sewer providers or the City (for transportation and surface water management) will not be able to meet these service standards, the City could choose to: 1) modify the Land Use Designation Plan identified in *Figure LU- 1* through an amendment to the Plan, 2) modify the level of service standards through an amendment to the Plan, 3) or restrict development until service can be provided at the established levels of service standards.

Other services are extremely important (like police, fire, and schools) and may be generally available at the time of occupancy; however, upgrades may be needed to provide services to new development at the same level or rate as other parts of the community. In these situations, it may take a few years for these full improvements to come on line.

Finally, there are other services that may be needed but are not critical or extremely important and barriers to the availability of service may take time to overcome. This situation can happen with services such as cable television or natural gas service. In addition, there may be situations (e.g., parks and libraries) where, for several years, the level of service may not be available for new development at the same rate as it is available for the existing community.

The City of Shoreline believes that water, sewer, and surface water management should be included in concurrency requirements even though the Growth Management Act does not specifically list them. The concurrency policies establish minimum standards for service availability for new development.

Capital Facility Concerns

Coordinating Among Competing Projects

The community will face a number of issues over the coming years which will determine if facilities need to be refurbished, expanded or developed and then when, where and how this will occur.

Many capital projects will be competing for development because not all facilities can be funded and built at the same time. Not only will funding need to be prioritized but also construction resources and land will need to be carefully allocated.

The competition between projects can be mitigated in some cases by greater coordination and co-location. For example, co-location of new recreation facilities with existing schools could reduce the need to purchase new park lands and free up resources to complete the project more quickly and economically. Enhanced efficiency can also reduce the need for additional facilities.

Prioritization

The community must balance a wide range of capital facility needs and desires. Many of these facilities are provided by public entities other than the City. For capital facility projects that are developed the City, the City will not have adequate resources to complete all capital improvement projects at the same time, and, therefore, decisions must be made to prioritize projects. In order to prioritize future City projects, the community must clearly identify which projects are most important to meeting the complex needs of the community. The policies on prioritization provide city officials with guidance when evaluating competing capital projects funded by the City.

Coordination and Public Involvement

The construction of new facilities within the community requires the involvement of many parties, including the public, local service providers and other public entities. Coordination and public involvement policies identify ways the City can bring all parties within the community together in the process of making these decisions on capital projects.

Mitigation and Efficiency

New facilities will have an impact on the community. There are a variety of ways in which the community can address and mitigate the impacts of these facilities. In addition, the community can evaluate the impact of new development on the need for new facilities and reduce the need for future improvements by addressing these impacts on site for new development. The policies on mitigation and efficiency provide guidance on how and when mitigation should be used to address capital facilities planning.

Inadequate Infrastructure

There are numerous indications that sewer, water, and storm water facilities will need to be upgraded or replaced in parts of the community. In some cases, these improvements will be necessary because of the advanced age or condition of the pipes/facilities. In other situations, existing systems may be insufficient to meet desired service levels. For example Shoreline Community College campus, and some areas of the North City Business District

cannot achieve the required fire flow to serve larger structures considering locating in these areas. Addressing these deficiencies may require not only installation of new piping but also installation of new hydrants infrastructure including water mains and hydrants, sewer lines, and storm drainage pipe and/or facilities. The City may need to have determined if that attracting these large developments is a priority, as well as to evaluate options for funding such infrastructure upgrades, since the cost of these improvements is is could be prohibitively large for developers to assume.

Comment [tj27]: This is the big policy item that needs to be discussed with this update .

In other areas, inflow and infiltration of the wastewater system results in capacity problems during significant storm events. Based upon numerous flooding incidents, there is a high demand for improved surface water facilities. In addition to improvements needed to correct or improve existing systems, new or expanded infrastructure may be needed to adequately serve areas where redevelopment is anticipated in coming years.

Comment [sc28]: May want to rewrite this based on new LID standards and new stormwater facilities that have been constructed

Except for surface water services, the City is currently dependent upon the service providers to inventory and address these deficiencies. In many of these situations, steps are already being proactively taken by the providers to address infrastructure issues. For example, the Ronald Wastewater District is actively addressing infiltration and inflow into the wastewater system.

Comment [tj29]: May want to revise language and see what is in SWMaster Plan. In many areas the flooding incidents have been improved and the focus seems to be moving towards water quality and replacing failing infrastructure but verify with Brian L.

For utilities that the City does not directly operate, service contracts or interlocal agreements can be used to guarantee the future provision of adequate infrastructure and corresponding service. The City has contracts or interlocal agreements with most providers, although some service continues to be provided based upon historical service obligations (such as Seattle Public Utilities services). Without a service contract, the City has limited ability to address inadequate infrastructure if the provider does not intend to do so. In these situations, the City may have problems ensuring adequate infrastructure and the City may need to look to contract with a different provider or assume direct provision of service in order to ensure adequate infrastructure.

Comment [sc30]: Update?

Comment [sc31]: update

Comment [tj32]: Franchise Agreements is the more appropriate language

Equitable Funding

Most utility services are financed by rates, which the customers pay directly to the providers. In some cases, taxes are used to support services provided by public entities. Seattle Public Utilities provides water service to portions of Shoreline. Utility taxes are collected by the City of Seattle for these services; however, Seattle's utility tax revenues go into Seattle's general fund and do not directly support the operation of the utility. The utility taxes Shoreline residents pay to Seattle Public Utilities do not directly help maintain infrastructure and provide service within Shoreline.

Comment [sc33]: update

In several situations, such as water, sewer and cable service, utility rates paid by customers to different providers for similar service is significantly different. These rate differentials may be the result of different capital improvement programs or administrative systems. Ronald Wastewater District is in the process of narrowing the difference in rates between its customers.

Comment [sc34]: update

Frequent Flooding

Comment [tj35]: ???

Recent storm events have brought attention to multiple areas within the community that experience potentially damaging or dangerous surface water run-off. During 1996, the City of Shoreline Customer Response Team logged 128 calls regarding flooding of creeks or basins and this number rose to 156 during 1997. The City received an additional 33 flooding calls through April 1, 1998. These calls were scattered through all parts of the City

Comment [bl36]: The majority of high priority flooding has been reduced or addressed. The focus in the future is maintenance including repair and replacement of existing infrastructure

and range from minor incidents to major flooding situations. During January 1997, the region experienced a major storm event resulting in severe flooding in many parts of the City. The most notable damage from this event was the wash out of the entire intersection of 6th Avenue NW and NW 175th Street. Public input has strongly indicated a desire for improvements to the surface water infrastructure within the community in order to minimize future damage from localized flooding.

Comment [sc37]: update

There are a number of issues for the community to face in addressing these surface water problems. Some relief may be available through greater on-site mitigation by requiring additional surface water retention capacity. In other cases, construction of new surface water facilities may be needed at significant cost. Methods chosen to address surface water problems will raise other issues such as aesthetics, environmental protection and water quality. For example, the use of swales is considered unaesthetic to some residents, but their use can enhance water quality. In these situations, the community may have to clarify its needs and prioritize its value. The community will also need to address surface water impacts that affect wildlife including local and regional salmon runs. The proposed listing of the Puget Sound Chinook Salmon as threatened species may result in stricter standards for controlling run-off and water quality throughout the community.

Comment [sc38]: update

Comment [tj39]: This all needs to be revised and updated

Environmental Impacts from Utility Improvements

When capital facilities and utilities are renovated, expanded or created they have an impact on the community. Several projects are being considered which could impact Shoreline. These include a potential new regional wastewater treatment plant and expansion of the regional solid waste transfer station. In addition, there have been a number of recent additions of transmission towers within the City which have had aesthetic impacts on neighborhoods. These projects raise questions about how the community addresses and mitigates utility facilities. The City relies upon SEPA to identify and address most impacts, however, the community may consider additional approaches to mitigate the impact of utility facilities and infrastructure. The City Council's adoption of an undergrounding ordinance is an example of the community acting to address these concerns in an expanded manner.

Comment [tj40]: These projects are completed

Comment [sc41]: update

Comment [tj42]: undergrounding ordinance was revised and drastically scaled back. Delete this sentence

Opportunities for Cooperation

The utilization of multiple providers to serve the utility needs of the community raises a number of issues about coordination with the City and among service providers. Trenching activities can often be consolidated through coordination, reducing the cost and impact of these activities. In some cases, cooperative use of utility facilities can benefit the community. The use of the City Light right-of-way for a trail facility (Interurban Trail) is an example of a potential beneficial cooperative arrangement.

Adequacy of Service

The community has expressed a desire to maintain current levels of service. However, in several areas, concern has been expressed about the quality of current services and the means to improve the way that these utilities provide service to the community. These concerns range from the unavailability of natural gas service to the quality of service for cable tv, telephone and cellular phones. A prime concern of community residents is the state of current storm water management. Public input consistently has indicated that residents are not satisfied with surface water management services. In response to these concerns, the City has assumed control of the surface water utility from King County as of April 1, 1998.

Comment [sc43]: update

Comment [tj44]: revise – don't think this is true any more

The City may face difficulties in assuring adequate services and facilities from providers the City does not directly control. This significant issue in the provision of essential services can

be addressed through contracts or interlocal agreements with individual agencies for services or through direct provision of service (such as surface water management). Lack of needed infrastructure from these services may result in permitting delays or moratoriums if services are required for concurrency.

Comment [sc45]: will want to rewrite this

There are a number of ways that the community can promote improved levels of service in the future. The City may evaluate current providers to determine if alternate providers or direct provision may be appropriate measures to achieve service standards desired by local residents. Service contracts, interlocal agreements, assumption of service or other measures may be needed in order to assure that services will be available to serve planned growth and meet concurrency requirements.

Comment [sc46]: May want to rewrite this

Siting and Mitigating Environmental Impacts

Large capital projects, whether for city-managed or non-city managed public facilities, can have a significant impact upon the community and neighborhoods where facilities are sited. Such projects can result in impacts to adjacent areas and the community. The community must identify how to best respond to the siting and impacts of new facilities. The impacts of new facilities can be considered through SEPA, but the community may wish to explore additional ways to identify and mitigate the impacts of existing facilities such as through master planning. In addition, siting criteria can help clarify where certain facilities are inappropriate or beneficial.

These issues will apply to all public facilities including essential public facilities. Under the Growth Management Act, the community cannot restrict the siting of essential public facilities within the City and has limited control over decisions regarding these projects. The community can, however, establish guidelines that will direct how and where these facilities can be established. (See the Land Use Element for discussion of Essential Public Facilities).

Comment [sc47]: Is this still an important concern, or can we drop this (since SEPA review is part of an integrated review process now)

Maintaining and/or Improving Services

Comment [sc48]: update

The community will face challenges in maintaining current services over the coming years. Aging facilities will need to be replaced or refurbished and additional or expanded facilities will be needed to serve new development. Numerous public comments received at the public meetings held in association with the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Update process addressed a range of issues associated with the adequacy of the City's surface water facilities. Many of these issues will be addressed through capital projects identified in the City's Surface Water Master Plan currently being developed.

Comment [tj49]: I assume there will be updated public comments?

In addition, the community must clarify areas where it desires a higher level of service. Community input is clear about the need for better surface water management. Public comments also suggest an interest in expanded parks and recreation facilities; the development of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan associated with the Comprehensive Plan Update may address those concerns by translating that interest desires into clear standards and proposed facilities.

Comment [tj50]: I assume this doesn't include the Transportation component (i.e. sidewalks)

Limited Funding Sources

The cost of desired capital facilities will certainly exceed current revenue sources. The community will be faced with deciding if desired facilities should be financed through alternate funding sources such as user fees, bonds, or impact fees.

Impacts fees are one method that could be used to pay for capital improvements such as parks or roads. For new residential developments, impact fees can create public benefits, but also raise home sale prices and thus property taxes for existing homes. A potential trade-off is reduced demand on the general fund for capital improvements. However, in a built-out community the amount of revenue derived from new and redevelopment will be limited. The community will need to decide if impact fees are an acceptable way to help fund new capital facilities.

Capital Funding

The following Capital Funding section is a general discussion of the range of funding sources that many communities access in funding capital facilities. It is provided here as background for the capital funding section of the plan. Specific funding sources are described in greater detail in the City's adopted 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan.

Potential Funding Sources

A limited range of revenue sources is available to the City of Shoreline for use in addressing capital facilities. There are three types of revenue sources for capital facilities, Multi-use, Single Use, and, less commonly, General Fund, described below.

1. Multi-use: taxes, fees, loans, and grants which may be used for virtually any type of capital facility (but which may become restricted if and when adopted for a specific type of capital facility);
2. Single use: taxes, fees, loans, and grants which may be used only for a particular type of capital facility; and
3. General fund: these monies are typically used for operations, rather than capital improvements.

Multi-Use Revenue Sources

Property Tax

Property tax levies are most often used by local governments for operating and maintenance costs. They are not commonly used for capital improvements.

The 2004 property tax rate in Shoreline is currently \$1.28 per \$1,000 of assessed value (AV). The maximum rate allowed by state law is \$1.60 per \$1,000 AV. The City has the option to set its rate at any level up to the maximum subject to the following provisions.

Under state law, local governments are prohibited from raising the property tax levy more than one percent from the previous year's levy (before adjustments for new construction and annexations). However, the state authorizes temporary or permanent increases above the 101 percent lid, up to a statutory limit under local voter approval. The City of Shoreline has not proposed a temporary lid lift.

General Obligation Bonds & Lease-Purchase (Property Tax Excess Levy)

There are two types of General Obligation (GO) bonds: voter-approved and Councilmanic. Voter-approved bonds increase the property tax rate, with increased revenues dedicated to paying principal and interest on the bonds. Local governments are authorized in "excess

Comment [m51]: Finance is reviewing all categories below for updates.

Comment [tj52]: Does this cover Surface Water Utility fees?

Comment [sc53]: update

levies" to repay voter-approved bonds. Excess levies are increased in the regular property tax levy above statutory limits. Approval requires a 60 percent majority vote in favor and a turn-out of at least 40 percent of the voters from the preceding general election.

Councilmanic bonds are authorized by a jurisdiction's legislative body without the need for voter approval. Principal and interest payments for Councilmanic bonds come from general government revenues, without a corresponding increase in property taxes. Therefore, this method of bond approval does not utilize a dedicated funding source for repaying the bond holders. Lease-purchase arrangements are also authorized by vote of the legislative body and do not require voter approval.

The amount of the local government debt allowable for GO bonds is restricted by law to 7.5 percent of the taxable value of the property within the City limits. This may be divided as follows:

General Purpose Bonds	2.5 percent
Utility Bonds	2.5 percent
Open Space and Park Facilities	2.5 percent

Of the 2.5 percent for General Purpose Bonds, the City may issue up to 1.5 percent in the form of Councilmanic bonds.

As of December 2003, the City had no Councilmanic GO and no voter-approved GO debt. The total unused debt capacity available for the City in 2003 is \$388.4 million.

If bonds were used to fund capital facilities, the impact on the individual taxpayer would vary widely depending upon the amount and term of the bonds.

