

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, November 6, 2000
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute.

(a) Proclamation of "Veterans Appreciation Day"

Mayor Jepsen presented Rick Grennier, Commander, American Legion Post 227, with a proclamation of "Veterans Appreciation Day."

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman discussed the Washington State Supreme Court ruling of Initiative 695 as unconstitutional.

Mr. Bauman went on to discuss the schedule of Council meetings in January. Mayor Jepsen advocated that Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Bauman and he base the designation of the January 8 Council meeting as a workshop or regular meeting on the items scheduled for the meeting agenda.

Next, Mr. Bauman noted comments during the October 23 Council workshop about a dispute between Sharon Cass and John Dixon. He said Ms. Cass and Mr. Dixon have agreed to a staff-proposed meeting with a mediator to try to resolve their differences regarding Twin Ponds Park.

Mr. Bauman next discussed the letter from Mayor Jepsen to King County Council Chairman Peter von Reichbauer regarding the construction of connectors from the 1st Avenue NE Solid Waste Transfer Station to the bus ramps at the North Metro Bus Base.

DRAFT

He also mentioned a news release from the office of King County Executive Ron Sims in support of construction of the connectors.

Mr. Bauman announced that Jan Briggs has begun work as Economic Development Coordinator.

Public Works Director Bill Conner reported that the City terminated the contract of the company originally hired to landscape the Shoreline Police Station. The City has hired a company to complete the project. Mr. Conner estimated completion in two weeks.

Finally, Mr. Bauman noted that there is no need for an executive session later in the meeting.

Upon roll call of the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmembers Grossman and Montgomery, who arrived later in the meeting.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Gustafson mentioned the installation and dedication at the Shoreline Library of the totem pole that the City received as an anonymous donation.

Councilmember Ransom said the King County Jail Advisory Committee met to discuss rising jail costs. The explanations provided were satisfactory to those in attendance. He noted an estimated increase in City of Shoreline jail costs of eight percent. He discussed causes for the cost increases, including longer sentences and stricter sentencing.

Councilmember Gustafson noted his participation in a press conference at the King County Courthouse regarding domestic violence awareness. He discussed the involvement of the Human Services Roundtable, the City of Shoreline and Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Timothy Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, questioned the lack of City response to the comments he made at the October 23 Council meeting regarding the letter he received from Mr. Dixon.

(b) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, suggested that her family should receive a refund on its property taxes if it is not able to receive City services. She advocated that Council search locally for the next City Manager. She asserted that variances to stream buffers for the projects at 2330 N 156th Place and at 14900 1st Avenue NE contradict the Shoreline Municipal Code.

(c) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193rd Street, said "everything we seem to do in Shoreline is against the will of the people who live here." He asserted that the Aurora Corridor Project is flawed because it fails to address traffic congestion.

DRAFT

(d) Sharon Cass, 2320 N 149th Street, reiterated issues she raised at the October 23rd meeting regarding Twin Ponds Park and volunteer John Dixon. She also requested that the City ask Aegis Assisted Living to clear garbage and debris from its property on 1st Avenue NE.

Mayor Jepsen noted that Mr. Crawford left the October 23 Council meeting immediately after making his comments and that staff and Council responded as soon as possible during the meeting. He stressed that Mr. Dixon is not a City employee and that Mr. Dixon does not represent the City. He disagreed that the City is withholding services from the Crawfords.

Councilmember Montgomery arrived at 7:05 p.m.

Councilmember Gustafson mentioned that Parkwood Neighborhood Association has supported Mr. Dixon's work in Twin Ponds Park. He reiterated that Mr. Dixon does not represent the City.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Departmental Presentations for the 2001 Proposed Budget (all departments except Public Works)

Finance Director Debbie Tarry noted that the Washington State Supreme Court has ruled Initiative 695 unconstitutional. She went on to review the implications for the City of Initiative 722 (I-722) passing or failing in the November 7 election.

Council had no questions regarding the 2001 proposed budgets of the City Council, City Manager or City Clerk.

Community and Government Relations Manager Joyce Nichols reviewed the 2001 proposed budget of her department. Council had no questions.

Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem reviewed the 2001 proposed budget of his department.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Beem confirmed that both the City of Shoreline and the City of Lake Forest fund Club Kellogg, the after-school program at Kellogg Middle School. He explained that Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services manages the separate Aldercrest Late Night Teen Program.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Beem mentioned the goal of participants in the soon-to-disband Human Services Roundtable to maintain representation before the State legislature of local elected officials on human services issues. He commented that representatives of cities in King County will meet in December and January to discuss

DRAFT

issues of regional significance. He explained that staff retained \$5,000 in the "Dues, Subscriptions, Memberships" budget line item toward participation in these efforts.

Councilmember Gustafson said the proposed Health and Human Services budget is consistent with Council discussion during its August budget retreat. He advocated City support for after-school activities at Einstein Middle School should a program develop there.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Beem explained that Youth Volunteer Corps identifies volunteer opportunities in the community and recruits and supports middle- and high-school student participation in community service. He said Youth Volunteer Corps "filled out an area in (City) services," particularly by engaging middle school students in community service.

Councilmember Ransom noted Council discussion of allocating grant funds for which cultural organizations could compete. Mayor Jepsen acknowledged the goal to augment competitive block grant funding with additional General Fund revenues. He said the City must determine when it can do so.

Council next addressed the 2001 proposed budget of the Office of the City Attorney.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the eventual addition of a paralegal position. City Attorney Ian Sievers noted that his office shares an administrative assistant position with the City Manager's Office and that he has trained the person in that position to provide support. He agreed that another support position may be necessary as the City Manager and City Attorney's Offices get busier.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the City could "get a better handle" on professional services costs by adding a staff position. Mr. Sievers commented on the value, as the City grows, of eventually adding a dedicated staff assistant to handle some level of litigation. Councilmember Ransom clarified that he was thinking more about prosecuting attorney services. Noting that he has inquired informally of other city attorneys, Mr. Sievers said the City is receiving a "very good deal" with Kenyon Law Firm.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Sievers explained that the "Professional Services" budget line item is strictly attorneys fees. He said the addition of a paralegal position would not mitigate these costs.

Mayor Jepsen noted that the prosecuting attorney and public defense services appear in the Public Safety/Criminal Justice Services budget.

Ms. Tarry reviewed the 2001 proposed budget for Finance/Information Services.

Councilmember Montgomery mentioned the financial problems the County has experienced as a result of the failure of a major information services project. She expressed concern that nothing similar happen at the City. Ms. Tarry asserted the quality

DRAFT

of the Information Services staff. She noted that implementation of the Hansen Project is proceeding on schedule. Mr. Bauman said Information Services establishes the clear objectives for information technology and exercises the project management necessary to avoid the kind of problems the County has experienced.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry anticipated successful, full implementation of the Hansen Project by mid-2001.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry asserted the timeliness of reviewing the City's Overhead Allocation Model and development fees. She said most organizations conduct such reviews every three to five years.

Councilmember Lee questioned the 1123.9 percent increase in the "Operating Supplies" budget line item. Ms. Tarry said the City previously identified the Technology Plan as one budget line item, "Other Reserves." She explained that staff has designated amounts related to the Technology Plan to the appropriate areas within the 2001 proposed budget. Thus, "Operating Supplies" now includes the software and hardware related to the Technology Plan.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry confirmed that the City will be revising and refining the broad purchasing policies that Council previously adopted.

Councilmember Lee asked about the audit of utility tax revenues. Ms. Tarry estimated that the results of the audit will not be available for six months. She noted that the auditor has already identified \$20,000 in miscoded sales tax revenue. She explained that staff will return to Council in 2001 with a budget amendment addressing the cost of the audit (under the contract, the auditing firm will receive 20 percent of any revenues it finds for the City).

Ms. Tarry reviewed the 2001 proposed budget for Citywide Services.

Deputy Mayor Hansen questioned the \$23,593 deficit in the "Contingencies" 2000 projected budget line item. Ms. Tarry explained that staff did not know the amount of medical benefits cost increases when it prepared the 2000 budget, that staff later acknowledged the cost increases and that it charged the increases against the "Contingencies" budget line item under Citywide Services. She mentioned that staff already knows the amounts of the 2001 medical benefits cost increases and that it has included these in the 2001 proposed budget.

Council next addressed the 2001 proposed budget of Human Resources.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Human Resources Director Marci Wright explained that the \$3,000 budgeted for "Software/Licenses/Upgrades" represents personal style inventory software the City purchased for training.

DRAFT

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Wright reviewed the training that Human Resources provided in 2000, including: conflict management and DiSC personal profile training for all City employees; and sexual harassment and safety training for new employees.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Wright explained that DiSC is a personal style inventory that reveals preferences for communication behavior. She said the system is useful for team building and improving communication within departments.

Councilmember Ransom asked about training Human Resources will provide in 2001. Ms. Wright mentioned training in team building for all City employees and additional management/supervisory training.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Wright estimated that Human Resources will fill 50 to 60 positions in 2001. She noted that Human Resources has filled 42 positions in 2000. She said 13 of these 42 recruitments were for new positions.

Deputy Mayor Hansen noted that the "Recruitment" 2000 projected budget line item will exceed the 2000 budget line item as amended by approximately \$29,000. Ms. Wright said Human Resources conducted more recruitments than it estimated. She attributed this to increased turnover and the need to conduct multiple recruitments for some positions.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Ms. Wright confirmed that the City Manager recruitment costs are not included in the Human Resources budget amounts.

Police Chief Denise Pentony reviewed the 2001 proposed Public Safety/Criminal Justice budget.

Mayor Jepsen noted his participation in a meeting of community leaders convened by the Shorecrest High School principal. He said the principal was "extremely pleased" about the addition of the School Resource Officer (SRO) to the two high schools. Mayor Jepsen highlighted that the Shoreline School District, the City of Lake Forest Park and the City of Shoreline were able to coordinate their budget and funding cycles to anticipate and fill this need.

Mayor Jepsen stressed Council concern about increasing jail contract costs (which, he said, have increased by 100 percent over three years). He mentioned that he and Deputy Mayor Hansen raised this concern during a recent meeting with King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia. Acknowledging that the increasing costs relate to the entire judicial system as well as to County management of the jail, he asked about cost-management efforts. Senior Management Analyst Eric Swansen said the King County Budget Office has undertaken an Adult Justice Operational Master Plan to consider system-wide improvements. He noted his participation on one of the three workgroups, and he mentioned that Mr. Bauman or Ms. Nichols will participate in the steering committee. He anticipated recommendations from the planning process by the first quarter of next year.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen asked if the County is incurring the same 32-percent increase in jail costs for unincorporated areas that the contract cities are incurring. He asked how the County allocates overhead costs and whether such costs are fairly distributed. Mr. Swansen agreed to research these issues.

