

## **AGENDA**

## SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP DINNER MEETING

Monday, February 25, 2019 5:45 p.m.

Conference Room 303 · Shoreline City Hall 17500 Midvale Avenue North

## MEETING WITH KING COUNTY COUNCILMEMBER ROD DEMBOWSKI

1. CALL TO ORDER

5:45 p.m.

## 2. DICUSSION WITH KING COUNTY COUNCILMEMBER DEMBOWSKI

- Homelessness and Affordable Housing
- County and Local Levies/Bond Measures
- Transportation Issues and Partnership Opportunities on the NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor
- Underutilized Land at the Fircrest Campus
- RADAR Update

## 3. ADJOURNMENT

6:45 p.m.

The Council meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2231 in advance for more information. For TTY service, call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas, call 801-2230 or see the web page at <a href="https://www.shorelinewa.gov">www.shorelinewa.gov</a>. Council meetings are shown on Comcast Cable Services Channel 21 and Verizon Cable Services Channel 37 on Tuesdays at 12 noon and 8 p.m., and Wednesday through Sunday at 6 a.m., 12 noon and 8 p.m. Online Council meetings can also be viewed on the City's Web site at <a href="https://www.shorelinewa.gov/government/council-meetings">https://www.shorelinewa.gov/government/council-meetings</a>.



## Memorandum

**DATE:** February 11, 2019

**TO:** Shoreline City Council

**FROM:** Jim Hammond, Intergovernmental/CMO Program Manager

**RE:** Dinner Meeting with King County Councilmember Rod Dembowski

**CC:** Debbie Tarry, City Manager

John Norris, Assistant City Manager

King County Councilmember Rod Dembowski and staff will attend the February 25, 2019 Dinner Meeting with the City Council. Staff has worked with Councilmember Dembowski's office to put together an agenda for the meeting. While Councilmember Dembowski and his staff regularly check-in with the City informally, the Council hosts a Dinner Meeting with him at least on an annual basis to have an opportunity to all meet together and discuss issues that affect both Shoreline and King County.

The County is working on a number of planning processes, initiatives and implementation of existing programs presently, including a range of efforts around homelessness and affordable housing in Shoreline and across north King County; partnering on transportation issues related to the NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street corridor; and two significant county-wide levies. Councilmember Dembowski is interested in the latest on the RADAR program. Additionally, both the County and Shoreline share a keen interest in efforts by multiple State agencies to explore options for the underutilized portion of the Fircrest campus.

This memo provides a brief synopsis of these topics and some questions and/or discussion items for Council to consider which may generate discussion. As always, the questions and discussion points are suggestions for Council consideration. In addition, Councilmember Dembowski may want to share other items with Council at the conclusion of the above discussion items.

#### **Homelessness and Affordable Housing**

Both the City and the County have been active in this area since the last time Councilmember Dembowski visited in May 2018. Numerous studies, such as the

Regional Affordable Housing Task Force, have shown that there exists a gap between need and availability of housing for a wide range of income levels, from below the poverty line to levels approaching the area's median income but still below affordable levels in this region's housing market. The most recent report, from Challenge Seattle, highlighted the need for workforce housing affordable to working families. Meanwhile, homelessness has increased in visibility on the streets while jurisdictions continue to devote additional resources to addressing this issue. King County, the City of Seattle, and other stakeholders, including the Sound Cities Association, are also in the midst of reviewing how homelessness services and resources are structured in the region.

In response to these challenges, the King County Council has made significant investments for the coming biennium, adding \$8 million in funding for affordable housing in north King County, intended for workforce housing sited within ½ mile of a transit station. The County is also directing funding to establish support for north King County cities related to developing housing policies, strategies, programs, and development regulations, as well as coordinating financial support to groups creating affordable housing for low and moderate-income households. This strategy is modeled on ARCH, which provides such services in east King County.

In Shoreline, the City Council has directed staff to look more closely at local homelessness and opioid addiction challenges, identify gaps and frame the discussion for ways that the City can augment its support for addressing these issues. A report to Council will be delivered at the Council's Business Meeting following tonight's Dinner Meeting.