Comment [tj54]: Update for City Hall . Where does Parks Bond fit?

Real Estate Excise Tax

RCW 82.46 authorizes local governments to collect a real estate excise tax levy of 0.25 percent of the purchase price of real estate within the city limits. The Growth Management Act authorizes collection of another 0.25 percent. Both the first and second 0.25 percents are required to be used for financing capital facilities specified in local governments' capital facilities plans.

The first and second 0.25 percent may be used for the following capital facilities:

1. The planning, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or improvement of streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, bridges, domestic water systems, and storm and sanitary sewer systems; or
2. The planning, construction, repair, rehabilitation, or improvement of parks and recreational facilities.

In addition, the first 0.25 percent may be used for the following:

- a. The acquisition of parks and recreational facilities;
- b. The planning, acquisition, construction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or improvement of law enforcement facilities, protection of facilities, trails,

libraries, administrative and judicial facilities, and river and/or floodway/flood control projects and housing projects subject to certain limitations.

The City of Shoreline has enacted both of the 0.25 percent real estate excise taxes. The King County Assessors Office determines the value of the property and the seller of the property is responsible for the payment of these assessed taxes. The total 2004 budget estimate is \$1.37 million allocated to capital facilities.

Comment [tj55]: Worth include the reduction of REET over the past 5 years

Comment [sc56]: update

Business and Occupation Tax

RCW 35.11 authorizes cities to collect this tax on the gross or net income of businesses, not to exceed a rate of 0.2 percent. Revenue may be used for capital facilities acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operations. Voter approval is not required to initiate the tax. Voter approval is required if the City desires to levy at a rate higher than 0.2 percent. The City has not utilized this revenue source.

Comment [sc57]: update

Local Option Sales Tax (Retail)

Local governments may collect a tax on retail sales of up to 0.85 percent. Counties, with voter approval, may collect an additional 0.15 percent which may be used only for criminal justice purposes (public transportation-benefit authorities may levy up to 0.6 percent). Voter approval is required for all local option sales tax increases.

In 2004, Shoreline budgeted \$5.26 million in retail sales tax to be expended on maintenance and operating costs. Criminal justice tax revenues (one percent) totals \$1.0 million.

Comment [sc58]: update

Gambling Tax

The City currently assesses an 11% gross receipts tax on local card room gambling activity. The City's current policy is to allocate 36% of the revenue collected from this tax to capital projects. This capital allocation is used to finance transportation capital projects.

Comment [j59]: Gambling Tax is 10%

Comment [tj60]: no longer true

Comment [sc61]: update

Utility Tax

RCW 35A.52 authorizes cities to collect a tax on gross receipts of electrical, gas, garbage, telephone, cable service, water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater management providers. Service users pay the tax as part of their utility bill.

State law limits the utility tax to 6 percent of the total receipts for cable services, electricity, gas, steam (not applicable to Shoreline), and telephone, unless a majority of the voters approved a higher rate. There are no restrictions on the tax rates for City-owned sewer, water, solid waste, and stormwater. Revenue can be used for capital facilities acquisition, construction, and maintenance. Effective January 1, 2005, the City began collection of a utility tax on the surface water utility. The City does not collect utility taxes on electricity, sanitary sewer or water, but does collect interlocal operating agreement fees (sometimes referred to as franchise fees).

Interlocal Operating Agreement Fee

Comment [sc62]: update

The City currently collects an interlocal operating agreement fee from Ronald Wastewater District. The amounts for this operating fee have been identified in the Interlocal Operating Agreement between the City and the District through 2017.

Community Development Block Grants

Approximately \$400,000 in community development block grant (CDBG) funding is available annually through participation in the King County CDBG Consortium. The City allocates the CDBG funding on an annual basis. Funds may be used for public facilities, economic development and housing projects which benefit low- and moderate-income households. Funds may not be used for maintenance and operations. The City has used CDBG funds in the past for curb ramp and sidewalk repair.

Comment [sc63]: update

It is not possible to accurately forecast revenues from CDBG grants.

Public Works Trust Fund Grants and Loans (PWTF)

The state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development provides low-interest loans for capital facilities planning, emergency planning, and construction of bridges, roads, domestic water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer. Applicants must have a capital facilities plan in place and must be levying the original 0.25 percent real estate sales tax (see real estate excise tax, above). Construction and emergency planning projects must be for reconstruction of existing capital facilities only. Capital improvement planning projects are limited to planning for streets and utilities.

Comment [sc64]: update

Loans for construction projects require a local match generated only from local revenues or state-shared entitlement (gas tax) revenues. The required local match is 10 percent of a 3 percent loan, 20 percent for a 2 percent loan, and 30 percent for a 1 percent loan.

Emergency planning loans are at a 5 percent interest rate. If state or federal disaster funds are received, they must be applied to the loan for the life of the project (20 years). Future PWTF funding cannot be reliably forecast.

Surface Water Management Funds

Surface Water Management (SWM) Utility provides funding to address problems caused by stormwater runoff. Typical problems include flooding of homes and roads, erosion of hillsides and streambanks, water pollution and damage to fish habitat. Unlike wastewater (sewage), most stormwater flows untreated into pipes, ponds, and ditches that empty into streams, wetlands, and lakes.

The Surface Water Utility fund collects revenue from residential and commercial tax parcels. ~~fee for single family homes is \$102 per year, and is~~ Parcel owners are billed along with property tax statements by King County. The rate for commercial property owners varies depending on parcel acreage and amount of impervious surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots.

Comment [sc65]: update

Surface water management fees are used to:

- replace, upgrade and maintain drainage systems -- stormwater control structures, settling ponds, catch basins, culverts and other facilities -- in neighborhoods that have had a history of serious flooding
- ~~restore enhance streams and wetlands that have been adversely banks and fish habitat damaged~~ impacted by uncontrolled runoff
- protect lakes, streams and wetlands and try to prevent future problems by implementing watershed management plans
- send out field investigators to respond to citizen complaints about drainage or water pollution problems and to provide technical assistance where needed

- encourage community stewardship of water resources through streamside plantings, storm drain stenciling, educational workshops and small grants to citizen groups and businesses
- ~~respond to flood hazards by staffing the Flood Warning Center, providing emergency referrals and coordination and maintaining river control facilities: pumping systems, levees, dikes, and revetments.~~

The Surface Water Management Fund transfers money internally to the General Fund for related administration functions. Related administrative functions can include records management, payroll costs, budgeting, accounts payable, management costs, salaries and benefits, debt service, and State Business and Occupation (B&O) taxes. This is in addition to the cost of repairs and improvements to the Storm/Surface Water systems in the City.

Single Use Revenue Sources

Comment [sc66]: is all this language necessary?

Special-Purpose Districts

RCW 67.38.130 authorizes cultural arts, stadium/convention special purpose districts with independent taxing authority to finance capital facilities. The District requires a majority voter approval for formation, and has a funding limit of \$0.25 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation.

Typically, such a special-purpose district would serve a larger geographical area than the single city. Revenue would be based on the tax base of the area within the special service district. If Shoreline were to propose a cultural arts or stadium/convention special purpose district with the same boundaries as the City, at a maximum allowable levy rate of \$0.25 per \$1,000 AV, estimated revenues would amount to \$9.1 million in a 6-year period, or \$39.7 million over twenty years.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Levy

The state authorizes a \$0.50 per \$1,000 AV property tax levy, which may be enacted by fire and hospital districts, cities and towns, and counties. Shoreline has not enacted an EMS levy because it is serviced by the countywide Medic One. According to state law, if the County's EMS levy applies to the City, then the City cannot enact an EMS levy for the City itself.

Fire Impact Fees

RCW 82.02.050-090 authorizes a charge (impact fee) to be paid by new development for its "fair share" of the cost of fire protection and emergency medical facilities required to serve the development. Impact fees must be used for capital facilities necessitated by growth, and not to correct existing deficiencies in levels of service. Impact fees cannot be used for operating expenses. Shoreline does not currently collect fire impact fees.

A fire impact fee for the City of Shoreline can be generated by multiplying the current level of service by the cost of related capital facilities to determine the cost per capita, then multiplying by the number of persons per dwelling unit to determine the cost per dwelling unit.

The City does not currently charge a fire impact fee because it does not directly operate fire protection capital facilities.

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

RCW 82.36 authorizes this tax, which is administered by the state Department of Licensing and paid by gasoline distributors. Cities and counties receive 10.6961 percent and 22.78 percent, respectively, of motor vehicle fuel tax receipts. Revenues must be spent for "highway purposes" including the construction, maintenance, and operation of City streets, county roads, and highways. In 2004, \$1,093,500 in fuel tax revenue is budgeted in Shoreline, of which \$745,000 is for operating, maintenance, and debt service costs, and \$348,500 is for capital facilities.

Local Option Fuel Tax

RCW 82.80 authorizes this county-wide local option tax equivalent to 10 percent of the state-wide motor vehicle fuel tax and a special fuel tax of 2.3 cents per gallon. Revenues are distributed back to the county and its cities on a weighted per capita basis (1.5 for population in unincorporated areas and 1.0 for population in incorporated areas). Revenues must be spent for "highway purposes." King County has not enacted this local option fuel tax.

Commercial Parking Tax

RCW 82.80 authorizes a tax for commercial parking businesses, but does not set rates. Revenues must be spent for "general transportation purposes" including highway purposes, public transportation, high-capacity transportation, transportation planning and design, and other transportation-related activities. Shoreline does not have a commercial parking tax at this time.

Transportation Benefit District

RCW 35.21.225 authorizes cities to create transportation districts with independent taxing authority for the purposes of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding any city street, county road, or state highway improvement within the district. Special district's tax base is used to finance capital facilities.

The District may generate revenue through property tax excess levies, general obligation bonds (including Councilmanic bonds), local improvement districts, and development fees (see related discussions, above, for background on each of these). Voter approval is required for bonds and excess property tax levies. Council approval is required for Councilmanic bonds, special assessments, and development fees.

Transportation improvements funded with district revenues must be consistent with state, regional, and local transportation plans; necessitated by existing or reasonable foreseeable congestion levels attributable to economic growth; and partially funded by local government or private developer contributions, or a combination of such contributions.

~~To date, no jurisdiction in the state has formed a transportation benefit district.~~

A transportation benefit district would address specific transportation projects reducing congestion caused by economic development. Consequently, the amount of revenue is a function of the cost of the project, rather than a levy rate, assessment amount, or fee schedule. It is, therefore, not possible to reliably forecast revenue from this source.

Comment [tj67]: Revise since we now have TBD

Road Impact Fees

RCW 82.02.050-090 authorizes cities and counties to exact road impact fees from new development for its “fair share” of the system improvement costs of roads necessary to serve the development. Impact fees must be used for capital facilities necessitated by growth and not to correct existing deficiencies in level of service. Impact fees cannot be used for operating expenses. Shoreline currently does not collect traffic impact fees.

Comment [tj68]: Impact Fees are currently under discussion as a result of TMP. Should be adopted later this year?

National Highway Systems Grants

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) awards grants for construction and improvement of National Highway System (NHS) components. In order to be eligible, projects must be a component of the NHS and be on the regional transportation improvement program.

Comment [tj69]: Do all these grants need to be identified? The TMP also identifies funding sources – either reference the TMP or make sure this is consistent

Ultimately, the NHS will include all interstate routes, a large percentage of urban and rural principal arterials, defense strategic highway networks, and strategic highway connectors. In the interim, the NHS will consist of highways classified as principal arterials.

Funds are available on an 86.5 percent federal, 13.5 percent local match based on the highest ranking projects from the regional Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) list.

It is not possible to forecast reliably how much, if any, revenue the City would receive from this source.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) Grants

Puget Sound Regional Council provides grants for road construction, transit, capital projects, bridge projects, transportation planning, and research and development. Projects must be on the regional TIP list, and must be for roads with higher functional classifications and local or rural minor collectors

Funds are available on an 86.5 percent federal/13.5 percent local match based on highest ranking projects from the regional TIP list.

Shoreline has received STP and Transportation Improvement Account grants for some of its transportation projects including Aurora Avenue and the Interurban Trail project.

Federal Aid Bridge Replacement Program Grants

WSDOT provides grants on a state-wide priority basis for the replacement of structural deficient or functionally obsolete bridges. Funding is awarded on 80 percent federal/20 percent local match.

Federal Aid Emergency Relief Grants

WSDOT provides funding for restoration of roads and bridges on the federal aid system which are damaged by natural disasters or catastrophic failures. Funds are available on an 83.13 percent federal/16.87 percent local matching basis. Because emergencies cannot be predicted, it is not possible to forecast revenues from this source.

Urban Arterial Trust Account Grants (UATA)

The Washington State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) provides funding for projects to alleviate and prevent traffic congestion. In order to be eligible, roads should be structurally deficient, congested by traffic, and have geometric deficiencies, or a high

incidence of accidents. Funds are awarded on an 80 percent federal/20 percent local matching basis.

Centennial Clean Water Fund (CCWF)

The Department of Ecology (DOE) issues grants and loans for the design, acquisition, construction, and improvement of water pollution control facilities and related activities to meet state and federal requirements to protect water quality.

State Revolving Fund Loans

DOE administers low-interest loans and low-interest guarantees for water pollution control projects. Applicants must demonstrate water quality need, have a facility plan for water quality treatment, show ability to repay a loan through a dedicated source of funding, and conform to other state and federal requirements. Shoreline does not have any programs that would qualify for these funds at this time.

Solid Waste - Department of Ecology Grants

The state awards grants to local governments for a variety of programs related to solid waste, including a remedial action grant to assist with local hazardous waste sites, moderate risk/hazardous waste implementation grants, and waste composting grants. It is not possible to forecast revenue from this source.

Storm Drainage Payment In Lieu of Assessment

In accordance with state law, the City could authorize storm drainage charges in lieu of assessments. The City does not currently collect a storm drainage facility charge per acre upon issuance of a building permit. Revenues from this charge are, or could be, deposited in the City's Storm Drainage Cumulative Reserve Fund. Revenues from this fund could be used for construction, maintenance and/or repair of storm drainage facilities, acquisition of property or related debt service.

Water Districts

Two water utility districts serve Shoreline's planning area. Water districts have independent taxing authority, with a property tax levy limit of 50 cents per thousand of AV. Tax revenue is restricted to uses related to the purpose for which the water district was created.

Grants and Loans

Grants and loans are additional sources of revenue that may be used for capital projects. The state Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) provides low-interest loans, and occasionally grants to finance sewer, water, access roads, bridges, and other facilities for specific private sector development. Funding is available only for projects which support specific private developments or expansion which promotes the trading of goods and services outside the state. The average requirement is to create one job per \$3,000 of CERB financing.

The Federal Economic Development Administration (EDA) provides grants for improvements that benefit economic development and reduce unemployment.