Councilmember Ransom requested an organization chart with the positions of Shoreline Police Officers. He asked how many positions are allocated to the Shoreline Police Department and how many positions are filled (he mentioned that the County has had difficulty keeping positions filled in the past.) Chief Pentony advised that the Shoreline Police Department included 47 dedicated positions in 2000 (including one City-funded administrative assistant position). She said the department is fully staffed. She explained that the addition of the proposed SRO would increase the number of dedicated positions to 48. She mentioned that three of the positions (two administrative assistants and one community service officer [CSO]) are not sworn officers.

Councilmember Grossman arrived at 8:11 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen asked about the ongoing issue of how labor negotiations and budgeting in the King County Sheriff's Office affect the CSO position in the Shoreline Police Department. Chief Pentony confirmed funding for 2001. Mr. Bauman said the City Manager's Office has asked the King County Sheriff's Office to explore two issues: 1) developing collective bargaining agreements to insure that the Shoreline CSO position is protected from layoffs; and 2) addressing civil service provisions that may also undermine the viability of the position.

Mayor Jepsen requested efforts to insure that County Council deliberations do not affect the Shoreline CSO position. He noted that he and Deputy Mayor Hansen mentioned this issue to County Councilmember Fimia.

Ms. Tarry discussed jail services in greater detail.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if longer jail stays have resulted from stiffer penalties. Mr. Swansen noted dramatic impacts from legislation addressing driving under the influence (DUI) and driving with a suspended license. Also, he commented that judges respond to the community attitude to get tough on crime with stiffer sentences with longer jail stays.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the discrepancy between the seven-percent increase in jail contract costs projected by City staff and the eight-percent increase in costs presented to the Jail Advisory Committee. Mr. Swansen said the City staff projection is based on a memo the County sent for budget planning purposes. He explained that the County will not officially set the rate until the County Council adopts its budget in late December. He asserted that the City staff projection is "well within the area" of the projection presented to the Jail Advisory Committee.

DRAFT

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry said the three-year \$125,000 federal grant for the SRO program will appear as a reduction in the contract fee the City pays the County.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, reviewed the 2001 proposed budget for his department.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Stewart explained that staff consolidated the budget line items under "Development Services Fund Programs" into one titled "Permits." He said Planning and Development Services staff are organized by permit type in accordance with the City Development Code.

Mayor Jepsen asked if consolidation of the "Development Services Fund Programs" into the single "Permits" line item will allow the City to anticipate use of permit fees over multiple years. Mr. Stewart said it will. Referring to page 61 of the 2001 proposed budget, he pointed out the \$679,704 projected "Ending Fund Balance." He said this proportion will remain consistent in future years. In addition, he commented that the Hansen Project, when it is fully operational, will enable staff to identify an actual dollar amount of carryover fees instead of the projected liability staff provides now.

Councilmember Ransom asserted considerable differences between the amounts on page 61 and the amounts on page 131 of the 2001 proposed budget. Ms. Tarry attributed these to the "Transfers In" and "Transfers Out." She said the "Transfers Out" relate to the overhead charged against the Development Services Fund. In addition, she noted that page 131 combines the General Fund and the Development Services Fund; whereas, page 61 presents the Development Services Fund alone.

Councilmember Ransom said he is trying to determine whether the funds adequately support Development Services expenditures. He noted an apparent excess of revenues versus expenditures on page 131 and an even larger excess on page 61. Mr. Stewart compared the 2000 Projected "Direct Expenditures" of \$894,259 on pages 61 and 131. He reiterated the difference of the "Transfers Out" and "Transfers In" on page 61. Ms. Tarry said these relate to the technology portion.

Deputy Mayor Hansen questioned the Development Services cost-recovery percentage. Mr. Stewart said cost recovery for "direct-cost services" is close to the 80 percent targeted by Council. He noted the ambiguity of how to allocate costs related to walk-in service.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the \$714,402 in "Transfers Out" on page 61 is for general administration or for planning and other functions outside of Development Services. Mr. Stewart said the "Transfers Out" cover the real costs (as identified in the cost recovery plan) for the operation of the permitting function.

In response to Councilmember Grossman, Mr. Stewart explained that consulting services has accounted for much of the "Transportation Planning" budget line item. He attributed

the \$121,000 decrease in the line item to the completion of the Aurora Corridor pre-design and the transfer of the project to Public Works.

Councilmember Grossman questioned the decrease of the "Economic Development" budget line item given Council emphasis on economic development. Mr. Stewart commented that the budget line item does not necessarily reflect the level of effort in the department on economic development. He said the department may focus other activities on economic development. For example, he mentioned the benefits in economic development of an over-the-counter permit process.

Mayor Jepsen noted that planning in response to the listing of salmon species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has offset the savings the City might have hoped to see from the transfer of major projects to Public Works.

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, reviewed the 2001 proposed budget for her department.

Mayor Jepsen noted that Councilmembers received a voice-mail message from a citizen concerned about the proposed purchase of a chemical application trailer and use of pesticides and other chemicals in the community. Ms. Barry discussed the City's vegetation management program, which includes very limited application of herbicides and pesticides. She said staff will also use the trailer to apply water-soluble fertilizers and for watering. Mayor Jepsen said Council may want to discuss the vegetation management program, particularly in terms of ESA.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Barry said the reference to Shoreview Park in the 2001 Planned Activity Summary on page 136 pertains to construction at the park. She said the City has not included any master planning for Shoreview Park in the 2001 proposed budget.

In response to Mayor Jepsen and Deputy Mayor Hansen, Ms. Barry noted her understanding that Council requested staff to prepare a master planning schedule for City parks. She said staff intends to work with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee to develop the schedule for presentation to Council.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the decision not to continue parks master planning in 2001. Mr. Bauman said the six-year Comprehensive Improvement Program (CIP) "is taxed with major projects" and not fully funded. He asserted that additional master planning for parks will exacerbate the situation. Councilmember Ransom commented that the City would not have to implement planned improvements. Mr. Bauman questioned whether the City would "want to have a master plan that's going to sit on the shelf for several years" before it can undertake construction.

Councilmember Grossman asserted his understanding of the intent to prepare a set of comprehensive plans for City parks in order to seek voter approval of a bond issue to fund improvements. Mr. Bauman said this was what Ms. Barry meant when she referred

DRAFT

to work with the advisory committee to develop a master planning schedule for City parks.

In response to Councilmember Grossman, Ms. Barry confirmed that the 2001 proposed budget neither precludes nor includes a master planning process for all City parks.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Barry explained that the contract with the North Rehabilitation Facilities (NRF) accounts for most of the increase in the "Intergovernmental Services" budget line item. She said the \$46,000 contract was previously budgeted as "Professional Services."

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Barry noted "pretty good attendance" at the Annex (Aldercrest Late Night Teen Program). She explained that the City of Shoreline and the City of Lake Forest Park entered into a contract on a pro-rated basis to fund the program.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the Neutral Zone teen program in Mountlake Terrace. Ms. Barry said she did not have current information about this program, but she agreed to research it.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the State Supreme Court ruling of I-695 as unconstitutional makes available the \$30,000 that staff had set aside for a special election. He advocated that Council allocate the funds toward Council goal eight: "Enhance Two-Way Communication through the Use of Technology (Government Access Channel and Website)." He encouraged other Councilmembers to consider and discuss other alternatives for these funds.

Councilmember Ransom noted the uncertainty caused by I-722. Councilmember Gustafson concurred.

Returning to the 2001 proposed Public Safety budget, Councilmember Grossman asked how staffing of the Shoreline Police Department compares with staffing of police departments in other cities of comparable size. He expressed his interest in the question of funding police versus funding prevention. Mr. Bauman said the proposed performance measurements will provide the City with a better understanding of such outcomes. He estimated that the staff size per capita of the Shoreline Police Department is approximately half that of police departments in other cities of similar size. He noted that the proposed Annual Police Citizen Satisfaction Survey will provide valuable information about the feeling of security in the community.

Councilmember Grossman expressed concern about the King County Sheriff's Office conducting the citizen satisfaction survey. Mr. Bauman said the survey will be conducted over the phone using random sampling. He noted close City staff involvement in the preparation of the survey.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen commented that the City has dramatically increased the number of police in Shoreline over the number present prior to incorporation. He asserted that a reduction in police staffing would be a mistake.

Councilmember Grossman supported the government access channel as a valuable opportunity. He mentioned other government agencies as potential partners. He asserted the possibility for high-quality community outreach programming.

Councilmember Ransom said continuously conservative financial projections have resulted every year in extra City funds. He advocated the allocation of additional funding for cultural services and other projects. He noted potential financial impacts of the State Supreme Court ruling I-695 unconstitutional and of I-722. He asserted that the auditor with which the City has contracted is likely to be successful in identifying additional tax revenue.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Barry confirmed that the City teen program is continuing. She explained the proposal to add five hours per week to two of the teen program assistant positions.

Deputy Mayor Hansen advocated that staff analyze the property tax rate at various ranges of assessment. He also requested that staff prepare a comparison to the property tax rate that would be in effect if Shoreline had not incorporated. He indicated interest in considering a reduction to the City's portion of the property tax.

Councilmember Gustafson concurred with Deputy Mayor Hansen's comments. He also supported expanded City use of the government access channel through partnerships with the Shoreline School District and the Shoreline Community College. Next, he mentioned his understanding that maintenance equipment the School District purchased with bond-issue funding was not being used. He asserted that City and School District maintenance overlap in some areas. Noting potential cost savings, he suggested an agreement between the City and the School District on facility maintenance. Finally, he advocated the preparation of a long-range vision regarding City parks, recreation and cultural services. He said this could help determine the feasibility of a bond issue to fund improvements.

Councilmember Lee asked about implementation of a biennial City budget. Ms. Tarry said State law requires that biennial budgets begin in an odd-numbered year. Also, Council must adopt an ordinance stating its intent to implement biennial budgeting at least six months before doing so. Ms. Tarry suggested the City could consider a proposal in 2002 for implementation of a 2003-2004 biennial budget.

