

July 1, 2002

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, July 1, 2002
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Grossman, seconded by Councilmember Montgomery, and unanimously carried, Councilmember Gustafson was excused.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

City Manager Steve Burkett wished everyone a happy 4th of July and reminded the public that fireworks are prohibited in the City of Shoreline.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Montgomery mentioned the Association of Washington Cities "Walk Across Washington" and invited residents to participate with her.

Mayor Jepsen reported on topics discussed at the Northend Mayors meeting, including municipal courts, sales tax legislation, and the King County parks issues.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:39 p.m. and reported on the Association of Washington Cities conference in Yakima. He also mentioned the Aegis project and suggested a second opinion on the current direction the City is taking.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mayor Jepsen said the Planning and Development Services Department (PADS) is currently going through a process to clarify

DRAFT

the definition of a stream. He said the issue is not unique to Shoreline and many municipalities are trying to define various types of watercourses.

Mr. Burkett said the Planning Commission is working on this issue and will have a continued public hearing on July 11, 2002. He commented that everyone wishes to preserve fish habitat, but the Code needs clarification.

On another topic, Mayor Jepsen responded to an issue raised at an earlier meeting regarding beach access at Appletree Lane. He said that it appears that access at the southern end can be limited to the public because there is little right-of-way there.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Ginger Botham, Shoreline, spoke as Highland Terrace (HT) Neighborhood Association representative. She mentioned several types of parking problems in the area adjacent to Shoreline Community College (SCC). She asked for enforcement when school is in session (after 10:00 a.m.) because by that time the legal parking has been used up.

(b) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, opposed the fireworks ban in Shoreline. He also asked for more public beach access.

(c) Nancy Marx, Shoreline, suggested that PADS staff receive more education on environmental planning. She mentioned fall University of Washington extension classes. She said the PADS staff does most things extremely well, but she felt staff lacks education in the field of streams and wetlands.

Mayor Jepsen suggested that a storefront officer and someone from SCC meet with the HT neighborhood to come up with a traffic control plan. Deputy Mayor Grossman added that he will work with SCC.

Mayor Jepsen concluded by noting that the City is generating ideas about how to gain additional beach access and that he supports continuing education for all staff.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Public Art Policy Briefing and Discussion

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, reviewed the background on the need for, and development of, an arts policy for the City of Shoreline. She outlined the questions upon which staff needs direction to finalize a policy:

- Should the City of Shoreline adopt and implement a Public Art Policy?
- If so, what funding mechanism should be used?
- If the "percent for art" program is selected, what amount should the calculation be based upon?
- Should there be a spending cap?

July 1, 2002

- How should Council delegate authority for implementation?

Ms. Barry described the work of the Public Art Subcommittee of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory (PRCS) Committee, noting the research done by that group. She said one important decision is whether to base the art funding on the construction bid less specific soft costs but tied only to funding sources that allow art as an eligible cost or to the total of all funding sources irrespective of what they allow as an eligible cost. Then she explained how the arts policy deals with the selection of art. She concluded by emphasizing the importance of having a public art policy and the contribution of public art to the quality of life in the community. She reviewed the recommendations of the subcommittee and the PRCS Committee as outlined in the Council packet.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, opposed expenditures on public art and gateways, saying such a policy will drive up construction costs and discourage new development. He suggested repealing the utility tax instead of spending money on gateways and public art.

Ms. Barry invited three members of the PRCS Subcommittee for Public Art (Bill Clements, Scott Keeny, and Herb Bryce) to join her at the Council table. Each provided arguments for the adoption of a public arts policy based on a percent for arts program.

Councilmember Montgomery supported adoption of a public arts policy. She agreed with Mr. Bryce that public art is "the soul of the City." She hoped that ultimately the City would have a one percent for the arts program. She did not support an annual spending cap. She felt Council should retain the discretion to eliminate a project, so that citizens would feel that they had a place to have their voices heard.

Councilmember Hansen also supported the public arts policy. He said the big issue is how to calculate the one percent. He did not support an annual spending cap. He also felt Council should have discretion to limit or eliminate projects. He supported delegating authority to the PRCS Committee for the art recommendations.

Councilmember Ransom also supported the public arts policy, since it fits in with the general cultural support for art in the State of Washington. He did not support a spending cap but did support Council discretion to limit or eliminate projects. He supported delegation of art selection to the PRCS Committee but also wished to see the Arts Council have a more direct and formal role. Ms. Barry assured him that the Arts Council will be involved.