Twenty-Year Capital Facilities Plan

As a 20-year plan, the Capital Facilities Program seeks to provide sufficient information regarding project costs and funding to ensure that the level of capital facilities planned are based on known available or reasonably anticipated revenue sources. Cost estimating and revenue forecasting for the 20-year plan is approximate and it should be expected that both cost estimates and revenue calculations will vary as more detailed analysis is prepared for the 6-year CIP and the annual budget.

The 20-year Capital Facilities Program is made up of those recommended projects in the following tables. These 20-year lists of recommended projects make up a broad “basket” of projects and only a limited level of detail is provided at this stage. Those top priority projects in the 20-year program are, generally, the most suited to “graduating” to the 6-year CIP as it is updated annually. Further plan and project refinement is made when projects are added to the annual budget.

Additionally, there may be other projects that are not included in the 20-year Capital Facilities Program for which funding has not been identified at this time. These projects are included in the following tables and listed as unfunded. The level of project detail, funding specificity, and certainty increases as projects move through a narrowing funnel from unfunded, to 20-year, to 6-year, to the annual budget.

While this 20-year program will help guide the development of the 6-year CIP and the annual budget, it is recognized that *additional projects may be added and priorities may change*. A project’s priority may increase, for example, if outside funding is identified. Or, additional projects may be identified, such as through the City’s traffic safety monitoring program. New safety information could potentially elevate the need for a specific project. The 20-year Capital Facilities Plan, shown below, may be updated with new or revised project lists. Additional projects that are listed as unfunded may be funded in years beyond the 20-year range or by funding that has not been estimated at this time, such as future unidentified grants, voter approved bonds, or developer mitigation.

The 20-year Capital Facilities Program serves as the basis for developing the 6-year CIP. Changes to the 20-year Capital Facilities Program occur through the Comprehensive Plan annual update process through City-initiated amendments or by private applications.

In addition to current cost information, the 6-year CIP cost is shown in the 20-year Capital Facilities Program for reference. Note that project costs in the CIP are derived by estimating inflation and project schedules. Because estimating project schedules and inflation over a 20-year period is unreliable, the 20-year Capital Facilities Program uses constant dollars for all projects (2004\$). Therefore, while the 20-year Capital Facilities Program is designed to be consistent with the adopted CIP, its figures are listed in constant dollars (2004\$) rather than escalated by inflation.

Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis

Background and Context

Capital facilities in Shoreline that are addressed in this section are placed in two categories: city-managed facilities and non-city managed facilities. City-managed facilities are defined as those that are owned and operated or managed by the City. Non-city managed facilities are defined as those public capital facilities that are not owned and operated by the City, or are facilities and services for which the City has an interlocal or franchise agreement, or services and facilities that are provided to City residents through independent districts. This distinction is relevant because, although the City has contractual relationships with some of these non-city managed service providers, the level of authority it can exert to ensure that a district's capital facility plan and implementation strategies are consistent with the City's vision and the goals and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the adopted development regulations is not as significant as it could be if the service was owned and operated by the City.

This element provides an inventory of both City-managed and non-city-managed public facilities and services. This includes surface water, transportation, park, recreation and cultural resources, police, fire, public schools, water, wastewater, and solid waste. Transportation facilities and park, recreation and open space are addressed in their respective elements of this Comprehensive Plan. Other utility facilities such as electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication services are discussed in the "Utilities Element - Supporting Analysis" section of the Plan.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Capital Facilities Element provide an inventory of public facilities, including their locations and capacities. The GMA also requires a forecast of future needs for capital facilities, and identification of the proposed capacities of new or expanded capital facilities, as well as facility locations if listed in the six-year plan.

For facilities funded by the City, the GMA requires the preparation of a six-year plan for financing new or expanded capital facilities. The six-year plan must consider financing within project funding capacities, clearly identify the sources of public moneys for these improvements, and ensure that these improvements are consistent with the Land Use Element. Finally, the GMA requires the City to reassess the Land Use Element or revise the adopted level of service if funding falls short of meeting future capital facility needs. The King County Countywide Planning Policies further state that capital facility investment decisions place a high priority on public health and safety.

This Capital Facilities Element will address the requirements of the Growth Management Act as well as help answer important questions such as:

- What kind of services and facilities does the community want and need to serve existing and future residents, and which services and facilities are most important?

- When should these services and facilities be provided and how should they be funded?
- If needed in the near-term, where should such facilities be located?
- How can the need for new facilities be limited and their impacts on the community be addressed?
- What is the City's role in ensuring and providing services and facilities and how should the City work with other providers to facilitate good service?

Shoreline is served by an extensive system of publicly funded and operated capital facilities: from schools and parks to utility systems and transportation facilities. Many of these facilities, such as water towers and roads, help meet the basic needs of residents. Some, such as fire stations and flood detention ponds, make the community safer. Community resources such as schools and libraries foster learning and educational development, and help make the City a better place. Others, such as parks and museums, enhance the quality of life.

The community benefits from these investments on a daily basis. In order to sustain and improve on the benefits that the community currently enjoys, the City must identify how it and other public service providers can best maintain existing facilities, and create new facilities to serve the needs and desires of local residents.

Over the coming years, many public facilities will need to be replaced, refurbished, or expanded, and new facilities created in order to serve existing and new residents. Some of these facilities are provided directly by the City. In other cases, separate providers deliver services and plan for and fund capital improvements to meet the mission of their district or service area. A few of these facilities serve not only the needs of Shoreline but also the larger region.

All of these projects will be competing for limited public resources. For projects that the City controls, citizens must decide which projects will proceed, how to fund them, and then prioritize them. At the development stage, the community must clarify where these facilities (whether provided by the City or not) will be located and how to address the impacts of new or expanded facilities on adjacent areas and the community.

This Capital Facilities Element identifies how the community will respond to these capital needs over the next twenty years.

Existing Conditions

This chapter identifies the primary capital facilities that exist within the City. These facilities are listed as **City-Managed Facilities**, and **Non-City-Managed Facilities**. The facility, provider, and an inventory including the name, size, and location of each facility are provided, if the information is available. A brief description of services provided at the facility is also presented to explain the use of the structure(s).

In addition, if available, currently identified plans for expansion are provided as a part of the existing conditions information, including the type of facility, the proposed size of the facility,

and the location and timing of expansion. In some cases, this information may be unknown at this time or proprietary.

The City maintains a number of franchise agreements with utility providers allowing for the existence of support facilities (e.g., sewer mains) within the City's right-of-way (streets). Many of the services referred to in this Chapter are impacted by the City through franchise and interlocal agreements.

City-Managed Facilities and Services

This section addresses existing public capital facilities owned or largely operated and managed by the City of Shoreline:

- City-Managed Buildings and Facilities
- Surface Water Facilities
- Transportation Facilities
- Park and Recreation Facilities

City-Managed Buildings and Facilities

Current City-Managed Facilities

The City of Shoreline offices provide a wide variety of services and functions including; parks and recreation, development services (permitting), planning and community development, economic development, budgeting, customer response, surface water planning, and transportation planning. In addition, the City maintains a number of administrative functions including finance and human resources as well as the offices of the City Clerk and City Attorney.

The City of Shoreline City Hall provides approximately 66,400 square feet of office space, 21,000 square foot auditorium, and a 75 car elevated parking structure located at 17500 Midvale Avenue N and 1110 N 175th Street. The City owns and maintains approximately 28,765 square feet of facilities to support the park system (includes Shoreline Center swimming pool, Richmond Highlands Community Center, numerous park rest rooms, and picnic shelters).

Surface Water Facilities

The Surface Water Master Plan adopted in 2011 provides a detailed discussion of the surface water facilities in Shoreline.

Transportation Facilities

The Transportation Master Plan adopted in 2011 and Transportation Element of this Plan provide a detailed discussion of the transportation facilities in Shoreline.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

There are a number of public parks and recreation facilities within the community. These facilities are discussed in more detail in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element of this Plan and in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.

Non-City-Managed Facilities and Services

There are additional public capital facilities and services available to the City of Shoreline. These include facilities and services that are provided to the City through contracts between the City of Shoreline and private or public utility districts and entities, or between individual residents and utilities or district service providers. These include fire and police, wastewater, water, public schools, and solid waste facilities and services. Facilities and services such as electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications, which are specifically characterized as “utilities” by the Growth Management Act are addressed in the Utilities element.

Police Facilities

Current Police Facilities

There are three police facilities located throughout the City of Shoreline, a main police station and two neighborhood centers:

Police Station <i>Building owned by the City</i> 1206 N 185 th Street	Neighborhood Center Eastside Storefront <i>Space leased by the City</i> 521 NE 165 th Street	Neighborhood Center Westside Storefront <i>Space leased by the City</i> 630 NW Richmond Beach Road
---	---	--

Police services are provided to the City through a -year-to-year contract with King County. Services are provided to the City of Shoreline under the “City Model” police contract in two major areas:

City Services: staff is assigned to and works within the City. In 2012, there are 52 FTE’s dedicated to the City including the two Storefront Officers noted below..

Support Services: staff is assigned within the King County Sheriff’s Office and is deployed to the City on an as-needed basis (e.g., criminal investigations and special response teams).

The City has two Community Policing Specialists (i.e., Storefront Officers), that are assigned to the two Neighborhood Centers (West and East storefront centers). Storefront Officers are assigned to these locations on a full-time basis, working with the local residential and commercial neighborhoods and schools to resolve issues and problems affecting them. Storefront Officers do not answer 911 calls (except when available).

Emergency calls for service to Shoreline are managed through the King County “911” Communications Center.

There are no city-managed jail cells located within the City. The Shoreline Police maintain two holding cells at their Police station on N 185th to detain suspects until they can be transferred to the King or Snohomish County jail facilities.

Planned Police Facilities

The City does not have any current plans to acquire or construct any additional police facilities. Police services are reviewed annually.

Shoreline District Court

Supportive of Police services is the Shoreline District Court (located at 18050 Meridian Ave N.), which is provided to the City through an interlocal agreement with King County. The District Court provides city-managed court services for the prosecution of criminal offenses committed within the incorporated City limits. The District Court serves several other jurisdictions as well. No known changes are planned for the Shoreline District Court facility or services.

Fire Protection

Current Fire Facilities

The Shoreline Fire Department serves an area slightly larger than the incorporated boundaries of the City of Shoreline. The Shoreline Fire Department estimates that the population served by the Department is 53,000. In addition to the Shoreline Area, the Fire Department provides fire suppression services to (Point Wells) in Snohomish County on a contractual basis.

The Shoreline Fire Department maintains five stations located at 17525 Aurora Ave N, 719 North 185th St, 1841 NW 195th St, 145 NE 155th St., and 1410 NE 180th Street. The department also maintains five pumpers, three advanced life support units, three basic life support units, and one ladder truck.

Public School Facilities

Public school services are provided by Shoreline Public School District #412. Within the District (which includes the cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park) there are 16 public schools, a bus barn and a District Office and Conference Center facility.

Current Public School District Facilities

School District #412 encompasses a sixteen square mile area, bounded by Puget Sound on the west, Lake Washington to the east, the Seattle City limits to the south, and the King/Snohomish County line to the north. The Shoreline School District boundaries include the cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. Residents of Shoreline are served by all District schools except Brookside Elementary School and Lake Forest Park Elementary School.

The School District operates one preschool/daycare center, 9 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, 2 high schools and 2 additional facilities located within the City of Shoreline. These facilities are listed in the table below.

Table CF-1: Shoreline School District Facilities

Name of Facility	Location
Preschool/Daycare Centers:	
Shoreline Children’s Center	1900 N 170th Street
Elementary Schools:	
Briarcrest Elementary	2715 NE 158th Street
Echo Lake Elementary	19345 Wallingford Avenue N
Highland Terrace Elementary	100 N 160th Street
Meridian Park Elementary	17077 Meridian Avenue N
North City Elementary	816 NE 190th Street
Parkwood Elementary	1815 N 155th Street.
Ridgecrest Elementary	16516 10th Avenue NE
Sunset Elementary(closed)	17800 10th Avenue NW
Syre Elementary	19545 12th Avenue NW
Middle Schools:	
Einstein Middle School	19343 3 rd Avenue NW
Kellogg Middle School	16045 25th Avenue NE
High Schools:	
Shorecrest High School	15343 25th Avenue NE
Shorewood High School	17300 Fremont Avenue N
Other Facilities:	
Aldercrest Learning Center	2545 NE 200th Street
North City Learning Center	
Cedarbrook	2000 NE Perkins Way

In addition to these facilities, the School District maintains a Transportation Center located adjacent to the Ridgecrest Elementary School site and a warehouse with a central kitchen located at Hamlin Park.

Planned School District Facilities

Generally, the School District can take the following steps to expand capacity at individual sites:

- Site a portable at an affected school. The District owns several portables for this purpose; if all are being utilized, the District could purchase or lease more.
- Alter/shift special program assignments to available space to free up space for core programs: e.g. gifted programs, special education, arts, activities, etc.
- Boundary adjustments: the areas from which individual schools draw may be adjusted; in more extreme cases, the district boundary could be modified.
- Expansion of affected schools (if feasible without eliminating playfields or parking).

Shoreline Center

The Shoreline Center is located at 18560 1st Avenue NE in the former Shoreline High School campus. The facility is owned by the Shoreline School District. The City maintains and operates portion under an interlocal agreement. It comprises approximately 209,000 square feet of enclosed space located on 35 acres of land.

The Shoreline Center accommodates several organizations and services, including the Shoreline School District offices, the Shoreline Conference Center, the Shoreline – Lake Forest Park Arts Council, the Shoreline PTA Council, the Shoreline Public Schools Foundation, the Shoreline Senior Center, as well as the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce. A football field, gymnasium and soccer fields are also located on the campus.

The Shoreline School District does not have any specific plans for substantial changes to the Shoreline Center building.

Water Service

The City of Shoreline is served by two public water utilities and maintains franchise agreements with each entity:

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), which serves the portion of the City located generally west of I-5

Shoreline Water District (SWD), which serves the portion of the City generally east of I-5

Existing Water System

The water system provides water conveyance and fire flow service to hydrants, individual and multi-family residences, commercial customers, and fire suppression systems. This water is supplied by Seattle Public Utilities via the 60+-inch transmission main located along 8th Avenue NE. The Seattle Public Utilities’ primary sources of water are the Cedar and Tolt Rivers.

SPU is a direct provider of water to the geographic area generally west of the I-5 corridor, servicing about 58 percent of the City’s population. The other 42 percent of the city is serviced by the SWD, which purchases water wholesale from SPU.

Seattle Public Utilities (Water)

Existing Seattle Public Utilities Water Services and Facilities

SPU facilities in the City of Shoreline constructed through 1994 include approximately 606,000 feet of 1-inch diameter to 66-inch diameter pipe, 879 fire hydrants from 2 to 8-inches in diameter (785 hydrants are 6 inches in diameter), and the following four major facilities:

Richmond Highlands Tanks at the Southwest corner of N 195th Street & Fremont Avenue N

Foy Standpipe at the northeast corner of Dayton Avenue N and N 145th Street

Foy Pump Station at the northeast corner of 5th Avenue NE and NE 145th Street

North Pump Station located east of 8th Avenue NE on NE 185th Street

The earliest portion of the water distribution system included 27,882 feet of waterline, which was built in 1933; the water system is now distributed throughout the SPU service area in Shoreline. In 1995, an estimated 2,640 feet of new pipe was built, generally to replace

existing water mains. The water system has approximately 17,000 feet of 3-inch and less diameter pipe in addition to 2,907 feet of 4-inch pipe.

