AGENDA

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP DINNER MEETING

Monday, June 25, 2007
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Highlander Room

TOPICS/GUESTS: Partnership for Youth Justice Diversion Program, Matthew David

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, June 25, 2007
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

		Page	Estimated Time
1.	**CALL TO ORDER**		7:30
2.	**FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**		
	(a) Proclamation of "Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Month"	1	
3.	**REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER**		7:35
4.	**REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**		
5.	**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**		7:40
6.	**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**		7:55
7.	**CONSENT CALENDAR**		7:55
	(a) Minutes of Special Meeting of May 14, 2007	3	
	Minutes of Study Session of May 21, 2007	15	
	Minutes of Special Meeting of May 29, 2007	29	

This is an opportunity for the public to address the Council on topics other than those listed on the agenda, and which are not of a quasi-judicial nature. The public may comment for up to three minutes; the Public Comment under Item 5 will be limited to a maximum period of 30 minutes. The public may also comment for up to three minutes on agenda items following each staff report. The total public comment period on each agenda item is limited to 20 minutes. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded. Speakers should clearly state their name and city of residence.

(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of June 13, 2007 in the amount of $1,747,061.30 — 31

(c) Motion Authorizing the City Manager to sign an Agreement with Yakima County to Settle and Release Claims and Withdraw Terminations related to Agreement to House Inmates — 33

(d) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Government Contracts Agreement (GCA) and Future Amendments between the City of Shoreline and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate funding totaling $10 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N 165th to N 205th) Project — 53

(e) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Regional Mobility Grant Program State Funding Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate funding totaling $2.5 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N165th to N 205) Project — 55

(f) Motion to Adopt Revised City Reserve Policies — 57

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING — 8:00

Public hearings are held to receive public comment on important matters before the Council. Persons wishing to speak should sign in on the form provided. After being recognized by the Mayor, speakers should approach the lectern and provide their name and city of residence. Individuals may speak for three minutes, or five minutes when presenting the official position of a State registered non-profit organization, agency, or City-recognized organization. Public hearings should commence at approximately 8:00 p.m.

(a) Public hearing to receive citizens comments on the 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) — 65

9. ADJOURNMENT — 9:30

The Council meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 546-8919 in advance for more information. For TTY service, call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas, call 546-2190 or see the web page at www.cityofshoreline.com. Council meetings are shown on Comcast Cable Services Channel 21 Tuesdays at 12 noon and 8 p.m., and Wednesday through Sunday at 6 a.m., 12 noon and 8 p.m. Council meetings can also be viewed on the City's Web site at cityofshoreline.com/cityhall/citycouncil/index.

Council Meeting Date: June 25, 2007 **Agenda Item:** 2(a)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	July Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Month Proclamation
DEPARTMENT:	Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services
PRESENTED BY:	Lynn M. Cheeney, Recreation Superintendent

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

July is National Parks and Recreation Month. This is an opportunity to acknowledge the many agencies in our community that provide facilities, programs, and opportunities to enrich the lives of local residents. Tonight, representatives from our Specialized Recreation Program will be in attendance to pick up the certificate. Some of these individuals participated in the recent "Shoreline Live" presentation.

Other agencies being recognized tonight include the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council, King County Library System, Shoreline Historical Museum, Little Leagues, soccer clubs, the Shoreline School District and the Shoreline South County YMCA. All there organizations, working together, allow both youth and adults to choose a variety of recreation and cultural activities to develop skills and encourage healthier life styles.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

CITY OF
SHORELINE

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, the City of Shoreline in cooperation with local agencies strive to provide facilities, programs, and cultural opportunities to enrich the lives of residents in our community; and

WHEREAS, it has been proven that youth who participate in a variety of recreational and cultural activities develop lifetime skills and healthier lifestyles; and

WHEREAS, facilities such as the Spartan Recreation Center, Richmond Highlands Recreation Center, Shoreline Pool, and public schools provide opportunities for active and passive recreational pursuits; and

WHEREAS, agencies such as the City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department; Little Leagues; soccer clubs; Junior Football, the Shoreline School District and the Shoreline YMCA offer a variety of fitness, health and educational activities for youth in our community; and

WHEREAS, special events such as Celebrate Shoreline, Shoreline Arts Festival, Swingin' Summer Eve, and Concerts in the Parks provide entertainment and enrich the lives of citizens of all ages; and

WHEREAS, the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council, King County Library System, the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Senior Center and the Shoreline Historical Museum, provide opportunities to enjoy a variety of educational and cultural programs for all ages; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shoreline manages and maintains over 375 acres of parks, greenways, open spaces, and several miles of trails located throughout the community for exercise and enjoyment of the beautiful natural setting;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robert L. Ransom, Mayor of the City of Shoreline, on behalf of the Shoreline City Council, do hereby proclaim the month of July 2007 as

PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES MONTH

in the City of Shoreline and encourage our citizens to celebrate by enjoying what their community has to offer by taking part in their favorite sport or activity, visiting a park or spending time with friends and family.

_____

Robert L. Ransom
Mayor of Shoreline

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, May 14, 2007 - 7:30 PM
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, Councilmember Gustafson, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McGlashan, Councilmember Ryu, and Councilmember Way

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:33 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ransom, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Ransom led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclamation of "Asian Pacific American Heritage Month"

Mayor Ransom read the proclamation recognizing the month of May as "Asian Pacific American Heritage Month." Shoreline residents Lola Oh and Fred and Christine Chou accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for this recognition.

Fred Chou said that Shoreline has matured since its incorporation in 1995 into a very livable City, and he is proud of it and the community. He commented that Asian Pacific Americans must remember their forefathers contribution to great nation. Furthermore, he stated that each of us should try our best to make a difference and leave a legacy for future generations. He thanked the City for the recognizing Asian Pacific American heritage and its community here in Shoreline.

3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Robert Olander, City Manager, discussed the Off-Leash Dog Park Study Group. He announced that the City is seeking volunteers for the group and applications are due to the Parks Project Manager by Friday, June 8. The City is sponsoring an Interurban Trail Bike Station on May 18 from 6:00 - 9:00 am. The Chamber of Commerce is hosting a small business forum on May 19 from 8:30 am - 4:30 pm at the Richmond Masonic Center

at 753 N. 185th Street. On May 21 there will be a meeting concerning the proposed lighting for tennis courts at the Shoreline Center. There will be a second meeting on May 24 at 6:00 pm at the Spartan Recreation Center in the Cascade Room. King County Metro will be hosting a community meeting concerning the Brightwater Treatment System on May 22 at the Richmond Beach Library from 6:30 - 8:30 pm. The next Planning Commission meeting is May 17 at 7:00 pm in the Mt. Rainier Room. Finally, he said the next 2010 Speaker Series session will be held May 24 at 7:00 pm in the Mt. Rainier Room with Mr. Ron Sher the CEO of Third Place Books. Mr. Sher will be discussing community gathering places.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Ransom commented that he attended the SeaShore meeting on Wednesday, and King County Executive Ron Sims indicated that one city bidding in more than one jurisdiction would be prohibited. He noted that SeaShore would be voting for officers soon. He added that the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) Public Issues committee postponed the vote on Medic One. He stated that King County is pushing for a levy lid lift instead, and SCA will bring back additional data about costs and effects next month.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Dale Wright, Shoreline, on behalf of Vision Aurora, discussed the cost for the first 1.2 miles of the Aurora Corridor Project. He outlined that the amount for the project including utilities was $31.7 million. He added that the utility firms pay $5.3 million in utility costs, leaving a balance of $26.4 million. He continued detailing the cost breakdown and concluded that the City spent $2.9 million on a $31.7 million project, which represents a 993% return on investment. He contrasted that if the City had spend the same funds on sidewalks there would only have been able to install 1.8 miles of sidewalk on one side of the street or 0.9 miles on both sides. He urged the Council not to reduce the scope of the project, but continue to move forward with the original vision for Aurora Avenue.

(b) Judy Allen, Shoreline, said 600 people attended the Council meeting in January 2006 and were concerned about integrity and ethics in Shoreline. She said Councilmembers are not voting for the best interests of the City but for selfish interests. She read an e-mail from Councilmembers to Michael Bolasina and others concerning a proposal to hire George Mauer as the city manager. She commented that this information is a matter of public record which can be found at www.wakeupshoreline.com. She asked Mr. Olander how much money has been spent to defend this type of attitude. She noted that a Key Award was given to Beth and Doug O'Neill by the Washington Coalition for Open Government. She asked the public to support Benefit Shoreline events on May 18 and June 23.

(c) David Hiller, Advocacy Director of the Cascade Bicycle Club (CBC), said he was speaking on behalf of over 300 CBC members residing in Shoreline and the 8,000 members overall. He discussed the Complete Streets presentation and said the public right-of-way should satisfy the needs of all the public. 15th Avenue is an exercise in

providing a safer environment, and every peer-reviewed academic study has shown a decrease in injury accidents in a three-lane environment. He added that if the capacity is increased on 15th Avenue the road will be less safe.

(d) Dennis Heller, Shoreline, thanked the City for the Bike-to-Work station. He also thanked the present and past Shoreline Councilmembers for the bicycle trail along the first 1.2 miles of Aurora Avenue. He noted that the trail is easily accessed from Aurora Avenue, and he hoped the trail would be around for next 50 - 60 years. He urged the Council to move forward with the Aurora Corridor project as Mr. Wright outlined.

Mr. Olander said the legal defense costs will be provided to Ms. Allen.

Councilmember Ryu wanted to know what Ms. Beth O'Neill had the City staff doing and how much time it took. Mr. Olander said he would be glad to forward that information to the Council.

Deputy Mayor Fimia asked the City Attorney to announce the outcome of the legal cases discussed.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, responded that the O'Neill matter was heard in Superior Court and their claim was dismissed. He said an appeal was filed and she has been given until May 24 to file a brief on the appeal.

Deputy Mayor Fimia added that all records were provided to Ms. O'Neill.

Mr. Sievers also clarified that the City staff doesn't track billable hours.

Mayor Ransom asked why the 60-block distance from 145th Avenue to 205th Avenue along Aurora is deemed to be only 1.2 miles when normally one mile is 20 blocks.

Mr. Olander responded that he would find out and report back; however, not all City blocks are the same length.

Mayor Ransom referred to Mr. Wright's statement regarding costs for building 1.8 miles worth of sidewalk. In previous Council meetings it was discussed that it would take $200 - $225 per lineal foot. He wondered if Mr. Olander had any comment on this.

Mr. Olander said he doesn't have access to Mr. Wright's analysis. He added that it depends on variables such as the cost of concrete.

Mayor Ransom added that the size of the sidewalks on Aurora may be different size.

Deputy Mayor Fimia asked if the utility costs will be paid by Shoreline ratepayers and not distributed to the utility companies' ratepayer base.

Mr. Olander responded that there are a number of utilities involved. He said Seattle City

Light (SCL) will charge Shoreline residents at some point through their billing process. The other utilities will spread the amount throughout their entire rate base. He added that this is a fairly normal procedure. Nonetheless, the City's ratepayers will not be charged for undergrounding in Seattle.

Deputy Mayor Fimia pointed out that it isn't just the $2.9 million but the utility costs for all the electric, and then a portion of the others that will affect the City's residents.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Gustafson suggested adding item 8(e), YMCA Request for Funding, prior to moving into the executive session.

Councilmember Way wondered if the City staff and the Council are prepared to discuss the request for funding.

Mr. Olander said two Councilmembers can put it on the agenda for next Monday and it would allow the City staff to prepare a staff report and recommendation with alternatives. He said it could be put on a future agenda, perhaps June 4 or June 11.

Councilmember McGlashan requested that the City staff check with Steve Dunn, noting that it is sponsored by Councilmember Gustafson and himself.

Deputy Mayor Fimia moved approval of the agenda, removing item 7(d) from the agenda and adding an executive session. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Fimia, seconded by Councilmember Ryu and carried 7-0, the following items on the Consent Calendar were approved:

(a) Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of April 9, 2007
Minutes of Special Meeting of April 9, 2007
Minutes of Special Meeting of April 19, 2007
Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of April 23, 2007
Minutes of Special Meeting of April 23, 2007

(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of May 2, 2007 in the amount of $1,438,122.92

(c) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Discretionary Work Request with King County for the 2007 Road Overlay Program

8. NEW BUSINESS

(a) 15th Avenue NE Traffic Study - Final Report

Mr. Olander introduced Public Works Director Mark Relph, Operations Manager Jesus Sanchez, and Traffic Engineer Rich Meredith.

Mr. Relph said 15th Avenue has a long history and he wanted to make sure Council has good information to consider.

Mr. Sanchez said they would be presenting the key findings of fact and reviewing snapshots of time to highlight what has transpired over the past two and a half years.

Mr. Meredith discussed the data that was collected and the final findings of the Traffic Study. He said the impacts were measured during all phases of construction. He outlined that the original objectives of the project were to improve vehicle and pedestrian safety in the corridor, to maintain the integrity of arterial and the neighborhood street network, and to accommodate the impacts of a three-lane conversion in the North City Business District north of NE 175th Street. He highlighted that a center turn lane creates more pedestrian crossing opportunities and lowers the accident rate and injuries. He also said that traffic diversions into the neighborhoods, which was a stated concern by some when the project started, did not materialize. He pointed out the data for the study parameters was collected at numerous times (3/03, 2/05, 2/06, 10/06, 2/07) and they attempted to take the measurements at the same time during each day. He said the findings show that the overall speeds have been reduced and there has been a decrease in traffic volumes to 1,339 cars, or 8 percent. He also stated that there have been 3 percent fewer collisions and a 31 percent reduction in injuries in the area. He noted that there was less traffic in the area than there was in 2003, which seems to indicate that some drivers have avoided the entire area. He displayed the measurements of the average weekday traffic volumes, accidents, and reported injuries. He commented that the weekday traffic volume was lower during the time of construction. However, it has rebounded since then, but it is still less than it was in 2003. He noted that public comments indicate there were complaints about peak hour congestion. As a result, the City retimed the lights and reduced travel time by 20-30 seconds through the corridor. In conclusion, he said, based on original assumptions, traffic patterns are as anticipated for this roadway and the City will continue to work on adverse impacts through Neighborhood Traffic Action Plans (NTAP). The next steps for this area will be the construction of two or three traffic islands and to continue implementing traffic calming devices through the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP) and NTAP.

Mayor Ransom called for public comment.

(a) Dennis Heller, Shoreline, submitted a letter from his neighbor, who advocated against any restriping on 15th Avenue NE. He said he has been a resident for 15 years and for

most of that time he has been a bicycle commuter. He said he is a member of the Cascade Bicycle Club and the Bicycle Alliance. During his commute he said he saw a "road diet program" in Seattle and it made a big difference on Phinney Ridge. He said he is happy that Shoreline has implemented such a program and congratulated staff for the study and the results. He said he spoke to Councilmembers about this and hopes for a unanimous vote not to restripe 15th Avenue NE to four lanes.

