

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, June 20, 2005
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, and Grace

ABSENT: Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Mayor Hansen, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exceptions of Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom.

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Chang and unanimously carried, Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom were excused.

(a) Shoreline Star—Dan Mann

Mayor Hansen presented the eighth Shoreline Star to Dan Mann and outlined his many years of service to the Shoreline community on the Chamber of Commerce, the Meridian Park Neighborhood Association, the Shoreline Merchants Association, as a Showmobile stage sponsor, as a youth soccer coach and, most recently, as a member of the Shoreline School Board. Mr. Mann expressed his appreciation and said that he is a strong supporter of good neighborhoods and schools. He honored all those who come down to Council meetings to comment and urged citizens to become involved in the process of governing their community.

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

Steve Burkett, City Manager, reported on various park improvements, the pre-construction meeting for the Aurora Project and the upcoming visible activity on Aurora Avenue beginning in late July, and the purchase by the City of two new hybrid vehicles.

Councilmember Grace reminded everyone of the Shoreline Arts Festival this weekend, noting that master artisans from Shoreline's Sister City of Boryeong will be participating.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen distributed information he gathered at the National League of Cities Community and Economic Development Policy Committee meeting from the cities of Littleton and Westminster, Colorado.

Councilmember Chang expressed concerns about coordination of activities by Shoreline's Sister City Association with the greater Seattle Korean community supporting the Boryeong relationship and other groups with an interest in Shoreline's sister city activities.

Mayor Hansen said the Sister Cities Association met Thursday night and anyone who wished could have attended the meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Robert Phelps, Shoreline, speaking for the Shoreline Auxiliary Communications Service, informed the Council that Amateur Radio Field Day is the last weekend in June. This event has been conducted in the past in Hamlin Park, but this year it will be held next to the Spartan Gym. He thanked the School District and the City for their cooperation. He said information regarding emergency preparedness will be made available to the public. He concluded by stressing the importance of the position of the Emergency Management Coordinator, saying it should be made permanent.

(b) Ros Bird, speaking for the Shoreline/Lake Forest Arts Council, invited everyone to the Shoreline Arts Festival and said each year the event grows. She also mentioned the artisans from Boryeong and said great efforts were made to publicize their participation in the Korean press. She said her goal is to increase the multiculturalism of this event.

(c) Janet Way, Shoreline, thanked Shoreline Star Dan Mann for his contributions to the community. She said she believed the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance on the north Aegis building is in error. She emphasized that Thornton Creek crosses the property and it is a chinook salmon-bearing stream. She hoped Shoreline would change some of its policies to better protect streams and wetlands.

5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Fimia and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

Councilmember Chang moved to approve items 6(a) and 6(c) as consent calendar items. Deputy Mayor Jepsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously and the following items were approved:

Motion to authorize the City Manager to enter into an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with King County governing the City's

participation as a member of the Community Development Block Grant Consortium for the fiscal years 2006 – 2008, which agreement is substantially the same as that set forth in the Council packet

Ordinance No. 393 adopting the National Incident Management System and amending the Shoreline Municipal Code, Emergency Management, Chapter 2.50

6. **ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS**

- (b) Ordinance No. 392 creating a new chapter in Title 10 of the Shoreline Municipal Code relating to motorized foot scooters and similar devices.

Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst, reviewed the background on this issue, noting Council had originally decided to postpone action on this item to see whether the state legislature would act on statewide regulations for scooters. However, when this did not occur, Council provided direction to bring back an ordinance to regulate them in Shoreline. He then highlighted the provisions of the ordinance, noting gas and electric powered scooters are defined and treated somewhat differently. He said the electric scooters only go from 9 to 15 miles per hour, whereas the gas scooters go much faster and need greater regulation.