Planned Seattle Public Utilities Water Service and Facilities

The Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) has plans for numerous maintenance and replacement projects of existing facilities. SPU is examining system-wide land use, zoning and fire protection needs to determine where improvements should be made to support service levels.

Shoreline Water District

Existing Shoreline Water District Services and Facilities

The Shoreline Water District's (SWD) administrative offices are located at 15th Avenue NE and NE 177th Street. The maintenance facility is located south of the administrative offices, at 15th Avenue NE and NE 169th Street.

In 1982, 27 cities, water districts and associations signed 30-year contracts to buy some or all of their water from SPU on a wholesale basis, and SWD was one of these districts. The contract signed by SWD in 1982 was effective until January 1, 2012. In November 2001, SWD was one of nine associations that signed a new 60-year water service agreement with SPU and their new contract now extends to January 1, 2062. This contract allows SWD to acquire all of its water from metered connections from SPU's Tolt Transmission Pipeline.

The Shoreline Water District system contains more than 92 miles of water main ranging in size from 2 to 20 inches. Transmission capability for the system is primarily provided by 12-inch diameter pipelines from the supply stations to various points within the service area. The transmission pipelines are located primarily along the major city transportation corridors. Some transmission capability is also provided by looped, 8-inch diameter pipelines in the heavily developed residential areas of the system.

The Shoreline Water District storage capacity is composed of a 3.7 million gallon reservoir, a 2.0 million gallon reservoir, and a smaller 400,000 gallon reservoir. Two booster pump stations are located on 8th Avenue NE, one at NE 160th Street and one at NE 185th Street. A supply station is located at 16th Avenue NE and NE 192nd Street.

Planned Shoreline Water District Services and Facilities

A comprehensive Water System Plan update was completed by the Shoreline Water District in 2012. This Plan identifies numerous projects including: equipment replacement and maintenance, pressure zone improvements, main replacements, new booster pump station to increase fire flows, and continued monitoring of water quality.

Wastewater

Ronald Wastewater District is the primary wastewater service provider for the City of Shoreline, and in October 2002 the City executed a franchise agreement with the District to construct, maintain, operate, replace and repair the sanitary sewer within the City. The Highlands Sewer District, serves a small part of the City in the Highlands neighborhood.

There are three unsewered areas located within the city limits (1) along 23rd Avenue NE between N. 145th and N. 150th Streets – 12 lots, (2) along 23rd Avenue NE near Ballinger Way – 36 lots, and (3) along Corliss Avenue N – 9 lots. These 57 lots in addition to approximately 12 known lots scattered individually throughout the District with on-site

sewage disposal systems are the total unsewered lots within the District service area. There are approximately 10 lots on septic systems located along 23rd Avenue NE just south of N. 150th Street. The Ronald Wastewater District is aware of two septic systems located in the Richmond Beach Neighborhood¹. Additionally, approximately four square blocks located between N 186th and N 190th along Corliss Avenue N, just west of the City of Shoreline Senior Center also are on septic systems.

Wastewater treatment services are provided by the City of Edmonds and the King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division (formerly Metro). King County DNR also provides gravity and pumped interceptor service.

Ronald Wastewater District (RWD)

Existing Ronald Wastewater District Services and Facilities

Ronald Wastewater District's service area includes the entire City of Shoreline with the exception of the Highlands neighborhood. In October 2001, RWD purchased the portion of sewer system owned by Seattle Public Utilities known as the Lake City Sewer District. This area covers most of the I-5 corridor, along with the southeastern portion of the City.

RWD Facilities include a wastewater collector and interceptor system consisting of 14 lift stations and over 190 miles of sewer mains varying in size from 6 to 30 inches in diameter.

The wastewater collected from within the District is treated at two facilities, King County Wastewater Division's West Point Treatment Plant and the City of Edmonds Treatment Plant, under contract arrangements. The Highlands Sewer District discharges wastewater flow into the Ronald Wastewater District system.

Planned Ronald Wastewater District Services and Facilities

A comprehensive sewer system plan was completed for the Ronald Wastewater District in September 2001. In addition, Ronald Wastewater District completed a comprehensive sewer system plan in 2003 for the Lake City Sewer District Area that was purchased from Seattle Public Utilities. Both plans identify numerous maintenance and improvement projects for existing facilities.

The District maintains a 10-year capital improvement program for its original sewer system and the old Lake City Sewer District system. The Capital improvement program includes an ongoing infiltration and inflow monitoring and reduction program.

Highlands Sewer District (HSD)

Existing Highlands Sewer District Services and Facilities

The Highlands Sewer District maintains a sanitary sewer collection system that conveys wastewater from approximately 100 households in the Highlands Neighborhood to the Ronald Wastewater District.

Planned Highlands Sewer District Services and Facilities

There are no known changes to future provision of service within the Highlands Sewer District.

¹ The Ronald Wastewater District reports that these septic systems were "grandfathered in" as a contract condition at the time the District took over the ownership of the Richmond Beach King County Sewer and Drainage District #3, in 1986.

Treatment Facilities

Existing King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division (KCDNRWD) and the City of Edmonds Services and Facilities

King County maintains a system of interceptor sewers and three (3) pumping stations within the City of Shoreline. King County transfers the majority of the flows from within the City of Shoreline via gravity and pumping to the West Point Treatment Plant. The West Point Treatment Plant currently has the capacity to treat up to 133 million gallons of wastewater per day.

The majority of the wastewater flows in the District's sewer pipes are generated by the citizens of Shoreline. Flows are also transferred from areas in Lake Forest Park, Highlands Sewer District and from Woodway, Mountlake Terrace, and Olympic View in Snohomish County through the District's sewer mains into either King County or City of Edmonds interceptors.

A small area within the City of Shoreline (approximately 2,200 households) is served via gravity and pumping into Snohomish County and to the City of Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Edmonds Wastewater Treatment Plant currently has capacity to treat approximately 12 million gallons per day.

Planned King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division and City of Edmonds Services and Facilities

In response to increased growth in our region, King County is constructing a new regional wastewater treatment plant, called Brightwater. Construction started in 2006. Treatment plant start-up and operations began in September 2011, with the entire system scheduled to be completed in 2012.

Brightwater will serve portions of King and Snohomish counties and support our mission to protect public health and the environment. The new facilities will include a treatment plant, conveyance (pipes and pumps taking wastewater to and from the plant), and a marine outfall (at Point Wells).

The capacity needed to treat future wastewater flows from Shoreline will be accommodated by this proposal.

Solid Waste

Existing Solid Waste Collection Services and Facilities

The City of Shoreline currently has a solid waste collection contract with Cleanscapes, LLC. that expires in 2015 for residential curbside solid waste and recycling collection and commercial solid waste collection. Shoreline maintains an interlocal agreement with King County for use of the First Northwest Transfer Station. In addition to solid waste collection the City also operates a household battery recycling program and a composting facility for recycling city-managed and school district green waste. The City also sponsors two recycling events during the year for residents to recycle household items.

Planned Solid Waste Services and Facilities

The City plans to continue solid waste collection through contract services, and to continue its agreement with King County for the use of the First Northwest Transfer Station which was

renovated in 2008. The City continues to encourage recycling throughout the city by modeling it in all City-owned facilities and through such programs as residential events.

Capital Facility Issues

General Growth Projections

According to growth projections, which provide the foundation for the Land Use element of the Comprehensive Plan, the City of Shoreline could experience an increase of up to approximately 2,650 additional households over the next twenty years. This figure is based on the housing target allocated to the City by King County (see the Land Use Element for additional discussion of the City's housing target).

For planning purposes, the projected growth expected over the 20-year period was allocated on an average basis over the 20-year period rather than allocated based on a year-by-year prediction that tries to factor in anticipated economic cycles. Growth will undoubtedly not occur precisely as projected over the next six-year or even the 20-year period. For this reason, the GMA requires that the Capital Facilities Plan be updated at least six years. This provides local governments with the opportunity to re-evaluate their forecast in light of the actual growth experienced, revise their forecast if necessary, and adjust the number or timing of capital facilities that are needed.

This Capital Facilities Plan is expected to be updated annually as part of the City's budget process, thereby ensuring that the Plan reflects the most current actual statistics related to growth in Shoreline, and that City Managed capital facilities are slated for upgrade in accordance with both the level of service standards and the City's concurrency policies.

Levels of Service

Level of service is a term that describes the amount, type, or quality of facilities that are needed in order to serve the community at a desired and measurable standard. This standard varies, depending not only by the type of service that is being provided, but also by the quality of service that is desired by the community. A community can decide to lower, raise, or maintain the existing levels of service for each type of capital facility and service. This decision will affect both the quality of service provided, as well as the amount of new investment or facilities that are, or will be, needed in the future to serve the community. Level of service standards state the quality of service that the community desires and for which service providers should plan. The adoption of level of service standards indicates that a community will ensure that those standards are met or can be met at the time development occurs. If such standards cannot be met, the community may decide to decrease the standard, determine how the improvements needed will be paid for, or deny the development. The Growth Management Act only requires communities to adopt level of service standards for transportation facilities; however, some communities may elect to establish service standards for City-managed capital facilities.

For many of the capital facilities in Shoreline, the City is not the direct provider of service. In the instances where the City does not provide the service, the City contracts with either districts or other governmental entities to provide services for the City. As noted in the inventory, the only capital facilities that the City has direct financial and managerial authority

for are city-managed buildings, transportation facilities (streets), and parks and recreation facilities. Because the City Public Works Department has planning, operational, and managerial responsibility for the City’s surface water management system this system has been categorized as a city-managed capital facility.

Capital facilities such as water service, wastewater service, etc., are provided through a public or private utility, district, or through a contract for services with another agency. The City may recommend levels of service or “service goals” for these capital facilities and services, but it does not have ultimate authority to affect these services directly, except in its agreements to pay for services. The City may establish minimum levels of service that it wishes to use as a guide to inform service providers of the level of service desired by the community, and then it may coordinate with the service provider to reasonably provide that level of service.

Levels of Service Standards – City-Managed Facilities

The City of Shoreline has identified level of service for the city-managed facilities and services listed in Table CF-2. These standards should be met and facilities in place at these minimum thresholds in order to serve new development adequately.

Table CF-2: Level of Service Standards for City-Managed Facilities and Services

Type of Capital Facility or Service	Level of Service Standard
Transportation	<p>As established by the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan:</p> <p>LOS D at the signalized intersections on arterials and unsignalized intersecting arterials within the City as the level of service standard for evaluating planning level concurrency and reviewing traffic impacts of developments, excluding the Highways of Statewide Significance and Regionally Significant State Highways (I-5, Aurora Avenue N and Ballinger Way). Intersections that operate worse than LOS D will not meet the City’s established concurrency threshold. The level of service shall be calculated with the delay method described in the Transportation Research Board’s Highway Capacity Manual 2010 or its updated versions.</p> <p>A supplemental level of service for Principal Arterials and Minor Arterials that limits the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio to 0.90 or lower, provided, the V/C ratio on any leg of a Principal or Minor Arterial intersection may be greater than 0.90 if the intersection operates at Level of Service (LOS) D or better. These Level of Service standards apply throughout the City unless an alternative Level of Service standard is identified in the Facilities and Service subelement of the Transportation Element for intersections or road segments, where an alternate level of service has been adopted in a subarea plan, or for Principal or Minor Arterial segments where:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Widening the roadway cross-section is not feasible, due to significant topographic constraints; or •Rechannelization and safety improvements result in acceptable levels of increased congestion in light of the improved operational safety of the roadway. <p>Arterial segments meeting these two criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Dayton Avenue N from N 175th Street – N 185th Street: V/C may not exceed 1.10 •15th Ave NE from N 150th Street – N 175th Street: V/C may not exceed 1.10
<p>Surface Water</p>	<p>To ensure proper management of surface water runoff, to protect and enhance the natural environment, and to meet regulatory requirements, surface water capital improvement projects will provide the following services:</p> <p>Flood Protection: Prevent or minimize structural damage and flooding of principal, major, minor, and collector arterials, enhance public safety, and reduce property damage.</p> <p>Water Quality: Meet NPDES regulatory requirements to protect water quality,</p> <p>Stream Habitat: Prioritize to protect and preserve existing habitat in accordance with applicable regulations, especially those related to anadromous fish species and enhance habitat where feasible.</p>

<p>Parks and Recreation</p>	<p>Maintain the Citywide geographic service area for Regional Parks</p> <p>Maintain the Citywide geographic service area for Large Urban Parks.</p> <p>Maintain the geographic service areas for Community Parks. However, as future development occurs at Hamlin Park, Shoreview Park, Ballinger Open Space, and Bruggers Bog Park, look for appropriate opportunities to address community park deficiencies including amenities such as sports fields, picnic facilities, playgrounds, nature preserves, recreational trails, and outdoor education areas.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Explore opportunities for an additional recreation facility in the eastern portion of Shoreline.</p> <p>Maintain existing geographic service areas for Neighborhood Parks but add additional neighborhood park amenities, as desired by the community, to the following sites: Echo Lake Park, Shoreline Park, Hillwood Park, Richmond Beach Community Park, Boeing Creek Park, Shoreview Park, Richmond Highlands Park, Cromwell Park, Twin Ponds Park, Hamlin Park, and Paramount Park, Kayu Kayu Ac Park, South Woods.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Partner with appropriate school sites to provide neighborhood park amenities to adjacent communities.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Continue exploring opportunities for new neighborhood parks in areas not serviced by a neighborhood park amenity.</p> <p>Natural/Special Use Parks. While a target level of service does not specifically apply to the natural/special use parks category, future opportunities should be taken to acquire sites with water access and walking/biking trail potential, as noted as a high priority through citizen participation.</p>
------------------------------------	---

Level of Service Standards – Non-City-Managed Facilities

In addition, the following planning goals are established to provide a *target* to guide the future delivery of important community services and facilities and to provide a measure to evaluate the adequacy of actual service.

Table CF-3: Targets for Delivery of Non-City-Managed Facilities and Services

Type of Capital Facility or Service	Target Level of Service Standard
Wastewater:	Collection of peak wastewater discharge plus infiltration and inflow resulting in zero overflow events per year due to capacity and maintenance inadequacies (or consistent with current health standards).
Water:	Consistent with fire flow rates stated in the adopted Fire Code (based upon land use type for system planning and actual use at the project level).

Adequacy and Concurrency

According to the GMA, public facilities and services shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is first occupied without decreasing the level of service described in the Comprehensive Plan. Adequate public facilities and services, such as water, sewer, and surface water management, are required to serve development. Additionally, the GMA mandates concurrency for transportation services to ensure that transportation improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development or that a financial commitment is made to complete the improvement within six years.

