

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Tuesday, February 19, 2002
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmembers Chang, Hansen and Ransom

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Gustafson and Montgomery

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. by Deputy Mayor Grossman, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Grossman led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the Deputy City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Mayor Jepsen and Councilmembers Gustafson and Montgomery. Deputy Mayor Grossman advised that Mayor Jepsen and Councilmembers Gustafson and Montgomery were excused.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS: None

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hansen noted Suburban Cities Association (SCA) efforts to establish an agenda for work with King County on the County budgeting process.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Mary Jo Heller, Shoreline, said she talked with several Councilmembers before the November 2001 election about the possibility of a large-scale gambling operation on 145th Street at Aurora Avenue N. She said Councilmembers denied the possibility at that time. She said she has learned that the gambling operation will be established. She expressed concern about the kind of gambling to be established and the clientele that it will attract. She noted prostitution on the corner of 145th Street and Aurora Avenue N February 15. She also expressed concern about the height, placement and light pollution of signs. She encouraged Council to investigate the requirements for a large gambling operation and the potential impacts of such an operation.

Councilmember Ransom said the Silver Dollar Casino has a purchase option for the Hideaway, which it has not exercised. He noted that the City approved the remodel of Cliff's (which operated previously as a five-table social card room) as a five-table

enhanced card room. He said Cliff's finished remodeling in November 2001 but has not reopened.

In response to Councilmember Hansen, City Manager Steve Burkett said none of the businesses in the vicinity of 145th Street and Aurora Avenue N has applied for a permit to establish a mini-casino or enhanced card room. He said Cliff's applied for a building permit for remodeling but not for expanded gambling permits.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Revised and Updated Capital Improvement Program

Mr. Burkett reviewed the staff report. He noted that staff will present a proposal at the February 25 Council meeting to contract with an engineering firm to assist staff to develop and, in some cases, manage Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. He mentioned the intent to use part of the approximately \$280,000 in salary savings from three currently vacant project management positions in Public Works to cover the cost of the contract, which will not exceed \$200,000.

Mr. Burkett said staff will return to Council during the first part of April to review changes in the 2002 City Budget and to recommend reduced appropriations in 2002 for capital projects. He stressed the importance of dependable sources of revenue for capital projects. For example, he stated the need to ensure a revenue stream to service loans to finance surface water management (SWM) projects. He noted the likely loss of \$1 million in funding the State provided to backfill sales tax equalization revenue the City lost upon passage of Initiative 695 (I-695). He mentioned the unreliability of gambling tax revenues, which free up funds in the City operations budget for spending on capital projects.

Mr. Burkett clarified that staff does not seek immediate Council action on the revised CIP. He reiterated that staff will return to Council with revisions to the 2002 City Budget based on the figures outlined in the staff report. He noted staff intent to complete the annual revision of the CIP in July, in advance of work on the 2003 Proposed City Budget.

Interim Public Works Director Art Maronek explained that staff formatted the information for each 2002 CIP project to include:

- project scope of work;
- project benefits;
- total cost estimate by project phase (in 2001 dollars);
- required environmental documentation and permits;
- project knowns;
- project unknowns;
- contingency percentages by project phase;
- inflation percentages by project phase;
- prior year expenditures;
- inflated project costs by phase and year and the inflated total cost; and

DRAFT

- project schedule by phase, year and month.

Mr. Maronek went on to review the status of the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project between N 145th Street and N 165th Street. He noted that: the pre-design is complete; the Council decision on the preferred alignment and cross section is scheduled for May; environmental work is scheduled for completion in July; funding is available for design, right-of-way and construction; and preliminary right-of-way appraisals have been completed.

Referring to the Aurora Corridor Project schedule on page 14 of the Council packet, Mr. Maronek explained that City condemnation of property, if necessary, will lengthen the project. He said staff is preparing mechanisms for Council to consider to shorten condemnation time. He commented that such mechanisms could reduce the length of the project by as much as 18 months. He estimated the related cost savings from inflation at \$1.3-\$1.8 million.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the mechanisms to shorten condemnation time. Mr. Burkett noted two options: 1) Council adoption of a condemnation ordinance; and 2) acquisition of properties through a "quick take," under which the City could use a property to build the project and proceed to court for a determination of the property value.

Mr. Maronek went on to review the status of the Interurban Trail Project. He noted completion of planning for the full length of the trail and of 30-percent design for the south and north segments. He said Seattle City Light (SCL) and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SeaTrans) clarified the need for changes as part of the first external plan review. He mentioned the need to address the problems of the owners of six properties along the south segment of the trail.

Mr. Maronek explained that differences in topography and SCL plans for facilities in the right-of-way make each segment of the Interurban Trail Project unique. He said staff recommends including only the south segment in the revised CIP because: it is the closest to being done; it doesn't include any at-grade roadway crossings; and staff knows, in general, how to solve the problems that the owners of the six adjacent properties may have. He suggested that the City "go to bid" on the south segment this spring and undertake the other segments in series.

Mr. Burkett explained that four of the six owners of property adjacent to the south segment of the trail have permits to use the SCL right-of-way that would interfere with the trail. He said the other two property owners have been using the right-of-way without permits. He asserted the need to resolve the issues of these property owners.

Mr. Burkett commented that the south segment of the Interurban Trail Project is fully funded; whereas, the remainder of the trail project is not fully funded. He noted a lack of grant funding for the central segment in particular. He mentioned the City intent to fund the Interurban Trail Project primarily with grant funding.

DRAFT

February 19, 2002

Councilmember Ransom said staff previously advised Council that the City had \$5.5 million for the trail and that this amount was sufficient to fund the entire project except the bridge over Aurora Avenue N. Mr. Burkett said staff estimates the cost for the entire Interurban Trail Project at \$8 million, including \$3 million for the bridge. Finance Director Debbie Tarry said the City has approximately \$5.2 million in funding for the Interurban Trail Project. She explained that the City cannot obligate the \$5.2 million until it begins certain phases of the project. She clarified that grant funds represent approximately \$3.3 million of the \$5.2 million. Mr. Burkett noted that \$.5 million of the \$3.3 million is limited to use for the bridge.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Maronek said he understood the section of the Interurban Trail between N 165th Street and N 155th Street to be part of the south-central segment of the project.

In response to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Maronek said the north segment of the Interurban Trail Project uses the SCL right-of-way to N 200th Street. He confirmed that the trail uses Meridian Avenue and "the side of Ballinger Commons" north to 205th Street.

Next, Mr. Maronek reviewed the North City Business District Improvements Project. Referring to page 27 of the Council packet, he noted the recommended consolidation of the project with the 15th Avenue NE Access and Safety Project and the 15th Avenue NE Pedestrian Crossings Project for the pre-design phase only. He explained that this will save approximately \$134,000. He noted that some of the grant funds for the 15th Avenue NE projects must soon be obligated for use. He said the projects can be handled separately again after completion of the pre-design study.

Mr. Maronek discussed the alternative configurations for 15th Avenue NE: a three-lane configuration from 145th Street to 196th Street; a four-lane configuration with enhancement for parking in the business district; or a three-lane alignment internal to the business district only. He acknowledged previous Council input regarding the configuration and its impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. He said staff will review the roadway configuration in April with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), SeaTrans and Metro and, afterward, provide a briefing to Council.

