

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING**

Monday, February 27, 2012
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline City Hall – Council Chamber
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Eggen, Councilmember Hall, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Winstead, Councilmember Salomon, and Councilmember Roberts

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor McGlashan, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor McGlashan led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmember Salomon, who arrived shortly thereafter.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Julie Underwood, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor McGlashan reported that he attended a meeting between the Regional Services subcommittee and the King County Emergency Medical Services Task Force concerning the levy renewal.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one wishing to provide public comment.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilmember Winstead, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember Roberts and unanimously carried, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

- (a) **Minutes of Business Meeting of January 23, 2012
Minutes of Special Meeting of February 6, 2012**

(b) **Approval of expenses and payroll as of February 16, 2012 in the amount of \$1,012,691.20 as specified in the following detail:**

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
1/22/12-2/4/12	2/10/2012	43777-43965	11463-11496	49443-49448	\$400,779.16
					\$400,779.16

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
2/6/2012	49323	49323	\$11,400.00
2/9/2012	49324	49347	\$351,603.40
2/9/2012	49348	49364	\$63,309.69
2/9/2012	49365	49367	\$745.95
2/9/2012	49368	49376	\$42,306.31
2/14/2012	49377	49378	\$115.00
2/16/2012	49379	49386	\$39,469.71
2/16/2012	49387	49412	\$70,012.77
2/16/2012	49413	49420	\$12,283.52
2/16/2012	49421	49442	\$20,665.69
			\$611,912.04

(c) **Adoption of Ordinance No. 629, Amending Shoreline Municipal Code n 3.01.010, Planning and Development Services Fees for Administrative Design Review**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND MOTIONS

- (a) Adoption of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Docket

Steve Szafran, Planner, provided a brief staff report and highlighted he presented this to the Council on February 6.

Deputy Mayor Eggen moved adoption of amendments 1, 2, 3, and 6 of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Docket. Councilmember McConnell seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Eggen discussed level of service C on Richmond Beach Road, noting that the community asked for that level due to a concern of safety, traffic volumes, and access. Mr. Szafran replied that it can be addressed when the 2012 Comprehensive Plan update occurs. He added that the capital facilities element addresses emergency services and the appropriate level for police, fire, etc. Councilmember McConnell stated that the best strategy to deal with Point Wells is to negotiate an agreement with Blue Square. However, she noted that the Council is open to looking at every option to keep the project manageable. Mayor McGlashan stated that level of service relates to how long a vehicle is delayed at an intersection, not how it affects a major incident.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt amendments 1, 2, 3, and 6 of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Docket, which carried 7-0.

9. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Discussion of Annexation of 145th Corridor

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, introduced Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner, who provided the staff report.

Ms. McIntire described the condition, features, and ownership of N. 145th Street. She said the road is under complex ownership shared between Seattle, King County, and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). At present, the southern half of the road belongs to Seattle and the northern half of the road is in unincorporated King County. Seattle and King County expressed interest in having Shoreline annex 145th Street. Ms. McIntire discussed the specifics of the street as it pertains to signals, street lights, pavement, sidewalks, utilities, and policing. She noted that WSDOT is responsible for overlaying the road. She pointed out that this corridor needs significant capital improvements, and there should be a multi-jurisdictional corridor study to identify changes with WSDOT, Seattle, Sound Transit, Metro Transit, and Shoreline. She touched on the annexation process, discussed the components of a possible agreement, and outlined the pros and cons.

Councilmember Hall asked for clarification of House Bill 1917, and Ms. McIntire replied that it is a corridor study for 145th Street. She said \$300,000 was allocated to WSDOT for the corridor study, and the scope of work focuses on identifying accessibility issues in sidewalks and other solutions. She said it is an extremely limited scope survey and involves existing conditions and volumes. Councilmember Hall noted that there is an on-ramp meter at 205th Street, but there isn't one on 145th Street so he asked if there was a way to estimate the number of trips that go straight through Shoreline on Meridian and other local roads. He suggested expanding I-5 to remove metering at 205th so local roads are freed up. Mr. Relph said he would pass that suggestion on to WSDOT staff.

Councilmember Salomon discussed the \$130,000 in extra General Fund allocations that the City would have to come up with. Mr. Relph responded that City staff has not addressed how the City would come up with the funds. Councilmember Roberts confirmed with Ms. McIntire that mitigation from Sound Transit may consist of sidewalk enhancements, signals, timing, and

capacity. However, they said they will not do any interchange improvements. Councilmember Roberts discussed snow plowing and wondered if the City would need to purchase more vehicles in order to ensure 145th Street is serviced as well as the other Shoreline streets. Mr. Relph replied that priorities may change, but he didn't foresee acquiring any new vehicles. Councilmember Roberts asked the timeline for a decision if the Council decided to annex 145th Street, and Mr. Relph estimated that consensus between all parties could be decided by this summer.

Councilmember McConnell pointed out that there are issues on 205th Street as well, including multiple ownership of infrastructure. Ms. McIntire added that 205th Street is also a county line. Councilmember McConnell wondered if ownership would justify the additional costs in the City's budget. Mr. Relph replied that that is what the City must determine, and the City has been very successful in obtaining grants.