In Olympia, there is a great deal of activity around these issues, including at Fircrest (see below), centered around increasing the supply of affordable housing at all income levels. There are also proposals that would limit the ability of local jurisdictions to enforce certain local laws and regulations with respect to homeless individuals.

The track record of collaboration between the City and the County has been strong. Since the last Dinner Meeting with Councilmember Dembowski, the two jurisdictions launched the process to site and build 100 units of supportive housing at Aurora Avenue and 198<sup>th</sup> Street that's affordable to the region's most vulnerable citizens. The King County Department of Community and Human Services identified a strong team, including Community Psychiatric Clinic and Catholic Housing Services, to build, own and operate the supportive housing project. These team members have introduced the project to the community and initiated the planning and permitting phases of the project.

## **Discussion Questions:**

- 1. As the City looks at challenges in its city related to housing and homelessness, are there specific ideas, examples, or models to consider?
- 2. Does the County have a specific vision for an ARCH-like entity in north King County?
- 3. Are there issues in the Legislature on which the City and County can work together?

4. Are there County or other initiatives that the City can support, in addition to working together at the Legislature?

## **County and Local Levies/Bond Measures:**

## EMS Services and King County Parks and Shoreline's Parks and Open Space Bond

The current King County Parks Levy generates an estimated \$66 million per year from 2014 through 2019 through a CPI-indexed property tax levy lid lift of 18.77 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value – an estimated \$90 per year for the owner of a home valued at \$480,000. It replaced two parks levies, the King County Parks Levy and the Open Space and Trails Levy, which expired at the end of 2013.

The King County Executive is in the process of developing a proposal for a 6-year renewal of the parks levy, planned for the August 2019 election. The Executive is expected to propose a levy rate somewhere between 16 and 19 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value – an estimated \$80 - \$95 per year for the owner of a home valued at \$500,000. The Executive's proposal is expected to include increases in pass through dollars for use by cities and major investments in open space acquisition. The County Council must take action to place the measure on the ballot by the end of April.

Councilmember Dembowski has expressed interest in setting aside 1 to 1.5 cents of the levy rate for use by cities, school districts, park districts or other entities building or operating public pools. The funds would be made available in evenly divided regional buckets (north, south, east and existing) to support capital costs and funds would not be available for ongoing operations or regular maintenance. Existing public pools, like those built through Forward Thrust, in need of major renovation would be eligible to receive money through the "existing" funding bucket.

Medic One/Emergency Medical Services (EMS) serves more than two million people in Seattle and King County and provides life-saving services on average every three minutes. Compared to other communities, cardiac arrest victims are 2 to 3 times more likely to survive in Seattle & King County. The Medic One/EMS system is primarily funded by a countywide, voter approved EMS levy which will expire in December 31, 2019. An extensive planning process is underway to collaboratively develop a Strategic Plan and financing plan for King County voters to renew in November 2019. The current levy rate is 33.5 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value and generates nearly \$200M a year.

Locally, Shoreline is considering whether to ask its residents to support a bond measure that would fund investment in important community priorities, including priority park improvements and the construction of a Community and Aquatics Center. Publicly operated community centers serve as an affordable place for people to exercise, pursue athletic and artistic passions, engage with others from the community with similar interests, and spend time with their family and friends. They are places where people of all ages can gather to enrich their bodies and minds, as well as foster feelings of community and civic pride.

The City Council selected a site for a potential future Community and Aquatics Center at 17828 Midvale Avenue N following a public review process. The site is centrally located, along the interurban trail, with good pedestrian, bike and transit access. This location also provides an opportunity for Shoreline to create a civic center in conjunction with the Park at Town Center across the street and Shoreline City Hall one block away. Although this is the case, the City is still evaluating if there are other locations that would meet the City's vision while reducing the overall cost of the project. The new Center will provide for both competitive and recreational swimming in addition to serving as a community meeting space and opportunities for low-cost, publicly accessible recreation programs for residents of the Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell, north Seattle and south Snohomish County.

## **Discussion Questions:**

- 1. Has the County made a final determination on the timing of when these levies will be placed on the ballot?
- 2. Since both the County and City look to ask voters to approve funding related to parks and recreation, how do you see them fitting together?