Mr. Maronek said the North City Business District Improvements Project is fully funded, but the revised CIP shows only the funds for the pre-design study. Mr. Burkett said staff has set aside the rest of the funds for the project.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the revision of the earlier cost projection of \$5.5 million for the North City Business District Improvements Project to \$4.04 million. Mr. Burkett said the earlier projection was a very rough estimate of the project cost. He explained that he directed Public Works staff to review and refine the estimate last summer during preparation of the 2002-2007 CIP and that work resulted in the \$4.04 million estimate. He noted the undergrounding of utilities as the most significant issue in

February 19, 2002

the project. He said the City needs additional information from SCL on the scheduling and costs for this work.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett confirmed that the City is funding the North City Business District Improvements Project—the City has not received grant funding for the project.

In response to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Burkett said the project includes 15th Avenue NE from 145th Street to 196th Street. He explained that most of the improvements—undergrounding of utilities, sidewalks, landscaping, street lights—would be limited to the North City Business District (from 172nd Street to 185th Street); whereas, the City proposes traffic safety improvements for segments of 15th Avenue NE south of 172nd Street. He noted the type and extent of the lane configuration of 15th Avenue NE as an outstanding issue.

Councilmember Chang questioned whether the City can deliver on the promises it has made to North City business people and residents for \$4.04 million. Mr. Burkett said the City currently has a conceptual design and rough cost estimates. He explained that the City will refine the cost estimates as the project proceeds through the pre-design and design phases.

Deputy Mayor Grossman commented that staff will return to update Council at each step in the project to confirm that Council is still comfortable with the direction and estimated cost of the project. Mr. Burkett asserted the need to insure that proposed City projects fit within available City revenue and the grants the City can obtain.

Councilmember Ransom said the City previously discussed the commitment of approximately \$1 million of General Fund revenue to the North City Business District Improvements Project and grant funding to complete the project. He expressed concern about the need to fund the project entirely from General Fund revenue. Noting declining State revenues, he said City revenues may begin to decline, too.

Mr. Maronek said one purpose of the pre-design study is to identify and incorporate the design standards of granting agencies, thereby enhancing the City's ability to obtain grant funding for the project.

In response to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Burkett discussed the schedule on page 27 of the Council packet for the North City Business District Improvements Project/15th Avenue NE Corridor Pre-design. Councilmember Hansen commented that the City will not undertake any infrastructure improvements for the North City project until January 2004 at the earliest. Councilmember Chang said many Shoreline citizens think the City will begin improvements in North City this year. Mr. Burkett acknowledged that staff previously said the City would begin improvements this summer, immediately after the Celebrate Shoreline parade. He then explained the need to convert the conceptual ideas from the design charrette into a biddable, buildable project through the pre-design study,

work with government agencies and design. He said this process will require more than two years.

Councilmember Hansen said the surest way to insure a decline in City revenues is to do nothing. He commented that a lack of City investment in infrastructure will result in a deteriorating neighborhood and a lack of private investment.

Councilmember Chang asserted the importance of planning. He said the City cannot invest \$1-2 million in design work and then decide not to build the project.

Deputy Mayor Grossman agreed. He said staff must return to Council at each project milestone to discuss the project and obtain Council direction. He described this as a "very iterative process."

Mr. Burkett said cities at which he has previously worked completed the pre-design and design of projects knowing that the funds needed to build the projects were not available. He explained that the cities then had the designs in place to take advantage of grant opportunities.

Councilmember Chang asked if the City can realistically expect to obtain grant funding considering the economic difficulties that the County, State and federal government face. Mr. Burkett said the potential for grant funding depends on the project. He noted that Aurora Avenue in Shoreline is one of the most unsafe segments of State highway in Washington. He said the State is aware of the need for safety and capacity improvements, and the potential for grant funding is high. He commented that 15th Avenue NE is not a State highway, that it is not as dangerous as Aurora Avenue and that the potential for grant funding is lower. With regard to the Interurban Trail Project, he mentioned that the federal government has set aside funds for projects addressing alternative modes of transportation.

Next, Mr. Maronek reviewed the Ronald Bog Drainage Improvements Project. He said the City has completed the planning, and the project is in pre-design. Referring to the chart on page 31 of the Council packet, he noted the inclusion of the one-year period normally required for the Army Corps of Engineers and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to process an application. He asserted the need to focus on the problem of meeting the Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) deadlines. He said the original project schedule was inaccurate and unrealistic. He commented that Public Works can address the PWTF deadlines through focused efforts. He said the contract City Engineer can perform a Quality Assurance Quality Check (QAQC) to determine how to shorten the length of the project and a critical path analysis to determine which project elements must be done in series and which can be done in parallel. He said if external constraints (such as Army Corps of Engineers and NMFS review) prolong the project, the City can request an extension of the PWTF deadline.

Continuing, Mr. Maronek reviewed the 3rd Avenue NW Drainage Improvements Project. He noted that the "updated, realistic" schedule includes the one-year Army Corps of

Engineers and NMFS application review period. He stressed the need to meet the PWTF deadlines for this project, and he noted the same methods as those he mentioned for the Ronald Bog project (QAQC and critical path analysis). He reiterated that the City can request an extension of the PWTF deadline if external constraints prolong the project.

In response to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Burkett clarified that the PWTF is a loan, not a grant. He stressed the need to identify a revenue stream to repay the PWTF loan funds the City proposes to use.

Mr. Burkett used the "City of Shoreline Example Project Schedule" matrix provided to Council to explain why pre-design and design requires two to three years.

Mr. Maronek went on to review the information on pages 39 and 40 of the Council packet regarding Shoreview Park, Paramount School Park and the Richmond Highlands Recreation Center. Mr. Burkett said the City has begun operations in the Richmond Highlands Recreation Center.

In response to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Maronek anticipated completion of the Shoreview Park Project under budget. He confirmed that Phase I and Phase II of the Paramount School Park Project will be completed within the combined budget for the two phases.

Councilmember Hansen said the City is approximately \$22,000 over budget on the Richmond Highlands Community Center Project. Mr. Burkett agreed. (He noted that Council approved an additional \$60,000 during construction to replace the siding.) Councilmember Hansen commented that a \$22,000 cost overrun is not unreasonable. He asserted that renovations and repairs of public buildings often result in much larger cost overruns. He stated that, with the exception of the Shoreline Pool Project, the City has predicted costs correctly. He said this gives him confidence about the cost projections for the longer-term and more expensive projects the City is undertaking.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Maronek described the vehicles that SCL needs to be able to operate on the Interurban Trail as very large boom trucks with a gross vehicle weight of 69,000 pounds. He said the trail is the same design grade as a street, although not as wide.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the SeaTrans suggestion to "split the trail approximately 150 to 200 feet north of North 145th Street." Mr. Maronek explained SCL and SeaTrans plans for "with-traffic bike and pedestrian movement" on Linden Avenue south of N 145th Street. He said SeaTrans has insisted on a revision to the south trailhead of the City's Interurban Trail Project to tie into this split design south of N 145th Street. He went on to describe the potential "win-win" of developing a joint-use parking lot alternative for the public parking relocated from the south trailhead and for the shopping center adjacent to the trail.

Councilmember Chang noted his understanding that, once the City begins building the Interurban Trail, construction will continue until the entire project (from 145th Street to 205th Street) is complete. Mr. Burkett noted that the City has yet to obtain grant funding and select an alignment for the central segment of the project. Councilmember Chang expressed concern that the City will build a portion of the trail that will not connect to anything for years or decades. Mr. Burkett reviewed the schedule for the Interurban Trail Project. He said the City intends to complete the project during the next three years, assuming the City can obtain the necessary grant funding or dedicate its own revenue.