(b) Chris Eggen, Shoreline, said he resides in Ridgecrest, which is two blocks from 15th Avenue NE. He stated that he and his neighbors oppose three lanes on the 15th Avenue corridor. He noted that the problem is people speeding down 12th Avenue NE during peak hours. Additionally, he said there is a noticeable increase of traffic on 5th and 8th Avenues. He noted that the neighbors in the area avoid 15th Avenue, and it may have impacted recovery of businesses in North City. He said the only issue in the neighborhood is peak hour traffic. He wondered if this is such a good solution, why isn't this configuration considered for Richmond Beach Way? He said it was voted down because there were Richmond Beach Councilmembers on the Council at the time it came to a vote.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about the improved signal coordination and the reduction in traffic flow time by 20-30 seconds between 155th Avenue and 180th Avenue North. He wondered if there is any information pertaining to bicycle traffic prior to the reconfiguration. He also inquired if traffic will continue to increase, and asked about improving bus traffic through having turnouts and similar traffic devices. He wanted to know if there were any plans in the future to resolve bus issues.

Mr. Meredith confirmed the data and said the traffic light timing change was implemented in February. He noted that the data wasn't kept prior to reconfiguration but there is an average of 35 to 85 bikes on that corridor each day. Mr. Meredith said the City should expect to see a slight increase because the flow has been improved. He guessed that there should be a higher traffic count than what the count was in February. He pointed out that the City doesn't have the right-of-way space to build bus pullouts. He added that the average bus stops for 20-30 seconds, and if a bus pulls over to the curb there is room for vehicles to pass.

Councilmember Gustafson asked the Council whether the primary need on the 15th Avenue corridor is to move high volumes of traffic or improve safety for motorists and pedestrians. He questioned if the Council is going to yield to those who want to increase traffic flow. He said studies have shown that three traffic lanes create a sense of community, enhances pedestrian safety, eliminates multiple threats, calms traffic, improves access to adjacent properties, provides a safe commercial zone, decreases collisions and injuries, reduces speeds, lower traffic volumes, and increases safety. He added that three traffic lanes also improve intersection visibility and help with emergency vehicle pass through. He added that islands would also make the corridor safer. He pointed out that three lanes also accommodates elderly drivers better, noting that Shoreline's elderly population is increasing. The City of Kirkland won't construct four lane streets, and the City of Redmond is doing the same thing, he said. There are many other cities moving

from four to three lanes. He concluded that he would like to see that occur on 175th Avenue to 195th Avenue and the entire corridor.

Councilmember Way asked if there was any data from 2007 on accidents, speeds and volumes.

Mr. Meredith said the speed and volume data was collected in February 2007 and there is some accident data from 2007 but he doesn't have any accident data prior to 2001. He added that since he didn't have any historical data the latest accident data he presented was from December 2006.

Councilmember Way noted that Meridian Avenue wasn't included in the traffic studies. She felt that if drivers aren't using the 15th Avenue corridor they must be using Meridian and other streets.

Mr. Sanchez agreed, noting that staff looked at Meridian, I-5, and other streets.

Councilmember Way added that since the businesses notice volumes are not the same as back in 2003, there has been an impact. She said it seems that the goal shouldn't be to increase speeds; they need to be lowered to get people into the corridor and utilize the businesses. She added that the route is a north-to-south arterial, which benefits the City. She said the goal should be to provide opportunities for people to use the corridor safely through bike and pedestrian enhancements. She asked what the law was concerning buses pulling over or vehicles passing a transit bus.

Mr. Meredith responded that vehicles can't lawfully use the center lane to pass, and that's why the City opted to widen the center lane and narrow the turn lane.

Deputy Mayor Fimia pointed out that the state law says vehicles must yield to the buses that pull out into traffic.

Councilmember Way felt that 10th Avenue NE could accommodate bike lanes much safer. She inquired if there are plans to do that.

Mr. Meredith said there are no plans to stripe bike lanes on 10th Avenue NE. However, he said there have been lots of changes on 10th Avenue NE to include reducing the speed limit to 25 miles per hour and adding a traffic circle. He encouraged bikes on 10th Avenue NE, but it isn't getting bike lanes. He added that 15th Avenue NE frequently has several commuter cyclists on it because it has few stops and is so attractive. On the other hand, 10th Avenue NE has crossings and stop signs, he said.

Councilmember Way said 10th Avenue NE seems like it provides opportunities to go up to 185th Street NE and west to Richmond Beach. She added that there are some Cascade Bike Club (CBC) members who say that it's a good route. She felt it is an obvious choice to work on.

Mr. Meredith commented that he would rather use 10th Avenue NE rather than 15th because it is calmer. He said he would like to create a bicycle map.

Councilmember Way supported the idea of a bicycling map. She addressed speeds near some of the school zones. She encouraged slower speeds and said there have been modest improvements in speeds and accidents. She hoped the City can keep the numbers down if traffic volumes increase.

Mr. Meredith noted that he measured from 2003 to 2006, and 2004 to 2006 should be lower by 30% than the numbers reported in 2001.

Councilmember Way concurred with his assessment.

Councilmember Hansen concurred with Councilmember Gustafson's comments. He pointed out that he led the fight against turning 185th Street into three lanes. However, he said he was wrong and since the conversion to three lanes the area is much safer. Speeds on a four lane street are increased because they provide the opportunity for cars to go a lot faster. Three lanes, he said, help control the speed and provide for easier access to get on and off of 15th Avenue NE. He said the physics concerning this are clear, and you have to ignore the statistics in order to support a four lane road.

Councilmember Ryu noted that there are two Councilmembers in support of changing Richmond Beach Road to three lanes, but she doesn't share that opinion. She concurred with Councilmember Way and stated the City should look at alternative bike routes. She felt bicyclists are able to find alternate routes to 15th Avenue NE. She noted that the City has lost over 1,400 vehicle trips per day and only gained about 35 to 85 bikes per day. She asked to see the overall collision graphic that reflected accidents up to the 4th quarter of 2006. She noted that the difference in collisions from previous years is getting narrower, and she would like to see the numbers in 2007. She felt it would make more sense to take into consideration the accident rate, which is the industry standard. She asked when the accidents occurred, and where they correlated with peak traffic times. She added that the businesses have contacted the City about this. She said Frank Lumber reported that most business occurs in the afternoon, and there has been a reduction in evening volume on 15th Avenue NE. She added that this business is not rebounding as much as they thought it would as result of construction. She asked if there have been any businesses that have closed in North City. She highlighted that the examples in Kirkland impressed her, but there are some existing four lane roads and it is great to see they're willing to meet the community's needs. She expressed concern about using a center turn lane as a passing lane. She noted that if a center island is added, then it becomes a two lane road. She questioned how something like this would impact volumes. She asked how someone would pass a bus if it is blocking as it travels up 15th Avenue.

Mr. Meredith said the City staff have identified three locations for islands. Islands, he noted, prevent people from driving the entire length of the center turn lane. He added that they shouldn't interfere with turning movements, driveways, or bus stops.

Councilmember Ryu asked how emergency vehicles are expected to pass a bus that's blocking the road.

Mr. Meredith said there won't be islands next to bus stops, and if an emergency vehicle needed the center turn lane they'd have to get around. Hopefully vehicles will pull over like they're supposed to.

Councilmember Hansen noted that emergency vehicles go through on the wrong side of the street if necessary.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if bicycles trip the vehicle counters. He also asked why there were not studies done during the summer months.

Mr. Meredith said they do trip the vehicle counters and that they are registered in the system as bicycles. He said studies were done on 170th Street NE. The studies were taken during the school session because traffic volumes are significantly impacted when school is in session.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the City has contacted Metro about the bus issues. Mr. Meredith responded that the City staff has discussed it with them.

Councilmember McGlashan discussed turning Richmond Beach into three lanes and asked if there was a comparison done between North City and Richmond Beach.

Mr. Meredith said Richmond Beach carries the same amount of traffic until 8th Avenue. He noted that Richmond Beach Road and 3rd Avenue has a high accident rate, but there hasn't been any specific analysis explaining the reason.

Councilmember McGlashan supported keeping the North City corridor three lanes because he said it is safer, there is less traffic, reduced accidents, slower speeds, and the bike lanes give a four to five foot buffer. On the other hand, he said, if there is a change to four lanes, citizens have to step into road to check their mailboxes. He commented that Martin Luther King Way in Everett is safer because it was revised to three lanes. He agreed with having bike routes, noting that if bikes have to "zigzag," then cyclists will get back into their cars. He pointed out that Frank Lumber is a proponent of four lanes, but he bought more property on 15th Avenue, so he obviously sees a value there. He said the City should look at more bike lanes. He noted that 15th Avenue is becoming more congested and the City isn't doing what is needed to get people to use alternatives. He pointed out that if bike lanes are taken away then people will get back in cars.

Deputy Mayor Fimia commented that when there's still so much controversy regarding an item, it means there's still room to improve it. She said the peak hour traffic volumes are going somewhere else and it looks like it is moving into the neighborhoods. She noted that there is 34% more volume on 5th Avenue NE, 82% more on 8th Avenue NE, 10% more on 10th Avenue NE, and 9% more on 25th Avenue. She commented that if traffic calming

drives traffic back to 15th Avenue, then we'll get more congestion. She noted that pedestrians don't feel safe on 15th Avenue NE and there needs to be more aggressive speed enforcement. She suggested lowering the speed limit to 30 mph. She added that fewer cars hurt the businesses and there needs to be some quantitative data from these businesses reviewed. She said it doesn't make sense to fix one problem and create another. Reducing 15th Avenue to 30 mph would accommodate bicyclists better, noting she would like other corridors to accommodate non-commute bicyclists. She added that she is not convinced that a road diet is the best answer. She wondered why another lane on 155th Avenue was added, which made it wider and less safe for pedestrians. She urged the Council to be consistent and not make a rule that the City reduces every road. She pointed out that there is not an increase in pedestrians in the corridor, and speeds are still too high. The City of Kirkland, she commented, had creative solutions to meet all the demands. She directed the City staff to come back with options. She highlighted there are possibly three projects and properties that may be developed in the next five or ten years. Growth in this corridor must be considered, she concluded.

Mayor Ransom commented that the City's Public Works Department "sold" the Council on the three lane project. He said there were comparisons made with Seattle which has bus turnouts, but we don't. He said references were made to the City of Kirkland and four lanes were shown to the Council. He noted that there was a site in Kirkland, which was in the middle of nowhere, that had three lanes but seeing it didn't accomplish anything. He said he strongly disagreed with the statistics that were conveyed to the Council. The traffic volume has dropped significantly at 175th Street and 15th Avenue NE, and there is a difference in collisions. He noted that prior to construction, there were eight to nine collisions, and approximately the same after construction. After the North City construction there was a further decrease. He concluded there was no major drop in accidents from pre to post construction. Additionally, he said there is no major difference in the collisions. He said the information presented was grossly incorrect and there has been no major decrease in accidents or personal injuries. He added that the sample was too small, and while there is a random significance in personal injuries, it is not statistically significant. These small samples are not statistically significant but only reveal a trend, he concluded. Concerning public sentiment, he stated there were over 1,500 letters in support of four lanes, with only 150 supporting three lanes. He said he received over 150 personal phone calls from residents that wanted four lanes, and only 30 phone calls from people who wanted three lanes. He said he went door-to-door and talked to people west of 15th Avenue NE who did not want the four lanes. He encouraged Council to support four lanes, as there is no significant statistical difference between having three or four lanes on 15th Avenue NE.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested the Council ask staff to come back with alternatives on how to do different configurations on 15th Avenue NE to reduce speeds and neighborhood impacts. She also asked for the City staff to take into consideration the need for bicycle access and usage in the corridor. Additionally, she said the City staff should discuss with Metro how to ensure the bus system isn't affected by any of the proposed configurations. She added that the City has to make all of this work, and asked if it is possible to bring this back to the Council on June 18th.

Mr. Relph said it is possible and the staff can come back with a proposal in June.

Deputy Mayor Fimia added that the recommendation was also to see what a four lane corridor would look like. She added that the Council needs several options, including an option for a four lane road if safety can be maintained.

Mr. Olander commented that the corridor can always be better, and there will always be differences in how statistics are interpreted. He said a major factor is the severity of accidents, and he rejected the characterization that the Public Works department "sold" this to the Council. He added that the City staff recommended this with no false pretenses and made the Council aware of the advantages and disadvantages. He felt that June would be too soon to return to Council with options.

Mr. Relph said more time would be appreciated because this is a difficult issue. He added that more time would help with being able to look into better options.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said the Council needed to get a clear understanding of the problems. She suggested the Council and staff come up with problem list.

Mayor Ransom commented that there is agreement that 15th Avenue should revert back to four lanes. Deputy Mayor Fimia noted that this is not an action item. Mayor Ransom said he is asking whether there is agreement to reconfigure 15th Avenue to four lanes.

Councilmember Ryu asked if the City has ever had a four lane corridor where the inside lanes are pass through lanes and the outside lanes are different. She encouraged thinking about the right lane being the bus and bicycle lane. The passing lane would be on the far left.

Councilmember Gustafson noted that the City staff has worked on this for four to five years and they have come forward with a valid recommendation. He added that the City staff has more expertise on this subject then the entire Council does. He noted that this item was for information only, not scheduled for action. He said the Council should allow the City staff to do what they need to do. He said the decision should be made to leave it at three lanes and all the reasons are there.

Councilmember McGlashan referred to the City of Kirkland street and said it isn't quite a four lane road. He said he is not a statistician, but the trends are good. He said with four lanes there have been fatalities, but there have not been any with three lanes.

Councilmember Way believed the staff has done an excellent job over the years, but would like to see more work on all the options because the public in the neighborhood deserves the City staff's expertise. She added that the traffic increases on 25th Avenue NE and the traffic decrease on 24th Avenue NE is an interesting anomaly.

Mr. Meredith said the City had an increase in traffic on 175th Avenue NE between I-5 and

15th Avenue NE and an increase through the North City Business District before construction. He interpreted that drivers were staying on I-5 and getting off on 175th and into the business district. Since project end, he commented, alternate routes have been taken, and that is probably why there is a drop in traffic numbers on 24th Avenue NE.

Councilmember Way expressed concerns because this is close to schools. She commented that cut-through traffic is perceived as the problem by the residents.

Mr. Olander noted that it is important to remember that even before we changed to three lanes, cut-through traffic was a problem. He said that there will always be some, but the City is making good progress in addressing the problem. He noted that this is happening all over the region. Additionally, it will take time to get good information on the alternate concepts. Modeling, he said, will give reasonable estimates but it depends on the level of detail. Nonetheless, he clarified that the City needs to do it right.