Mayor Jepsen reviewed the alternatives that Councilmembers raised and asked staff to prepare cost estimates for them.

Councilmember Ransom expressed support for additional funding for the government access channel. He also mentioned the apparent willingness of the School District to consider selling the Cedarbrook property. He said the property is the last 11 acres

available in Shoreline. He noted the purchase of the property as a park site as one element of a bond issue.

Councilmember Grossman clarified that the School District is "looking at options for Cedarbrook; they haven't said that they would sell it."

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, asserted that Council has not provided citizens adequate opportunity to provide input on the budget. She questioned the purchase of the chemical application trailer for "vegetation management" and suggested education about alternatives.

(b) Tim Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, addressed several points: 1) Council should make development of a comprehensive approach to the Endangered Species Act its top priority; 2) a 16-foot-wide planter strip in the Aurora Avenue Corridor will result in pedestrian deaths; 3) Council isolates itself from public comment and should allow more citizen input on staff budget presentations; 4) the City proposes to use herbicides in a watershed to the detriment of fish; and 5) the City is not working with the State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

(c) Sharon Cass, 2320 N 149th Street, reiterated her problems with Mr. Dixon.

(d) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193rd Street, said residents of his neighborhood have complained to him about herbicide spraying in ditches in which children play. He advocated that Council closely consider the City vegetation management program, the problems in Twin Ponds Park and the issue of volunteers presenting themselves as City representatives.

Deputy Mayor Hansen advocated that the City consider steam weeders and other alternative vegetation management techniques.

There was a brief discussion of the role of volunteers at City parks.

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Cancelled

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:43 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, November 13, 2000
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmembers Montgomery and Ransom, who arrived later in the meeting.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman introduced Simone Deminch, a seventh grade student videotaping part of tonight's Council meeting as a school project. He also asked that Council add an executive session at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Bauman provided the Council with preliminary Shoreline voting results on Initiative 722 (I-722) showing 49 percent in favor of the initiative and 51 percent opposing it. He noted that a lawsuit challenging I-722 has been filed, which will be discussed with Council at a later date.

Continuing, Mr. Bauman reported on issues related to Twin Ponds Park and attempts to mediate a dispute between the Cass family and park volunteer John Dixon.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:14 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen stated that Evergreen School has worked to restore the stream and marsh north of the school. Now, Evergreen is hoping to work with Parkwood Elementary School to do an environmental event in Twin Ponds Park on Earth Day.

Continuing, Mr. Bauman responded to comments made last week regarding trash at the Aegis Assisted Living project site, noting a code enforcement action there.

DRAFT

4. WORKSHOP

- (a) Public Works Department
- (b) Capital Improvement Program

Bill Conner, Public Works Department, reviewed projects planned for 2001 to meet City Council goals three and six. He explained Public Works involvement in the North City Sub-Area Plan and other annual programs, including the overlay program, pedestrian improvements and surface water small projects. He noted that next year, in addition to the stream inventory assessment conducted in conjunction with Council goal six, the department will conduct an infrastructure needs assessment that will be used to develop the Hansen database of the City's infrastructure. He continued that next year will be the third year of the three-year Transition Plan, which includes hiring seven more Road Maintenance workers and the transfer of certain services from King County to City-managed private contracts. Additionally, the department will continue the facilities support program and implement park improvements at Shoreview Park, Paramount Park, the Richmond Highlands Recreation Center and the Shoreline Pool.

Mr. Conner reviewed Public Works' 2001 analysis of change, which includes providing localized control of tree maintenance, roadside spraying, vegetation control and sign maintenance. 2001 will also mark the beginning of large scale construction work and the hiring of a new construction inspector. Public Works will also assume responsibility for coordination of utilities franchises through the hiring of a Utilities Coordinator.

Turning to the 2001-2006 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Mr. Conner provided the caveat that passage of I-722 may impact the City's ability to move forward on some of these projects as scheduled. He explained that the six-year CIP draws down the balance of \$18 million carried forward in 2000 until only \$57,000 is anticipated to remain in 2006. He noted the figures do not include the \$6 million in federal funds announced by Congressman Jay Inslee a few weeks ago. It assumes \$7.7 million in total transfers from the General Fund over this six-year period.

Mr. Conner reviewed Public Works' 2000 activities and then described the park projects on the 2001 calendar: 1) Paramount School Park; 2) Shoreview Park; 3) the Rec Center; 4) construction at the swimming pool; and 5) erosion control at Richmond Beach Saltwater Park. He pointed out that of the City's 26 parks, only five meet minimum standards for the particular type of park. It is estimated that it will cost over \$10 million to bring all the parks up to a minimum standard. He reminded Council that the approach taken was to complete master plans and construction on selected parks and then come back in 2002 with additional master plans.

Continuing, Mr. Conner described the other capital improvement projects on the 2001 schedule. He concluded by highlighting projects of future years.

Mayor Jepsen supported development of a policy on the placement of signs and mentioned the Lake Forest Park approach of putting the city logo on street signs. He

concluded with the hope that it does not take until 2010 to finish the Aurora Corridor Project.

Councilmember Lee was concerned about who will have responsibility for the complicated issues involved in utility franchises. Mr. Conner said the job responsibilities of the new Utility Coordinator will evolve over time. The individual will be hired initially to handle franchises at the permitting level. Contract negotiations and policy discussions will continue to occur at the City Manager's Office level, with the Utility Coordinator providing technical support.

Councilmember Lee emphasized the importance of predicting project schedules accurately so that public and Council expectations are met.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the condition of the Shoreline Pool and whether the current repairs will prevent future breakdowns. Mr. Conner responded that "running a pool is like owning a boat." He said the repairs of the pool to date have given staff an understanding of how the pool works. Many parts have been replaced, and he is confident it is in much better shape now than two years ago.

Continuing, Councilmember Gustafson asked for an update on the emergency operations plan and proposed emergency exercise. He also expressed an ongoing concern about unfunded mandates, such as the Endangered Species Act (ESA), which necessitates the hiring of an Environmental Educator.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Conner explained that the 315 percent increase in professional services reflects the one-time cost of the infrastructure assessment contract, and the transfer of certain activities from King County (previously accounted for under intergovernmental services) to private contracts (professional services).

Councilmember Gustafson asked about resurfacing the tennis courts at Shoreview Park. Mr. Bauman responded that this is being taken care of outside the CIP. Councilmember Gustafson asked that a plan be developed to address the tennis courts at Kellogg and Meridian Park as well, so that all are kept in good repair.

Councilmember Gustafson noted \$5,000 was raised by the community to help with Shoreview Park construction and should be collected once construction begins.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Conner explained the concept of partnering with Shoreline Community College to build sports fields.

Councilmember Gustafson emphasized the importance of linking the Interurban Trail to the Burke-Gilman Trail at both ends. Mr. Conner assured him the plan is for a circular loop.

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about the magnitude of the projects and wanted to be sure the City could stay on target. He questioned whether I-722 will allow the funding to come in as projected.

Mr. Conner said that if the City is severely impacted by I-722 and has to postpone construction activity to a later date, the cost of projects will certainly increase. He assured Council that staff is now on board to aggressively pursue the projects on the 2001 list. He mentioned the hiring of Ann Tonella-Howe as a very experienced project manager for the Aurora Corridor. He concluded that funding for the projects is the least of the City's worries in 2001.

Councilmember Ransom commented that when the City assumed the Shoreline Pool, King County provided four years of supplemental funding and warranted the pool and boilers. Mr. Conner concurred that this money is covering most of the repairs to the pool, but he noted that 2000 is the last year for this funding.

Councilmember Grossman observed that there are more projects in the CIP than staff and that many are substantial, even for experienced staff members. He was concerned about burning out a young staff and wished to ensure contingency contracting ability for professional help. Mr. Conner pointed out that the City uses excellent design consultants and that the contracts would need to be managed even with professional help. He said there is now an engineering staff work plan that describes each staff member's work schedule for 2001.

Responding to Councilmember Grossman, Mr. Conner said that each project contains a contingency of 10 percent or more, with \$200,000 in a general contingency fund.

Councilmember Grossman asked about conversations with the School District about capital improvement issues, specifically parks. Mr. Bauman noted that the joint use agreement was recently adopted. The first joint project is Paramount School Park. The City is also considering the Athletic Center project. However, the thought is to focus on the projects on the current list before adding new ones.

Deputy Mayor Hansen commented that even after three years, the City will have \$7 million on hand for CIP projects, so the City is reasonably funded for the next three or four years. Mr. Conner noted that the figures he provided do not include \$6 million anticipated from the federal government and a possible state grant for the Aurora Corridor. He noted the City has done a wonderful job of getting grants for projects.

Deputy Mayor Hansen commented on the number of small projects done in the last few years. He was very confident about the department's ability to accomplish the CIP. In conclusion, he asked about an additional \$500,000 in revenue for the Surface Water Management Fund in 2001. Mr. Conner said he would check on this.

At 7:45 p.m., Councilmember Montgomery arrived.

DRAFT

RECESS

At 7:45 p.m., Mayor Jepsen recessed the meeting. At 7:52 p.m., the meeting reconvened.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Charlotte Haines, North City Neighborhood Association, personally thanked the City for its work in improving curb ramps and bus pads. On behalf of the neighborhood association, she supported the redevelopment of North City. She said people's fears about traffic congestion have calmed and residents are ready to accept increased density on 15th Avenue NE.

(b) Gretchen Atkinson, North City Business Association, also thanked the City for its plans to improve the infrastructure in North City. She said businesses are looking forward to working with the new Economic Development Coordinator to bring new businesses to North City. On another topic, she reminded Council about the Tree Lighting Ceremony to be held in North City on December 2.

(c) Patty Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, asked about public input in the City Manager hiring process and suggested a local person would know about local problems, such as the Aegis development. She mentioned plans to remove trees at this site. Ms. Crawford alluded to funding in the Planning and Development Services budget for watershed management and questioned whether citizens are getting their money's worth. She also asked about the vegetation management plan and suggested alternative methods.

(d) Timothy Crawford, 2326 N 155th Street, suggested that citizens be allowed to address department heads directly with budget questions. He commented on money in the Capital Improvement budget for stream rehabilitation, asking if money allocated in 2000 was spent. He suggested cooperation with other entities in dealing with the ESA. He asked the City to take care of natural resources.