Water and sewer service providers have demonstrated the ability to meet current demand at the service levels established in the Comprehensive Plan. The City uses the most current Department of Ecology stormwater manual to assure that new development meets the established service standards for surface water management and requirements of the current NPDES permit. The City continues to work with all non-City-managed service providers to determine their ability to continue to meet these service standards over the next 20 years under the Land Use Designation Plan identified in *Figure LU-1*. If the City determines that water and sewer providers or the City (for transportation and surface water management) will not be able to meet these service standards, the City could choose to: 1) modify the Land Use Designation Plan identified in *Figure LU- 1* through an amendment to the Plan, 2) modify the level of service standards through an amendment to the Plan, 3) or restrict development until service can be provided at the established levels of service standards.

Other services are extremely important (like police, fire, and schools) and may be generally available at the time of occupancy; however, upgrades may be needed to provide services to new development at the same level or rate as other parts of the community. In these situations, it may take a few years for these full improvements to come on line.

Finally, there are other services that may be needed but are not critical or extremely important and barriers to the availability of service may take time to overcome. This situation can happen with services such as cable television or natural gas service. In addition, there may be situations (e.g., parks and libraries) where, for several years, the level of service may not be available for new development at the same rate as it is available for the existing community.

The City of Shoreline believes that water, sewer, and surface water management should be included in concurrency requirements even though the Growth Management Act does not

specifically list them. The concurrency policies establish minimum standards for service availability for new development.

Capital Facility Concerns

Coordinating Among Competing Projects

The community will face a number of issues over the coming years which will determine if facilities need to be refurbished, expanded or developed and then when, where and how this will occur.

Many capital projects will be competing for development because not all facilities can be funded and built at the same time. Not only will funding need to be prioritized but also construction resources and land will need to be carefully allocated.

The competition between projects can be mitigated in some cases by greater coordination and co-location. For example, co-location of new recreation facilities with existing schools could reduce the need to purchase new park lands and free up resources to complete the project more quickly and economically. Enhanced efficiency can also reduce the need for additional facilities.

Prioritization

The community must balance a wide range of capital facility needs and desires. Many of these facilities are provided by public entities other than the City. For capital facility projects that are developed the City, the City will not have adequate resources to complete all capital improvement projects at the same time, and, therefore, decisions must be made to prioritize projects. In order to prioritize future City projects, the community must clearly identify which projects are most important to meeting the complex needs of the community. The policies on prioritization provide city officials with guidance when evaluating competing capital projects funded by the City.

Coordination and Public Involvement

The construction of new facilities within the community requires the involvement of many parties, including the public, local service providers and other public entities. Coordination and public involvement policies identify ways the City can bring all parties within the community together in the process of making these decisions on capital projects.

Mitigation and Efficiency

New facilities will have an impact on the community. There are a variety of ways in which the community can address and mitigate the impacts of these facilities. In addition, the community can evaluate the impact of new development on the need for new facilities and reduce the need for future improvements by addressing these impacts on site for new development. The policies on mitigation and efficiency provide guidance on how and when mitigation should be used to address capital facilities planning.

Inadequate Infrastructure

There are numerous indications that sewer, water, and storm water facilities will need to be upgraded or replaced in parts of the community. In some cases, these improvements will be necessary because of the advanced age or condition of the pipes/facilities. In other situations, existing systems may be insufficient to meet desired service levels. Addressing these deficiencies may require not installation of new infrastructure including water mains and hydrants, sewer lines, and storm drainage pipe and/or facilities. The City has determined that attracting these large developments is a priority, as well as to evaluate

options for funding such infrastructure upgrades, since the cost of these improvements could be prohibitively large for developers to assume.

Except for surface water services, the City is currently dependent upon the service providers to inventory and address these deficiencies. In many of these situations, steps are already being proactively taken by the providers to address infrastructure issues. For example, the Ronald Wastewater District is actively addressing infiltration and inflow into the wastewater system.

For utilities that the City does not directly operate, service contracts or interlocal agreements can be used to guarantee the future provision of adequate infrastructure and corresponding service. The City has contracts or interlocal agreements with most providers, although some service continues to be provided based upon historical service obligations (such as Seattle Public Utilities services). Without a service contract, the City has limited ability to address inadequate infrastructure if the provider does not intend to do so. In these situations, the City may have problems ensuring adequate infrastructure and the City may need to look to contract with a different provider or assume direct provision of service in order to ensure adequate infrastructure.

Equitable Funding

Most utility services are financed by rates, which the customers pay directly to the providers. In some cases, taxes are used to support services provided by public entities. Seattle Public Utilities provides water service to portions of Shoreline. Utility taxes are collected by the City of Seattle for these services; however, Seattle's utility tax revenues go into Seattle's general fund and do not directly support the operation of the utility. The utility taxes Shoreline residents pay to Seattle Public Utilities do not directly help maintain infrastructure and provide service within Shoreline.

In several situations, such as water, sewer and cable service, utility rates paid by customers to different providers for similar service is significantly different. These rate differentials may be the result of different capital improvement programs or administrative systems. Ronald Wastewater District is in the process of narrowing the difference in rates between its customers.

Environmental Impacts from Utility Improvements

When capital facilities and utilities are renovated, expanded or created they have an impact on the community. Several projects are being considered which could impact Shoreline. These include a potential new regional wastewater treatment plant and expansion of the regional solid waste transfer station. In addition, there have been a number of recent additions of transmission towers within the City which have had aesthetic impacts on neighborhoods. These projects raise questions about how the community addresses and mitigates utility facilities. The City relies upon SEPA to identify and address most impacts, however, the community may consider additional approaches to mitigate the impact of utility facilities and infrastructure. The City Council's adoption of an undergrounding ordinance is an example of the community acting to address these concerns in an expanded manner.

Opportunities for Cooperation

The utilization of multiple providers to serve the utility needs of the community raises a number of issues about coordination with the City and among service providers. Trenching activities can often be consolidated through coordination, reducing the cost and impact of these activities. In some cases, cooperative use of utility facilities can benefit the

community. The use of the City Light right-of-way for a trail facility (Interurban Trail) is an example of a potential beneficial cooperative arrangement.

Adequacy of Service

The community has expressed a desire to maintain current levels of service. However, in several areas, concern has been expressed about the quality of current services and the means to improve the way that these utilities provide service to the community. These concerns range from the unavailability of natural gas service to the quality of service for cable tv, telephone and cellular phones. A prime concern of community residents is the state of current storm water management. Public input consistently has indicated that residents are not satisfied with surface water management services. In response to these concerns, the City has assumed control of the surface water utility from King County as of April 1, 1998.

The City may face difficulties in assuring adequate services and facilities from providers the City does not directly control. This significant issue in the provision of essential services can be addressed through contracts or interlocal agreements with individual agencies for services or through direct provision of service (such as surface water management). Lack of needed infrastructure from these services may result in permitting delays or moratoriums if services are required for concurrency.

There are a number of ways that the community can promote improved levels of service in the future. The City may evaluate current providers to determine if alternate providers or direct provision may be appropriate measures to achieve service standards desired by local residents. Service contracts, interlocal agreements, assumption of service or other measures may be needed in order to assure that services will be available to serve planned growth and meet concurrency requirements.

Siting and Mitigating Environmental Impacts

Large capital projects, whether for city-managed or non-city managed public facilities, can have a significant impact upon the community and neighborhoods where facilities are sited. Such projects can result in impacts to adjacent areas and the community. The community must identify how to best respond to the siting and impacts of new facilities. The impacts of new facilities can be considered through SEPA, but the community may wish to explore additional ways to identify and mitigate the impacts of existing facilities such as through master planning. In addition, siting criteria can help clarify where certain facilities are inappropriate or beneficial.

These issues will apply to all public facilities including essential public facilities. Under the Growth Management Act, the community cannot restrict the siting of essential public facilities within the City and has limited control over decisions regarding these projects. The community can, however, establish guidelines that will direct how and where these facilities can be established. (See the Land Use Element for discussion of Essential Public Facilities).

Maintaining and/or Improving Services

The community will face challenges in maintaining current services over the coming years. Aging facilities will need to be replaced or refurbished and additional or expanded facilities will be needed to serve new development. Numerous public comments received at the public meetings held in association with the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Update process addressed a range of issues associated with the adequacy of the City's surface water

facilities. Many of these issues will be addressed through capital projects identified in the City's Surface Water Master Plan currently being developed.

In addition, the community must clarify areas where it desires a higher level of service. Community input is clear about the need for better surface water management. Public comments also suggest an interest in expanded parks and recreation facilities; the development of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan associated with the Comprehensive Plan Update may address those concerns by translating that interest desires into clear standards and proposed facilities.

Limited Funding Sources

The cost of desired capital facilities will certainly exceed current revenue sources. The community will be faced with deciding if desired facilities should be financed through alternate funding sources such as user fees, bonds, or impact fees.

Impacts fees are one method that could be used to pay for capital improvements such as parks or roads. For new residential developments, impact fees can create public benefits, but also raise home sale prices and thus property taxes for existing homes. A potential trade-off is reduced demand on the general fund for capital improvements. However, in a built-out community the amount of revenue derived from new and redevelopment will be limited. The community will need to decide if impact fees are an acceptable way to help fund new capital facilities.

Capital Funding

The following Capital Funding section is a general discussion of the range of funding sources that many communities access in funding capital facilities. It is provided here as background for the capital funding section of the plan. Specific funding sources are described in greater detail in the City's adopted 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan.

Potential Funding Sources

A limited range of revenue sources is available to the City of Shoreline for use in addressing capital facilities. There are three types of revenue sources for capital facilities, Multi-use, Single Use, and, less commonly, General Fund, described below.

1. Multi-use: taxes, fees, loans, and grants which may be used for virtually any type of capital facility (but which may become restricted if and when adopted for a specific type of capital facility);
2. Single use: taxes, fees, loans, and grants which may be used only for a particular type of capital facility; and
3. General fund: these monies are typically used for operations, rather than capital improvements.

Multi-Use Revenue Sources

Property Tax

Property tax levies are most often used by local governments for operating and maintenance costs. They are not commonly used for capital improvements.

The 2004 property tax rate in Shoreline is currently \$1.28 per \$1,000 of assessed value (AV). The maximum rate allowed by state law is \$1.60 per \$1,000 AV. The City has the option to set its rate at any level up to the maximum subject to the following provisions.

Under state law, local governments are prohibited from raising the property tax levy more than one percent from the previous year's levy (before adjustments for new construction and annexations). However, the state authorizes temporary or permanent increases above the 101 percent lid, up to a statutory limit under local voter approval. The City of Shoreline has not proposed a temporary lid lift.

General Obligation Bonds & Lease-Purchase (Property Tax Excess Levy)

There are two types of General Obligation (GO) bonds: voter-approved and Councilmanic. Voter-approved bonds increase the property tax rate, with increased revenues dedicated to paying principal and interest on the bonds. Local governments are authorized in "excess levies" to repay voter-approved bonds. Excess levies are increased in the regular property tax levy above statutory limits. Approval requires a 60 percent majority vote in favor and a turn-out of at least 40 percent of the voters from the preceding general election.

Councilmanic bonds are authorized by a jurisdiction's legislative body without the need for voter approval. Principal and interest payments for Councilmanic bonds come from general government revenues, without a corresponding increase in property taxes. Therefore, this method of bond approval does not utilize a dedicated funding source for repaying the bond holders. Lease-purchase arrangements are also authorized by vote of the legislative body and do not require voter approval.

The amount of the local government debt allowable for GO bonds is restricted by law to 7.5 percent of the taxable value of the property within the City limits. This may be divided as follows:

General Purpose Bonds	2.5 percent
Utility Bonds	2.5 percent
Open Space and Park Facilities	2.5 percent

Of the 2.5 percent for General Purpose Bonds, the City may issue up to 1.5 percent in the form of Councilmanic bonds.

As of December 2003, the City had no Councilmanic GO and no voter-approved GO debt. The total unused debt capacity available for the City in 2003 is \$388.4 million.

If bonds were used to fund capital facilities, the impact on the individual taxpayer would vary widely depending upon the amount and term of the bonds.

Real Estate Excise Tax

RCW 82.46 authorizes local governments to collect a real estate excise tax levy of 0.25 percent of the purchase price of real estate within the city limits. The Growth Management Act authorizes collection of another 0.25 percent. Both the first and second 0.25 percents are required to be used for financing capital facilities specified in local governments' capital facilities plans.

The first and second 0.25 percent may be used for the following capital facilities:

1. The planning, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or improvement of streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, bridges, domestic water systems, and storm and sanitary sewer systems; or
2. The planning, construction, repair, rehabilitation, or improvement of parks and recreational facilities.

In addition, the first 0.25 percent may be used for the following:

- a. The acquisition of parks and recreational facilities;
- b. The planning, acquisition, construction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or improvement of law enforcement facilities, protection of facilities, trails, libraries, administrative and judicial facilities, and river and/or floodway/flood control projects and housing projects subject to certain limitations.

The City of Shoreline has enacted both of the 0.25 percent real estate excise taxes. The King County Assessors Office determines the value of the property and the seller of the property is responsible for the payment of these assessed taxes. The total 2004 budget estimate is \$1.37 million allocated to capital facilities.

Business and Occupation Tax

RCW 35.11 authorizes cities to collect this tax on the gross or net income of businesses, not to exceed a rate of 0.2 percent. Revenue may be used for capital facilities acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operations. Voter approval is not required to initiate the tax. Voter approval is required if the City desires to levy at a rate higher than 0.2 percent. The City has not utilized this revenue source.

Local Option Sales Tax (Retail)

Local governments may collect a tax on retail sales of up to 0.85 percent. Counties, with voter approval, may collect an additional 0.15 percent which may be used only for criminal justice purposes (public transportation-benefit authorities may levy up to 0.6 percent). Voter approval is required for all local option sales tax increases.

In 2004, Shoreline budgeted \$5.26 million in retail sales tax to be expended on maintenance and operating costs. Criminal justice tax revenues (one percent) totals \$1.0 million.

Gambling Tax

The City currently assesses an 11% gross receipts tax on local card room gambling activity. The City's current policy is to allocate 36% of the revenue collected from this tax to capital projects. This capital allocation is used to finance transportation capital projects.

Utility Tax

RCW 35A.52 authorizes cities to collect a tax on gross receipts of electrical, gas, garbage, telephone, cable service, water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater management providers. Service users pay the tax as part of their utility bill.

State law limits the utility tax to 6 percent of the total receipts for cable services, electricity, gas, steam (not applicable to Shoreline), and telephone, unless a majority of the voters

approved a higher rate. There are no restrictions on the tax rates for City-owned sewer, water, solid waste, and stormwater. Revenue can be used for capital facilities acquisition, construction, and maintenance. Effective January 1, 2005, the City began collection of a utility tax on the surface water utility. The City does not collect utility taxes on electricity, sanitary sewer or water, but does collect interlocal operating agreement fees (sometimes referred to as franchise fees).

