

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Public Hearing on Year 2000 User Fee Schedules for the City's Fee Based Services (Development Services, Parks and Recreation, etc.)
DEPARTMENT: City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY: Bob Deis, City Manager *LB (for)*

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On November 29th, your Council heard recommendations from staff on a comprehensive review of the City's user fee schedules and recommendations for making adjustments to the user fee schedules based on cost-recovery policy, market competitiveness, and City program growth.

In order to ensure that the citizens of Shoreline have a formal opportunity to provide input into the City's user fees for the coming year, the City Council has scheduled a public hearing on the recommended adjustments to the City's user fee schedules.

This public hearing has been scheduled to occur after the City Council and public have had an opportunity to review the recommendations and provide input from the November 29th workshop, but prior to Council decisions. This will allow the City Council to receive public testimony before final fee adjustment decisions are reached.

Based on input from your Council and the community, staff will return on December 13th with an ordinance updating the City's comprehensive user fee schedules.

Because of the recommended adjustments in fees, City staff has notified the main stakeholders involved, including the developer community and sports leagues, of the proposed increased fees and of the scheduled public hearing.

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct the public hearing to receive citizen input on the proposed adjustments to the City's comprehensive user fee schedules.

Approved By: City Manager *LB* City Attorney *[Signature]*

BACKGROUND ANALYSIS

Overhead Allocation Plan and User Fee Reviews

As you know from last week's discussion, the objectives of the City's annual update of the overhead allocation plan and user fee review is to answer the questions:

- What does it cost the City to provide various services? These costs include both direct and overhead costs.
- What are the current City cost recovery levels for services that are provided to the public?
- Are the cost calculations currently used by the City adequately identifying all cost components?

The primary goal is to provide the City with cost-of-service information that it can then blend with City policy in order to determine the proper fees to be charged for services. With the overhead allocation plan, the City is able to calculate the full cost of services and set fees based on City policy for each fee for service area. The only fee for service area where a specific cost recovery level has been set is in the area of Planning and Development Services, where your Council goal has been set at 80% of the full-cost of recovery. The new fee recommendations are calculated to recover this 80% level.

Policy Considerations

As you will also recall from our previous policy discussions, user fee services are those performed by a governmental agency on behalf of a private citizen or group. The assumption underlying most fee recommendations is that costs of services benefiting individuals directly, and not the community as a whole, should be borne by the individual receiving the benefit.

In some circumstances, policy considerations dictate the setting of fees at a level which does not reflect the full-cost of providing services. The following factors are examples of such policies:

- Elasticity of Demand - The price charged for a service can affect the quantity demanded by potential users.
- Economic Incentives - It may be desirable to use fees as a means of encouraging or discouraging certain activities. For example, there is a general societal benefit of providing recreational opportunities for youth (crime prevention). Thus, one can justify a General Fund subsidy for youth recreation programs.
- Competitive Restraints - Citizens or businesses may choose private sector services with lower fees depending on availability. For example, demand for recreation fees is highly dependent on what else may be available at lower prices.

- **Subsidy Policy** - Subsidy policies are usually set to support with general tax dollars services whose benefits extend to the community at large such as police services or for promoting public health.

Your Council will recall the table below from our previous fee discussions. The decision matrix helps to illustrate the analysis used when determining user benefits and fees versus appropriate taxpayer subsidies. The four rows identify different activities which have varying levels of either individual and/or public benefit. Row one lists the characteristics of an activity such as police services that is appropriately funded by taxpayers. Row four lists the characteristics of a user fee such as many types of development services for which the individual benefiting from the service should pay. The matrix doesn't provide absolute answers, but is intended to be used as a tool in identifying relevant economic and public policy issues when considering increases in user fees.

Most types of development services clearly fall into the row four category of providing individual benefit and the recommended development fees are being appropriately set to minimize the level of taxpayer subsidy for this type of service.

	WHO BENEFITS	TYPE OF SERVICE	TAX vs FEE POLICY MIX
(1)	Community	Public	100% Taxes
(2)	Primarily the Community with less individual Benefits	Public / Private	Mostly Taxes & Some Fees
(3)	Primarily the Individual with less Community Benefits	Private / Public	Mostly Fees & Some Taxes
(4)	Individual Benefit Only	Private	100% Fees

Examples of service that fall under each category:

- (1) Police services
- (2) Code Enforcement Activities
- (3) Recreation services
- (4) Development services

Planning and Development Services Fees

The development fees were last updated in Ordinance 147 on January 26, 1998. At that time the hourly rate was increased from \$74 per hour to \$93 per hour. The \$93 hour rate was developed with the intent of allowing the City to recover 80% of the cost of providing development services. With updated 1999 revenue, expenditure, and overhead numbers, the \$93 hourly service fee is now projected to recover approximately 68.8% of the full-cost of service as represented by the 2000 Proposed Budget with the following change.

Based on increased 1999 development revenue activity over the past few months, staff is recommending increasing the 2000 Proposed Budget revenue for development activities by \$90,000 (based on current rates) over the 2000 Proposed Budget revenues presented on October 25, 1999. The additional revenue from raising the development service fees to recover 80% of the full-cost of providing service would be over and above this additional \$90,000.

Based on the requirement of Initiative 695, requiring all user fee increases to be put before a vote of the people at a minimum cost of \$25,000 or a potential maximum of \$95,000 per election, the fee ordinance includes language to allow all of the City's user fees to be automatically updated on an annual basis based on the CPI. The City Council will have the option to not increase the fee schedules based on the CPI in any individual budget year.

Of the total Development Services Revenue, 66% comes from charges related to the hourly rate and 34% comes from building permit fees pursuant to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The UBC was last updated on January 11, 1999. Since the UBC was recently updated, we are recommending, that for 2000, the UBC table be increased by the CPI (3.0%). In future years, the hourly rate and the UBC will both be increased by the CPI as part of the annual budget process unless the City chooses to not increase the fees for that year.

Staff is recommending increasing the current hourly rate from \$93 to \$114 (23%) per hour, and increasing the Building Permit fees as guided by the UBC by the CPI (3%). These new rates are based on the 2000 estimated full-cost (direct and overhead) of providing development services and the hourly rate that is required to recover 80% of the full-cost of providing development services. This increase is primarily caused by applying the City Council 80% policy to the estimated 2000 costs rather than prior year actual costs. We are still excluding program costs related to Code Preparation and Walk-In Services.

The individual Planning and Development fees on the attached fee schedule (Exhibit A) are calculated using the \$114 per hour rate and the number of hours that it has historically taken to provide each individual development service. This has the across the board affect of increasing almost all fees by 23% and the UBC building permit fees by 3%.

By increasing the hourly service rate to \$114 per hour and the building permit fees by 3%, the increase in fee revenue for 2000 is estimated to be \$180,513 (16.3%), assuming a

similar level of building activity in 2000 as is being experienced in 1999. The 2000 Proposed Budget does not reflect this additional revenue.

The total additional development services revenue that would be added to the 2000 Proposed Budget would be \$270,513. This includes the additional \$90,000 due to higher than expected 1999 development activity and \$180,513 due to these recommended fee increases.

The table below shows the various hourly rates that would need to be charged based on the percent of full-costs to be recovered, from the 80% policy up to 100%.

The City of Seattle currently charges \$110 per hour for building and \$175 per hour for land use to recover 100% of the full-costs of their services and King County is raising their charges from \$ 120 to \$126 per hour for 2000 to recover something less than 100% of their full-costs.

Hourly Rate	% of Cost Recovery	Increase Over 2000 Proposed Budget
\$ 93	68.8%	
114	80%	180,513
135	90%	341,880
155	100%	503,246

As an example of the impact of the increase in fees, the cost of a typical application for a new 2,000 square foot, single-family home valued at \$135,000, would increase by \$120.75 or 5% of the total permit fee. This reflects the cost of the building improvements only. The permit charges shown below represent 1.18% of the \$200,000 purchase price of a new home once the additional costs of land, overhead, profits, real estate fees, etc. are added to the building improvements. This and other examples are shown in the table below.

Single-Family House	Current Charges	New Charges	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Permit	\$ 1,189.75	\$ 1,224.75	\$ 35.00	3%
Review	773.34	796.09	22.75	3%
Site	93.00	114.00	21.00	23%
Furnace	93.00	114.00	21.00	23%
Fireplace	93.00	114.00	21.00	23%
WSBCC*	4.50	4.50	0.00	0%
Total	\$ 2,246.59	\$ 2,367.34	\$ 120.75	5%

* Washington State Building Code Council

Other Examples

Lot Line Adjustment	\$ 465.00	\$ 570.00	\$ 105.00	23%
Grading Permit	\$ 279.00	\$ 342.00	\$ 63.00	23%
Preliminary Short Plat	\$ 2,790.00	\$ 3,420.00	\$ 630.00	23%

Since the recommended Planning and Development Services fee schedule is based on this hourly rate times staff hours for processing, the new \$114 per hour charge will increase all of the fees by 23% with two exceptions.

1. The appeal fee of \$350, as set by your Council in Ordinance No. 75, is not based on the hourly charge and remains unchanged. It was determined with the passage of that ordinance, that if the appeal fee were based on the estimated hours required to hear appeals times the hourly rate, then the appeal fee would be too high and would be prohibitive for the average citizen. This equates to a fee for about 3 hours work, when in reality, the average appeal requires from 40 to 80 hours of work. If the actual costs were charged, the appeal fees would range from \$4,560 to \$9,120 per appeal.
2. Approximately 34% of the revenues generated by Planning and Development Services are from building permits. The cost of building permits in the City of Shoreline, as well as in other cities, is based on building valuation and the Uniform Building Code (UBC) cost formula. The recommendation increases the values in the UBC by the CPI (3%).

This information is being provided to your Council in order to affirm the existing 80% policy or to establish a new policy direction for development cost recovery based on previous discussions.

We have also added a new section to the Planning and Development Services fee schedule to cover civil penalties assessed for code enforcement actions and recovery of abatement costs under our newly established Code Enforcement Program, with the intent to have all of our current fees and penalties included in our comprehensive fee schedules.

Parks and Recreation Fees

As your Council will recall from the 2000 Annual Planning and Budget Retreat, staff committed to return with a revised Parks and Recreation fee schedule. In the past, staff has reported that parks fees have been within the market range of pricing with other jurisdictions. However, in preparation of this report, an extensive analysis was conducted on a class by class basis. This analysis has identified classes and services that are priced below market.

The analysis included two critical data collection steps. First, cost of service information was refined to allocate direct costs and parks overhead costs for recreation services. Second, a thorough market analysis was developed that compared Shoreline's pricing information with that of surrounding jurisdictions. A regional average market price for each service was developed by averaging the prices charged for similar services provided by the cities of Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace, Lynnwood and North Seattle. King County pricing was used where applicable. The cities of Auburn and Kent were used to establish the average market price for the Teen Program fee based services because these were the only jurisdictions that provided a similar teen trip program for comparison. See Attachment B for the market information in the 1999 Recreation Services Analysis. This two step analysis provided the necessary framework to develop the proposed fee schedule (see Attachment A -Exhibit B for the fee schedule).

The goal of adjusting pricing at this time is to assure that we are equitably distributing the responsibility between the beneficiary of the service and the taxpayer to pay for the cost of providing recreation and parks services. The proposed price increases do not exceed market range, and increase the revenue and cost recovery of Parks programs that fall into a service mix that primarily benefits the individual rather than the whole of the community.