(e) Sharon Cass, 2320 N 149th Street, asked when the "deadly nightshade" growing behind her property in Twin Ponds Park will be removed. She provided an example of when park volunteer John Dixon appeared to be giving directions on the City's behalf to a North Rehabilitation Facility crew working at the park. She reiterated that drainage is a big problem at Twin Ponds.

(f) Bill Ingraham, 19924 Aurora Avenue N, informed the Council of three problems at Twin Ponds Park: 1) presence of poisonous nightshade and futile attempts to kill it by cutting it down; 2) filling the wetlands, which is illegal; and 3) presence of dangerous nettles.

(g) Kelly Swenson, 2308 N 149th Street, said she represented the majority of the Parkwood Neighborhood Association in supporting the work of John Dixon at Twin Ponds Park. She explained his activities and said he has done a lot to clean up the park.

DRAFT

(h) Carol Ingraham, 18568 Densmore Avenue N, emphasized that cutting nightshade does not get rid of it. She said the nightshade growing around the soccer fields at Twin Ponds Park is a real problem, and the City could be fined if it is not addressed.

Mr. Conner explained the stream rehabilitation/habitat enhancement program is hoped to be an annual program with public outreach. In 2001, this money is devoted to the stream assessment contract, which is funded from various sources.

Mayor Jepsen said the City Manager search process will be discussed at the Council of Neighborhoods.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauman said staff will return at a later date with information about the City's noxious weed program and specifically how it is applied at Twin Ponds Park.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Montgomery moved to approve the agenda, adding an executive session after Item 10. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the agenda was approved as amended.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved that Council approve the consent calendar. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following items were approved:

**Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 9, 2000
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of October 23, 2000
Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 23, 2000**

Approval of expenses and payroll as of October 18, 2000 in the amount of \$ 841,933.92

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (a) Public hearing to consider citizens' comments regarding the 2001 revenue sources, including the property tax levy

Debra Tarry, Finance Director, introduced her presentation by noting that it includes additional information from that provided in the Council packet and a change in the staff recommendation. She said the 2001 total resources figure is \$80.5 million. Of this, 45 percent is beginning balances and interfund transfers. 48 percent of all the resources in the 2001 budget are designated for capital purposes. Only 33 percent (\$26.8 million) is

November 13, 2000

dedicated to the General Fund. Property taxes support 23 percent of this General Fund budget.

Turning to the key resource variables for the 2001 budget, Ms. Tarry said the King County Assessor is proceeding with implementation of I-722 as approved by the voters. Legal action is anticipated, but an injunction would be necessary to change application of I-722 to the 2001 property tax levy process. She explained the impacts of I-722 from a scenario of least impact to that of greatest impact. If I-722 is found to be fully constitutional, the City would experience an annual revenue loss of \$2.5 million, with a one-time loss of \$2.42 million. She noted that the proposed 2001 budget provided for a limited property tax increase of two percent, but it did not provide for losses from the repeal of fee and tax increases, the rollback to 1999 Assessed Valuations (AV) for property tax purposes or the repayment of fees and taxes collected in 2000 as a result of increases taken in 1999. She outlined the dollars lost as a result of these provisions—a total of \$2.42 million. She also outlined annual losses if the Council does not take action to reinstate utility taxes and franchises fees, as well as the fees adopted in 1999 for development services and recreation.

Continuing, Ms. Tarry outlined the Council's potential responses to I-722. Council could act on the property tax levy ordinance on tonight's agenda; however, staff does not recommend this because there may be some clarification on certain items, such as the rollback provision in I-722, in the next two weeks. Council has until December 7 to adopt its 2001 property tax levy. Additionally, Council may wish to establish reserve funds for potential repayment of taxes and fees. She noted that utility tax and recreation and development fee increases will become void on December 7 because of I-722. However, Council could re-enact the utility and fees by ordinance, or call for a special election. She pointed out that utility taxes do not become effective until 60 days after passage. If Council adopted utility taxes on November 27, 2000, the estimated revenue loss will be between \$334,000 and \$404,000. An election in February would result in a revenue loss of approximately \$900,000.

Turning to how to create the reserve funds mentioned previously, she said staff believes, based on the number of unknowns related to I-722, that it may be premature to make operational reductions at this time. She noted that over the last few years, a large portion of operational dollars have been set aside for capital. In 2001, this amount is \$3.3 million. Staff recommends considering a delay in certain capital projects until the final outcome of I-722 is determined. If no future replacement revenues are forthcoming, operational expenditure reductions will be required in the coming years. These would be approximately equal to those discussed in 1999 in consideration of Initiative 695 discussions (i.e., roughly five percent from the Public Safety budget and 20 percent from the budgets of all other departments). She concluded that the recommended reserve is approximately \$3 million.

Turning to the property tax rate, Ms. Tarry said the City's current tax rate is \$1.60/\$1,000 AV. This amounts to 10.4 percent of the property owner's tax bill. The big question in terms of property tax calculations this year is where to start. Staff used the previous

DRAFT

year's levy to prepare the proposed budget. Historically, the City's "levy limit" (the highest amount of revenue that the City can receive in property taxes) has been based on 1996's levy limit. It now appears the percentage increase must be based on the 1999 levy and AV. She explained a table depicting the revenue generated by various property tax rates. She said the amount the City can levy with I-722 provisions in place would actually be \$84,696 less than last year. This represents a reduction in revenue to the 2001 proposed budget of \$333,748. She showed the impact of various levy rates on the tax bill of an owner of a \$180,000 home.

Ms. Tarry concluded that Council would have to define a substantial need to enable the City to levy an amount in excess of the implicit price deflator (IPD) (the figure used since adoption of Referendum 47 to determine the levy limit). In other words, Council would have to identify specific needs justifying a rate higher than the IPD. In Shoreline's case, such a finding might be based on the desire for economic development, the fact that grants have yet to be awarded for capital projects totaling \$62.5 and the need to backfill revenues lost after passage of I-695.

Ms. Tarry pointed out that comparing an unincorporated area of King County to Shoreline, Shoreline residents appear in all scenarios to pay a lower tax rate than in the unincorporated areas. She emphasized that even with a lower tax rate, the level of services provided has been much better than prior to incorporation.

In conclusion, Ms. Tarry outlined the staff recommendations:

- delay property tax adoption for potential clarification in next two weeks;
- determine Council action on utility tax and user fees;
- reserve potential repayment amount of \$1.9 to \$2.42 million;
- reserve potential loss from delay in utility tax collection, AV adjustment (1999 levels); and
- place holds on certain capital projects to fund reserves until I-722 has been clarified.

Ms. Tarry alluded to possible 2001 CIP projects that might be put on hold in order to reserve the necessary \$3 million. She said the criteria used to develop the list were that the projects not be largely funded by grants or by Surface Water Management funds. The plan would be to proceed through the design phase on these projects so they would be ready for construction, depending on the final outcome of I-722.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to address the Council on this topic, Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the public hearing was closed.

Mayor Jepsen commented that, because of the complexity of this issue and the lack of clarity, he supported a delay.

DRAFT

Councilmember Lee commented that the estimated amounts for payback for taxes and fees does not take into consideration the administrative costs involved in doing refunds. Mayor Jepsen asserted his belief that this portion of I-722 will not survive a court challenge.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson's question about the feasibility and timing of an injunction, Bob Noe, Acting City Attorney, commented that litigation will proceed at approximately the same speed as that related to I-695. Mr. Bauman added that an injunction may be acted upon within the next two weeks.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Tarry commented that Council could levy a higher property tax rate than that allowed by I-722, but that it certainly would not be prudent to spend the related revenues prior to decisions on I-722.

Councilmember Gustafson also supported delaying the decision on the property tax.

Councilmember Grossman confirmed that deferring capital projects would not result in staff layoffs.

Deputy Mayor Hansen did not believe there would be a gap in revenues if the utility tax is reaffirmed and I-722 is found unconstitutional. He wished to investigate alternatives, such as submitting the utility tax to a vote. He also asked where resales fit in the AV computations.

Mr. Noe responded that I-722 does not address resales or actual values. Ms. Tarry said the assessor is saying that new construction built in 2000 is being rolled back to what it would have been valued in 1999.

Councilmember Ransom felt that Council will want to reaffirm the utility tax and user fees as quickly as possible to prevent any possible gaps in the revenue stream. He asserted that a finding of substantial need could be made to validate a higher property tax. He suggested that the City pursue the maximum legally-allowed rate, whether it is 102 or 106 percent.

Councilmember Lee suggested that the City start with the level set out in I-722, given passage of the initiative.

Councilmember Ransom asked what would happen if the City levied a higher rate. Ms. Tarry said the assessor will take whatever action is required to obey the law. She reiterated that if Council wishes to levy a higher rate, it would not be prudent to budget those funds until a final decision is made on I-722.

Councilmember Ransom expressed his concern that if the City levies a lower rate (e.g., 102 percent) in 2001, the decision will affect the City in future years. Therefore, he supported a higher rate that could be rolled back later if necessary. He acknowledged that the amount of the difference is not large in 2001, but he said when compounding is

considered the amount could be significant in the future, particularly for the projects in the CIP. Noting that the community wants these capital projects, he said Council should take a stand on this.

Noting that the two-percent limit that I-722 imposes falls short of the IPD, Mayor Jepsen said the initiative prevents the City from even keeping up with inflation. He expressed interest in levying an increase equal to the IPD at least, but he asserted the need for greater clarity about when this can be done. He summarized that Council will consider these issues again on November 27.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Motion to adopt the proposed 2001 Statement of Legislative Priorities

Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager, provided Council with an update of the situation in the 2001 legislature. She said the Democrats will probably regain the House by one or two seats and will probably retain control of the Senate by one seat. This will make it very difficult to govern. There will be major issues to deal with, including budget limitations imposed by various initiatives. In the 32nd District, the legislators are all incumbents who have been very helpful to Shoreline in accomplishing Council priorities.

Looking at new items for 2001, Ms. Nichols said the focus will be getting backfill funding for I-695 on a permanent basis and getting sales tax equalization funded, perhaps from sales taxes. She said staff will continue to seek funding for the Aurora Corridor and other capital projects. She mentioned other priorities, including opposing unfunded mandates, protecting local taxing authority, funding for ESA implementation and opposing buildable lands. She concluded that the goal will be to stay focused on top priorities in this challenging session.