Mr. Seeger mentioned a typographical error in the ordinance that will be corrected and suggested the following editing changes to it: "Certain Uses Prohibited (B) No gas or electric power motorized foot scooter or similar device shall be operated from ~~(after)~~ sunset to ~~(and before)~~ sunrise during the summer Daylight Savings period and from 8:00 p.m. to ~~before~~ sunrise during the winter non-Daylight Savings period." A second recommended change is: "Violation—penalty (B) In lieu of the penalty described above, a Shoreline Police Officer may use the following for a person under 16 years of age found operating a gas or electric motorized foot scooter or similar device in violation of the provisions of this chapter:"

Mr. Seeger said the police will only provide verbal warnings for "a couple of months" as the education process moves forward.

Councilmember Fimia moved to pass Ordinance No. 392 to regulate foot scooters. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Flannery Collins, Assistant City Attorney, said there is no reason why gas scooters could not be prohibited completely.

Councilmember Fimia said in the practical sense it will be very difficult to regulate the noise and speed of gas scooters. Since license plates are not issued for these devices, it will be very difficult to track them. She also suggested that if this ordinance passes

tonight, it will be important to get information to the schools as quickly as possible before summer vacation begins.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Seeger said that when the teens discussed the provisions of the ordinance, they wanted to be sure they could use the scooters in the winter in the early evening. This is why the ordinance requires lights and sets the hour of 8:00 p.m. as when the prohibition starts during Daylight Savings Time.

Councilmember Fimia noted that bicycles are not restricted in terms of evening use and felt electric scooters could be treated like bicycles.

Mr. Burkett said that if Council wishes to delete gas scooters, staff could come back with the appropriate ordinance language.

Responding to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Seeger said that according to a recent study, most of those injured while riding these devices are teenagers.

Councilmember Chang said that based on his experience of riding on a new gas scooter, many adults would find it difficult physically to ride these scooters as a means of transportation.

Councilmember Grace appreciated how the ordinance was crafted in response to Council comment. He concurred with Councilmember Fimia that education will be very important. He did not see a compelling reason to exclude gas powered scooters completely and noted that no other cities have done this.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen was disappointed that the state legislature did not take action on this, since the state regulates many other safety issues. He agreed that education is critical because enforcement will be a low priority for the police. In addition to educating teenagers, he said the more important education will be of those who sell these devices. They must know what Shoreline's rules are and have them available for purchasers.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen referred to the "Prohibited Areas" section, noting that the listing of "streets" in #1 is confusing. Mr. Seeger said it was meant to refer to internal park streets, not public streets.

Councilmember Fimia confirmed that her motion included the changes suggested by staff.

Councilmember Fimia moved to prohibit gas scooters in Shoreline. This motion did not receive a second and was withdrawn.

Councilmember Chang noted that the new gas scooter he rode was "pretty quiet."

Councilmember Fimia felt that the language requiring a working muffler is not strong enough to ensure that the motor is quiet.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen pointed out there are many reasons why a working muffler should be required and that the noise issue covers more than just scooters. The City must be sure it is enforcing the noise ordinance.

Mayor Hansen commented it is very difficult to regulate certain types of noise. However, the noise ordinance has been applied successfully in certain situations.

Mr. Seeger agreed that the definition of a public disturbance noise is very broad.

Councilmember Fimia felt the code may need to be 'fine-tuned,' because she did not want to refer to another ordinance to regulate noise in scooters.

Councilmember Fimia moved to amend C2 of the Requirements for operating motorized foot scooters and similar devices to add the phrase "so that it is the minimal necessary" at the end. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Councilmember Fimia explained that her amendment makes it clear that a rider cannot "get away with the least amount of noise suppression." She said that for some young people the noise itself will be the attraction.

Councilmember Grace was not sure how "the minimal necessary" could be enforced because it is so subjective. He said motorcycles make more noise and yet are not regulated in this way.

Mr. Burkett said that it is not subjective at all to determine whether a scooter has a "working muffler." This is the minimum that can be enforced.

A vote was taken on the amendment, which failed 2 – 3, with Councilmembers Chang and Fimia voting in the affirmative.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen suggested taking a broader look at the noise ordinance itself to see whether other cities have a different standard involving a decibel reading that Shoreline could adopt in place of the more discretionary standard in the current ordinance.