No fee increases are recommended that affect programs that serve primarily the community such as Celebrate Shoreline, Hamlin Haunt, other community events and the free drop-in teen programs. These programs serve the critical need of providing a truly public amenity or provide service to an under served segment of the community.

Fee increases will impact low income participants. The City of Shoreline Parks Department currently utilizes a \$9,000 grant from King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia's office for scholarships and a \$2,500 grant for a summer preschool program. These grants help to assure that low income youth and disabled participants have equal access to City programs regardless of income status. Due to Initiative 695, King County will not be providing this grant funding to the City of Shoreline in 2000. Staff is working on evaluating options for fee waivers, discounts based on ability to pay and scholarships for low income participants. A report and recommendations will be forthcoming to your Council in January 2000.

The main programs affected by the proposed fee adjustments are General Recreation Classes, Aquatics and Facility and Ball Field rentals. Listed below are a few examples of the proposed fee adjustments:

Program Area	Class Name	Current Fee	New Proposed Fee	% Change	Market Average
Aquatics	Drop in Swims	1.40	\$1.75	25%	\$1.76
Aquatics	Water Exercise	3.10	\$3.50	12%	\$3.25
Aquatics	Private Pool Rental (1-25)	\$43	\$50	16%	\$73
Aquatics	Private Pool Rental (26-60)	\$60	\$70	16%	\$79
General Rec	Pre-Ballet	\$32	\$40.5	26%	\$35.70
General Rec	Super Sitters	\$24	\$30	25%	\$26.80
General Rec	Karate for Kids	\$30	\$36	20%	\$32.30
General Rec	Skyhawks Camp	\$86	\$94.5	8.5%	\$109
General Rec	Fall Softball League	\$41(Per Game)	\$46(Per Game)	12%	\$44.87
General Rec	Yoga	\$50	\$65.25	30%	\$50
General Rec	Dog Obedience	\$65	\$68.5	5%	\$58.38
Teen Trips	River Rafting	\$55	\$60.75	10%	\$57.90
Teen Trips	Kayaking	\$20	\$25	25%	\$25.20
Facility Rental	Adult Soccer(Per Game)	\$25	\$28	12%	\$24
Facility Rental	Youth Baseball(Per Game)	\$3	\$6	100%	\$6.60
Facility Rental	Youth Baseball(Per Practice)	\$0	\$2	100%	\$3.88
Facility Rental	Adult Baseball(Per Practice)	\$6	\$12	100%	\$18

In the Aquatics program area, swim lesson prices are proposed to remain the same because they are priced at market. Drop-in admissions for recreation swims are increased by \$.35 to bring the fees into alignment with the local market. Specialty classes such as water aerobics fees are proposed to increase by \$.40 per class. The City will continue to offer the 10 punch card option. This will provide a significant discount to frequent user.

A formula is identified in the Fee Ordinance to calculate General Recreation fees. The Fee Ordinance will allow for a maximum of 50% overhead to be charged to General Recreation Programs. However, this is an upper limit. It is proposed that youth recreation class fees be calculated including 20-25% overhead and a 30-35% overhead for adult recreation classes.

The Teen Programs will continue to be subsidized heavily. The City currently offers a limited number of fee based trips for teens at a minimal charge to the participant. The proposed increases will still be priced below actual cost to provide the service.

Increases are proposed in the Facilities and Ball Field rental pricing. Adult fees will be increased from \$25 to \$28 per game, and increased from \$6 per practice to \$12 per practice. This will place adult ball field rental fees in the top of the market range.

The City of Shoreline has not charged youth sports groups for the exclusive scheduled use of City ball fields for practices. The proposed Fee Ordinance includes a \$2 per practice rental fee for youth sports. This translates to \$1 per hour. Also proposed, is a \$6 per game rental fee for youth sports. This is an increase from \$3 per game to \$6 per game. This translates to \$3 per hour.

This youth ball field rental fee increase is expected to generate a total of approximately \$13,650 in additional revenue. For example, the North King County Little League, one of the largest consumers of field time, would be paying approximately \$4,300 more on an annual basis.

Another justification of charging youth sports for practice is the need create a system that will encourage all user groups to use their scheduled time efficiently. These increases are within the range of fees charged by surrounding jurisdictions. For example, Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood charge \$5 an hour for practices and games, and Edmonds charges \$4 an hour for practices and games.

These are areas that may draw concern from user groups. City staff has notified the main stakeholder involved of the proposed increased fees and of the scheduled workshop discussion.

Some attrition can be expected with any increase in fees. Based on an estimated attrition rate of 10%, the proposed fee schedule would generate an estimated additional \$90,567 annually in revenue. It would increase cost recovery from 39.98% to 48.20%, and on average Parks fees would increase by 22%. The tables immediately below help to illustrate this information and highlight with more detail the impacts per program.

2000 Proposed Fee Schedule: Cost and Revenue Impacts			
Program	Current 2000 Proposed Revenue	New Revenue with Proposed Fee Schedule	% Price Increase Per Program
General Rec Family	10,686.00	\$ 1,443	15%
General Rec Preschool	20,961.00	\$ 5,022	26%
General Rec Children	102,339.00	\$ 24,970	27%
*Teen Program	32,578.00	\$ 7,330	25%
General Rec Adult	71,514.00	\$ 12,615	19%
Aquatics	191,717.00	\$ 15,391	8%
Facility Rentals	82,625.00	\$ 23,796	32%
Total	\$ 512,420	\$ 90,567	22%
*Increased price and revenue is from the teen recreation trips only.			

1999 Adjusted Parks Costs and with New Revenues (Includes % share of Parks Admin & Parks Maint.)						
Program	1999 Expenditure	1999 Revenue	1999 % of Cost Recovered	New Total Revenue Based on Year 2000	2000 Expenditures	2000 % of Cost Recovered
*Aquatics	402,058	\$ 191,717	47.68%	\$ 207,108	\$ 387,303	53.47%
**Facility Rentals	175,566	\$ 80,918	46.09%	\$ 106,421	\$ 170,930	62.26%
***General Programs	405,887	\$ 209,597	51.64%	\$ 249,550	\$ 434,853	57.39%
****Teen Program	222,808	\$ 33,255	14.93%	\$ 39,908	\$ 257,883	15.48%
Total	1,206,319	\$ 482,232	39.98%	\$ 602,987	\$ 1,250,969	48.20%
*Aquatics expenditures include all direct costs and a % share of Parks Administration overhead						
**Facilities includes \$130,920 of the Park's Maintenance budget for little league baseball and youth soccer field preparation, and a % share of Parks Administration overhead						
***General programs include \$16,078 of the Parks Maintenance budget for tennis, soccer and softball field preparation and a % share of Parks Administration overhead						
**** Teen program includes all direct costs and a % share of Parks Administration overhead						

Public Records Fees

The fee schedule for the cost of reproducing public records is also included in this comprehensive City fee review. These fees were evaluated and were determined to be in-line with the City's current cost of reproduction. These fees will also be updated annually based on the CPI.

Because of the recommended adjustments in fees, City staff has notified the main stakeholders involved, including the developer community and the sports leagues of the proposed increased fees and of the scheduled public hearing.

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct the public hearing to receive citizen input on the proposed adjustments to the City's comprehensive user fee schedules.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A. - Ordinance 218

Ordinance Exhibit A - Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule

Ordinance Exhibit B - Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

Ordinance Exhibit C - Public Records Fee Schedule

Attachment B. - 1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

ORDINANCE 218

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING REVISED FEES FOR SERVICES FOR LAND USE AND BUILDING PERMIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS, FOR PARKS AND RECREATION, AND FOR PUBLIC RECORDS CHARGES, AND REPEALING PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED FEE SCHEDULES.

WHEREAS, the City has an overhead allocation plan to calculate both the direct and indirect cost of providing City services; and

WHEREAS, the City has utilized the overhead allocation plan to conduct user fee studies during 1997, 1998, and 1999 of the City's development and parks and recreation fees to arrive at recommendations on appropriate fee levels for the City's fee based services; and

WHEREAS, the results of these studies were presented and discussed with the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the costs of services and user fees have now been updated to reflect the 2000 Proposed Budget and revenues and the staff has prepared recommended 2000 fee schedules for development services, parks and recreation, and public records charges;

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Adoption of Development Services Fee Schedule. The City Manager or designee is authorized to charge applicants for development and land use permits received by the City's Permit Center, the amounts set forth in the Development Services Fee Schedule, as presented in Exhibit A to this ordinance.

Section 2. Adoption of Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule. The City Manager or designee is authorized to charge applicants for the City's recreation programs and for rental of the City's park facilities, the amounts set forth in the Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule, as presented in Exhibit B to this ordinance.

Section 3. Adoption of Public Records Fee Schedule. The City Manager or designee is authorized to charge for copies of written records, maps, photographs, audio and video tape recordings and diskettes, and other material as requested through the disclosure for public records process, as presented in Exhibit C to this ordinance.

Section 4. Annual Adjustments. The fee schedules in Exhibits A, B and C shall be automatically updated on an annual basis on January 1st of each year by the Seattle Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (CPI-U). The adjustment shall be calculated each year and included in the City Manager's Proposed Budget. The annual adjustment shall be based on the CPI-U average for the period that includes the last six months of the previous budget year and the first six months of the current budget year. The City Manager may choose to not include annual CPI-U adjustments in the City Manager's Proposed Budget and the City Council may choose to not include annual CPI-U adjustments in the Adopted Budget for select user fees in any individual budget year without impacting the full force of this section for subsequent budget years.

The annual adjustments to the fees in Exhibit A shall be rounded to the nearest dollar with the exception of the Building Permit fees which shall be rounded to the nearest quarter dollar. The annual adjustments to the fees in Exhibits B and C shall be rounded to the nearest quarter dollar.

Section 5. Repealer. The fee schedules as enacted in Ordinance No. 147 (update of City Fee schedules) and Ordinance No. 188 (uniform building code update) are hereby repealed.

Section 6. Severability. Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this ordinance be preempted by state or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances.

Section 7. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City and shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON DECEMBER ____, 1999.

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Sharon Mattioli
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: _____, 1999

Effective Date: _____, 1999

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule
Fees Based on \$114 per Hour

Exhibit A.

Type of Permit Application	Current Fees	New Fees	Fee Change	Hour Change
Appeals	\$ 350	\$ 350	0.00	0.0
Accessory Dwelling	\$ 0	\$ 114	114.00	0.0
Binding Site Plan	\$ 189 deposit plus \$93/hour	\$ 228 deposit plus \$114/hour	39.49	(0.0)
Lot Line Adjustment	\$ 465 deposit plus \$93/hour	\$ 570 deposit plus \$114/hour	105.00	0.0
Building Permit	1997 Uniform Building Code	1997 Uniform Building Code	3% rounded to	
<u>Valuations</u>		Plus CPI Increase (3.0%)	nearest quarter dollar	
\$1 - \$500	\$ 23.50	\$ 24.25	0.75	
\$501 - \$2,000	\$23.50 for the first \$500.00 + \$3.05 for each additional \$100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000.00.	\$24.25 for the first \$500.00 + \$3.25 for each additional \$100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000.00.	0.75	
\$2,001 - \$25,000	\$69.25 for the first \$2,000.00 + \$14.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.00.	\$71.25 for the first \$2,000.00 + \$14.50 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.00.	2.00	
\$25,001 - \$50,000	\$391.25 for the first \$25,000.00 + \$10.10 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00.	\$403.00 for the first \$25,000.00 + \$10.50 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00.	11.75	
\$50,001 - \$100,000	\$643.75 for the first \$50,000.00 + \$7.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00.	\$663.00 for the first \$50,000.00 + \$7.25 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00.	19.25	
\$100,001 - \$500,000	\$993.75 for the first \$100,000.00 + \$5.60 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00.	\$1,023.50 for the first \$100,000.00 + \$5.75 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00.	29.75	
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	\$3,233.75 for the first \$500,000.00 + \$4.75 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.00.	\$3,330.75 for the first \$500,000.00 + \$5.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.00.	97.00	
\$1,000,001 +	\$5,608.75 for the first \$1,000,000.00 + \$3.65 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof.	\$5,777.00 for the first \$1,000,000.00 + \$3.75 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof.	168.25	
Plan Review Fee	65% of the Building Permit Fee	65% of the Building Permit Fee	0.00	
All Other Plan Reviews or work	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)		
Construction Permit for Work Commenced Without a Building Permit	None	Twice the Applicable Building Permit Fee		
Conditional Use Permit	\$ 2,790 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	\$ 3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	630.00	0.0
Continuation and/or Minor Alteration of Nonconforming Use	\$ 94 deposit plus \$93/hour	\$ 114 deposit plus \$114/hour	19.74	(0.0)

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule
Fees Based on \$114 per Hour

Exhibit A.

Type of Permit Application	Current Fees	New Fees	Fee Change	Hour Change
Home Occupation	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)		
Residential Furnace	\$ 94	\$ 114	19.74	0.0
Residential Fireplace (up to two)	\$ 94	\$ 114	19.74	0.0
Commercial Mechanical	\$ 94	\$ 114	19.74	0.0
All other Mechanical (Residential and Commercial)	\$ 94	\$ 114	19.74	0.0
<u>Environmental Review</u>				
Environmental Checklist:				
Single Family	\$ 930	\$ 1,140	210.00	0.0
Multi-Family/Commercial	\$ 1,395	\$ 1,710	315.00	0.0
Environmental Impact Statement Review	\$ 3,142 deposit plus \$93/hour	\$ 3,990 deposit plus \$114/hour	848.11	1.2
Grading Permit	\$ 279 deposit plus \$93/hour	\$ 342 deposit plus \$114/hour	63.00	0.0
Sensitive Area Permit	\$ 628 plus \$93/hour	\$ 912 plus \$114/hour	283.62	1.2
Rezone	\$ 4,650 plus public hearing \$1,750	\$ 6,840 plus public hearing \$1,750	2,190.00	10.0
<u>Shoreline Substantial Development:</u>				
Shoreline Exemption	\$ 189	\$ 228	39.49	(0.0)
Substantial Development Permit (based on valuation)				
up to \$10,000	\$ 1,357	\$ 1,710	352.70	0.4
\$10,000 to \$500,000	\$ 3,142	\$ 3,876	734.11	0.2
Over \$500,000	\$ 10,682	\$ 6,840	(3,842.43)	(54.9)
Shoreline Variance	\$ 2,790 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	\$ 3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	630.00	0.0
Sign Permit	\$ 189 plus \$93/hour	\$ 228 plus \$114/hour	39.49	(0.0)
Special Use Permit	\$ 4,650 plus public hearing \$1,750	\$ 5,700 plus public hearing \$1,750	1,050.00	0.0
Street Vacation	\$ 2,790 plus public hearing \$1,750	\$ 4,560 plus public hearing \$1,750	1,770.00	10.0
<u>Subdivisions:</u>				
Preliminary Short Plat	\$ 2,790 for two lot shortplat, plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	\$ 3,420 for two lot shortplat, plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	630.00	0.0
	\$ 279 for each additional lot	\$ 342 for each additional lot		
Final Short Plat	\$ 465	\$ 912	447.00	3.0
Site Development (Engineering Plans Review and Inspections)	\$ 1,116	\$ 1,368	252.00	10.0

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule
Fees Based on \$114 per Hour

Exhibit A.

Type of Permit Application	Current Fees	New Fees	Fee Change	Hour Change
Short Plat Change	\$ 943	\$ 1,368	425.43	1.9
Preliminary Subdivision	\$ 3,519 plus \$31/lot plus public hearing \$1,750	\$ 4,332 plus \$31/lot plus public hearing \$1,750	813.08	0.2
Final Subdivision	\$ 2,765 plus \$19/lot	\$ 3,420 plus \$19/lot	655.14	0.0
Variances	\$ 2,765 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	\$ 3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required)	655.14	0.3
Right-of-Way:				
Minimum Administrative Fee	\$50 plus \$93 per hour	\$50 plus \$114 per hour		
All Other Work:				
All Other Fees Per Hour	\$ 93 /hour	\$ 114 /hour	21.00	0.0
Pre-Application for Rezone	\$ 60	\$ 114 /hour	54.00	

Code Enforcement Fees

Civil Penalties

A. A civil penalty for violation of the terms and conditions of a notice and order shall be imposed in the amount of \$500. The total initial penalties assessed for notice and orders and stop work orders pursuant to this chapter shall apply for the first fourteen-day period following the violation of the order, if no appeal is filed. The penalties for the next fourteen day period shall be one hundred fifty percent of the initial penalties, and the penalties for the next fourteen day period and each such period or portion thereafter shall be double the amount of the initial penalties.

B. Any responsible party who has committed a violation of the provisions of the Critical Areas chapter will not only be required to restore damaged critical areas, insofar as that is possible and beneficial, as determined by the Director of the Department of Planning and Development Services, but will also be required to pay civil penalties in addition to penalties under Section A, for the redress of ecological, recreational, and economic values lost or damaged due to the violation. Civil penalties will be assessed according to the following factors:

1. An amount determined to be equivalent to the economic benefit that the responsible party derives from the violation measured as the total of:
 - a) The resulting increase in market value of the property; and
 - b) The value received by the responsible party; and
 - c) The savings of construction costs realized by the responsible party as a result of performing any act in violation of the chapter; and
2. A penalty of \$1,000 if the violation was deliberate, the result of knowingly false information submitted by the property owner, agent, or contractor, or the result of reckless disregard on the part of the property owner, agent, or their contractor. The property owner shall assume the burden of proof for demonstrating that the violation was not deliberate; and
3. A penalty of \$2,000 if the violation has severe ecological impacts, including temporary or permanent loss of resource values or functions.

C. A repeat violation means a violation of the same regulation in any location within the city by the same responsible party, for which voluntary compliance previously has been sought or any enforcement action taken, within the immediate preceding 24 consecutive month period, and will incur double the civil penalties set forth above.

City Abatement Costs

The City shall be reimbursed all direct costs of repairs, alterations or improvements, or vacating and closing, or removal or demolition, incurred in abatement of any nuisance defined by City ordinance including reimbursement of actual hourly employee wages and benefits.

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule / Fire Permit Fees*Fees based on \$114 per Hour*

		Current Fees	New Fees	Fee Change
<u>Automatic Fire Alarm System</u>				
Tenant Improvement (Each additional zone over one \$57.00)		\$ 279	\$ 342	\$ 63
New System		372	456	84
<u>Cryogenic Tank</u>				
		279	342	63
<u>Dip Tank</u> (incorporating flammable or combustible liquids)				
		372	456	84
<u>Fiberglass Operations</u>				
		372	456	84
<u>Fire Extinguishing Systems</u>				
Commercial Cooking Hoods: : 1 to 12 flow points		279	342	63
More than 12		372	456	84
Other Fixed System Locations		372	456	84
<u>Fire Pumps</u>				
		372	456	84
<u>Flammable/Combustible Liquids</u>				
Commercial Tanks:	Aboveground Tank Installations (first tank)	186	228	42
	Underground Tank Installations (first tank)	186	228	42
	Underground Tank Installations (additional)	93	114	21
	Underground Tank Piping (with new tank)	186	228	42
	Underground Tank Piping Only (vapor recovery)	279	342	63
	Underground Tank Removal (first tank)	186	228	42
	(additional)	47	57	11
Residential Tanks:	Removal or Decommission	93	114	21
<u>Flammable Liquid Mixing / Dispensing Room</u>				
		372	456	84
<u>Hazardous Materials Containment Systems</u>				
	Spill Control	186	228	42
	Drainage Control/Secondary Containment	372	456	84
<u>Hazardous Materials Storage Tanks</u>				
		279	342	63
<u>High Piled Storage</u>				
Class I - IV Commodities:	501 - 2,500 square feet	186	228	42
	2,501 - 12,000 square feet	279	342	63
	Over 12,000 square feet	372	456	84
High Hazard Commodities:	501 - 2,500 square feet	279	342	63
	Over 2,501 square feet	465	570	105
<u>Hydrants / Water Mains</u>				
		279	342	63
<u>LPG (Propane) Tanks</u>				
Commercial		279	342	63
Residential		186	228	42

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule / Fire Permit Fees*Fees based on \$114 per Hour*

	<u>Current Fees</u>	<u>New Fees</u>	<u>Fee Change</u>
<u>Spray Booth</u>	372	456	84
<u>Sprinkler Systems (Each Riser)</u>			
New Systems (plus \$2.85 per head)	465	570	105
Tenant Improvement: 1 to 10 heads	279	342	63
11 to 20 heads	372	456	84
More than 20 heads (plus \$2.85 per head)	465	570	105
Residential (R-3) 13-D System, Up to 30 heads	465	570	105
13-D Systems with more than 30 heads add \$2.85 per head			
<u>Standpipe Systems</u>	372	456	84
<u>Underground Sprinkler Supply</u>	279	342	63

Additional Fees:

Projects that exceed the normal limits of anticipated work hours required for plans review or inspections because of scale or complexity may be assessed additional fees. All fees are calculated at \$114 per hour.

Reinspection fees may be assessed if work is incomplete, corrections not completed or the allotted time is depleted. Fees will be assessed at \$114 per hour, minimum one hour.

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

SHORELINE POOL

Public Swims:

Children 4 & Under	Free		
Youth 5 to 17 years	\$ 1.75 per person per session	1.40	0.35
Senior 60+ years	1.75 per person per session	1.40	0.35
Disabled	1.75 per person per session	1.40	0.35
Adult	2.75 per person per session	2.25	0.50
Family, Parent & Their Children	7.00 Family, Parent & Their Children	6.00	1.00
Reduced Swim Nights	0.75 per youth; \$1.50 per adult	0.75	0.00

Swim Lessons:

Parent & Tot	2.50 per class	2.50	0.00
Preschool (1-5)	3.65 per class	3.65	0.00
Youth (1 & 2)	3.65 per class	3.65	0.00
Youth (3-7)	3.10 per class	3.10	0.00
Adult	3.65 per class	3.65	0.00

Water Exercise Fees

Adult			
Each Class	\$ 3.50	3.10	0.40
10 Class Card	28.00 (\$2.80 per class)	23.00	5.00

Senior			
Each Class	\$ 2.75	2.25	0.50
10 Class Card	22.00 (\$2.20 per class)	16.00	6.00

Pool Rentals:

If an individual or organization rents the pool and if spectator admissions/sales are charged on-site, 20% of the gross amount will be collected by and for the City of Shoreline. For sale of goods, user groups must complete a Short-Term Concessionaire Permit.

1. Private Rentals			
1 to 25 people	\$ 50.00 per hour	43.00	7.00
26 - 60 people	70.00 per hour	60.00	10.00
61 - 90 people	90.00 per hour	80.00	10.00
91 - 120 people	110.00 per hour	95.00	15.00
121 - 150 people	130.00 per hour	120.00	10.00

2. Special Interest Groups	\$ 40.00 per hour	36.00	4.00
----------------------------	-------------------	-------	------

Pool Rental Special Interest Groups are groups that use the pool to teach or practice water skills, such as SCUBA or kayaking. These groups have trained instructors and leaders.