Councilmember Chang concurred with Councilmember Hansen's comments.

Deputy Mayor Grossman supported public art as a way of humanizing infrastructure. He supported the more conservative funding calculation.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen concurred with previous comments, noting the only outstanding policy decision is how to calculate the one percent. He described the policies of adjacent cities (Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, and Woodinville). All of them fund at a more conservative level than is proposed.

Mayor Jepsen wished to understand the difference between eligible and total construction costs and receive more information about what sources of funds may not be eligible. He also commented that road overlays, curb cuts and ramps, and other lifecycle maintenance issues should not be included as new capital investment in the community. He questioned whether there is a need for an annual Art Plan, since the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a six-year plan. He suggested the plan can be updated on an as-needed basis. He also wished to ensure that one criteria for proposed projects is that they be within the budget. Ms. Barry responded that when a prospectus is put out for a new piece, the artist who submits a proposal will already know the budget.

Councilmember Chang felt there should be a tie from the previous year's revenue to the current year's spending. He also felt it is important for Council to have the final say on what is purchased.

Councilmember Montgomery felt what Councilmember Chang is suggesting is a spending cap. She felt the Council should have the final say on what projects are funded. She supported basing the funding on eligible construction costs.

Ms. Barry responded that the ad hoc selection committees will be responsible for selecting art that reflects community values and standards.

Mayor Jepsen concluded that Council is in agreement on all of the policy issues except the funding calculation. He reiterated that Council needs to have more information on which types of grants are not eligible.

Councilmember Ransom emphasized that the proposal amounts to less than \$100,000 per year to be spent on public art.

Mayor Jepsen thanked the members of the Subcommittee and PRCS Committee for their work on this proposal.

- (b) Transmittal of the Proposed 2003 – 2008
Capital Improvement Program
- (c) Transmittal of the Proposed 2003 – 2008
Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Burkett distributed the new CIP document. He provided the schedule for discussion and highlighted the changes in the process, particularly that the CIP is to be adopted in

July rather than with the Operating Budget at the end of the year. This allows the Council more time to discuss the individual projects and timelines.

Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager, placed the CIP in the context of several broader planning processes--the Storm Water Management Master Plan, the Long Range Transportation Plan, and the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. He explained how the CIP and the Transportation Improvement Plan fit into these plans. He said in the future the CIP will become more routine as the long range planning occurs.

Mr. Burkett said that when the CIP is adopted, the first year will be placed in the 2003 budget. The 2003 – 2008 CIP is \$85.5 million, with transportation receiving 58 percent of this amount. Thirty-three percent of all projected funds come from grants. Another 19 percent comes from fund balance, which is one-time funding from previous years earmarked for certain projects. The General Fund is another major source of funding.

Continuing, Mr. Burkett outlined significant changes to the CIP compared to what the Council saw in February:

- \$3 million increased cash contribution to the City Hall project, now a 2003 – 2005 project, with a \$300,000 allocation from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) for debt service starting in 2006;
- the funding for Richmond Beach Saltwater Park is for master planning only;
- the Interurban Trail has a timeline update with construction starting in 2003;
- Aurora Avenue N. 165th – 205th Design funding is in the six year plan;
- three projects have been combined into the 15th Avenue Improvements; and
- phasing improvements at Ronald Bog and reallocating some funds to the 3rd Avenue NW project.

Moving on to new projects, Mr. Burkett highlighted:

- police station security improvements;
- Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan Update;
- swimming pool long term-maintenance;
- General Facilities Management Plan;
- Interurban Trail Pedestrian Crossing;
- Pedestrian Program (envisioned as an ongoing program);
- N. 160th Street at Greenwood Avenue N. pre-design study;
- Dayton Avenue N. at 175th St. retaining wall study;
- 5th Avenue NE street drainage improvements;
- Transportation Master Plan; and
- Surface Water Comprehensive Plan.

Turning to policy issues, Mr. Burkett outlined the decisions Council will be considering related to:

- use of a portion of the REET for City Hall debt service;
- municipal art funding (discussed earlier this evening);

DRAFT

- Council Goal #7, a bond issue;
- the amount of the General Fund contribution for capital projects;
- the amount of funding for the annual road surface maintenance program;
- Referendum 51; and
- proposed increase of Surface Water Management Fees.

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, described the organization of the CIP document itself and the three funds within it.