Mayor Hansen was also disappointed that this was not addressed on a statewide level. He felt it will be good to have an ordinance on the books, even if it not easily enforceable. He asked if this ordinance applies only to public property, and Mr. Seeger said private property is not regulated here. Mayor Hansen assumed scooters are prohibited from school property and was told they are. He asked how a "Business District" is defined.

Ms. Collins defined a Business District as "a territory continuous to and including a highway, when within any 600 feet along such highway there are buildings in use for business or industrial purposes, including but not limited to hotels, banks, or office buildings, railroad stations and public buildings which occupy at least 300 feet of frontage on one side, or 300 feet collectively on both sides of a highway."

DRAFT

Mr. Seeger said no type of scooter is allowed on Business District sidewalks.

A vote was taken on the motion, and Ordinance No. 392 regulating foot scooters passed unanimously.

Councilmember Fimia asked staff to bring information about violations and complaints back to Council next spring. She thought the ordinance could be revisited if there are many complaints about the noise.

Mr. Burkett confirmed Council direction to review the noise ordinance.

7. **ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING**

- (a) Public Hearing to consider citizens' comments on the proposed 2006 – 2011 Capital Improvement Plan and the proposed 2006 – 2011 Transportation Improvement Plan

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, reviewed the schedule for CIP and TIP adoption, which is calendared for July 11. She reviewed that the CIP is a financial planning and management tool that contains six years of capital projects. She emphasized that the cost figures are estimates. The earlier years are more refined than the outer years. The CIP allows for coordination of capital projects with other agencies and municipalities. It is a flexible document and subject to change, which is why it is reviewed each year and Council is given the opportunity to clarify priorities for staff. She concluded that the TIP is a subset of the CIP addressing transportation projects in the Roads Capital Fund.

Ms. Tarry said the CIP identifies \$161.5 million for capital resources. Almost half of this amount is grants, primarily for the Aurora projects. The remaining resources are Real Estate Excise Tax, borrowing through loans such as the Public Works Trust Fund, Surface Water Utility fees, fuel tax, General Fund and voter-approved bonds. Of the \$161.5 million, the Aurora projects represent the largest portion. Without the Aurora projects, grants represent 22% of the capital resources.

Mayor Hansen opened the public hearing.

(a) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, addressed the 15.96 acres called the South Woods, noting that the South Woods Preservation Group wants the entire site preserved. She recalled that Council moved the purchase of South Woods from a Priority #3 to #1A in the Capital Facilities Element, and that \$2 million was allocated to this end. She was surprised to see that the CIP contains only \$1 million for the South Woods property purchase, an amount to be raised by grants and bonds. This will purchase only one-fifth of the total site. On the other hand, nine acres of Hamlin Park is to be purchased through Conservation Trust Funds and bonds. She said South Woods is highly used and has potential as an environmental education laboratory. She emphasized the natural value of the area and asked Council to preserve the entire site.

DRAFT

(b) Vicki Westberg, Shoreline, was also disappointed that only \$1 million is allocated in the CIP for South Woods rather than \$2 million. She said the entire site can serve functions in environmental education, mental health, and the general well-being of the community as the woods continue to maintain air and water quality. She believed the citizens will receive much more value than the investment in the site, whatever it is. She asked Council not to simply appease citizens but to support their vision.

(c) Janet Way, Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, supported the previous speakers regarding South Woods. She said Council intended to provide \$2 million for this project. She asked that this level be sustained, since the property is threatened by potential division. She said it could be used for environmental education, a highly neglected area in school curriculum. She said the value of the site is its size and complexity and the total value of the coverage of the trees.

Continuing, she asked about the Darnell Park project related to drainage and wetlands. She said Boeing Creek should be designated as a creek and any work should be done treating it as a wetland or creek. In Cromwell Park, the headwaters of Thornton Creek should be designated in the Surface Water Master Plan. She concluded with her concern about the City Hall allocation. She said there is not definite support from the citizens to spend this amount of money. She urged Council to consider all alternatives, using the existing site.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion.

Councilmember Fimia moved a substitute motion to keep the public hearing open until July 11. Councilmember Chang seconded the motion.