3. School Districts	\$ 23.00 per hour	23.00	0.00
---------------------	-------------------	-------	------

4. Swim Teams			
When sharing the pool	\$ 5.00 per lane	19.50 per hour	
When using the entire pool	7.00 per lane	30.00 per hour	

Swim Teams include Swimming, Diving, Synchronized Swimming, and Water Polo. These groups have trained coaches and are registered with a national organization.

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

Family Membership Program

(Entitles member to all public swims and adults to all adult swims)

Youth, Senior, Disabled				
10 Swim Pass	\$ 14.00	12.00	2.00	
3 Month Pass	55.00	50.00	5.00	
Annual Pass	130.00	120.00	10.00	
Adult				
10 Swim Pass	\$ 22.00	16.00	6.00	
3 Month Pass	85.00	80.00	5.00	
Annual Pass	205.00	195.50	9.50	
Family				
10 Swim Pass	\$ 56.00	45.00	11.00	
3 Month Pass	130.00	120.00	10.00	
Annual Pass	340.00	325.80	14.20	
Locker Fees	\$ 0.25 per locker			

RECREATION CLASSES & PROGRAMS

1. General Recreation Classes and Programs

General recreation classes and programs includes classes for preschool through senior adult-aged participants in the arts, sports, fitness and wellness, special interest, and environmental education interest areas.

The charge for general recreation classes and programs shall be based on the direct cost of providing the class plus a 50% overhead charge. The direct costs include the full cost of all instructors, facility rentals, supplies, transportation and promotional efforts, and all other services related to the offering of the class or program.

2. Special Recreation Classes and Summer Playground Programs

Special Recreation classes and programs includes classes offered for developmentally disabled participants. Summer Playground Programs serve youth in the community. A large portion of participants in these programs are lower income.

The charge for Special Recreation classes and Summer Playground Programs shall be based on the direct cost of providing the class plus a 50% overhead charge.

3. Teen Classes and Programs

Teen classes and programs include recreation programs for middle and high school aged youth.

The charge for Teen recreation classes and programs shall be based on the direct cost of providing the class plus a 50% overhead charge.

Annual Adjustments for 1, 2 and 3

The City Manager may propose, and the City Council may adopt, a smaller overhead percentage for any or all recreation classes and programs and may reduce fees for classes and programs under 2 and 3 below direct costs.

ATHLETIC FIELDS

1. Baseball/Softball fields

a. Adult	\$ 28.00 per game	25.00	3.00
b. Youth	6.00 per game	3.00	3.00
c. Seniors 55 or older	6.00 per game	0.00	6.00
d. Practice Fields - Youth	2.00 per practice	0.00	2.00
e. Practice Fields - Adults	12.00 per practice	6.00	6.00

2. Soccer and Other Field Sports

Exhibit B.

Old

Fee Change

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

a. Adult	\$ 28.00 per game	25.00	3.00
b. Youth	6.00 per game	3.00	3.00
c. Practice Fields - Youth	2.00 per practice	0.00	2.00
d. Practice Fields - Adults	12.00 per practice	6.00	6.00
3. Tournament Field Rental Fee			
a. Adult	\$ 25.00 per game	25.00	0.00
b. Youth	11.00 per game	11.00	0.00
c. Tournament Field Cancellation Fee	6.00 per game	6.00	0.00
4. Athletic field lights			
	11.00 per hour	10.00	1.00
5. Field Reservation Form Processing Fee			
Under 75 games/practices	\$ 10.00	10.00	0.00
75-200 games/practices	20.00	20.00	0.00
200+ games/practices	50.00	50.00	0.00

CONCESSION/FACILITY USE

If an individual or organization rents a City facility and if spectator admissions/sales are charged on-site, 20% of the gross amount will be collected by and for the City of Shoreline. For sale of goods, user groups must complete a Short-Term Concessionaire Permit.

RICHMOND HIGHLANDS RECREATION CENTER

1. Rentals During Non-Public Hours:			
Entire building	\$ 33.00 per hour (2 hour minimum)	33.00	0
Gymnasium Only	16.50 per hour (2 hour minimum)	16.50	0
2. All groups assessed a \$5.00 handling/processing fee per reservation form.			

OUTDOOR FACILITIES (Picnic Shelters)

Any groups renting outdoor facilities for activities including, but not limited to, dog shows, outdoor weddings, day camps, Fun Runs and organized picnics will pay according to the following fee schedule.)

1 - 100 Participants	\$ 50.00 per day Monday-Friday	45.00	5
	60.00 per day Saturday-Sunday	55.00	5
101 + participants	0.50 per participant per day	0.40	0

Reservation Form Handling Fee: All groups will be assessed a \$5.00 processing fee per Reservation Form.

PARKS SPECIAL USE

The charge for special use permits for parks facilities shall be based on the full cost of providing the park facility or services requested. The City Manager may propose, and the City Council may adopt, a smaller overhead percentage for parks special uses and may lower the fees below the full cost of providing the facility or services requested.

City of Shoreline Public Records Fee Schedule

Materials Copied on the Copier	\$ 0.15 per page if more than five pages
Materials provided on Computer Diskettes	1.50 per disk
Video Tapes	11.55 per tape
Audio Tapes	2.00 per tape
Photos/Slides	\$2 - \$20 depending on size and process
Colored Maps (up to (11" x 17"))	1.50
Large Copies (24" x 36")	3.00
Mylar Sheets	5.00

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Regional Average Market Price is based on comparisons with the Cities of Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace, Lynnwood, and North Seattle, except for the Swimming Pool which replaced Northshore/King County for Edmonds and the Teen Program which only used the Cities of Auburn and Kent.					
Recreation Service	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Public Swims:					
	Per Person/Per Session		Per Person/Per Session		
Children 4 & Under	Free		Free		Free
Youth 5 to 17	\$ 1.40		\$ 1.76		\$ 1.75
Senior 60+ years	\$ 1.40		\$ 1.68		\$ 1.75
Disabled	\$ 1.40		\$ 1.68		\$ 1.75
Adult	\$ 2.25		\$ 2.39		\$ 2.75
Family: Parent & Their Children	\$ 6.00		\$ 6.17		\$ 7.00
Reduced Fee Swim Nights	\$ 0.75		N/A		\$0.75/youth 1.50/adults
Swim Lessons:					
		\$2.25, 2.50, 3.00, 3.10 & 3.65 per half-hour	\$3.10 - \$3.60 per half hour	3.10 & 3.65 per half hour	
Water Exercise Fees:					
Adult	per class		per class		
Each Class	\$ 3.10		\$ 3.25		\$ 3.50
10 Class Card	\$ 23.00	\$ 2.30	N/A	\$ 2.80	\$ 28.00
Senior					
Each Class	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.60	\$ 2.66	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.75
10 Class Card	\$ 16.00		N/A		\$ 22.00
Pool Rentals:					
1. Private Rentals					
1 to 25 people		\$ 43.00	\$ 73.70	\$ 50.00	
26 - 60 people		\$ 60.00	\$ 79.10	\$ 70.00	
61 - 90 people		\$ 80.00	\$ 96.25	\$ 90.00	
91 - 120 people		\$ 95.00	\$ 113.75	\$ 110.00	
121 - 150 people		\$ 120.00	\$ 127.50	\$ 130.00	
2. Special Interest Groups		\$ 36.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 40.00	
3. School Districts		\$ 23.00	N/A	\$ 23.00	

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Total hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
4. Swim Teams						
When sharing the pool		\$3.25/lane	\$ 19.50	\$ 6.84/lane	option	\$ 5.00/lane
When using the entire pool		\$5.00/lane	\$ 30.00	N/A	\$	\$7.00/lane
Pass Program (Entitles holder to all public swims)						
		per person/per		per person/per session		
Youth, Senior, Disabled						
10-Swim Pass		\$ 12.00		\$ 13.50		\$ 14.00
3-Month Pass		\$ 50.00		\$ 51.70		\$ 55.00
Annual Pass		\$ 120.00		\$ 125.00		\$ 130.00
Adult						
10-Swim Pass		\$ 16.00		\$ 19.67		\$ 22.00
3-Month Pass		\$ 80.00		\$ 80.00		\$ 85.00
Annual Pass		\$ 195.50		\$ 202.75		\$ 205.00
Family						
10-Swim Pass		\$ 45.00		N/A		\$ 56.00
3-Month Pass		\$ 120.00		\$ 130.00		\$ 130.00
Annual Pass		\$ 325.80		\$ 335.00		\$ 340.00
Locker Fees						
		\$ 0.25		N/A	N/A	\$ 0.25

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Current Game Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Game Fee
ATHLETIC FIELDS					
1. Baseball/Softball fields					
a. Adult	25.00/game	\$ 16.67 (1.5 hours)	\$ 13.88/hour	\$ 18.67	\$ 28.00/game
b. Youth	3.00/game	\$ 1.50 (2 hours)	\$ 3.30/hour	\$ 3.00	\$ 6.00/game
c. Seniors 55 or older	Free		\$ 2.00/hour	\$ 4.00	\$ 6.00/game
d. Practice fields	\$ 6.00/practice	Adult: \$3.00 (2 hours) Youth: Free (2 hours)	Adult: \$ 9.34/hour Youth: \$3.88/hour	Adult: \$ 6.00/hour Youth: \$1.00/hour	\$12.00/practice Youth:
2. Soccer and other field sports					
a. Adult	\$ 25.00/game	Adult: 14.29 (1.75 hrs)	13.88/hour	\$ 16.00	\$ 28.00/game
b. Youth	\$ 3.00/game	Youth: \$1.72 (1.75 hrs)	3.30/hour	\$ 3.43	\$ 6.00/game
c. Practice fields	\$ 6.00/practice	Adult: 3.00 (2 hrs) Youth: Free (2 hrs)	Adult: \$ 9.34/hour Youth: \$3.88/hour	Adult: \$ 6.00/hour Youth: \$1.00/hour	\$12.00/practice Youth:
3. Tournament Field Rental Fee					
a. Adult	25.00/game		16.40/game		\$ 25.00/game
b. Youth	11.00/game		7.63/game		\$ 11.00/game
Cancellation Fee	6.00/game		N/A		\$ 6.00/game
4. Athletic Field Lights		\$ 10.00	Adult: 7.00/hour Youth: 6.00/hour	\$ 11.00	
5. Field Reservation Form Processing Fee					
Under 75 games/practices		\$ 10.00	N/A	\$ 10.00	
75-200 games/practices		\$ 20.00	N/A	\$ 20.00	
200+ games/practices		\$ 50.00	N/A	\$ 50.00	

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Current Reservation Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Reservation Fee
FACILITY RENTALS					
<u>Recreation Center Rentals</u>					
Meetings during public hours		\$ 2.50	N/A	category	
<u>Exclusive Use</u>					
Entire Building		\$ 33.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 33.00	
Gym Only		\$ 16.50	\$ 18.25	\$ 16.50	
Processing Fee	5.00/reservation		N/A		5.00/reservation
<u>Picnic Shelter Rentals</u>					
Weekdays					
1-100 participants	\$ 45.00	N/A	\$ 44.00	N/A	\$ 50.00
101+ participants	\$45.00 plus 40 per participant	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$50.00+ .50 per participant
Weekends					
1-100 participants	\$ 55.00	N/A	\$ 44.00	N/A	\$60.00 + .50 per participant
101+ participants	\$55.00 plus 40 per participant	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Processing Fee	5.00/reservation		N/A	N/A	5.00/reservation

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
GENERAL RECREATION FEE-BASED PROGRAMS						
<i>(all fees are per participant per class unless otherwise noted)</i>						
<u>Family</u>						
Bird Watching Adventures	1.5	\$3.00	\$	2.00	\$	2.50
Take a Walk On The Wild	2	\$3.00	\$	1.50	\$	2.00
Family Tennis Lessons	4	\$15.00	\$	3.75	N/A	4.68
Family Tennis Lessons- family of 4 or more	4	\$60.00	\$	15.00	N/A	18.75
					16.50	66.00
<u>Preschool</u>						
Creative Dance	6	\$	32.00	\$	5.33	\$
Toddler Tunes	6	\$	45.00	\$	7.50	\$
Wiggles and Giggles	6	\$	32.00	\$	5.33	\$
					9.02	40.50
Musical Magic	6	\$	45.00	\$	7.50	\$
Musical Creations	3	\$	25.00	\$	8.33	\$
Musical Tales	3	\$	25.00	\$	8.33	\$
					9.02	54.00
Pre-Ballet	6	\$	32.00	\$	5.33	\$
					5.95	40.50
Parent/Tot Music & Movement	2.5	\$	30.00	\$	12.00	\$
Kindermusik for Babies	6	\$	55.00	\$	9.17	\$
Kindermusik - Beginning	4	\$	55.00	\$	13.75	\$
Kindermusik - Growing With	4	\$	45.00	\$	11.25	\$
					9.02	45.00
Hot Shots Basketball	3	\$	29.00	\$	9.67	\$
Little Kickers Soccer	3	\$	29.00	\$	9.67	\$
Mini-Major Leaguers	3	\$	29.00	\$	9.67	\$
					5.44	32.00
					5.44	32.00
					5.44	32.00

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Boeing Creek Explorers	1	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	N/A	\$ 3.75	\$ 3.75
Indoor Playground	1.5	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.33	\$ 0.88	\$ 1.70	\$ 2.50
Funastics (8 weeks)	6	\$ 38.00	\$ 6.33	\$ 6.11	\$ 7.00	\$ 42.00
Playground Pals	16	\$ 30.00	\$ 1.88	N/A	Subsidy Program	(See Narrative)
Environmental Explorers	2	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.50	N/A	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.00
Skyhawks Mini-Hawk Camp - Summer	15	\$ 78.00	\$ 5.20	\$ 3.64	\$ 5.75	\$ 86.25
Safety First	1	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	N/A	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00
Kids						
Paint & Swim	14	\$ 64.00	\$ 4.57	N/A	\$ 5.75	\$ 80.50
Art & Swim	14	\$ 64.00	\$ 4.57	N/A	\$ 5.75	\$ 80.50
Curtain Call Theater Camp	40	\$ 210.00	\$ 5.25	N/A	\$ 5.75	\$ 230.00
Cultural Arts Explosion Camp	22.5	\$ 105.00	\$ 4.67	N/A	\$ 5.15	\$ 116.00
Mad Science Camp	15	\$ 110.00	\$ 7.33	N/A	\$ 7.33	\$ 110.00
Safety First	1	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	N/A	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00
Ballet I	8	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.25	\$ 50.00
Hip Hop Jazz	8	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.25	\$ 50.00
Clogging	8	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.95	\$ 6.25	\$ 50.00
Young Ladies & Gentlemen	3	\$ 30.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.50	\$ 37.50
Beauty Basics	6	\$ 35.00	\$ 5.83		\$ 7.30	\$ 43.75
Starting Point	4	\$ 35.00	\$ 8.75	\$ 11.25	\$ 8.75	\$ 35.00
Super Sitters	6	\$ 24.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.48	\$ 5.00	\$ 30.00
Friends Are Fun	3	\$ 20.00	\$ 6.67		\$ 6.67	\$ 20.00
I'm Peer Proof (3 hours)	6	\$ 25.00	\$ 4.17	N/A	\$ 5.22	\$ 31.50
Stages	7.5	\$ 58.00	\$ 7.73	\$ 7.50	\$ 8.50	\$ 63.75

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Karate For Kids	9	\$ 30.00	\$ 3.33	\$ 3.59	\$ 4.00	\$ 36.00
Jumpin' Gymnastics	8	\$ 45.00	\$ 5.63	\$ 6.11	\$ 7.00	\$ 56.00
Tennis Courtstars Camp	8	\$ 48.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.32	\$ 6.50	\$ 52.00
Jr. Tennis Team	24	\$ 65.00	\$ 2.71	\$ 9.79	\$ 3.50	\$ 84.00
Tennis & Swim Weeks	12	\$ 38.00	\$ 3.17	N/A	\$ 4.00	\$ 48.00
Basketball & Swim Weeks	12	\$ 38.00	\$ 3.17	N/A	\$ 4.00	\$ 48.00
Soccer & Swim Weeks	12	\$ 38.00	\$ 3.17	N/A	\$ 4.00	\$ 48.00
Skyhawks Camps	12	\$ 71.00	\$ 5.92	\$ 3.64	\$ 6.50	\$ 78.00
Skyhawks Camps	15	\$ 78.00	\$ 5.20	\$ 3.64	\$ 5.72	\$ 85.80
Skyhawks Camps	30	\$ 86.00	\$ 2.87	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.15	\$ 94.50
Sportszone	12	\$ 52.00	\$ 4.33	N/A	\$ 5.00	\$ 60.00
Skyhawks Spring Break Camp	10	\$ 68.00	\$ 6.80	N/A	\$ 5.00	\$ 50.00
Playground Program	30	\$ 45.00	\$ 1.50	N/A	Subsidy Program	(See Narrative)
Teen		Subsidy Program			Subsidy Program	(See Narrative)
The Write Stuff	12	\$ 15.00	\$ 1.25	N/A	\$ 1.60	\$ 19.20
REI Pinnacle Climb	3	\$ 10.00	\$ 3.33	\$ 2.95	\$ 4.15	\$ 12.45
Enchanted Parks Trip	6.5	\$ 10.00	\$ 1.54	N/A	\$ 2.00	\$ 13.00
Snowboarding (lift ticket only)	10.5	\$ 25.00	\$ 2.38	\$ 4.19	\$ 3.00	\$ 31.50
Snowboarding (lift ticket & rental)	7.5	\$ 45.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 4.19	\$ 7.50	\$ 56.25
Monroe Ropes Course	8	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 6.25	\$ 50.00
Northwest Trek	8.5	\$ 10.00	\$ 1.18	N/A	\$ 1.50	\$ 12.75
Hikes	9.5	\$ 10.00	\$ 1.06	N/A	\$ 1.50	\$ 14.25
Kayaking	6	\$ 20.00	\$ 3.33	\$ 4.82	\$ 4.20	\$ 25.20
Greenlake Groove Out	8	\$ 18.00	\$ 2.25	N/A	\$ 2.82	\$ 22.50
Mountain Biking	10	\$ 32.00	\$ 3.20	N/A	\$ 4.00	\$ 40.00
River Rafting	9	\$ 55.00	\$ 6.11	\$ 6.44	\$ 6.75	\$ 60.75
Wild Waves	6.5	\$ 24.00	\$ 3.69	\$ 2.90	\$ 3.75	\$ 24.50
Mariners Game	6.5	\$ 15.00	\$ 2.31	\$ 3.10	\$ 2.89	\$ 19.00
Camping Overnight	32	\$ 40.00	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.62	\$ 2.00	\$ 64.00
Pizza, Pop & Painting	15	\$ 20.00	\$ 1.33	N/A	\$ 1.70	\$ 25.50

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Theater Arts Splash	6 \$	25.00 \$	4.17	N/A	\$ 5.22	\$ 31.50
Art Adventure Trips						
Pioneer Square	5 \$	5.00 \$	1.00	N/A	\$ 1.50	\$ 7.50
Richard Hugo House	5 \$	5.00 \$	1.00	N/A	\$ 1.50	\$ 7.50
Pac NW Ballet	5 \$	15.00 \$	3.00	N/A	\$ 3.75	\$ 18.75
Actor's Toolbox	7.5 \$	10.00 \$	1.33	N/A	\$ 1.50	\$ 11.25
High School Improv	5 \$	10.00 \$	2.00	N/A	\$ 2.50	\$ 12.50
Adult						
Kruckeberg Garden Tour	2 \$	20.00 \$	10.00		\$ 13.00	\$ 26.00
Feng Shui	2.5 \$	27.00 \$	10.80	\$ 9.50	\$ 13.50	\$ 33.75
Investment Mgt. Basics	6 \$	15.00 \$	2.50		\$ 3.25	\$ 19.50
Home Buyer Seminar	3 \$	10.00 \$	3.33	\$ 1.25	\$ 3.50	\$ 10.50
Survival Skills for Single Parents	3 \$	25.00 \$	8.33	\$ 5.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 30.00
Investing in a Volatile Market	2 \$	5.00 \$	2.50	\$ 1.25	\$ 3.00	\$ 6.00
Thai Cooking	2 \$	20.00 \$	10.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 24.00
Holiday Hors D'oeuvres	2.5 \$	25.00 \$	10.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 30.00
Cooking Once-a-Month	3 \$	25.00 \$	8.33	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 36.00
Indian Cooking	2 \$	20.00 \$	10.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 24.00
Be a 30-Minute Gourmet	2.5 \$	25.00 \$	10.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 30.00
Nutrition for a Healthy & Busy Lifestyle	2 \$	25.00 \$	12.50	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.50	\$ 25.00
Breath of Life	2 \$	17.00 \$	8.50	N/A	\$ 10.60	\$ 21.25
Intro to Fitness	1.25 \$	10.00 \$	8.00	N/A	\$ 9.60	\$ 12.00
Sound Healing	3 \$	30.00 \$	10.00	N/A	\$ 12.00	\$ 36.00
Mind/Body Fitness NIA (1 X week)	5 \$	35.00 \$	7.00	N/A	\$ 8.40	\$ 42.00
Mind/Body Fitness NIA (2 X week)	10 \$	60.00 \$	6.00	N/A	\$ 7.20	\$ 72.00

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Yoga	9	\$ 50.00	\$ 5.56	\$ 5.60	\$ 7.25	\$ 65.25
Dog Problem Seminar	2	\$ 10.00	\$ 5.00	N/A	\$ 6.25	\$ 12.50
Dog Obedience Classes	7	\$ 65.00	\$ 9.29	\$ 8.34	\$ 9.75	\$ 68.50
Get Published/ Magazine Writing	12.5	\$ 70.00	\$ 5.60	\$ 5.60	\$ 7.00	\$ 87.50
Beginning Fiction	11.25	\$ 40.00	\$ 3.56	\$ 8.00	\$ 4.45	\$ 50.00
Power Writing	4.5	\$ 45.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.50	\$ 56.25
Beginning Poetry	8	\$ 56.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 8.75	\$ 70.00
Nonfiction Book Proposals	2.25	\$ 25.00	\$ 11.11	\$ 10.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 31.50
Career, Marketing	2	\$ 25.00	\$ 12.50	\$ 6.00	\$ 15.60	\$ 31.50
Creativity, Mystery, Essays	5	\$ 40.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 50.00
Secrets of Good Writing	2.5	\$ 25.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.50	\$ 31.25
Write About Your Life	12	\$ 50.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 5.00	\$ 6.25	\$ 75.00
Travel Writing	4	\$ 40.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.50	\$ 50.00
Dialogue, grammar, Write from the heart	3	\$ 30.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 11.66	\$ 12.50	\$ 37.50
Adult Beginning Tennis	8	\$ 29.00	\$ 3.63	\$ 3.57	\$ 4.75	\$ 38.00
Martha Stewart Wanna bees	2	\$ 7.00	\$ 3.50	N/A	\$ 4.55	\$ 9.00
Ukrainian Easter Egg Decoration	5	\$ 30.00	\$ 6.00	N/A	\$ 7.80	\$ 39.00
Voluntary Simplicity	2	\$ 15.00	\$ 7.50	N/A	\$ 9.75	\$ 19.50
How does Your Garden Grow	1.5	\$ 5.00	\$ 3.33	N/A	\$ 4.33	\$ 6.50
Composting	2	\$ 5.00	\$ 2.50	N/A	\$ 3.25	\$ 6.50
Jazzercise (10 weeks)	10	\$ 40.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.20	\$ 52.00
Afterwork Aerobics	10	\$ 40.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.20	\$ 52.00
Drop-In Programs						
Senior Adult Volleyball	2	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.50	\$ 1.00
Coed Volleyball	2.5	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 0.76	\$ 1.20	\$ 3.00
Basketball	2.5	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 0.76	\$ 1.20	\$ 3.00

1999 Recreation Services Price Analysis

Attachment B.