Ms. Tarry reviewed the financial aspects of the revised CIP. She said the 2002-2007 CIP that Council adopted in December 2001 totaled a little over \$110 million, and the revised CIP totals \$79.6 million for the same time period. She listed the following reasons for the decrease in the total: staff has revised the scopes of some projects; staff has revised the costs of the projects (to include both standard inflationary measures and contingencies); and staff has eliminated some projects (as a result of resource limitations or because of their low priority). She said staff will continue to reconsider the CIP annually (e.g., reviewing project cost estimates and City resources). She noted staff intent to review the 2003-2008 CIP this spring and early summer for presentation to Council for consideration and adoption in late July.

Continuing, Ms. Tarry reviewed the 2002 capital budget. She said the \$13.7 million in capital expenditures in the 2002 City Budget will be reduced to \$5.6 million under the revised CIP. She explained that staff will prepare a budget amendment for Council consideration in mid-April. Referring to pages 41-46 of the Council packet, she highlighted aspects of the capital funds within the City budget:

- General Capital Fund—she noted the deletion of approximately \$1 million in anticipation of the elimination of State backfill funding for revenue the City lost upon passage of I-695.
- Roads Capital Fund—she said staff has retained the \$2.6 million previously reserved for future phases of the Interurban Trail, North City Business District Improvements and Aurora Corridor Projects in addition to the funds designated for those phases of the projects scheduled between 2002 and 2007.
- Surface Water Capital Fund—she explained that requirements of legislation such as the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) have increased SWM operation expenses. She noted that the City will also need to dedicate SWM fee revenues to PWTF loan payments in the future. She mentioned that King County raised its SWM fees in December 2001 from \$85 per parcel to \$102 per parcel. She said staff recommends the City implement a similar SWM fee increase in 2003 to address operational and capital SWM needs. She mentioned staff plans to review the adequacy of the rate structure to meet long-term operational and capital SWM needs as part of the 2003 budget process.

Deputy Mayor Grossman invited public comment.

DRAFT

February 19, 2002

(1) Kellie Swenson, Shoreline, expressed support for the Interurban Trail Project. She agreed with Councilmember Hansen that the City is managing capital projects well and keeping costs under control.

(2) Mary Jo Heller, Shoreline, said Westminster Triangle residents support the high priority of the Interurban Trail Project. She advocated serious City consideration of the bridge for the Interurban Trail over Aurora Avenue. She expressed disappointment at the loss of Paul Cornish as Project Manager of the Interurban Trail Project. She expressed concern about using contract engineers, who may have less involvement in the community, instead of staff to manage City capital projects.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Tarry said the "TEA-21 Federal" revenue referred to on page 44 of the Council packet lumps together a number of grant resources. She noted that the revised CIP reflects only those elements of the Aurora Corridor Project scheduled within the timeframe of the CIP and only those grants that have been awarded.

Councilmember Chang asked if money saved in construction of the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project can be applied to the second and third phases. Mr. Burkett said the answer depends on the grant, and the City has received a variety of grants for the Aurora Corridor Project. Ms. Tarry said the City could apply savings in City revenues toward future phases of the project. Mr. Burkett agreed with Councilmember Chang that the City has incentive to save as much as possible.

Councilmember Hansen asked if the \$28 million budgeted for the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project includes funds to rebuild the roadbed. Mr. Burkett said the City will consider the necessity and extent of roadbed reconstruction as part of the value engineering for the project. He confirmed that the revised CIP includes the initial estimates for roadbed reconstruction.

Councilmember Ransom said the future priority of the Aurora Corridor to the State looks worse and worse. He acknowledged that the City has the funding to build the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project. He asked what the City will do if it does not have the funds necessary for the subsequent phases. Mr. Burkett said it is too early to say. He reiterated that Aurora Avenue is a State highway and that it is unsafe, and he noted the need to expand capacity. He said City staff and the City lobbyist are working to insure the inclusion of the Aurora Corridor Project in the list of projects for the State transportation plan. He identified Aurora Corridor Project funding as one important discussion topic when Council meets with Senator Patty Murray's staff during its upcoming trip to Washington, D.C. He asserted that the City is likely to obtain additional funding for the Aurora Corridor Project "given the nature of the project and the need for improvements on Aurora."

Responding to Councilmember Chang's question about the cost of the second and third phases of the Aurora Corridor Project, Mr. Burkett referred to the chart on page 20 of the Council packet, "Aurora Avenue North: N 165 to N 205." He noted the total cost estimate of approximately \$60 million.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said most of the concerns about City capital projects have related to the multiple changes in project time frames. He asserted that "a lot of it is learning curve." Noting that construction of the new Richmond Beach Library and the Shoreview Park Little League Field took 12 years, he said the readjustments to the Aurora Corridor Project should not seem surprising. He reiterated Councilmember Hansen's observation that most City projects are on budget. He indicated that he feels comfortable with the refined project cost estimates and timelines.

Councilmember Ransom attributed the length of the Richmond Beach Library and Shoreview Park Little League Field projects to the loose government organization before the City incorporated. He said that the City provides a coordinated, integrated process. He acknowledged that some City capital projects may take longer than Council had anticipated, but he said the project time frames are short in comparison to those of the capital projects in Shoreline before the City incorporated, and he asserted that citizens will be pleased with the results of the projects. He mentioned road and drainage improvements since incorporation as "something to be proud of."

(b) Quarterly City Council Goals Reports

Mr. Burkett reviewed the quarterly City Council goals reports.

Regarding Council goal six ("Adopt a plan for City Hall"), Councilmember Chang asked about siting a City Hall at Cromwell Park or at surplus School District property. Mr. Burkett noted a deed restriction limiting development at Cromwell Park.

Councilmember Ransom said the Forward Thrust funding the County used to establish other Shoreline parks limits their use for a City Hall. He explained that the County purchased the Cromwell Park property directly from the School District without using encumbered funds. He said the County applied the same limitations as those on Forward Thrust-funded parks to Cromwell Park before turning the park over to the City. He asserted this was an error. He said the City should be able to negotiate with the County to remove the limitations on Cromwell Park. Mr. Burkett said staff can investigate the possibility of removing the limitations and compare Cromwell Park with other potential sites.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett said the City Hall project is the only one for which the City can use councilmanic bonds. He noted the option of using voter-approved bonding for City capital projects.

Councilmember Ransom said he has been concerned for some time about the adequacy of SWM revenues to cover the costs of SWM operations and capital projects. He asserted that even the recommended increase in SWM fees may be insufficient. He said the City needs to operate SWM like a utility in which the revenue stream is sufficient to complete capital projects and operate and maintain the system. He commented that the City cannot

February 19, 2002

expect to use General Fund revenue to backfill SWM needs. He said the City must determine the amount of funds necessary to cover the future costs of the system.

In response to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Burkett said the City will communicate with businesses in the areas in which it proposes to locate gateways as part of the gateway master planning process.

Councilmember Hansen said the recommended increase in SWM fees will increase annual SWM revenues to approximately \$2.4 million. Councilmember Ransom said the current SWM revenues of approximately \$2 million have not been adequate to meet operational and capital needs. Mr. Burkett reiterated staff plans to evaluate the SWM rate structure.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Kellie Swenson, Shoreline, supported the left-turn lanes, U-turn lanes and the raised medians proposed as part of the Aurora Corridor Project. She said raised medians improve safety and the turn lanes facilitate traffic movement.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:46 p.m., Deputy Mayor Grossman declared the meeting adjourned.

Carol Shenk
Deputy City Clerk

February 25, 2002

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, February 25, 2002
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Steve Burkett, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager

The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m. All Councilmembers were present.

City Manager Steve Burkett distributed a list of potential dinner meetings with other local agencies, committees and officials. He also discussed a meeting of the Shoreline School District Land Bank Committee earlier in the day to consider potential uses of the Aldercrest School site.

Councilmember Chang asked if King County Executive Ron Sims' plans to close many County parks will affect Shoreline. Mr. Burkett described the newest County proposal to create a metropolitan taxing district.

Mayor Jepsen mentioned the concern Councilmember Ransom raised about City regulation of rooftop signs. He explained that the Development Code prohibits new rooftop signs, but the City allows the continuation of those rooftop signs that existed at the time Council adopted the Development Code. He said Councilmember Ransom wants to speak about the sign issue during the regular meeting after the staff presentation on the Development Code amendments and before public testimony. He questioned whether this would be a proper procedure.

Councilmember Hansen asked about the measurement of setbacks between buildings and property lines.

Mr. Burkett discussed the list of potential dinner meetings. He noted the option of including a dinner meeting with the Executive Board of the Council of Neighborhoods.

In response to a suggestion by Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Burkett said staff will add a dinner meeting with the Lake Forest Park City Council to the list.

February 25, 2002

DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom said architects working with the School District on potential uses of the Aldercrest site want to make a presentation to Council. Mayor Jepsen suggested staff schedule the presentation during the March 25 Council dinner meeting.

Mayor Jepsen reiterated Councilmember Ransom's request to speak prior to public testimony on the proposed Development Code amendments. He said other Councilmembers believe this may not be appropriate.

Councilmember Ransom said he wants to explain to Council and the public his belief that churches should be able to use recreational vehicles for housing with fewer restrictions.

Councilmembers discussed options for recreational vehicle use and for signage placement and size.

Mayor Jepsen suggested that Council discuss the Development Code as part of the regular meeting after public testimony.

Continuing, Mayor Jepsen mentioned the King County proposal for corporate sponsorship of Metro bus shelters. He said the proposal would allow sponsoring corporations to place their logos on the shelters. He also discussed the Shorewood Hills Homeowners Association drainage issue and the Sister Cities Association.

Mr. Burkett raised the idea of a day- or day-and-a-half-long Council retreat in late April or early May. Councilmembers discussed possible dates.

At 7:20 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, February 25, 2002
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:25 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

City Manager Steve Burkett mentioned the meetings regarding the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan scheduled 7-8:30 p.m. March 5 and 6.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Mayor Grossman moved to approve the agenda. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

**Minutes of Workshop Meeting of February 4, 2002
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of February 11, 2002
Minutes of Regular Meeting of February 11, 2002**

Approval of expenses and payroll as of February 15, 2002 in the amount of \$1,200,947.96

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the King County 2002/2003 Waste Reduction and Recycling Interlocal Agreement for \$41,679

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the 2002/2003 State of Washington Department of Ecology Coordinated Prevention Grant Agreement for \$53,571

AGENDA INTERRUPTION

There was Council consensus to discuss agenda item 9 (a) before agenda item 8 (a), which was scheduled to begin at 8 p.m.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Gray & Osborne, Inc. for Engineering Services in an amount not to exceed \$200,000

Mr. Burkett briefly reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract not to exceed \$200,000, with Gray & Osborne, Inc. for professional engineering services. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett confirmed that the City Engineer position is one of the three vacant engineering positions. Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about internal control and evaluation of the contract engineering services. Mr. Burkett said Gray & Osborne will, for the time being, act as the City Engineer. In response to Councilmember Ransom, he confirmed that Gray & Osborne will not bid on any of the projects it manages for the City.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed concern about the historical knowledge lost with the departure of three engineers from Public Works. Mr. Burkett asserted the importance of insuring that staff of Gray & Osborne have access to past discussions, directions and decisions regarding City capital projects.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract not to exceed \$200,000, with Gray & Osborne, Inc. for professional engineering services. The motion carried 7-0.

RECESS

DRAFT

At 7:48 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared a recess until 8 p.m.

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (a) Public Hearing to consider citizen comments on Development Code amendments

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, reviewed the staff report. He discussed the additional information staff developed in response to Council requests during its January 22 workshop.

Referring to page 64 of the Council packet, Mr. Stewart went on to note that staff inadvertently failed to strike "for each tenant and maximum 50 sq. ft." for "Maximum Sign Area" under "Building-Mounted Signs" in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Table 20.50.540B in the draft that Council reviewed earlier.

Referring to page 44 of the Council packet, Mr. Stewart said Ordinance No. 299 does not change the definitions of setback in SMC 20.20.046. He acknowledged Councilmember Hansen's comment that the definitions are confusing, and he noted the following wording in particular: "measured perpendicular to the building at the closest point to the front lot line." He explained the intent to measure perpendicular to the lot line, not the building. He said staff has prepared alternate language to clarify this intent.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing.

(1) James Kim, Burien, represented a group of investors interested in developing a mixed-used building at Aurora Avenue N and N 149th Street. He urged Council to reconsider restricting left-turn access on Aurora Avenue N.

Mayor Jepsen pointed out that the public hearing is meant to address the proposed Development Code amendments. He encouraged people with comments about the Aurora Corridor Project to wait until the "Continued Public Comment" period later in the meeting.

(2) Rob Hill, Shoreline, thanked City staff for its assistance in proposing the amendment to increase the height in the R-48 zone. He encouraged Council to support the proposed amendment.

(3) Bob Koch, Shoreline, expressed concern about the safety and aesthetics of six-foot-high front yard fences.

(4) Randy Ferrell, Shoreline, requested a clear definition of "structurally altered" in SMC 20.50.590, "Nonconforming signs." He suggested specific exemptions for repairs, maintenance and the relocation of signs on buildings.

DRAFT

(5) Steve Ortman, Shoreline, urged Council to reject the proposed amendment in front yard fence height. He said Edmonds, Lake Forest Park and Kirkland cite traffic safety and neighborhood crime prevention as justifications for their front yard fence height limitations.

(6) Jerry Kriesel, Shoreline, advocated that the City publicize the maximum front yard fence height (on its web site and in notifications by mail) to eliminate excuses of not knowing about the limit.

(7) Warren Heggen, Shoreline, supported the proposed amendment to increase the maximum height of front yard fences from three and a half feet to six feet. He said the current height limitation penalizes property owners who comply with it.

(8) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, supported the Planning Commission proposal to work with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce and Shoreline businesses to develop a viable sign ordinance. He asserted that small businesses on Aurora Avenue N need visibility, accessibility and parking. He indicated that sign restrictions limit the visibility of businesses and, thereby, their competitiveness. He said Council should reassess the illegality of rooftop signs.

(9) Terry Green, Shoreline, said businesses previously requested that Council clarify whether signs grandfathered when Council adopted the Development Code will still be allowed if the Aurora Corridor Project requires their relocation.

(10) Sandra Banduchy, Shoreline, asked Council to reconsider the proposed amendment to increase the maximum building height in the R-48 zone.

Councilmember Hansen moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance No. 299 amending the Development Code including Shoreline Municipal Code Chapters 20.20 Definitions; 20.30 Procedures and Administration; 20.40 Zoning and Use Provisions; 20.50 General Development Standards; 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities; 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and 20.80 Special Districts

Councilmember Hansen moved that Council adopt Ordinance No. 299. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the proposed requirement that a recreational vehicle (RV) "must be parked on approved surface that meets the Off Street Parking Construction Standards in the Engineering Guide" (page 34 of the Council packet). Mr. Stewart said

the provision requires parking on an impervious surface. He confirmed that a standard driveway would be acceptable.

Councilmember Ransom mentioned the proposal he presented at the January 22 workshop to allow RV occupancies of up to four weeks "if connected for water, sewer and electricity." He said this proposal reflects City of Lynnwood's approach. He went on to express concern about limiting the number of RV occupancies to the number of lots, regardless of lot size. He said some churches occupy lots of more than an acre.

Councilmember Gustafson said the Shoreline School District has hosted multi-day sports tournaments and has permitted families of participating student athletes to occupy RVs overnight on District property. Mr. Stewart said the proposed amendment would limit the District to one RV per lot. He went on to describe the administration and enforcement of the proposed amendment.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Stewart said the School District could not legally host 15 to 20 RVs overnight under the proposed amendment. He said staff would need to draft a provision allowing large institutional facilities a more liberal use for this purpose. Councilmember Gustafson advocated that Council direct staff to draft such a provision.

Councilmember Ransom suggested that the City address the issue of RV occupancy at large institutional facilities by stipulating that on large properties each quarter acre count as one lot.

Councilmember Montgomery mentioned long occupancies of multiple RVs on the Crista campus.

Mr. Burkett said the City should not clutter the Development Code in an effort to address every imaginable issue. He commented that the proposed amendment provides an option for most RV occupancies. He noted temporary use permits as an option for others. Councilmember Hansen agreed, saying that large institutional facilities can apply for temporary use permits to address RV occupancies that fall outside of the proposed amendment. Councilmember Chang agreed.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about the discretionary application of the proposed amendment. **He moved that Council revise the proposed amendment for very large parcels of property owned by non-profits, churches and school districts to count each quarter acre of square footage as one lot for the purpose of determining the number of allowed RV occupancies.**

In response to Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmember Ransom explained his intent that the revision apply only to non-profit organizations such as churches and school districts.

Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion.

DRAFT

Continuing, Councilmember Hansen opposed the motion as an effort to address every possible situation.

Deputy Mayor Grossman commented that a church representative, seeking to comply with the City code, suggested the amendment to allow temporary RV occupancies. He said Council is doing a disservice to those requesting the amendment if it doesn't meet their needs. He favored limiting the revision to non-profit organizations, churches and other institutions.

Councilmember Hansen opposed any distinction by type of property owner.

Commenting that the designation of a quarter acre as a one-lot equivalent seems random, Mayor Jepsen opposed the revision. He supported a provision to address RV occupancies at large institutional facilities. Councilmember Gustafson agreed. He favored a provision specifically allowing temporary use permits to large institutional facilities for temporary RV occupancies.

A vote was taken on the motion that Council revise the proposed amendment for very large parcels of property owned by non-profits, churches and school districts to count each quarter acre of square footage as one lot for the purpose of determining the number of allowed RV occupancies. The motion failed 1-6, with Councilmember Ransom voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Gustafson moved that Council delete Section 20.40.495, "Recreational Vehicle," from Ordinance No. 299 and direct staff to revise it for Council consideration at a future meeting. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5-2, with Councilmembers Hansen and Montgomery dissenting.

Regarding Tab 15, Councilmember Ransom noted his previous concern about the theoretical possibility of a 60-foot-tall building adjacent to a residential property. However, he agreed that the R-48 zoning designation is meaningless if the owner of an R-48 property cannot achieve that density. He noted the staff determination that the minimum height necessary to accommodate 48 units on the average R-48 parcel in Shoreline is 50 feet. He said it seems reasonable to allow up to 60 feet for flexibility. He asserted that Council should approve the proposed amendment or eliminate the R-48 zoning designation.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said the Development Code provision limiting the height of front yard fences to 42 inches resulted from a great deal of public input. He noted public support for retaining the 42-inch limit. He advocated public education to address confusion about the maximum allowable height of front yard fences.

Deputy Mayor Grossman moved that Council revise Ordinance No. 299 to delete the amendments to Section 20.50.110 of the Development Code, which increase the

maximum allowable height of front yard fences. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Gustafson called the issue of front yard fence height one of property owner rights versus community good and neighborhood character. He said he has driven around Shoreline considering safety issues and front yard fence heights. He asserted that the proposed amendments make a strong recommendation to limit front yard fence heights to 42 inches while still respecting property owner rights. He supported the proposed amendments and opposed the motion to delete them.

Councilmember Hansen noted that many residents have six-foot-high front yard fences that were grandfathered when Council adopted the Development Code. He said the Development Code currently precludes the neighbors of these residents from having front yard fences of the same height. He opposed the motion to delete the proposed amendments.

Councilmember Ransom supported the right of a property owner to have a front yard fence of the same six-foot height as that of a neighboring property owner. He opposed the motion to delete the proposed amendments.

Councilmember Chang said six-foot-tall front yard fences will make the work of police, firefighters and emergency medical personnel more difficult. He supported the motion to delete the proposed amendments.

Mayor Jepsen expressed surprise at the amount of public input about front yard fence heights. He supported a 42-inch maximum front yard fence height as more visually appealing and conducive to safety. However, he stressed the difficulty of enforcing this height restriction given the number of six-foot-tall front yard fences that already exist in Shoreline. He noted that the City can require the removal of any fence that poses a safety hazard. He favored the proposed amendments.

A vote was taken on the motion to revise Ordinance No. 299 to delete the amendments to Section 20.50.110 of the Development Code, which increase the maximum allowable height of front yard fences. The motion failed 2-5, with Deputy Mayor Grossman and Councilmember Chang voting in the affirmative.

Regarding Tab 32, Councilmember Chang expressed surprise to learn that the rooftop sign at his business is nonconforming. He agreed with the public comments about the importance of visibility to the competitiveness of Shoreline businesses. He asked whether signs grandfathered when Council adopted the Development Code will still be allowed if the Aurora Corridor Project requires their relocation. He also asked whether a business can replace a grandfathered rooftop sign after removing it for repairs. Mr. Stewart noted that other sections of the Development Code allow for maintenance and repair of nonconforming structures. He said the new sign code would apply if a grandfathered sign was altered (i.e., if the physical characteristics or structure of the sign were changed). He asserted that this would be the case even if the alteration were

required by a public authority. He said Council can direct staff to initiate an amendment to the Development Code language if this interpretation does not represent Council intent.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the Aurora Corridor Project could affect a grandfathered rooftop sign by requiring alteration of a building. Noting that the City has made many efforts to avoid altering buildings, he asserted that the rooftop sign would continue to be grandfathered. He asked if this assertion is accurate. He went on to note his assumption that the City will address other signs affected by the Aurora Corridor Project under the relocation policy Council adopted. Mr. Stewart confirmed that the relocation policy will govern how the City addresses other signs. He mentioned another class of potentially nonconforming signs: those in legally appropriate locations that exceed the size restrictions in the Development Code.

In response to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Stewart said he does not know how many signs could be affected by the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project.

Councilmember Gustafson said signs grandfathered when Council adopted the Development Code should continue to be grandfathered if the Aurora Corridor Project requires their relocation. He advocated that the City discuss SMC 20.50.590 with businesses and provide a clear definition of "structurally altered."

In response to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Stewart confirmed that the Planning Commission is currently addressing sign issues. He said Commissioners strongly support additional community involvement before making a recommendation to Council on these issues.