Councilmember Fimia pointed out that the public just received the CIP last week and they will functionally have other opportunities to speak on it anyway, so the public hearing should be kept open. She felt closing the hearing will send the message there are no more opportunities to speak on the CIP.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen pointed out that public comment is allowed after all agenda items, and people know they have these opportunities to comment. So closing the public hearing will not confuse anyone.

Councilmember Fimia said public hearings are frequently kept open. She thought those who do not come often to meetings will assume no more comment is allowed if the hearing is closed. She said leaving the hearing open will signal that Council still wishes to hear from the public.

Councilmember Chang added that other cities set aside a certain night of the week to discuss important agenda items. This allows the public to be educated in detail and

participate better in the process. He felt Shoreline should do something like this. Since it is too late to do this on the CIP, he supported the motion.

Councilmember Grace did not disagree with the concept of special meetings to discuss complex issues and suggested it be thought of for the future. He said it is important to make clear that the public has an opportunity to comment on the CIP up to the time of adoption. He said Council should address concerns about the timing of public hearings by looking at the Agenda Planner and then scheduling extra time, rather than repeatedly having to change the publicly announced process.

Mayor Hansen said the public hearing was advertised and individuals will be allowed to comment for the next two weeks anyway, so no purpose is served to hold the public hearing open.

A vote was taken on the substitute motion, which carried 3 – 2, with Mayor Hansen and Deputy Mayor Jepsen dissenting, and the public hearing was continued to next week and July 11.

Ms. Tarry then continued with her background discussion on the CIP. She noted that this year there has been an additional flow of information for the CIP during the master plan discussion and 20-Year Capital Facilities Element adoption. These helped identify the broad investment needs for capital projects for the long-term and the foreseen funding thresholds. The CIP/TIP was developed from the Capital Facilities Element. Costs are continuously refined from these planning documents through the project scope development for individual projects.

Ms. Tarry then reviewed the 17 projects in the General Capital Fund (GCF). These are programmed for \$28.4 million. She also outlined the various funding sources for these projects. She said City Hall is the largest project in GCF, followed by parks and open space acquisitions. There is also non-project-specific funding, which is an allocation of indirect costs and chargeable time in the engineering group not directly attributed to any specific project (planning, training, etc.). Ms. Tarry then reviewed the projects in the GCF.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, described the Richmond Beach Area Park as the development of the pump station site north of Appletree Lane. The park development, which has gone through an extensive public process, will be funded by a portion of the \$750,000 in Brightwater mitigation funds. The remainder of the mitigation funds will be used for other park improvements or for property acquisition, possibly shoreline property. He clarified the project description but Councilmember Fimia felt the project description did not reflect what Mr. Deal described.

Councilmember Fimia said there is no doubt that citizens wish to have the parks maintained and certain parks upgraded. However, there was a great deal of public input on the parks before Shoreline was incorporated. She used Cromwell Park as an example.

She felt the County's approach placed much of the money into the construction and maintenance rather than a master planning process.

Mr. Deal said it is critical to have plans ready when grants become available because sometimes grant funding becomes available on short notice. Sometimes it takes more than a year to do the planning and conduct a community process and without these things in place, opportunities could be missed to apply for grants. He used Twin Ponds Park and Ronald Bog as examples of parks that would be eligible for grants once master planning has been done.

Councilmember Fimia cautioned that staff should first go to the public and neighborhoods around these areas to find out what, if any, improvements are desired. She said if this has been done already, she would like to see the documentation. Then, with this input as a guide, a consultant could be hired to do a master plan. She did not want to do the master plans before the public process. If the plan is not what the public wants, delays are created. She asked if there has already been a public process to identify the greatest needs in the parks.

Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager, said staff is not in favor of large, extensive master plans for these very reasons. He gave examples where scaled back master plans make sense. He said Mr. Deal has met with neighbors of the pump station to find out what is important and what they do not want. Then the concepts were designed and brought back. Another example is the Richmond Beach Saltwater Park. He said any improvements will involve a lot of public involvement.

Mr. Burkett added that the development of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan involved extensive public review through the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board.