Recreation Service	Class Hours	Current Class Fee	Current Hourly Fee	Regional Average Hourly Market Price	Recommended Hourly Fee	Recommended Class Fee
Leagues		PER GAME		PER GAME	PER GAME	
Men's Basketball		\$ 45.00		\$ 47.75	\$ 49.50	
Men's Slowpitch Softball - Summer		\$ 41.81		\$ 44.87	\$ 46.00	
Men's Fall Softball		\$ 41.81		\$ 44.87	\$ 46.00	
Co-Rec Softball		\$ 42.82		\$ 45.39	\$ 47.11	
Specialized Recreation (for the developmentally disabled)						
Adult Community Choices		Subsidy Program			(See Narrative)	
One day a week	40	\$ 114.00	\$ 2.85	N/A	\$ 2.85	\$ 114.00
Trips						
Goin' Downtown	4	\$ 12.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Bowling & Mr. Bills	4	\$ 12.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Funtasia	4	\$ 8.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Reptile man	3.5	\$ 12.00	\$ 3.43	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 12.60
Baseball Trip	6	\$ 16.00	\$ 2.67	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 21.60
Mus. of Flight & Gasworks	5	\$ 12.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 18.00
Hit the Greens	4	\$ 6.00	\$ 1.50	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Cinco de Mayo	4	\$ 8.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Fly a Kite	4	\$ 8.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 14.40
Husky Game	4.5	\$ 8.00	\$ 1.78	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 16.20
Flowers, Eggs & Fun	3	\$ 6.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.13	\$ 3.60	\$ 10.80

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Public Hearing on the 2000 Operating and Capital Budget
DEPARTMENT: City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY: Bob Deis, City Manager LB (for)

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

By this December 6th City Council meeting, your Council will have conducted three budget workshops covering individual departmental budgets, the 2000 capital budget, and the adjustments that have been made to the City's financial situation since the 2000 budget was originally proposed by the City manager on October 25th.

These adjustments include: the passage of Initiative 695, the adoption of utility taxes, the adoption of the 2000 property tax levy, franchise fees on Seattle Public Utilities, an update to the City's comprehensive fee schedules, and other issues that have arisen during the first three budget workshops.

While there has been an opportunity for public input at each of the three previous budget workshops, in order to ensure that the citizens of Shoreline have a formal opportunity to provide input into the overall 2000 budget and the priorities for the City for the coming year, the City Council has scheduled a public hearing on the 2000 budget. This public hearing has been scheduled to occur after the City Council and public have had an opportunity to hear from all of the City departments on their 2000 budgets, but prior to Council decisions. This will allow the City Council to receive public testimony before final budget decisions are reached.

The 2000 operating and capital budget is scheduled for final adoption on December 13, 1999.

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct the public hearing to receive citizen input on the 2000 operating and capital budget.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Development Code – Phase I
DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY: Timothy Stewart, Director
Anna Kolousek, Assistant Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

After the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan (November 23, 1998), your Council directed Planning and Development Services to prepare permanent development regulations, which would correspond with the Plan goals and policies and comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (City Council Goal #1).

On January 19, 1999, the Council approved the process for the preparation of the development code. In order to make the processes manageable, the Council agreed to split the code writing and adoption into two phases: Phase 1 – the procedural sections of the code and uncontroversial standards; Phase 2 – the substantive changes to the development regulations.

The purposes of this workshop are:

- 1) Brief your Council on the results of the Shoreline Planning Academy work.
- 2) Review the Development Code – Phase 1, as recommended by the Planning Commission for the adoption by your Council.
- 3) Overview of Phase 2.

On February 23, thirty-seven citizens were appointed to the Shoreline Planning Academy. The Academy met ten times between April and September of 1999. They addressed many issues and reached consensus on some procedural improvements, as well as on the substantive issues of the code. On June 7, 1999, your Council received a status report on the Academy work and the work on Phase 1 of the code.

The draft of the Code (Phase I) was completed and distributed for public review and comments on July 15, 1999. The Planning Commission, members of the Planning Academy, general public and staff were invited to identify unanticipated problems and/or issues and submit written requests for amendments to the draft by August 13, 1999.

A total of 179 amendments were submitted. The staff reviewed and prepared recommendations on each requested amendment and summarized these in table form.

On July 29, 1999 the Planning Commission held, jointly with the Planning Academy members, a workshop to discuss the first draft of the Development Code (Phase 1). The Public Hearings in front of the Commission and their deliberations took place on September 2, September 16, and October 21, 1999, when the Commissioners unanimously recommended to the City Council approval of the Development Code – Phase I (Attachment A). We are planning to present the draft for your adoption in January 2000.

Concurrently with the public review and adoption process of the Phase 1, the staff is finishing the work on the preparation of Phase 2 of the code – the development regulations. The draft of Phase 2 will be available for public review and comments in January 2000. The Planning Commission will proceed with workshops, public hearings, and recommendations to your Council in spring of 2000.

RECOMMENDATION

No action by the Council is necessary at this time.

Approved By:

City Manager

LB

City Attorney

[Signature]

BACKGROUND/ SUMMARY

BACKGROUND:

The core of our present zoning code was developed by King County to implement the County Comprehensive Plan of November 1994. The Plan contained goals and policies promoting housing opportunities for all segments of the community by encouraging infill development in designated urban growth areas. The King County zoning code (Title 21A of the King County Code, effective February 2, 1995) implemented the plan goals of encouraging infill development in a notable reduction of the allowed minimum lot size (from 7,200 square feet in RS-7200 and 5,000 RS-5000 square feet, to 2,500 square feet - for all single family residential zones).

It was this zoning code that the City of Shoreline adopted in City Ordinance No. 11 (on June 26, 1995) to govern the development of land on an interim basis, while the City was preparing its own comprehensive plan. The need for amending the King County zoning code became apparent as the City began to receive applications for all the land use permits, that property owners had decided could wait until incorporation became a fact. Acting in response to citizen and Council concerns, that the style of development allowed by the King County Zoning Code was harming the existing character of Shoreline, your Council adopted several moratoria and revisions to the code over the past four years.

On November 23, 1998, your Council adopted Shoreline's first Comprehensive Plan. The new Comprehensive Plan contains a vision promoted by goals and policies. To bring the existing codes and ordinances adopted during incorporation and prior to adoption of the Comprehensive Plan into conformity with the new Plan, your Council adopted a Goal No. 1 - "Develop and Adopt Permanent Codes That Implement the Policies of the Comprehensive Plan".

On January 19, 1999, your Council approved the process and timetable for adoption of the permanent development regulations that implement the Comprehensive Plan. In order to make the process more manageable, the Council agreed to split the code writing and adoption into two phases: Phase 1 - procedural issues of the code, and uncontroversial development standards; Phase 2 - development regulations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND THE EXTENSIVE WORK UNDERTAKEN BY THE PLANNING ACADEMY:

In order to provide for full and effective public participation in the development code production process, your Council appointed on February 23, 1999 thirty-seven citizens to the Shoreline Planning Academy.

The Academy had two purposes:

1. To educate selected members of the Shoreline community about the legal, technical and ethical constraints and opportunities of planning and growth management; and
2. To educate selected members of the Shoreline staff about the views, values and opinions of Shoreline's community, neighborhoods and individuals.

Between April 8 and September 23, the Academy has met ten times. The Academy sessions were separated into two parts, in harmony with the code preparation phases. During the first four sessions, the Academy members concentrated on the procedural issues of the code. They also took photographs of positive and negative features of various developments which are now "translated" into development standards reflecting the "community vision". They were asked to obtain permit type information from various other jurisdictions (in person and on the web site) and comment on the various jurisdictions information about short plats, variances, accessory dwelling units and other application types. Please note, that your Council reviewed in detail the Academy work together with the examples of their photographs of positive and negative features on June 7, 1999.

At the conclusion of the Phase 1 sessions, the Academy members discussed, with the staff's assistance, the procedures for administrative, quasi-judicial and legislative decision making. The Academy reached a clear consensus on the following process improvements:

- Establish neighborhood notification process.
- Road variances to go through the same process as zoning variances.
- Develop clear design standards.
- Establish mandatory pre-application meetings with neighbors.
- Hearing Examiner to be a hearing authority on quasi-judicial matters, rather than the Planning Commission.

DEVELOPMENT CODE - PHASE 1:

Using the information gained from the first four sessions of the Academy, staff drafted the draft of the Development Code - Phase 1.

The Phase 1 draft includes the following major revisions to the existing procedures:

1. Provision for mandatory pre-application meetings with neighbors.
2. Improved and clarified notification processes.
3. Established process for "legislative decisions".
4. Revised appeal procedures and elimination of the "closed" record appeal hearing.
5. Clarification of criteria for all legislative, quasi-judicial - Type C, and administrative - Type B decision processes.
6. Revised procedure for subdivisions.
7. New environmental procedures.

The draft code was distributed for public review and comments on July 15, 1999. The Planning Commission, members of the Planning Academy, general public and staff were invited to identify unanticipated problems and/or issues and submit written requests for amendments to the draft by August 13, 1999. A total of 107 amendment sheets were submitted. A number of these documents contained multiple proposed amendments. Staff has reviewed these proposals and identified 179 separate amendments for the Planning Commission's review and consideration and prepared recommendations on each requested amendment. Staff's recommendation regarding each amendment were consolidated into three categories, A - staff agreed with the amendment, NC - staff position was neutral and no change was recommended, and D - staff disagreed with the amendment for variety of reasons. (The reasons were noted in supplemental keynotes and further discussed at the Planning Commission Hearings.)

A summary of requested amendments, associated page numbers of the code, names of those proposing a specific amendment, preliminary staff recommendations, and Planning Commission recommendations to your Council regarding each proposed amendment, are summarized in the Table of Amendments, Attachment D. The document including the full text of the proposed amendments is Attachment F.

The Planning Commission is the designated planning agency to hold the public hearing and to make recommendations to the City Council regarding adoption of the Development Code. On July 29, 1999, the Planning Commission held, jointly with the Planning Academy members, a workshop to discuss the first draft of the Development Code (Phase 1). The Public Hearings in front of the Commission and their deliberations took place on September 2, September 16, and October 21, 1999, when the Commissioners unanimously recommended to the City Council approval of the Development Code – Phase I. (Please, refer to Attachment E, Minutes of the Commissions proceedings.)

At these meetings, the Planning Commission reviewed each proposed amendment and either concurred with the staff recommendation or in some cases reached their own conclusions. The decisions of the Planning Commission are included in the draft presented for your Council review tonight (Attachment A). The new text added by the Planning Commission is shaded, text eliminated by the Planning Commission is marked with strikethrough.

Both staff and the Planning Commission disagree with a significant number of proposed amendments. In these cases, both the Planning Commission and staff believe that adopting the proposed amendment would be detrimental or present significant issues that have not been fully addressed. Staff and the Planning Commission disagree with a number of major revisions (reasons are in *italic*), that we expect will be discussed at the public hearing. These include:

- Changing Engineer Variances, Site Development Permit, Bed and Breakfast Permit and Boarding House Permits from Type A (no public hearing, with appeal to Superior Court) to Type B (public hearing in front of the Hearing Examiner on appeal) actions.
Engineering Variances are of a technical nature and after the adoption of engineering standards, they will have clear criteria specified in the code. The other types of permits are based on clearly specified standards.
- Requiring additional Notice Requirements for Type A (e.g. building permits, lot line adjustments) actions.
All Type A actions are based on strict compliance with the code requirements. Any projects, which would exceed the SEPA (State Environmental Protection Act) threshold for categorical exemption (specified in the new section - Environmental procedures), would automatically require public notice.
- Allowing Type A (e.g. building permits, lot line adjustments) actions to be appealed to Hearing Examiner.
All Type A actions are based on strict compliance with the code requirements. Any projects, which would exceed the SEPA (State Environmental Protection Act)

threshold for categorical exemption may be appealed to the Hearing Examiner under Type B.

- Changing review authority for Final Plat decisions to the Hearing Examiner.
The Final Plat is only a graphic presentation of the approved preliminary plat. This is a mandatory step for recording of the final mylar.
- Changing criteria for Special Use and Conditional Use Permits.
The criteria proposed in the draft are detailed and appropriate to serve as a basis for written findings and decision re. permit.

For most amendments relating to definitions, staff believes that amending these items is premature and disagrees with amendment proposals for Phase I. However, staff agrees that additional work needs to be considered and proposes additional review during Phase 2 work.

Staff opposed changes to Attachment C at this time, and proposes additional work during Phase 2 on many of the amendments suggested for this part of the Code.

Staff also prepared for the Commission review and recommendations to your Council the following :

- Recommendations to repeal various sections of the existing code because the new provisions specified in the proposed draft would replace them (Attachment B).
- The "uncontroversial" change to the minimum density and the minimum lot size in low-density single-family zones R-4 and R-6 (Attachment C).

PHASE 2:

Presently we are finishing the work on the Phase 2 – Development Code regulations. This portion of the code includes the basic zoning and use regulations, design standards for residential and non-residential developments (including parking, tree protection, clearing, grading, landscaping, sign regulations), engineering standards, and the special overlay district for the critical areas. These standards will be available for the public review and amendment process in January 2000. Following the public review, the Planning Commission will hold public hearing(s) and make recommendations to your Council for adoption (anticipated in early spring of 2000).

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A – Development Code, Phase 1
- Attachment B – Existing Codes to be Repealed
- Attachment C – Draft Amendment to Density and Minimum Lot Area (SMC 18.12.030)
- Attachment D – Table of Amendments
- Attachment E – Minutes of the Planning Commission meetings : 9/2, 9/16, 10/21
- Attachment F – Proposed Amendment Documents (Copies for public review are available in the City Clerk's Office)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Proposed 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities

DEPARTMENT: Community/Government Relations

PRESENTED BY: Joyce Nichols, Community/Government Relations Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

In November 1998, your Council adopted a set of statements and objectives to guide the City of Shoreline's positions regarding state and federal legislation during 1999. Those statements of policy objectives reflected broad policy guidelines, not precise pieces of proposed legislation, and were used to establish City positions in support of or opposition to legislation proposed during the 1999 session of the state legislature.

As we did for the 1999 legislative session, staff has developed proposed policies for your review. These policies, once adopted by your Council, will provide a set of statements that staff may use to determine whether the City should support or oppose specific bills as they are developed during the 2000 session.

As you are aware, the legislative session that begins January 10, 2000, runs 60 calendar days. In a "short" session with several complicating factors—dealing with impacts of the passage of Initiative 695, while the House of Representatives remains evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans—the 2000 session will present a unique set of challenges for the City as it pursues its legislative priorities.

The proposed 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities is included as Attachment "A" and includes most of the policy statements adopted by your Council in 1998. New policies and significant changes are highlighted for your ease in reviewing the proposals.

In order to monitor and possibly impact legislation, we believe the best use of our resources is to again work with the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) which has a bigger voice and greater presence in Olympia. As a newer city, our success in advancing /defending the City's interests in Olympia is generally based on providing information to legislators and their staff to help them understand the impacts of pending legislation on our community. Staff reviewed AWC's list of policies and resolutions and included several in our proposed 2000 legislative priorities.

Most of the proposed policy statements are relatively broad. Once adopted by Council, staff will use these general policy statements to produce letters and testimony for your Council in support or opposition to specific bills, and to respond to changes or amendments to legislation during the session. Key pieces of legislation that do not fit any of the adopted Council policies will be brought forward during the session for specific review by your Council. Also, we plan to host a meeting with Shoreline's legislative delegation on December 13, to brief them about the City's position on various policy matters and develop stronger linkages with them and their staff.

This process should prove beneficial to the City in the upcoming session. But more importantly, we will be building on the foundation established to date in order to provide a bigger impact in future legislative sessions.

The proposed 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities is included as Attachment "A" and contains most of the policy statements adopted by your Council in 1998. Significant changes are highlighted for your review. Several issues—some new and some "holdover" issues from the 1999 session, will likely receive top priority in the upcoming session. These include:

- Proposals to replace/backfill revenue lost by passage of Initiative 695, including sales tax equalization, transportation, criminal justice, and health and human services revenues.
- Proposals to fund sales tax equalization from sales tax revenues so that citizens get back a fair share of the sales taxes they pay in order to support essential services in their cities.
- Seeking funding for the Aurora Avenue project, infrastructure improvements and economic development opportunities and investments.
- Opposing "buildable lands" legislation that would impose sanctions/penalties on cities not meeting their growth targets/housing production goals.
- Retaining local taxing authority (e.g., gambling tax reductions).
- Protecting the City's interests to manage its rights-of-way; to assume water/sewer districts as intended by the Growth Management Act, without a vote of the entire district; and funding to carry out programs required to meet Endangered Species Act mandates.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required at this time. Staff recommends that your Council review and provide direction to staff for any changes to the Proposed 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities. Staff will return with this item for final approval on December 13.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

ATTACHMENT— Proposed 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities.

City of Shoreline 2000 Statement of Legislative Priorities

During 2000, the City of Shoreline shall support or oppose legislation at the state and federal levels in accordance with the following policies:

I. Self Government

Local Control

Requests the Legislature to give local elected officials maximum flexibility in addressing the needs and desires of their communities and to allow them to have a major voice in determining the nature, scope, and funding of local programs and services.

Mandates

- Supports adequate funding for existing mandated programs.
- Opposes efforts to reduce funding for mandated programs while leaving program requirements.
- Opposes additional state and federal mandates on local governments unless such mandates are compelled by a significant public interest and are accompanied by sufficient financial resources.

II. Infrastructure and Capital Financing

(Infrastructure includes roads, storm water systems, treatment facilities, water systems, sanitary sewer systems, parks, etc.,)

Federal and State Capital Assistance

1. Strongly supports maintaining existing infrastructure funding and placing a priority on stable, adequate funding for transportation, storm water, water supply, and water quality facilities.
2. Strongly supports a comprehensive legislative approach addressing how the state will help fund needed capital facilities, especially transportation related infrastructure. A comprehensive approach is essential given that five state/federal highways are located in Shoreline—I-5, Highway 99 North, Bothell Way (SR 522) 145th and 205th.
3. Urges continuation, expansion and flexibility of federal and state capital grant-in-aid and assistance programs for local governments.

Parks and Recreation

Supports legislation that establishes an ongoing capital funding program for the acquisition, development, and/or rehabilitation of local park and recreation facilities, and that allows for public-private agreements.

III. Transportation

Transportation Funding

1. Secure state funding for the Aurora Avenue North project safety and mobility improvements. The three-mile section of Aurora through the City of Shoreline has one of the worst accident records of any highway in the state.
2. Strongly supports a balanced transportation revenue package that provides additional revenue to cities for transportation financing, particularly to address local road preservation and maintenance needs.
3. Strongly supports state funding for capital improvements to state highways and roads located inside cities, including funds for mobility, safety and drainage improvements as part of the base budget for transportation projects.
4. Supports legislation to allocate revenue to assist local governments in financing large scale projects which are essential to economic development and relieve congestion along regionally significant transportation routes.
5. Supports the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) and recommends continued funding for the Transportation Improvement Account. Shoreline is requesting approximately \$6.7 million for street improvement projects on our six-year Capital Improvement Projects list.
6. Supports legislation indexing the motor vehicle fuel tax (to inflation) to allow revenues to keep pace with inflation and to address increasing demands on the transportation system. Shoreline's 1999 projected gas tax revenue is approximately \$1.1 million, which funds approximately 38 percent of our street maintenance budget.
7. Supports legislation requiring state agencies as well as special purpose districts to update and coordinate their policy and capital plans to be in conformance with those adopted locally under the Growth Management Act. (This policy statement also appears on page 10 under section XI.—Fircrest.)

IV. Municipal Finance

Shared Revenue Programs

Strongly supports legislation to fund sales tax equalization from sales taxes in order to ensure citizens get back a fair share of the sales taxes they pay to fund essential services in their cities.

Electronic Commerce

In 1998 Congress enacted the Internet Tax Freedom Act. The Act imposes a three-year moratorium on federal, state and local taxation of Internet access charges and electronic commerce. The Act also created an Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce that is studying electronic commerce tax issues and will report to Congress on whether electronic commerce should be taxed, and if so, how. Washington Governor Gary Locke serves on the Commission. The State of Washington should be an advocate for preserving and protecting state and local government tax authority when negotiating with the federal government on such matters as taxation of e-commerce and other remote sales.

Local Taxing Authority

The 1999 legislature passed a law reducing the maximum tax rate cities may impose on bingo games from 40 percent to five percent. This change will result in a reduction of about \$49,000 in 2000 revenue to Shoreline. The Legislature also considered reducing the maximum rate on social card games from 20 percent to 10 percent. Shoreline strongly opposes legislation preempting or reducing local tax authority in the absence of a compelling state interest and a corresponding decrease in service requirements. These changes have the same economic impact as an unfunded mandate.

Fiscal Notes

Supports requiring the state Department of Revenue to expand its fiscal notes to include the impacts on local government—including any disproportionate impact on specific cities. Currently, fiscal note analysis includes local government impacts in gross figures only which can mask disproportionate impacts of proposed legislation (e.g., proposed sales and use tax exemptions) on certain geographic areas of the state or on border cities. This change would provide legislators more information about negative revenue impacts of proposed legislation.

State Facilities

Strongly urges the legislature to reimburse cities for services provided to state facilities and for capital improvement costs necessary to serve state facilities and/or programs located in cities, such as group homes.

V. Health and Human Services

Human Services Funding

1. Strongly urges the congress, the legislature and the county to meet their long-standing funding responsibility for vital human services, to address emerging needs, and provide replacement revenues to cities for programs formerly funded by the federal government.
2. Urges the state to carefully monitor how welfare reform places new social services burdens on local governments, and to provide adequate funds to local governments to make new initiatives succeed, and not result in a cost-shift to cities and counties.

Family, Children and Youth Services

1. Urges the legislature to adequately fund health and welfare programs for children.
2. Supports affordable child care, including before and after school programs, in recognition that affordable, accessible child care is essential for family economic self-sufficiency and children's health, growth and development.
3. Supports legislation and funding for youth involvement programs, e.g., after school/evening educational and activity programs for adolescent and teen-age youths, in recognition of the demonstrated benefits these positive, supervised activities can provide.
4. Supports continued funding for the Community Public Health and Safety Networks which provides funding for local human services in Shoreline (e.g., Healthy Start abuse prevention program) and advocates for state-funded human services that respond to local needs and priorities, and for the Family Policy Council which coordinates activities of state agencies that provide child and family services.

Services for the Elderly

Supports semi-independent living opportunities that allow the elderly to remain in their communities.

Services for the Developmentally Disabled

Supports programs to assist the developmentally disabled.

Siting Social Services Facilities

Supports legislation to include local governments in the decision-making process for siting state social services facilities in their communities.

VI. Law and Justice

1. Strongly supports remedial legislation to limit liability for local governments that provide probation and pretrial services. This issue arose out of a state Supreme Court decision earlier this year significantly extending the liability of local governments for supervision of criminal defendants in misdemeanor probation or pretrial release programs. The Court held that municipal employees who have supervisory authority, and their employers, have a duty to protect the public from dangerous acts by offenders under their supervision. The problem created by this decision is it makes local governments liable for the acts of probationers without the ability to revoke probation, which rests with the courts. Without legislation limiting the liability in these cases, alternatives to jail could be too risky to maintain.
2. Supports legislation to allocate funds to local governments when the state increases criminal penalties that require additional jail time, or when new laws require additional police, court, or jail services. Increases in jail time for certain categories of crimes amount to unfunded mandates and can increase jail costs with no offsetting revenue.
3. Urges legislature to seek innovative and cost-effective solutions to relieve overburdened courts, law enforcement agencies, and jails.
4. Urges state and federal governments to provide technical and financial assistance to local governments for alternatives to incarceration, such as electronic home monitoring and more effective treatment, prevention and transitional programs. These programs can be effective in reducing jail costs and the number of repeat offenses, and controlling other criminal justice system costs.

Juvenile Justice Services

Encourages the legislature to provide sufficient funds for local governments to initiate and expand youth services to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system.

VII. General Government

Liability

Supports legislation to exempt cities from joint and several liability for the acts of other persons at fault. In certain circumstances, cities can be held jointly and severally liable for acts of third parties—even if the other party acted intentionally. Where a city may be minimally at fault, it may have to pay 100 percent of the damages if the other party at fault is without funds.

VIII. Economic Development and the Growth Management Act

Economic Development

1. Supports amending the state constitution to permit local governments to enter into public-private partnerships which are not in conflict with the "lending of credit" restrictions in the state constitution (which prohibits the state from lending or giving funds to private persons who are not poor or infirm). Current restrictions put Washington cities at a disadvantage when trying to support economic development opportunities using public-private programs to finance infrastructure improvements in support of urban redevelopment.
2. Supports legislation establishing capital assistance programs to help cities finance economic development related local capital projects.

Annexation Reform

Strongly supports legislative reforms to annexation statutes to ensure conformance with the Growth Management Act, to standardize annexation procedures between code and non-

code classified cities, and legislation to allow cities to annex contiguous unincorporated property across county lines. The Growth Management Act makes cities responsible for capital planning in their urban growth areas. Annexation statutes enacted before the Growth Management Act was passed do not address or recognize this requirement. We propose that the legislature direct a review of annexation statutes for conformity with the Growth Management Act.

Growth Management Act

1. Supports legislation that further defines, coordinates, simplifies and streamlines land use decisions and permitting under the Growth Management Act as well as the State Environmental Policy Act and the Shorelines Management Act. We propose that the legislature streamline these laws to address conflicting language, in some cases overlapping public notice requirements, and redundancies, in order to simplify the administrative requirements on local governments.
2. Urges the legislature to fully fund any new planning and/or regulatory mandates.
3. Strongly supports retention of the right of cities to assume water/sewer districts, consistent with the Growth Management Act, without requiring a vote of all district residents.
4. Strongly supports full state funding of the significant costs and analysis required for "buildable lands" inventories that six counties—and the cities within them—must perform.
5. Strongly opposes further attempts by the Legislature to impose sanctions or penalties on cities not meeting their growth targets/housing production goals. Holding cities responsible for market-influenced factors outside their control is counterproductive to meeting the intent of the Growth Management Act.
6. Supports legislation to enhance local flexibility to fairly assess impact fees upon new growth, as well as upon expanded public facilities of regional or statewide significance.
7. Supports legislation requiring mitigation of the impacts to cities caused by state or agency actions around the siting of public facilities of regional or statewide significance, such as Fircrest.

Affordable Housing

Supports legislation that assures current affordable housing subsidies available to local governments are retained in law, and supports authorization of a permanent, stable funding source for affordable housing that allows people with middle and low incomes entry into the housing market (i.e., State Housing Trust Fund Grants).

IX. Energy, Utilities and Telecommunications

Energy

Strongly supports meaningful participation by cities in state and federal actions relating to the development, planning, conservation, deregulation, allocation, and utilization of energy resources in the Northwest.

Electric Energy Restructuring

1. Strongly opposes legislation unfairly shifting costs to specific customer classes, particularly residential, low income and small commercial customers.
2. Supports legislation ensuring local governments have authority to serve as "aggregators" for their residential, small commercial, or institutional customers, or to participate in aggregation groups. (In a deregulated energy industry, cities could form large groups of consumers to get better electricity rates than if they were to act alone. This aggregation authority is included in the agreement with Seattle City Light as a means for Shoreline to maintain an 8% cap on power rate differentials in a deregulated environment.)

3. Opposes legislation that would allow locally produced power to leave the state in search of a higher price to the detriment of the local customer.

Telecommunications

1. Supports active participation by local governments in state and federal actions regarding wireless communications, cable television and broadcast satellite.
2. Strongly supports legislation affirming and protecting the City's ability to manage its rights-of-way and publicly-owned infrastructure—which are some of the City's most important assets—with specific authority to: regulate how, when and where facilities are located; and, require utilities to bear the cost of relocating their facilities within the rights-of-way for needed public improvements.
3. Strongly supports preservation of taxing authority and the right to compensation for costs incurred by cities as a result of the presence of telecommunication facilities in city rights-of-way, including full recovery of permitting and other administrative costs.
4. Strongly supports legislation recognizing the responsibility of the telecommunications industry to assume appropriate legal liability due to its presence in city rights-of-way.

Utility Taxation and Franchise Authority

1. Monitor legislation equalizing taxing authority between municipalities that own utilities and those that do not. Shoreline is provided utility service by another City in three critical areas; electricity (100% of the City), water (60% of the City), and wastewater (30% of the City). For most municipalities in the state, utility tax revenues are a key source of revenues for ongoing operations. Shoreline residents served by Seattle utilities currently pay tax to Seattle's general fund making it difficult for Shoreline to utilize this revenue source. Shoreline's franchise agreement with Seattle City Light address this concern with respect to electrical services. Legislative cooperation between Seattle and Shoreline is an integral part of this agreement. This policy supports continued vigilance in this area in order to identify risks and opportunities that may arise during the legislative process.
2. Strongly supports legislation recognizing that local franchising authority needs to be protected and asserted over all utilities on an equal basis which would allow cities to regulate activities of utilities operating inside their boundaries. Some telecommunications companies are asserting that they are exempt from municipal franchising authority. This recommendation seeks clarification that cities have uniform authority to manage their rights-of-way through franchises.

X. Environment

Clean Water

Supports flexibility in the administration of state and federal clean water regulations to achieve a balance between meeting environmental objectives and the financial costs of compliance.

Water Resources

1. Supports flexible regional planning for water resources and water supply that includes affected parties, including cities, and that when initiated, provides clear direction for the state in making decisions affecting water rights, natural resource protection and overall allocation of the state's waters.
2. Supports legislation clarifying the state's water resource laws and policies to reflect a balance between in-stream uses (fish, wildlife, recreation), and out-of-stream uses (municipal water supply, hydroelectric power, irrigation), and encouraging state agencies that implement and enforce water policies to coordinate with each other and with local governments.

3. Supports clarification of applicable statutes, rules or policies that better define and describe the nature and duration of municipal water rights, including assurances if water is conserved, cities will not lose rights to that water through regulatory or judicial action.
4. Supports continuous evaluation and monitoring of the 1998 legislation authorizing flexible watershed-by-watershed basin planning.

Solid Waste

Supports equal and fair involvement of cities in coordinated solid waste planning and funding distribution.

Sanitary Sewers

1. Supports equal and fair involvement of cities in coordinated planning for sanitary sewers, facility distribution, and water source issues related to sanitary sewers.
2. Supports flexibility in the utilization of a capacity charge to provide funding for new infrastructure to provide additional capacity for growth in sewage treatment facilities.

Endangered Species Act (ESA) Funding and Policy

1. Supports provision of significant and ongoing funding assistance to local governments by the state legislature and federal government to assist cities as they respond to current and pending ESA listings, including direct grants of federal and state money to cities located in territory covered by potential ESA listings to develop necessary scientific knowledge, habitat conservation plans, and habitat restoration projects to respond to ESA listings of salmon.
2. Supports city involvement in financing and decision-making regarding policies, plans and projects developed to respond to the ESA at a local, regional and state level.
3. Supports ongoing evaluations of the actions of federal, state and local efforts to address ESA issues to ensure that the fish are being recovered and economic development, especially in urban areas, is considered in salmon recovery efforts.

XI. Fircrest

Fircrest is an approximately 80-acre site, owned by various state agencies. It includes several public uses, such as the Fircrest School for the Developmentally Disabled, Health Laboratories, Washington State Patrol, King County North End Rehabilitation Facility, and the Food Lifeline/ Food Bank. Under the Growth Management Act, state agencies are required to comply with local land use plans. However, there is currently no requirement that a state agency proposing a change in the day-to-day use or operations of one of its facilities—a change that could have a major impact on surrounding uses—include the local jurisdiction in the decision-making process.

Additionally, there is no requirement that major state facilities located within cities provide mitigation to the local jurisdiction(s) for the provision of services or infrastructure improvements needed to serve the state facility.

The City of Shoreline incurs costs to serve Fircrest—e.g., police services and transportation system maintenance costs—and receives no compensation for these service impacts from the state agencies housed on the Fircrest Campus. The following proposed statements of policy are intended to address these concerns:

1. Strongly supports continued authority for cities to plan for all land within their boundaries, and for the compliance of state agencies with those resultant plans, development regulations, and implementation strategies.

2. Strongly urges legislation to reimburse cities for services provided to state facilities and for capital improvement costs necessary to serve state facilities within city boundaries.
3. Supports legislation requiring state agencies as well as special purpose districts to update and coordinate their policy and capital plans to be in conformance with those adopted locally under the Growth Management Act.