# <u>Transportation Issues and Partnership Opportunities on the NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor</u>

The NE 145<sup>th</sup> Corridor remains a critical local and regional transportation priority, a rare east/west corridor in north King County. On the eastern end, from Bothell Way to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, significant street improvements are being planned by Sound Transit to support its development of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line connecting the communities of Woodinville, Bothell, Kenmore, Lake Forest Park, and Shoreline to Sound Transit's Shoreline South/145<sup>th</sup> light rail station. These improvements will also benefit Metro service along 145<sup>th</sup>Street, provide needed improvements to non-motorized transportation and, ideally, support general purpose traffic operations, too.

At the I-5 Interchange at NE 145<sup>th</sup>Street, the City has been working hard to develop a partnership with key stakeholders as it continues to advance design for interchange improvements that will not only address growing traffic woes, but also enhance both transit and non-motorized access to the light rail station. Key partners include, Sound Transit, King County Metro, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle. A great deal of technical collaboration has taken place and continues to evolve, and discussions among jurisdictions moves forward, too. However, regional partners to date have not committed funding to this project, leaving its future uncertain. The City continues to pursue avenues for partnership and full funding on a timeline that would allow for completion of the project prior to the opening of Lynnwood Link.

To the west of the I-5 Interchange, extending to Aurora Avenue, the City continues to advance its planning and design for the corridor. Improvement of this portion of the corridor will be of great interest to Metro, which projects significant ridership and service frequency. With the use of State Connecting Washington dollars, some portion of this corridor will see improvements, which will also enhance the development of the new

urban community that is coming into existence as a result of the City's decision to upzone the neighborhood around the light rail station.

### **Discussion Questions:**

- 1. What do you see as the key next steps for building partnerships in this corridor?
- 2. What do you see as some of the most significant challenges being faced here?
- 3. What opportunities exist to build collaboration and secure regional support for this important east/west corridor?

#### **Update on the RADAR program**

Councilmember Dembowski provided invaluable assistance to the City of Shoreline, securing \$100,000 in Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) funding for a pilot successful Response, Awareness, De-escalation and Referral ("RADAR") Program and Mental Health Navigator program. This funding has been continued into this biennium. A \$780,000 dedicated allocation from the MIDD sales tax to fund these programs on an ongoing basis in Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Kirkland. This innovative partnership with law enforcement helps de-escalate potential conflicts and provides critical resources to first responders dealing with those experiencing behavioral health crises.

## **Discussion questions**:

- 1. What is the current status of these programs?
- 2. How do you see these programs evolving in the coming months/years?

#### **Underutilized Land at the Fircrest Campus**

After decades of minimal change within the Fircrest campus, strong interest has come from several different parts of the State to address underutilized property. The Department of Social and Health Services (DHSH), which operates the Fircrest Residential Habilitation Center (RHC), is considering submitting a Master Development Plan (MDP) for review of the Fircrest Campus. Given that RHC operations have changed and contracted over the years, the footprint for the MDP appears to be smaller than the entirety of the current Fircrest Campus.

In the same timeframe, Washington State House Speaker Frank Chopp has expressed interest in making some portion of the underutilized area of the Fircrest Campus, that area not included in the MDP, along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE available for the development of affordable housing. This proposal exists independently of the RHC, its operations and its planning process. Finally, Governor Jay Inslee has made it a priority to improve the State's delivery of behavioral health services, and the Fircrest campus has been identified as one of many State properties under consideration as a home for a Behavioral Health Facility, for civilly (not criminally) committed individuals who would currently reside at Western State Hospital.

The City Council has directed staff to learn more about State ideas and proposals regarding the underutilized property. The State (Legislature and Agencies) needs to

determine the amount of underutilized land, subdivide this from the Fircrest Campus, and determine the land uses for the subdivided property.

The County has budgeted \$500,000 for planning around the Fircrest campus. It is City staff's understanding that approximately \$250,000 was intended for pre-planning work that may be required to determine land use and zoning of the subdivided property. As plans evolve and take more definite shape, this type of planning will prove extremely valuable.

## **Discussion Questions:**

- 1. What do you see as the most important opportunities for the State, County and State to partner on utilization of any subdivided property?
- 2. Do you have a recommendation on how the \$250,000 in planning funds should be utilized?