

January 19, 1999

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Tuesday, January 19, 1999
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Montgomery, Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, King,
Lee, and Ransom

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Deputy Mayor Montgomery, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Deputy Mayor Montgomery led the flag salute. Upon roll by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Mayor Jepsen.

Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Lee and unanimously carried, Mayor Jepsen was excused.

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

Robert Deis, City Manager, reported that Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager, had informed him that Aurora Avenue through Shoreline is on the list prepared by the Chambers of Commerce of King County of proposed projects for Referendum 49 funding. Mr. Deis also referred to a memo from Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, regarding vesting and quasi-judicial actions. Councilmember Lee asked for the RCW references on quasi-judicial actions.

4. **COUNCIL REPORTS**

Deputy Mayor Montgomery announced the selection of Officer Brent Naylor as Shoreline's first "Officer of the Year." Police Chief Sue Rahr described why Officer Naylor was selected and commended him for his outstanding service.

Councilmember King reported that Shoreline Owner's Manuals were distributed at the general meeting of the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) and received very positive responses. She also reported that she and Councilmember Gustafson will attend the "Near Shore" meeting on Thursday.

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom said he was appointed to the National League of Cities (NLC) Human Development/Human Services Committee. He reported on the partisan nature of the discussions at the last NLC meeting. He concluded by announcing that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee had its first meeting and elected Dwight Stevens as Chair and Patty Hale as Vice Chair.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Development Code Review and Revision Process

Mr. Stewart reviewed the staff report, noting the importance of the review and revision of the development code. He described the proposal for a Planning Academy, at which the citizens of Shoreline could express their values and beliefs about the land use code and the staff could share technical knowledge, as well as learn about these values. The Academy would not be a legislative body, but, rather, frame issues for debate.

Mr. Stewart described the structure of the Academy, the topics of its nine sessions, the proposed reporting process, and appointment procedures.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery noted that Mayor Jepsen had informed Councilmembers that he agreed with the concept of the Planning Academy but was concerned about the way the representation was organized. He felt it would be more appropriate to have each of the groups propose a list of appointments for Council review to ensure balance.

Responding to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Stewart explained that the intent of the Academy is to provide education to all interested parties, including staff. Staff and the community will learn from each other what set of land use regulations make sense for Shoreline. The hope would be that the individual members of the Academy would take the information back to their groups for discussion.

Mr. Deis emphasized that staff will develop the revised code but it is important that it reflect community values. The Planning Academy is a key citizen involvement project.

Responding to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Stewart said the meetings will be open to the public but public comment will not be taken. Individuals can contact Academy members to have their views discussed. Then when the public hearings occur, everyone will be encouraged to participate. Because time will be limited, the written worksheets are proposed to ensure that everyone's views are considered.

Councilmember Gustafson liked the concept but was somewhat concerned about the number of people involved. Responding to his question about how Academy members will continue their involvement at the conclusion of the sessions, Mr. Stewart said it is not anticipated that the group will continue to interact; however, individuals will have developed leadership through knowledge and will hopefully speak at public hearings.

DRAFT

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart described his experiences with other planning forums. He said this concept is really based on the police academy and the theories of John Freedman about how to meld personal knowledge (held by the community) and technical knowledge (held by the professionals). Mr. Stewart explained how the session evaluation worksheets will be used to determine community views on various issues and to develop alternatives.

Councilmember Lee said her concern was the end result of the project. Mr. Stewart said its two products will be the "proceedings" (worksheets) of the Academy and, indirectly, the development code. The Academy will not write the code, but it will help staff understand the issues.

Councilmember Lee said the end product is similar to the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committees (CPACs). She said the members of the Academy should represent the whole community and be very committed. She wanted to see a mission statement for the project with a clear product as an end result. Mr. Deis concurred with having a mission statement and attempting to be sure that Academy members are committed to the process.

Councilmember King supported the Academy concept, noting she and Councilmember Lee had attended the police academy. She asked how the Academy members will get feedback on their input, and Mr. Stewart said the staff recommendations will give a sense of what the opinions were at the Academy.

Councilmember King felt there will be many individuals willing to commit to the requirements, and Councilmember Gustafson liked the link to the neighborhood groups.

Councilmember Ransom had serious concerns about the Planning Academy:

- the Academy replaces CPACs and groups with wide community input with a much smaller group;
- no business groups are represented;
- of the 35 Academy members, only seven are picked by the Council; this could lead to recommendations that the Council does not support.

Mr. Stewart said staff wrestled with the appropriate mechanism to be sure that all stakeholders are represented. The City Manager's appointments were designed to be sure there is broad representation from all sides. He said how broad to make the public process is always debatable. However, the group will not propose anything that Council will need to endorse. Staff will propose the amendments, which will be tested at the Planning Commission with public hearings.

Mr. Deis said the appointments could be made by the City Council after seeing the recommendations of the Planning Commission and the Council of Neighborhoods. This would allow the Council to address questions of representation and allow all stakeholders to be represented.

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom felt Council should be able to appoint a larger portion of the Academy members. He also asked for clarification of the role of the Academy, Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Stewart said the Planning Commission's role will be discussed on Thursday evening, but Commissioners have already expressed strong support for the concept. It may be that some Planning Commissioners would like to serve on the Academy themselves, which he said is an option. If there is not Planning Commission participation, staff will bring forward updates to both the Commission and the Council. Ultimately, the Planning Commission and the Council have a legal role in updating the code. However, this is a legislative role, not a quasi-judicial one. Therefore, broad discretion is allowed for debate and discussion. He said a similar discussion will occur at the Council of Neighborhoods.

Councilmember Ransom thought it was inappropriate for Planning Commissioners to serve on the Academy when they will be reviewing what comes forward. Mr. Stewart said he would agree if the role of the Academy were voting on specific proposals. However, the role will be broader, in terms of moving ideas to the point of developing a consensus. So the Academy would benefit from the wisdom of the Commissioners, who have struggled with various land use policies over the past three years.

Councilmember Lee concurred with Councilmember Ransom because the Academy provides the opportunity for the community to let Commissioners and the Council know its values. She said she needs something very clear and concrete to allow her to recruit membership to the Academy. She also felt the Council should look at the appointments of the other groups first to see what groups are not represented.

Mr. Deis said staff can return next Monday with a mission statement of what the Academy will do and the parameters of the commitment to membership. He said the Council will be asked to do some of the recruitment in the community.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery supported involving more people in the process, even though it adds to the difficulty of getting consensus. She warned there is some potential for the proposed codes not to be in the future best interests of the entire City.

Mr. Deis felt that generally the individuals he has worked with in Shoreline have given good direction in the best interests of the community.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery confirmed Council consensus for staff to move forward.

(b) Discussion of Lead Status and Grant Application for Funding
regarding the Interurban Trail Project

Kirk McKinley, Transportation Manager, reviewed the staff report, which outlines the Transportation Enhancement Grant application for the Interurban Trail project and requests staff to pursue lead agency status for the project. He noted that because the

January 19, 1999

grant is so large, \$5.2 million, the City identified two parts of the proposal that could be taken out: the crossing of Aurora Avenue at 155th Street, and the section between 175th Street and 188th Street. He said staff of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has advised the City that the proposal is competitive. He outlined the decision points for the grant, which conclude with a final decision by the Legislature and Governor Locke in April. If the proposal is funded, the monies should be available in early 2000.

Continuing, Mr. McKinley said the application is based on King County's work on this project. The County conducted a very involved public process that resulted in a recommended corridor and projected costs. He hoped that Shoreline's design process would confirm what King County has already done. He noted that the feedback during Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan and Capital Improvement processes was supportive of the trail and that adoption of these plans in 1998, along with completion of the Seattle City Light franchise, were the major building blocks to allow the City to move forward.

Mr. McKinley emphasized that Shoreline and King County staffs are working together and that King County is supportive of Shoreline assuming lead agency status. This will require an amendment to the interlocal agreement with King County for the transfer of parks properties. He said Seattle City Light is also a partner in the implementation and has agreed to write a letter of support for the project. When Shoreline assumes lead status, the funding that King County has already received for the project will be transferred to Shoreline. The County has offered to bring together a committee of all those on the corridor, north Pierce County to Everett, to coordinate design and future grant applications. Mr. McKinley concluded that if Shoreline receives lead status, the next step would be to initiate the design process. A continuing step is to make sure this project is being coordinated with the Aurora project and kept on the "front burner" for economic development efforts.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery reported that Mayor Jepsen had emphasized that the Aurora Pre-Design work and the trail project must be coordinated and promote the City's economic development plan.

Councilmember Ransom pointed out that although the project is listed at \$12.5 million, \$6 million is the estimated value of the right-of-way, not a project cost. It will cost about \$6 million to create the trail and the City is looking for grant funding for more than 80 percent of that amount. Additionally, the County has \$400,000 for project design.

After Mr. McKinley explained potential funding that may be provided by King County, Councilmember Lee said she is still trying to confirm how economic development and the redevelopment of Aurora Avenue are integrated with this proposal. She did not want to see simply a walking/biking trail. She felt the public should be able to do a variety of things along the route of the trail, and she did not see anything in the project description to indicate this.

DRAFT

Mr. McKinley said some of the development project representatives that have talked with the City lately have indicated an interest in access to the trail because this is another corridor that can draw customers or add to the attractiveness of a facility.

Mr. Deis added that one of the keys for economic development along Aurora Avenue is to get people to stop and get out of their cars. He also noted the possibility of a community college technology center locating along Aurora Avenue, which would be a generator of bicycle use.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the width of the trail. Mr. McKinley said the Burke-Gilman Trail is usually 12-15 feet wide, which is what is proposed here. A soft-surface path may also be constructed.

Councilmember Gustafson asked to see the "Shoreline Interurban Trail Final Design Report." Mr. McKinley reiterated that the County has done a lot of the design work for the trail. The \$400,000 in County funding can be used for construction designs.

Responding again to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. McKinley said that Seattle City Light has the ability to lease parts of the right-of-way. Most of the leases, which are between Midvale Avenue and Aurora Avenue in the 185th Street area, are 30-day leases. Many properties have leases for parking, access, or storage. Some have leases with buildings actually in the right-of-way.

Councilmember Gustafson advised that as much research as possible should be done to look for funding. Mr. McKinley said staff will continue to seek all sources of funding. Mr. Deis added that this is a benefit of working with King County, because all staff expertise can be pooled. Councilmember Gustafson said Shoreline should develop a plan for promoting this project, including private and group donations.

Councilmember Ransom noted that most of the right-of-way is 100 feet wide. Noting the trail at Greenlake is 30 feet wide, he was concerned that saying the trail will be 10 - 15 feet wide will close off a desirable opportunity, particularly in terms of enhancing Aurora Avenue. Mr. McKinley said the 12-15 feet is the paved portion of the trail. This will occur within about 30 feet of space, so the planning is for the wider area.

Councilmember Hansen said his concern in this project is identifying the users of the trail and how they will use it. He said an overhead crossing of Aurora Avenue is provided around 155th Street but bicyclists will not be able to use this. He noted that even pedestrians do not like to climb the walk for an overhead crossing. He felt it made more sense to use an existing crossing at 160th Street. Councilmember Hansen said that more planning will be necessary to firm up the design.

Mr. McKinley said that one of the reasons the overhead crossing was identified as a pull-out was that the Aurora Pre-Design study is looking at opportunities for crossing Aurora Avenue. He agreed that pedestrians do not use bridges unless it is a link to where they want to go.

Councilmember Hansen also asked about connectivity with the Seattle and Snohomish County portions of the trail, as well as the Burke-Gilman Trail. Mr. McKinley said the description in the Comprehensive Plan for the connection with the Burke-Gilman Trail was not a trail but a bicycle-demand corridor, which would partly use the streets.

Responding to Councilmember King, Mr. McKinley said the County study identified two options for an aerial bridge at 155th Street. There was also an underground crossing at 175th Street, but this may be a long way away.

Councilmember Lee pointed out that the study did not envision Aurora Avenue as the "center" of Shoreline and the key to its economic development. Shoreline's goals could change parts of the study.

Referring to the PSRC, Councilmember Lee felt that perhaps Shoreline should designate a person to be active in the PSRC. She said it has funding to allocate, so it would be worthwhile for an elected official from Shoreline to be able to influence the PSRC. Mr. Deis said the conduit for membership on the PSRC board is through SCA.

Councilmember King said the way to get appointed by the SCA is to attend the PSRC meetings. If a person attends consistently, then the following year that person will probably be appointed.

Councilmember Lee commented on the difficulty of part-time Councilmembers attending meetings during the day. She needed to know indirect ways to assist Shoreline's agenda.

Councilmember King added that this is an advantage of having a separately-elected Mayor, who is free during the day to attend meetings.

Councilmember Gustafson concluded by thanking King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia for her efforts in carrying forward the Interurban Trail project, as well as Shoreline resident Patty Hale.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery confirmed Council support for the application process and directed staff to pursue lead agency status.

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Maggi Fimia, King County Councilmember, was happy that this project is moving forward again. She said King County would like to continue working on this, in the role of coordinating efforts between the jurisdictions and the Department of Transportation. She said the County would like to be involved in the design and public process. She emphasized that this is a regional trail and the grants should be approached interjurisdictionally. She also asked that King County be recognized in signage and materials.

January 19, 1999

DRAFT

(b) Patty Hale, 16528 8th Avenue NE, said the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee would like to look at the trail design. She noted that because there was no one at tonight's meeting to speak about the trail, the inference could be drawn that there is full public support for it.

Turning to the Planning Academy, Ms. Hale said the feedback forms should go back to the Academy members to provide accountability of staff reporting about the Academy. Ms. Hale also felt that Planning Commissioners should not be seated on the Academy.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:48 p.m., Deputy Mayor Montgomery declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, January 25, 1999
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Montgomery, Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, King, Lee and Ransom

ABSENT: None

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclamation of "Neighbor Appreciation Day"

Mayor Jepsen said he hoped Neighbor Appreciation Day, which is sponsored by the Council of Neighborhoods, would become a tradition in Shoreline. Its goal is to set aside a day to focus on the positive contributions individuals make in their neighborhoods.

Mayor Jepsen introduced Dick Nicholson and Joanne Hargrave of the Council of Neighborhoods. Noting that Shoreline is a City of distinct neighborhoods with a lot of civic pride, Mr. Nicholson gave examples of the neighborliness he has experienced in his neighborhood. Ms. Hargrave outlined some ways to observe Neighbor Appreciation Day. She distributed Neighbor Appreciation Day postcards, urging Council and the audience to use them to let people know that their neighborliness is appreciated.

Mayor Jepsen read the proclamation and urged citizens to participate in this event.

3. **REPORT OF CITY MANAGER**

Robert Deis, City Manager, distributed information on the Planning Academy. He encouraged Councilmembers to recruit members of the community to serve on the Academy.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Deis explained that the Academy sessions will be divided into two phases. The first will cut off around May or June. The

DRAFT

amendments to the development code which evolve from this phase will be acted upon by the Council by August. The more contentious issues will be discussed during the fall and completed in November or December.

Then, Mr. Deis informed the Council that the City's Interurban Trail grant application was not included in the list of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Enhancement Committee.

Kirk McKinley, Transportation Manager, described the projects recommended for funding by the PSRC. He said Shoreline's project was considered too large, despite the fact that staff had been urged to submit it in that form and include segments that could be pulled out. The other PSRC concern was that Shoreline was not far enough along on the final design. Mr. McKinley outlined future funding strategies, including working with King County to transfer the design funds to Shoreline, breaking the corridor into segments, aggressively pursuing all grant opportunities and building partnerships. He outlined other potential funding sources and said the City would resubmit an application for Transportation Enhancement Act funding in the fall.

Concluding, Mr. McKinley said the next steps for the Interurban Trail project are a regional meeting hosted by King County and held in Shoreline on February 3rd with other jurisdictions with trail segments, modification of the interlocal agreement with King County to make Shoreline the lead agency, and transfer of the design funds.

Councilmember Gustafson concurred with the importance of developing a strategy and building partnerships. He suggested including state and federal legislators in this effort.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. McKinley assured the Council that the County appears to be prepared to transfer the funding for the design phase of the project as soon as Shoreline is designated as lead agency.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(a) Janet Way, Paramount Park Neighborhood Group, presented the Council with a banner signed by all the children who attended the group's frog release last spring. Suggesting that a group of citizens and students do an assessment of Shoreline's habitat, she said that Matt Loper, of Shoreline Community College, is willing to take this on with the help of his students.

(b) Garry Horvitz, 19811 10th Place NW, spoke in support of the library in Richmond Beach Park. He felt the Environmental Impact Statement was complete, objective and unbiased and that it shows the park location has no unavoidable adverse impacts. Siting the library elsewhere would cause the expenditure of taxpayer dollars to purchase the site and at the same time remove developable property from the market and eliminate future tax revenues.

DRAFT

With regard to the library issue, Mr. Deis reported on his efforts to arrange a meeting with Council, the Library Board and the King County Library System staff on the proposed design for the library.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the agenda, moving Item 8(a) to the consent calendar. Deputy Mayor Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the agenda was approved as amended.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Deputy Mayor Montgomery moved approval of the consent calendar. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following items were approved:

Workshop minutes of January 4, 1999
Dinner Meeting minutes of January 11, 1999
Regular Meeting minutes of January 11, 1999

Approval of payroll and expenses as of January 15, 1999
in the amount of \$ 342,338.21

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute Consultant Agreements with OTAK and Reid Middleton, Inc. for Professional Engineering Services with work to be later assigned on each capital project

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary 1999 Interlocal Agreements with King County and the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health so the City may receive \$33,460 in grant funding to administer the City Optional Program (COP) for Special Recycling Events and the Business Recycling Program; and passage of Ordinance No. 189 amending Ordinance No. 184 by increasing the appropriation from the General Fund and authorizing expenditures for waste recycling programs

Ordinance No. 186 establishing a date for an election on the question of annexation to the City of Shoreline of an area contiguous to the City, commonly known as Annexation Area A-2

8. OTHER ACTION ITEMS: ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

DRAFT

- (a) Motion to approve the preliminary plat for the Paramount Ridge Subdivision, with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Conditions of the Report of the Planning Commission, as amended by the Recommendation of the Hearing Examiner

Mayor Jepsen asked if any Councilmembers have an interest in the property that is the subject of the hearing; if any Councilmembers stand to gain or lose financially as a result of the outcome of this action; and if any Councilmembers have engaged in communications outside the meeting with opponents or proponents of the matter to be discussed. Councilmembers indicated negative responses to all questions.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, highlighted the salient points of the record. He described the site plan, noting the average lot size for the nine lots is 6,600 square feet and that the application was completed before the adoption of the moratorium on lots of less than 7,200 square feet. He pointed out that the proposal is located within the Thornton Creek drainage basin and is in an erosion hazard area. The site is heavily wooded. Because a fire truck cannot access the properties due to the size of the road, the homes would be required to have sprinkling systems. The issue of stormwater drainage has not yet been resolved.

Referring to page 66 of the Council packet, Mr. Stewart reviewed the procedural history of the application, including the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) appeal of the Mitigated Determination of Non-significance. He referred to the conditions related to stormwater on page 63 of the packet. He emphasized that the SEPA appeal was heard and decided upon by the Hearing Examiner. The Council is hearing the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner on the appeal of the preliminary plat.

Mr. Stewart noted the number of public comments received. Most of them were based on environmental concerns: removal of trees and vegetation and the impact on neighborhood appearance, stormwater and erosion hazards; the capacity of the local stormwater drainage system; the stability of the soil; and the potential drainage of stormwater from Paramount Park play field onto the site.

Mr. Stewart reviewed the nine conditions recommended by staff and the Planning Commission as outlined on pages 52 and 53 of the Council packet. He emphasized that the preliminary plat is conditioned so that no vegetation is removed from the plat until: 1) the final plat has been obtained; 2) all construction plans have been reviewed by the City; and 3) a site development permit has been issued.

Mr. Stewart said many of the solutions to the stormwater problems appear to require that an easement be obtained from an abutting property owner. This easement has not yet been granted. Mr. Stewart concluded by noting the addition to condition #1 and the four supplemental conditions recommended by the Hearing Examiner, as found on page 57.

Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the preliminary plat for the Paramount Ridge Subdivision, with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Conditions of the

DRAFT

Report of the Planning Commission, as amended by the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen asked how the City can guarantee compliance with the supplemental conditions imposed by the Hearing Examiner after construction is complete. These conditions require an erosion control plan, vegetation management plan, vegetation restoration plan, and maintenance of vegetation in the 20-foot buffer. Mr. Stewart responded that developers must post a bond to assure performance during the development process. Once the application has been completed and the property transferred to individual property owners, they would be subject to the laws and conditions established within the covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) in the homeowners' agreement.

Mayor Jepsen said the CC&Rs would have to contain the buffer conditions. Mr. Stewart said it would be appropriate to address the long-term maintenance of the buffers within the vegetation management plan itself. Mayor Jepsen questioned whether the vegetation management plan has any standing after completion of the development. Mr. Stewart said the plans could include actions that would be required beyond the permitting phase.

Councilmember King had serious concerns about the plat, particularly about the storm drainage. She was concerned about building in an erosion hazard area. She noted the frog population was sure to be impacted. She did not feel that requiring sprinklers as a trade-off for the width of the road meets basic safety concerns. She also noted "mistreatment" of the neighborhood by a previous developer, whom she felt was not penalized severely enough.

Mr. Stewart said the storm drainage concerns are shared by the staff and the Hearing Examiner and are reflected in the conditions on the plat. He emphasized that if these conditions cannot be adequately resolved, the plat will go back to the Planning Commission for a new hearing. He said Council will have the opportunity to review the studies and make the final determination that the conditions have been met before voting on the final plat. He said this plat is different from previous ones because the preliminary plat approval will not entitle the developer to do vegetation removal or grading. The studies required prior to the final plat must be completed to the satisfaction of the City before the project can move forward.

Regarding the fire safety issue, Mr. Stewart said the Shoreline Fire Department has signed off on the plat given the upgrade of the water pipes and the sprinkling of the houses.

Mr. Stewart did not feel it would be appropriate to compare one developer to another. However, it is fair to consider code enforcement and how applicants who do not follow the code are dealt with. In this case, the City can prosecute violations of the permit.

Responding to Councilmember King, Bruce Disend, City Attorney, said that any violation of the code authorizes the City to bring a civil action with financial penalties

DRAFT

against the violator. If the violation would cause damage to others, even an injunction might be an appropriate remedy.

Councilmember King suggested a requirement that the storm water go through grassy swales to ensure that it is clean before it gets into Thornton Creek. She also wondered how much monitoring staff does of these conditions.

Mr. Stewart said erosion control is a significant issue in SEPA. Water quality issues are closely tied to the proposed stormwater management system. Staff is concerned about both stormwater quality and quantity and recognizes the importance of these two elements, particularly since this is an erosion hazard area.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery asked how the City evaluates the analyses and studies provided by the applicant. Mr. Stewart said staff in both the Development Services division and the Public Works department review the data for adequacy. If either department feels the study is inadequate, it is sent back for further revision. Occasionally a City will hire a third party outside reviewer. Deputy Mayor Montgomery felt this might be appropriate in cases of serious erosion and stormwater concerns.

Councilmember Lee pointed out that the condition requiring the buffer to remain as it is will be difficult to enforce. She felt the conditions should be more quantitative. Mr. Stewart said the critical decision on this project is whether the proposed stormwater management system is sufficient to meet the Council's concerns. This decision will be based on technical engineering results. He reminded Council that tonight the review is of the preliminary plat. Under Washington State law, the preliminary plat is a conceptual stage. The final plat stage is when very detailed engineering plans can be verified and tested. He said the record establishes concerns for water quality, downstream mitigation, vegetation, and erosion control. It provides a framework to evaluate the engineering detail as it comes forward. The additional Findings of Fact on page 56 recognize problems of drainage and flooding downstream.

Responding to Mr. Deis, Mr. Stewart said there are standards in place now that the applicant will be required to meet. Staff feels the conditions placed on the plat provide reasonable and sufficient grounds on which to base future determinations.

Mr. Deis referred to Condition #10, which gives the City leverage with respect to water quality and quantity. Mr. Stewart reviewed several requirements not enumerated in the staff report because they are already in the code. As the data comes forward, these regulations will be applied. This will be the basis for any additional requirements.

Councilmember King asked if legally the City can require the developer to conform to more stringent standards. Mr. Deis said if the data shows that there are additional problems, then the standards can be increased. However, this cannot be done until the engineering data is provided.

Daniel Bretzke, Planning and Development Services, said the pre-development state of the site is considered. On this site, all the water runs off, and it does so at a certain rate. He reviewed the amount of rain that falls in two-year, ten-year and hundred-year storms. The code requires that after development, the water does not run off any faster than in the pre-development stage. He said development will cause the rain to run off faster, so the goal is to create a system that matches the original flow. This is quantifiable and based on the codes.

Mr. Stewart added that staff does not wish to add a condition based on speculation of the unknown. Staff prefers to wait for the data to be presented and thoroughly analyzed.

Responding to Councilmember King's question about whether the City can "raise the bar" in terms of water flow, Mr. Stewart said these kinds of issues will be addressed during the review of the development code.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Stewart said the Hearing Examiner's Condition #10 is sufficient as written because the Council has the ability to make the decision on the final plat when it comes forward.

Councilmember Gustafson confirmed that the easement for lots 5 and 6 cannot be obtained without the neighbor's permission. Mr. Stewart noted there may be more than one location for the easement.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Disend said that ultimately the property owner is responsible for off-site impacts caused by development. The City is obligated to ensure that the standards adopted by Council are being carried out. If this is done, the liability shifts from the City to the developer.

Councilmember Gustafson commended the citizens who had been involved with the process and their articulateness in raising concerns and issues. He said this was reflected by the conditions imposed by the Planning Commission and the Hearing Examiner.

Councilmember Lee commented on previous Council discussions about private roads and depending upon homeowners' associations to provide upkeep for the common areas.

Mr. Disend said the City does not have policies or criteria regarding the appropriateness of private roads. He recommended that Council approach this issue in a systematic fashion and said staff could bring forward data and guidelines for whether it is always appropriate for the streets and sidewalks to be public. He said Council could require a developer to execute a "no protest agreement" for the establishment of a Local Improvement District (LID). However, this approach simply defers the issue and would require the City to take further action in the future.

Mayor Jepsen said that as long as the City allows private roads, there must be a mechanism to ensure that private roads are maintained to an acceptable standard. It

DRAFT

January 25, 1999

should be clearly stated that the private road option creates obligations for property owners.

After discussion of additional language that could be added to Condition #9 regarding an agreement not to protest formation of an LID in the event the private road fell into disrepair, Councilmember Hansen felt that Condition #9 already addresses this and that Council was getting into detail more appropriately handled at the final plat stage.

Mr. Deis said that he had just been informed by the City Engineer that all long plats as of a certain date have been required to be public. However, there are plats in the pipeline to which this requirement has not been applied.

Mayor Jepsen noted that Condition #9 requires that the duties and responsibilities for the maintenance and repair of the commonly owned facilities shall be set forth in the CC&Rs recorded with the King County Auditor. He said this provision addresses his concern.

Councilmember Ransom agreed with Councilmember Gustafson that the conditions have been well-thought out. He highlighted the comments of Professor David Kalman regarding the environment. He agreed with Council that drainage will be a major issue and that assurances must be provided that drainage will be controlled.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 7 - 0, and the preliminary plat for the Paramount Ridge Subdivision, with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Conditions of the report of the Planning Commission, as amended by the recommendation of the Hearing Examiner was approved.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: February 1, 1999

Agenda Item: 7(b)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of January 29 th , 1999
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Al Juarez, Financial Operations Supervisor 

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

It is necessary for the Council to approve expenses formally at the meeting. The following claims expenses have been reviewed by C. Robert Morseburg, Auditor on contract to review all payment vouchers.

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of \$1,215,978.29 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for December 27, 1998 through January 9, 1998 in the amount of \$230,251.94 paid with ADP checks 2414-2452, vouchers 20001-20092, benefit checks 70190-70195 and City of Shoreline Check 2869 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on January 15, 1998:

Expenses in the amount of \$739.30 paid on Expense Register dated 1-14-99 with the following claims checks: 9981, 9987-9999 and

Expenses in the amount of \$99,596.61 paid on Expense Register dated 1-15-99 with the following claims checks: 10000-10029 and

Expenses in the amount of \$239,019.83 paid on Expense Register dated 1-15-99 with the following claims checks: 10030-10049 and

Expenses in the amount of \$461,297.90 paid on Expense Register dated 1-15-99 with the following claims checks: 10050-10062 and

Expenses in the amount of \$9335.88 paid on Expense Register dated 1-15-99 with the following claims checks: 10063-10072 and

Expenses in the amount of \$175,736.83 paid on Expense Register dated 1-15-99 with the following claims checks: 9982-9986, 10073-10109.

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Phase II \$50,000 Health and Human Services General Fund Allocations
DEPARTMENT: Health and Human Services
PRESENTED BY: Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager *LB RM*
Rachael Markle, Grant Specialist

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The Office of Health and Human Services (HHS) presented the completed Health and Human Services Strategy for City of Shoreline: Maximizing Shoreline's Vested Interest in Its People and Communities document to Council in September of 1998. The Health and Human Services Strategies document denotes fifteen "Desired Outcomes" based on an assessment of Shoreline residents needs. Having identified needs and desired results as part of this study and upon previewing the overall General Fund support of HHS programs during your 1999 budget retreat, Council then approved an additional \$50,000 in the Office of Health and Human Services budget for the purpose of funding a competitive grant process to address these goals and work toward the "Desired Outcomes". This \$50,000 will be used to fund projects in 1999. Project awards will be made for only one year. Recipients are aware that receiving funds in 1999 in no way obligates the City to fund a project or applicant in subsequent years.

In order to make these funds available to human service providers for 1999 programs the application process was abbreviated. Council instructed staff to review applications that were previously submitted by agencies for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) public service funds that were not funded or reduced. Council also asked staff to solicit and review proposals from the Klub Kellogg and the Center for Human Services, both of which approached Council for funding of a variety of health and human service projects in 1998. The City's Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department Teen Program was also asked to submit applications for new programs due to the "Desired Outcomes" focus on youth services.

The premise for conducting a competitive health and human service funding process was to devise a method to select proposals that would most effectively and efficiently help Shoreline achieve the "Desired Outcomes" outlined in the Health and Human Services Strategy for City of Shoreline. Each applicant was required as part of the application to address how their specific proposal would aid Shoreline's residents in reaching the "Desired Outcomes". Staff also developed a temporary rating criteria sheet that placed an emphasis on the proposal's ability to feasibly address the "Desired Outcomes" (see attachment B). A new rating criteria system will be developed before the Year 2000 Application process is initiated. The new system will require additional analysis and trial.

The same Citizen Advisory Committee used to evaluate the 1999 CDBG applications, which consists of both community representatives and City staff, evaluated all of the applications submitted. The Committee used the rating criteria sheet (Attachment B), which attached numerical values to questions for the purpose of assessing the proposed project's ability to implement the Council approved Health and Human Services Strategy "Desired Outcomes", to rank each application.

The following chart lists all of the applicants. The Committee's recommendation to Council is to fund the projects denoted in bold type. The funding recommendation developed by the Citizen Advisory Committee is as follows:

City of Shoreline General Funds Grant Round			
New Applications			
Applicant	Brief Project Description	Funding Request	Funding Recommendation
Center for Human Services	Adult Substance Abuse Services & Family Counseling Support Services	\$29,000	\$16,000 Substance abuse/\$10,000 Family Counseling
City of Shoreline EarthWorks	Summer Environmental Employment Program for Teens	\$13,495	\$10,000
City of Shoreline Scholarships	Scholarships to low-income middle school youth for Outtahere Events	\$2,050	none
YMCA: Club Kellogg	After Middle school recreation/tutoring	\$10,000	\$10,000
City of Shoreline Choices Program	Recreation for adults w/ developmental disabilities	\$7,991	none
Lutheran Social Services	International Counseling Services	\$7,000	none
Pathways for Women YWCA	Emergency & transitional shelter for women and children	\$205	none
Emergency Feeding Program	6,711 Emergency meals	\$877	\$877
Multi Service Center of N/E King County	Emergency shelter to homeless families	\$1,038	\$1,038
Shoreline Healthy Start	Home based support for new young families	\$2,200	\$2,085
Center for Human Services	Anger Management	\$200	none
Shoreline/LFP Senior Center	Health Enhancement Program	\$1,700	none
TOTAL		\$75,756	\$50,000

It should be noted that the proposal that was first brought to your Council in 1998 was designed for 30 students, and the new application is for 80 students. For this reason, the current proposal is more cost-effective. The Committee believes that this application provides an effective level and style of instruction (See Attachment A). The Committee also endorsed the program's approach in not targeting students specifically identified as low-income or at-risk because they believe that all students in the this age group within unsupervised environments are effectively at risk to experiment in dangerous behaviors.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt the Citizen Advisory Committee's recommendation for allocating \$50,000 in 1999 General Funds and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing these projects.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney MP

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The office of Health and Human Services was asked to develop a competitive process to allocate \$50,000 in funds to be used for projects that strive to address the "Desired Outcomes" denoted in the newly approved Health and Human Services Strategy document. Since this is the first year that Council has made General Funds available to health and human service providers on a competitive basis, the application process was abbreviated and conducted separately from the City's Community Development Block Grant application process. In subsequent years, should Council decide to continue funding HHS programs at the same level, the extra \$50,000 should be combined with the \$40,000 of direct General Funding that has been awarded to the Center for Human Services and City's annual CDBG public service allocation. All of these funds will be allocated through a competitive process in the Year 2000. The process will likely be linked to the CDBG process. At a minimum, the applications should be solicited earlier to coincide with agency/organizational planning and programming of funds to be expended within a given year.

This 1999 application process was obviously abbreviated because the extra \$50,000 allocation and HHS strategies were approved in late 1998. The competition was limited to selected applicants and projects in order to expedite the process. Council directed staff to include in the competition applications that were submitted for 1999 CDBG funds, but were not funded; CDBG applications that received reduced funding amounts; and three new applicants (Klub Kellogg, Center for Human Services, and the City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services). Klub Kellogg and the Center for Human Services represent health and human service providers that approached Council for funding through General Fund allocations for the 1999 year. The City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department Teen Program was asked to submit applications for new projects due to the "Desired Outcomes" emphasis on the provision of services to Shoreline's youth.

Using Council's directive, the following applications were sought from the following agencies/organizations:

- 1) The 1999 CDBG applicants that were not funded: (Shoreline Choices Program, Lutheran Social Services, Child Care Resources, and King County Sexual Assault). These applicants were not asked to submit new applications. The applications they submitted for CDBG funds were reassessed. Each of these agencies was asked to complete a new Program Outcomes question to update their application to address the newly accepted Health and Human Services "Desired Outcomes". The application update was due December 30th. Child Care Resources and King County Sexual Assault chose not to update their applications and were therefore not reconsidered for funding.
- 2) The 1999 CDBG applicants that were funded, but not at the requested level: (YWCA of Seattle, King County, and Snohomish County, Emergency Feeding Program, Food Lifeline, Multi Service Centers of North and East King County, Shorenorth Parent Education Program, Center for Human Services, and Shoreline/LFP Senior Center) were reconsidered for full funding. The applications they submitted for CDBG funds were reassessed. Each of these agencies was asked to complete a new Program Outcomes question to update their application to address the newly accepted Health and Human Services Desired Outcomes. Food Lifeline, whose request was only reduced by \$500, was the only reduced CDBG applicant that chose not to update their application for this relatively small amount. Application updates were due December 30th.
- 3) The agencies and organizations which approached Council for funding health and human service projects in 1999 (Center for Human Services and Klub Kellogg) and the City of Shoreline Teen Program were asked to submit new applications to be considered for

funding. Staff developed an application that was very similar to the CDBG applications submitted by the other agencies and organizations competing for the funds to ensure comparable proposals. These applications were due January 4, 1999 in order to give the applicants sufficient time to develop new project proposals.

The applications were evaluated and ranked by the same Citizen Advisory Committee used to make the funding recommendations to Council on the 1999 CDBG funds. Members of this committee included:

1. **Irene Hartzell** is a resident of Shoreline and has 25 years of professional experience in human services as a clinical psychologist. She also has experience working in low-income areas. Currently, Ms. Hartzell is retired and has recently obtained her real estate license.
2. **Edel Hondl-Murray** is a resident of Shoreline (since 1972) and has 32 years professional experience in Human Services as a psychiatrist. She is currently retired and interested in getting involved in her community.
3. **Gidget Terpstra** is a resident of Shoreline (24 years). She has been very active in the community for 23 years especially in the areas of youth and health/human services. She is currently employed as the Readiness to Learn Coordinator for Kellogg Middle School and Shorecrest High School. She was awarded and administered a successful City of Shoreline CDBG project for the Readiness to Learn program in 1997. She was also referred by the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association to serve on the committee.

*Note: Ms. Terpstra informed staff and the Citizen Advisory Committee of her professional connection to Kellogg Middle School and the City of Shoreline Teen Program. She is the Readiness to Learn Program coordinator at Kellogg Middle School and played an integral role in the development of the Klub Kellogg concept. She also stated that through her position at Kellogg Middle School she had strongly advocated for the Kellogg open gym program currently operated by the City's Teen Program. She stated that she personally, nor the Readiness to Learn Program in which she is employed, stand to benefit financially from the success of the Klub Kellogg or the City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services applications.

She offered to remove herself from the committee prior to the Citizen Advisory Committee meeting. Staff indicated to Ms. Terpstra that her connections to these organizations did not constitute a conflict of interest, but would like for the Citizen Advisory Committee members to make the final decision. Ms. Terpstra disclosed the above information to the Citizen Advisory Committee members. After a brief period of discussion, the Citizen Advisory Committee unanimously asked Ms. Terpstra to stay and fully participate.

4. **Bill Wilson** is a resident of Shoreline who graduated from Shoreline Public Schools. Mr. Wilson has experience in property management, especially low-income elderly housing. He has been a licensed real estate broker and general contractor for over twenty (20) years. He also served on the CDBG Funding Advisory Committee for 1998.

In order to also include perspectives of City staff involved in planning and community issues, a staff member was also included in the Advisory Committee. In order to ensure the competitiveness of the review process, no representatives were selected from City departments

with a direct stake in the outcome of the funding decisions. The following City employee served on the Committee:

1. Allan Johnson, Planner with the Planning and Community Development Department

Review/Selection Process

The Citizen Advisory Committee met one time, January 12th. Staff provided each committee member with copies of the new applications; a summary of each project including a staff overview; and new rating criteria sheets to rank each application. Each member independently reviewed each application prior to any discussion by the group using ratings sheets based directly on the Council approved Health and Human Services Strategies document.

As you recall, in September 1998, the Health and Human Services Task Force completed the Proposed Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline for Council review. This report identified potentially 15 "Desired Outcomes". The "Desired Outcomes", in priority order, are as follows:

- 1) More youth in structured, positive activities
- 2) Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- 3) More young people who are skilled and prepared
- 4) Reduce substance abuse
- 5) Reduce child abuse and neglect
- 6) More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing
- 7) More youth have contact with caring adults
- 8) More community members work together to solve problems
- 9) Increase affordable child care
- 10) Increase affordable housing
- 11) Increase employment
- 12) Reduce teen pregnancy
- 13) Reduce domestic violence
- 14) Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth
- 15) Preserve the independence and quality of life for seniors.

Each advisory committee member's project ranking was posted for each project. A total tally was calculated for each project to determine numerical project funding priorities. Then the committee determined, as a group the funding levels based largely on the project's rating sheet scores. (*Please see Attachment B: Rating Criteria Sheet*)

Results

The CDBG Funding Advisory Committee reviewed and ranked the applications for 1999 General Fund Health and Human Services projects. The recommendations of the Committee have been summarized in the following list.

City of Shoreline General Funds Grant Round		
New Applications		
Applicant	Brief Project Description	Funding Recommendation
Center for Human Services	Adult Substance Abuse Services & Family Counseling Support Services	\$16,000 Substance abuse/\$10,000 Family Counseling
City of Shoreline EarthWorks	Summer Environmental Employment Program for Teens	\$10,000
YMCA: Club Kellogg	After Middle school recreation/tutoring	\$10,000
Applicants funded w/CDBG \$ at reduced amounts		
Emergency Feeding Program	6,711 Emergency meals	\$877
Multi Service Center of N/E King County	Emergency shelter to homeless families	\$1,038
Shoreline Healthy Start	Home based support for new young families	\$2,085
TOTAL		\$50,000

The Advisory Committee recommended funding three new projects and the balance of three CDBG projects that received reduced funding. More complete descriptions of each project can be found in *Attachment A*, along with brief descriptions of the Committee and staff rationale for its recommendation.

SUMMARY

The Citizen Advisory Committee has met and reviewed the resubmitted CDBG applications and the new applications for Shoreline's 1999 General Fund Competitive grant process for health and human service provision. The Committee recommended funding three (3) new human service applicants for \$46,000 and three (3) reduced CDBG applicants for \$4,000 to total \$50,000. The Committee's recommendation is based on a careful review of the applications and by applying the Council-approved Health and Human Services Strategies document for policy guidance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt the Citizen Advisory Committee's recommendation for allocating 1999 Health and Human Service General Funds and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing these projects.

OPTIONS

An option is to set aside the Committee's recommendation and fund a different set of agencies.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Citizen Advisory Committee's Detailed Recommendation

Attachment B: Example of ratings sheet used to evaluate each application

ATTACHMENT A

Citizen Advisory Committee's Detailed Recommendation

ATTACHMENT A

1999 Health and Human Services General Fund Citizen Advisory Committee's and Staff Recommendations

APPLICANT	Shoreline/South County YMCA	AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$10,000
PROJECT	Klub Kellogg	RECOMMENDED: \$10,000
LOCATION	Kellogg Middle School 16045 25 th NE Shoreline, WA	

USE OF FUNDS: Providing 43% of the funds to operate an after school program for 80 Kellogg Middle School students

PROJECT SUMMARY: Klub Kellogg is an after school recreation and tutoring program offered from 3-5 p.m. each school day at Kellogg Middle School. The program provides tutoring, homework support, community service projects, arts & crafts, and recreational activities. School buses transport students home after the program.

DESIRED OUTCOMES TO BE ADDRESSED

- #1: More youth in structured, positive activities
- #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- #7: More youth have contact with caring adults
- #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth.

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 411 points out of 500 possible points

- In response to the "Desired Outcomes", all children need access to supervised, positive after school activities. Between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. all unsupervised kids are at risk to experiment with dangerous behaviors. Middle school children are at a critical stage in their development. This age group often "falls through the cracks". They are too old for day care, but not old enough to drive/work.
- There are few opportunities for middle school kids with working parents to access structured, adult supervised activities. Klub Kellogg does not specifically target the enrollment of at risk youth. The premise of Klub Kellogg is that all unsupervised youth are at risk of becoming involved in activities that may not be healthy. Klub Kellogg can be viewed as a preventative program that intercedes in kid's lives before they engage in risky behavior.
- The project can facilitate addressing many of the "Desired Outcomes" identified by the City of Shoreline as benchmarks for health and human services by: 1) providing the opportunity for 80 youth to participate in structured, positive after school activities; 2) reducing delinquency, violence and crime through the provision of a safe secure environment for youth where unsafe behaviors that may occur if they were unsupervised can be avoided; 3) more youth having contact with caring adults such as the YMCA staff, drop-in parents, volunteers, and guest speakers; and 4) increasing the overall level of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning through the provision of support for academic achievement especially for those students referred to the program by teachers, parents, etc. due to their individual academic needs.
- The cost for Shoreline for the project seems reasonable at an estimated \$125 each for 80 youth during the school year for an estimated 360 hours including staffing, transportation, after school snacks, and activities.

Klub Kellogg, cont.

- Scholarships will be provided to low income kids. Low income and special needs youth will be recruited/referred to the program via school counselors, teachers including English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, and Ballinger Homes.
- Staff raised the issue of the qualifications of the Klub Kellogg instructors, specifically the absence of teaching and counseling professionals. The Committee found that the YMCA characteristically employs young, energetic people that can serve as role models that can easily relate to kids and did not see this to be a detriment.
- Staff also called Terry Pollard of the YMCA to discuss Klub Kellogg's current enrollment to verify the feasibility of the program serving 80 kids in 1999. Mr. Pollard was confident that the program would serve the 80 kids.

Note: Staff expressed concerns after reviewing the Klub Kellogg proposal when it was first presented to Council in September, 1998. Briefly, these concerns were: 1) The Klub Kellogg concept, which is receiving local government subsidies, does not target low income and delinquent youth; 2) Klub Kellogg staff do not have teaching backgrounds, yet the program has an academic, as well as recreational focus; and 3) The cost of the program verses the number of kids being served raised issues of cost effectiveness.

The Klub Kellogg proposal submitted for the purposes of this competitive funding process has in part addressed these issues. Staff recommends that a very specific contract be developed between the City and the YMCA to further insure that the issues raised by staff originally about Klub Kellogg are addressed.

APPLICANT	Center for Human Services	AMOUNT REQUESTED:	\$29,000
PROJECT	Adult Substance Abuse Services and Family Counseling Support Services	RECOMMENDED:	\$26,000
LOCATION	17018 15 TH Avenue NE, Shoreline, WA 98155		

USE OF FUNDS: Adult Substance Abuse Services and Family Counseling Support Services

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Adult Substance Abuse Services: Comprehensive substance abuse treatment and support for adults who are addicted to alcohol and/or other drugs. This program includes initial assessments, intensive outpatient treatment that meets Phase I Deferred Prosecution requirements, Urine Analysis (UA) monitoring, skill building, relapse and prevention education, family support, and group and individual support counseling.

Family Counseling Support Services: Short term family support services help families facing the challenges of raising children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), sexual abuse issues, and other special needs. Improving parenting skills and children's self esteem helps stabilize at-risk families.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) TO BE ADDRESSED

- #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- #4: Reduce substance abuse
- #5: Reduce child abuse and neglect
- #7: More youth have contact with caring adults
- #11: Increase employment
- #13: Reduce domestic and dating violence

CHS, cont.

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria Score: 359 out of 500 possible point

- Substance abuse services are a critical need. There are fewer and fewer options for persons with low incomes to access affordable counseling and treatment of substance abuse. Substance abuse is often the cause and effect of many other problems that could potentially be addressed via treatment in a program offered at an agency such as CHS.
 - \$16,000 should be allocated to Substance Abuse Services and \$10,000 should be allocated to Family Counseling Support services. This recommendation was made based on CHS's past performance. Staff indicated that the level and cost of family support services provided in the past by CHS have not been documented accurately. Staff went on to say that CHS does a better job at documenting and providing substance abuse services and professional counseling.
 - Although staff alluded to problems with CHS's lack of contractual documentation and failure to meet contractual goals, the Committee still considered the applicant's services as a means to strive towards the "Desired Outcomes" for Shoreline residents.
 - Drug and alcohol assessments to be performed by CHS for the Shoreline schools should be expedited (within three or fewer days) to better serve our students and community. The contract with CHS should reflect this request and compliance should be mandatory.
 - Affordable Family Counseling will assist Shoreline residents in achieving many of the Desired Outcomes.
-

APPLICANT	City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department Teen Programs
PROJECT	Teen EarthWorks Program
LOCATION	The project will be multi-site based.

AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$13,495 **AMOUNT RECOMMENDED:** \$10,000

USE OF FUNDS: These funds would be used to support a Program Coordinator/Crew Leader. The program would be administered by the Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department.

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Teen EarthWorks program will provide summer employment for environmental project completion at City parks and wetlands for **low-income** youth aged 14-19 years. This partnership program will involve: 1) King County's Work Training Program (WTP), who will fund all wages for the youth and two adult Crew Leaders; and 2) The Shoreline School District, who will provide the summer school program that these youth attend for 4.5 weeks in the mornings.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- #1: More youth in structured, positive activities
- #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- #3: More young people who are skilled and prepared
- #4: Reduce substance abuse
- #5: Reduce child abuse and neglect
- #6: More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing
- #7: More youth have contact with caring adults
- #11: Increase employment
- #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

Earthworks, cont.

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 368 points out of 500 possible points

- The project will address many of the Desired Outcomes.
- The project employs a positive, meaningful method of teaching and training youth. Earthworks will provide participants with interesting, hands-on work experience that should positively impact participants lives and the Shoreline community.
- The project targets low income youth who may not have the financial means to find positive alternatives to fill the summer hours after summer school ends.
- The project connects youth to their community.
- The project could be implemented with less than the requested amount of funds.
- Disabled youth and ESL students should be considered as candidates for this program.

APPLICANT Shorenorth Parent Education Center
PROJECT Healthy Start: Shoreline/LFP
LOCATION 2545 N.E. 200th
 Seattle, WA 98155

1999 CDBG Request: \$7,200

1999 CDBG Award: \$5,000

1999 General Fund Request: \$2,000

1999 General Fund Recommendation: \$2,085

USE OF FUNDS: Operating support for family support services

PROJECT SUMMARY:

Healthy Start: Shoreline/LFP provides voluntary home-based support services to new young families 21 years or younger, who are pregnant or have an infant six months or younger. Home visiting services continue for three years and a support group is also available. Healthy Start has determined that there are 40 eligible families in Shoreline/LFP, and has already enrolled 24 families. The original 1999 CDBG request was for \$7,200 to serve six families. For the \$5,000 awarded in 1999 CDBG funds, Shorenorth would only be able to serve four families. If Shorenorth is awarded the additional \$2,200 requested from HHS funds they will be able to serve all six of the originally proposed families.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #1: More youth in structured, positive activities
- * #5: Reduce child abuse and neglect
- * #6: More people have adequate food, shelter and clothing
- * #7: More youth have contact with caring adults
- * #8: More community members working together to solve problems
- * #12: Reduce teen pregnancy
- * #13: Reduce domestic and dating violence
- * #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at this recommended funding level:

- Family support will be provided by experienced therapists through home visits and group support sessions to six (6) families.

Shorenorth, cont.

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 344 points out of a possible 500 points

- This intensive service model has proven highly effective in reducing rates of child abuse and neglect.
- Funds were reduced in order to fund the Senior Center Health Enhancement Program.
- A new case manager was hired to specifically serve the Shoreline families. She has been working very hard to connect with the Shoreline families and has already been very successful. She has greatly expanded the level of service Shoreline families are receiving.
- Healthy Start was funded by Shoreline last year and has exceeded all program outcome measures. The quality of the reporting has also been sufficient, whereby saving administrative time.
- The Healthy Start model compliments the Desired Outcomes.

APPLICANT	Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline
PROJECT	Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline
LOCATION	PO Box 18145 Seattle, WA 98118

1999 CDBG Request: \$10,812

1999 CDBG Award: \$9,935

1999 General Fund Request: \$877

1999 General Fund Recommendation: \$877

USE OF FUNDS: Operating support for emergency food assistance program

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Emergency Feeding Program works with area agencies and churches to provide an emergency response to the nutritional needs of people in crisis hunger situations and to provide resource counseling to move them to longer-range resources. It is projected that in 1999 the program will provide 6,711 meals to low income Shoreline residents seeking emergency food. Each person assisted through the Emergency Feeding Program receives a box of six meals to last two days. Meals can be picked up at the Center for Human Services, a local human service agency.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #6: More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at this recommended funding level:
-6,711 food packets provided to Shoreline residents

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 379 points out of a possible 500 points

- The program strives to accommodate special dietary needs as requested by clients, such as low sodium, diabetic, Asian foods, teen, and liquid diets.
- The **low per unit cost and the high number of Shoreline residents served** indicated that the agency was serving our population in a cost-effective manner.
- The agency has been meeting and exceeding outcome measures for their 1998 CDBG contract with the City of Shoreline. Staff reported that a site visit with the agency yielded very positive results further reinforcing the feasibility of this agency's program.
- Although the applicant is directly addressing only one "Desired Outcome", without the achievement of this outcome, attainment of the other 14 outcomes will be very difficult, if not impossible.
- Funds were reduced in order to fund the Senior Center Health Enhancement Program.

APPLICANT Multi-Service Centers of North and East King County
PROJECT Emergency Shelter
LOCATION 16225 NE 87th St.
Redmond, WA 98052

1999 CDBG Request: \$7,000 **1999 CDBG Award:** \$5,962
1999 General Fund Request: \$1,038 **1999 General Fund Recommendation:** \$1,038

USE OF FUNDS: Personnel and operational support for Kenmore Emergency Shelter

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Multi-Service Center's project offers emergency shelter and support services for homeless families in Northeast King County provided in a nine-unit apartment complex in Kenmore. Trained housing staff on-site provides information, referrals, and a wide range of services and case management. In addition, a Motel Voucher Program and a Firsts' months rent program assists families in transition. In 1997, 53 of the 368 individuals served at the Kenmore Shelter were from the City of Shoreline totaling 1,113 bed nights.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

* #6: More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at this recommended funding level:

- (800) shelter bed-nights/first months rent/cold weather vouchers/transitional housing
- (80 - 150) case management hours
- (200) Information and referral hours

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 362 points out of a possible 500 points

- The amount of service delivered to the number of Shoreline residents was impressive.
- Out of the three agencies applying to address the need of homelessness, this agency has the lowest per person cost and the highest number of persons served.
- Although the applicant is directly addressing only one "Desired Outcome", without the achievement of this outcome, attainment of the other 14 outcomes will be very difficult, if not impossible.
- Funds were reduced from the requested amount in order to fund the Senior Center Health Enhancement Program.

APPLICANT City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department
PROJECT Teen Program
LOCATION Low-Income Scholarship Waivers
Varied Trip locations

AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$2,050 **AMOUNT RECOMMENDED:** NONE

USE FUNDS: Low-Income Scholarship Waivers for 7th and 8th grade youth

PROJECT SUMMARY:

This project seeks to offer fee waivers/scholarships to low-income middle school students for the summer teen trip program. This grant proposal will allow 10 registration spots (per each trip) to be available for low-income youth.

Scholarships, cont.

DESIRED OUTCOMES:

- #1: More youth in structured, positive activities
- #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- #4: Reduce substance abuse
- #7: More youth have contact with caring adults

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 312 out of 500 possible points

- The project was not clearly defined.
- There are less expensive trips of equal quality that could possibly be offered to reduce the cost of the project and yield the same effect.

APPLICANT YWCA of Seattle, King County, Snohomish County
PROJECT Safety Net for Families
LOCATION 6027 208th Street SW
Lynnwood, WA 98036

1999 CDBG Request: \$6,205

1999 CDBG Award: \$6,000

1999 General Fund Request: \$205

1999 General Fund Recommendation: -0-

USE OF FUNDS: Operational funds for emergency and transitional shelter.

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Safety Net for Families at the YWCA Pathways for Women branch will provide emergency shelter for homeless single parent families via motel vouchers in Shoreline or at the Lynnwood shelter. These services, along with case management and support services, will be provided for up to 5 Shoreline families. Each household receives two sessions of case management per week while in shelter. Support services address housing, health, and employment issues.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- * #4: Reduce substance abuse
- * #5: Reduce child abuse and neglect
- * #6: More people have adequate food, shelter and clothing
- * #7: More youth have contact with caring adults
- * #11: Increase employment
- * #12: Reduce Domestic and dating violence
- * #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at this recommended funding level:

- 435-450 Emergency shelter bed-nights
- Residents utilizing the emergency shelter or motel vouchers will have access to information and referral services; housing counseling; health counseling; employment training; and workshops (parenting, life skills)

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 381 points out of a possible 500 points

- Although the project scored well, the Committee decided that awards should not be made for less than \$500 based on administrative burdens for both the applicants and the City.

APPLICANT Center for Human Services
PROJECT Anger Management for Youth and Parents
LOCATION 17018 15th Avenue NE
Shoreline, WA 98155

1999 CDBG Request: \$5,200

1999 CDBG Award: \$5,000

1999 General Fund Request: \$200

1999 General Fund Recommendation: none

USE OF FUNDS: Operational funds for anger management program

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Anger Management for Youth and Parents Program will provide services to youth and parents that take into consideration developmental needs and youth assets. The program will provide group sessions for youth and their families -- one for ages 13-15, another for ages 16-18, and one for their parents. In addition, up to 40 hours of individual counseling will be available to this population throughout the year. The purpose of the program is to reduce negative outcomes for youth by giving them healthy alternatives for appropriate anger expression. City of Shoreline residents are projected to be 70% of enrolled clients.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #2: Reduce delinquency, violence and crime
- * #4: Reduce substance abuse
- * #13: Reduce domestic violence and dating violence
- * #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 308 points out of a possible 500 points

- The Committee decided that awards should not be made for less than \$500.

APPLICANT Senior Services of Seattle/King County: Shoreline Lake Forest
Park Senior Center
PROJECT Health Enhancement Program
LOCATION 18560 1st Ave NE #1
Shoreline, WA 98155

1999 CDBG Request: \$6,700

1999 CDBG Award: \$5,000

1999 General Fund Request: \$1,700

1999 General Fund Recommendation: none

USE OF FUNDS: Personnel costs for Health Enhancement program

PROJECT SUMMARY: The Health Enhancement Program provides seniors with direct access to an RN and Social Worker in which the senior participant can develop a specific plan to address issues affecting their health. All clients are seen at least once by the Social Worker to be evaluated for the need for counseling to support health improvement goals or to work specifically on a psychosocial goal. An estimated 37 Shoreline residents (50% of the program clients) will be served through this program in 1999.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #15: Preserve the independence and quality of life for seniors

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 329 points out of a possible 500 points

- The project did not closely address the desired outcomes.

**APPLICANT
PROJECT
LOCATION**

Lutheran Social Services of Washington & Idaho
International Counseling Service
433 Minor Ave. N.
Seattle, WA 98109-5439

1999 CDBG Request: \$7,000

1999 CDBG Award: none

1999 General Fund Request: \$7,000

1999 General Fund Recommendation: none

USE OF FUNDS: Operating support for individual and group counseling services

PROJECT SUMMARY: International Counseling Services provides professional services in a culturally and linguistically sensitive manner to people of Russian, Middle Eastern and East African heritage. Services provided include: individual, marital and family counseling and working with schools to promote cultural awareness. The program provides resource assistance and case management, along with support groups for people from these ethnic communities. In 1997, ICS served 79 Shoreline refugees and immigrants, providing outreach to 47 Russians and East Africans, counseling to 12 people of African or Middle Eastern heritage, and support group services to 20 Russians. International Counseling Services will serve an estimated 58 immigrants and refugees from the City of Shoreline in 1999.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #1: More youth in structured, positive activities
- * #2: Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
- * #5: Reduce child abuse and neglect
- * #6: More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing
- * #8: More community members working together to solve problems
- * #11: Increase employment
- * #13: Reduce domestic and dating violence
- * #14: Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth
- * #15: Preserve the independence and quality of life for seniors

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at requested funding level:

- (120) counseling hours
- Serve 96 clients with support group sessions (eight clients per group; one to two groups per month)
- (72) case management sessions
- (45) client/provider contact outreach sessions

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 320 points out of a possible 500 points

- Although the program provides a valuable service, the committee expressed that this counseling group serves a limited clientele in comparison to the other counseling agencies, which applied.

APPLICANT City of Shoreline, Department of Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services
PROJECT Adult Community Choices (single service)
LOCATION Richmond Highlands Recreation Center
16554 Fremont Ave. N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

1999 CDBG Request: \$7,991

1999 CDBG Award: \$7,991

1999 General Fund Request: \$7,991

1999 General Fund Recommendation: none

USE OF FUNDS: Operating support for recreational and social services

PROJECT SUMMARY: Adult Community Choices provides daytime recreational, social and vocational opportunities to approximately 20 adults with developmental disabilities. The program has three components -- Intake Interest Inventory and Initial Meeting; Activity Planning; and Activity Enactment. The program is targeted at adults with developmental disabilities who live at home, are unemployed and have no support outside the family. An estimated 20 Shoreline residents will be served in the Adult Community Choices program in 1999.

DESIRED OUTCOME(S) ADDRESSED:

- * #8 More Community Members working together to solve problems: The Adult Community Choices program will work to offer an opportunity for more community members to work together and solve the challenge of adults with developmental disabilities.

Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 1999 at requested funding levels:

- 579 hours of adult daycare and programming

KEY POINTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF DELIBERATIONS

Rating Criteria score: 271 points out of a possible 500 points

- The program addresses important needs, recreation and respite, but the project does not closely address the Desired Outcomes.

ATTACHMENT B

***EXAMPLES OF RATING
SHEETS USED TO
EVALUATE EACH
APPLICATION***

CITY OF SHORELINE 1999 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES GENERAL FUND APPLICATIONS RATING SHEET

Applicant Name: _____ Project Name: _____

Instructions: Please complete a rating sheet for each application. Please fill in the agency information at the top of this page. Please assign point values to criteria 1-7 below. The point range for each criteria is listed to the left: ex. 1. Local Needs: point range 0-15. For the purposes of this rating process, zero is the lowest value with values increasing according to the proposal's ability to address the criteria. Please add comments in the space provided, if you wish. Comments will help staff understand ratings. Rating criteria are based on the Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline.

Criteria	Score	Comments
1. LOCAL NEEDS: point range 0-15 a. Does the applicant adequately state the need and how this proposal will positively affect that need? b. Will this project have a positive impact in Shoreline? If so, how much of an impact?		
2. PURPOSE: point range 0-15 a. Does the project seek to achieve self-sufficiency and independence for clients? b. Does the project help to develop Shoreline as a healthy, safe, and economically prosperous community? c. Does the project build on the strengths and assets in the Shoreline community?		
3. OUTCOMES: point range 0-25 a. Does the project adequately address one or more of the <i>Desired Outcomes</i> ?		
4. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the program/project? b. Does this project represent a duplication in services?		
5. DIVERSITY: point range 0-10 a. Does the proposal help to ensure that health and human services reflect and are sensitive to the cultural, racial, economic, age, ability level, and social diversity of Shoreline? b. Does the proposal work at reducing programmatic barriers to services and supports? (e.g., language/interpretation, provide child care, transportation, alternate service hours, etc.)		