Ms. Tarry moved on to the soccer fields upgrade, which is scheduled for 2007 with funding coming from a voted bond issue and possibly grants. Mr. Burkett added that the soccer groups have set aside some money for this. They would like to do the fields sooner than 2007. He said staff will definitely work with these groups and their funding would be part of any matching funds grants for which the City might apply.

Turning to the Hamlin Park acquisition, Mr. Burkett said there is already an agreement with Seattle Public Utilities to buy this property. In development of a purchase and sale agreement, an appraisal was done on the site. The estimated value of the property is \$3.8 million, which is substantially higher than the last estimate.

Ms. Tarry said the funding for the South Woods purchase would be Conservation Futures grant funding and possibly from a voted bond issue. Mr. Burkett explained the \$1 million recommendation. Information is expected from the County about how much funding will be available there. The other funding is a bond issue. Council could assign a higher allocation. It is currently estimated it would cost \$6 – 9 million to acquire the entire site. Balancing this project with all the other projects, staff has made this

recommendation. Three acres is proposed because there is a need for a neighborhood park, so the \$1 million would be for the acquisition (not construction) of this land. Mr. Burkett noted that the City already owns 80 acres at Hamlin Park, so this treed parcel is "not that rare." The School District is responsible for educational activities so an environmental center would fall within its purview. He concluded that in order to make South Woods a higher priority and the funding more solid, Council would have to make decisions about priorities and perhaps take money from another project that already has funding allocated to it.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen recalled that at one time School Superintendent Welsh had written a letter saying that the School District is not interested in using this site for environmental education because of the availability of Hamlin Park. Mr. Burkett responded that there was a letter written to some residents who contended that the reason the school district originally purchased the property was for environmental education. The response said that the school district had no documentation to support this contention.

Responding to Councilmember Grace, Mr. Burkett confirmed that the school district is willing to sell three acres. He said the site is owned jointly with the Water District, but these entities are proceeding with a subdivision of the property. Both districts feel a responsibility to their constituents to receive maximum value for the property. The Water District is amenable to waiting on the sale of the property. The school district has agreed to possibly sell the property at less than current market value, but it wishes to proceed within the next two or three months. The district is counting on the sale of the property for at least a half million dollars for their projects.

Responding to Councilmember Grace, Mr. Burkett reported that he had been told there had been an offer to buy the entire site for \$6 million.

Councilmember Grace suggested that the entire site could be preserved for some period of time if the City would buy the school district's half for \$3 million and the Water District would hold on to the other half of the site. Mr. Burkett concurred that if the City wants to take this approach, the City could probably acquire the school district's half for less than \$3 million.

Councilmember Chang supported purchasing the entire South Woods site. He suggested looking for a "creative" way to get it. He felt it would be a "huge mistake" for the Briarcrest neighborhood if the site goes out of public ownership. He suggested the possibility of delaying the City Hall purchase in order to buy this site.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Deal said that the PROS Plan was passed with \$2 million assigned for South Woods. Councilmember Fimia said this site was discussed at the retreat and given a priority. She felt it is very important to purchase the entire site. She suggested that councilmanic bonds might be used.

Mr. Burkett said the key to councilmanic bonds is that the funding must be repaid.

DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia suggested moving the \$600,000 for gateways to parks acquisition. She said gateways were not a priority at the retreat, nor mentioned in the master plans.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Mr. Burkett said an appraisal of the property two years ago was \$5.72 million. She said any process that moves forward must include the South Woods Preservation Group, which was not included in this discussion. She wanted staff and the Council to make the commitment that none of the South Woods property would be “negotiated away” without the full knowledge and commitment of the South Woods Preservation Group.

Mr. Burkett said staff has a plan and has already applied for grant funding and have discussed the site with the owners. He said if Council directs purchase of the entire site, staff will try to find a “creative” way to do that.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said the site is already in public ownership. He suggested asking the school and water districts to explain why the property is to be removed from public ownership.

Moving on to the Facilities-Major Maintenance Fund, Ms. Tarry said this is a new fund for major maintenance for the police station, pool, and Richmond Highlands Recreation Center. The funding is \$70,000/year from the General Fund.