Councilmember Gustafson asked for clarification of "Fiscal Notes." Ms. Nichols explained that proposed legislation carries with it an estimate of the proposed cost of the mandate. She said the office that makes this calculation does not do a very good job of figuring out impacts to local governments. This policy calls for the fiscal note to zero in more on impacts to cities.

Councilmember Gustafson also asked for clarification regarding changes to the street vacation statute. Ms. Nichols said this will become important if the City does Aurora Avenue redevelopment projects. Currently, cities cannot recover the full value of the street being vacated. The proposal is to increase the recoverable value to the full amount.

Councilmember Montgomery supported the priorities and commented on the importance of lobbying for Shoreline's interests. She suggested attendance at the Association of Washington Cities Legislature Conference in February. Ms. Nichols noted that Shoreline has a representative on all the crucial monetary committees, which will be a real benefit.

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom referred to the local taxing authority policy, pointing out that conditions were very different when the legislature allowed cities to tax social card games at 20 percent. At that time, the card rooms had as few as five tables and needed only one person to supervise the games. The Gambling Commission did not require security cameras. Now, card rooms must have 50 security cameras and an extensive system that requires a minimum of 85 employees. Councilmember Ransom said history has shown that a 20-percent tax rate is too high, causing casinos to fail—it costs a casino 80 percent of its revenues to operate under the Gambling Commission rules. He noted that a rate reduction from 20 percent to 10 percent has twice passed both houses and been vetoed by the governor. He said most cities and counties have gone to 10 percent. He felt it was “ridiculous” for Shoreline not to follow this trend.

Mayor Jepsen observed that no other Councilmembers support a change to this language. Councilmember Ransom responded that he did not expect a change but wished to explain why the tax was 20 percent in the past when the requirements were totally different.

Councilmember Grossman asked to be kept advised on what Councilmembers can do to assist Ms. Nichols, noting the extreme budget difficulties that will be presented by implementation of the various initiatives.

Councilmember Lee asked about requiring a determination of the constitutionality of initiatives before they go on the ballot. Mayor Jepsen said Senator Fairley is working on this.

Councilmember Gustafson concluded that Council must keep in contact with federal legislators as well as State and local ones.

Mayor Jepsen asked that the priorities be shared immediately with King County.

Councilmember Lee moved to adopt the proposed 2001 Statement of Legislative Priorities. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Patty Crawford, 2326 N. 155th Street, asked Council to think about people on fixed incomes when making budget decisions. She felt departments should have to tighten up just as citizens do. She said travel expenses in all departments have gone up this year. She reiterated her concern about tree removal at the Aegis site.

11. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 9:25 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that Council will recess into executive session for 15 minutes to discuss one item concerning property. At 9:54 p.m., the executive session concluded, and the meeting reconvened.

November 13, 2000


DRAFT

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:55 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of November 9, 2000 |
| DEPARTMENT: | Finance |
| PRESENTED BY: | Al Juarez, Financial Operations Supervisor  |

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

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

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of \$1,585,821.47 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for October 15 through October 28 in the amount of \$295,876.43 paid with ADP checks 2894,2896,2898 through 2899 and 4958 through 5016, vouchers 440001 through 440116 and benefit checks 6423 through 6433.

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on October 26:

Expenses in the amount of \$33,288.10 paid on Expense Register dated 10/24/00 with the following claim checks: 6316-6319 and

Expenses in the amount of \$156,108.92 paid on Expense Register dated 10/25/00 with the following claim checks: 6320-6338 and

Expenses in the amount of \$50,488.12 paid on Expense Register dated 10/25/00 with the following claim checks: 6339-6342 and

Expenses in the amount of \$1,115.25 paid on Expense Register dated 10/25/00 with the following claim check: 6343 and

Expenses in the amount of \$33,455.18 paid on Expense Register dated 10/26/00 with the following claim checks: 6344-6378

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on November 8:

Expenses in the amount of \$200.00 paid on Expense Register dated 10/26/00 with the following claim check: 6379 and

Expenses in the amount of \$377.45 paid on Expense Register dated 10/30/00 with the following claim check: 6380 and

Expenses in the amount of \$2,293.61 paid on Expense Register dated 10/31/00 with the following claim check: 6381 and

Expenses in the amount of \$229.00 paid on Expense Register dated 10/31/00 with the following claim check: 6382 and

Expenses in the amount of \$8,391.73 paid on Expense Register dated 11/2/00 with the following claim check: 6383 and

Expenses in the amount of \$388,258.36 paid on Expense Register dated 11/6/00 with the following claim checks: 6384-6397 and

Expenses in the amount of \$13,593.48 paid on Expense Register dated 11/7/00 with the following claim checks: 6398-6422 and

Expenses in the amount of \$157,088.47 paid on Expense Register dated 11/7/00 with the following claim checks: 6434-6452 and

Expenses in the amount of \$277.38 paid on Expense Register dated 11/8/00 with the following claim checks: 6453-6461 and

Expenses in the amount of \$397.50 paid on Expense Register dated 11/8/00 with the following claim checks: 6462-6468 and

Expenses in the amount of \$1,519.90 paid on Expense Register dated 11/8/00 with the following claim checks: 6469-6485 and

Expenses in the amount of \$1,432.05 paid on Expense Register dated 11/8/00 with the following claim check: 6486 and

Expenses in the amount of \$441,430.54 paid on Expense Register dated 11/8/00 with the following claim checks: 6487-6500

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Authorize the Interim City Manager to Execute Lease Extensions for the Eastside and Westside Police Storefronts |
| DEPARTMENT: | Public Works |
| PRESENTED BY: | William L. Conner, Public Works Director <i>wlc</i> |

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval to authorize the Interim City Manager to extend the leases for the Eastside and Westside Storefronts. The existing 2000 and proposed 2001 budgets include sufficient funding for these lease extensions.

Eastside Storefront

Staff is requesting your Council's authorization to extend the Eastside Storefront lease for one year beginning November 1, 2000. The Eastside Storefront lease was signed in October 1996 for a period of three years with the potential for one three-year extension. In September 1999, the lease was amended to provide three one-year lease extensions. Your Council's authorization is necessary to exercise any lease extension. The lease was set to expire on October 31, 2000, but the landlord, B.A.M. has offered to waive this irregularity as long as the City exercises its option to extend the lease for 1 year prior to November 30, 2000.

Extending the lease for one year retroactive to November 1, 2000 will obligate the City through October 31, 2001, at a monthly rental rate of \$692.25, which is \$9.44 per square foot. This rental amount has been adjusted based upon a 6.5% change in the Consumer Price Index over a two-year period. This price compares very favorably with the North King - South Snohomish County average market price of \$13.67 per square foot. Other than the rental amount, no terms of the lease will change. The total annual rental obligation is \$8,307.00. If the City does not act to accept the offered renewal option, the City will become a month to month tenant subject to altered rental terms or lease termination upon 30 days notice.

Westside Storefront

Staff is also working on an action to extend the Westside storefront lease for two years beginning March 1, 2001. The Westside storefront lease began on March 1, 1996 for a period of five years through February 28, 2001. This lease has three renewal options of two years each. The process for exercising these options includes negotiations on a

new lease rate that must be resolved and memorialized in writing 45 days prior to termination or January 14, 2001.

The current lease rate is \$14.00 per square foot including common area maintenance charges. This is higher than the average market price but an acceptable value given the lack of business space available in that area and the City's diminished responsibility for standard variable costs, e.g., parking lot maintenance. Staff will return to your Council prior to January 14th for authorization to extend this lease after a new lease rate is negotiated.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to execute lease extensions for the Eastside and Westside Storefronts.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney [Signature]

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Authorize the Interim City Manager to Amend the Lease Agreement with Highland Plaza LLC at a Monthly Cost of \$100 to Acquire Additional Lease Storage Area Located in the Highland Plaza Annex |
| DEPARTMENT: | Public Works |
| PRESENTED BY: | William L. Conner, Public Works Director <i>wlc</i> |

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval to amend the City's existing Lease Agreement with Highland Plaza LLC to acquire additional storage area space located in Highland Plaza, known as the City Hall Annex. The additional space area is needed to store blue prints and other materials.

The additional space consists of 92.8 square feet of storage area. The lease period would commence on December 1, 2000 and extend through March 31, 2003. The lease end date is the same for all the leased space in that building. The rental amount is \$100 per month. The rental space is not included for calculation of pro-rata share for the allocation of variable costs, so the \$100 per month minimum rent is the only charge for this additional storage space.

There is sufficient funding in the existing 2000 and proposed 2001 Operating Budgets to pay for the additional rental cost.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to amend the Lease Agreement to acquire the 92.8 square feet of additional lease located in the Highland Plaza Annex at a monthly cost of \$100.

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

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Authorize the Interim City Manager to Execute a Professional Services Contract Not to Exceed \$282,345 with Tetra Tech / KCM, Inc. for the Inventory and Characterization of Stream and Wetland Resources. |
| DEPARTMENT: | Public Works Planning and Development Services |
| PRESENTED BY: | William L. Conner, Public Works Director <i>wlc</i> Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director <i>TJS</i> |

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

In response to the May 15, 2000 staff report regarding the listing of Puget Sound Chinook Salmon as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), your Council directed staff to conduct an inventory and characterization of stream and wetland resources within the City of Shoreline. Staff prepared and advertised a request for proposal, and received proposals from ten firms. The proposals were evaluated using the following criteria: experience of the firm and key personnel, demonstrated ability to perform the work within an established budget and schedule, method and approach to providing the requested services, previous experience with public agencies coordinating and facilitating projects of this size and scope, and references.

The selected firm is Tetrattech/KCM. The scope of work includes identifying, mapping, and classifying stream and wetland resources, identifying primary ecological functions for each basin, locating fish passage barriers, identifying fish species present and expected wildlife present, and identifying fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.

The purpose of this staff report is:

- To obtain your Council's authorization for the City Manager to execute the contract for professional services.
- To obtain your Council's authorization for the City Manager to execute a contract with King Conservation District to receive grant (non-competitive) funds to partially fund this contract.

The goals of this project are:

- To produce a document that would be used to follow the intent of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. This document will:
 - Identify critical areas and associated development constraints, and
 - Identify guidelines to enforce protection standards.

- To identify stream enhancement opportunities for Capital Improvement Plan development.
- To provide recommendations for improvements to operations and maintenance practices in order to better protect critical areas within the City.
- To provide scientifically sound resource data that is needed to adopt City policies and critical area regulations pursuant to the ESA and related 4(d) rule requirements.

The project products and measurable results are:

- GPS location survey of identified stream and wetland features loaded into the City's GIS system.
- Sketch level maps of identified features.
- Characterization Reports documenting resource identification, classification, and habitat description for each of the City's eight drainage basins.

The baseline information provided by this project constitutes a first step in habitat conservation planning; it will be used as a basis for future watershed planning efforts within the City. The stream and wetland inventory and characterization will provide a tool for review of development proposals for consistency with our critical areas development standards. The Characterization Reports will provide the scientific data and analysis needed for improving land use management policies to address protecting the City's natural resources.

Project funding

The project will extend over two years. Funding has been included in both the 2000 Adopted Operating and CIP Budgets and in the Proposed 2001 Operating and CIP Budgets. Multiple funding sources have been identified for this project:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| King Conservation District Assessment Grant | \$ 61,600 |
| WA State Dept. of Community & Economic Dev. Grant | \$ 38,500 |
| Shoreline Wastewater Management District | \$ 35,000 |
| Surface Water Management Fees | \$147,245 |

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize:

- The Interim City Manager to execute a Professional Services contract with Tetra Tech / KCM, Inc. for the inventory and characterization of stream and wetland resources and their primary functions within the City of Shoreline, in an amount not to exceed \$282,345.
- The Interim City Manager to execute a Grant contract with King Conservation District for \$61,600 to fund a portion of the project.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

History

The streams and wetlands characterization/inventory project was first discussed with Council on May 15th, during the presentation on the potential impacts of the ESA on the City. As it was clear that compliance would be greatly aided by our knowledge of potential sensitive areas, Council directed staff to do a stream inventory. On August 21, the Public Works Director updated your Council on our progress, reporting that staff had obtained proposals from ten firms, and were moving ahead with the selection. Staff has now selected the firm and completed the scope of work. Work is set to start in December.

Analysis

The goals of this project are to:

- Produce a document that would be used to follow the intent of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. This document will provide the required scientific data relating to critical areas within Shoreline, which will give the development staff at Shoreline accurate tools to:
 - Identify critical areas and associated development constraints, and
 - Identify guidelines to enforce protection standards.
- To identify stream enhancement opportunities for Capital Improvement Plan development.
- To provide recommendations for improvements to operations and maintenance practices in order to better protect sensitive areas within the City.

Pursuing this project will give the City knowledge needed to comply with ESA requirements. It also comprises steps toward direct implementation of several goals of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. Specifics of these requirements and goals are described below:

ESA Requirements

As staff presented to Council on August 21, the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) final 4(d) Rule for (our region) was adopted on July 10, 2000. This means that, when the rule takes effect on January 8, 2001, any City action that fails to protect the endangered species is considered "take". NMFS has made it clear that a lack of knowledge regarding the City's sensitive environmental resources will not excuse activities that result in a "take".

The City's issuance of development or land use permits that may be proven to fail to protect sensitive areas could result in significant liability. Given this risk, an inventory of streams and wetland resources will be a protection for the City, greatly facilitating the permitting process.

Year 2001 Council Goals

Goal No. 6 is to develop a comprehensive program response to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and Shoreline Master Program. The inventory and assessment project described in this staff report will provide critical

scientific data and recommendations needed to fully develop and implement a comprehensive program in response to the ESA and the CWA.

Shoreline Comprehensive Plan

This project supports and implements the following goals and policies of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan.

Goal EN 1 states: Through leadership, policy, and regulation, the City shall strive to minimize its impacts on the natural environment. The City shall lead and support efforts to protect and improve the natural environment, protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas, and minimize pollution and the waste of energy and materials.

In the policies relating to this goal, EN 1, EN6, EN7, and EN10 directly support proceeding with this inventory. They are quoted below (*italics*), with comments (*non-italics*):

EN 1: Lead and support regulatory efforts, incentives and projects to protect and improve the natural environment and preserve environmentally sensitive areas consistent with federal and state policies.

Streams and wetlands are environmentally sensitive areas, as defined in policy EN7(quoted below). Doing this stream inventory will enable the City to identify these environmentally sensitive areas.

EN6: Cooperate with local, state, and federal governments, tribal governments, international agencies, and non-profit organizations to protect and enhance the environment, especially on issues that affect areas beyond Shoreline's boundaries.

Shoreline has five stream basins that extend beyond its boundaries: Thornton, McAleer, Lyons, and West Lake Washington (2 separate basins). An inventory and assessment of these basins will assist the City in coordinating activities with those of neighboring jurisdictions.

EN7: The following shall be considered environmentally sensitive areas and regulated through the Shoreline Municipal Code: 100 year floodplains, landslide hazard areas, steep slopes, erosion hazard areas, seismic hazard areas, wetlands, streams, and critical wildlife habitat areas.

EN10: Provide standards in the subdivision code that restrict the creation of new lots in areas which contain sensitive areas or sensitive area buffers.

The information provided by this project will provide the data necessary to support the adoption of these standards, greatly facilitating the development permitting process.

Furthermore, in the Environmental Element section, is the statement: *The City will work with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, residents, and other interested parties to identify and protect native wildlife species and habitats from the adverse impacts of current land use and future development.* This stream and wetlands inventory will be directly applicable to this identification process.

Goal ENV is to: Manage the storm and surface water system through a combination of engineered solutions and the preservation of natural systems in order to:

- *Provide for public safety*
- *Prevent property damage*
- *Protect water quality*
- *Preserve and enhance fish and wildlife habitat and sensitive areas*
- *Maintain a hydrologic balance.*

Again, the streams and wetlands inventory project will give the City of Shoreline information necessary to achieve this goal, especially in regards to fish and wildlife habitat and sensitive areas.

Policy EN55 states: All wetlands in the City should be identified and preliminarily classified.

Policy EN60 directs us to: Identify surface water features with restoration potential.

Policy EN61 directs the City to: identify, prioritize, and eliminate physical barriers and other impediments to anadromous fish spawning and rearing habitat.

Summary of Scope of Work

The scope of work (see Attachment A) includes identifying, mapping, and classifying stream and wetland resources, identifying primary ecological functions for each basin, locating fish passage barriers, identifying fish species present and expected wildlife present, and identifying fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. The following is a summary of the work elements that will be undertaken by the consultant to complete the project during 2000, and 2001:

The City of Shoreline Stream Assessment will be conducted in four phases.

Phase I (Review Existing Information/GIS) consists of devising a strategy for data collection and storage, reviewing existing information related to the City's natural resources, and developing a public involvement plan. Tasks for this phase include identifying and collecting existing data, formatting new data for GIS, and identifying data gaps. The consultant will also work with property owners to obtain access, delineate stream reaches and basin boundaries, and define sub-basin planning units.

Phase II (Field Reconnaissance and Inventory) is the fieldwork that includes inventorying the streams and wetlands and establishing fish presence and distribution. In this phase the consultant will evaluate in-stream habitat quality, fish passage barriers, fish identification, riparian vegetation and contiguous wetlands, and flooding and erosion issues. The consultant will examine the portions of the drainage basins accessible to salmon, verifying migration barriers and examining selected reaches above the barriers for the presence of resident fish such as cutthroat.

Phase III (Regulatory Review) includes reviewing various Shoreline Programs such as stormwater and land use for ESA compliance. In addition, the consultant will develop recommendations for operational changes and recommendations for City legislative alternatives. These recommendations will focus on problems identified and existing conditions observed during the stream and wetland inventories.

Phase IV (Basin Characterization and Needs Assessment) This phase involves preparing reports that assess the information compiled in the above phases. The reports will characterize each of the cities eight basins regarding existing conditions, problems, and impacts, and assess potential future problems and impacts related to anticipated growth.

The project products and measurable results are:

- GPS location survey of identified stream and wetland features uploaded to the City's GIS system.
- Sketch level maps of identified features.
- Characterization Report documenting resource identification, classification, and habitat description for each of the City's eight drainage basins.

The stream and wetland inventory and assessment will provide the City with specific data needed for developing capital improvement plans and for improving operations practices. The inventory data and stream/wetland characterization will provide a tool for review of development proposals for consistency with critical areas development standards. The Characterization Reports will provide the scientific data and analysis needed to improve land use management policies in order to better protect the City's natural resources.

The project schedule:

| | |
|---|--|
| Phase I - Review Existing Information/GIS and developing public involvement plan. | December 6, 2000 through April 6, 2001 |
| Phase II - Field reconnaissance and inventory of the streams and wetlands, and establishing fish presence and distribution. Upload data into GIS. | December 11, 2000 through June 15, 2001 |
| Phase III - Regulatory review of Shoreline Programs for ESA compliance. Develop recommendations for operational changes and changes to city ordinances. | July 2, 2001 through August 31, 2001 |
| Phase IV - Basin Characterization Reports and needs assessment. | October 15, 2001 through December 21, 2001 |
| Final Report, data, and all primary work products identified in the RFP scope of services due to the City. | December 31, 2001 |

Project Funding

Since the project will extend over multiple years, funding has been included in both the 2000 Adopted Operating and CIP Budgets and in the Proposed 2001 Operating and CIP Budgets. Multiple funding sources have been identified for this project:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| King Conservation District Assessment Grant | \$ 61,600 |
| WA State Dept. of Community & Economic Dev. Grant | \$ 38,500 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Shoreline Wastewater Management District | \$ 35,000 |
| Surface Water Management Fees | \$147,245 |

The total estimated project cost is \$282,344.98. For details, see attachment B, "Estimate of Professional Services".

KCD

On December 15, 1997 the King County Council adopted Ordinance #12959 which authorized a special assessment pursuant to RCW 89.08.400 for resource conservation within the King Conservation District. Each non-exempt parcel within the District is assessed \$5.00 per year. This annual assessment is distributed thusly: \$3.00 per parcel to each of the five regional watershed forums in equal amounts; \$1.00 per parcel to each city in the District from which funds are collected; and \$1.00 per parcel to the District for its operations. Each jurisdiction and watershed forum is required to expend funds received from the assessment on programs consistent with purposes of the District under RCW 89.08.

To fund a portion of the stream inventory and assessment project, staff has applied for and received an award for a non-competitive KCD grant of \$61,600. This amount includes the total KCD account balance for the City of Shoreline through year 1999 plus an estimate of the total year 2000 assessment collections.