Councilmember Winstead expressed concern about costs and asked if there were any other road projects having a higher priority in the City. She said she isn't supportive of this at this point.

Councilmember Salomon confirmed that grants are for capital improvement. However, he expressed concerns about the ongoing maintenance. Councilmember Winstead added that they would be matching grants and the City would still need to come up with the funds to match the grant amount.

Deputy Mayor Eggen said it would be very difficult to do any widening, but ADA improvements would be worthwhile. He stated that it is a designated emergency route if I-5 is not accessible and it is an important regional route. He added that there are some liability issues from a pending lawsuit concerning telephone poles in sidewalks, but felt the City should continue investigating this proposal. Councilmember Roberts concurred and said he hopes the City can negotiate with Seattle and have their assistance in financing this. He expressed concerns about the cost while also stating that something must be done to improve east-west and regional traffic flow.

Councilmember Hall concurred, adding that the cost of this is important, but the vision to have a higher level of service than King County or Seattle must be retained. He noted that the City would be applying that high level of service to a road. This route serves regional traffic and the only government agency that will step up is Shoreline, so we need to find more funding sources for it. He felt the City should move forward to determine how to address the funding issue.

Councilmember Salomon concurred with previous speakers and said this warrants further consideration. He asked the City Attorney to weigh in on liabilities associated with the road. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, noted that the lawsuit is about ADA access and there could be some kind of injunctive relief. He said he could try to locate the pleadings, but now it's just an assessment of deficiencies in the sidewalks. Mr. Relph informed the Council that another safety concern is the left turn movements at the intersections, which should be addressed in the WSDOT study.

Councilmember McConnell noted that she doesn't mind more investigation, but the City does not have the funding for this. She said she wants the City to hold other entities accountable.

Mayor McGlashan noted that this will always be a State highway and inquired if there has been increased traffic due to drivers avoiding the Highway 520 tolling. Mr. Relph replied that there has been an 11% increase on 145th Street and I-5 since the tolling started.

(b) Discussion of Sidewalk Prioritization Criteria

Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner, discussed the background, policy direction, and the prioritization process for pedestrian attractors and generators. She explained the project rankings, funding, and methodology options, which depend on the needs, available data, and technology or the desired level of detail. She described the general criteria that other cities utilize, noting that the City of Shoreline methodology is based primarily on arterials, attractors/generators, completion of the system, missing links, and the priorities within the neighborhood traffic action plans. Items that are absent from the City's list include equity evaluation, physical buffers, block length, and transit ridership. She stated that our methodology is less detailed than other jurisdictions. She noted that an alternative analysis to reevaluate the methodology would include developing a second screen for the high priority projects and identifying new or different criteria to rank existing projects. She noted the City staff recommends reconvening the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Hall said he appreciates the fact that the City came up with a simple methodology. He said Shoreline has lower revenue streams than the cities the methodology was compared to. He pointed out that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is an annual opportunity for the Council to consider the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and a good time to see what priority projects rise to the top of the list. He said he is more comfortable with what the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) has done in the past. However, he noted the bigger challenge is the funding.

Councilmember Roberts felt that the project list was good and well-prioritized, but felt that two of the criteria, accessing versus connecting, seem to be doing the same thing.

Deputy Mayor Eggen said he was most unhappy with the scoring system. He stated that the most important thing is pedestrian safety and this scoring system doesn't respond well to unsafe walkways. He suggested that "eliminating unsafe pedestrian pathways" should be the top priority. He urged the Council to look at this from a safety perspective. Councilmember Salomon concurred. Councilmember Hall concurred but felt the criteria addresses safety. He discussed specific projects and felt the list reflects the areas in Shoreline with the highest safety concerns. Deputy Mayor Eggen added that there is nothing in this item that discusses separation between pedestrians and the road. He added that the lack of a sidewalk does not mean an area is inherently unsafe.

Ms. Underwood suggested that an additional column measuring safety or separation could be added to the matrix. Mayor McGlashan noted that the measure of safety would have to be determined first, and Ms. McIntire agreed and gave some examples of what aspects could be considered. She noted that many of the accidents have occurred at crossings, where the size of a sidewalk would not have made a difference.

Councilmember Roberts suggested the Council not do more work on this. He commented on specific comments and concluded that determining separation criteria is difficult.

Councilmember Winstead said she appreciates the data and favored keeping the prioritization criteria as is. She said it may be a good idea for the Council and subcommittee to walk the highest priority projects and decide subjectively.

Councilmember McConnell concurred. She suggested that every year the Council review the projects and rankings instead of abandoning the work of the CAC. She agreed with the rankings.

Deputy Mayor Eggen added that limited funds make picking the right projects more important. He noted that the Council should respect the CAC work and it would be a good compromise to walk the routes. He endorsed Councilmember Winstead's idea to walk these routes as it lends itself to the City's Healthy City Strategy.

Mayor McGlashan asked how the safe school routes grant is awarded, to which Ms. McIntire responded that there are several criteria which are generated by the State. The criteria include the number of students who receive free and reduced lunch, the number of students who walk to school, etc. Mayor McGlashan spoke in favor of the proposed bridge at 192nd Avenue.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:11 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk