ATTACHMENT B

PROJECT COSTS

ATTACHMENT "B"

Tt/KCM, Inc.

ESTIMATE OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

1917 First Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
Tel (206) 443-5300
Fax (206) 443-5372

CLIENT : City of Shoreline, Washington
PROJECT : Shoreline Stream and Wetland Inventory and Assessment
P.D. No. : 9090051-002 Proj. No.: _____ Date: 11/3/00

PHASE/TASK DESCRIPTION	LEVEL OF EFFORT -- STAFF HOURS					
	Project Manager	Senior Scientist	Scientist II	Scientist I	GIS Tech	Admin/ Graphics
PHASE I REVIEW EXISTING INFO/GIS						
1 IDENTIFY GIS COVERAGES						
1.1 Collect Data					24	2
1.2 Identify Deficiencies	4	12			8	2
2 COLLECT PHASE I INFORMATION						
2.1 In Office						
2.1.1 Collect & Review Existing Information	4	8	16	24		
2.1.2 Format key information (GIS)		8			60	40
2.1.3 Preliminary list of concerns	4	16	16			4
2.1.4 Additional Data	2	8	16	8	8	8
2.2 Collect Information from Residents						
2.2.1 Sort Information		2	16			4
2.2.2 Format key information (GIS)				24	12	24
2.3 Conduct Field Reconnaissance						
2.3.1 Observation forms	2	2	8			4
2.3.2 Windshield Survey	2	8	24	16		
2.3.3 Upload GIS information	2				24	24
3 IDENTIFY STAKEHOLDERS/STRATEGY						
3.1 Public Involvement	40					24
4 DEFINE PLANNING UNITS						
4.1 Define Preliminary Stream Reaches						
4.1.1 Extent of streams to classify	2	8			4	
4.1.2 Classify Stream Reaches	2	40			24	8
4.2 Preliminary Sub-Basin Boundaries						
4.2.1 Determine Relative Scale of Sub-Basins	4	8	4		8	16
4.2.2 Identify Sub-Basin Boundaries	2	4	24		16	
PHASE II - FIELD RECONNAISSANCE						
5 STREAM RECONNAISSANCE						
5.1 Stream Reconnaissance/Ranking	8	72	72	72		16
5.2 Rapid Assessment	2	4	40	40		16
5.3 Upload GIS information	4	4	8		40	
5.4 Prepare Reports	8	20	40	20		
6 WETLAND INVENTORY						
6.1 Existing Information	4	10	10	20	5	16
6.2 Verify Classification	4	20	20	40	5	16
6.3 Report Preparation		5	20	20	5	40
7 FISHERY ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION	(Daley Design; Subconsultant Cost Below)					
7.1 Existing Data Collection	8					8
7.2 Onsite Assessment/Evaluation	8				24	8
7.3 Report Preparation	8		24			16
PHASE III REGULATORY REVIEW						
8 ESA COMPLIANCE						
8.1 Program Review	4	4	40			16
8.2 Areas of Non-Compliance	4	4	20			16
9 ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS						
9.1 Develop Ordinance Recommendations	32	24	16			16
PHASE IV BASIN CHARACTERIZATION						
10 CHARACTERIZE BASIN						
10.1 Refine GIS Coverage	4	4	24		40	
10.2 Basin Characterization Reports						
10.2.1 Draft Reports	8	40	40	20		40
10.2.2 Final Reports	8	40	40			40
11 PROJECT MANAGEMENT						
11.1 Progress Reports/Invoices	24					24
11.2 Startup Meeting	4	4	4		4	8

ATTACHMENT "B"

Tt/KCM, Inc.
1917 First Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
Tel (206) 443-5300
Fax (206) 443-5372

ESTIMATE OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CLIENT : City of Shoreline, Washington
PROJECT : Shoreline Stream and Wetland Inventory and Assessment
P.D. No. : 9090051-002 Proj. No.: _____ Date: 11/3/00

PHASE/TASK DESCRIPTION	LEVEL OF EFFORT — STAFF HOURS					
	Project Manager	Senior Scientist	Scientist II	Scientist I	GIS Tech	Admin/ Graphics
11.3 Quality Assurance	40					8
11.4 Meetings (5)	20	20	20			20
TOTAL HOURS	272	399	562	304	311	484
HOURLY RATE (DJW)	$41.22	$39.52	$30.16	$21.25	$32.50	$18.72
SUBTOTAL	$11,211.84	$15,768.48	$16,949.92	$6,460.00	$10,107.50	$9,060.48

TOTAL DIRECT JOB WAGES			$69,558.22
OVERHEAD COST	(Total DJW	x 2.10)	$146,072.26
PRINTING (by others or large quantity)	($500.00	x 1.10)	$550.00
COMPUTER RESOURCES ($5 X # Admin/Graphic Hours)	($2,420	x 1.10)	$2,662.00
COMMUNICATIONS (Telephone, facsimiles, convenience copies,etc ($200 x 1.10)	($200	x 1.10)	$220.00
Daley Design - Fishery Assessment	($10,700	x 1.10)	$11,770.00
OTHER: Stream Invertebrate Analysis - 27 Samples @ $150/per	($4,050	x 1.10)	$4,455.00
SUBTOTAL			$235,287.48
CONTINGENCY (20%)			$47,057.50
TOTAL COST			$282,344.98

G:\PWORKS\Operations\SWM\Basin Inventory\2000\Contract\[Costs - Attachment C - 10-20 Revision.xls]Tt-KCM

Council Meeting Date: November 27, 2000 **Agenda Item: 7(f)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorization for the Interim City Manager to Execute a Contract with INCA Engineers, Inc. for North City Sub-Area Planned Action SEPA
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works and Planning and Development Services (PADS)
PRESENTED BY:	Bill Conner, Public Works Director Timothy Stewart, PADS Director Anna Kolousek, PADS Assistant Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this agenda item is to obtain your Council's approval of the professional services contract for INCA Engineers, Inc. to prepare a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) for the North City Sub-area Plan.

On October 19, 2000, the Planning Commission finished their deliberations on the North City Sub-area Plan and unanimously recommended the approval of this Plan to your Council. Staff will present the progress report on the North City Sub-area Plan at the December 4th Council workshop.

The Planning Commission recommended that the Planned Action SEPA include traffic analysis of the proposed improvements on 15th Avenue NE and mitigation of traffic impacts, including neighborhood street cut-through traffic mitigation.

The Planned Action EIS will meet all requirements of SEPA and at the same time provide a substantive incentive to development proposals that will be consistent with the North City Sub-area Plan. The demonstration projects and all other development proposals consistent with the vision will not be required to go through the environmental review. This will provide more certainty and shorter permit review times for projects that are consistent with the Plan. The public also will benefit from this process, because the impacts will be evaluated at the planning stage and the mitigation will be part of the SEPA Planned Action Ordinance. Your Council will adopt a planned action ordinance together with the Sub-area Plan next year.

The proposed 2001 Roads Capital Improvements Fund budget includes $160,000 for the environmental review of the proposed improvements to enhance the aesthetic environment and provide the pedestrian mobility and safety in the North City Business District.

As required by the City purchasing procedures, staff reviewed the qualifications and performance data filed with the City in its annual solicitation of Engineering, Design, and Environmental Roster and selected INCA Engineers, Inc. as the firm most qualified to manage the preparation of the Planned Action SEPA for the North City Sub-area. INCA Engineers, Inc. will work with a subcontractor, Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc., on analysis and mitigation of traffic and other potential environmental impacts. Staff negotiated the proposed contract, which it believes to be fair and reasonable given its scope and complexity. The amount for this contract will not exceed the amount of $142,200. (Please see Attachment A, Scope of Work, for detail description of work included in the Planned Action SEPA and Consultant Fees.)

The following Table outlines the schedule for the Planned Action SEPA and Sub-area Plan Adoption:

Milestones	**North City Sub-area Plan**	**SEPA Planned Action**
SEPA Scoping Notice and Comment Period		October 4 through 18, 2000 *(No comments received on scoping notice)*
Planning Commission Recommendation to the City Council	October 19, 2000	
Revision to the Plan and Code	November 2000	
Revisions to CIP	November, December 2000	
Preparation of the Draft EIS		November 2000 through February 2001
Public Review and Comments on the DEIS(Planning Commission will receive the DEIS and may comment)		March 2001
Preparation of the Final EIS, Planned Action SEPA Ordinance, and the draft North City Sub-area Plan and the Code documents for the City Council Action	April, May 2001	April, May 2001
City Council Action on the Planned Action SEPA Ordinance and the Comp. Plan: North City Sub-area Plan and the Development Code: Special District	June 2001	June 2001

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to execute the Professional Services Contract for the Planned Action SEPA for the North City Sub-area Plan with INCA Engineers, Inc. in the amount not to exceed $142,200.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Scope of Work

Attachment A

City of Shoreline - North City Sub-Area Plan
Planned Action EIS

Scope of Work

Project Understanding

The City of Shoreline proposes to adopt a sub-area plan and special overlay district for the North City neighborhood. The area affected extends from approximately 172nd Street to just north of 180th Street along 15th Avenue NE. The sub-area plan will encourage the neighborhood to redevelop with a mix of uses according to standards and design guidelines in the special overlay. The plan identifies five demonstration projects within the study area, on parcels that are considered to have a high potential for redevelopment within the near term. The sub-area plan also includes redesign of 15th Avenue NE, to reduce the number of travel lanes and to improve pedestrian circulation and amenities. The draft plan and zoning district overlay have been reviewed by the Planning Commission and recommended to the City Council.

The City wishes to designate the sub-area plan as a planned action, pursuant to authorization in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA, RCW 43.21C), implementing rules (WAC 197-11), and other provisions of state law (36.70B). The City issued a SEPA determination of significance for the sub-area plan and regulations on October 4, 2000, indicating that an environmental impact statement (EIS) would be prepared. No comments were received from the public or agencies in response to the scoping notice. Based on preliminary decisions, major issues that will be considered in the planned action EIS include transportation/parking, land use compatibility, relationship to plans and policies (including consistency with the Endangered Species Act), aesthetics/views, and air quality. Additional issues may arise during the course of SEPA analysis and may be added to the scope of the EIS. Information in the EIS prepared for the City's Comprehensive Plan may be adopted or incorporated by reference as appropriate.

The proposal considered in the EIS will include the sub-area plan and special overlay recommended by the Planning Commission, 50% buildout, including construction of the demonstration projects, criteria for further review after 50% buildout is achieved (phasing), and alternatives for mitigating impacts of transportation improvements to 15th Avenue NE . Other major capital improvements necessary to implement the proposal, if identified, may be included as well. Mitigation alternatives considered in the EIS may include different approaches to protecting adjacent neighborhoods from diverted traffic, and design variations for the demonstration projects. Varied strategies for implementing the sub-area plan will also be considered. SEPA land-use alternatives are limited to no action. The time horizon for the analysis is 2010 or 50% buildout with projected full development in 2015. For the purposes of SEPA analysis, the mitigation will be

phased – mitigation proposed for 50% buildout (2010) and criteria for additional review and mitigation after 50% buildout is achieved. The focus of the planned action EIS, and the subject for more detailed analysis, will be the mid-point of build-out of the sub-area. Demonstration projects will be used as examples for the 50% buildout. Full build-out will be considered at a more general level of analysis with criteria for additional analysis. It is expected that the majority of the traffic mitigation to project impacts will occur at the same time that 15th Avenue NE is reduced from four lanes to three lanes. This action is assumed to occur during the existing condition within the next several years.

As subconsultants to INCA Engineers, Huckell/Weinman Associates will be responsible for preparing the EIS document, and for analyzing environmental impacts to land use, plans and policies and aesthetics. This will include reviewing/summarizing the input of other technical consultants. McCulley Frick & Gilman (MFG) will conduct the air quality analysis. CH2M Hill will provide the EMME-2 transportation modeling for the various scenarios.

1.0 Project Management and Coordination

This task includes all administrative efforts needed to coordinate with the CITY and to complete the project on time and within budget. Subtasks will include the following:

1.1 Progress Reports and Invoices: The CONSULTANT shall prepare monthly progress reports and invoices. Assume four are required.

1.2 Coordination Meetings: The CONSULTANT shall attend six coordination meetings with the CITY staff during the project development.

1.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control: The CONSULTANT shall provide quality assurance reviews by senior staff.

1.4 Coordination with Subconsultants: This task includes the management and oversight of the subconsultants including review of progress reports and monthly invoices and provides overall coordination of the subconsultants work on the various tasks.

2.0 Traffic Modeling

2.1 Travel Demand Forecasting

The model developed by King County in November, 2000 will be used as the basis for developing the traffic forecasts for the North City DEIS. The HOV and SOV volumes will be determined using mode split factors from the PSRC model.

2.1.1 Revise Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) Land Use Assumptions to reflect Sub-Area Overlay. The CONSULTANT will disaggregate the existing data files in the travel demand model focus area and will distribute the

trips using the Fratar method of two dimensional matrix balancing. The City will provide the changes in employment, housing, new developments and other assumptions. Additional trips as a result of the sub-area land use changes will be added to assigned network volumes per each scenario.

2.1.2 Define Network and Recalibrate the Model: Network files specific to model focus area of the 15th Avenue NE Corridor will be augmented to a more detailed representation of potentially impacted transportation facilities. Screenline analyses for validation will be performed for up to 6 screenline locations in the vicinity of the North City Sub-Area.

2.2 Existing (year 2001) Year Analysis

The CONSULTANT will perform year 2001 traffic forecasts using a linear interpolation method based on existing land use. This will include PM Peak mainline volume estimates and intersection turning movements. These will be provided for both the 15th Avenue NE mainline and intersections in the corridor to be defined at a later date by the CONSULTANT.

Traffic volumes will be provided for the following scenarios along 15th Avenue NE:

1. Baseline (existing cross-section of 4 lanes)
2. 2 through lanes (one each direction) w/ center two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL) in North City Sub-Area only.
3. 2 through lanes w/center TWLTL for entire length of 15th Avenue NE (N 145th Street to N 205th Street)
4. Additional mitigation concepts (up to 3)

2.3 Support 2010 Year Analysis

Year 2010 Traffic Forecasts: The CONSULTANT will perform year 2010 traffic forecasts using a linear interpolation method based on existing and 2015 land use. This will include PM Peak mainline volume estimates and intersection turning movements. These will be provided for both the 15th Avenue NE mainline and intersections in the corridor to be defined at a later date by the CONSULTANT.

Traffic volumes will be provided for the following scenarios along 15th Avenue NE:

1. Baseline (existing cross-section of 4 lanes)
2. 2 through lanes (one each direction) w/ center two-way left-turn lane(TWLTL) in North City Sub-Area only.
3. 2 through lanes w/center TWLTL for entire length of 15th Avenue NE (N 145th Street to N 205th Street)
4. Additional mitigation concepts (up to 3)

2.4 Support 2015 Year Analysis

Year 2015 Traffic Forecasts: The CONSULTANT will perform year 2015 traffic forecasts assuming full build-out of the City's 2015 Comprehensive Plan land use. This will include PM Peak mainline volume estimates and intersection turning movements. These will be provided for both the 15th Avenue NE mainline and up to XX intersections in the corridor to be defined at a later date by the CONSULTANT.

Traffic volumes will be provided for the following scenarios along 15th Avenue NE:

1. Baseline (existing cross-section of 4 lanes)
2. 2 through lanes (one each direction) in North City Sub-Area only.
3. 2 through lanes w/center TWLTL for entire length of 15th Avenue NE (N 145th Street to N 205th Street)
4. Additional mitigation concepts (up to 3)

3.0 Traffic Analysis

The traffic analysis will evaluate the existing year, the year 2010 (50% buildout) and the year 2015 (100% buildout) level of service of the arterial street network, regional transportation network (within the study area), selected residential streets in the vicinity, and selected intersections. The level of service analysis of 15th Avenue NE will review conversion from the existing four lanes to a three lane section with one traffic lane in each direction, a center left-turn lane and parallel parking on both sides. The 2010 and 2015 analysis will be based on the traffic volume projections as shown in the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. Potential impacts to the traffic flow on 15th Avenue NE and diversion of the traffic from 15th Avenue NE onto residential streets and other arterials will be identified and recommendations will be made for mitigation, as appropriate. The existing CITY traffic model, created by CH2M Hill (EMME-2), will be used to distribute and assign trips for the various land use alternatives and traffic alternatives. It is expected that the traffic model will be completed in approximately three to four weeks. Traffic counts will be taken, the first week of December, to verify and calibrate the EMME-2 model. Raw turning movement counts generated by EMME-2 will be entered into a Synchro traffic model, created by the CONSULTANT, to obtain operational levels of service.

3.1 Preliminary Traffic Analysis

This task includes the efforts to gather and review information needed to prepare the traffic study for the North City Sub-Area Plan. Subtasks will include the following:

3.1.1 Review of Existing Documents: The CONSULTANT shall review existing documents including the Comprehensive Plan, Comp. Plan

DEIS/FEIS (incl. Traffic Appendix), Signal Coordination Study, Planning Commission Recommended Draft North City Sub-Area Plan, SR 522 Tech. Report/Traffic Projecting, accident data, and existing traffic volume counts as provided by the CITY. The CONSULTANT shall also make every effort to obtain existing traffic volume counts from WSDOT, as needed for the study area.

3.1.2 Identify Additional Information: The CONSULTANT shall, in cooperation with CITY staff, identify locations where additional information is needed, possibly including additional traffic counts on adjacent residential streets. INCA believes that an additional twenty (20) turning movement counts and three (3) 48-hour counts will be required in the vicinity of the project to provide a baseline for monitoring the volume of potentially diverted traffic and completing the traffic analysis.

3.1.3 Review Existing CITY Traffic Model: The CONSULTANT shall coordinate with CH2M Hill to determine how the EMME-2 traffic model routes and diverts existing trips and what assumptions have been used in the creation of the model the CONSULTANT will provide the CITY with documentation and methodology generated by this task

3.1.4 Field Review with CITY: The CONSULTANT shall attend three (3) field reviews with CITY staff to observe the existing traffic patterns at approximately twelve (12) intersections and the surrounding neighborhoods. Attention will be focused on potential mitigation of the diverted traffic from the arterial streets to residential. It is anticipated that one (1) meeting will be in the AM peak hours (7-9AM) and two (2) meetings will take place in the PM peak hours (4-6PM).

3.1.5 Preliminary Identification of Mitigation: The CONSULTANT shall make a preliminary identification of which streets are most likely to be impacted by the project and also to identify possible mitigation options for the identified streets. It is anticipated that mitigation options will include various traffic calming measures on streets and converting greater portion of 15th Avenue NE from four lanes to a three lane section with one traffic lane in each direction, possibly its entire length within the CITY from NE 145th St to N 205th St.

3.1.6 Mitigation Workshop: Following the field reviews, the CONSULTANT shall attend two (2) workshops with City staff to discuss the mitigation options identified in Task 3.1.5 by the CONSULTANT. The growth rate to be used in the traffic analysis shall also be confirmed at this time.

3.1.7 Review of Preliminary Trip Generation and Origin-Destination Analysis: The CONSULTANT shall use the results of the EMME-2 model for trip generation and distribution. The CONSULTANT will document how the trips are routed/ diverted and what assumptions are made for the various components of the traffic network.

3.1.8 Meeting to Discuss Trip Distribution Patterns: The CONSULTANT shall attend one (1) meeting with City staff, following completion of the preliminary trip distribution analysis, to discuss the traffic distribution and diversion analysis results.

3.2 Traffic Study

This task includes all the engineering efforts needed to analyze the existing and future traffic conditions within the 15th Avenue NE study area. All level of service and capacity type calculations and analyses will be performed in accordance with the 1997 Highway Capacity Manual Update, using EMME-2 and Synchro software (version 4.0) and SimTraffic software (version 3.2) and the Highway Capacity Software (HCS version 31c). Accident analysis will follow standard Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) practices.

Three possible alternatives will be reviewed for level of service:

- A no-build condition which will consist of a four lane roadway configuration on 15th Avenue NE
- A build condition in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and four lane roadway configuration.
- Existing 50% and 100% build conditions, which will include a three lane roadway section with one travel lane in either direction and a two-way left-turn lane along 15th Avenue NE between NE 172nd Street and NE 180th Street.

In addition, the possibility of traffic diverting onto residential streets in the vicinity will be evaluated for the existing 50% and 100% build condition alternatives.

Subtasks will include the following:

3.2.1 Existing Level of Service Analysis: The CONSULTANT shall perform the following tasks for existing condition:

3.2.1.1 Using Synchro PM peak-hour level of service analysis at all signalized intersections on the following roadways:

- 15th Avenue NE , between N 205th St and N 145th St
- Meridian Ave N between N 205th St. and N 145th St
- Ballinger Way between 15th Avenue NE and SR 522
- SR 522 between N 145th St and Ballinger Way
- 5th Ave between N 145th St and N 185th St
- N 145th St between SR 522 and Meridian Ave
- N 205th St between Meridian Ave and Ballinger Way
- N 185th St between Meridian Ave and 10th Ave
- N 175th St between Meridian Ave and 25th Ave
- N 155th St between Meridian Ave and 15th Avenue NE.

Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency

3.2.1.2 Arterial Level of service analysis on 15th Avenue NE between N 145th St. and N 205th St. level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency.

3.2.1.3 Review the arterial level of service on 5th Avenue NE, 10th Avenue NE, 25th Avenue NE, Meridian Ave N, NE 145h St (SR 523), N 175th St., N 155th St, Ballinger Rd. NE (SR 104), SR 522, N 205th St, and I-5within the 15th Avenue NE study area. Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency.

3.2.2 Accident Analysis: The CONSULTANT shall analyze the three most recent years of accident data provided by the CITY for 15th Avenue NE:

3.2.2.1 Update the accident analysis from the August draft study to include High Accident Locations on Meridian, Ballinger Way, SR 522, SR 523, and I-5.

3.2.2.2 Provide recommendations for modifications or improvements to the traffic operations based on the results of the accident analysis.

3.2.3 Trip Generation and Origin Destination Analysis: The CONSULTANT shall review and coordinate a trip generation analysis and determine the origin-destination patterns for the proposed future developments within the North City Sub-Area Plan. This shall be determined by:

3.2.3.1 The CONSULTANT shall coordinate with the CITY to determine the type and size of the development (i.e. number of units, square footage of residential and commercial units, density) within the North City Sub-Area Plan, based on the proposed development for the demonstration projects. This information will be used to confirm the trip generation rate for the area according to the ITE Trip Generation Manual.

3.2.4 Future Intersection Level of Service Analysis: The CONSULTANT shall perform the following items for the interim year 2010 (50% build out) and the full build out 2015 (100% build out) based on the traffic projections in the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan, or as directed by the CITY. It is assumed that the following capital improvement projects will be constructed by the year 2010:

1. I-5 auxiliary lane NB between N 175th St and N 205th St;
2. 15th Avenue NE between 145th and 170th widening and pedestrian improvements;
3. Highway 99 (Aurora) improvements between N 145th St and N 205th St;
4. N 175th St at I-5 left-turn lanes

3.2.4.1 PM peak hour level of service analysis at all signalized intersections on the following roadways:

- 15th Avenue NE , between N 205th St and N 145th St
- Meridian Ave N between N 205th St. and N 145th St
- Ballinger Way between 15th Avenue NE and SR 522
- SR 522 between N 145th St and Ballinger Way
- 5th Ave between N 145th St and N 185th St
- N 145th St between SR 522 and Meridian Ave
- N 205th St between Meridian Ave and Ballinger Way
- N 185th St between Meridian Ave and 10th Ave
- N 175th St between Meridian Ave and 25th Ave
- N 155th St between Meridian Ave and 15th Avenue NE.
- 15th/165th intersection (new)

Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency

3.2.4.2 Arterial Level of service analysis on 15th Avenue NE between N 145th St. and N 205th St. level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency. A review of the elimination of driveways to 15th Avenue NE and creation of alley system behind the proposed developments shall be considered in this analysis as appropriate.

3.2.4.3 Review the arterial level of service on 5th Avenue NE, 10th Avenue NE, 25th Avenue NE, Meridian Ave N, NE 145h St (SR 523), N 175th St., N 155th St, Ballinger Rd. NE (SR 104), SR 522, N 205th St, and I-5 within the 15th Avenue NE study area. Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency.

3.2.5 Preliminary Parking Analysis for the North City Sub-Area Plan: The CONSULTANT shall conduct a preliminary parking analysis (including on street parking), based on information included in the Planning Commission Recommended Draft North City Sub-Area Plan and coordination with the CITY. The analysis will determine the expected availability of parking in the North City Area and determine the potential parking impacts to the area. The CONSULTANT shall prepare a conceptual estimate of what on-street parking enforcement costs would be for required mitigation alternatives.

3.2.6 Confirm Mitigation Alternatives: The CONSULTANT shall evaluate the results of the analyses from tasks 3.2.1 to 3.2.4 and identify traffic impacts associated with the three-lane section for 15th Avenue NE . The evaluation will focus on the signalized intersections and arterial roadway level of service. It will also include the location, type and timing of mitigation needed for each proposed alternative based on the field review and the mitigation workshop conducted under Tasks 3.1.4 and 3.1.5. If the proposed mitigation requires a phased approach, criteria will be outlined to determine the timing for the implementation of the

mitigation. Mitigation measures proposed for residential streets will be consistent with the Shoreline Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program. Southbound traffic flows also will be reviewed to ensure proper mitigation for morning peak reviews. A maximum of two alternatives for mitigation will be evaluated in addition to the existing (four lane) condition and the build condition (2 lane with a two way left-turn lane through the North City Sub-Area.) They may include:

- A mitigated build condition which includes a three lane roadway section with one travel lane in either direction, a two-way left-turn lane along 15th Avenue NE between NE 172nd Street and NE 180th Street, and comprehensive traffic calming on residential streets in the study area, as identified by the CONSULTANT, in cooperation with City staff.
- A mitigated build condition which will include a three lane roadway section with one travel lane in either direction and a two-way left-turn lane along 15th Avenue NE between N 205th Street and NE 145th Street and comprehensive traffic calming on residential streets in the study area, as identified by the CONSULTANT, in cooperation with City staff

3.2.7 Redistribution of Traffic for Mitigation Alternatives: The CONSULTANT shall perform analysis of potential through traffic diversion away from 15th Avenue NE onto the regional transportation network and on the surrounding residential street network for each of the identified mitigated alternatives.

3.2.8 Level of Service for Mitigated Alternatives: The CONSULTANT shall perform the following items for the existing and interim year 2010 (50% Buildout) and the full build out year 2015 (100% Buildout) for the mitigated alternatives identified in task 3.6 based on the traffic projections in the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan (or as directed by the CITY) and the redistribution of traffic performed in task 3.7:

3.2.8.1 PM peak hour level of service analysis at all signalized intersections on the following roadways:

- 15th Avenue NE , between N 205th St and N 145th St
- Meridian Ave N between N 205th St. and N 145th St
- Ballinger Way between 15th Avenue NE and SR 522
- SR 522 between N 145th St and Ballinger Way
- 5th Ave between N 145th St and N 185th St
- N 145th St between SR 522 and Meridian Ave
- N 205th St between Meridian Ave and Ballinger Way
- N 185th St between Meridian Ave and 10th Ave
- N 175th St between Meridian Ave and 25th Ave
- N 155th St between Meridian Ave and 15th Avenue NE.

Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency

3.2.8.2 Arterial Level of service analysis on 15th Avenue NE between N 145th St. and N 205th St. level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency.

3.2.8.3 Review the arterial level of service on 5th Avenue NE, 10th Avenue NE, 25th Avenue NE, Meridian Ave N, NE 145h St (SR 523), N 175th St., N 155th St, Ballinger Rd. NE (SR 104), SR 522, N 205th St, and I-5 within the 15th Avenue NE study area. Level of service shall be compared against the CITY'S Comprehensive Plan for concurrency.

3.2.9 Optional Mitigated Alternative: The CONSULTANT shall perform, as needed, analysis similar to that described in tasks 3.7 and 3.8 for one (1) additional mitigation alternative. This alternative would be a mitigated build condition that includes a four - lane roadway along 15th Avenue NE . The roadway would operate with four travel lanes during the peak hours only (7-9 AM and 4-6PM). During all other times, the outside lanes would be available for on-street parking. This alternative would also restrict left-turns along the roadway through the commercial district.

3.3 Traffic Study Preparation

This task includes all the engineering efforts needed to prepare the traffic study report documents. Subtasks will include the following:

3.3.1 Draft Study: The CONSULTANT shall prepare five (5) copies of the "Draft" North City Sub-Area Plan Traffic Study for review by the CITY, including documentation and methodology used in tasks. The CONSULTANT shall meet with the CITY staff to review comments on the Draft report.

3.3.2 Final Study: The CONSULTANT shall prepare five (5) copies of the "Final" North City Sub-Area Plan Traffic Study based on the comments from the CITY and provide the CITY with a reproducible copy.

4.0 SEPA EIS

4.1 Prepare Planned Action EIS: Issues addressed in the scope of work include those preliminarily identified as the focus of the planned action EIS – transportation, land use compatibility, consistency with plans and policies (including ESA), and air quality. A contingency task/budget is included to accommodate potential inclusion of additional issues, should that be deemed necessary or desirable by the City. The consultant's approach to the major scope issues is identified below.

4.1.1 Transportation and Parking: INCA Engineers will prepare the transportation analysis. Huckell/Weinman Associates will review and summarize INCA's analysis for inclusion in the EIS.

4.1.2 Land Use Compatibility: The land use analysis will evaluate the compatibility of the amount, types and scale of uses proposed in the sub-area plan with the existing land use pattern and with adjacent development. The focus will be on bulk and scale and any potential conflicts between uses, particularly at the edge of the overlay district. The development impacts considered in the DEIS/FEIS for the adopted Comprehensive Plan will be compared to those impacts resulting from the proposed development under the Sub-area Plan. It is assumed that the City will provide the basic quantitative information related to the development capacity of the proposal and alternatives.

4.1.3 Relationship to Plans and Polices: Major plans and policies that will be addressed include the federal Endangered Species Act, the state Growth Management Act, state stormwater requirements, and the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. The analysis will summarize the requirements of these plans/policies and discuss the relative consistency of the proposed action with them.

4.1.4 Aesthetics/Views: The overall aesthetic character of the sub-area will be described and changes encouraged by the proposal identified. The nature of the change will be discussed. View blockage is also a potential issue, since the proposal permits considerably taller and larger buildings than currently exist in the sub-area, and since adjacent uses are generally one and two-story residential buildings. The nature of any probable changes in views will be identified.

The analysis will rely primarily on narrative descriptions of existing character; graphics from the North City sub-area plan will be used to describe planned changes. No photographic simulations are considered necessary.

4.1.5 Air Quality: McCulley Frick and Gilman (MFG) will perform the air quality analysis, as a subconsultant to INCA. They will use INCA's traffic modeling output, as input to an air quality model, to reflect the redesign and travel patterns on 15th Avenuenue. Their analysis will model air quality impacts at key intersections, focusing on localized emissions of CO. (The cost estimate assumes modeling of 5 intersections for 3 alternatives (proposal, no action, plus one other or a different intersection configuration.)

4.1.6 Other EIS & Project Tasks: The preparation of the planned action EIS will also involve drafting of other required sections of the EIS (summary, project description, phasing, criteria for 50% buildout, criteria for preparation of phased documents when 50% buildout is achieved), as well as tasks involved in managing preparation of the document. These are identified in the proposed budget that follows.

4.1.7 Contingency Issues: It is possible that additional environmental issues, beyond those identified above, may be deemed necessary or desirable to include in the EIS. The budget includes a "contingency" line item to accommodate such potential issues.

4.2 Transportation Element Preparation

This task includes all the efforts needed to prepare the transportation element of the SEPA EIS for the North City Subarea Plan and street improvements proposed for mitigation. Subtasks will include the following:

4.2.1 Draft Transportation Element: The CONSULTANT shall prepare the transportation element of the PDEIS for review by the CITY. The CONSULTANT shall meet with the CITY staff to review comments on the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS).

4.2.2 Respond to Comments: The CONSULTANT shall respond to comments from the CITY on the PDEIS. Revisions will be made to the document as required to address the comments.

4.2.3 Final Transportation Element: The CONSULTANT shall prepare revisions to the transportation element including responses to the comments from the public and other agencies on the DEIS.

PROJECT MAN-HOUR REQUIREMENT ESTIMATE
INCA Engineers, Inc.

City of Shoreline
North City Sub-Area Plan
Planned Action EIS

MAJOR TASK DESCRIPTION	Project Principal	Project Manager	Project Engineer	Design Engineer	Tech. Support	Clerical	TOTAL
1.0 Project Management and Coordination							
1.1 Progress Reports and Invoices (6)		2					2
1.2 Coordination Meetings (4)		12	12	8			32
1.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control		8					8
1.4 Coordination with Subconsultant		4	8				12
2.0 Traffic Modeling							
2.1 Travel Demand Forecasting		See Attached Subconsultant Breakdown					
2.1.1 Revise Traffic Analysis Zone							
2.1.2 Define Network and Recalibrate the Model							
2.2 Existing (year 2001) Year Analysis							
2.3 Support 2010 Year Analysis							
2.4 Support 2015 Year Analysis							
3.0 Traffic Analysis							
3.1 Preliminary Traffic Analysis							0
3.1.1 Review of Existing Documents		1	2	12			15
3.1.2 Identify Additional Information			2	4			6
3.1.3 Review Existing City Traffic Model			4	24		16	44
3.1.4 Field Review with City		4	12	12			28
3.1.5 Preliminary Identification Mitigation		6	16	32			54
3.1.6 Mitigation Workshop		4	4	4			12
3.1.7 Review of Preliminary Trip Generation and Origin-Destination Analysis			2	12			14
3.1.8 Meeting to Discuss Trip Distribution Patterns		4	4	4			12
3.2 Traffic Study							
3.2.1 Existing Level of Service Analysis			8	24			32
3.2.2 Accident Analysis			2	12			14
3.2.3 Trip Generation			4	16			20
3.2.4 Future Intersection Level of Service Analysis			2	12			14
3.2.5 Preliminary Parking Analysis for North City Sub-Area Plan			4	8			12
3.2.6 Confirm Mitigation Alternatives		2	4	12			18
3.2.7 Redistribution of Traffic for Mitigation Alternatives		2	4	16			22
3.2.8 Future Level of Service for Mitigated Alternatives			4	12			16
3.2.9 Optional Mitigated Alternatives		1	2	12			15
3.3 Traffic Study Preparation							
3.3.1 Draft Study		8	24	48	60	32	172
3.3.2 Final Study		2	2	8	16	4	32

PROJECT MAN-HOUR REQUIREMENT ESTIMATE
INCA Engineers, Inc.

City of Shoreline
North City Sub-Area Plan
Planned Action EIS

MAJOR TASK DESCRIPTION	Project Principal	Project Manager	Project Engineer	Design Engineer	Tech. Support	Clerical	TOTAL
4.0 SEPA EIS							
4.1 Prepare Planned Action EIS		See Attached Subconsultant Breakdown					
4.2 Transportation Element Preparation		10	22	16		6	54
TOTAL ALL TASKS	0	70	148	308	76	58	660

CONSULTANT FEE DETERMINATION -- SUMMARY SHEET

Project: **City of Shoreline**
North City Sub-Area Plan
Planned Action EIS

DIRECT SALARY COST (DSC):

	Classification	Hours	X	Rate	=	Cost
1.	Project Principal	0				$0.00
2.	Project Manager/Sr. Supervising Engineer	70		124.10		$8,687.00
3.	Project Engineer/Senior Engineer	148		102.89		$15,227.72
4.	Engineer/Designer	308		77.57		$23,891.56
5.	Technical Support	76		66.96		$5,088.96
6.	Clerical	58		51.44		$2,983.52
	SUBTOTAL	660				$55,878.76

REIMBURSABLES:

Mileage (350 Miles X 0.31/mile)	$108.50	
Reprographics	$300.00	
Traffic counts	$1,500.00	
		$1,908.50
SUBTOTAL		$57,787.26

SUBCONSULTANTS

Huckell/Weiman Associates	$51,400.00	$51,400.00
McCulley, Frick & Gilman	$15,000.00	$15,000.00
CH2M Hill	$12,000.00	$12,000.00
Management Reserve		$6,012.74
GRAND TOTAL - ESTIMATED FEE		$142,200.00

Prepared By: _____ Date: _____

Checked By: _____ Date: _____

Council Meeting Date: November 27, 2000 **Agenda Item: 7(g)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize the Interim City Manager to Execute Consultant Agreements with the Consulting Firms of Otak, INCA Engineers Inc., KPG, & Perteet Engineering, Inc. for Professional Engineering Services with Work to be Later Assigned on Each Operations or Capital Project
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director WLC

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose for this report is to request your Council's approval to retain the services of four consultant firms with traffic engineering experience on an on-call basis to support design and construction needs for various Operations and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was published in the Seattle Times and the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce on August 14, 16, and 21, 2000. A total of 21 proposals were received. Staff evaluated the qualifications of the consultants and selected four firms with qualifications and experience that were in accordance with the City's requirements and standards. The firms selected were Otak of Kirkland, INCA Engineering, Inc. of Bellevue, KPG of Seattle, and Perteet Engineers, Inc. of Everett.

These firms were selected based on their knowledge and experience in the design and construction of capital improvements. Each of these firms has provided these types of professional engineering services to many municipal agencies throughout the Puget Sound area. All four firms have provided satisfactory support to the City in the past. They also demonstrated a strong commitment to project management and providing service to the City.

The agreement term for each firm will not exceed two years, a base year plus one annual extension upon satisfactory performance at the City's discretion. Staff anticipates that the total engineering fees for each firm will range from $150,000 to $300,000 per year or a total amount not to exceed $600,000 for the two-year period. These firms would provide traffic engineering support to various projects including: Aurora Avenue Corridor, Interurban Trail, 15th Avenue NE, North City Business District Improvements, Surface Water Small Projects, the Curb Ramp Program, and the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program.

Staff has negotiated consultant agreements with Otak, INCA Engineers, Inc., KPG, and Perteet Engineering, Inc. for engineering services on a task order basis. The negotiation resulted in setting hourly rates for the different classifications of staff with the consultant. The development of each future task order scope of work and cost will then be based on those hourly rates. The hourly rates for the consultants may be adjusted for inflation and overhead costs at the beginning of each year through an amendment to the agreement.

In addition to awarding new work to the above-mentioned firms, we seek your Council's approval to continue work already awarded to our existing on-call engineer consultants. On January 11, 1999, and January 25, 1999, your Council approved on-call agreements with INCA, Otak and Reid - Middleton for engineering services with an expiration date of December 30, 2000. Staff is currently working with these consultants on various projects, e.g. Shoreview Park Improvement Project, on a task order basis. Staff is requesting that your Council extend these three contracts to December 31, 2001 in order to complete the task orders that are currently underway. By extending these contracts, staff will be able to continue working on these projects without encountering time delays. No new tasks will be assigned against these contracts after December 30, 2000.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to execute task order consultant agreements with Otak, INCA Engineers, Inc., KPG, and Perteet Engineering, Inc. for professional engineering services in support of CIP and Operations Projects. Staff also recommends authorizing the Interim City Manager to extend the existing consultant contracts with INCA, Otak and Reid - Middleton until December 31, 2001.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: November 27, 2000 **Agenda Item:** 9(a)1

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing and Adoption of Ordinance No. 256 Implementing User Fee Schedules for the City's fee Based Services (Development Services, Parks and Recreation, etc.)
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On December 13, 1999, your Council adopted updated user fee schedules based on the City's cost-recovery philosophy and market competitiveness. The update included fees that would retain the 80% revenue recovery policy for the services provided by Planning and Development Services (building permits and development activities) and established a balanced fee approach for the variety of programs and services provided through the City's Parks and Recreation Department, and all other fees. The purpose of this agenda item is for your Council to consider re-enacting those fees by adopting Ordinance No. 256 (Attachment A).

As has been discussed several times with your Council during the 2001 budget planning process, two of the provisions of Initiative 722 (I-722) would impact the fee schedule adopted in 1999. The provisions require municipalities that increased any rates, fees, charges or taxes between July 2, 1999, and December 31, 1999, to roll the increases back to the July 1, 1999 levels and rebate the amounts of those increases to those who paid them. Since I-722 passed on November 7, 2000, the fees that were adopted in 1999 would be repealed as of December 7, 2000, the effective date of I-722. The elimination of these fees would result in an estimated annual revenue reduction of $100,629 in recreation fees and $180,513 in development fees.

The development user fees adopted in 1999 established an hourly rate of $114 per hour to bring the cost recovery rate up to 80% of the full-cost (direct and overhead) of providing development services, including overhead expenses. This hourly rate excluded programs costs related to Code Preparation and Walk-In Services. The fees still resulted in a 20% General Fund subsidy.

The City's Park & Recreation fees were developed with a balance between cost recovery and market competitiveness.

Since these fees are based for a large part on cost recovery, and rolling the fees back to pre-July 1999 levels would either require additional subsidy to offer the programs or reduction in the programs to maintain the current cost recovery ratio, staff would

recommend that your Council adopt Ordinance No. 256, which adopts fees at the same rate as was adopted in 1999 for year 2000. The proposed 2001 budget did not include any CPI increase in fees, as monies have been included in the Finance Department for a review of the City's fee structure in 2001.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council hold a public hearing on the fee schedules and then adopt Ordinance No. 256 adopting (readopting) fees for services for land use and building permit development applications, for parks and recreation, and for public records charges.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

A. Ordinance No. 256 adopting the fees
B. Exhibit A – Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule
C. Exhibit B – Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule
D. Exhibit C – Public Records Fee Schedule

ORDINANCE NO. 256

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING FEES FOR SERVICES FOR LAND USE AND BUILDING PERMIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS, FOR PARKS AND RECREATION, AND FOR PUBLIC RECORDS CHARGES

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the costs of services and user fees have been reviewed to reflect the 2001 Proposed Budget and revenues and the staff has prepared recommended 2001 fee schedules for development services, parks and recreation, and public records charges;

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

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

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

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

Section 4. Annual Adjustments. The fee schedules in Exhibits A, B and C shall be automatically updated on an annual basis on January 1st of each year by the Seattle Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (CPI-U). The adjustment shall be calculated each year and included in the City Manager's Proposed Budget. The annual adjustment shall be based on the CPI-U average for the period that includes the last six

months of the previous budget year and the first six months of the current budget year. The City Manager may choose to not include annual CPI-U adjustments in the City Manager's Proposed Budget and the City Council may choose to not include annual CPI-U adjustments in the Adopted Budget for select user fees in any individual budget year without impacting the full force of this section for subsequent budget years.

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

Section 5. Repealer. The fee schedules as enacted in Ordinance No. 218 (update of City Fee schedules) is hereby repealed.

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

Section 7. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City and this ordinance shall take effect and be in full force on December 7, 2000.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 27, 2000.

_____
Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

_____
Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: , 2000
Effective Date: , 2000

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule

Exhibit A.

Fees Based on $114 per Hour

Type of Permit Application	Fees
Appeals	$ 350
Accessory Dwelling	$ 114
Binding Site Plan	$ 228 deposit plus $114/hour
Lot Line Adjustment	$ 570 deposit plus $114/hour
Building Permit Valuations	1997 Uniform Building Code Plus CPI Increase (3.0%)
$1 - $500	$ 24.25
$501 - $2,000	$24.25 for the first $500.00 + $3.25 for each additional $100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $2,000.00.
$2,001 - 25,000	$71.25 for the first $2,000.00 + $14.50 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $25,000.00.
$25,001 - $50,000	$403.00 for the first $25,000.00 + $10.50 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $50,000.00.
$50,001 - $100,000	$663.00 for the first $50,000.00 + $7.25 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $100,000.00.
$100,001 - $500,000	$1,023.50 for the first $100,000.00 + $5.75 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $500,000.00.
$500,001 - $1,000,000	$3,330.75 for the first $500,000.00 + $5.00 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including $1,000,000.00.
$1,000,001 +	$5,777.00 for the first $1,000,000.00 + $3.75 for each additional $1,000.00, or fraction thereof.
Plan Review Fee	65% of the Building Permit Fee
All Other Plan Reviews or work	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)
Construction Permit for Work Commenced Without a Building Permit	Twice the Applicable Building Permit Fee
Conditional Use Permit	$ 3,420 plus public hearing $1,750 (if required)
Continuation and/or Minor Alteration of Nonconforming Use	$ 114 deposit plus $114/hour
Home Occupation	Hourly Rate (hour minimum)
Residential Furnace	$ 114
Residential Fireplace (up to two)	$ 114
Commercial Mechanical	$ 114
All other Mechanical (Residential and Commercial)	$ 114

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule

Exhibit A.

Fees Based on $114 per Hour

Type of Permit Application	Fees
Environmental Review	
Environmental Checklist:	
Single Family	$ 1,140
Multi-Family/Commercial	$ 1,710
Environmental Impact Statement Review	$ 3,990 deposit plus $114/hour
Grading Permit	$ 342 deposit plus $114/hour
Sensitive Area Permit	$ 912 plus $114/hour
Rezone	$ 6,840 plus public hearing $1,750
Shoreline Substantial Development:	
Shoreline Exemption	$ 228
Substantial Development Permit (based on valuation)	
up to $10,000	$ 1,710
$10,000 to $500,000	$ 3,876
Over $500,000	$ 6,840
Shoreline Variance	$ 3,420 plus public hearing $1,750 (if required)
Sign Permit	$ 228 plus $114/hour
Special Use Permit	$ 5,700 plus public hearing $1,750
Street Vacation	$ 4,560 plus public hearing $1,750
Subdivisions:	
Preliminary Short Plat	$ 3,420 for two lot shortplat, plus public hearing $1,750 (if required)
	$ 342 for each additional lot
Final Short Plat	$ 912
Site Development (Engineering Plans Review and Inspections)	$ 1,368
Short Plat Change	$ 1,368
Preliminary Subdivision	$ 4,332 plus $31/lot plus public hearing $1,750

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule

Exhibit A.

Fees Based on $114 per Hour

Type of Permit Application	Fees
Final Subdivision	$ 3,420 plus $19/lot
Variances	$ 3,420 plus public hearing $1,750 (if required)
Right-of-Way:	
Minimum Administrative Fee	$50 plus $114 per hour
All Other Work:	
All Other Fees Per Hour	$ 114 /hour
Pre-Application for Rezone	$ 114 /hour

Code Enforcement Fees

Civil Penalties

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

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

1. An amount determined to be equivalent to the economic benefit that the responsible party derives from the violation measured as the total of:

a) The resulting increase in market value of the property; and

b) The value received by the responsible party; and

c) The savings of construction costs realized by the responsible party as a result of performing any act in violation of the chapter; and

2. A penalty of $1,000 if the violation was deliberate, the result of knowingly false information submitted by the property owner, agent, or contractor, or the result of reckless disregard on the part of the property owner, agent, or their contractor. The property owner shall assume the burden of proof for demonstrating that the violation was not deliberate; and

3. A penalty of $2,000 if the violation has severe ecological impacts, including temporary or permanent loss of resource values or functions.

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

City Abatement Costs

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

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule / Fire Permit Fees

Fees based on $114 per Hour

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

Planning and Development Services Fee Schedule / Fire Permit Fees

Fees based on $114 per Hour

		Fees
LPG (Propane) Tanks		
Commercial		342
Residential		228
Spray Booth		456
Sprinkler Systems (Each Riser)		
New Systems	(plus $2.85 per head)	570
Tenant Improvement:	1 to 10 heads	342
	11 to 20 heads	456
	More than 20 heads (plus $2.85 per head)	570
Residential (R-3) 13-D System, Up to 30 heads		570
13-D Systems with more than 30 heads add $2.85 per head		
Standpipe Systems		456
Underground Sprinkler Supply		342

Additional Fees:

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

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

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

SHORELINE POOL

Public Swims:

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

Swim Lessons:

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

Water Exercise Fees

Adult		
Each Class	$ 3.50	
10 Class Card	28.00	($2.80 per class)
Senior		
Each Class	$ 2.75	
10 Class Card	22.00	($2.20 per class)

Pool Rentals:

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

1. Private Rentals

1 to 25 people	$ 50.00	per hour
26 - 60 people	70.00	per hour
61 - 90 people	90.00	per hour
91 - 120 people	110.00	per hour
121 - 150 people	130.00	per hour

2. Special Interest Groups $ 40.00 per hour

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

3. School Districts $ 23.00 per hour

4. Swim Teams

When sharing the pool	$ 5.00	per lane
When using the entire pool	7.00	per lane

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

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

Family Membership Program
(Entitles member to all public swims and adults to all adult swims)

Youth, Senior, Disabled	
10 Swim Pass	$ 14.00
3 Month Pass	55.00
Annual Pass	130.00
Adult	
10 Swim Pass	$ 22.00
3 Month Pass	85.00
Annual Pass	205.00
Family	
10 Swim Pass	$ 56.00
3 Month Pass	130.00
Annual Pass	340.00
Locker Fees	$ 0.25 per locker

RECREATION CLASSES & PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Adjustments for 1, 2 and 3
The City Manager may propose, and the City Council may adopt, a smaller overhead percentage for any or all recreation classes and programs and may reduce fees for classes and programs under 2 and 3 below direct costs.

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

ATHLETIC FIELDS

1. Baseball/Softball fields			
a. Adult	$	28.00	per game
b. Youth		6.00	per game
c. Seniors 55 or older		6.00	per game
d. Practice Fields - Youth		2.00	per practice
e. Practice Fields - Adults		12.00	per practice
2. Soccer and Other Field Sports			
a. Adult	$	28.00	per game
b. Youth		6.00	per game
c. Practice Fields - Youth		2.00	per practice
d. Practice Fields - Adults		12.00	per practice
3. Tournament Field Rental Fee			
a. Adult	$	25.00	per game
b. Youth		11.00	per game
c. Tournament Field Cancellation Fee		6.00	per game
4. Athletic field lights		11.00	per hour
5. Field Reservation Form Processing Fee			
Under 75 games/practices	$	10.00	
75-200 games/practices		20.00	
200+ games/practices		50.00	

CONCESSION/FACILITY USE

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

RICHMOND HIGHLANDS RECREATION CENTER

1. Rentals During Non-Public Hours:			
Entire building	$	33.00	per hour (2 hour minimum)
Gymnasium Only		16.50	per hour (2 hour minimum)

2. All groups assessed a $5.00 handling/processing fee per reservation form.

City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

OUTDOOR FACILITIES (Picnic Shelters)

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

1 - 100 Participants	$ 50.00	per day Monday-Friday
	60.00	per day Saturday-Sunday
101 + participants	0.50	per participant per day

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

PARKS SPECIAL USE

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

Exhibit C.

City of Shoreline Public Records Fee Schedule

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

Council Meeting Date: November 27, 2000 **Agenda Item: 9(a)2**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing and Adoption of Ordinance No. 257 Implementing Utility Taxes
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On October 25, 1999, your Council adopted a utility tax on natural gas, telephone and cellular telephone services, and sanitation services at the rate of 6% and on cable television at the rate of 1% which was to be implemented if I-695 passed. The purpose of this agenda item is for your Council to consider re-enacting these utility taxes by adopting Ordinance No. 257 (Attachment A).

The passage of I-695 was estimated to reduce City revenues by $2.9 million annually, or 17% of the City's General Fund at that time. In 1999 your Council reviewed the options for dealing with I-695, which included expenditure reductions, additional revenue sources, and the temporary use of the City's fund balance as a reserve fund to help phase in the new lower service levels over time as a result of the I-695 revenue losses. After a review of these options, your Council concurred that the additional impact of a $2.9 million annual reduction on the current and future service levels and infrastructure preservation would be severe, leaving the City with a minimal ability to provide service and maintain the City's infrastructure over the long-term. This was especially true given the very modest service levels the City of Shoreline provides when compared to most urban communities. I-695 did pass on November 2, 1999, and as a result the utility tax was implemented. Although I-695 was challenged in Court the State Legislature proceeded with the reduction of the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax to $30 per vehicle during the 2000 Legislative Session. With this action by the State Legislature, the City of Shoreline's general fund revenues were reduced by $2.5 million as projected with the passage of I-695 (the difference of $400,000 represents the $15 per vehicle fee collected in King County that remains in effect and must specifically be used for transportation purposes).

As has been discussed several times with your Council during the 2001 budget planning process, two of the provisions of Initiative 722 (I-722) would impact the utility tax. Those provisions would require municipalities that increased any rates, fees, charges or taxes between July 2, 1999, and December 31, 1999, to roll the increases back to the July 1, 1999 levels and rebate the amounts of those increases to those who paid them. The repayment of the collected utility taxes will most likely face legal challenges. The City will not proceed with refunds until the legality of this provision is determined. Further

discussion regarding this provision will be included in the staff report regarding the 2001 budget adoption, which is scheduled on the December 11 City Council Agenda.

Since I-722 passed on November 7, 2000, the utility tax that was adopted in 1999 will be repealed as of December 7, 2000, the effective date of I-722. The elimination of the utility tax would result in an annual revenue reduction of $1.5 million.

If I-722 is implemented and no replacement revenues are identified, the same realities of service reductions will exist for the City today as existed for the City in 1999 when the impacts of revenue reductions related to I-695 were discussed. This information has previously been discussed with your Council and is included as Attachment B.

Based on the potential service impacts, we recommend that your Council consider once again adopting the utility tax. Since I-695 was recently ruled unconstitutional, a public vote is not necessary to enact (or re-enact) the utility tax, although your Council could chose to seek public approval of the utility tax. The first possible election date would be in February 2001.

Although it is likely that there will be litigation regarding I-722, it is unknown what the outcome of that litigation will be, and what provisions will be made in the mean time. Staff is recommending that your Council proceed with the adoption of the utility tax to minimize the revenue loss that will occur with I-722. If your Council does not take action on the utility tax on November 27, then additional revenue loss may occur, and additional reductions in capital funding will be necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council hold a public hearing on the utility tax and then adopt Ordinance No. 257 establishing (reestablishing) the utility taxes on natural gas, telephone and cellular telephone services, pager services, and sanitation services at the rate of 6% and on cable television at the rate of 1%. A utility tax of 6% will also be levied on water and sewer services to the extent that such tax is or may in the future be authorized by law.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

BACKGOUND

The City of Shoreline over the last few years has been establishing its service operations in such areas as public safety, parks, roads maintenance, surface water, etc. As discussed on a number of previous occasions with your Council, the service levels inherited from the County were often at a rural level (i.e., parks maintenance and development) and in many cases (i.e., roads and surface water maintenance) were below the level necessary to preserve the City's infrastructure assets (streets, storm drains, parks, buildings). The City has been working diligently within our current resources to develop and implement cost-effective programs to increase the level of service in the parks, roads, and surface water areas in an effort to preserve the City's infrastructure and to provide a better living environment for the community. Yet, our service levels at the current tax base are still modest in some areas and just approaching adequate in others.

For example, our parks system for the most part lacks irrigation and urban standard playing fields. Our parks maintenance effort is only one-half of other area cities. We lack the police resources to fully address traffic enforcement issues brought up by citizens. The average staffing for neighboring cities is twice what we have at Shoreline. When considering the Public Works transition plan, you have heard about services such as shoulder maintenance and catch basin vactoring service levels that are a fraction of what is necessary for our inherited infrastructure. We have only begun establishing those service enhancements that will be necessary to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act.

It is also clear that our Capital Improvement Program (CIP) cannot be funded sufficiently with current revenues in order to address longstanding needs within the community. In order to fund basic infrastructure improvements for roads, for example, we are forced to greatly delay or indefinitely postpone upgrades and improvements to city parks and recreation facilities. There are a number of park capital projects that either have only the first phase of improvements included in the 2001-2006 CIP due to limited financial resources or have extended schedules in order to match available financial resources. These would include Twin Ponds, Ronald Bog, Richmond Highlands Recreation Center, and Paramount Park. The Park Open Space & Recreational Services Plan identified other park projects that are of high priority to improve the park standards. These include Cromwell Park, Richmond Beach Saltwater Park, Richmond Beach Community Park, and Echo Lake Park. These projects have either been included in the 2001-2006 CIP on a very limited scale or have not been included due to the limited financial resources. We estimate the cost of these additional park improvements to be in excess of $10 million. In addition the 2001-2006 CIP is dependent on $62.5 million in unawarded grants or loans to complete projects as proposed.

In addition to these projects the Council has identified economic development as a major Council Workplan Goal. This includes designing and constructing public improvements for North City as well as completing a second sub-area plan in an area that would stimulate economic development. If the results of this sub-area plan indicate a need for the City to participate in the funding of public improvements, future financial resources will need to be identified. We have maintained low operational costs, ending our budget years with funds that are carried forward to the next year or transferred into

our capital fund to help augment our relatively small capital resources and yet there are still needs that exceed current resources.

Initiative 722 Impacts

The most immediate I-722 impact to the City is the provision of the repeal of the property tax levy, park and development fee increases, utility tax, and franchise fee policy adopted in 1999. In addition, the requirement to repay any of the tax and/or fee increases previously collected will have serious financial impacts to the City. The following table identifies the revenue sources that have been collected in 2000 that may be required to be repaid and the potential 2001 revenue losses if the provisions of I-722 are implemented.

	2000	2001
Property Tax*	$ 335,400	-
Property Tax Assessed Valuation Rollback to 1999 **	-	333,800
Recreation Fees***	100,629	100,629
Development Fees***	180,513	180,513
Utility Taxes	1,373,179	1,462,953
Franchise Fees****	433,000	433,000
Total	$ 2,422,721	$ 2,510,895
*Represents the increase of levy from 1999 to 2000 less that attributed to new construction and annexations. This amount may vary based on the final outcome of the valuation changes that must be accommodated by the County Assessor.		
**This represents the anticipated reduction in property tax levy, as compared to the proposed 2001 budget, if the roll-back provisions of I-722 are implemented. This valuation reduction is estimated, but will not be finalized unitl the County Assessor determines the final valuation roll-back.		
***Represents projected collections for January through December as was projected in 1999.		
****Franchise Fees may not be subject to the repeal or refund provisions of I-722		

As your Council can see, the implementation of I-722 as passed on November 7 will have a significant financial impact on the City. The approximate loss of $2.5 million in year 2001 revenues, represents 12% of budgeted General Fund revenues. This is a large reduction to a General Fund budget that funds very modest service levels.

Expenditure Reductions

In 1999 the City went through the process of preparing two budget scenarios, one assuming I-695 passed with no alternative revenue sources implemented to replace those lost by the passage of I-695, and a second assuming I-695 did not pass. The budget scenario developed assuming I-695 passed and assuming that there were no replacement revenues for those lost by I-695, required approximately $2.9 million in expenditure reductions. This is approximately the same anticipated revenue loss expected from I-722 if the City is unable to preserve the use of the utility tax and other fee increases that were implemented in 1999 along with the impact of the "roll back" in assessed valuations. The list of expenditure reductions developed in 1999 is still representative of the service reductions that would be necessary if I-722 is implemented and there are no revenue replacement sources. For this purpose those proposed reductions can be found at the end of this memorandum (Attachment B).

Timeline

According to RCW 35.21.865, an ordinance adopting a utility tax must be passed at least 60 days before the effective date of the ordinance. This would mean that if your Council approves the utility tax ordinance on November 27, 2000, it will become effective, January 27, 2001. This being the case, there will be no utility tax in effect between December 7, 2000 (the effective date of I-722) and January 27, 2001. We anticipate the loss of revenue to be approximately $404,000 for this time period, $202,000 which would apply to the 2001 budget. If it is discovered that the 60 day provision is not applicable to the re-enactment of the utility tax, then no gap in revenue would exist.

I-695 would have required any tax or fee increase to obtain voter approval. Since the Supreme Court recently found I-695 unconstitutional, your Council does not need to seek voter approval to enact the utility tax. At the same time, your Council could seek voter approval voluntarily. The earliest election date would be in February 2001. Because of the 60 day delay between the approval of the utility tax and the effective date of the utility tax, the earliest that the utility tax could be effective would be April 2001. This would result in an approximate 5 month time period (December 7, 2000 to April 2001) in which no utility tax is in effect. The revenue loss for this time period is estimated at approximately $900,000, of which $700,000 would apply towards the 2001 budget.

In either of these cases the City will either need to make expenditure reductions to offset the anticipated revenue loss, or allocate a portion of the I-695 backfill or fund blance to cover the anticipated losses. This will impact the revenues available to the 2001-2006 CIP and therefore some adjustments will be necessary to accommodate the reduced CIP revenues.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council hold a public hearing on the utility tax and then adopt Ordinance No. 257 establishing (reestablishing) the utility taxes on natural gas, telephone and cellular telephone services, pager services, and sanitation services at the rate of 6% and on cable television at the rate of 1%. A utility tax of 6% will also be levied on water and sewer services to the extent that such tax is or may in the future be authorized by law.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Ordinance No. 257 adopting the utility tax
B. Potential I-695 Expenditure Reductions

ORDINANCE NO. 257

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ESTABLISHING UTILITY TAXES, AND ESTABLISHING UTILITY TAX RELIEF FOR ELIGIBLE CITIZENS

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the City's current service levels and the currently unmet City needs in the areas of service delivery, infrastructure maintenance, and capital improvements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the public interest is best served by the implementation of utility taxes, to provide revenue to offset a portion of the loss of state shared revenue from the reduction in the motor vehicle excise tax by the legislature in 2000, and to retain the current levels of City services;

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

Section 1. Utility Tax Imposed. There is levied and shall be collected from every person a tax for the act or privilege of engaging in utility occupation activities as defined in Section 2. Such tax shall be measured by the application of rates against the gross proceeds of sales from customers within the City. The tax provided for in this ordinance shall be known as the "utility tax," and is levied upon the privilege of conducting the business of manufacturing or distributing natural gas, telephone, cellular telephone, cable television, or solid waste collection business within the City of Shoreline. This tax is also levied upon any public or private operator of any municipal domestic water distribution and supply system or municipal domestic sewer system as a public utility, to the extent that such tax is or may in the future be authorized by law. All revenues collected pursuant to this ordinance shall be deposited into the General Fund and shall be used for the funding of general City services or capital projects as the City Council shall direct through its annual budget process.

Section 2. Definitions. As used in this ordinance, unless the context or subject matter clearly requires otherwise, the words or phrases defined in this section shall have the indicated meanings.

A. "Cable television services" means the one-way transmission of video programming and associated nonvideo signals to subscribers together with subscriber interaction, if any, which is provided in connection with video programming.

B. "Cellular telephone service" means two-way voice and data telephone/ telecommunications system based in whole or substantially in part on wireless radio communications and which is not currently subject to regulation by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC). Cellular telephone service includes cellular mobile service. The definition of cellular mobile service includes other wireless radio communications services such as specialized mobile radio (SMR), personal communications services (PCS) and

any other evolving wireless radio communications technology which accomplishes the same purpose as cellular mobile service.

C. "Gas distribution business" means the business of selling, furnishing, or transmitting gas, whether manufactured or natural.

D "Gross proceeds of sale" or "Gross income of business" means the value proceeding or accruing from the sale of tangible personal property and/or for services rendered, without any deduction on account of the cost of property sold, the cost of materials used, labor costs, interest, discount paid, delivery costs, taxes, or any other expense whatsoever paid or accrued and without any deduction for losses.

E. " Pager service" means service provided by means of an electronic device which has the ability to send or receive voice or digital messages transmitted through the local telephone network, vial satellite or any other form of voice or data transmission.

F. "Person" means any person, firm, corporation, association, or entity of any type engaged in a business subject to taxation under this ordinance.

G. "Solid waste collection business" means every person who receives solid waste or recyclable materials, or both, as defined in this section, for transfer, storage, or disposal including but not limited to all collection services, public or private solid waste disposal sites, transfer stations, and similar operations.

"Solid waste" or "wastes" means all putrescible and nonputrescible solid and semisolid wastes including, but not limited to, garbage, rubbish, ashes, industrial wastes, swill, sewage sludge, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles or parts thereof, and recyclable materials.

"Recyclable materials" means those solid wastes that are separated for recycling or reuse, such as papers, metals, and glass, that are designated as recyclable materials pursuant to SMC 13.15.020.

H. "Telephone business" means the business of providing network telephone service as defined in this section. It includes cooperative or farmer line telephone companies or associations operating an exchange.

"Network telephone service" means the providing by any person of access to a local telephone network, local telephone network switching service, toll service, or coin telephone services, or the providing of telephonic, video, data, or similar communication or transmission for hire, via a local telephone network, toll line or channel, cable, microwave, or similar communication or transmission system. "Network telephone service" includes interstate service, including toll service, originating from or received on telecommunications equipment or apparatus in this state if the charge for the service is billed to a person in this state. "Network telephone service" does not include the providing of competitive telephone service, the providing of cable television service, or the providing of broadcast services by radio or television stations.

"Competitive telephone service" means the providing by any person of telecommunications equipment or apparatus, or service related to that equipment or apparatus such as repair or maintenance service, if the equipment or apparatus is of a type which can be

provided by persons that are not subject to regulation as telephone companies under RCW Title 80 and for which a separate charge is made.

I. "Sewerage Operation" means operation of sanitary sewer facilities, including collection, treatment and disposal facilities, and combined sanitary and surface water drains and outfalls.

J. "Water Distribution Operation" means the business of operating a plant or system for the distribution of water for hire or sale.

Section 3. Utility Occupation Activities Subject to Taxation. Upon every person within the City in the following activities; as to such persons, the amount of the tax due with respect to such business in the City shall be equal to the gross income of the business, multiplied by the following applicable rates:

Activity	Tax Rate
A. Gas Distribution Business	6%
B. Telephone Business	6%
C. Cellular Telephone Service	6%
D. Cable Television Service	1%
E. Solid Waste Collection Business	6%
F. Water Distribution Operation	6%
G. Sewerage Operation	6%
H. Paging Service	6%

Section 4. Deductions. The following items may be deducted from the total gross income upon which the tax is computed:

A. Credit losses actually sustained by taxpayers whose regular books are kept on an accrual basis.

B. That portion of gross income derived from charges to another telecommunications company for connecting fees, switching charges, or carrier access charges relating to intrastate toll telephone services, or for access to, or charges for, interstate services, or charges for telephone service which the purchaser buys for the purpose of resale.

C. Adjustments made to a billing or customer account in order to reverse a billing or charge that was not properly a debt of the customer.

D. Amounts derived from a business which the City is prohibited from taxing under the constitution of this state or the Constitution or laws of the United States.

E. Grants from governmental agencies.

F. For municipal sewer utilities, the amount paid to another municipal corporation or agency for sewer interception, treatment, or disposal.

G. For municipal water operations, the amount paid to another municipal corporation or agency for water distributed within the City.

Section 5. Administration and Audit.

A. The administration and collection of the tax imposed by this Section 1 shall be by the City Manager or the Manager's designee. The Manager is instructed and authorized to adopt appropriate reporting requirements and to make such further rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this ordinance.

B. Each taxpayer shall keep records reflecting the amount of the taxpayer's gross income from sales and services within the City and such records shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of the finance director or the finance director's duly authorized agent upon reasonable notice for verification of tax returns. In the event that such audit discloses a discrepancy of more than ten percent (10%) between the amount reported by the taxpayer and the actual gross revenues collected by the taxpayer, the taxpayer shall reimburse the City for all costs associated with said audit.

Section 6. Due date-Delinquency.

A. The tax imposed under Section 1 shall be due and payable in monthly or quarterly installments at the taxpayers discretion, and shall accompany a return on a form approved by the Finance Director and be made on or before the thirtieth day of the month following the reporting period in which the tax accrued. Quarterly reporting periods shall begin the first day of the months of January, April, July and October.

B. If payment is not made by the fifteenth day following the due date there shall be a penalty of ten percent (10%). This penalty shall increase to fifteen percent (15%) on the thirtieth day following the due date and twenty percent (20%) on the forty-fifth day following the due date if payment is not made.

Section 7. Unlawful acts. It is unlawful for any person liable for the tax imposed by this chapter to fail to pay the tax when due or for any person to make any false or fraudulent return or any false statement in connection with the return.

Section 8. Violation – Penalty. Any person violating any provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof punished pursuant to SMC 9.10.050.

Section 9. Severability. Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this ordinance be preempted by state or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances.

Section 10. Repeal Ordinance No. 210 is repealed in its entirety.

Section 11. Referendum. This ordinance shall be subject to the referendum procedure of RCW 35.21.706. A referendum petition may be filed within seven days of passage with the City Clerk to obtain a ballot title, final form and identification number in cooperation with the City Attorney and the petitioner. After issuance of the final petition by the Clerk, the petitioner shall have thirty days to secure signatures of not less than fifteen percent of the registered voters of the City of Shoreline as of the last municipal general election on the petition forms and file with the City Clerk. This procedure shall supersede SMC Ch. 1.12 and all statutes for referendum which might apply.

Section 12. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City. This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force on December 7, 2000, provided, however, if a referendum petition is filed pursuant to Section 11 of this ordinance, the ordinance shall be suspended until either a deadline imposed under Section 11 is not met or there is a vote on the referendum.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 27, 2000.

_____
Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

_____
Sharon Mattioli
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: , 2000
Effective Date: , 2000

Attachment B

Potential Expenditure Reductions due to Initiative 695

October 25, 1999

Reduction Description / Impact of Reduction

City Council

23,681 • Reduce or eliminate national and State conferences

The City Council will be less informed and the City's voice will be reduced on national and state issues that may impact the City.

City Manager's Office

210,724 • Reduce/eliminate professional services support for utility review, annexations, community projects, goal setting retreats, and other issues

Staff will need to use internal support where available instead of professional services thus reducing the number of projects that can be simultaneously completed in any given year.

• Eliminate a professional staff position

This will reduce the ability to provide analysis on a wide-variety of issues (i.e., criminal justice, utilities, annexations, community projects, capital projects, etc.) causing the City to delay projects and/or make decisions with less professional analysis.

• Decrease two or more administrative support staff

This will reduce the ability of support staff to respond to needs of the organization and the residents in a timely manner causing delays in projects and citizen responses.

City Clerk's Office

57,163 • Eliminate videotaping of City Council meetings

This excellent outreach and public education tool would no longer be available to the community making it difficult for some citizens to keep in touch with the Council process.

• Eliminate high school intern program

All other staff would spend more time doing routing clerical tasks with consequent slow downs in the delivery of service.

• Eliminate duplicate legal notices (Asian Weekly and Shoreline Enterprise)

The City outreach efforts of attempting to inform as many citizens as possible of legal notices would be curtailed.

• Elimination of administrative support staff

Elimination of a support staff would impact the timeliness and quality of service delivery in four areas: 1) the production of City Council minutes; 2) the distribution and organization of Hearing Examiner materials; 3) the implementation of our citywide records management program; and 4) same-day provision of various documents and information to internal and external customers. Minutes writing would probably be done under a professional services contract but not to the same level. The citywide records management program would be placed on hold to allow the Deputy City Clerk to resume duties as Hearing Examiner staff.

Community & Government Relations

160,250 • Eliminate Neighborhood Newsletters

Neighborhoods groups will need to get their information from the City's newsletter *Currents*, other sources, or will need to independently develop and mail their own newsletters.

• Eliminate Neilson-type feedback surveys as recommended by Citizen Involvement Committee

The City Council and staff will need to find alternative means for receiving feedback from the community on a variety of issues.

• Eliminate mini-grants as part of the Neighborhood Program

There will no longer be available City funds for small local neighborhood improvements through the Neighborhood Mini-Grants Program.

• Eliminate one professional position

The City would no longer be able to provide support for the Neighborhood Program. The Neighborhood groups would need to receive information and support through other City sources on a piecemeal basis.

Attachment B

Potential Expenditure Reductions due to Initiative 695

October 25, 1999

Reduction Description / Impact of Reduction

Health & Human Services

160,548 • Eliminate the General Fund portion of grants to outside agencies

Reductions of grants at this level will result in the elimination of 3 - 6 agency contracts and elimination of the Senior Center and the Center for Human Services contracts.

• Eliminate membership in the Human Services Roundtable

Leaving the Human Services Roundtable would eliminate an opportunity to partnership with King County to develop a regional strategy to address human service needs, reduce the City's voice in Olympia on human service issues, and would increase our reliance on other organizations to articulate regional human service priorities.

City Attorney's Office

25,000 • Reduce the use of outside legal counsel on City issues (i.e., gambling moratorium, adult entertainment, etc.)

Essential litigation will be handled in-house with a commensurate reduction in support for the organization. It is likely that code enforcement litigation would be most affected.

Finance/Information Services

541,823 • Eliminate projects and support services included in the City's Five-Year Technology Plan (i.e., training, hardware and software upgrades, maintenance management systems, and full GIS system development and implementation)

This will require the City to make smaller modifications to the planned direction for the Customer Response database being implemented citywide, slower development of the records management infrastructure and GIS program development, will slow down the rate of available technology training and program documentation, and would impact the City's ability to effectively manage its infrastructure. This would require a slowing of hardware replacements, slow evolution to web and electronic commerce applications and new ways of dealing with our customers.

• Decrease one professional staff in Information Services

This will result in less emphasis on technology and system improvements and development with a return to more of a maintenance mode for our current information systems.

• Decrease one professional staff in Finance

This will result in reducing the level of support for the remainder of the organization in terms of financial tracking assistance and analysis and will require the reprioritization of the work of the remaining staff.

• Reduce temporary help and overtime in Finance and Information Services.

This will require staff to perform more basic administrative duties, require reprioritization of projects, and/or delays of certain projects during some portions of the year when workload is heaviest. Computer repairs and network upgrades will need to take place during working hours rather than at night or on weekends inconveniencing other staff.

Citywide Services

100,320 • Decrease the number of outside organizations that the City remains involved with to those that are required. This would eliminate membership in the Association of Washington Cities, the Puget Sound Regional Council, the Suburban Cities Association, National League of Cities, Economic Development Council, and the Sister Cities Association.

This would reduce the City Council's ability to receive information about what other cities are doing nationally and reduce the cities ability to influence regional transportation, planning, economic development, and other regional issues.

• Eliminate Clean Sweep Events

This would eliminate the annual community building events that help to clean-up neighborhoods and parks and bring the community together.

• Reduce some office and operating supplies (i.e., letterhead, fax machine, printer toner & supplies)

The City would need to develop an internal policy on the usage of paper, printers, and other basic office supplies.

Attachment B

Potential Expenditure Reductions due to Initiative 695

October 25, 1999

Reduction Description / Impact of Reduction

Human Resources

56,325 • Eliminate administrative support

This would require the remaining professional staff to handle all basic administrative duties including correspondence, scheduling candidates for interviews, scheduling and arranging staff training sessions, filing, copying, etc.

• Reduce advertising for recruitment of vacant staff positions

With the City's diminished ability to hire new positions advertising would be reduced. The remaining funds for advertising would be used for recruiting vacant positions

Public Safety/Criminal Justice

448,849 • Eliminate the two storefront officers and close the City's two storefronts

This would dramatically reduce the City's ability to provide community policing. This would result in less time available to communicate and work with citizens on their local public safety issues.

• Reduce one of the three traffic officers

This would either reduce the level of traffic enforcement in the City or would require the pulling of a reactive patrol officer from their assigned patrol district to periodically spend more time on traffic enforcement

• Reduce one reactive patrol officer (new position for Area A-2)

This would require the existing patrol officers to also provide coverage for this new area, thus increasing the size of the coverage areas with the potential decrease in response time or need for increased overtime.

• Decrease in administrative support staff

This would require the remaining administrative support position to increase their workload and reprioritize some of the projects, thus causing the delay in certain projects or Reponses to citizen inquiries for information.

• To reach cut levels above this level would require the reduction of one or more of the proactive officers that focus on vice, drug houses, etc.

• Above this, the City would be looking at reductions of patrol officers and detectives which would affect response times and criminal case management.