This staff report includes a recommendation for your Council's authorization to execute a Grant contract with KCD to use the accumulated City of Shoreline assessments from KCD to fund the stream inventory and assessment.

CTED

The inventory and assessment will also be partially funded through a \$38,500 grant from the Washington Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED). The funding is provided through the Growth Management Act (GMA) competitive grant program. GMA grants are intended to meet the CTED statutory responsibility provided under RCW 36.70A.190(1) to establish a program of financial assistance and incentive to counties, cities, and towns to encourage and facilitate the adoption and implementation of comprehensive plans and development regulations throughout the state.

The City was awarded a grant under the Critical Areas category. The purpose of the Critical Areas grant category is to help local governments protect critical areas, incorporating the best available science. Activities may include, but are not limited to inventories, public involvement, research and data gathering; drafting, adopting or amending critical area policies and ordinances; and establishing incentive programs to implement the local comprehensive plan. The City of Shoreline received formal acceptance of the scope of work for the grant project on September 7, 2000 and a contract between CTED and the City was routed and signed by the City Manager on September 26, 2000. The City received the first installment of this grant (\$28,875) in late October.

Shoreline Wastewater Management District

Shoreline Wastewater Management District manages facilities within several City stream basins. The District recognizes that the City's planned stream inventory and assessment project would be beneficial to both parties. On November 7, 2000, the District's Board of Directors adopted a motion to participate in the project funding to a maximum of \$35,000. City staff are continuing to work with the District to develop a Letter Of Understanding that will detail the specifics of the District's participation in the project.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize:

- The Interim City Manager to execute a Professional Services contract with Tetra Tech / KCM, Inc. for the inventory and characterization of stream and wetland resources and their primary functions within the City of Shoreline, in an amount not to exceed \$282,345.
- The Interim City Manager to execute a Grant contract with King Conservation District for \$61,600 to fund a portion of the project.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Scope of Work
Attachment B: Project Costs

ATTACHMENT A
SCOPE OF WORK

ATTACHMENT A SCOPE OF WORK

SHORELINE STREAM AND WETLAND INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

The City of Shoreline Stream and Wetland Inventory and Assessment will be conducted in four phases. Phase I (Review Existing Information/GIS) consists of devising a strategy for data collection and storage and reviewing existing information related to City of Shoreline natural resources. Phase II (Field Reconnaissance and Inventory) covers most of the actual fieldwork including inventorying the streams and wetlands and establishing fish presence and distribution. Phase III (Regulatory Review) includes ESA compliance evaluation and ordinance review. Phase IV (Basin Characterization and Needs Assessment) involves characterizing each of the eight basins individually regarding streams, wetlands, fish presence and habitat, fish passage barriers, riparian habitat and habitat conservation areas.

PHASE I REVIEW EXISTING INFORMATION/GIS

Task 1. Identify GIS Coverages Available to Support Inventory and Assessment

A key component of the basin planning process is an efficient strategy for collection, storage, organization, and presentation of basin information. The City's existing Geographical Information System (GIS) provides an excellent structure for managing basin information. The City has already developed a variety of GIS coverages that will be useful in the basin inventory and assessment process. These coverages and other coverages to be reviewed and incorporated include:

- Digital Orthophotos (entire City)
- Basin Boundary Maps
- Stormwater Study Maps
- WRIA Map
- National Wetlands Inventory and City/County Wetlands Inventory
- Soils Maps
- Parcel Maps
- Road Center Line Maps
- Zoning Maps

- Priority Habitat and Species Maps

The City also has available a GIS survey and database of public drainage infrastructure.

The most appropriate existing coverages will be used as base maps throughout the planning process.

Subtask 1.1 Collect Data.

Collect from state and local governments relevant GIS data for the eight basins within the City of Shoreline boundary. These basins are Boeing Creek, Thornton Creek, McAleer Creek, Lyons Creek, West Lake Washington (2 basins), and Middle Puget Sound (2 basins).

Subtask 1.2 Identify Deficiencies.

Determine if all the needed data are currently available from the City in GIS format. Identify additional coverages that are needed or may be developed during the inventory process. Provide a letter report to the City identifying the additional coverages and proposed means for creating or obtaining them.

PRODUCT: (1) Collection of Relevant GIS Data
(2) Letter Report

Task 2 Information Collection

Two information collection steps are necessary to allow characterization of basin conditions:

- Office Data Collection—Collection of existing basin information (e.g., reports, water quality data, staff and stakeholder input) and uploading into the GIS as appropriate.
- Field Data Collection—Collection of new information regarding basin conditions through field reconnaissance (Phase II).

Key data gaps that must be filled to allow development of plan recommendations will be identified. Data collection strategies to allow evaluation of plan effectiveness over time (e.g., stream health surveys, and benthic macroinvertebrate sampling) will be developed.

Subtask 2.1. In Office – Collect and Review Existing Information

Conduct interviews with key City and agency staff to identify known basin conditions, problems, impacts, and available sources of information.

2.1.1 Collect and review pertinent, available existing information such as:

- Existing reports, complaint database, etc.

- Flow data at key points in watershed
- Fisheries information
- Upland bio-diversity information
- Water quality data
- High water marks, frequency/severity of flooding, repetitive loss sites, sites known to have been repeatedly damaged
- Wetland and stream reports from the development community.
- Historic aerial photos that illustrate pre-development conditions
- Historic flooding photographs

2.1.2 Format key information for uploading into the GIS database (e.g., water quality limited water bodies, problem sites, and data links) as attributes of specific locations, sub-basins, or stream reaches.

2.1.3 Develop preliminary list of concerns and problems within the basin.

2.1.4 Determine if additional data are necessary. If any new data are needed, prepare a list of the type of information and where it is needed.

PRODUCT: (1) GIS coverage of specific areas of concern/note with attribute files.

(2) Collection of existing information

(3) Preliminary list of concerns and data needs

Subtask 2.2. Collect Information from Basin Residents

Collect information from basin residents during the four public meetings under Task 3. Sort information to identify issues of public concern versus private issues or problems. Where appropriate, upload specific problem information into GIS as sub-basin or stream reach attributes. If necessary, confirm anecdotal information during Phase II.

2.2.1 Collect information. The four public meetings in Task 3-Public Involvement will be used to solicit relevant information about habitat, fish use, etc. There will be one city-wide meeting, and one meeting each in the Thornton Creek, Boeing Creek, and McAleer Creek basins.

2.2.2 Sort information on problems based on type of problem, severity, location and level of public concern. Update preliminary list of concerns and problems within the basin.

2.2.3 Format new information for uploading into the GIS database (e.g., water quality limited water bodies, problem sites, and data links) as attributes of specific locations, sub-basins, or stream reaches.

PRODUCT: (1) GIS coverage of specific areas of concern/note with attribute files.

Subtask 2.3. Conduct Sub-basin Reconnaissance (Field Truthing Windshield Survey)

Before conducting reconnaissance, review existing information, maps, and GIS coverages to identify specific locations to visit. Examples of potential areas to visit include the following:

- Reported flooding problem areas and other complaints
- Areas with land uses with potential for significant water quality impacts
- Upland forest and other habitat identified as having high biodiversity
- Significant wetlands and closed depressions
- Significant regional stormwater storage and conveyance facilities

Develop observation-recording forms so survey information can be uploaded into GIS as attributes for specific locations within sub-basins. Conduct a windshield survey of the watershed to verify issues identified during subtasks 2.1 and 2.2, assess overall basin conditions, and identify new issues (e.g., potential sources of water quality problems, construction site erosion locations, etc.). Record coordinates of locations surveyed using backpack GPS and take photographs. Upload survey forms and site photos in GIS as attributes.

2.3.1 Develop observation forms.

2.3.2 Conduct windshield survey. Use GPS to record coordinates of site of interest.

2.3.3 Upload relevant information to the City's GIS system.

Task 3. Public Involvement

The Consultant will assist the City of Shoreline in a public involvement effort. Public involvement will include informing residents of the stream and wetland inventory and assessment and the ordinance review. The Consultant will design a flyer and handouts, develop a meeting agenda, and participate in up to four public meetings. Shoreline staff will assist with agenda development, review flyers and handouts, and facilitate the meetings.

Assuming liability issues involving TetraTech/KCM, Inc. and the City of Shoreline can be satisfied, the Consultant will invite Shoreline Community College students under the lead of Matt Loper, Ph. D., professor of

Environmental Science to assist with wetland and stream inventories and assessments and also the fish identification task.

Subtask 3.1 Public Involvement

Assist the City in devising a public involvement strategy mainly oriented toward private property access. Design flyer and participate in up to four public meetings.

PRODUCT: (1) Public Meetings

Task 4 Define Planning Units

The Consultant will delineate stream reaches, basin boundaries and sub-basin boundaries is needed to create base maps for use in the planning process. Dividing a stream into reaches provides a structure for storing information regarding stream condition, prioritizing potential future projects, and determining the appropriate scale of sub-basins to use in the planning process. Sub-basin boundaries are necessary to allow evaluation of future development impacts on sensitive stream systems, mapping and evaluation of key watershed problems (e.g., pollutant sources), and identification of appropriate locations for performing stream flow gauging.

While preliminary delineation of stream reaches and sub-basin boundaries are necessary for guiding data collection and planning activities, this information will be refined following the field reconnaissance work described in Phase II.

Subtask 4.1. Define Preliminary Stream Reaches

Stream reaches are typically delineated based on clear end points and relatively uniform characteristics. For instance, a reach may have approximately the same gradient throughout, with the downstream boundary consisting of a major road crossing that obstructs fish passage, and the upstream boundary consisting of a significant change in gradient and, hence, stream characteristics.

4.1.1 Determine the extent of the streams to be classified. Prior to field work beginning, the Consultant will develop criteria for defining the extent of tributaries to classify, and the upstream end points. A map will be provided showing the streams to be delineated.

4.1.2 Classify stream reaches according the Shoreline Municipal Code or other acceptable classification system determined by the City. Delineated reaches will be digitized to create a GIS coverage. Information collected in later stages of the basin plan will be incorporated into the coverage as attribute files (e.g., habitat conditions of each stream reach).

PRODUCT: (1) GIS coverage with stream reaches numbered and end points identified.

Subtask 4.2 Define Preliminary Sub-Basin Boundaries

Sub-basin boundaries will be defined at an appropriate scale to ensure that land use or other density management recommendations can achieve their desired goals (e.g., prevent stream degradation). Appropriate sub-basin boundaries may also depend on other factors such as slopes, soils, and extent of urbanization.