Councilmember Ransom referred to the information on page 38 of the Council packet regarding rooftop signs. He said a Council majority voted to delete Community Development (CD) Policy 19 ("Discourage signs at upper levels of buildings . . .") from the Comprehensive Plan. He said Council discussed this issue several times, and he mentioned signs at Chuck Olson Chevrolet and Aurora Rents during those discussions. He noted the discrepancy between the Comprehensive Plan (as amended to exclude CD Policy 19) and the Development Code, which prohibits rooftop signs. He said he submitted a Development Code amendment during the comment process to delete this prohibition. He commented that Planning and Development Services does not like rooftop signs. He said the owner of Aurora Rents can maintain his current upper-level sign, but he cannot upgrade it. He referred to a book published by the International Sign Association, Unmasking the Myths on Signs and the Use of Signage as a Planning Tool. He stressed the importance of signs to businesses. He asked Council to make the Development Code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Ransom moved that Council delete "E. Signs mounted on the roof" from SMC 20.50.550. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen said he does not remember the conclusions of past Council discussions on signage.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said he does not support the motion. He said the Planning Commission, which is currently addressing sign issues, is a more appropriate venue for a more thorough discussion of the whole signage issue. Councilmember Gustafson agreed. He said he recalls Council discussion of grandfathering the signs of existing businesses.

Councilmember Chang compared the prohibition of new rooftop signs to the prohibition of new six-foot-high front yard fences. He asserted that businesses will not want to locate in Shoreline if they cannot be competitive.

Councilmember Ransom referred again to the deletion of CD Policy 19 from the Comprehensive Plan. He said this included rooftop signs. He commented that the Development Code precluded Cascade Bingo from replacing its upper-level sign. He urged Council to support his motion. He said Council will not have the opportunity to delete the rooftop sign prohibition for at least another year.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the Development Code has included SMC 20.50.550 (E) for over 18 months. He advocated that Planning Commission consideration of sign issues include a concerted effort to determine how CD Policy 19 was deleted from the Comprehensive Plan. He said discussion of the prohibition represents the tension between community values and current conditions along the Aurora Corridor. He identified the process underway in the Planning Commission as the appropriate means of addressing that tension. He advocated that the Planning Commission process run its course. Councilmember Montgomery concurred.

A vote was taken on the motion that Council delete "E. Signs mounted on the roof" from SMC 20.50.550. The motion failed 2-5, with Councilmembers Chang and Ransom voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ransom mentioned that he requested reconsideration of sign restrictions on churches in residential zones. He advocated that neighborhood churches be subject to the same sign standards as neighborhood businesses.

Councilmember Montgomery asked if restrictive sign standards in residential zones have been a problem for churches. Councilmember Hansen mentioned a situation involving Prince of Peace Evangelical Lutheran Church on 145th Street.

Continuing, Councilmember Hansen noted the different maximum monument sign sizes allowed under Figure 20.60.560 (page 122 of the Council packet) and the different maximum sizes allowed for freestanding and building-mounted signs in Neighborhood Business and Office zones in Table 20.50.540B (page 199 of the Council packet). He suggested a standard maximum sign size of 50 square feet.

DRAFT

Councilmember Hansen moved that churches be subject to the sign standards for Neighborhood Business and Office zones. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen referred again to the process underway in the Planning Commission to review sign regulations as the best method to address sign standards for churches. He noted that Planning Commission Chair Marlin Gabbert is in the audience and, therefore, aware of the Council discussion.

Councilmember Ransom asserted that making churches subject to the same sign standards as neighborhood businesses is reasonable. He said Council is not likely to consider this amendment again for at least another year.

Mr. Stewart commented that Council can request staff to initiate an amendment to the Development Code at any time.

Councilmember Gustafson favored Planning Commission consideration of sign standards for both churches and schools.

A vote was taken on the motion that churches be subject to the sign standards for Neighborhood Business and Office zones. The motion failed 3-4, with Councilmembers Chang, Hansen and Ransom voting in the affirmative.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Stewart distributed revised language for the definitions of setback in Ordinance No. 299 (page 44 of the Council packet).

Councilmember Hansen moved that Council amend the revisions in Ordinance No. 299 to Chapter 20.20.046 page 30 to read as follows:

<u>Setback, Aggregate Yard</u>	Total <u>yard</u> setback area that equals the sum of the minimum front yard, rear yard, and side yard setbacks.
<u>Setback, Front Yard</u>	<u>A space extending the full width of the lot between the front property line and the setback line which is measured perpendicular from the front lot line to the minimum yard setback line.</u>
<u>Setback, Rear Yard</u>	<u>A space extending across the full width of the lot between the rear lot line and the yard setback line which is measured perpendicular from the rear lot line to the minimum yard setback line.</u>
<u>Setback, Side Yard</u>	<u>A space extending from the front yard to the rear yard measured perpendicular from the side lot line to the minimum yard setback line.</u>

Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

A vote was taken on the motion that Council adopt Ordinance No. 299—amending the Development Code including Shoreline Municipal Code Chapters 20.20 Definitions; 20.30 Procedures and Administration; 20.40 Zoning and Use Provisions; 20.50 General Development Standards; 20.60 Adequacy of Public Facilities; 20.70 Engineering and Utilities Development Standards; and 20.80 Special Districts—as amended—to delete Section 20.40.495, "Recreational Vehicle," and to amend the revisions to Chapter 20.20.046 page 30. The motion carried 7-0, and Ordinance No. 299, as amended, was adopted.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:55 p.m., Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Deputy Mayor Grossman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

10. NEW BUSINESS

- (a) Oral Presentation by Shoreline Water District regarding ongoing negotiations with Seattle Public Utilities for the purchase of the West-Side Water System in Shoreline

Mr. Burkett introduced Shoreline Water District Manager Cynthia Driscoll and Rick Harbert, Engineering Consultant to the District.

Referring to a handout, Ms. Driscoll identified the "Attendees" at the February 26 General Tour as the negotiating team participants representing the District and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). She invited Councilmembers to participate in the tour. She said the District has not yet scheduled the Detailed Engineering Tour.

Ms. Driscoll said the District submitted a six-page letter to SPU that included a list of requested documents. She explained that it will take a long time for SPU to provide the documents and that, as a result, the District will not have many details in time for its next presentation to Council.

Mr. Harbert discussed a map representing the west side water system in Shoreline and the area currently served by the Water District. He said SPU serves approximately 12,000 customers west of Interstate 5 between 145th Street and 205th Street. He said the District is "making good progress" in obtaining information from SPU. He asserted the complexity of separating the portion of the SPU system in Shoreline from the rest of the SPU system. He also noted the need to determine the extent of the assets (e.g., booster pump stations, supply pump stations, reservoirs, pipelines) before the District can address the financial issues of acquiring the west side water system.

Mr. Harbert said the District is aware, and it has made SPU aware, that the Aurora Corridor is a high priority to City Council. He noted water pipelines in the Aurora Corridor. He stated the intent of the District to insure that any necessary pipeline replacement in the Aurora Corridor occurs in advance of or concurrent with reconstruction of the roadway.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Les Nelson, Shoreline, said residents who receive water from SPU are satisfied with the service. He asserted that separating the portion of the SPU system in Shoreline from the rest of the SPU system will restrict circulation in the water system. He expressed concern about the financial impacts to customers of the District purchase of the SPU system.

Councilmember Hansen thanked the District for its report and for its progress in the negotiations with SPU.