Councilmember Grace commented that this is confusing because the milestones look more like facilities upgrades rather than maintenance. He wondered if this was not capitalizing maintenance costs.

Mr. Burkett said this is “gray area,” and Ms. Tarry clarified that these projects meet the criteria defined for being a capital project because each is more than \$10,000 and extends the life of the building.

Councilmember Fimia commented on the \$16,000 feasibility study for public works maintenance and a \$33,500 general facilities management plan. She felt less money could be spent on these items.

Ms. Tarry said these will be completed in 2005 and were authorized in the 2005 – 2010 CIP.

Moving on to the Roads Capital Fund, Ms. Tarry said there are 19 projects for \$117.7 million. She reiterated that the reason the largest component of this fund is grants is because of the Aurora projects. Some of the projects will be fully funded by utility providers for the improvements along Aurora Avenue. The master planning process and development of the Surface Water Master Plan has allowed the City to identify payments from the Surface Water Utility for surface water components of roads projects.

Councilmember Fimia said she continues to have a real disagreement about using Surface Water Utility fees for roads projects. She felt that when roads are expanded, the project

June 20, 2005

should assume the burden of the surface water needs that must be met because more impervious surface is created. The utility fees deal with the impacts of existing infrastructure. She said there are so many past infrastructure surface water needs to be addressed by the fees.

Ms. Tarry said the other alternative is to show the components of the roads projects that address surface water issues within the Surface Water Capital Fund. Staff felt it was easier to leave them in the Roads Capital Funds. She said the utility fees are paid by both residential and commercial properties.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen asked how much could be generated through Section 108 loans. He noted that President Bush has not allocated this type of loan in this budget cycle, but it appears Congress will restore it. He asked to see "the Section 108" numbers. He wondered how much could be generated to address the sidewalk programs and to fund them more quickly.

Mr. Burkett suggested at this point just taking Council questions, since most of the projects have been in the CIP for several years and have been thoroughly discussed. He suggested staff could highlight the new projects.

In response to a question of Councilmember Fimia's earlier in the meeting, Councilmember Grace noted that "In 2005, the City Council can levy up to \$83,008,404 or 1.5% of the City's estimated assessed value" in Councilmanic debt.

Ms. Tarry pointed out that the CIP does not include Alternative 2 funding for the Interurban bridge crossings because the document was produced before the Council's decision on that contract. The final document will show funding at the Alternative level of \$4.7 million.

Ms. Tarry said the annual roads surface maintenance funding has been increased with anticipated fuel tax money. She also commented on an error in the document, noting that on page 125, the \$1.82 million that shows as Roads Capital funds in 2006 is really grant funding.

Ms. Tarry commented on the estimate for the Aurora project, 165th – 205th, noting Council will have the opportunity to review the scope of that project in the future and refine the \$60 - \$80 million estimate. She said the utility improvements to be made in conjunction with that project will be fully reimbursed from the utility providers but the costs show up in the 2006 – 2011 CIP.

She turned to the additional funding in the CIP for new sidewalks programmed at \$5.4 million over the six years to do priority routes. The design will happen early next year if approved. She said the funding will come from Roads Capital monies freed up by financing the surface water components of certain roads projects from Surface Water Utility fees as previously discussed. Additionally, \$1 million was moved from Phase 2 of

the Aurora project to fund sidewalks. She noted that the interest investment projections have also gone up by about \$800,000.

Finally, Ms. Tarry said that the improvements at Aurora Avenue and 185th Street are really right-of-way acquisition. Further study will be needed to determine appropriate improvements at that intersection.

Councilmember Grace asked about the traffic small works projects. Jill Marilley, City Engineer, said this allows the Traffic Engineer to be able to do small improvements that come up through discussions with neighborhoods.

Responding to Councilmember Grace, Ms. Marilley said these are generally traffic solutions as opposed to pedestrian safety projects, such as crosswalks.

Mr. Burkett said the advantage of this approach is that neighborhood problems can be addressed quickly rather than having to wait for the annual CIP process.