Mayor Ransom said his position is that if public wants four lanes, the Council should give it to them regardless of what studies show.

Mr. Olander asked the Council to have the City staff prepare a concept paper concerning what the alternatives might be and bring it back to the Council in three to four weeks.

Deputy Mayor Fimia reiterated that there needs to be a statement list of problems which can be done rationally. She translated that the City needs to determine what is still not working and how to achieve the original goals. She said she would like to hear from the Council, City staff, and from the community. She suggested a targeted survey to that whole study area.

Mr. Olander said the City staff can bring that back to the Council.

Councilmember Hansen commented that he has taught statistics to businesses and the 30.9% drop is significant. He added that Councilmember McGlashan's point about no fatalities in the three-lane configuration is important. He said the City's liability will be a lot higher if there is a fatality and the City has such clear statistics showing the three-lane road is much safer. He was concerned about who will take responsibility if the City builds a four lane road and someone is killed.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Councilmember Hansen moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 7-0. At 9:58 p.m., Mayor Ransom declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, May 21, 2007 - 6:30 PM
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McGlashan, Councilmember Ryu, and Councilmember Way

ABSENT: Councilmember Gustafson

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:42 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ransom, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

(a) Proclamation of "Bicycle Awareness Month"

Mayor Ransom read the proclamation declaring the month of May as "Bike Awareness Month" in the City of Shoreline. David Hiller, Advocacy Director of the Cascade Bicycle Club, accepted the proclamation and spoke briefly about the benefits of bicycling.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager, provided the City Manager's report. She reported on the success of the Shoreline Bike-To-Work Station, as well as four Arterial Speed Study Community Meetings to be held on May 22, May 23, May 29, and May 31. The next 2010 Speaker Series will feature a discussion on Community Gathering Places by Ron Sher, founder of Third Place Books, on Thursday, May 24. A Cromwell Park Community Meeting will be held May 24, and a Boeing Creek Park Community Meeting and Self-Guided Site Tour will be held on Thursday, May 31. The next meeting of the Comprehensive Housing Strategy Citizen Advisory Committee will be Tuesday, May 22, and the next meeting of the Aurora Business and Community (ABC) Team will be Wednesday, May 23. The next regular meeting of the Parks Board will be on Thursday, May 24. On Monday, May 28, all City offices will be closed in observance of Memorial Day. In lieu of a regular City Council meeting, on Tuesday, May 29, the City will be

hosting a dinner meeting with our sister city delegation from Boryeong, Korea focusing on fostering our business and community relations. The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held Monday, June 4.

Councilmember McGlashan moved to excuse Councilmember Gustafson. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

4. COMMUNITY PRESENTATION

(a) TeenHope Shelter

Henry Della Chiaie, Executive Director, TeenHope, began his presentation by outlining his background and experience working with at-risk youth. He discussed the services provided by TeenHope and gave statistics on participation and resources. He noted that TeenHope serves 160 youth per year and turns away approximately 85 youth per year; the primary reason for turning them away is because the facility is full. TeenHope is a clean and sober shelter, and the primary goal is to get the kids the tools they need to succeed. TeenHope has a family mediation program as well as an active outreach program, although most calls come from schools and the police department. TeenHope's mission is to promote healthier individuals and families by providing services and shelter. TeenHope's long-term goals include increasing annual funding by 15%, establishing a transitional home, and transitional shelters within five years. Mr. Della Chiaie concluded that working to acquire state, local and federal grants is an ongoing effort at TeenHope.

Councilmember Way asked if TeenHope refers youth to other resources if they are unable to help, and if TeenHope accepts donations. Mr. Della Chiaie responded that they can refer youth to over 25 other resources and agencies, and they do accept donations. He provided the following contact information for the facility: 915 N 199th, Shoreline, WA 98133, (206) 546-1010.

Councilmember Ryu pointed out that the services TeenHope provides is a better alternative to going to jail or trying to survive on the street. She asked about the shelter's success rate. Mr. Della Chiaie stated that 73% of teens staying longer than two weeks are placed in positive housing within 90 days.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired about the grants and potential funding sources the shelter is pursuing. He also asked if the kids are required to leave the shelter early in the morning, and what services are available for a child/parent situation.

Mr. Della Chiaie said there are several drug and alcohol prevention grants, as well as a Comcast grant, that are available. Youth staying in the shelter have to leave by 7:30 a.m. He noted that several transitional housing services could accommodate the child/parent situation, but there are no transitional homes in Shoreline.

Mr. Della Chiaie then outlined TeenHope's new program called Safe Place. As part of this program, TeenHope partners with participating businesses, which serve as a first-stage

refuge for when teens first become homeless. When they reach a Safe Place business, they can then call TeenHope for additional assistance.

Deputy Mayor Fimia asked how Safe Place businesses are identified and when the program is scheduled to commence. She also asked where the at-risk youth are primarily coming from, and what the City could to in terms of prevention and intervention. Mr. Della Chiaie said that yellow and black signs in the windows of participating businesses identify them as a Safe Place. He said the program is 75% funded and should be ready to launch in the next few months. He noted that 52% of the kids come from King County, with the remainder mainly coming from Snohomish County. He said cities can promote drug and alcohol education and help schools and agencies recognize the warning signs. Deputy Mayor Fimia was glad that TeenHope is a clean and sober home, because otherwise it's just enabling their problems.

Responding to Councilmember Way, Mr. Della Chiaie said the usual places they go to do outreach include Kenmore Lanes, the Everett bus station, Westlake Mall, and Broadway, and sometimes the skate park during the day.

Councilmember Ryu noted that most of the kids at Shorewood and Shorecrest high schools are good, and positive peer pressure can make a big difference.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Steve Dunn, Shoreline, thanked the Council for discussing the new YMCA project, noting that Councilmembers have been to YMCA events and support their mission. He clarified the YMCA request for $1 million in City funding over 20 years to help support youth and family programs. He noted that the YMCA will serve over 10,000 kids annually, and there are many kids and families who need help. He said the YMCA has raised $3.9 million of its $5.7 million goal. He urged the Council's support of this "once-in-a-lifetime" opportunity.

(b) Dale Wright, Shoreline, said the Mayor questioned the validity of his statement last week that Aurora Corridor Phase 1 is actually 1.2 miles. He noted that information provided by CH2MHill in response to a Shoreline Merchants Association letter clarifies that the project was extended to 1.2 miles. He said he used $300/linear foot as the estimate for sidewalk construction costs, which he felt was conservative. He clarified that the City of Shoreline cost for Phase 1 is $2.9 million out of a total project cost of $31.7 million, and it is not the City's responsibility to reimburse utilities.

Deputy Mayor Fimia clarified that last week she asked if a portion of the utility costs will be borne by rate payers, and the City Manager confirmed that they will be.

(c) Judy Parsons, Shoreline, speaking as a member of Vision Aurora, said Vision Aurora advocated that the same design principles in Phase 1 be used for the next phases of the Aurora Corridor. She said the next phases should include the same pedestrian safety

improvements and a 4-foot amenity zone. She gave examples of how the lack of an amenity zone is dangerous and inconvenient for pedestrians. She urged the Council to select one of the 110-foot-width alternatives.

(d) Harley O'Neil, Shoreline, on behalf of the Innis Arden community, presented Henry Della Chiaie, of TeenHope, with a check for $1,000 as a donation to help TeenHope programs. He said Spin Alley Bowling would be happy to participate in the Safe Place program.

(e) Beth O'Neill, Shoreline, said that Deputy Mayor Fimia abused her position when she made false statements about her during two Council meetings, which led her to file a lawsuit against her. This lawsuit was mentioned by Deputy Mayor Fimia and Councilmember Ryu at last Monday's Council meeting. She provided the background and events leading up to the lawsuit, noting that public documents requested of Deputy Mayor Fimia have not been provided. She said even though a private citizen was able to confirm that the Deputy Mayor made a false statement, she has not issued an apology.

(f) Mary Fox, Shoreline, continued reading the statement of Ms. O'Neill, noting that the Deputy Mayor erased the e-mail that was the subject of a their repeated public disclosure requests. She commented that the Deputy Mayor contacted people involved in the underlying land use question because of her political ties, and that Councilmembers Ryu and Way tried to squelch public comment on this issue for the same reason. She urged the public to speak up during Council meetings, noting that the public has nothing to fear as long as they speak the truth. She said this information will be posted on a website called www.wakeupshoreline.com.

(g) Charlotte Haines, Shoreline, commented that the three-lane configuration on 15th Avenue NE from NE 150th Street to NE 172nd Street was not just a sample piece, but was the configuration that was originally approved by the City Council and was to include the business district. However, political pressure from the Door Store changed the three-lane configuration to four lanes. She noted that the Door Store frequently uses the City street and sidewalks to unload lumber without concern for traffic interruption or safety. She said business has increased for some under the three-lane configuration, and continued development will bring new customers and more revenues to the City. She urged the Council to extend the three-lane configuration through the business district.

(h) Sally Granger, Shoreline, noted that pedestrian safety is the first priority of the City of Seattle Traffic Engineering Department, and it has completed six road lane reductions. She pointed out that one Councilmember said she doesn't feel safe as a pedestrian in the North City Business District, but that's because that section still has four lanes. She said as a 45-year resident of Shoreline just one street off 15th Avenue NE, she finally feels safe driving 15th Avenue because of the 3-lane configuration.

(i) Fran Lilliness, Shoreline, commended the City for the successful completion of Aurora Corridor Phase 1, noting that the beauty and amenities of the project make her proud to

be a Shoreline citizen. She noted that traffic is calmer and pedestrian safety is improved. She thanked the Council for a "mission accomplished."

(j) Judy Allen, Shoreline, commented on the management contract that was produced prior to the December 12, 2005 Council meeting. She said the document stated that Robert Ransom was Mayor, but Scott Jepsen was the Mayor at that point (Mayor Hansen had resigned). She asked why Councilmember Ryu, who was not on the City Council at that time, was included in Council correspondence and decisions. She also asked who wrote the press release announcing George Mauer as the new City manager.

Mayor Ransom clarified that he was not challenging Mr. Wright's statement; he simply asked the City Manager to respond to his question about the actual length of Aurora Phase 1, but he has not received a response yet.

Councilmember Ryu wished to ensure that the Council receives a copy of the letter by Ms. O'Neill and Ms. Fox.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said her phone number is 368-0814, and she would be happy to talk to anyone regarding the statements of Ms. O'Neill and Ms. Fox.

Councilmember Hansen noted that he drove the Aurora Corridor to see if he would notice any difference after project completion, and he was surprised at how nice the corridor turned out.

Councilmember Way reported on her participation in the beach walk sponsored by the Seattle Aquarium, noting that the month of June has the lowest tides of the year. She spoke in support of improving habitat and connections to the Puget Sound.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Economic Development Advisory Board

Tom Boydell, Economic Development Manager, stated that this item responds to Council direction to return with a draft plan to form a permanent economic development advisory committee. He provided an overview of the proposal, which would create a permanent advisory board composed of a minimum of 12 people that would broadly represent the interests of the community. He pointed out that this committee would rely on existing resources, as there is no staffing or additional budget resources available. The intent is that committee members would serve limited-length terms, since it is often difficult for business people to make long-term commitments.

Mayor Ransom called for public comment.

(a) Chris Eggen, Shoreline, supported this proposal, noting that this would provide the small business community a forum for making their needs and problems known to the City Council. He said that due to some business problems along 15th Avenue NE, it

would be advantageous if the Ridgecrest neighborhood had a permanent presence on the committee.

Deputy Mayor Fimia proposed some changes to the proposal to help clarify the goals and purpose of the committee. She noted that the City has a good economic development plan, but it just needs some additional community help to implement, since the City has only one employee devoted to economic development. She proposed that committee members be diverse in terms of geography, age, and ethnicity, adding that this committee is a good opportunity for business people to become stakeholders. She also proposed that the committee's work include developing performance measures, reviewing and recommending updates to the Economic Development Plan, and reviewing City legislation that has potential impacts on economic development in Shoreline. Her proposal also included recommendations on the frequency of meetings and the composition of the committee. She suggested up to 16 members representing a broad cross-section of the community, with at least three representing Aurora Avenue businesses. She also suggested that the chairperson be selected by the committee rather than by the City Council.

Ms. Modrzejewski responded that Mr. Olander, City Manager, concurred with Deputy Mayor Fimia's suggestions. She noted that the proposal was originally put together with staff workload considerations in mind. Mr. Boydell added that the work plan should be driven by the committee, and that staff would strive to accommodate the business community's needs and its work plan.

Mayor Ransom agreed with the suggestion to reserve three positions for Aurora Avenue businesses but suggested specifying the general locations of those businesses along Aurora Avenue. He also felt that the five at-large positions should be specified, and that the City Council, rather than staff, should select the five at-large members. He said this is because they would be serving four-year terms, and this is consistent with other advisory committees appointed by the Council.

Deputy Mayor Fimia felt that staff could select the at-large members, since they got a good cross-section doing it on the Comprehensive Housing Strategy Citizen Advisory Committee. She noted that the staff recommendations ultimately come before the Council for approval anyway.

Councilmember Ryu pointed out that a 4-year commitment for a small business owner is huge amount of time; therefore, some flexibility should be expected. She said making the expectations clear will help people in the application process.

Councilmember Way suggested that allowing for substitutes or alternates within the same business might provide the flexibility needed. Staff responded that it wants the committee to succeed, and it can be difficult to decide what is best at this particular point.

Councilmember Way also suggested seeking out home business owners, possibly group homes, and formulating additional application questions such as: "Are you a Shoreline business owner? Do you work for or represent a Shoreline business? Are you affiliated

with other organizations which might have an interest in economic development in Shoreline?"

Councilmember McGlashan expressed concerns about the staff resources needed to support this committee. He wondered whether the City needs to allocate more resources in order to have a successful economic development program. He pointed out that even though crime has declined and people feel safer, the Council hired an additional street crimes officer, which seems to be an unnecessary expense. He said since time is valuable for small business owners, perhaps the City should do a survey to gauge if there is enough interest.

Ms. Modrzejewski commented on the success of the Aurora Business and Community Team (ABC Team) and the Economic Development Task Force Advisory Committee, despite the fact that some members couldn't make long-term commitments. She pointed out that the application process for the Economic Development Committee could serve as a type of survey and will help the City measure the level of interest.

Councilmember McGlashan noted the frequency of meetings in the City and wondered if we are "burning people out." He noted there are lot of demands on Mr. Boydell and wondered if the City is developing the Economic Development Program correctly.

Councilmember Hansen felt that the proposed changes largely amount to "wordsmithing" and don't significantly change the overall proposal. He supported leaving the appointments to the City Manager's officer rather than the City Council and suggested starting small, with perhaps 12 members. He emphasized the importance of getting the committee "off the ground" to see how it works, and then perhaps making changes later. He supported flexibility and advised against developing too many conditions, since stating specific parameters could hinder the committee and set it up for a temporary failure.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested having between 2-4 at-large members, noting that this is just an advisory group to help implement the Economic Development Plan. He felt this would actually lessen Mr. Boydell's workload since it would provide a forum for him to talk to these groups at one time, and it would hopefully get the Chamber of Commerce and others moving. She liked the idea of including group homes and agreed that it should be flexible. She felt that appointees could designate who their alternate would be in the event they cannot attend, but maintained that the committee should be comprised of 16 members.

Councilmember Ryu supported the proposal, noting that one benefit of the committee is that it would serve as a type of "information clearinghouse" for businesses. She felt it would lead to efficiencies in information-sharing, and she concurred with the idea of self-designated alternates.

Councilmember Way said she does not oppose additional staff time it it's something we can manage, but that can't be substituted for the street crimes officer.

Mayor Ransom noted that the committee really needs five at-large members, since not everyone shows up and a minimum number is needed in order to be effective. Mr. Boydell concurred, noting that attendance began to diminish on the Economic Development Task Force as it went into the final weeks of its work.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested revising the questionnaire to evoke a response from the applicants as to how they can help implement their area of interest in support of the City's goals.

Mayor Ransom suggested that this committee will require additional secretarial support in order to be effective.

Mr. Boydell confirmed the Council's expectation that the meetings of this committee will be open to the public.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested that staff seek volunteers, possibly retirees, to provide assistance to the committee.

RECESS

At 8:56 p.m., Mayor Ransom called for a five minute recess. The Council meeting reconvened at 9:05 p.m.

(b) Cascade Cities Agenda and Green City Partnership Programs

Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, introduced Leslie Baton, Alison Van Gorp, and Jeff Aiken, representing the Cascade Land Conservancy (CLC). He noted that the Cascade Cities Agenda was presented to the Council previously, and CLC staff is here tonight to answer any questions the Council might have. He reminded the Council that the Cascade Agenda is a long-term sustainability plan that looks 100 years into the future. He said the Council's goals mirror those of the CLC, and for this reason it is proposed that the Council adopt a resolution expressing the intent to become a Cascade Agenda City. He commented on the partnership possibilities as a Cascade Agenda City and that this program responds to the Governor's bill calling for creative ways to do transfer of property rights.

Ms. Van Gorp outlined the Cascade Agenda Cities program, noting that CLC partners with cities in achieving a threefold objective -- to make great public places, quality neighborhoods, and a successful region. She said these partnerships are vital in helping achieve the regional goals of the CLC.

Ms. Baton, speaking on behalf of the Green Cities Program (GCP), said the GCP has learned through other partnerships that there are many areas needing a level of support and care that they're not receiving. The GCP encourages people and cities to get involved and help preserve open space. In particular, the GCP helps to prevent "ivy deserts" that have been occurring in some areas. She said the GCP has seen a loss of the forest canopy

in several places, and a strong community stewardship program is needed to reverse this trend. She noted that the City of Shoreline has 300 acres of substantial open space.

Mayor Ransom called for public comment.

(a) Charles Brown, Shoreline, noted that the City received a 70% vote in favor of preserving the South Woods as part of the Parks Bond, and South Woods turned out to be the most expensive bond issue item. He said South Woods is evidence that there is strong support for community stewardship programs in Shoreline. He displayed a "weed wrench" and demonstrated its use, noting that holly is a significant invasive weed that is becoming as big a problem as scotch broom. He urged more citizen involvement in removing invasive plants in Shoreline's urban forests.

Ms. Modrzejewski commented on the "Ivy OUT" projects conducted through the City Parks Department as well as the City's Sustainability Team, which is addressing these issues.

(b) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, said the Cascade Cities Agenda is very exciting, and inclusivity is essential to achieve success. She noted that the Council has done a lot to open these issues up to the public, including community meetings about development in Shoreline. She said she is seeing revitalization of some community groups, but there is still much more to do. She announced that forums on urban sustainability would be held on May 30 and June 26, featuring Jan Spencer, which will change the way we think about communities.

Councilmember Hansen commented favorably on the Cascade Cities Agenda, noting that the general policies meet the first seven goals the City adopted. He said it is a great way to improve the local environment. He commented that one potential problem for some urban forests is the lack of diversity in habitat. He noted that some tree species, such as Douglas fir, are susceptible to the spruce beetle, so if an urban forest is composed primarily of this one species, it could be problematic. He noted that South Woods is an urban forest comprised primarily of one species, so diversity of habitat should also be a principle of the preservation goal.

Councilmember Way supported the Cascade Cities Agenda and GCP, noting that Shoreline needs to work together with adjacent jurisdictions since ivy doesn't stop at the city limits. She commented on her interest in promoting an Open Space Plan (OSP), noting that although it should start with an inventory of publicly owned areas, it should be expanded to include private areas as well.

Ms. Baton noted that partnerships with other cities began with an analysis of publicly owned areas, but that focus was expanded to include the full spectrum of lands.

Mr. Tovar commented that the Parks Plan is a start, but the City has to look at everything collectively, including private land, public land, right-of-way, etc. He noted that a large part of the impact is not within the purview of the City, so in most cases the City needs

"buy-in" and support on an individual level, which requires public outreach and environmental education. He said the City can address the Open Space Plan through the Sustainability Team, which will be studying the 2005 Parks Open Space Plan and work with the CLC to identify priorities. He noted that the Council resolution is simply a statement of intent that the Council is interested in pursuing this partnership.

Councilmember Way emphasized the need to include fish and wildlife corridors as elements of the Open Space Plan, noting that other cities have plans that can serve as a model for enhancing wildlife corridors. She noted that transfer of development rights can be done through conservation easements, which the CLC can help facilitate, or they can be accomplished within an existing property. She also emphasized the need to focus on the nearshore environment and improve connections between the Puget Sound and the creeks/wetlands. She asked if any of the groups were working with Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) in this regard.

Ms. Baton said GCP has worked with some properties on the nearshore regarding feasibility and potential acquisition. Ms. Van Gorp said CLC has identified BNSF as an area of potential partnership in terms of conservation and preservation.

Councilmember Way pointed out the need for more help from the community on these stewardship programs. She listed Earth Corps, King County Waterworks, and the City's newly established environmental mini-grant program as potential resources that could help accomplish these conservation goals.

Responding to Councilmember McGlashan, Ms. Baton explained that on most cases, holly is considered an invasive species. Councilmember McGlashan pointed out that in Shoreline's urban forests, one of the biggest problems is the thick canopy, which can lead to a loss of underbrush and new tree starts. He inquired if thinning could be done without making the trees susceptible to wind.

Ms. Baton said the GCP could work with the City to explore ways to thin forests in an ecological way that would create the needed canopy gaps as well as get the required stratification.

Councilmember Ryu supported the proposed resolution, noting that it is an inexpensive way to get expert help and focus our attention. She pointed out the need to consider the right-of-way (ROW), noting that it consists of up to 20% of the City's total land mass. She expressed concern about potential ROW maintenance costs and hoped the City could pursue inexpensive ways to maintain the ROW, possibly through natural vegetation.

Mr. Tovar noted that there are lots of implications of the ROW, including habitat, storm water, and utilities, so the City is missing a lot if it ignores the ROW.

Noting the costs of maintaining lawns and fields as well as the propagation of weeds such as dandelions, Councilmember Ryu asked if schools have any alternatives to lawn in the natural cycle of re-landscaping.

Ms. Baton said her organization looks at school properties as potential natural restoration areas, where sustainable plants, flowers, trees could be substituted for sod.

Deputy Mayor Fimia noted that the Cascade Cities Agenda also fits in with Council Goals #8 and #10, since Fircrest is a large site with redevelopment potential. She asked where the Cascade Agenda fits in with Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040.

Ms. Van Gorp noted that while the Cascade Agenda takes a 100-year perspective, it also looks at quality of life factors such as open space and natural areas.

Deputy Mayor Fimia stated that while she supports growth management in concept, the region is not dealing with existing transportation problems, which begs the question, "Why would we take more growth?" She said the 30-year projections estimate there will be enormous growth in congestion and vehicle trips, but reasonable alternatives are not being proposed.

Ms. Van Gorp replied that this issue should be discussed on a regional level, since she frequently hears about how to meet citizens' needs as we assume this growth. She said her organization is committed to working with the state legislature to address these issues.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested that the CLC and other groups partner together to look at the costs and benefits, since there are limited tax revenues and every tax dollar needs to bring a benefit.

Mr. Tovar emphasized the need to pay attention to the legislative agenda and ask the legislature to provide some of the necessary tools. He said there might be some kinds of enhanced revenues that will be made available to those cities that are doing a good job, perhaps Cascade Agenda cities.

Mayor Ransom expressed general support for the resolution and asked for clarification of the transfer of development rights and how those would relate to the South Aurora Triangle (SAT) and building heights, as included on page 21 of the Council packet.

Mr. Tovar noted that the City is obligated to accommodate some growth as part of the Growth Management Act, and while transferring development rights from rural to urban areas is difficult to accomplish in a practical way, the SAT was identified as a potential area for accommodating growth. He said there are still many more details to work out, and the Council will ultimately make a decision following a lengthy process in the Planning Commission and in the Council. He pointed out that becoming a Cascade Agenda city doesn't commit the City to become a receiving area for growth.

Mayor Ransom summarized Council consensus to direct staff to move forward with a resolution.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Councilmember Way moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Deputy Mayor Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

Councilmember Hansen noted that Ordinance No. 471 is a required reading, so he recommended that item 6(d) be considered next. There was Council consensus to do so.

(d) Ordinance No. 471 Extending the Seattle Public Utilities Water Franchise

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, explained that this would typically go on a Consent Calendar, but state law requires that franchise agreements not be adopted at the same meeting in which it is introduced, so it requires two readings. He said the terms of the contract are set forth in Ordinance No. 214, which passed in 1999, and it has been extended several times since then. The proposed two-year extension would expire on June 30 2009. The franchise contains the usual franchise terms, including a 6% franchise fee. He said staff would like to place this on the June 4 Consent Calendar, since the Council cannot pass it tonight.

There was Council consensus to place this on the June 4 Consent Calendar.

(c) Reserve Policies

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, provided the staff report and explained that operating reserves are maintained to provide a buffer for unexpected economic changes and provide flexibility for unexpected expenditures. Reserves also help manage the City's cash flow needs and provide resources to pay for the City's insurance deductibles in the case of unexpected damage. She explained the City's current reserve policy, which includes a General Reserve Fund; this has a legal cap on the amount of funds that can be accumulated. Staff is recommending that Council eliminate this fund and instead, establish a "Revenue Stabilization Fund". The purpose of the fund would be to set aside adequate reserves to cover revenue shortfalls over a recessionary period and basically serve as an "emergency savings account" for the City. The City currently has operating reserves in excess of the recommended policy revisions by approximately $952,000. If the Council allocates any of the excess reserves for expenditures it should be for one-time items, as per the City's financial policies. Staff recommends that the Council give direction to staff to revise the City's financial policies for reserves/funds balance to include the following:

- Establish a Revenue Stabilization Fund equal to a three-year level of 10% of economically sensitive operating revenues.
- Establish a policy to require a $3 million General Fund Operating Reserve for cash flow purposes.
- Continue to require an insurance contingency and a budget contingency reserve within the General Fund equal to $805,000.
- Establish a policy to maintain the City Street Fund Reserve equal to 20% of operating revenues.

- Include language to provide reserve levels for bond covenants, enterprise funds, equipment replacement, and other City fund.

Mayor Ransom called for public comment. There was no one in the audience wishing to provide public comment on this item.

Councilmember Ryu agreed with this approach, noting that the first mile of Aurora Avenue caused higher than expected vacancy rates and decreased the amount of revenues coming into the City. She said defining the policy will create more certainty and allow more open discussions as to why certain amounts are there. She pointed out that the amenities along Aurora Avenue, including the plantings, will increase the City's operating costs, so having the reserves defined in this way will be useful for future planning.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned the need for the new policy if the policy is what enabled the City to have adequate reserve levels. Ms. Tarry clarified that Council's intent all along has been to accumulate reserves to meet the needs of the citizens, and while it has done this, the policy needs to be updated to accurately reflect what has occurred.

Ms. Mödrzejewski pointed out that staff regularly under spends and accumulates surpluses, which then go into reserves. However, this is taxpayer money, and it calls into question the need for keeping this amount of money in reserves. She said the new policy ties these funds to economic cycles and allows the City to be more strategic and develop a formula that makes sense.

Councilmember Way asked staff to clarify the difference between a surplus and revenues, noting that someone asked her why we have a $10 million surplus. Ms. Tarry said the reserves essentially amount to the City's savings account to be used for unexpected emergencies and to respond to economic shifts. The City wants to maintain its level of service during these times so that services and consistently provided. Councilmember Way asked how we can explain to people the need for these reserves. Ms. Tarry noted that although we have short-term budget gaps, there are actually long-term financial issues that the City must deal with, and the reserves play a part in that. Councilmember Way expressed support for the policy as stated.

Mayor Ransom noted that most governments maintain an amount equal to three-months cash reserves, but the amount that staff recommends equates to approximately six weeks. He pointed out that the School District's cash reserves were reduced to approximately four weeks and it created a terrible bind for them, so he was concerned about only maintaining a six-week contingency. He noted that the City accumulated funds for the City Hall project because people generally didn't support a bond issue for this project; the City was able to save a substantial amount so it could buy the property and still have some left over for the building. He said while he doesn't object to the policy changes, he is more comfortable with a larger budget contingency.

Deputy Mayor Fimia asked about the intent of the state law governing reserves and if the proposed policy changes are consistent with that intent. Ms. Tarry responded that she

would have to go back and research the intent of the state law; however, there is no legal limitation on the General Fund reserve -- this is separate fund the City can establish. Deputy Mayor Fimia wished to ensure that adequate funds are maintained for the roads capital fund, pointing out that it doesn't appear to be fully funded in future years. She asked for a staff-recommended range of reserves and one-time expenditures that could be used to address both short-term and long-term needs. Ms. Tarry said the proposed policy is what staff considers being a minimum range and good fiscal policy. She said while the reserve amount may look like a lot of money, in really isn't, given the long-term economic forecast. Deputy Mayor Fimia noted that we all have both fixed costs and variable costs in our personal lives, so a true accounting of the City's fixed and variable costs would be helpful in understanding the overall financial picture.

Councilmember Hansen said he strongly felt that the proposed reserves are not too high, and that the funds are continually working for the City's benefit. He said adequate reserve levels allow the City to reduce the level of taxation in future periods. He asked for an accounting of the gambling tax collections for the first quarter. Ms. Tarry said that overall, gambling revenues were down 2% for the first quarter compared with the same time period in 2006. Councilmember Hansen said because gambling revenues are unstable, the City's reserve fund should not be reduced. He said it is nice to know the City had an $838,000 surplus in 2006, noting that these savings are put into capital projects. He pointed out that there are many more capital projects out there than the City can ever fund. He said flexibility is the key to a good fiscal policy, and this reserve policy accomplishes that.

Mayor Ransom suggested that Councilmembers submit any additional questions to staff in writing.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 p.m., the Council meeting was adjourned.

_____

Scott Passey, City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING WITH CITY OF BORYEONG, KOREA DELEGATES

SHORELINE SISTER CITIES ASSOCIATION

Tuesday, May 29, 2007
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Shoreline Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, Councilmember Gustafson, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McGlashan, Councilmember Ryu, and Councilmember Way

ABSENT: none

STAFF: Robert Olander, City Manager; Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager; Rachael Markle, Assistant Planning & Development Services Director; Mark Relph; Public Works Director; Marci Wright, Human Resources Director; Ian Sievers; City Attorney; Debbie Tarry; Finance Director; Tony Burtt, Shoreline Police Chief; Scott Passey, City Clerk

GUESTS: Shin Joon Hee, Mayor, City of Boryeong; Kim Nam Soo, Director, Industry & Development, City of Boryeong; Kang Il Gyu, , Director, Planning & Audit, City of Boryeong; Kim Jang Hwa, Director, Trade & Relations, City of Boryeong; Choi Kwang Hee, Person in charge of Introductions, City of Boryeong; Kim Jong Gi, Executive Secretary, City of Boryeong; Pyeon Sam Beom, Councilmember, City of Boryeong; Lee Chang Sung, Councilmember, City of Boryeong; Lim Se Bin, Councilmember, City of Boryeong; Seong Nak Gyu, Councilmember, City of Boryeong; Lee Bok, , Council Clerk, City of Boryeong; Lee Soo Hun, President, Dae Chon Aju Motor College; Jie Myoung Seok, Assistant Professor, Dae Chon Aju Motor College; Lee Byung Jik, Principal, Dae Chon High School; Park Eun Wo, Business Manager, AB Tech; Lee Jong Seung, Advisor, Boryeong-Seattle Relations Association; Lee Hun Kyu, Vice President, Boryeong-Seattle Relations Association; Kim Dong Woon, Member, Boryeong-Seattle Relations Association; John Chang, President, Shoreline Sister Cities Association; Sue Walker, Superintendent, Shoreline Public Schools; Dan Mann, Board Member, Shoreline School District; Vicki Stiles, Executive Director, Shoreline Historical Museum; Lee Lambert, President, Shoreline Community College; Judy Smith, President, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce; Amy

Daybert, Editor, Shoreline/LFP Enterprise; Andrew Kim, Shoreline Sister Cities Association; Cheryl Lee, Former President, Shoreline Sister Cities Association, Connie Samson, Shoreline Sister Cities Association; Sammy Samson, Shoreline Sister Cities Association

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mayor Ransom, who presided. John Chang, Shoreline Sister Cities Association President, provided translation. Mayor Ransom gave brief welcoming remarks and invited the guests to enjoy the dinner. At 6:40 p.m., Mayor Ransom introduced the Shoreline City Council and other invited guests. Boryeong City Mayor Shin introduced the members of the Boryeong delegation.

Mayor Ransom then read a proclamation recognizing the week of May 28-June 1 as "Boryeong City Week" and presented it to Mayor Shin. He then gave a speech in which he discussed the value of the sister city relationship with Boryeong City and emphasized a three-fold approach to sister city exchange activities:

1. Educational and cultural exchanges
2. Governmental and civic exchanges
3. Economic exchanges and business collaboration

Mayor Ransom then presented Mayor Shin with gifts and briefly remarked on the meaning and significance of the gifts. Mayor Shin then responded with remarks and presented Mayor Ransom with a gift.

John Chang, Shoreline Sister Cities Association President, concluded the meeting with remarks on the benefits that can be achieved through sister city relationships.

At 7:40 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

_____

Scott Passey, City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of June 13, 2007
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debra S. Tarry, Finance Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

It is necessary for the Council to formally approve expenses at the City Council meetings. The following claims/expenses have been reviewed pursuant to Chapter 42.24 RCW (Revised Code of Washington) "Payment of claims for expense, material, purchases-advancements."

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of $1,747,061.30 specified in the following detail:

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
05/06/07-05/19/07	5/25/2007	19095-19288	6360-6408	32832-32844	$462,066.46
					$462,066.46

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
5/31/2007	32814		$826,108.38
5/31/2007	32815	32817	$4,361.00
5/31/2007	25804		($4.27)
	27245		($8.73)
	29186		($68.84)
	31769		($69.36)
5/31/2007	32818	32821	$151.20
5/31/2007	32822	32831	$1,603.68
6/5/2007	32845	32846	$63,895.67
6/5/2007	32847	32855	$5,116.03
6/5/2007	32856	32864	$18,923.88
6/6/2007	32865	32892	$147,673.80
6/7/2007	32893	32902	$1,993.89
6/7/2007	32903	32938	$127,830.53

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
6/7/2007	32762		($500.00)
6/7/2007	32816		($110.00)
6/7/2007	32939		$95.00
6/12/2007	32940	32951	$16,069.78
6/13/2007	32952	32967	$71,933.20
			$1,284,994.84

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney_____

Council Meeting Date: July 25, 2007 **Agenda Item:** 7(c)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Settlement Agreement with Yakima County on Jail Services
DEPARTMENT:	City Attorney's Office
PRESENTED BY:	Ian Sievers, City Attorney

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

In 2002, Shoreline joined a coalition of other King County cities in negotiating a long term contract with Yakima County to house city inmates awaiting trial in municipal court or to serve a jail sentence following conviction. This initiative was in response to reluctance by King County to continue to offer its jail to suburban cities as a regional service. The resulting jail contract with Yakima County provided a lower cost for incarceration than the King County contract used by Shoreline since incorporation.

The Yakima contract established a duty of prisoner care and supervision in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations; guaranteed a minimum number of daily jail beds available for city inmates; and provided bus transportation for inmates to and from the Renton jail.[1] In exchange, each city paid a set daily fee per inmate and collectively committed to a 440 average daily bed usage for all city inmates. Yakima used the bed guarantee as a revenue stream to pay dept service on bonds to finance a new correctional facility for Yakima's needs and the interlocal agreement with King County cities as well as operating costs. The long term contract runs to the end of 2009.

The Jail Advisory Group (JAG), formed by city participants in the interlocal agreement to administer the contract, commissioned consultants to report on the Yakima jail operation in September 2006. The consultant's report found that delay in opening the new Yakima correction facility was contributing to overcrowding and contributing to violence in the inmate population. It also found unacceptable delay in providing medical care. Statements by Yakima County officials to the JAG and the local press indicated an unwillingness to open the completed new facility even after its shake-down operation because it would be less expensive to continue operation of the existing jail. In response to their consultant's report and likelihood of continuing problems in the old facility eleven of the contract cities, including Shoreline, filed a formal claim as a prerequisite to suit for breach of contract. Attachment A. Some cities substituted jail beds in alternate facilities at higher cost and several cities filed one-year notices to terminate the long-term interlocal with Yakima. Shoreline continued to use the Yakima

[1] A companion 2002 interlocal agreement with Renton and the coalition cities allowed use of the Renton jail as a short term holding facility and collection point.

facility while pursuing settlement negotiations based on corrective measures taken by Yakima to resolve some of the most acute problems of inmate safety and medical care as reported by the JAG consultant in January, 2007. Opening the new facility, however, was seen as the only satisfactory long term solution to overcrowded conditions and inmate safety.

Over the past several months the JAG and city attorneys of the contract cities have been negotiating a settlement to this dispute with Yakima County. Attachment B is the tentative agreement to settle claims which has been reached. It includes amendments and clarification of the existing interlocal agreement for jail facilities and requires Council authorization. Key terms of this agreement are:

- Yakima agrees to an enforceable commitment to fully operate the new correction facility. Yakima County opened two pods at the end of February in response to the cities claim of breach and commits to opening the remaining two pods by the end of this year absent the occurrence of certain limited circumstances defined in the agreement.

- The cities that remain in the jail interlocal will not be obligated to pay the guaranteed average bed usage of the original contract if Renton and Seattle leave the agreement. The guarantee will be reduced by the bed usage of these cities.

- Shoreline agrees to settle and withdraw its claim for possible past breaches of the interlocal agreement based on cures and the promise to open the rest of the correction facility. There is no waiver of future claims for breach.

- Yakima and JAG agree to detailed reporting protocols on jail operations to allow prompt notice of complaints and problems in the future.

- By settling, Shoreline will be given the same terms as those contract cities that reach a separate settlement with Yakima on more favorable terms.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact. Shoreline's proportional share of the collective guarantee bed cost will not change if Renton and Seattle follow through with their notice of intent to terminate participation in the jail interlocal agreement

RECOMMENDATION

Motion authorizing the city manager to sign the Agreement to Settle and Release Claims and Withdraw Terminations Related to Agreement to House Inmates.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Shoreline Claim against Yakima County
B. Agreement to Settle and Release Claims and Withdraw Terminations Related to Agreement to House Inmates.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ____

CITY OF AUBURN, a noncharter code city; CITY OF BELLEVUE, a noncharter code city; CITY OF DES MOINES, a noncharter code city; CITY OF FEDERAL WAY, a noncharter code city; CITY OF KIRKLAND, a noncharter code city; CITY OF LAKE FOREST PARK, a noncharter code city; CITY OF MERCER ISLAND, a noncharter code city; CITY OF REDMOND, a noncharter code city; CITY OF SEATTLE, a first-class charter city; CITY OF SHORELINE, a noncharter code city; CITY OF SNOQUALMIE, a noncharter code city; CITY OF TUKWILA, a noncharter code city, Claimants, vs. YAKIMA COUNTY, Defendant.	**CLAIM FOR DAMAGES** (RCW 4.96.010-.020)

To the Board of County Commissioners for Yakima County:

Pursuant to RCW 4.96.010 and .020, and to Yakima County Code § 2.98.090, you are hereby notified that the claimants, the Cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Des Moines, Federal Way, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island, Redmond, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie and Tukwila (collectively, "Claimants"), claim damages from Yakima County ("Yakima").

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

SUMMARY OF CLAIM

Claimants are among 35 municipalities (the "Cities") in King County that contract with Yakima for jail services. Claimants' claim for damages arises out of Yakima's refusal to open a new jail facility, as it is required to do pursuant to the terms of an agreement with the Cities, even though the new jail has been constructed and is ready to be opened. Because Yakima has refused to open its new jail, Claimants' inmates who are sent to Yakima are housed in Yakima's old jail facility in conditions that a consultant team has described as overcrowded and unsafe. Yakima has stated that it does not have sufficient funds to open the new jail, but this assertion is both legally unavailing and factually unsupported. The Cities pay Yakima more than $8 million annually to house City inmates, a rate that was calculated to provide sufficient funds for Yakima to open and operate the new jail. Instead, Yakima has applied the money to its general fund. Claimants have therefore suffered damage in the form of overpayments to Yakima.

Moreover, Yakima's breach of its contractual obligations has forced Seattle to send some of its inmates to another jail, at substantial cost, and has forced Claimants to seek alternative jail space for their inmates. This claim seeks payment of all of Claimants' losses caused by Yakima's breach of contract, including costs and overpayments incurred to date, and costs to be incurred in the future in securing alternative jail space.

CLAIMANTS

Claimants are municipal corporations organized under the laws of the State of Washington. Claimants' addresses are as follows:

City of Auburn
25 West Main St.
Auburn, Washington 98001

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

City of Bellevue
450 110th Ave. NE
Bellevue, Washington 98009

City of Des Moines
21630 11th Avenue South
Des Moines, Washington 98198

City of Federal Way
33325 8th Ave. S.
Federal Way, Washington 98063

City of Kirkland
123 Fifth Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033

City of Lake Forest Park
17425 Ballinger Way NE
Lake Forest Park, Washington 98155

City of Mercer Island
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, Washington 98040

City of Redmond
15670 NE 85th Street
Redmond, Washington 98073

City of Seattle
600 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98124

City of Shoreline
17544 Midvale Ave. N.
Shoreline, Washington 98133

City of Snoqualmie
8020 Railroad Ave. SE
Snoqualmie, Washington 98065

City of Tukwila
6200 Southcenter Blvd.
Tukwila, Washington 98188

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

FACTS

Contract Between Cities and Yakima

In or around August 2002, the Cities and Yakima entered into an interlocal agreement for jail services (the "Agreement"), under which the Cities agreed to rent jail beds from the Yakima County Department of Corrections and Security. Prior to execution of the Agreement by all parties, the Cities and Yakima agreed to modify certain provisions of the Agreement. The Cities and Yakima then entered into an Addendum ("Addendum") to the Agreement, effective October 31, 2002, containing the modifications, including an extension of the termination date. The Agreement and the Addendum were signed by all of the Cities and by Yakima.

In the Agreement and Addendum, Yakima agreed to maintain its correctional facilities, including a new jail facility, to care for and house inmates from the Cities. In exchange for Yakima's commitment to provide care, housing and security for City inmates, the Cities agreed to pay Yakima a fee according to a specified schedule.

In the Agreement and Addendum, Yakima agreed to a "Minimum Bed Guarantee." Beginning on October 1, 2003, Yakima guaranteed a minimum of 440 daily jail beds for City inmates. The Cities agreed to pay Yakima for the specified number of jail beds, even if the actual number of City inmates sent to Yakima were to fall below the Minimum Bed Guarantee.

The Agreement and Addendum required Yakima to exercise due diligence to complete its new jail facility, at which point Yakima would be required to begin accepting City inmates in the new jail:

> Following the commencement of construction, Yakima County agrees to exercise due diligence to complete the New Jail Facility, the occupancy date, following the shakedown period, is currently estimated by Yakima County to be July 1, 2004. Upon receipt of a full or temporary certificate of occupancy for the New Jail Facility, and upon completion of the required "shakedown period," Yakima

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

County agrees to accept City Inmates pursuant to this Agreement in the New Jail Facility.

Addendum, § 2(c) (modifying Agreement, § 2; emphasis added).

In or around November 2004, the Cities and Yakima entered into a Second Amendment to the interlocal agreement (the "Second Amendment"), which became effective on December 31, 2004. Among other terms, the Second Amendment provided that the Cities would pay a reduced fee for up to 100 beds of the 440 bed commitment.

During the negotiation of the Agreement, the Addendum, and the Second Amendment, representatives of Yakima repeatedly assured the Cities that the County would build and open the new jail. The bed rental fee that was negotiated, including the reduced fee in the Second Amendment, was calculated by Yakima staff to cover the Cities' share of the operating and debt service costs for both Yakima's existing jail facilities and the new jail. Yakima's commitment to build, open and operate the new jail was an essential inducement for the Cities to enter into the long-term interlocal agreement and amendments.

The Cities, including Claimants, have complied with all of their contractual duties and obligations. Pursuant to the Agreement, the Addendum, and the Second Amendment, the Cities have paid Yakima more than $8 million per year to house City inmates and to provide funding for Yakima to open and operate the new jail. In 2006, the Cities are scheduled to pay Yakima approximately $8.76 million.

Consultant Report

In or around September 2005, the Cities retained two consultants with extensive experience in administering and working with correctional facilities to undertake an assessment of inmate safety and the quality of medical care being delivered to inmates in the Yakima County jail. On November 30, 2005, the consultants issued their report. Their principal recommendation was that,

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

in order to improve the level of inmate safety, Yakima should open the new jail (referred to in the Report as the "Justice Center"):

> **Recommendations**. The two most important steps that could be taken to increase levels of inmate safety are to begin to use the currently vacant Justice Center to relieve crowding in the Main Jail Complex and to continue efforts to introduce a modified direct supervision management model in the Annex. . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> While operational changes in the Main Jail and Annex can reduce levels of violence and enhance the level of inmate safety, virtually anything done in those two facilities will be something of a stopgap measure. The facilities are going to remain crowded, idleness is likely to continue, and other compromises of strong correctional practice will continue to be necessary. **Our recommendation for a more permanent solution is to open the new Justice Center**. [Emphasis in original.]

Yakima's Refusal to Open New Jail

A certificate of occupancy was issued for the new jail in or around August 2005. In or around November 2005, the new jail began its "shakedown mode" (i.e., a test run of its facilities, systems and procedures). More than 100 inmates, including City inmates, were transferred to the new jail for the shakedown.

On or about December 5, 2005, the Cities sent a letter to the Yakima County Administrator and Yakima County Department of Corrections officials requesting a formal response to the consultants' report. The letter requested that Yakima provide a specific work plan to implement the report's recommendations, in particular the opening of the new jail.

On or about January 12, 2006, Steve Robertson, Director of the Yakima County Department of Corrections, sent a letter in response to the Cities' December 5 letter. With respect to the new jail (referred to in Mr. Robertson's letter as the "JC"), Mr. Robertson stated that it was "currently in 'shakedown mode.'" He acknowledged that the shakedown was nearly complete, but further stated: "As you know, we are not scheduled to open the new JC in 2006." In fact, this was not something

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

of which the Cities were "aware." The Agreement had contemplated that the new jail would be ready to house inmates by July 1, 2004. Even though that date had been delayed, the Cities assumed the new jail would open and be operational in 2006 once the shakedown was complete. Mr. Robertson's letter closed by claiming that Yakima had insufficient funds to operate the new jail.

On or about February 28, 2006, in response to Mr. Robertson's letter, the Cities wrote a letter to the Yakima County Commissioners expressing the Cities' "grave concerns" regarding Yakima's apparent intent to breach the terms of the Agreement by refusing to open the new jail. The Cities cited the contractual provisions requiring Yakima to construct, open and accept City inmates in the new jail, and representations made by Yakima during contract negotiations:

> In 2004, when the second amendment to the contract was negotiated, Yakima County representatives continued to assure the Cities that the county would be building and opening the new jail. During these negotiations Yakima County staff developed the reduced rate fee for up to 100 unused beds. This fee was intentionally calculated by your staff to cover both the debt service and the fixed costs associated with the full operation of the new jail.

In response to Mr. Robertson's claims that Yakima had insufficient funds to operate the new jail, the Cities noted that such claims were without factual or legal basis:

> Any financial constraints the county may be facing do not relieve the county of its legal obligation to open and operate the New Jail Facility. Additionally, under the terms of our agreement, the 35 cities will pay Yakima County $8.76 million to house city inmates in 2006. This funding is more than sufficient to cover the Cities' share of the operating and the debt service costs for both the existing and the new jails.

The letter further expressed the Cities' understanding that a certificate of occupancy for the new jail had been issued in August 2005, and that the shakedown had begun in November 2005. The Cities demanded that Yakima open the new jail by July 1, 2006.

The Yakima County Commissioners responded in a letter dated March 8, 2006, which stated that the shakedown period had been extended until June 2006. In response to the demand to open the new jail, the Commissioners claimed that the Agreement "clearly obligates [the Cities] to

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

provide Yakima County with acceptable inmate populations to fully open, and operate the New Jail Facility as intended." The Commissioners cited no provision imposing any obligation on the Cities to provide "acceptable inmate populations," and in fact the Agreement contains no such provision.

On or about May 23, 2006, Yakima County ended the shakedown. In announcing the termination, Yakima noted that while the shakedown has disclosed certain problems, all of these had been repaired. The new jail, although fully constructed, is not open and houses no inmates.

Yakima's actions constitute breach of contract and breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

DAMAGES

The Cities pay Yakima more than $8 million annually to house City inmates, a rate that was calculated to provide sufficient funds for Yakima to open and operate the new jail. Because Claimants have been paying Yakima to house City inmates in a new jail that Yakima has refused to open and operate, they have suffered and will continue to suffer damage in the form of overpayments to Yakima. The amount of that damage is unknown at this time.

Moreover, in light of Yakima's continued breach of its obligation to open the new jail and breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, Claimants and the other Cities have undertaken an exhaustive search for alternative jail space to house City inmates. Yakima's breaches have caused Seattle to send some of its inmates to another jail, at a cost to date to Seattle of more than $415,000, and will further force Claimants to incur additional expenses in the future in locating and securing alternative jail space. The amount of that damage is unknown at this time.

Demand is hereby made that Yakima pay Claimants their losses caused by Yakima's breach of contract, including but not limited to expenses and overpayments incurred to date, and expenses to be incurred in the future in securing alternative jail space.

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

FINAL DECISION REQUESTED

Claimants request that the Board of County Commissioners for Yakima County make a final decision on this claim.

The undersigned declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this _____ day of September, 2006.

CITY OF AUBURN

By: _____
Daniel B. Heid, WSBA No. 8217
Auburn City Attorney

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF BELLEVUE

LORI M. RIORDAN, City Attorney

By: _____
Siona D. Windsor, WSBA No. 22785
Assistant City Attorney

CITY OF DES MOINES

By: _____
Anthony A. Piasecki
Des Moines City Manager

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

CITY OF FEDERAL WAY

By: _____
Patricia A. Richardson, WSBA No. 16419
Federal Way City Attorney

CITY OF KIRKLAND

By: _____
Robin S. Jenkinson, WSBA No. 10853
Kirkland City Attorney

CITY OF LAKE FOREST PARK

By: _____
Michael P. Ruark, WSBA No. 2220
Lake Forest Park City Attorney

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

By: _____
Londi K. Lindell, WSBA No. 14427
Mercer Island City Attorney

CITY OF REDMOND

By: _____
James E. Haney, WSBA No. 11058
Redmond City Attorney

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

CITY OF SEATTLE

THOMAS A. CARR
Seattle City Attorney

By: _____
Gregory C. Narver, WSBA #18127
Assistant City Attorney

CITY OF SHORELINE

By: _____
Robert Olander
Shoreline City Manager

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE

By: _____
Patrick B. Anderson, WSBA No. 2487
Snoqualmie City Attorney

CITY OF TUKWILA

By: _____
Shelley Kerslake, WSBA No. 21820
Tukwila City Attorney

Thomas A. Carr
Seattle City Attorney
600 Fourth Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

AGREEMENT TO SETTLE AND RELEASE CLAIMS AND WITHDRAW TERMINATIONS RELATED TO AGREEMENT TO HOUSE INMATES

This Agreement to Settle and Release Claims and Withdraw Terminations Related to Agreement to House Inmates ("Settlement Agreement") is between Yakima County and the Cities that execute this Settlement Agreement ("Settling Cities").

RECITALS

A. WHEREAS, Yakima County and 35 King County cities (the "Cities") have entered into an Interlocal Agreement and addenda and amendments thereto (collectively, the "Agreement"), for the Yakima County Department of Corrections (YCDOC) to house the Cities' misdemeanor inmates; and

B. WHEREAS, the Cities have formed a Jail Advisory Group (JAG) and a Jail Operations Group (JOG) to facilitate the Cities' administration of the Agreement; and

C. WHEREAS, the Cities of Seattle and Renton (Terminating Cities) are also parties to the Agreement, the JAG and the JOG; and

D. WHEREAS, the Agreement calls for the construction, completion and operation of a New Jail Facility; and

E. WHEREAS, a dispute arose between Settling Cities and Terminating Cities and Yakima County regarding the opening of the New Jail Facility and other operational concerns raised in a 2005 report by consultant William C. Collins (Consultant) to the Cities; and

F. WHEREAS, on September 27, 2006, the Cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Des Moines, Federal Way, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island, Redmond, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, ("Claimants") filed a claim under chapter 4.96 RCW ("Claim") against Yakima County related to the dispute; and

G. WHEREAS, Renton on August 22, 2006, and, Seattle on December 8, 2006, gave Yakima County notice of their intent to terminate their Interlocal Agreements with Yakima County, and these two cities represent 182 of the 440 bed commitment under the Agreement; and

H. WHEREAS, the Cities of Auburn, Des Moines, and Snoqualmie ("Settling Terminating Cities") also gave Yakima County notice of their intent to terminate their Interlocal Agreements with Yakima County, and

I. WHEREAS, in January 2007, subsequent to the various cities' claims and notices of intent to terminate the Agreement, Consultant William Collins issued a report that documents significant improvements in inmate safety and medical care made by YCDOC during 2005 and 2006, and that YCDOC is committed to continued improvement in jail operations, including direct and modified direct inmate supervision; and

J. WHEREAS, Yakima County irrevocably intends to open and operate the New Jail Facility for the term of the Agreement; and

K. WHEREAS, Yakima County opened 2 of the 4 pods of the New Jail Facility, also known as the Justice Center, on February 27, 2007, and is doing all things necessary and appropriate to fully open and operate the Justice Center by December 31, 2007, and

L. WHEREAS, the Settling Cities recognize that full opening and safe operation of the New Jail Facility involve unpredictable factors that are beyond Yakima County's control including availability of good candidates to be hired to serve as corrections officers and support staff as well as retirement, resignation, and/or termination of existing corrections officers and staff; and

M. WHEREAS, under the Section 4 of the Agreement, the Minimum Bed Commitment of the Settling Cities is reduced by the ADP attributable to any city that terminates the Agreement; and

N. WHEREAS, Yakima does not seek to require Settling Cities to pay any amounts that, under the Agreement, are the responsibility of any terminating city, and

O. WHEREAS, Yakima County and the Settling Cities wish to resolve their differences and continue to be parties to the Agreement with the following commitments; and

P. WHEREAS, this Settlement Agreement is intended to clarify but not to change terms of the Agreement,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits to be derived, Yakima and the Settling Cities agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Opening and Operation of New Jail Facility.

A. Yakima County irrevocably intends to open and operate the New Jail Facility for the term of the Agreement. Therefore, Yakima County shall do everything reasonably within its control to open the 3rd and 4th pods of the New Jail Facility on or before December 31, 2007, and to fully operate the New Jail Facility for the term of the Agreement.

B. Circumstances reasonably beyond the control of Yakima County that prevent safe opening and/or operation of the New Jail Facility shall excuse Yakima County from opening all 4 pods of the New Jail Facility on or before December 31, 2007, and/or from subsequently operating the New Jail Facility for the term of the Agreement. Such circumstances include, without limitation, availability of good candidates to be hired as corrections officers and support staff as well as retirement, resignation, and/or termination of existing corrections officers and staff. Provided however, "circumstances" shall not include decisions, acts or omissions arising or resulting in whole or in part from budgetary or financial considerations or circumstances, or termination by any King County city of its Inmate Housing Agreement with Yakima County.

C. If, due to circumstances reasonably beyond the control of Yakima County, all 4 pods of the New Jail Facility are not open and operating by December 31, 2007, and/or for the term of the Agreement, Yakima County shall remain obligated to continue to do all things necessary and appropriate to fully open and operate the New Jail Facility as soon as possible after December 31, 2007, and to fully operate the New Jail Facility for the term of the Agreement.

2. Financial Responsibility of Settling Cities.

A. The Minimum Bed Commitment of the Settling Cities and Settling Terminating Cities shall, pursuant to Section 4 of the Agreement, be reduced by the ADP attributable to any city that terminates the Agreement.

B. At no time shall Settling Cities be responsible to pay for another city's alleged or actual minimum bed commitment.

3. Release of Settling Cities' Claims and Withdrawal of Notice of Termination.

A. Settling Cities release and forever discharge Yakima, its elected officials, officers, employees and agents from the Claims they filed against Yakima County on September 27, 2006, and from any known claims, damages, and/or causes of action for failing to open the New Jail Facility.

B. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, this release does not extend to:

1. Settling Cities' rights under Paragraph 16(b) of the Agreement, as amended, except as specifically released herein.

2. Claims by Settling Cities arising out of or resulting from Yakima's promises and/or obligations contained in this Settlement Agreement which are to be fulfilled in the future.

C. The notices of termination of each of the Settling Terminating Cities are withdrawn with prejudice with respect to events prior to the date of the execution of this Settlement Agreement that are known to said Cities, except in the event Yakima County breaches Section 1 of this Settlement Agreement, such notices shall have the same effect they had on the day before the date of the execution of this Settlement Agreement.

4. Release of Yakima County Claims.

Yakima County releases and forever discharges the Settling Cities, their elected officials, officers, employees and agents from any claims, damages and/or causes of action, including but not limited to defamation, slander, false light, negligent or intentional interference with business expectations, attorney's fees and cost, arising out of or resulting from Cities' September 27, 2006, Claim against Yakima County.

5. Operational Reporting:

As further consideration for the promises and commitments made by the Settling Cities herein, Yakima County shall report the following information to the JAG:

A. Total daily population per jail facility, on a weekly basis (i.e. custody report);

B. Number of city inmates housed in special housing, by category of special housing, on a weekly basis;

C. Inmate assaults broken down by jail facility and floor area, on a monthly basis (i.e. report titled Assaults by Month, Location);

D. Next business day reporting to affected city of Transport Referral Form with supporting documentation; and

E. Inmate grievances, providing number of grievances by category, for total population, on a monthly basis.

The JAG shall be responsible for forwarding all information provided under this section to the Cities. The frequency and nature of the requested reports may be changed by *mutual agreement.*

6. Inmate Housing Classification.

A. Yakima County will maintain an inmate housing classification system, and will assist the JAG to understand classification issues that affect Cities' inmates' housing assignments.

B. Yakima County will, consistent with Yakima County's operational necessity, provide Settling Cities reasonable advance notice of changes to the classification system to permit comment.

7. JAG Meetings.

The YCDOC Director, or his/her designee, shall attend JAG meetings and report on any issues as requested.

8. Agreements with Other Cities

If Yakima County enters into an agreement with, or otherwise permits, a non-settling city that is a current party to the Agreement to house its inmates at Yakima County on terms more favorable than those contained in the Agreement or in this Settlement Agreement, such more favorable terms shall apply to all Settling Cities. For purposes of this section, "terms more favorable " shall include any term or condition applicable to housing inmates, such as minimum bed commitment, bed rates or other financial obligations, termination, or commitments or conditions for opening and operating the New Jail Facility, that, compared to the Agreement or this Settlement Agreement, provides some benefit or reduces some burden to the non-settling city.

9. Effect on Interlocal Agreement.

This Settlement Agreement is not intended to reduce the rights or obligations of Settling Cities and Yakima County contained in the Agreement except as it relates to the impacts of Terminating Cities as described above. The provisions of this Settlement

Agreement related to operational protocols are clarifications of the rights and obligations under the Agreement.

10. Advice of Counsel.

The Settling Cities and Yakima County warrant that they are each represented by counsel or have the opportunity for said representation and that counsel, if any, have fully explained the provisions of this Settlement Agreement and that all parties have had an opportunity to participate in its drafting.

11. Non-admission.

This Settlement is solely for the purpose of settling disputed claims and shall not be construed as an admission by Yakima or Settling Cities as an admission of any liability or wrongdoing.

12. Headings

The Section headings in this Settlement Agreement are inserted for convenience only and are not intended to be used in the interpretation of the contents of the Sections they introduce.

13. Severability.

If any of the provisions of this Settlement Agreement are held to be invalid or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall nevertheless continue to be valid and enforceable.

14. Binding Effect on Signatories

This Settlement Agreement shall be binding on Yakima County only after nine of the following cities: Auburn, Bellevue, Des Moines, Federal Way, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island, Redmond, Shoreline, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, have executed this Settlement Agreement, and its effective date shall be the date the ninth of these cities executes this Settlement Agreement. Yakima County shall not delay executing the Settlement Agreement pending Settling Cities obtaining authorization from their legislative bodies to execute this Agreement.

15. Attorney's Fees and Costs.

Any attorney's fees and/or costs incurred by Settling Cities and/or Yakima related to the disputes resolved by this Settlement Agreement shall be borne by the respective party who incurred said fees or costs.

16. Breach of Settlement Agreement.

The prevailing party in any litigation brought to enforce this Settlement Agreement is entitled to reimbursement for its reasonable attorney's fees and all reasonable costs and expenses incurred in addition to any damages and equitable relief.

17. Governing Law

This Settlement Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Washington.

18. Counterpart Copies

This Settlement Agreement may be signed in counterpart or duplicate copies, and any signed counterpart or duplicate copy shall be equivalent to a signed original for all purposes.

YAKIMA COUNTY

Date: May 15, 2007

Attest:

Christina S. Steiner,
Clerk of the Board

SEAL OF THE BOARD OF YAKIMA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS STATE OF WASHINGTON

Michael D. Leita, Chairman

Ronald F. Gamache, Commissioner

J. Rand Elliott, Commissioner

CONSTITUTING
THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR YAKIMA COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Approved as to form:

Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

City of Auburn

Date:

By:_____

Approved as to form:

_____
City Attorney

City of Bellevue

Date:

By:_____

Approved as to form:

_____
City Attorney

This page intentionally left blank

Council Meeting Date: June 25, 2007 **Agenda Item: 7(d)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Government Contracts Agreement (GCA) and Future Amendments between the City of Shoreline and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate funding totaling $10 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street)
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works Department
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor/Interurban Trail Project Manager Phil Ramon, Administrative Services Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: Staff is requesting Council to authorize the City Manager to execute a Government Contracts Agreement (GCA) and future amendments between the City of Shoreline and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate $10 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street). WSDOT will be issuing two agreements; the first agreement will include the $3 Million for the Right of Way Phase, the second and final agreement will include the $7 Million for the Construction Phase for a total of $10 Million for the entire project. These funds originated from a gas tax approved by Washington State voters in November 2006.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street – N. 205th Street) is identified as the No. 4 Goal of the Council's 2007 - 2008 Work Plan. This project is also identified in the City's 2007 - 2012 Capital and Transportation Improvement Programs. The following provides a summary of the funding sources for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street – N. 205th Street):

Funding Sources	Amount
Roads Capital Fund	$10,490,354
Federal STP – C	$7,410,473
Federal STP Funds	$3,600,000
Federal - STP –U	$525,361
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	$855,472
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	$1,368,755
New Gas Tax Funding	**$10,000,000**
Nickel Gas Tax Funding	$2,100,000
King County	$2,401,742
Regional Mobility Transit Grant *	$2,500,000
Future Funding	$36,688,524
Total	**$77,940,681**

The following provides key elements of the GCA:

- The original agreement will provide funding totaling $3 Million for the Right of Way Phase of the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street – N. 205th Street).

- Funding for construction and construction administration will be addressed by supplemental agreements.

- The City shall submit progress billings for the actual direct and related indirect costs of work to the State for the 2007 – 2009 biennium. All progress billings must be submitted by the City to the State prior to May 15, 2009 for the Right of Way Phase.

- The City agrees that an audit may be conducted by the State.

In accordance with purchasing policies, Council authorization is required in order for staff to obligate grant funds exceeding $50,000.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a Government Contracts Agreement (GCA) and future amendments with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate funds totaling $10 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street).

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

Council Meeting Date: June 25, 2007 **Agenda Item: 7(e)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Regional Mobility Grant Program State Funding Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate funding totaling $2.5 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street)
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor/Interurban Trail Project Manager Phil Ramon, Administrative Services Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: Staff is requesting Council to authorize the City Manager to execute a Regional Mobility Grant Program State Funding Agreement between the City of Shoreline and WSDOT Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to obligate $2.5 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street. These funds will be programmed during the Construction Phase of the project.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street – N. 205th Street) is identified as the No. 4 Goal of the Council's 2007 - 2008 Work Plan. This project is also identified in the City's 2007 - 2012 Capital and Transportation Improvement Programs. The following provides a summary of the funding sources for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street – N. 205th Street):

Funding Sources	Amount
Roads Capital Fund	$10,490,354
Federal STP – C	$7,410,473
Federal STP Funds	$3,600,000
Federal - STP –U	$525,361
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	$855,472
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	$1,368,755
New Gas Tax Funding	$10,000,000
Nickel Gas Tax Funding	$2,100,000
King County	$2,401,742
Regional Mobility Transit Grant	**$2,500,000**
Future Funding	$36,688,524
Total	**$77,940,681**

The following provides key elements of the Regional Mobility Grant Program State Funding Agreement:

- The regional mobility grant has been established to aid local governments in funding projects such as inter county connectivity service, park and ride lots, rush hour transit service, and capital projects that improve the connectivity and efficiency of the transportation system,
- The expiration date for the funding is June 30, 2009
- The project participation rate shall be 5.84%

In accordance with purchasing policies, Council authorization is required in order for staff to obligate grant funds exceeding $50,000.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a Regional Mobility Grant Program State Funding Agreement with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDDOT) to obligate funds totaling $2.5 Million for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165th Street to N. 205th Street).

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

Council Meeting Date: June 25, 2007 **Agenda Item:** 7(f)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Reserve Policies
DEPARTMENT:	Finance Department
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:
The City's current adopted financial policies provide for maintaining an operating contingency reserve, unreserved operating fund balances, a budgeted operating contingency, and a budgeted insurance contingency. Staff has reviewed the current policies and is recommending that the City Council repeal the current policies and adopt new reserve policies that support the City's long-term fiscal stability goals and that would be more transparent and understandable to the public.

BACKGROUND

Adequate fund balance and reserve levels are a necessary component of the City's overall financial management strategy and a key factor in external agencies' measurement of the City's financial strength.

The City needs to maintain operating reserves for these primary purposes: a buffer for unexpected economic changes, to manage the City's cash flow needs, provide resources to pay for the City's insurance deductibles in the case of unexpected damage to the City's assets (buildings, equipment, infrastructure) and to provide flexibility for unexpected expenditures.

Current Policies
In 2000 the City adopted the following reserve policies:

Contingency Reserve
It is the City's policy to maintain a contingency reserve in accordance with RCW 35A.33.145. The reserve will be available for unforeseen urgent or emergency needs. The contingency reserve is intended to provide for unanticipated expenditures or revenue shortfalls of a non-recurring nature. The maximum allowable amount in the contingency reserve is 37.5 cents per thousand dollars of assessed valuation.

Unreserved Fund Balance
It is the City's policy to maintain a unreserved balance in each of the operating funds of the City (i.e., General, City Streets) at a level sufficient to provide for cash flow needs, a reasonable amount for emergent or unforeseen needs, and an orderly adjustment to adverse changes in revenues, including termination of revenue sources through actions of other governmental bodies. The Finance Director, in conjunction with the

departments and the City Manager, will analyze fund balance requirements and recommend formal fund balance policies for each of the principal City funds. Fund balance policies will be reviewed at least every three years to ensure all relevant factors are being considered. Until such time as a thorough analysis has been completed for each fund, the City's policy will be to provide a minimum fund balance (combination of Contingency Reserve and Unreserved Fund Balance) of at least 10% of budgeted operating revenues for the General Fund and a minimum unreserved fund balance of 5% of budgeted operating revenues for other City operating funds.

Budgeted Operating Contingency

In order to provide for unforeseen expenditures or new opportunities throughout the year, the General Fund budget will have an operating contingency of $250,000 that will be used only with City Council approval. Savings within departmental budgets throughout the year will be the first source for funding unforeseen expenditures or providing for new opportunities before the Operating Contingency is accessed.

Budgeted Insurance Reserve

A separate insurance reserve account will be budgeted within the General Fund budget to be used for potential substantial events (street damage, inverse condemnation, etc.) and infrastructure repair not covered by insurance policies or other sources such as FEMA. The budgeted amount should approximate 2% of the City's assets (not including roads and surface water utilities).

Current Reserve Levels

As of January 1, 2007, the City had the following operating reserves:

General Fund Unreserved Fund Balance	$ 8,482,000
General Reserve Fund	$ 2,275,000
Total General Operating Reserves	$10,757,000
City Street Fund	$ 947,000

The required operating reserve levels per the City's adopted financial policies are:

General Fund Unreserved Fund Balance:	
Insurance Reserve	$ 255,000
Budget Contingency	$ 250,000
Fund Balance	$ 2,862,270
General Reserve Fund	$ 2,445,389
Total General Operating Reserves	$ 5,812,659
City Street Fund	$ 121,104

Comparing the actual General Operating Reserves as of January 1, 2007, and the reserve levels required, actual levels exceeded required levels by $4,944,341. Even though this is the case, staff believes that the current policy does not provide adequate General Operating Reserves. The current policy does not provide a reserve level adequate to manage the City's operating cash flow needs or provide adequate reserve levels in the case of recessionary pressures.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

General Reserve Fund

Staff is recommending that Council eliminate the "General Reserve Fund", which has a legal cap on the amount of funds that can be accumulated. Instead, staff would recommend that Council establish a "Revenue Stabilization Fund". The purpose of the fund would be to set aside adequate reserves to cover revenue shortfalls over a recessionary period and basically serve as an "emergency savings account" for the City.

Cities have used a variety of formulas either tied to expenditure activity or revenue activity to establish such a reserve. Some formulas used by other cities include:

- A percentage of operating revenues or operating expenditures
- An amount equal to a certain number of months of expenditures such as the average of three months of general fund expenditures. (For Shoreline this would be approximately $7.7 to $7.9 million)
- A percentage of economically sensitive operating revenues for certain amount of time. The City of Des Moines uses such a formula which is defined as 10% of economically sensitive revenues to cover revenue shortfalls over a three year recessionary period. (For Shoreline this would be approximately $6 million)

Staff would recommend that the City use a formula similar to that used by the City of Des Moines. The Revenue Stabilization Fund would accumulate an amount equal to 30% of annually budgeted economically sensitive revenues. Economically sensitive revenues include sales tax, gambling tax, utility tax, investment interest, state-shared revenues, permit fees, and recreation fees. Since historically recessions and their related recoveries have lasted two to three years, staff believes it is important to maintain a three year level of the recommended 10% of economically sensitive revenues, or 30% of the annually budgeted amount. For 2007 the amount required would be $5,792,000.

Investment revenue from the investment of this reserve would go to the City's general fund to support operating services. This will be necessary to obtain the level of investment interest that is currently budgeted within the City's General Fund.

General Fund Operating Reserves

In order to adequately manage the cash flows within the City's General Fund the City must maintain an operating reserve within the General Fund of $3 million. This is primarily because the General Fund expenditures tend to occur on a relatively equal basis each month throughout the year, while many of the substantial revenue sources are received on a quarterly basis (i.e., gambling tax, utility taxes) or semi-annually (i.e., property tax). In reviewing the General Fund cash flow for 2005 and 2006 it appears that the largest negative cash flow balance during the year was $2.5 million. Reserves allow the City to manage the cash flow adequately so that we do not have to borrow monies and pay interest during times of the year when there is a negative cash flow.

In addition to the need to manage cash flow, staff would recommend that the Council continue the policy of budgeting a budget contingency and insurance reserve. Staff would recommend that the budget contingency be $550,000, approximately 2% of

budgeted operating revenues, and the insurance contingency of $255,000. This would be a total of $805,000 in reserve contingencies.

The total recommended General Fund Operating Reserve would be $3,805,000 .

City Street Reserves

Staff recommends that the City Street reserves be set at 20% of operating revenues. The primary reason to establish reserves at this level is to provide adequate reserves to manage the cash flows of the fund. The operating revenues for the City Street fund are $1,021,000 for 2007. A 20% reserve level is approximately $200,000. The remaining revenues used to provide maintenance for City streets comes from the General Fund.

Total General Operating Reserves

If the Council agrees to revise the current operating reserve policy, as recommended by staff, the required 2007 operating reserves would be as follows:

General Fund Operating Reserve:	
Insurance Deductible Reserve	$ 255,000
Budget Contingency	$ 550,000
Cash Flow Reserve	$ 3,000,000
Total General Fund Operating Reserve	$ 3,805,000
Revenue Stabilization Fund	$ 6,000,000

The combination of the General Fund Operating Reserve and the Revenue Stabilization Fund are $9,805,000. This is approximately $952,000 less than current general operating reserve levels of $10.757 million. It should be noted that the $952,000 includes the $838,000 in one-time savings from 2006.

The City's financial policies state that resources (fund balance) greater than budget estimates in any fund shall be considered "one-time' resources and shall not be used to fund ongoing service delivery programs. If the Council chooses to modify the existing operating reserve policy and spend any reserves in excess of required levels then this needs to be done with the expectation that the funds are used for one-time purposes. To date the Council has discussed using approximately $116,000 of the excess reserves for funding for the Senior Center and the YMCA.

At any time in the future if operating reserves drop below required levels the City will need to include in its annual budget funds to bring reserves to the required levels.

Other Reserves

In addition to the City's general operating reserves (General Fund, General Reserve and Street Fund) the City has fund balance in designated funds (those funds which have revenues that have been designated for a specific purpose such as code abatement, equipment replacement or drug seizure) and fund balance in funds that restricted for specific purposes (those funds in which there is a legal requirement that the resources must be spent for a specific purpose such as capital or surface water revenues).

Staff recommends that Council include in a modified reserve/fund balance policy the following:

- The City shall maintain reserves required by law, ordinance and/or bond covenants.
- The City shall maintain reserves in the Enterprise Funds as follows:
  - Surface Water Utility Fund – 15% - 25% of total budgeted operating expenses plus any fund balance dedicated for future surface water capital improvements.
- Reserve balances of other funds shall be set through the budget process in an amount consistent with the purpose and nature of the fund.
- The City will maintain fully funded reserves for the replacement of City equipment, vehicles, personal computers, and computer network hardware. Contributions will be made through assessments to the using funds and maintained on a per asset basis. *This is the City's current practice.*

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact to revising the City's reserve policies. The City currently has operating reserves within the City's General Fund in excess of the recommended policy revisions by approximately $952,000. If the Council allocates any of the excess reserves for expenditures it should be for one-time items, as per the City's financial policies. To date the Council has discussed using $116,000 of these monies for one-time funding for the Senior Center and the YMCA.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Council adopt by motion revised reserve policies as is provided in Attachment A to this staff report.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

ATTACHMENT A

RESERVE AND FUND BALANCE POLICIES

Adequate fund balance and reserve levels are a necessary component of the City's overall financial management strategy and a key factor in external agencies' measurement of the City's financial strength.

Maintenance of fund balance for each accounting fund assures adequate resources for cash flow and to mitigate short-term effects of revenue shortages. Reserve funds are necessary to enable the City to deal with unforeseen emergencies or changes in condition.

A. General Policy

The City shall maintain reserves required by law, ordinance and/or bond covenants.

All expenditures drawn from reserve accounts shall require prior Council approval unless previously authorized by the City Council for expenditure within the City's annual budget.

If reserves and/or fund balances fall below required levels as set by this policy, the City shall include within its annual budget a plan to restore reserves and/or fund balance to the required levels.

All reserves will be presented in the City's annual budget.

B. Revenue Stabilization Fund

The City will establish a Revenue Stabilization Fund and shall accumulate a reserve equal to thirty percent (30%) of annual economically sensitive revenues within the City's operating budget to cover revenue shortfalls resulting from unexpected economic changes or recessionary periods.

C. General Fund Operating Reserves

The City shall maintain a General Fund Operating Reserve to provide for adequate cash flow, budget contingencies, and insurance reserves. The General Fund Operating Reserves will be determined as follows:

1. Cash Flow Reserve: The City shall maintain a cash flow reserve within the General Fund in an amount equal to $3,000,000. This is approximately equal to 1.5 months of operating expenditures. The City will review annually the required cash flow reserve level that is necessary to meet the City's cash flow needs. If it is determined than $3,000,000 is not adequate, the Finance Director shall propose an amendment to these policies.
2. Budget Contingency: The City shall maintain a budget contingency reserve within the General Fund equal to 2% of budgeted operating revenues.

3. Insurance Deductible Reserve: The City shall maintain a an insurance reserve within the General Fund to be used for potential substantial events that cause damage to the City's fixed assets and/or infrastructure.

D. Equipment and Vehicle Replacement Reserves

The City will maintain fully funded reserves for the replacement of vehicles, computer equipment, and equipment identified on the City's fixed asset listing. Contributions will be made through assessments to the using funds and maintained on a per asset basis.

E. City Street Fund Reserve

The City shall maintain an operating reserve within the City's Street Fund an amount equal to 20% of annually budgeted operating revenues.

F. Surface Water Utility Fund Reserve

The City shall maintain an operating reserve within the Surface Water Utility Fund an amount equal to no less than 20% of budgeted operating revenues.

This page intentionally left blank

Council Meeting Date: June 25, 2007 **Agenda Item:** 8(a)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing - Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On June 11, 2007, staff presented the proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP to the City Council. The following schedule is being followed to facilitate the adoption of the 2008 – 2013 CIP.

June 11, 2007	Presentation of the Proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP and TIP
June 18, 2007	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP and TIP
June 25, 2007	Public Hearing and Council Discussion on the Proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP and TIP
July 2, 2007	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP and TIP
July 9, 2007	Council Adoption of 2008 – 2013 CIP and 2008 – 2013 TIP

Tonight, a public hearing is being held to give the public a formal opportunity to comment on the proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP. Following the public hearing the City Council will have an opportunity for additional discussion about the CIP. Copies of the proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP are available in the City Clerk's Office at City Hall, the Shoreline and Richmond Beach Libraries, the Neighborhood Police Storefronts and the City's website for review by the public.

RCW 35.77.010 law requires that all cities, towns, counties, and transit agencies review and revise their Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) annually. The plan needs to be submitted to the Washington State Department of Transportation before August 1, 2007. A public hearing must be held prior to adoption by resolution of the revised and extended TIP. The TIP will serve as the Roads Capital Fund section of the City's 2008 – 2013 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that has been submitted to Council for review.

The annual TIP update and adoption with a public hearing and by resolution is a state and federal requirement. The TIP is used to allocate federal and state funding. The City of Shoreline's TIP is incorporated into the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) adopted TIP and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The TIP lists all the transportation projects. A project must be included in the local agency's (City,

County or Transit Agency) TIP in order to be eligible for Federal or State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) funding.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The Proposed 2008 – 2013 CIP is balanced as required by the Growth Management Act and totals $172 million. The General Capital Fund totals $32.9 million; City Facilities/Major Maintenance Fund totals $340,000; Roads Capital Fund (2008 – 2013 TIP) totals $120.4 million; and Surface Water Utility Fund capital projects totals $18.3 million.
Attachment A is a summary of the proposed 2008 – 2013 Capital Improvement Plan. The TIP consists of the Roads Capital section of Attachment A.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council hold the public hearing and then discuss questions and/or issues that have been raised regarding the proposed CIP by the public or by the City Council.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A – Proposed 2008 – 2013 Capital Improvement Summary

City of Shoreline 2008 - 2013 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Total 2008-2013
General Capital							
Facilities Projects							
City Maintenance Facility	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,400,000	$0	$1,400,000
Civic Center/City Hall	$18,697,162	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$18,697,162
Parks Projects							
Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Improvements	$2,440,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,440,000
Parks Repair and Replacement	$241,000	$242,000	$252,000	$263,000	$273,000	$283,920	$1,554,920
Richmond Beach Area Park Improvements Pump Station	$381,000	$145,893	$0	$0	$0	$0	$526,893
Saltwater Park Pedestrian Bridge Major Repair	$220,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$220,000
Cromwell Park Improvements	$1,075,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,075,000
Boeing Creek Park Improvements	$943,899	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$943,899
Baseball/Softball Field Improvements	$110,000	$115,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$225,000
Hamlin Park Improvements	$85,000	$665,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$750,000
Kruckeberg Gardens	$475,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$475,000
Off Leash Dog Park	$140,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$140,000
Trail Corridors	$1,151,000	$1,309,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,460,000
Twin Ponds Park Soccer Field Improvements	$1,112,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,112,000
Twin Ponds Park Master Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$50,000
Open Space Projects							
Paramount Open Space	$164,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$164,000
Non-Project Specific							
General Capital Engineering	$71,498	$74,715	$78,077	$81,591	$85,263	$89,099	$480,243
General Fund Cost Allocation Charge	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$202,524
General Capital Fund Total	$27,340,313	$2,585,362	$363,831	$378,345	$1,792,017	$456,773	$32,916,641
City Facilities - Major Maintenance							
Facilities Projects							
Police Station Long-Term Maintenance	$0	$0	$0	$48,000	$0	$0	$48,000
Parks Projects							
Pool Long-Term Maintenance	$0	$0	$17,000	$0	$67,000	$88,000	$172,000
Richmond Highlands Community Center Long-Term Mainte	$40,000	$44,000	$36,000	$0	$0	$0	$120,000
City Facilities - Major Maintenance Fund Total	$40,000	$44,000	$53,000	$48,000	$67,000	$88,000	$340,000

City of Shoreline 2008 - 2013 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Total 2008-2013
Roads Capital Fund							
Pedestrian / Non-Motorized Projects							
Curb Ramp, Gutter & Sidewalk Program	$122,000	$130,000	$138,000	$145,000	$151,000	$157,000	$843,000
Sidewalks - Priority Routes	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$3,600,000
Traffic Small Works	$220,000	$232,000	$248,000	$261,000	$273,000	$285,000	$1,519,000
System Preservation Projects							
Annual Road Surface Maintenance Program	$822,000	$700,000	$700,000	$700,000	$700,000	$700,000	$4,322,000
Richmond Beach Overcrossing 167AOX	$2,940,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,940,000
Traffic Signal Rehabilitation	$168,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$168,000
Safety / Operations Projects							
Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program	$192,000	$202,000	$213,000	$223,000	$230,000	$239,000	$1,299,000
145th Dual Left Turn at Aurora and New Traffic Signal at 149th	$0	$0	$150,000	$175,000	$175,000	$0	$500,000
Traffic Signal at 170th/15th Ave NE	$365,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$365,000
Aurora Avenue North 165th-205th	$14,718,000	$18,719,311	$20,007,245	$18,060,685	$18,945,760	$0	$90,451,001
Aurora Avenue North 165th - 205th Utility Improvements	$0	$5,940,000	$6,415,000	$0	$0	$0	$12,355,000
Non-Project Specific							
Transportation Improvements Formulation & Engineering	$258,531	$270,165	$282,322	$295,027	$303,303	$321,952	$1,731,299
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$334,080
Roads Capital Fund Total	$20,461,211	$26,849,156	$28,809,247	$20,515,392	$21,433,743	$2,358,632	$120,427,380

City of Shoreline 2008 - 2013 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Total 2008-2013
Surface Water Capital							
Flood Protection Projects							
Surface Water Small Projects	$184,000	$197,000	$210,000	$222,000	$233,000	$243,000	$1,289,000
Boeing Creek Park Stormwater Project	$785,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$785,000
East Boeing Creek Drainage Improvements	$858,000	$469,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,327,000
Hillwood Park Emergency Bypass	$0	$0	$52,000	$387,000	$0	$0	$439,000
N 167th & Whitman Avenue N Drainage Impvs.	$152,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$152,000
N 148th St. Near Linden Ave N Drainage Improvement	$219,000	$46,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$265,000
Pan Terra Pond & Pump Project	$2,155,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,155,000
Pump Station No. 25	$0	$264,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$264,000
Cromwell Park Wetland	$291,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$291,000
Cromwell Park Pond	$291,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$291,000
Thornton Creek Corridor	$2,469,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,469,000
Ronald Bog Park Wetland	$0	$70,000	$501,000	$0	$0	$0	$571,000
Water Quality Facilities							
Darnell Park Wetpond	$123,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$123,000
Cromwell Park Wetpond	$165,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$165,000
Stream Rehabilitation/Habitat Enhancement							
Stream Rehab / Habitat Enhancement Program	$63,000	$67,000	$72,000	$76,000	$79,000	$83,000	$440,000
Boeing Creek Reach 1 - Bank Stabilization	$0	$730,000	$679,000	$875,000	$551,000	$405,000	$3,240,000
Boeing Creek Reach 8 - Bank Stabilization	$0	$304,000	$262,000	$434,000	$454,000	$0	$1,454,000
Green (Shore) Streets Initiative	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Non-Project Specific							
SWM CIP Project Formulation & Engineering	$281,371	$294,033	$307,265	$321,092	$335,541	$350,640	$1,889,942
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	$86,073	$86,073	$86,073	$86,073	$86,073	$86,073	$516,438
Surface Water Capital Fund Total	**$8,322,444**	**$2,527,106**	**$2,169,338**	**$2,401,165**	**$1,738,614**	**$1,167,713**	**$18,326,380**
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**$56,163,968**	**$32,005,624**	**$31,395,416**	**$23,342,901**	**$25,031,373**	**$4,071,118**	**$172,010,401**

City of Shoreline 2008 - 2013 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Total 2008-2013
RESOURCES							
General Fund Contribution	$874,509	$878,215	$892,017	$905,918	$919,920	$934,027	$5,404,605
Real Estate Excise Tax - 1st Quarter Percent	$841,500	$458,330	$475,497	$493,007	$510,867	$529,084	$3,308,285
Real Estate Excise Tax - 2nd Quarter Percent	$841,500	$858,330	$875,497	$893,007	$910,867	$929,084	$5,308,284
Fuel Tax	$603,138	$615,201	$627,505	$640,055	$652,856	$665,913	$3,804,669
Surface Water Fees	$1,174,820	$1,237,523	$1,181,639	$1,242,122	$1,347,513	$1,565,834	$7,749,451
Investment Interest Income	$569,192	$289,348	$268,822	$187,120	$208,643	$48,985	$1,572,111
Lease Savings & Revenue	$500,000	$200,000	$200,000	$200,000	$100,000	$0	$1,200,000
Municipal Financing	*$12,750,000*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	*$0*	$12,750,000
Other Financing for Surface Water	*$0*	*$1,500,000*	*$2,000,000*	*$1,500,000*	*$0*	*$0*	$5,000,000
Public Works Trust Fund Loan	$2,052,090	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,052,090
Grants - Awarded	$17,174,790	$16,344,662	$0	$0	$0	$0	$33,519,452
Future Grants	*$125,000*	*$75,000*	*$200,000*	*$225,000*	*$225,000*	*$50,000*	$900,000
Future Grants - Aurora 145th - 165th	*$0*	*$1,000,000*	*$16,507,000*	*$17,002,435*	*$16,662,553*	*$0*	$51,171,988
King County Mitigation (Brightwater, Hidden Lake)	$1,417,570	$145,893	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,563,463
Bond Issue	$6,245,000	$2,014,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,259,000
Utility Reimbursements	$0	$5,940,000	$6,415,000	$0	$0	$0	$12,355,000
In-Lieu of Sidewalk Fees	$49,003	$38,601	$118,406	$184,688	$0	$0	$390,698
LID Participation		$0	$0	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$900,000
Use of Accumulated Fund Balance	$10,945,856	$410,521	$1,634,034	($430,451)	$3,193,154	($951,809)	$14,801,305
TOTAL RESOURCES	**$56,163,968**	**$32,005,624**	**$31,395,416**	**$23,342,901**	**$25,031,373**	**$4,071,118**	**$172,010,401**