Mayor Jepsen asked how people with questions about the proposed purchase of the west side water system can obtain information. Ms. Driscoll said the District is still recruiting members for the Citizen Advisory Committee. She noted the goal to include two representatives from the west side of Shoreline. She mentioned that much of the District deliberations regarding the negotiations will take place in executive session because the information, if public, could affect the purchase price. She said the Citizen Advisory Committee will address issues such as the implementation of the purchase of the west side water system and the potential impact on rates. She stressed that both the District Board of Commissioners and City Council must approve District actions regarding the purchase.

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Les Nelson, Shoreline, read from a letter to Council regarding electrical power lines related to the addition at Safeway at Aurora Avenue N and N 155th Street. He contested statements by Safeway's architect in a letter to the City requesting a variance, and he contested text in the Road Standards Variance the City granted Safeway. He reported disruption of electrical power to homes near Safeway. He described the power pole and fixtures now visible from his home. He requested that the City respond to a list of five requested actions in his letter.

(b) Wong Han, Shoreline, noted his plan to develop the property he owns at 16543 Aurora Avenue N. He said the street frontage of the property is 200 feet. He asserted that it will be almost impossible for a northbound driver to make a U-turn and cross three lanes of heavy Aurora Avenue traffic to access his property. He asked the City to consider this situation. He said he knows many of the Korean business owners along the Aurora Corridor. He stated that none of them supports the Aurora Corridor Project.

(c) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, asserted that Council should reflect on the message that it sends to businesses. He said the prohibition of rooftop signs was a taking of a right that Shoreline merchants had, and that Seattle and Lynnwood merchants still have, without prior discussion. He encouraged Councilmembers to talk with business owners about their operations.

Mayor Jepsen asked staff to follow up with the speakers who represented Korean business owners to learn whether they have seen the interpreted newsletters the City has issued to provide information about the Aurora Corridor Project to the Korean community. He asked staff to respond to Council and Mr. Nelson about Mr. Nelson's letter.

Councilmember Chang said Mr. Kim, who spoke earlier in the meeting, represents George Choi of Edmonds and other investors who propose to redevelop the Skyline Motel property. He explained that the investors are concerned that the median proposed as part of the Aurora Corridor Project will limit access to the property and preclude the viability of any business tenants in the mixed-used building they propose to build. He noted a prevalent understanding that "the median is non-negotiable." He advocated Council willingness to negotiate, compromise or, at least, listen.

Continuing, Councilmember Chang said he has received phone calls from Shoreline residents who pay electricity bills for streetlights. He requested information on staff progress on the streetlighting issue. Mr. Burkett said staff is gathering information with which to prepare options for Council consideration later this year.

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:30 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, March 4, 2002
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmember Ransom, who arrived shortly thereafter.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Assistant City Manager Larry Bauman said staff met with Wong Han and spoke with James Kim to address the concerns each raised during the February 25 Council meeting about the impact of the Aurora Corridor Project on their development projects on Aurora Avenue.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hansen said he visited City park projects earlier in the day. He described the Shoreview Park Project as impressive. He said he attended the March 13 Suburban Cities Association Management Board meeting and a February 28 joint neighborhood association meeting.

Councilmember Gustafson attended the February 28 Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) meeting. He said the consortium of King County cities annually allocates entitlement program funds of approximately \$10,450,000. He shared with Council a JRC report of approved and completed activities and projects.

Continuing, Councilmember Gustafson mentioned opportunities for public input on the Draft Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 8 Near-term Action Agenda for Salmon

DRAFT

Habitat Conservation. He noted a public workshop in Seattle March 14 and one in Redmond March 21.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:40 p.m.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said he visited third-grade students at Echo Lake Elementary School to participate in their consideration of community and government.

Councilmember Ransom mentioned his participation in the School District Land Bank Task Force. He noted discussion of proposals for the Alderwood Annex.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mayor Jepsen said Council is scheduled to receive a presentation on the Alderwood Annex proposals during its March 25 dinner meeting.

Continuing, Councilmember Ransom said he attended a WRIA 8 meeting in Councilmember Gustafson's absence. He also mentioned a King County proposal to require the City to fund the District Court.

Mayor Jepsen reported that he presented the State of the City Address to the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce February 13. He mentioned coverage in the Shoreline Enterprise and the inclusion of the address in Currents, the City newsletter.

Rob Beem, Assistant Director, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services, introduced Teen Program Supervisor Sigrid Batara. Ms. Batara and teen participants in Empowering Youth Everywhere (EYE) discussed the Richmond Highlands Recreation Center grand reopening activities scheduled March 23, 4:30-9 p.m.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Stan Terry, Shoreline, praised City emphasis on sidewalks and pedestrian safety in specific capital projects (e.g., Aurora Corridor Project, North City Business District Improvements Project) and in general.

(b) Les Nelson, Shoreline, addressed the relocation of power poles behind the Safeway store at 155th Street and Aurora Avenue N. He asserted that plans for the Safeway project do not comply with City Ordinance No. 182, which addresses undergrounding. He questioned the time line for a City response to his February 24 letter. He asked how he can become a party of record to insure the City notifies him of changes in the Safeway project plans.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, City Attorney Ian Sievers said anyone can request to receive further information on a particular permit application. Mr. Bauman said he will ask Planning and Development Services staff to note the file to make sure to advise Mr. Nelson of any significant administrative actions that are not publicly noticed concerning the Safeway project.

DRAFT

Councilmember Chang suggested that City staff meet with Mr. Nelson and Safeway representatives to allow Mr. Nelson to address his concerns. Mr. Bauman said the City cannot require Safeway representatives to meet with Mr. Nelson, but staff can ask if they would be willing to do so.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauman agreed that staff will provide information to Council about the undergrounding requirements and exemption that Mr. Nelson discussed.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Police Survey Results

Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony reviewed the staff report. She said the results of the 2001 Police Services Survey are consistent with those of the 1998 survey. She noted that the 2001 survey helped Shoreline Police identify areas for improvement, including: customer service; crime prevention; and two-way communication.

Chief Pentony said survey respondents were unaware of many Shoreline Police community policing programs. She said the police department will work with Communications Specialist Susan Will to create a media plan to educate Shoreline citizens about opportunities to work with Shoreline Police to prevent crime. She mentioned that the department will focus on the following in its 2002 strategic plan:

- improving crime prevention;
- establishing more Block Watches;
- police newsletters/communication;
- school programs; and
- citizen advisory boards.

Reviewing the top ten crime concerns of the respondents of the 2001 survey, Chief Pentony noted a drop in concern about violent crime. She mentioned greater concern about violent crime in other cities surveyed. Regarding traffic and speeding (the third highest crime concern), she said the police department is addressing complaints about residential streets through the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program and complaints about arterial streets through the Traffic Complaint Form.

Councilmember Montgomery questioned the drop in the perception of Shoreline police as "effective" or "very effective" from 76 percent in 1998 to 56 percent in 2001. Chief Pentony said she does not know the reason for the decline. She stated her intent to investigate it.

Councilmember Chang said he has worked with Chief Pentony. He praised her professionalism. He asserted a day-and-night difference between the services of the Shoreline Police Department and police services in Shoreline before incorporation. He stated his tremendous respect for the department and its officers.