Responding to Councilmember Fimia, Ms. Marilley said the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program funding is for staffing and analysis of how to solve neighborhood safety problems. Once a solution is determined, there are multiple opportunities to try to find funding.

Councilmember Fimia reiterated her question about which projects are getting grants and what other types of projects would be eligible for that funding. She said she was looking for a specific answer as to the major grants the City applies for and what types of projects are eligible. For Aurora Avenue, she asked if the money secured for the first mile could have been used for miles two and three. Mr. Burkett said some of the funding will be moved into the second phase of the project. He said that generally the City goes after grants once the City has identified a project.

Councilmember Fimia reiterated her request for the categories that projects grants can be used for.

Ms. Marilley said many grants are time-sensitive, and granting authorities make the rules. She used the Transportation Improvement Board's granting criteria as an example. The City must determine if particular projects meets the criteria, so there is flexibility in what project is used. Once the grant funding is received, it must be applied to that particular grant. Very few grants are broad.

Councilmember Fimia expressed her familiarity with how grants are awarded. She asked for a consolidated list for the types of grants the City is going after and the criteria for each. She also reiterated her desire to change the gateway allocation, probably to the sidewalk program. She asked how many sidewalks can be installed for the \$5 million allocation.

Ms. Marilley said the range of costs was \$70 to \$250/lineal foot. Using \$150/lineal foot as the estimate, six or seven miles of sidewalks could be constructed. This would take care of the arterials. She said \$5 million spread over six years allows for better planning.

Responding again to Councilmember Fimia, Ms. Marilley outlined the three components of the 3rd NW project. She said that as this project has progressed, less expensive ways of achieving the goals of the project have been identified. The third phase of this project was to install a pumping system at Pantera Pond to address drainage problems in Happy Valley. However, smaller projects have already made a difference in flooding problems there. She said the project is still in the CIP as a planning issue, to be implemented in 2008. However, the idea is not to hurry to design.

Councilmember Grace commented that the sidewalk priority routes are to be identified in the first part of 2006. He said sidewalks around schools are a priority. Setting forth these priorities will help determine where the funding is focused.

Councilmember Fimia asked that staff list options on how to reduce costs on Phases 2 and 3 of the Aurora Corridor project. Ms. Tarry said staff will bring forward a schedule of actions. Mr. Burkett said the City is in the environmental process now and within the next year the Council will be making decisions about the elements and alignments of Phase 2. Councilmember Fimia wanted to discuss these decisions sooner rather than later. She feared staff is already talking to property owners and making a number of assumptions about what the elements of Phase 2 will be.

Ms. Marilley said the Public Works Director and Kirk McKinley have been talking with businesses about the remaining phases but have not brought forward a specific design. This allows for earlier input by the businesses.

Ms. Tarry moved to the Surface Water component, noting it reflects the Surface Water Master Plan.

Mr. Burkett said that as part of the master plan, there was some additional funding added. This is reflected in the CIP.

Councilmember Grace asked whether the funding for the "Small Projects," page 175 of the CIP, will be used for already identified projects or if it is a contingency fund.

Jesus Sanchez, Operations Manager, said it is a combination of both. He said the City has learned from the several major storm events that have occurred in the past few years and the problem areas have been prioritized. Two have been identified: 187th and Midvale and 152nd and Ashworth, which will be addressed this year.

Responding to Mayor Hansen, Mr. Sanchez said the Aurora project will not address these problems. He also explained how problems in the systems are monitored by staff after storms.

Councilmember Fimia commented on the \$200,000/year allocated to surface water management and engineering. She felt this \$1.8 million for six years should be put into the actual projects instead. Mr. Burkett responded that the total allocation for surface water is \$22 million, so it makes sense to spend ten percent of that to do the planning. Sometimes additional planning has saved millions of dollars, at Ronald Bog and 3rd Avenue NW, for example. Ms. Tarry added that 75% of this item is internal staff time allocation.

Councilmember Fimia responded that through the master planning process, the projects have been identified. Each project has a planning component already.

Ms. Tarry said some of the costs are not allocated directly to specific projects. She concluded that this discussion will continue next week.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.