Interlocal Operating Agreement Fee

The City currently collects an interlocal operating agreement fee from Ronald Wastewater District. The amounts for this operating fee have been identified in the Interlocal Operating Agreement between the City and the District through 2017.

Community Development Block Grants

Approximately \$400,000 in community development block grant (CDBG) funding is available annually through participation in the King County CDBG Consortium. The City allocates the CDBG funding on an annual basis. Funds may be used for public facilities, economic development and housing projects which benefit low- and moderate-income households. Funds may not be used for maintenance and operations. The City has used CDBG funds in the past for curb ramp and sidewalk repair.

It is not possible to accurately forecast revenues from CDBG grants.

Public Works Trust Fund Grants and Loans (PWTF)

The state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development provides low-interest loans for capital facilities planning, emergency planning, and construction of bridges, roads, domestic water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer. Applicants must have a capital facilities plan in place and must be levying the original 0.25 percent real estate sales tax (see real estate excise tax, above). Construction and emergency planning projects must be for reconstruction of existing capital facilities only. Capital improvement planning projects are limited to planning for streets and utilities.

Loans for construction projects require a local match generated only from local revenues or state-shared entitlement (gas tax) revenues. The required local match is 10 percent of a 3 percent loan, 20 percent for a 2 percent loan, and 30 percent for a 1 percent loan.

Emergency planning loans are at a 5 percent interest rate. If state or federal disaster funds are received, they must be applied to the loan for the life of the project (20 years). Future PWTF funding cannot be reliably forecast.

Surface Water Management Funds

Surface Water Management (SWM) Utility provides funding to address problems caused by stormwater runoff. Typical problems include flooding of homes and roads, erosion of hillsides and streambanks, water pollution and damage to fish habitat. Unlike wastewater (sewage), most stormwater flows untreated into pipes, ponds, and ditches that empty into streams, wetlands, and lakes.

The Surface Water Utility fund collects revenue from residential and commercial tax parcels. Parcel owners are billed along with property tax statements by King County. The rate for commercial property owners varies depending on parcel acreage and amount of impervious surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots.

Surface water management fees are used to:

- replace, upgrade and maintain drainage systems -- stormwater control structures, settling ponds, catch basins, culverts and other facilities -- in neighborhoods that have had a history of serious flooding
- enhance streams and wetlands that have been adversely impacted by uncontrolled runoff
- protect lakes, streams and wetlands and try to prevent future problems by implementing watershed management plans
- send out field investigators to respond to citizen complaints about drainage or water pollution problems and to provide technical assistance where needed
- encourage community stewardship of water resources through streamside plantings, storm drain stenciling, educational workshops and small grants to citizen groups and businesses

The Surface Water Management Fund transfers money internally to the General Fund for related administration functions. Related administrative functions can include records management, payroll costs, budgeting, accounts payable, management costs, salaries and benefits, debt service, and State Business and Occupation (B&O) taxes. This is in addition to the cost of repairs and improvements to the Storm/Surface Water systems in the City.

Single Use Revenue Sources

Special-Purpose Districts

RCW 67.38.130 authorizes cultural arts, stadium/convention special purpose districts with independent taxing authority to finance capital facilities. The District requires a majority voter approval for formation, and has a funding limit of \$0.25 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation.

Typically, such a special-purpose district would serve a larger geographical area than the single city. Revenue would be based on the tax base of the area within the special service district. If Shoreline were to propose a cultural arts or stadium/convention special purpose district with the same boundaries as the City, at a maximum allowable levy rate of \$0.25 per \$1,000 AV, estimated revenues would amount to \$9.1 million in a 6-year period, or \$39.7 million over twenty years.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Levy

The state authorizes a \$0.50 per \$1,000 AV property tax levy, which may be enacted by fire and hospital districts, cities and towns, and counties. Shoreline has not enacted an EMS levy because it is serviced by the countywide Medic One. According to state law, if the County's EMS levy applies to the City, then the City cannot enact an EMS levy for the City itself.

Fire Impact Fees

RCW 82.02.050-090 authorizes a charge (impact fee) to be paid by new development for its "fair share" of the cost of fire protection and emergency medical facilities required to serve the development. Impact fees must be used for capital facilities necessitated by growth, and not to correct existing deficiencies in levels of service. Impact fees cannot be used for operating expenses. Shoreline does not currently collect fire impact fees.

A fire impact fee for the City of Shoreline can be generated by multiplying the current level of service by the cost of related capital facilities to determine the cost per capita, then multiplying by the number of persons per dwelling unit to determine the cost per dwelling unit.

The City does not currently charge a fire impact fee because it does not directly operate fire protection capital facilities.

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax

RCW 82.36 authorizes this tax, which is administered by the state Department of Licensing and paid by gasoline distributors. Cities and counties receive 10.6961 percent and 22.78 percent, respectively, of motor vehicle fuel tax receipts. Revenues must be spent for “highway purposes” including the construction, maintenance, and operation of City streets, county roads, and highways. In 2004, \$1,093,500 in fuel tax revenue is budgeted in Shoreline, of which \$745,000 is for operating, maintenance, and debt service costs, and \$348,500 is for capital facilities.

Local Option Fuel Tax

RCW 82.80 authorizes this county-wide local option tax equivalent to 10 percent of the state-wide motor vehicle fuel tax and a special fuel tax of 2.3 cents per gallon. Revenues are distributed back to the county and its cities on a weighted per capita basis (1.5 for population in unincorporated areas and 1.0 for population in incorporated areas). Revenues must be spent for “highway purposes.” King County has not enacted this local option fuel tax.

Commercial Parking Tax

RCW 82.80 authorizes a tax for commercial parking businesses, but does not set rates. Revenues must be spent for “general transportation purposes” including highway purposes, public transportation, high-capacity transportation, transportation planning and design, and other transportation-related activities. Shoreline does not have a commercial parking tax at this time.

Transportation Benefit District

RCW 35.21.225 authorizes cities to create transportation districts with independent taxing authority for the purposes of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding any city street, county road, or state highway improvement within the district. Special district's tax base is used to finance capital facilities.

The District may generate revenue through property tax excess levies, general obligation bonds (including Councilmanic bonds), local improvement districts, and development fees (see related discussions, above, for background on each of these). Voter approval is required for bonds and excess property tax levies. Council approval is required for Councilmanic bonds, special assessments, and development fees.

Transportation improvements funded with district revenues must be consistent with state, regional, and local transportation plans; necessitated by existing or reasonable foreseeable congestion levels attributable to economic growth; and partially funded by local government or private developer contributions, or a combination of such contributions.

A transportation benefit district would address specific transportation projects reducing congestion caused by economic development. Consequently, the amount of revenue is a function of the cost of the project, rather than a levy rate, assessment amount, or fee schedule. It is, therefore, not possible to reliably forecast revenue from this source.

Road Impact Fees

RCW 82.02.050-090 authorizes cities and counties to exact road impact fees from new development for its “fair share” of the system improvement costs of roads necessary to serve the development. Impact fees must be used for capital facilities necessitated by growth and not to correct existing deficiencies in level of service. Impact fees cannot be used for operating expenses. Shoreline currently does not collect traffic impact fees.

National Highway Systems Grants

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) awards grants for construction and improvement of National Highway System (NHS) components. In order to be eligible, projects must be a component of the NHS and be on the regional transportation improvement program.

Ultimately, the NHS will include all interstate routes, a large percentage of urban and rural principal arterials, defense strategic highway networks, and strategic highway connectors. In the interim, the NHS will consist of highways classified as principal arterials.

Funds are available on an 86.5 percent federal, 13.5 percent local match based on the highest ranking projects from the regional Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) list.

It is not possible to forecast reliably how much, if any, revenue the City would receive from this source.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) Grants

Puget Sound Regional Council provides grants for road construction, transit, capital projects, bridge projects, transportation planning, and research and development. Projects must be on the regional TIP list, and must be for roads with higher functional classifications and local or rural minor collectors

Funds are available on an 86.5 percent federal/13.5 percent local match based on highest ranking projects from the regional TIP list.

Shoreline has received STP and Transportation Improvement Account grants for some of its transportation projects including Aurora Avenue and the Interurban Trail project.

Federal Aid Bridge Replacement Program Grants

WSDOT provides grants on a state-wide priority basis for the replacement of structural deficient or functionally obsolete bridges. Funding is awarded on 80 percent federal/20 percent local match.

Federal Aid Emergency Relief Grants

WSDOT provides funding for restoration of roads and bridges on the federal aid system which are damaged by natural disasters or catastrophic failures. Funds are available on an 83.13 percent federal/16.87 percent local matching basis. Because emergencies cannot be predicted, it is not possible to forecast revenues from this source.

Urban Arterial Trust Account Grants (UATA)

The Washington State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) provides funding for projects to alleviate and prevent traffic congestion. In order to be eligible, roads should be structurally deficient, congested by traffic, and have geometric deficiencies, or a high incidence of accidents. Funds are awarded on an 80 percent federal/20 percent local matching basis.

Centennial Clean Water Fund (CCWF)

The Department of Ecology (DOE) issues grants and loans for the design, acquisition, construction, and improvement of water pollution control facilities and related activities to meet state and federal requirements to protect water quality.

State Revolving Fund Loans

DOE administers low-interest loans and low-interest guarantees for water pollution control projects. Applicants must demonstrate water quality need, have a facility plan for water quality treatment, show ability to repay a loan through a dedicated source of funding, and conform to other state and federal requirements. Shoreline does not have any programs that would qualify for these funds at this time.

Solid Waste - Department of Ecology Grants

The state awards grants to local governments for a variety of programs related to solid waste, including a remedial action grant to assist with local hazardous waste sites, moderate risk/hazardous waste implementation grants, and waste composting grants. It is not possible to forecast revenue from this source.

Storm Drainage Payment In Lieu of Assessment

In accordance with state law, the City could authorize storm drainage charges in lieu of assessments. The City does not currently collect a storm drainage facility charge per acre upon issuance of a building permit. Revenues from this charge are, or could be, deposited in the City's Storm Drainage Cumulative Reserve Fund. Revenues from this fund could be used for construction, maintenance and/or repair of storm drainage facilities, acquisition of property or related debt service.

Water Districts

Two water utility districts serve Shoreline's planning area. Water districts have independent taxing authority, with a property tax levy limit of 50 cents per thousand of AV. Tax revenue is restricted to uses related to the purpose for which the water district was created.

Grants and Loans

Grants and loans are additional sources of revenue that may be used for capital projects. The state Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) provides low-interest loans, and occasionally grants to finance sewer, water, access roads, bridges, and other facilities for specific private sector development. Funding is available only for projects which support specific private developments or expansion which promotes the trading of goods and services outside the state. The average requirement is to create one job per \$3,000 of CERB financing.

The Federal Economic Development Administration (EDA) provides grants for improvements that benefit economic development and reduce unemployment.

Twenty-Year Capital Facilities Plan

As a 20-year plan, the Capital Facilities Program seeks to provide sufficient information regarding project costs and funding to ensure that the level of capital facilities planned are based on known available or reasonably anticipated revenue sources. Cost estimating and revenue forecasting for the 20-year plan is approximate and it should be expected that both cost estimates and revenue calculations will vary as more detailed analysis is prepared for the 6-year CIP and the annual budget.

The 20-year Capital Facilities Program is made up of those recommended projects in the following tables. These 20-year lists of recommended projects make up a broad “basket” of projects and only a limited level of detail is provided at this stage. Those top priority projects in the 20-year program are, generally, the most suited to “graduating” to the 6-year CIP as it is updated annually. Further plan and project refinement is made when projects are added to the annual budget.

Additionally, there may be other projects that are not included in the 20-year Capital Facilities Program for which funding has not been identified at this time. These projects are included in the following tables and listed as unfunded. The level of project detail, funding specificity, and certainty increases as projects move through a narrowing funnel from unfunded, to 20-year, to 6-year, to the annual budget.

While this 20-year program will help guide the development of the 6-year CIP and the annual budget, it is recognized that *additional projects may be added and priorities may change*. A project’s priority may increase, for example, if outside funding is identified. Or, additional projects may be identified, such as through the City’s traffic safety monitoring program. New safety information could potentially elevate the need for a specific project. The 20-year Capital Facilities Plan, shown below, may be updated with new or revised project lists. Additional projects that are listed as unfunded may be funded in years beyond the 20-year range or by funding that has not been estimated at this time, such as future unidentified grants, voter approved bonds, or developer mitigation.

The 20-year Capital Facilities Program serves as the basis for developing the 6-year CIP. Changes to the 20-year Capital Facilities Program occur through the Comprehensive Plan annual update process through City-initiated amendments or by private applications.

In addition to current cost information, the 6-year CIP cost is shown in the 20-year Capital Facilities Program for reference. Note that project costs in the CIP are derived by estimating inflation and project schedules. Because estimating project schedules and inflation over a 20-year period is unreliable, the 20-year Capital Facilities Program uses constant dollars for all projects (2004\$). Therefore, while the 20-year Capital Facilities Program is designed to be consistent with the adopted CIP, its figures are listed in constant dollars (2004\$) rather than escalated by inflation.

This page intentionally blank

Utilities Element Goals & Policies

Introduction

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the City of Shoreline to include a Utilities Element within its Comprehensive Plan consisting of the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.(RCW 36.70A.070). The Utilities Element should also provide a framework for the efficient and predictable provision and siting of utility facilities and services within the City consistent with each of the serving utility's public service obligations.

This Element contains the goals and policies necessary to support the City's responsibility for ensuring that City residents are provided with basic utility services, and for coordinating with private utilities to ensure that the City's Comprehensive Plan is supported by utility infrastructure. Publicly operated utilities – water, wastewater and surface water – are addressed in the Capital Facilities element. This Utilities Element, in concert with the Capital Facilities Element (refer to the Capital Facilities Element for water, stormwater, sewer facilities) and the Land Use Element, provides the goals and policies that guide utility provision within the City.

The *Utilities Element – Supporting Analysis* section of this Plan contains an inventory of utility services in the City, specifically electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication services, (cable, telephone, etc.) and provides the foundation for the following goals and policies.

Utilities Goals

Goal U I: Promote city-wide utility services that are:

- consistent,
- high quality,
- equitable,
- responsive,
- forward looking,
- environmentally sensitive and energy efficient,
- locationally and aesthetically sensitive, and
- functionally and financially efficient.

Goal U II: Facilitate the provision of appropriate, reliable utility services, whether through City-owned and operated services or other providers.

Goal U III: Acquire Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline.

Utilities Policies

Level of Service

- U1:** Coordinate with utility providers to ensure that the utility services are provided at reasonable rates citywide and that those services meet service levels identified/recommended in the Capital Facilities Element.
- U2:** Investigate alternative service provision options that may be more effective at providing services to our residents.
- U3:** ~~Promote~~ Encourage/Assist the timely provision of the full range of utilities within Shoreline in order to serve existing businesses, including home businesses, and promote further economic development.
- U4:** Support the timely expansion, maintenance, operation, and replacement of utility infrastructure in order to meet anticipated demand for growth identified in the Land Use Plan Element.

Comment [j1]: Need maps of existing and proposed utilities including telecommunication, electric and natural gas for analysis section.

Comment [j2]: These aren't really level of service standards.

Comment [jef3]: Typically you don't have LOS for utilities.

Comment [j4]: Ask CMO if this is still a policy. We don't have control over most utility rates. There are no LOS standards recommended in the CF Element. KEEP JEF

Comment [j5]: Talk to Dan E to interpret this policy

Comment [j6]: What do we not have?

Comment [jef7]: Not sure what this one is saying.

Consistency and Coordination

- U5:** Coordinate with other jurisdictions and governmental entities in the planning and implementation of multi-jurisdictional utility facility additions and improvements.

Mitigation and Efficiency

- U6:** Encourage the design, siting, construction, operation, and relocation or closure of all utility systems in a manner that:
 - is cost effective,
 - ~~is aesthetically pleasing,~~
 - minimizes and mitigates impacts on adjacent land uses,
 - is environmentally sensitive, and
 - is appropriate to the location and need.
- U7:** Encourage the co-location or joint use of trenches, conduits, or poles so that utilities may encourage expansion, maintenance, undergrounding and upgrading facilities with the least amount of disruption.
- U8:** ~~Encourage utilities to consider the replacement of outdated equipment with technologically updated or advanced alternatives, providing that the cost of the updated equipment is fiscally reasonable.~~ OBSOLETE

Comment [jef8]: How would we write a regulation to implement this policy?

Comment [bl9]: Agree with Jeff. A project that is environmentally sensitive and appropriate for location and need is likely to be visually aesthetic (though terms are very subjective)

Comment [jef10]: Shouldn't mix this co-location with WTF

Solid Waste

- U98:** Monitor solid waste collection providers for adequacy of service and compliance with service contracts.
- U940:** Support recycling efforts throughout the community.

Electricity

- U140:** Where found to be safe and appropriate, promote recreational use of utility corridors, such as trails, sport courts, and similar facilities.
- U12:** ~~Encourage electric utilities to mitigate the aesthetic impacts of high voltage utility corridors and sub-stations within the community. REDUNDANT TO U6~~
- U13:** ~~Negotiate and condition electric utility providers to limit disturbance to vegetation within major utility transmission corridors to that which is necessary for the safety and maintenance of transmission facilities, where feasible. REDUNDANT TO U14~~
- U141:** Negotiate and condition electric utility providers to exercise restraint and sensitivity to neighborhood character in trimming vegetation and tree limbs around aerial lines, where feasible.
- U15:** ~~Negotiate and condition the planting of appropriate varieties of trees in the vicinity of power lines in compliance with applicable state regulations and sensitivity to necessary tree maintenance, where feasible. REDUNDANT TO CITY REGS~~
- U162:** Promote the undergrounding of new and existing electric distribution lines where physically and financially feasible as streets are widened-improved and/or areas are redeveloped, based on coordination with local utilities.
- U17:** ~~Promote the undergrounding of new electric distribution lines, with the exception of high voltage electrical transmission lines, based on coordination with local utilities. COMBINED WITH U16~~

Comment [j11]: Talk to Paul Laine about what is in the franchise agreement. Can we actually "condition", is there a permit? DL – This language is pretty awful. As recently seen in the Westminster Triangle, SCL will need to adopt their own policies or be willing to meet with residents.

Comment [tj12]: Re-word but something along this lines is needed/appropriate. It is not adequately covered in the Franchise agreement and the Agreement only covers trimming in ROW, not on private property

Comment [jef13]: Covered in franchise agreement. Parks and PW taking lead.

Comment [j14]: Is this superseded by existing regulations?YES

Comment [tj15]: Delete – new undergrounding code doesn't support this.

Telecommunications

- U183:** ~~Explore strategies that minimize or reduce the impacts of telecommunication facilities and towers on the community.~~
- U194:** Promote the gradual undergrounding of telecommunication lines in coordination with the undergrounding of other utilities and capital facility systems.
- U2015:** Support the provision of high quality cable and satellite service throughout the community.
- U216:** ~~Promote opportunities for distance learning and telecommuting in coordination with telecommunication and cable providers.~~
- U2217:** Encourage and work with telecommunication providers to develop fiber optic cable networks and ~~other emerging~~ technologies and increase interconnectivity between different networks.
- U2318:** Work with utility companies and public institutions to develop a full range of community information services, available to citizens and businesses through the telecommunication network.

Comment [jef16]: Already regulated in Title 13 and 20

Comment [j17]: Is this still relevant? Seems like there's something here that might be useful, but in coordination with Economic Development and climate initiatives instead of cable providers. Attract home businesses or others that can operate virtually and don't generate traffic, etc.

Comment [j18]: Fiber optic has become the standard, do we know what other emerging technologies would be?

Comment [jef19]: Does this pertain to a utility?

Wireless Communications Facilities

- U19:** Facilitate access to reliable wireless communications services throughout the City of Shoreline.
- U20:** Protect community aesthetics by planning for well-sited and well-designed wireless service facilities that fit unobtrusively in the Shoreline environment.
- U21:** Manage the placement of all communication antennas, antenna support structures, buildings, and associated equipment so as to promote efficient service delivery and avoid unnecessary proliferation.
- U22:** Ensure the safety of wireless communications facilities and avoid potential damage to people and property.

Comment [m20]: Note, that these used to be called Wireless Telecommunication Facilities, but it has become necessary to change the acronym.

Natural Gas

- U23:** Cooperate with natural gas utilities for improvements and expansion throughout the community, and support the eventual provision of full coverage of natural gas services. OBSOLETE

Comment [jef21]: Keep

Utilities Element Goals & Policies

Introduction

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the City of Shoreline to include a Utilities Element within its Comprehensive Plan consisting of the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.(RCW 36.70A.070). The Utilities Element should also provide a framework for the efficient and predictable provision and siting of utility facilities and services within the City consistent with each of the serving utility’s public service obligations.

This Element contains the goals and policies necessary to support the City’s responsibility for ensuring that City residents are provided with basic utility services, and for coordinating with private utilities to ensure that the City’s Comprehensive Plan is supported by utility infrastructure. Publicly operated utilities – water, wastewater and surface water – are addressed in the Capital Facilities element. This Utilities Element, in concert with the Capital Facilities Element (refer to the Capital Facilities Element for water, stormwater, sewer facilities) and the Land Use Element, provides the goals and policies that guide utility provision within the City.

The *Utilities Element – Supporting Analysis* section of this Plan contains an inventory of utility services in the City, specifically electrical, natural gas, and telecommunication services, (cable, telephone, etc.) and provides the foundation for the following goals and policies.

Utilities Goals

Goal U I: Promote city-wide utility services that are:

- consistent,
- high quality,
- equitable,
- responsive,
- forward looking,
- environmentally sensitive and energy efficient,
- locationally and aesthetically sensitive, and
- functionally and financially efficient.

Goal U II: Facilitate the provision of appropriate, reliable utility services, whether through City-owned and operated services or other providers.

Goal U III: Acquire Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline.

Utilities Policies

Level of Service

- U1:** Coordinate with utility providers to ensure that the utility services are provided at reasonable rates citywide and that those services meet service levels identified/recommended in the Capital Facilities Element.
- U2:** Investigate alternative service provision options that may be more effective at providing services to our residents.
- U3:** Encourage/Assist the timely provision of the full range of utilities within Shoreline in order to serve existing businesses, including home businesses, and promote further economic development.
- U4:** Support the timely expansion, maintenance, operation, and replacement of utility infrastructure in order to meet anticipated demand for growth identified in the Land Use Element.

Consistency and Coordination

- U5:** Coordinate with other jurisdictions and governmental entities in the planning and implementation of multi-jurisdictional utility facility additions and improvements.

Mitigation and Efficiency

- U6:** Encourage the design, siting, construction, operation, and relocation or closure of all utility systems in a manner that:
- is cost effective,
 - minimizes and mitigates impacts on adjacent land uses,
 - is environmentally sensitive, and
 - is appropriate to the location and need.
- U7:** Encourage the co-location or joint use of trenches, conduits, or poles so that utilities may encourage expansion, maintenance, undergrounding and upgrading facilities with the least amount of disruption.

Solid Waste

- U8:** Monitor solid waste collection providers for adequacy of service and compliance with service contracts.
- U9:** Support recycling efforts throughout the community.

Electricity

- U10:** Where found to be safe and appropriate, promote recreational use of utility corridors, such as trails, sport courts, and similar facilities.

- U11:** Negotiate and condition electric utility providers to exercise restraint and sensitivity to neighborhood character in trimming vegetation and tree limbs around aerial lines, where feasible.
- U12:** Promote the undergrounding of new and existing electric distribution lines where physically and financially feasible as streets are improved and/or areas are redeveloped, based on coordination with local utilities.

Telecommunications

- U13:** Minimize impacts of telecommunication facilities and towers on the community.
- U14:** Promote the undergrounding of telecommunication lines in coordination with the undergrounding of other utilities and capital facility systems.
- U15:** Support the provision of high quality cable and satellite service throughout the community.
- U16:** Promote opportunities for distance learning and telecommuting in coordination with telecommunication and cable providers.
- U17:** Encourage and work with telecommunication providers to develop fiber optic cable networks and technologies and increase interconnectivity between different networks.
- U18:** Work with utility companies and public institutions to develop a full range of community information services available to citizens and businesses through the telecommunication network.

Wireless Communications Facilities

- U19:** Facilitate access to reliable wireless communications services throughout the City of Shoreline.
- U20:** Protect community aesthetics by planning for well-sited and well-designed wireless service facilities that fit unobtrusively in the Shoreline environment.
- U21:** Manage the placement of all communication antennas, antenna support structures, buildings, and associated equipment so as to promote efficient service delivery and avoid unnecessary proliferation.
- U22:** Ensure the safety of wireless communications facilities and avoid potential damage to people and property.

Natural Gas

- U23:** Cooperate with natural gas utilities for improvements and expansion throughout the community.

This page intentionally blank

Utilities Element Supporting Analysis

Comment [sc1]: Update map

Comment [sc2]: GMA requires:
(4) A utilities element consisting of the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.

Background and Context

The Utilities Element is based on estimates of existing and future demand for utility service. Where possible, current utility consumption trends are used to indicate likely future consumption. Some utilities, such as cellular telephone, are rapidly growing with changing technologies. Consequently, future demand is difficult to predict. In other instances, where utility providers are private corporations, specific information on utility consumption and demand are considered to be proprietary and are therefore not disclosed.

The Utilities Element gauges the ability of existing and planned utility facilities to meet future demand. (I'm pretty sure that GMA requires that Land Use Plans direct utility investment, not the other way around) Generally, the current provision of utility services and the ability to meet future population demand in Shoreline are not hindered by any serious constraints.

The Supporting Analysis section presents basic information regarding the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including electrical, natural gas, telephone, and cable (water, wastewater, and surface utilities water are discussed in the Capital Facilities Element). Further information is available from individual utilities or in the planning documents of the various service districts.

The City of Shoreline does not own or manage most of its public utilities. The only City-owned utility is the City's Surface Water Utility, which is addressed in the Capital Facilities element. Utilities addressed here and in the Capital Facilities Element have a broad impact on the future of the community. In many cases, utilities are needed to meet the basic needs of daily living and ensure health and safety. Utilities can also significantly enhance the quality of life in the community.

When considering the future provision of utility services, a number of issues must be considered: legal requirements; aesthetic and environmental impacts; governance; costs and revenues. In order to address these issues, the community (through its utility providers) must identify the type and quality of utilities needed to serve local residents and determine how these services can best be provided. As a part of this discussion, the community must consider the aesthetic and environmental impacts of new services on the community as well as issues of governance, costs and revenues.

Existing Conditions

The City maintains a number of franchise agreements between utility providers and the City allowing for the existence of support facilities (e.g., cable, electrical wire, natural gas pipe) within

the City's right-of-way (streets). Non-City-managed utility services are ~~controlled~~ controlled by franchise agreements between the utilities and the City of Shoreline.

The status of the franchise agreements is noted in the listing of current providers. (Following information needs to be updated)

Electrical Service

Electrical service is provided within the City of Shoreline by Seattle City Light. The City has a non-exclusive franchise agreement with Seattle City Light through January 4431, 2014 (Ordinance #1387).

Natural Gas Service

Puget Sound Energy provides natural gas service to the residents of the City of Shoreline. The City maintains a franchise agreement (Ordinance #308) with Puget Sound Energy through October 31, 2017.

Existing Natural Gas Service and Facilities

Puget Sound Energy- is a power and natural gas utility serving King and four other Counties. Puget Sound Energy purchases gas from other regions and manages the distribution of natural gas to customers within its service area. This involves pressure regulation and the development and maintenance of distribution lines.

(This may need updating) Natural gas is currently supplied to most areas within the City of Shoreline through 136 miles of natural gas mains. Gas flows through the system under high pressure in the main located along 5th Avenue NE and along Fremont Avenue North from North 185th Street down to North 155th Street over to Dayton Avenue North, then down Dayton Avenue North to North 150th Street, over to Fremont Avenue North, down to North 145th Street.

Comment [sc3]: Maybe we can replace this paragraph with a map.

As of December 2011, Puget Sound Energy serves approximately 10,344 customers in the City of Shoreline. (update)

Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) does not define natural gas as an essential service. Therefore, Puget Sound Energy is not required to provide services.

Planned Natural Gas Services and Facilities

Extension of service is based on individual requests and the results of a market analysis to determine if revenues from an extension will offset the cost of construction. Overall, Puget Sound Energy does not foresee any problems that would limit the supply of natural gas to the City of Shoreline in the future. (update)

Telecommunications

Comment [sc4]: Perhaps add discussion about how telecom, internet and cable are interconnected

Existing Telephone Services and Facilities (update)

Local telephone service in Shoreline is provided by ~~QwestCenturyLink east of Meridian Avenue N and South of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way, and by on the east side, VerizonFrontier west of Meridian Avenue N and North of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way on the west side, and Electric Lightwave(?) which is franchised to serve in areas throughout Shoreline. The City has a franchise agreement with Electric Lightwave through June 2006. The City does not have franchise agreements yet with QwestCenturyLink or VerizonFrontier for local telephone service.~~

Comment [tj5]: Who? Don't think we have a franchise with them any more.

QwestCenturyLink and VerizonFrontier collectively provide telephone service to about 15,000 customers in the City of Shoreline. Of these 15,000 customers, 12,000 are residential and 3,000 are commercial. QwestCenturyLink and VerizonFrontier do not provide estimates of local capacity due to the proprietary nature of this information.

Future Telephone Services and Facilities

Washington Utilities Trade Commission (WUTC) regulations require QwestCenturyLink and VerizonFrontier to provide adequate telecommunications service on demand, and Section 480-120-086 of the Washington Administrative Code requires QwestCenturyLink and VerizonFrontier to maintain adequate personnel and equipment to handle any reasonable demand and traffic. New technology such as multiplexing and digital transmission, cellular and fiber optic technologies are allowing dramatic advances in communication. Because QwestCenturyLink and VerizonFrontier provide service on demand, there are no limits to future capacity.

Existing Cable Television Service

Land-line Cable Television service is provided in the City of Shoreline by Comcast and Frontier. The City maintains franchise agreements with Comcast and Frontier for use of the City's rights-of-way to maintain and operate their cable network. The City of Shoreline is also served by two satellite Cable Television providers – Dish Network and Direct TV.

Comcast serves the entire Shoreline area except for a one-quarter square mile area in the northeast quadrant. This area is comprised of Holyrood Cemetery and the Ballinger Commons apartment complex. Ballinger Commons management provides television services for its residents by satellite dish. (update)Frontier serves the same area as their telephone network - west of Meridian Avenue N and North of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way.

Comment [j6]: I do not know if this is accurate. I would need to contact Comcast and Ballinger Commons. I think that this has probably been updated.

Future Cable Television Services and Facilities (update)

The demand for cable television is likely to continue to increase as population grows. At the same time, new technology will allow cable companies to provide more channel options to their customers. Most areas in Shoreline are served by cable television currently, but some new development may strain existing cable facilities.

Comment [j7]: This probably needs to be updated. Future needs will rely more on the fiber optic network providing all communication services – voice, data and cable TV. Thus having a separate section for future cable needs is already a little outdated. The same issue could be brought up regarding future telephone service. Many new telephone subscribers are using digital voice (VOIP), rather than traditional copper-wire telephone. Thus, you may want to reconfigure this for "Future telecom"

Fiber Optic Facilities (update)

The City maintains franchise agreements with Electric Lightwave and AboveNet Communications for their fiber optic data networks in Shoreline. These franchise agreements expire on July 24, 2026 and September 9, 2021 respectively.

The City maintains a 10 year franchise agreement with US Crossing Inc., which operates a fiber optic network (Ord. 207, July 26, 1999).

Comment [j8]: The city did enter into a franchise with us crossing back in 1999, but it was never signed. However, during the Aurora project, Jon Vicente has stated that "Level 3 Communications" does have fiber in the ROW as a pass through; this is the same fiber as US Crossing. It is currently on my work plan to look into this and get Level 3 franchised if in fact they do have fiber in the ROW. However, we currently do not have a franchise with them.

Other Telecommunications –data, internet etc.

Water/Sewer Utilities

Surface Water Utility

Utility Issues

Equitable Funding (do we want to retain this section?)

Comment [tj9]: This is a big issue. Discussion and/or direction needed.

Most utility services are financed by rates, which the customers pay directly to the providers. In some cases, taxes are used to support services provided by public entities. For example, Seattle City Light provides electricity to the community. Utility taxes are collected by the City of Seattle for these services; however, Seattle’s utility tax revenues go into Seattle’s general fund and do not directly support the operation of the utility. The utility taxes Shoreline residents pay to Seattle Public Utilities do not directly help maintain infrastructure and provide service within Shoreline. (update, in addition we should note the discussion about taking over SPU)

In some situations, such as cable service, utility rates paid by customers to different providers for similar service is significantly different. These rate differentials may be the result of different capital improvement programs or administrative systems.

Environmental Impacts from Utility Improvements

When utility facilities are renovated, expanded or created they have an impact on the community. One example of a utility project that could impact a community is the addition of transmission towers. Such infrastructure can have aesthetic impacts on neighborhoods, and a community must consider how it should address and mitigate such facilities.

Opportunities for Cooperation

The utilization of multiple providers to serve the utility and capital facility needs of the community raises a number of issues about coordination with the City and among service providers. Trenching activities can often be consolidated through coordination, reducing the cost and impact of these activities. In some cases, cooperative use of utility facilities can benefit the community. The use of the City Light right-of-way for a trail facility is an example of a potential beneficial cooperative arrangement.

Adequacy of Service

The community has a legitimate interest in not only that utility services are available, but also in the quality of those services and the opportunities for enhancing those services to the community. These concerns range may include the unavailability of natural gas service, and the quality of service for cable television, and telephone and cellular telephone service.

The City may face difficulties in ensuring adequate services and facilities from providers the City does not directly control. This issue can be addressed through contracts or interlocal agreements with individual agencies for services, or through the decision to have the City provide the service directly. Lack of infrastructure needed to provide these services may result in permitting delays or moratoriums if services are required for concurrency.

In order to ensure that the community receives service at the desired levels of service, the City may need to consider changes to its service contracts, interlocal agreements, or possibly expand City services in order to serve existing and planned growth at desired levels and meet concurrency requirements.

Non-City Managed Capital Facilities Plans

For capital facility plans from service providers other than the City of Shoreline, the reader is referred to the current comprehensive and/or capital facility plans of the responsible agencies.

General Facilities

Historical Museum, Shoreline Center
Shoreline School District

Libraries
King County Library District

Postal Buildings
U.S. Postal Service

Public Housing
King County Housing Authority

Human Services
Washington Department of Health
Washington State Department of
Social and Health Services
(DSHS)

Public Safety
Fire Department No. 4
King County Corrections
King County District Court
Washington State Patrol

Public Schools
Shoreline School District

Community College
Shoreline Community College

Transportation
Metro/ King County
Community Transit
Sound Transit
Washington State Department of
Transportation

Land Reserves
Washington Department of Natural
Resources

Non-City Managed Facilities and Utilities

Water
Seattle Public Utilities Water Division
Shoreline Water District

Wastewater
Highlands Sewer District
Ronald Wastewater District

Solid Waste
King County Solid Waste Division
Rabanco
Waste Management
NorthwestCleanScapes

Electricity
Seattle City Light

Natural Gas
Puget Sound Energy

Telecommunications and Cable
AT&T
Comcast
Electric Lightwave
AboveNet Communications
VerizonFrontier
Qwest CommunicationsCenturyLink

Comment [sc12]: update

Comment [sc13]: update

Comment [sc10]: Are these two separate agencies/

Comment [sc11]: update

Comment [sc14]: update

This page intentionally blank

Utilities Element Supporting Analysis

Background and Context

The Utilities Element is based on estimates of existing and future demand for utility service. Where possible, current utility consumption trends are used to indicate likely future consumption. Some utilities, such as cellular telephone, are rapidly growing with changing technologies. Consequently, future demand is difficult to predict. In other instances, where utility providers are private corporations, specific information on utility consumption and demand are considered to be proprietary and are therefore not disclosed.

The Utilities Element gauges the ability of existing and planned utility facilities to meet future demand. Generally, the current provision of utility services and the ability to meet future population demand in Shoreline are not hindered by any serious constraints.

The Supporting Analysis section presents basic information regarding the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including electrical, natural gas, telephone, and cable (water, wastewater, and surface utilities water are discussed in the Capital Facilities Element). Further information is available from individual utilities or in the planning documents of the various service districts.

The City of Shoreline does not own or manage most of its public utilities. The only City-owned utility is the City's Surface Water Utility, which is addressed in the Capital Facilities element. Utilities addressed here and in the Capital Facilities Element have a broad impact on the future of the community. In many cases, utilities are needed to meet the basic needs of daily living and ensure health and safety. Utilities can also significantly enhance the quality of life in the community.

When considering the future provision of utility services, a number of issues must be considered: legal requirements; aesthetic and environmental impacts; governance; costs and revenues. In order to address these issues, the community (through its utility providers) must identify the type and quality of utilities needed to serve local residents and determine how these services can best be provided. As a part of this discussion, the community must consider the aesthetic and environmental impacts of new services on the community as well as issues of governance, costs and revenues.

Existing Conditions

The City maintains a number of franchise agreements between utility providers and the City allowing for the existence of support facilities (e.g., cable, electrical wire, natural gas pipe) within the City's right-of-way (streets). Non-City-managed utility services are controlled by franchise agreements between the utilities and the City of Shoreline.

The status of the franchise agreements is noted in the listing of current providers.

Electrical Service

Electrical service is provided within the City of Shoreline by Seattle City Light. The City has a non-exclusive franchise agreement with Seattle City Light through January 31, 2014 (Ordinance #187).

Natural Gas Service

Puget Sound Energy provides natural gas service to the residents of the City of Shoreline. The City maintains a franchise agreement (Ordinance #308) with Puget Sound Energy through October 31, 2017.

Existing Natural Gas Service and Facilities

Puget Sound Energy is a power and natural gas utility serving King and four other Counties. Puget Sound Energy purchases gas from other regions and manages the distribution of natural gas to customers within its service area. This involves pressure regulation and the development and maintenance of distribution lines.

Natural gas is currently supplied to most areas within the City of Shoreline through 136 miles of natural gas mains. Gas flows through the system under high pressure in the main located along 5th Avenue NE and along Fremont Avenue North from North 185th Street down to North 155th Street over to Dayton Avenue North, then down Dayton Avenue North to North 150th Street, over to Fremont Avenue North, down to North 145th Street.

As of December 2011, Puget Sound Energy serves approximately 10,344 customers in the City of Shoreline. Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) does not define natural gas as an essential service. Therefore, Puget Sound Energy is not required to provide services.

Planned Natural Gas Services and Facilities

Extension of service is based on individual requests and the results of a market analysis to determine if revenues from an extension will offset the cost of construction. Overall, Puget Sound Energy does not foresee any problems that would limit the supply of natural gas to the City of Shoreline in the future.

Telecommunications

Existing Telephone Services and Facilities

Local telephone service in Shoreline is provided by CenturyLink east of Meridian Avenue N and South of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way, and by Frontier west of Meridian Avenue N and North of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way. The City does not have franchise agreements with CenturyLink or Frontier for local telephone service.

CenturyLink and Frontier collectively provide telephone service to about 15,000 customers in the City of Shoreline. Of these 15,000 customers, 12,000 are residential and 3,000 are commercial. CenturyLink and Frontier do not provide estimates of local capacity due to the proprietary nature of this information.

Future Telephone Services and Facilities

Washington Utilities Trade Commission (WUTC) regulations require CenturyLink and Frontier to provide adequate telecommunications service on demand, and Section 480-120-086 of the Washington Administrative Code requires CenturyLink and Frontier to maintain adequate personnel and equipment to handle any reasonable demand and traffic. New technology such as multiplexing and digital transmission, cellular and fiber optic technologies are allowing dramatic advances in communication. Because CenturyLink and Frontier provide service on demand, there are no limits to future capacity.

Existing Cable Television Service

Land-line Cable Television service is provided in the City of Shoreline by Comcast and Frontier. The City maintains franchise agreements with Comcast and Frontier for use of the City's rights-of-way to maintain and operate their cable network. The City of Shoreline is also served by two satellite Cable Television providers – Dish Network and Direct TV.

Comcast serves the entire Shoreline area except for a one-quarter square mile area in the northeast quadrant. This area is comprised of Holyrood Cemetery and the Ballinger Commons apartment complex. Ballinger Commons management provides television services for its residents by satellite dish. Frontier serves the same area as their telephone network - west of Meridian Avenue N and North of N 160 Street/NW Innis Arden Way.

Future Cable Television Services and Facilities

The demand for cable television is likely to continue to increase as population grows. At the same time, new technology will allow cable companies to provide more channel options to their customers. Most areas in Shoreline are served by cable television currently, but some new development may strain existing cable facilities.

Fiber Optic Facilities

The City maintains franchise agreements with Electric Lightwave and AboveNet Communications for their fiber optic data networks in Shoreline. These franchise agreements expire on July 24, 2026 and September 9, 2021 respectively.

Other Telecommunications –data, internet etc.

Water/Sewer Utilities

Surface Water Utility

Utility Issues

Equitable Funding

Most utility services are financed by rates, which the customers pay directly to the providers. In some cases, taxes are used to support services provided by public entities. For example, Seattle City Light provides electricity to the community. Utility taxes are collected by the City of Seattle for these services; however, Seattle's utility tax revenues go into Seattle's general fund and do not directly support the operation of the utility. The utility taxes Shoreline residents pay to Seattle Public Utilities do not directly help maintain infrastructure and provide service within Shoreline. (update, in addition we should note the discussion about taking over SPU)

In some situations, such as cable service, utility rates paid by customers to different providers for similar service is significantly different. These rate differentials may be the result of different capital improvement programs or administrative systems.

Environmental Impacts from Utility Improvements

When utility facilities are renovated, expanded or created they have an impact on the community. One example of a utility project that could impact a community is the addition of transmission towers. Such infrastructure can have aesthetic impacts on neighborhoods, and a community must consider how it should address and mitigate such facilities.

Opportunities for Cooperation

The utilization of multiple providers to serve the utility and capital facility needs of the community raises a number of issues about coordination with the City and among service providers. Trenching activities can often be consolidated through coordination, reducing the cost and impact of these activities. In some cases, cooperative use of utility facilities can benefit the community. The use of the City Light right-of-way for a trail facility is an example of a potential beneficial cooperative arrangement.

Adequacy of Service

The community has a legitimate interest in not only that utility services are available, but also in the quality of those services and the opportunities for enhancing those services to the community. These concerns range may include the unavailability of natural gas service, and the quality of service for cable television, and telephone and cellular telephone service.

The City may face difficulties in ensuring adequate services and facilities from providers the City does not directly control. This issue can be addressed through contracts or interlocal agreements with individual agencies for services, or through the decision to have the City provide the service directly. Lack of infrastructure needed to provide these services may result in permitting delays or moratoriums if services are required for concurrency.

In order to ensure that the community receives service at the desired levels of service, the City may need to consider changes to its service contracts, interlocal agreements, or possibly expand City services in order to serve existing and planned growth at desired levels and meet concurrency requirements.

Non-City Managed Capital Facilities Plans

For capital facility plans from service providers other than the City of Shoreline, the reader is referred to the current comprehensive and/or capital facility plans of the responsible agencies.

General Facilities

Historical Museum, Shoreline Center
Shoreline School District

Libraries

King County Library District

Postal Buildings

U.S. Postal Service

Public Housing

King County Housing Authority

Human Services

Washington Department of Health
Washington State Department of
Social and Health Services (DSHS)

Public Safety

Fire Department No. 4
King County Corrections
King County District Court
Washington State Patrol

Public Schools

Shoreline School District

Community College

Shoreline Community College

Transportation

Metro/ King County
Community Transit
Sound Transit
Washington State Department of
Transportation

Land Reserves

Washington Department of Natural
Resources

Non-City Managed Facilities and Utilities

Water

Seattle Public Utilities Water Division
Shoreline Water District

Wastewater

Highlands Sewer District
Ronald Wastewater District

Solid Waste

King County Solid Waste Division
CleanScapes

Electricity

Seattle City Light

Natural Gas

Puget Sound Energy

Telecommunications and Cable

Comcast
Electric Lightwave
AboveNet Communications
Frontier
CenturyLink