Councilmember Ransom noted burglary and drug-related issues among top police priorities in 1995. He said Shoreline Police "busted" 185 drug houses during the first few years after incorporation, and drug houses then seemed to disappear. Noting the relationship between drug-related crimes and burglary and auto prowls in the past, he asked if the reemergence of burglary and auto prowls as top crime concerns indicates a reemergence of drug-related crimes. Chief Pentony said Shoreline has not experienced a significant amount of drug-related crime. She asserted the lack of a drug problem in Shoreline schools. She explained that burglaries and auto prowls are usually crimes of opportunity. She offered to research burglary and auto prowls cases the department has solved to determine whether they related to drugs. She noted that the top crime concerns represent citizen perception, not necessarily the reality, of crime in Shoreline.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Chief Pentony confirmed the survey finding that citizens feel very safe in Shoreline parks.

Councilmember Ransom attributed part of the drop in the perception of police effectiveness to the need for additional follow-up. He said the Customer Response Team (CRT) has been very effective at gathering data. He suggested CRT as a resource for the police department. Chief Pentony said the department works with CRT. She said the service efforts and accomplishments report, due out next month, will provide more information about police effectiveness.

Councilmember Ransom said the survey results show the community's positive feelings about the police department and reflect the input he receives from citizens. He complimented Chief Pentony.

In response to Deputy Mayor Grossman, Chief Pentony confirmed that 1,900 Part I crimes occurred in Shoreline in 2001. She explained that 800 of these were larcenies (thefts of \$250). She said the number of Part I violent crimes was very low (one homicide, 16 forcible rapes, 46 robberies and 47 aggravated assaults).

Deputy Mayor Grossman expressed surprise that approximately 30 percent of the residents surveyed had contact with police during the previous year. Chief Pentony commented that the high percentage reflects the interaction of Shoreline citizens with the department.

Deputy Mayor Grossman asserted the value of the School Resource Officer (SRO) program. He noted that the third graders with whom he visited recently at Echo Lake Elementary School have a very positive perception of police as a result of their interaction with SRO Mike Phill.

Councilmember Gustafson noted that gang activity fell from number five on the 1998 list of citizen crime concerns to number 12 on the 2001 list. Chief Pentony said police experience confirms this perception: Shoreline Police no longer see gang activity. She mentioned that police in Seattle and Tacoma still have problems with gangs.

DRAFT

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Chief Pentony said vandalism is not increasing in Shoreline.

Councilmember Gustafson praised the communication he received from the police department after his home was burglarized. However, he said he received little communication after the case went to the prosecutor's office. He asserted the need for ongoing contact. He mentioned that his property has been held in evidence for nearly two years. Chief Pentony agreed with the need for ongoing communication. She advocated efforts to bridge the gap between the police department and the prosecutor's office. She suggested that police detectives follow up on cases and report back to crime victims.

Councilmember Hansen asserted that the prosecutor's office should be responsible for communicating about cases it receives and that Shoreline Police should not use their time to follow up on these cases. He noted his participation in the Citizens Academy during the previous year, and he encouraged others to participate in the program. He expressed concern at the perception of a slight deterioration in police services. He commented that citizens generally seem satisfied with the police department. He stated his satisfaction with the department.

Mayor Jepsen estimated that the total of Part I and Part II crimes during 2001 (approximately 3,800) averages to approximately ten crimes per day. He reiterated the concern that Councilmember Hansen expressed about the perception of a deterioration in police services. He noted his interest in comparing the results of the police services survey to the results of the recent City survey.

Councilmember Montgomery said, overall, Shoreline residents are very satisfied with the services of the Shoreline Police. She expressed concern about the County financial crisis. She stated her hope that the City can maintain a good police contract at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Bauman said City Manager Steve Burkett participates with staff from other contracting cities in a group that is considering how to control police services costs over time.

Councilmember Ransom commented that the perceptions of the survey participants do not always reflect the reality of the time period in question.

(b) King County 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan

Public Works Operations Manager Jesus Sanchez provided a brief overview of the staff report.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Mr. Sanchez confirmed that policy RTS-4 (page 28 of the Council packet) would preclude limiting the standard hours of operation

DRAFT

at County transfer facilities for self-haul customers without an ordinance approved by the County Council.

Councilmember Montgomery asked if the "incentive rates . . . to minimize conflicts between self-haulers and commercial haulers" (page 28 of the Council packet) will mean higher rates for self-haulers. Mr. Sanchez explained the intent to create alternatives and incentives to reduce the amount of traffic congestion at transfer sites. He said this might result in increased fees for self-haulers at certain times during the day.

Councilmember Montgomery noted a high number of self-haulers at the time the City incorporated. Mr. Bauman said the number of self-haulers using the First Northeast Transfer Station includes residents of Seattle and Lake Forest Park.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Sanchez said the State Department of Ecology will not begin reviewing the 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan until cities representing 75 percent of the population take action to adopt it.

Councilmember Gustafson questioned the status of City efforts to achieve direct access to the First Northeast Transfer Station from Interstate 5. Mr. Bauman noted the need for federal approval for use of the on- and off-ramps at the Metro bus base. He identified this as one of the high-priority goals for the lobbyist in Washington, D.C. with whom the City has contracted. He agreed that Council will be able to discuss the issue when it meets with federal legislators representing Shoreline during the National League of Cities Conference.

Mayor Jepsen said he remembered a previous draft of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan that addressed financial compensation for communities in which transfer stations are located. Mr. Sanchez said the finance section of the plan alludes to mitigation fees that cities could adopt in consultation with King County. He commented that private haulers often pass on fee increases to ratepayers. Mayor Jepsen said he remembered provisions under which the Countywide program would compensate cities affected by major transfer facilities.

Mayor Jepsen said the name of the First Northeast Transfer Station makes it easy to gloss over the impacts to the City of its location within Shoreline. He noted that other transfer stations are named by city. Mr. Sanchez offered to address this issue with the County.

Councilmember Chang suggested a City yard waste compost center with a dumping fee of \$40 per ton. He mentioned the County dumping fee of \$82.50 per ton. He said the City could use the compost in parks and sell it to residents. Recycling Coordinator Rika Cecil asserted that a compost center for Shoreline residents would require a large piece of land. She explained City plans to create a compost facility for municipal green waste. She said the master plan for the First Northeast Transfer Station includes the expansion of the recycling facility to provide an area for self-haulers to dump yard waste for subsequent transfer to Cedar Grove.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen reiterated that Council wants to maintain the self-hauling option for Shoreline residents. He noted the goal to include "Shoreline" or "City of Shoreline" in the name of the First Northeast Transfer Station. He asked staff to confirm that the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan still addresses financial compensation for cities with transfer stations within their boundaries.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Les Nelson, Shoreline, clarified that his objections to the relocation of electrical power facilities behind the 155th Street and Aurora Avenue N Safeway store concern City staff interpretation of Ordinance No. 82. He asked if the City has applied the ordinance to require undergrounding anywhere in Shoreline.

(b) Dale Wright, Shoreline, noted discussion during the February 25 Council meeting of the raised medians included in the Aurora Corridor Project. He cited a study by the Texas Department of Transportation that found that adjacent businesses benefited economically from raised medians. He asserted safety as a more important consideration. He cited a Georgia Department of Transportation study comparing accident rates on roads with two-way left-turn lanes and roads with raised medians. He said the study showed that roads with raised medians had a 45-percent lower accident rate, a 43-percent lower injury rate and a 78-percent lower rate of pedestrian fatalities than roads with two-way left-turn lanes. He asserted that raised medians are essential to making Aurora Avenue safer.

Mayor Jepsen said the City has enforced the undergrounding requirements of Ordinance No. 82 in many situations. He said staff is preparing a response to Mr. Nelson's February 24 letter. He noted that Council has asked staff to provide information about its interpretation of City undergrounding requirements regarding the Safeway project.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:05 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

**This page intentionally
left blank.**