Criteria	Score	Comments
6. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-15 a. Does the applicant provide evidence that the project will succeed? b. Is the applicant stable and does the agency have the capacity to implement/maintain the program/project? c. Has the applicant been funded before? If yes, how have they performed?		
7. FUNDING: point range 0-10 a. Is the request reasonable, given the services provided? What is the cost benefit ratio? b. If this is a regional project, is the request to Shoreline reasonable, relative to what others are paying?		

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize the City Manager to Execute Engineering Consultant Agreement with KPFF Consulting Engineers for the Design of Street improvements on 15th Avenue NE Between NE 146th Street and NE 165th Street
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	Douglas W. Mattoon, Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On November 23, 1998, your Council adopted Ordinance No. 184 (1999 Budget) which included the project for improvements on 15th Avenue NE between NE 146th Street and NE 165th Street. This street improvement project is also included in the Capital Improvement Program adopted by your Council on November 9, 1998 (See Attachment A). The next step, the subject of this agenda item, is to hire an engineering consultant for this project.

During the period from August 1992 through July 1995, there have been sixty-three accidents within the project limits. This equates to an average of twenty accidents per year, which is high for a street of this type. Typically, a comparable section of street would experience between six and ten accidents per year. Of those sixty-three accidents, twenty-nine were at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and NE 155th Street, which is the entrance to the Fircrest campus. Currently, the people walking along the street on the east side must do so along a narrow dirt path very close to the traffic.

This project (See Attachments B and C) will construct a continuous, center left-turn lane on 15th Avenue NE between NE 150th Street and NE 155th Street and a new sidewalk on the east side of the street from NE 150th Street to NE 165th Street. The addition of a left turn lane will increase safety in the area by reducing the number of pedestrian and vehicle accidents. The center left-turn lane is also needed to separate the turning movements into the small businesses and apartment complexes on the west side of 15th Avenue NE from the through traffic. The sidewalks will be constructed six to eight feet wide with an adjacent planter strip where feasible. The sidewalk and planter strip design will be reviewed with your Council as project plans are developed. Providing a continuous sidewalk along the east side of the street will increase safety for the pedestrians by separating them from the traffic and providing a more stable walking surface. A new traffic signal will be constructed at NE 150th Street. A new pedestrian actuated signal will be constructed south of NE 147th Street to replace the three existing crosswalks between NE 146th Street and NE 150th Street. The existing traffic signals at NE 155th Street and NE 160th Street will be modified to match the street widening and

new sidewalk. This project will also install pedestrian safety enhancements at NE 152nd Street and NE 170th Street. The pedestrian enhancements will consist of new crosswalks with refuge islands, signing, and illumination.

The estimated total cost for this project is \$1,620,000. City funds for this project will come from the Roads Capital Account in the amount of \$1,620,000. Three grant applications have been prepared and submitted in connection with this project. The first grant was submitted to the Washington State Department of Transportation for the TEA-21 Hazard Elimination System program to fund pedestrian safety enhancements. The other two grants were submitted to the Washington State Transportation Improvement Board for funding through the Urban Arterial Trust Account and the Pedestrian Facilities Program. These latter two grants are focused on the street and intersection improvements and the new sidewalk on the east side of 15th Avenue NE between NE 150th Street and NE 165th Street. These grants, if received, would reduce the City's level of funding required from the Roads Capital Account. The City will be notified in April or May of this year whether or not these grants will be awarded to this project. The project schedule will include right of way acquisition of portions of adjacent private property and construction is anticipated to begin in the year 2000.

King County began work on the project in 1992 prior to the City's incorporation. The design for this project was completed for the County by the consulting firm of KPFF Consulting Engineers of Seattle. The County selects consultants based on a process comparable to the City's selection process and includes an evaluation of project specific proposals from interested consultants. King County received proposals from interested consulting firms in response to a "Request for Proposals" which were advertised in local newspapers in 1992. A selection panel comprised of King County Department of Transportation staff reviewed the information received from the consultants and a list of the top firms was developed for further consideration. The top rated firms were then interviewed by a second panel comprised of individuals from the private sector with expertise in related fields such as architecture or public administration. KPFF Consulting Engineers was selected based on their experience with comparable projects for other agencies in the Puget Sound area.

Staff recommends that KPFF Consulting Engineers be retained by the City to complete design modifications and assist the City in the construction of these improvements. It is important to use the same consultant who has the history of the project development and can provide continuity for the City in completing the improvements. Using KPFF Consulting Engineers will result in a cost savings for redesign since they have been involved in the project development since its beginning. King County completed the design of this project in accordance with their standards. The proposed modifications to meet the City's desires for this project include adding a landscaped planter strip between the curb and sidewalk where feasible, updating the curb ramps to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, and incorporating the undergrounding of existing power and other overhead utility wires.

The design phase of this project is scheduled to be complete by the end of 1999. The construction of these improvements is scheduled to be done in 2000 according to the adopted Capital Improvement Program. In order to ensure project design modifications and right of way acquisition is completed for construction in 2000, several steps need to

be completed this year. The design process will begin an engineering review of the existing forty-four pages of project plans in preparation for conducting a meeting with the community and adjacent property owners to solicit their input on the current design elements and any features they would like to see added. Once feedback from the community has been received, design options will be prepared for your Council's consideration. Your Council will review the final design for the improvements as a part of the design process. Once the design has been approved, negotiations with adjacent property owners can begin. Right of way acquisition is anticipated to begin mid-1999 and be complete early in 2000. The right-of-way acquisition process including property appraisal and negotiation with owners can be quite lengthy. Once all the needed right of way has been secured, the construction phase will begin. It is anticipated that construction will be complete by the end of 2000.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a consultant agreement with KPFF Consulting Engineers including future amendments for design and construction administration services as needed to complete this project. Total costs will not exceed the approved CIP budgeted amounts without prior authorization by your Council.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: CIP 15th Avenue NE

Attachment B: Project Map NE 145th Street to NE 155th Street

Attachment C: Project Map NE 155th Street to NE 165th Street

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

City of Shoreline 1999 - 2004 Capital Improvement Plan
15th Avenue NE


Project: 15th Avenue NE
Project Limits: NE 146th Street to NE 165th Street

Project Scope: This project will construct a continuous, center left-turn lane on 15th Avenue NE between NE 150th Street and NE 155th Street and a new sidewalk on the east side of the street from NE 150th Street to NE 165th Street. The sidewalks will be constructed eight feet wide with adjacent planter strip where feasible. A new traffic signal will be constructed at NE 150th Street. A new pedestrian actuated signal will be constructed south of NE 147th Street to replace the three existing crosswalks between NE 146th Street and NE 150th Street. The existing traffic signals at NE 155th Street and NE 160th Street will be modified to match the street widening and new sidewalk. A biofiltration swale will be constructed along the south side of NE 152nd Street between 15th Avenue NE and 12th Avenue NE. This project will also install pedestrian safety enhancements in various locations within the entire corridor from NE 145th Street to the Northerly City Limits.

Project Justification: During the period from August 1992 through July 1995 there have been sixty-three accidents within the project limits. This equates to an average of twenty accidents per year. Of those sixty-three accidents, twenty-nine were at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and NE 155th Street which is the entrance to the Fircrest campus. The addition of the left turn lane will increase safety in the area by reducing the number of pedestrian and vehicle accidents. Currently the people walking along the street on the east side must do so along a narrow dirt path very close to the traffic. Providing a continuous sidewalk along the east side of the street will increase safety for the pedestrians by separating them from the traffic and providing a more stable walking surface. The center left-turn lane is needed to separate the turning movements into the small businesses and apartment complexes on the west side of 15th Avenue NE from the through traffic. The biofiltration swale is included to provide water quantity enhancement and mitigate impacts from the project.

Phase	Previous Expenditures	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total Project Cost
Project Expenditures:								
Pre-Design		\$55,000						\$0
Design	\$430,951	\$50,000	\$150,000					\$485,951
Right of Way			\$1,100,000					\$200,000
Construction			\$100,000					\$1,100,000
Construction Contingency			\$165,000					\$100,000
Construction Administration								\$165,000
Total Project Expenditures	\$430,951	\$105,000	\$1,515,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,050,951
Revenue Sources:								
King County - Prior Funding	\$430,951	\$105,000	\$1,515,000					\$430,951
Roads Capital Account								\$1,620,000
Total Project Revenues	\$430,951	\$105,000	\$1,515,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,050,951

15th Avenue NE NE 145th Street to NE 155th Street



February 8, 1999



City of Shoreline
Planning and Development Services



15th Avenue NE NE 155th Street to NE 165th Street