4.2.1 Determine the potential analyses that will be sub-basin dependent. From that determination decide the relative scale/size of the desired sub-basins.

4.2.2 Identify preliminary sub-basin boundaries based on topographic boundaries, and then digitize them to create a GIS coverage.

PRODUCT: (1) List of sub-basin dependent analyses. Letter report summarizing method for breaking the Basin and streams into Planning Units.
(2) GIS coverage with sub-basin boundaries identified

PHASE II FIELD RECONNAISSANCE AND INVENTORY

Task 5 Conduct Stream Reconnaissance

Field reconnaissance of each stream reach identified in Phase I will be necessary to evaluate the following:

- In-stream habitat quality
- Fish passage barriers including steep stream gradients
- Fish identification through electrofishing or trapping in selected areas
- Riparian vegetation and contiguous wetlands
- Flooding and erosion issues
- Water quality

Prior to initiation of field surveys, the Consultant and the City will agree upon a protocol for private property access. Reconnaissance will be on a reach by reach basis and, for the purposes of habitat assessment, will employ the methodology developed in the Tri-County Urban Issues Study for planning level assessments of stream reaches. Detailed analysis/sampling of the substrate and water quality will not be undertaken at this time. This task is based on 13 total stream miles.

The Consultant will conduct field reconnaissance of each stream reach to confirm the pre-field classification assigned using the Tri-County methodology as well as to collect other, non-habitat related information. This reconnaissance will involve qualitative evaluation of the Tri-County parameters using the professional judgement of team members. Following confirmation of the pre-field classification, the important task of identifying potential basin planning solutions will begin during Phase III of the project.

A habitat condition ranking for each reach will be generated using the Tri-County stream reach assessment methodology. This ranking will be presented in the Basin Characterization Report and used as the basis for developing proposed basin management measures.

In addition to the specific stream habitat parameters evaluated for each reach, the stream reconnaissance team will also identify other features within those reaches. The following types of site-specific information will be collected at key locations as appropriate:

- Coordinates of key features (backpack GPS).
- Photos of key features.
- Descriptions of significant habitat features and general descriptions of stream reaches with poor habitat quality.
- Description of potential restoration sites.
- Locations/descriptions of existing artificial in-stream structures (e.g. weirs, culverts, etc.) and a general description of stream reaches with structures or improvements near streams that present an obstacle to future restoration.
- Locations/descriptions of unmapped side tributaries and drainage outfalls.
- Locations/descriptions of major creek head-cuts and other erosional features.
- Fish migration blockage information (e.g. culvert diameter, gradient, and length).
- Water quality observations.
- Reported high water marks at known flooding locations.
- A rapid bio-assessment and aquatic life assessment to provide a baseline (invertebrates and observe periphyton).

As with the watershed reconnaissance activities, information will be manually tabulated using forms and then uploaded into the GIS, or may be uploaded directly.

***Subtask 5.1 Conduct stream reconnaissance and habitat ranking.
Record observed wildlife and areas for restoration.***

Subtask 5.2 Rapid bio-assessment and aquatic life assessment

Subtask 5.3 Upload information to the GIS system

Subtask 5.4 Prepare reports for each basin

PRODUCT: (1) GIS coverage/attribute files with stream recon information

Task 6. Wetland Inventory and Classification

The consultant will review existing wetland information including studies and mapping. Classification of previously mapped wetlands will be confirmed. Each basin Characterization Report will include a chapter addressing wetlands and a GIS layer. This task includes up to three meetings. Wildlife observed during fieldwork will be recorded.

Subtask 6.1 Existing information

The Consultant will review existing wetland information (aerial photos; city maps; NWI, PHS, King County Inventory and NRCS maps, development records, etc.). Soils and topo information will be reviewed to identify potential unmapped wetlands.

Subtask 6.2 Verify Classification

The Consultant will ground-truth wetlands to determine level of accuracy of existing information and confirm wetland classification. Larger wetlands will be classified according to WDOE Hydrogeomorphic Method (particularly wetlands associated with a stream or other waterbody), as appropriate to type of wetland. With appropriate insurance/liability guarantees, Shoreline Community College Students will be used for office and field activities under the guidance of a wetland team leader.

Subtask 6.3 Report Preparation

The Consultant will prepare the wetland chapters in each of the eight Basin Characterization Reports.

Task 7. Fisheries Assessment and Evaluation

Wayne Daley of Daley Design will lead the fishery assessment and evaluation. With appropriate insurance/liability guarantees, the Consultant will coordinate student involvement in this effort with Dr. Matt Loper of Shoreline Community College. The Consultant will examine the portion of the eight drainage basins which are accessible to salmon, verify migration barriers and examine selected reaches above the barriers for presence of resident fish such as cutthroat.

Subtask 7.1 Existing Data Collection

The Consultant will review existing data collected by Shoreline, King County, environmental groups and WDFW. This information will assist in the onsite assessments. Information to be reviewed includes fish observations, flow data, water quality data and site maps.

Subtask 7.2 Onsite Assessment

The Consultant will conduct a preliminary stream walk of the sections of streams accessible to salmonids and other critical sites to determined best

methods for evaluation of the fish presence or absence. Sites for collection of fish by either use of traps or electrofishing will be determined and a schedule for those efforts will be completed. A schedule for spawner surveys will be prepared.

All potential fish passage barriers within these portions of the streams will be evaluated and a preliminary determination of corrective actions will be completed.

Subtask 7.3 Report Preparation

The Consultant will prepare a report addressing the fisheries resource within the City of Shoreline and potential areas for fisheries habitat restoration.

PHASE III REGULATORY REVIEW

Phase III consists of reviewing various Shoreline Programs such as stormwater and land use for ESA compliance. In addition, the Consultant will develop recommendations for operational changes and for City ordinances alternatives. These recommendations will focus on problems and existing conditions observed during the stream and wetland inventories.

Task 8. ESA Compliance

The 4(d) rule gives considerable discretion to local governments. King, Snohomish and Pierce Counties, along with several cities in the Puget Sound region, have initiated a Tri-County Salmon Response Effort. This document provides guidance for the City of Shoreline for future regulatory and program development for ESA compliance. The Consultant will review City of Shoreline road maintenance, stormwater management and land management programs in light of the three similar core programs of the Tri-County Proposal and document differences and suggest changes.

Subtask 8.1 Review City of Shoreline Programs and Tri-County Proposal

Subtask 8.2 Determine potential areas of risk.

Task 9. Develop Recommendations for City of Shoreline Ordinance

The Consultant will develop recommendations for the City of Shoreline, on a basin by basin evaluation, to address the following areas:

- Revisions to the critical area classification
- Buffer widths
- Restoration/mitigation/enhancement standards

- Compliance with Endangered Species Act
- Operation and maintenance
- Tri-County Salmon Response Effort coordination
- Goals and future opportunities primarily related to habitat protection, restoration and enhancement; water quality improvement; erosion and sediment control and floodplain issues.

The Consultant will review other plans nearing approval by USFWS/NMFS under the ESA 4(d) rules and consult with USFWS/NMFS on which requirements they will have for a local jurisdiction's plan to comply with ESA 4 (d). The Consultant will use the information as part of the evaluation and recommendations.

PHASE IV BASIN CHARACTERIZATION AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Phase IV of this project involves the creation of a Basin Characterization Report for each of the eight basins within the Shoreline city limits. Issues to be addressed include the following: streams, wetlands, fish presence and habitat, fish passage barriers, riparian habitat, erosion, flooding, basin function and habitat conservation areas.

The Basin Characterization Report will utilize to the maximum extent possible existing mapping and reports prepared by USGS, King County, Cities of Shoreline and Seattle, Washington Departments of Ecology and Fish and Wildlife, Natural Resources Conservation Service and various consultants.

Task 10. Characterize Basin, Assess Needs, and Develop Basin-Specific Goals

The results of the information collection and reconnaissance activities will be used to characterize existing basin conditions, problems, and impacts and assess potential future problems and impacts related to anticipated growth.

Subtask 10.1. Refine Stream Reaches and Sub-basin Boundaries

Based on the results of Phase II, refine the GIS coverages for sub-basin boundaries and stream reaches.

PRODUCT: (1) Revised GIS coverages

Subtask 10.2. Prepare Basin Characterization Reports

Using the information collected and compiled during Phase II, basin surface water conditions, problems, and existing and potential future undesired impacts will be documented in a Basin Characterization Report for each of the eight basins. In general, the report will address the following:

- Categorize stream reaches according to Tri-County methodology
- Identify and classify wetlands according to WDOE methodology.
- Identify sub-basins wherein high quality stream reaches may conflict with future land use
- Identify major flooding and water quality issues
- Evaluate basin characteristics and potential future issues in light of existing City policies and major state and federal regulatory drivers (e.g., ESA, Municipal NPDES permit, and GMA). These will be used to identify the "needs" for each basin. Examples of categories of potential needs include:
 - Identify critical habitat
 - Identify site specific opportunities for rehabilitation of degraded stream habitat and riparian corridors
 - Flood hazard reduction
 - Water quality source control
 - Critical areas mapping
 - Identify site specific opportunities for development standards alternatives (e.g., buffer widths, site planning, layout, and drainage)
 - Public education
 - Identify basin-specific goals that determine the extent to which surface water problems/impacts are to be addressed within that basin

10.2.1 Prepare draft Basin Characterization Report (5 copies)

10.2.2 Address comments received and prepare a final report (10 copies)

PRODUCT: (1) Basin Characterization Reports (10 copies)

Task 11. Project Management

It is important to maintain effective communication between the City Project Manager, City staff, Consultant Project Manager and staff to ensure the anticipated work is completed on time, on budget and in a satisfactory manner.

Subtask 11.1 Invoices

The Consultant will prepare monthly status reports detailing accomplishments and problems encountered. The status report will be submitted with each invoice.

Subtask 11.2 Project Plan/Startup Meeting

A project plan will be prepared to document the project and the roles of staff members. A project startup meeting will be held to begin the project and ensure everyone understands his or her roles, budget, and schedule.

Subtask 11.3 Quality Assurance Review

Documents will be reviewed for completeness by the Consultant's Quality Assurance staff prior to submittal to the City.

Subtask 11.4 Meetings

Prepare for and meet with City staff 5 times to discuss the status of the project.

PRODUCT: (1) Five (5) meetings with City staff.