Paul Haines, Public Works Director, reviewed the City's priority projects. He explained the project timeline for the Aurora Avenue N. 145th – 165th project. He said the timeline shows both the best-case scenario and a delayed case scenario. In the best case, construction should begin in 2004. The CIP document shows a 2005 construction date, as a middle ground between the best and worst-cases. In the best case about six months remains in the environmental process.

Turning to the Interurban Trail, Mr. Haines said should begin construction in 2003. The two phases are offset slightly because of work that must be completed with Seattle City Light.

Councilmember Hansen asked why there are two scenarios for the Aurora Project and only one for the Interurban Trail. Mr. Haines said the trail project has not shown a trend of being challenged and a fairly good agreement has been reached with Seattle City Light about the process.

Moving on to the Ronald Bog improvements, Mr. Haines reiterated that the project focus is to improve specific flooding problems. The former project scope of \$6 million would have required a more comprehensive review of the entire drainage basin. This will occur during the Surface Water Master Plan. The new project focuses on 175th and 10th Avenue NE (\$1.4 million).

Continuing, Mr. Haines said the 3rd Avenue NE project has gone through value engineering. The design strategy Council approved in 2001 will now be implemented. He concluded that the construction schedule has been moved forward about three months.

Mr. Burkett summarized that the CIP reflects past Council priorities and Council goals. He said the public hearing is scheduled for next week, with adoption on July 22nd.

Noting the CIP was just released tonight and this week has the 4th of July holiday, Mayor Jepsen suggested delaying the public hearing a week or two. Adoption of the CIP could then occur in August. Mr. Burkett agreed that the public hearing can easily be rescheduled for July 15th.

Councilmember Hansen commented that adoption could still occur on July 22nd if discussion has been completed.

Responding to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Burkett explained the item "municipal financing 14%" is the projection that money would be borrowed from the municipal bond market for the City Hall project.

Responding again to Councilmember Hansen, Mr. Burkett confirmed that the REET income is roughly \$1.2 million per year.

Councilmember Hansen confirmed that the proposed approach to flooding around Ronald Bog area is sandbagging at this point. He wondered if with this approach the outflow pipe from the bog is sufficient to prevent the flooding.

Kris Overleese, Project Manager for Ronald Bog, explained what is proposed and said more evaluation is needed to determine the final solution.

Mayor Jepsen commented that there was a great deal of public interest in the Ronald Bog project and the proposed daylighting of the stream. The City made an effort to convince neighbors that this was the solution to the problem and now it is "switching gears."

Mr. Haines responded that the public process is not being displaced, but the new timeline will allow for completion of the Surface Water Master Plan, which will test the validity of the improvements planned for that basin.

Mayor Jepsen wished to ensure that the Ronald Bog Master Plan and the Parks Master Plan for Ronald Bog are done at the same. Right now they are programmed for different years.

Mayor Jepsen questioned the need for a new Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. He also expressed concern about projects in the CIP that appear to be maintenance. Finally, he commented on doing studies for projects that then have no funding to implement the results of the study.

Mr. Burkett responded that it makes it more likely that the City can obtain a grant for a particular project if a study has already been done.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the \$700,000 for the annual road maintenance program should be re-evaluated and validated. Mr. Haines responded that by the end of the year, the street inventory will have been completed and this can be done.

Councilmember Ransom was concerned about the south-central section of the Interurban Trail because the businesses on Aurora Avenue will be impacted. He asked about Darnell Park, which has never been developed, and the now vacant Olympic Boat property. Mr. Burkett said there is enough certainly about the trail that redevelopment can occur here with the possibility of integrating with the Darnell Open Space.

Mr. Burkett concluded that the Transportation Improvement Program is the Roads Capital Section of the CIP and will be adopted by a separate action.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, opposed spending public funds to replace the bridge to the 35 houses on Appletree Lane. He suggested the money be used for an overpass for the public to have beach access. He suggested the City vacate the road back to the homeowners so that they can pay for the bridge themselves. On other topics, Mr. Poland opposed municipal art spending and the fireworks ban.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the overcrossing will require only \$254,000 of City funds. The remainder is federal grants and other funding. Mr. Haines added that this is a City bridge that the City is obligated to keep up.

Addressing Mr. Poland's comments on fireworks, Councilmember Ransom noted his ongoing hope that eventually Shoreline will have its own fireworks display or partner with the City of Edmonds.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:23 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk