AGENDA (v.2)

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP DINNER MEETING

Monday, June 23, 2008 — Shoreline Conference Center
6:00 p.m. — Highlander Room

TOPICS/GUESTS: King County Sheriff's Office Update

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, June 23, 2008 — Shoreline Conference Center
7:30 p.m. — Mt. Rainier Room

		Page	Estimated Time
1.	**CALL TO ORDER**		7:30
2.	**FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**		
3.	**REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER**		
4.	**REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**		
5.	**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**		7:40

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. Speakers may address Council for up to three minutes, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. If more than 15 people are signed up to speak each speaker will be allocated 2 minutes. When representing the official position of a State registered non-profit organization or agency or a City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes and it will be recorded as the official position of that organization. Each organization shall have only one, five-minute presentation. The total public comment period under Agenda Item 5 will be no more than 30 minutes. Individuals will be required to sign up prior to the start of the Public Comment period and will be called upon to speak generally in the order in which they have signed. If time is available, the Presiding Officer may call for additional unsigned speakers.

6.	**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**		8:00
7.	**CONSENT CALENDAR**		8:00
	(a) Minutes of Study Session of May 5, 2008	1	
	Minutes of Business Meeting of May 12, 2008	15	
	(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of June 10, 2008 in the amount of $ 1,386,612.78	27	
	(c) Motion to Authorize an increase in the Construction Contract Authority for Road Construction Northwest, allowing the City Manager to execute a final contract change order in the	29	

amount of $52,931.05 and final payment for the North Central Segment of the Interurban Trail

(d) Motion to Authorize an Increase in the Construction Contract Authority for Gary Merlino Construction Company, allowing the City Manager to execute a change order and final payment for the Aurora Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project (N 145th Street – N 165th Street) and the Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project — 31

(e) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Sungard Public Sector for the purchase of software and consultant services to upgrade the City's financial system — 35

(f) Adoption of Shoreline Water District Franchise — 39

8. ACTION ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

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 2009-2014 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) — 41 — 8:10

9. ADJOURNMENT — 9:10

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 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.

 DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, May 5, 2008 - 6:30 p.m.
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ryu, Deputy Mayor Scott, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember McGlashan, and Councilmember Way.

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ryu, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

(a) Recognition of Outgoing Planning Commission Members

Mayor Ryu recognized David Harris, Robin McClelland, and Chakorn Phisuthikul for their service on the Planning Commission. David Harris thanked the City of Shoreline for opportunity to serve in this capacity and with other commissioners. Robin McClelland thanked the City and said this is her first time ever being appointed to anything and she was honored to serve. She added that the City of Shoreline Planning Commission is envied by many in the area and is a good, smart, and caring group.

(b) Proclamation of Building Safety Week

Mayor Ryu read the proclamation declaring "Building Safety Week" in the City of Shoreline. Ray Allshouse, Building Official, Mark Bunje, and Shoreline Fire Department Commissioner Jim Fisher were present and accepted the proclamation. Ray Allshouse accepted the proclamation on behalf of public code officials. Deputy Fire Chief Bogdonavich thanked the City on behalf of the Fire Department. Mark Bunje highlighted that the Fire Department has a great relationship with the City and that makes a big difference.

RECESS

At 6:45 p.m. Mayor Ryu called for a fifteen minute recess. Mayor Ryu reconvened the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Councilmember Hansen arrived at 7:02 p.m. Councilmember McConnell arrived at 7:03 p.m.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, stated that the Annual Volunteer Appreciation Breakfast was on May 2 and it was a tremendous success. He said in 2007 volunteers donated over 14,700 hours to the City of Shoreline. He provided reports and updates on various City projects, events, and meetings.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS: None

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Marianne Lee, Shoreline, stated that 179th Place is a private road and is ready to collapse. She said there is an open sinkhole and the contractor says the whole street is in imminent danger of collapse. She said she has written a letter and would like the Council to consider how to get some help in changing it from a private road to a public road. She added that garbage trucks can't drive on it and the residents can't afford to repair the street. She stated it is the cul-de-sac on Fremont Avenue and 179th Place.

b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, stated that the residents have heard that the Council is interested in green roofs, but access is needed to them. She added that solar panels also need to be accommodated. She said they need to consider ventilation systems for the removal of allergens and moisture to prevent mold. She commented that the Council reference to Regional Business (RB) infinite zoning offended her. She said RB is limited and it should be "width times length times height" to determine the limitations.

c) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, read the environmental impact statement for the Comprehensive Plan and is convinced that R-48 is the highest build-out for the modeling. He added if something higher is done then visioning isn't needed, but a customized permitting process could be in place for higher densities. He felt the City should embrace high density because it is an efficient use of land, but it needs to be planned. He commented that City staff reports tend to be one-sided, and once public comment is closed the City staff gets to speak and the residents can't respond.

d) Les Nelson, Shoreline, thanked the Council for moving up the Comprehensive Plan review to resolve issues and have a shared vision with the community.

e) Pat Murray, Shoreline, asked the Council to maintain the moratorium on a permanent basis. He felt that the co-mingling of residential houses with businesses doesn't profit the City of Shoreline. He stated that the Arabella Apartments and the Murray's project owners have only appeared by proxy and they should come present to the Council in person. He noted

that the owners expect citizens to absorb the increased population and parking, which isn't appropriate. He felt the property owners need to mediate the impacts of their developments. He felt multi-family developments should be responsible for their own parking by having their tenants pay for parking as part of the rent.

Mr. Olander commented that the City staff will provide a response concerning the 179th Place issue. He added that the City staff only puts the best, professional recommendations in staff reports and it is the right of the public to disagree; the Council can make its own decision.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Council Subcommittee Recommendations for Study Sessions and Public Input/Involvement Opportunities

Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager, provided the staff report and outlined the suggested changes to enhance and increase productive discussion among Councilmembers. Those suggestions included holding the study sessions in a different room and eliminating general public comment during those sessions. She stated that this could be put in place as a pilot for four months or eight study sessions, beginning in June and finishing in October.

Mr. Olander added that this is worth doing on a trial basis to see how it works. He urged the Council to consider this.

Mayor Ryu wondered if each suggestion on this item can be broken down, discussed, and voted on individually.

Councilmember McGlashan liked the idea of changing meeting rooms, however, he noted that the Highlander Room is dark.

Councilmember Eggen said he has heard from the public and they don't want public comment reduced, even to move meetings along. He said he would like to keep it as it is. He wanted the focus on changing the room.

Councilmember Way pointed out that she advocated for as much public comment time as possible and doesn't want that changed. She doesn't feel that moving to the Highlander Room will make huge difference.

Councilmember McConnell agreed with Councilmember Eggen, but with two modifications. She felt public comment should be kept and supported the room change.

Councilmember Hansen commented that he has no problem with any of the recommendations.

Deputy Mayor Scott supported the City staff recommendation.

Mayor Ryu only agreed to change rooms to have a setting change.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that study sessions are for studying the agenda topics.

Councilmember Hansen stated he would like to see general public comment removed or moved to the end. He said comments might be answered at the end through the discussion.

Mr. Olander noted that the subcommittee also encouraged other modes of communication such as town hall meetings, e-mail and the City website.

Mayor Ryu added that some sort of general public comment is desired, but it doesn't matter whether it is at the beginning or the end of the meeting.

Councilmember Way stated that the Council worked on this at length several years ago. She agreed with former Councilmember Gustafson at the time, who felt general public comment should be at the beginning of the meeting.

Councilmember McGlashan stated that the purpose was to get us into less formal discussion and focused on study items.

Councilmember Hansen said he is glad to ask former Councilmember Gustafson his opinion on this.

There was Council consensus to move the Study Sessions from the Mt. Rainier Room to the Highlander Room and do this on a four-month trial basis.

(b) Proposed Environmental Sustainability Strategy

Juniper Nammi, Associate Planner, reviewed the Sustainability Strategy and noted that she included all of the public comments received by the City.

Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, provided some background and stated that there was a hearing on April 21, where staff received oral and written comments. He added that the City staff wants to hear Council direction, corrections, and prioritization prior to bringing back a final draft in June.

a) Bill Bear, Shoreline, submitted a fifteen-page analysis and said he is concerned that sustainability has become a "catchword." He felt that the recommendation didn't address monitoring; the Strategy needs to have clear monitoring targets and concepts.

Councilmember Eggen thanked staff and stated that he can't make any informed statements until he has reviewed the information. He said he will analyze the City staff response to comments. He said he would be happy to engage in e-mail correspondence with the City concerning this.

Mayor Ryu commented that this is an amazing amount of work the public did in reviewing the Strategy. She commented that she appreciated the summary table.

Councilmember Way stated that this is a wonderful document. She wondered what the City staff reaction is to the comments on toxics reduction and the employment of the proportionary principle. She wanted to know how they would apply to Shoreline parks. She said she knows that the City has a policy concerning the avoidance of using toxins and pesticides but she would like to find a way to do more.

Mr. Deal responded that the City staff always looks for better ways. He responded that Kirk Peterson is at the National Sustainability Conference. He noted that the Parks Department uses very little herbicide and a majority of the parks are pesticide free. He added that there are no pesticides on the turf areas. He said the grass is aerated and needs good overseeding. He estimated that the City fertilizes less than 10% of its park areas.

Councilmember Way stated that she saw a helpful documentary by Washington State University on intensive planting and low-impact methods. She wondered if City could put it on Channel 21 to educate the public.

Mr. Deal noted that educating the community is a vital part of the strategy. Ms. Nammi stated that the City staff will look at adding an index to the document.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if it would be helpful to send e-mail to the City staff concerning support or opposition to the different comments. He felt it is hard to give direction on this. Mr. Olander responded that e-mail would help. Councilmember McGlashan recommended having this item on the agenda again before adoption. Mr. Olander said it will be scheduled. Mr. Tovar asked that a deadline be determined for input and that the item will be rescheduled in June.

Mayor Ryu referred to items submitted on page 13-26. She asked if there will be a first draft or response ready soon. Ms. Nammi replied that the response should be done by the end of the day tomorrow.

Mr. Olander said the next discussion meeting will possibly be scheduled mid-June with the adoption scheduled for the end of June or the beginning of July. Ms. Nammi highlighted that there were lots of requests for more specificity and time indicators, but the details won't be determined until the implementation phase. She said the Strategy is a statement of a broad, general direction. Mr. Olander added that progress and measures are a part of the policy direction concerning this item.

(c) Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N. 165th Street to N 185th Street) 30% Design

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, proposed an aggressive timeline for this project and stated it has taken an enormous amount of work to get to the 30% level. He said the City Staff, HDR and the sub-consultants have been working hard.

Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor Project Manager, gave the presentation. He introduced Kris Overleese who he said would be leading the discussion on the stormwater tool kit and the City

staff proposal for a stormwater system. He also introduced Paul Ferrier, Project Manager from HDR and Jeff Hamlin, Manager of Water Resources from HDR. Mr. McKinley discussed the coordination with other City projects and utility firms, including right-of-way acquisition and funding. He said 30% design is a milestone and explained that the basic design component is the main focus of the 30% level.

Kris Overleese, Aurora Corridor Project, outlined the recommended Stormwater Toolkit, which includes the following tools: raingarden/planter; bioswale; box filter; ecology embankment; catch basin inserts; storm filters; vortex separator; and Silva Cell with pavers. The City, she highlighted, is reducing impervious surface and replacing the entire stormwater system from N. 165th to N. 205th Street. She noted that the Aurora Business and Community (ABC) Team formulated the Stormwater Toolkit and HDR added a few items to it. She said the big issue is to focus on natural stormwater elements in the Town Center area. She outlined the remaining schedule for design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and the next steps.

Mr. McKinley said that in the Stormwater Toolkit the City staff is proposing that the focus of the low impact design tools be implemented in the N. 175th Street to N. 185th Street corridor, while other locations would use more conventional systems. He stated that the idea is to make the N. 175th Street to N. 185th Street corridor an educational resource for the community and City staff. He said that ten block area will be monitored and maintained. He added that the City staff would also like to have some interpretive signage featured in the area.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Brian Derdowski, Issaquah, representing Public Interest Associates, stated he was the prime sponsor of 1998 King County Surface Water Management manual. He added that the manual is not sufficient to handle the problem. He said that the City's Stormwater Plan is going to comply with obsolete standards. He noted there is an opportunity to work with redevelopment to require water quality treatment, and connecting to a publicly-designed system could be an asset for them as well as for the City. He said he negotiated the conditions on the Echo Lake rezone and the developer was required to have a good faith negotiation to improve stormwater flows so the developers met with City and installed a stormwater control system. He commented that the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project is a major public investment that will upgrade the infrastructure and if the City can expand its vision to incorporate some capacity for redevelopment along the street it might help. He suggested the Council ask the City staff to determine what percentage of flows will be treated.

b) Les Nelson, Shoreline, asked about the costs and the maintenance on the cartridge filters. He suggested a test be done on the systems to make sure there is a way to quantify the results and monitor the system. He felt it would be hard to tell what is or isn't working.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned if the N. 196th Street traffic light is included. Mr. McKinley responded that the N. 196th Street light is in question, but he knows there won't be one at N. 182nd Street. He also stated that the crosswalk at N. 180th Place would remain.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the 30% design milestone was negotiated with WSDOT.

Mr. McKinley stated that the City is required to get WSDOT approval for such things as channelization and striping. He said the City has submitted the 30% design and they have reviewed it and have questions. He noted that the City is responding to the questions right now. He said there are some good discussions going on about the 175th and 185th Street intersections, which should be resolved soon.

Councilmember McGlashan asked about the right-of-way land swap with Seattle City Light. Mr. McKinley responded that the land swap involves 185th Street south to Ronald Place. He added that the City is asking for 4 to 6 feet of the existing Seattle City Light property that abuts Aurora Avenue to fit the business access transit (BAT) lane; the City would trade 4-6 feet of right of way on the Midvale side of the street.

Councilmember McGlashan said he toured SEA Streets and heard that the individual residents have to maintain the swales. Mr. McKinley responded that typically swales are more expensive to install and maintain and the intent is to have the City assume the cost of maintaining them. Councilmember McGlashan questioned if planters are cheaper and more effective than bioswales. Ms. Overleese responded that bioswales are cheaper because they have more grass; raingardens have amended soils and various plants. However, both of them can fit in the same footprint.

Councilmember Way noted that she visited the Highpoint project. She felt it is effective at cleaning stormwater and improving the habitat. She said these technologies are becoming more common. She pointed out that Pierce County found bioswales to be less expensive than vaults. She requested that City staff generate some cost estimates of vaults and pavement/pipe systems compared to the installation and maintenance costs of bioswales.

Mr. Relph responded that the City staff always prepares cost estimates. He urged the Council to keep the constraints in mind. One of them, he said, is that the roadway between 165th and 175th Street doesn't have extensive right-of-way widths and the amount of driveways will dictate the kinds of alternatives that can be used. Conversely, there is more opportunity between 175th and 185th Street.

Mr. Olander highlighted that the planter strip doubles as a utility corridor, so there are challenges with the 110-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Relph reminded the Council to remember the flexibility of the design and that some business locations will have their amenity zone reduced, which is another constraint.

Mr. Hamlin responded to the Council's inquiries regarding maintenance. He noted that the raingarden or vegetated swales use natural drainage practices on landscaped areas to provide a natural drainage pattern. As far as applying low-impact development or natural drainage practices, the intent is to maximize its use while maintaining cost-effectiveness. He said it is a tight right-of-way and they are trying to add the natural elements where possible. They are applying options in areas where HDR can do it and the estimates have been developed specific to this corridor.

Councilmember McConnell discussed the options listed on page 25. She said she can see where the things would be used where possible. She wondered where the Silva Cells could be used. Mr. Hamlin replied that the Silva Cell isn't accepted as a water quality device, so they can't be proposed.

Councilmember Way wanted to know if a permeable strip on the road edge as a way of including permeable pavement was considered. She also asked if porous sidewalks were considered as a way to increase the effectiveness of the entire system.

Mr. Ferrier responded that they have considered it, but pervious pavement clogs when applied with high volumes of traffic. He also stated sometimes the water gets into the subgrade and causes cracks and potholes. He noted that WSDOT hasn't approved pervious pavements for usage.

Mr. Relph added that the City has to maintain the structural adequacy of the section and it is a detail that hasn't been worked out as far as long-term maintenance goes.

Councilmember Way clarified that she is referring to the bus rapid transit lane area along the curb. She felt there would be much less traffic in that lane and there won't be constant buses running there. She felt a pervious strip could be used with amended soils to accept the runoff. She requested these options be looked at more extensively. She said there was an agreement to do the hybrid plan and that includes an extensive use of these technologies. She commented that the Council owes it to the citizens to protect the creeks. This, she highlighted, is an opportunity to set an example for other developers and urged the Council to apply this as vigorously as possible.

Mayor Ryu inquired what it would take for WSDOT to approve pervious surfaces.

Mr. Relph replied that because of the weight of the buses, the bus rapid transit lanes actually take on more of a load than the other lanes. He noted that 100% of the street section from 165th to 205th Street will be filtered for water quality. He added that there is a mix of tools that are being used so the City isn't missing anything.

Mr. Olander noted that the City doesn't have the right soils and pervious pavements have their places which are in parking lots, residential areas, and parking strips. He said it is extremely difficult to use in high travel or high load areas. He said the City staff is committed to maximize natural drainage where it can be done.

Mayor Ryu asked if pervious pavement can be utilized in the left-turn pockets. Mr. Cohen responded that there would be less loading in those areas, but it could result in serious damage to the roadway.

Mr. Relph added that the City is committed to the intent of low impact development. He noted that it is a mix that needs to be obtained while still maintaining structural adequacy.

Councilmember Hansen asked where pervious pavement is being used. Mr. Olander stated that it has been installed on the trail north of Sears.

Councilmember Eggen said he noticed that the Echo Lake Apartments were developed very close to the roadway and wondered if the City can obtain sufficient right-of-way to build the third mile. Mr. McKinley responded that the City will be potentially redeveloping properties to the ultimate widths, so there won't be a problem.

Councilmember Eggen stated that it looks like the City is committed to a two-stage process, doing Phase 2 and 3 separately. He asked if Phase 3 could be combined with Phase 2 if the funds are there. Mr. McKinley stated if the funding came in it would be evaluated at that time.

Councilmember Eggen assumed the reason for the light at 182nd was to allow another left-turn opportunity for cars traveling north. He asked if it would impact the light at 185th. Mr. McKinley responded that he didn't think so. He added that the area is in the traffic analysis phase. Mr. Relph added that by not having a signal on 182nd the progression to the corridor will increase.

Councilmember Hansen inquired if there were any figures that compared flooding or water quality on the first mile of the project. Mr. McKinley responded that he wasn't sure, but will check with the stormwater specialists. Councilmember Hansen asked how the Vortex separators worked. He asked if it was possible to get a centrifuge without external power. Mr. Hamlin responded that the water swirls and creates a centrifuge and the sediments are collected on the outside edge, with oils and grease trapped inside to reduce particulate matter. He said the system utilizes water and gravity.

Councilmember Hansen questioned if the City is vactoring on a regular basis. Mr. Relph noted that the City has a contract for vactoring. Councilmember Hansen asked what the cost of one was and how the one between 145th and 165th Street was doing. Mr. Relph said the system is still under warranty, but he would check on the system's history.

Mayor Ryu commented that some companies have a cheap way of dumping vactoring materials. She inquired if the operating costs will increase above projections. Mr. Relph replied that those are the kinds of things that are evaluated when looking at one system over another.

Mr. Olander highlighted that the foreign solids and liquids are separated out and all of the vactoring products have to be handled appropriately.

Mayor Ryu noted that there are lessons learned from the first mile and it is refreshing to get into the details of this project. She expressed a desire to have more conventional medians between 165th to 175th Street and wanted to know if more could be done. She said there were rounded medians in the first mile and the water spills off into the pavement. She added that it is expensive to water medians and would like to look at more natural ways of treating and landscaping native plants. She said the first mile took twenty months and she wanted an easier process for the second mile. She inquired how many months it would take to complete Phase 2.

Ms. Overleese estimated that it would take eighteen months to complete.

Mr. Relph also added that there are some interesting alternatives being discussed. He said he will return to the Council to inform them of the ways the work can be accelerated.

RECESS

At 9:20 p.m. Mayor Ryu called for a five minute recess. Mayor Ryu reconvened the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

(d) Ordinance No. 500 Amending the Shoreline Municipal Code Chapters 20.50.020 and 20.50.230 to Establish Transition Area Requirements for Residential Development of Land in Regional Business (RB), Community Business (CB) and Industrial (I) Land Use Districts in Proximity to Residential Neighborhoods – Continued Discussion

Mr. Olander noted that the Council wanted further discussion on this item. He noted that there was discussion about adding another transition regulation which would place a density cap on residential development in RB. He asked the City staff to investigate it and present their findings to the Council.

Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, stated that Ordinance No. 500 is the culmination of a lot of work that dealt with the moratorium and the transition regulations that would be imposed. He said that there is still concern about the unit count and unlimited density. If the City wants to look at a cap in the RB zone there would need to be a new interim control which could be introduced to Council very soon. Then the City would spend six months coming up with the permanent regulations. He noted that Ordinance No. 500 deals with parking, setbacks, mass, etc. He said the unit cap in the RB zone can be dealt with fairly soon as an interim control, then permanent regulations would come at a later date.

Mr. Olander also expressed the Council desire to look at the Comprehensive Plan (CP) in more detail and conduct a visioning exercise with the community to talk about density as a kickoff to the CP review. He recommended adoption of Ordinance No. 500.

Councilmember McGlashan stated that he is confused about putting a cap in RB when essentially there is. He said there is no such thing as "RB infinity." He said by the time the regulations are applied they won't be anywhere near R-110, so he questioned why there is a need to create additional restrictions.

Mr. Tovar replied that there isn't a sufficient comfort level in the community about the limitations on unit counts. He expressed that the cap is an interim step and there is more work to be done which may affect a future cap.

Councilmember McGlashan pointed out that parking creates more of a restriction. He noted that if the developer can't build or find enough he'll have to make his building smaller.

Mr. Olander noted that he has heard that parking reductions up to 50% are causing concern. He noted that this could warrant a higher level of density if a subarea plan says so.

Councilmember Eggen noted that the Code has lots of problems and it is unfair to the neighbors and property owners who want to build. The transition zone, he explained, was an attempt to build in some compromise. He felt that the reduction of parking and standards should only be based on actual evidence that the number of cars parked will be consistent with the reduction. He said he posed some questions to the City staff and wondered where his responses were.

Mr. Tovar responded that he has been trying to find answers for him and his frustration is trying to figure out what happened. He said there isn't a lot of documented evidence to find answers to his questions.

Councilmember Hansen felt this is a good piece of legislation and that it is a reasonable compromise. He said the perfect ordinance doesn't exist in a changing environment. He reminded everyone that this ordinance affects 70 different properties. He wondered why the facade breakup has to be at least 800 square feet.

Mr. Cohen replied that 800 is not an exact number and the City looked at renderings and looked at the facade facing the single-family home. He noted that the façade could be anything from 600 to1,000, but they looked at the bulk studies.

Mr. Tovar added that this isn't a subjective number and they experimented with different sizes and thought this was a reasonable number.

Councilmember Hansen inquired why rooftop equipment wasn't provided in this zone when it is in others. Mr. Cohen responded that this is a transition area and there is no limit to the amount of rooftop equipment but there is a concern that it would clutter the skyline.

Councilmember Hansen noted that cell towers are 15 feet tall and if units are set back toward the middle of building below the slope but over the 65 foot limit, people still wouldn't see anything up there. He suggested an eight-foot restriction for mechanical, HVAC, and elevators.

Mr. Tovar said it would be helpful to identify any amendments the Council would want to make to Ordinance No. 500.

Councilmember Hansen replied he is mostly interested in the rationale. He commented that the five-foot setback for rooftop railings seems to make sense. He favored getting rid of the moratorium.

Councilmember Eggen asked whether or not external elevators and various equipment is allowed above the stepbacks or is it allowed on top of building at 65 feet. Mr. Cohen said he needs to confirm but he thinks they are allowed.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Scott moved to extend the meeting to 10:15 p.m. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

Councilmember Way stated she has two issues. First, she said the ordinance is missing enabling legislation from 2000 that provided for the "R-infinity" zoning and that it is an underlying problem that needs to be resolved. She said the 1998 Comprehensive Plan did not appear to show the City couldn't have maximum densities in RB and CB zones and that needs to be resolved first. The second problem is the need to know what the mechanism is to require a large-scale RB development next to single-family zones. The City needs something to go to the Planning Commission and Council so the decision will have the least likelihood of a court challenge. She added that it has been suggested that a special use permit may be a good tool to do this. She said she is trying to ensure that over the next six months that the Council isn't inundated by large-scale RB applications without proper conditions. She highlighted that on page 77, section #8 was removed and it was a mechanism that would have given the Council and the Planning Commission a tool to deal with this problem.

Mayor Ryu asked the City staff about the impact of retaining section #8 and not striking it out.

Mr. Tovar replied that it meant that quasi-judicial items would be heard by the Council whenever someone submits a permit application. He noted that if there are special use permits the Council would be in the business of spending agenda time on them. He highlighted that the development permit process should be timely, fair, and predictable. He explained that special use, conditional use, and planning development permits are filled with unpredictability and are old tools from a bygone era that were used for flexibility. He added that unpredictability costs the City more money.

Mr. Olander explained that this provision allows buildings to be higher with a conditional use or special use permit.

Councilmember Way read the definition of special use permit which is to allow compatibility between adjacent land uses.

Mr. Olander further explained that adding in section #8 allows the Council to increase the height. He noted that in a special use or conditional use permit, the criteria needs to be developed, otherwise it will be arbitrary and capricious.

Councilmember Eggen stated that the special use permit definition has some conditions that may partially satisfy the requirement that there are standards to apply. He added that section #8 applies to R-48 zoned areas, not RB and CB zones. He felt it would be a way to apply conditions to development before the City gets final standards in order.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:15 p.m. Deputy Mayor Scott moved to extend the meeting to 10:25 p.m. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion, which carried 6-1, with Councilmember McGlashan dissenting.

Mr. Olander polled the Council on creating a density cap in the RB zone.

Mayor Ryu passed out a section of the Comprehensive Plan and read Land Use policy #38 (LU-38), section 38.1 dated November 2004 and noted that the Planning Commission recommendation didn't have any reference to unlimited density. For both reasons she supported a moratorium/interim control related to a density cap.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned if this was about a permanent regulation in the RB zone.

Mr. Tovar confirmed that this was about creating a cap for every parcel zoned RB.

Mayor Ryu added that the baseline needs to be established to move on and once this is settled the second issue can be resolved.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that building height has never been an issue in this City and there are current building height regulations in every zone.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:25 p.m. Councilmember Hansen moved to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 6-1, with Councilmember McConnell dissenting.

Councilmember McGlashan felt the City won't experience any economic development with all the proposed reductions.

Mayor Ryu explained that the density cap only applies to residential units. She acknowledged that the City needs commercial development as a way to promote economic development without the fear of unlimited density.

Councilmember Way discussed the density cap and asked if it would be done after Ordinance No. 500 would be adopted.

Mr. Tovar said the cap could be in place next week with an ordinance, which would be the interim control. Then the City staff would come back with replacement legislation within six months which would be the final cap.

Deputy Mayor Scott favored the density cap as offered by Mr. Olander.

Councilmember Eggen expressed concern about passing legislation that isn't well thought out and would like to discuss it more.

Mayor Ryu clarified with Mr. Olander that this doesn't preclude Ordinance No. 500 and that it is a separate ordinance.

Councilmember Way felt it would be a good idea to look at other cities and compare what is being done here.

Mr. Olander clarified that he has heard four members who want to look at this further. He added that if the City is moving towards more subarea plans, then this is good. This, he explained, could be the base density cap for residential construction in RB zones, unless authorized by a subarea plan. This, he said, means that densities can be an element.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Scott Passey, City Clerk

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, May 12, 2008 7:30 PM
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ryu, Deputy Mayor Scott, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember McGlashan, and Councilmember Way.

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:35 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ryu, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Ryu led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember McConnell, who was expected to arrive later.

(a) Proclamation of the Richmond Beach Community Association as a Century Corporation

Mayor Ryu read the proclamation recognizing the Richmond Beach Community Association as a 100-Year Corporation. Sean Quigley, President of the Richmond Beach Community Association, thanked the City and noted that the organization is looking forward to another 100 years of community building.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Julie Modrzejewski, Acting City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City projects, meetings, and events. She stated that the Spring Clean Sweep Recycling Event was a success and communicated statistics from the event held on May 12. She highlighted that the Shoreline Community College is graduating its first "green collar" workers, graduates from their Solar Design program.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Eggen announced that he attended the SeaShore Transportation Committee meeting where the Sound Transit II proposals were discussed. He added that the also attended a Municipal Solid Waste Management Committee meeting.

Councilmember Way said she attended the Kruckeberg Mother's Day sale.

Mayor Ryu stated there is a North King County Green Business Conference on June 10 at the Shoreline Community College. The City of Shoreline, Shoreline Community College, and King County are partners in sponsoring this event. There will be a portion concerning solid waste and recycling. Additionally, there will be discussion on Cleanscapes dump fees and the probability of having to build a new facility in the future. She also announced that the King County Council will be having a meeting in Shoreline next Monday and there is a public reception at 6:00 p.m. in the Shoreline Room.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, read from the Comprehensive Housing Strategy report. She read sections concerning affordable alternatives, third places, locating housing in a more compact fashion, having housing variety, and that Shoreline can accommodate Growth Management Act targets. She read that housing prices will go up and will limit affordability. She concluded that the Council has duty to follow the recommendations.

b) Boni Biery, Shoreline, stated that the Sustainable Shoreline Education Association along with the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department is sponsoring a "Champion Trees Contest," which will help build an environmentally sustainable community. She hoped everyone participates in the event that will run through Labor Day.

c) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, stated that the community spoke against Ordinance No. 478 and it cannot be supported until there is a community vision and Comprehensive Plan review. She referred to Ordinance No. 505 and felt there wasn't a full disclosure to the public or the surrounding neighborhoods and still not an appropriate process. She stated that an R-110 cap should be contingent upon a legal opinion from the state since the current Comprehensive Plan (CP) does not allow for anything higher than R-48. She is in favor of allowing higher densities on Aurora, over R-48, as long as a public process is followed and a good transitional zone is in place between the higher densities and the low density single family dwellings.

d) Les Nelson, Shoreline, reviewed the history of density designations and stated that there is confusion in the CB and RB based on the fact that there is CB land use and RB land use in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that in 1998 the CP maximum density was R-48 for CB and RB land use. The new Development Code zoning densities were raised from 18 to 48 dwelling units per acre and the CB and RB went from 48 to no maximum dwelling units per acre. He added that when Ordinance No. 238 was done there weren't any notices sent to adjacent single family neighborhoods. In 2001, Ordinance No. 276 amended the CP and added "RB" in CB areas with no mention of increasing residential density limits. In 2005, he stated that the CP still has RB and CB land use identified as high density, and to date, no CP amendment that permits more than 48 dwelling units per acre.

e) Brenda Marler, Shoreline, stated that there are two single-family lots in her neighborhood, the Westminster Triangle. She said a developer is building four houses where there were two and are losing old growth trees. She noted that her house is across from property and the Council is doing nothing to protect the trees when lots are being cleared. She commented that when the Council voted in a 90-foot buffer along the trail the residents didn't have a say. She pointed out that the neighborhood meetings need to be taped because there needs to be a record of what's happening. She doesn't feel all of the neighbors are agreeing with what is going on in the City and at these meetings.

f) Brian Derdowski, Issaquah, on behalf of Public Interest Associates, asked the Council to retain some discretionary authority on land use applications. He felt the CP amendment is a better method. He said phasing development makes a big difference to the community. He asked the Council to consider whether a 110-unit cap is appropriate for all areas and questioned if it should apply uniformly or if parcels should be considered differently.

Councilmember Way asked Ms. Modrzejewski if she had any information concerning Ms. Marler's comments. Ms. Modrzejewski said the City staff will investigate and provide some background for the full Council.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember McGlashan moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember McGlashan moved approval of the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0 and the following items were approved:

(a) Minutes of Business Meeting of March 24, 2008
Minutes of Special Meeting of March 31, 2008
Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of April 14, 2008
Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of April 28, 2008

(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of April 28, 2008 in the amount of $2,291,338.62

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND MOTIONS

(a) Ordinance No. 504 Approval of Shoreline Town Homes Final Plat, 1160 N. 198th Street

Paul Cohen, Planner, and Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, provided a brief report on the proposal to approve a final plat for townhomes. Mr. Cohen announced that the Planning Commission recommended approval and the Council approved a preliminary plat when

Ordinance No. 422 was adopted in April 2006. The City staff has reviewed site, engineering, and building permits to ensure the conditions approved by Council are met. He stated that the City must also receive performance and maintenance bonds before occupancy can occur. He described the site as having 18 lots with one critical area tract. He added that the site meets 2005 King County storm water manual requirements. He noted that the site features filtration beds, pervious pavement, a rain garden, a bioswale, and a fence delineates the wetland buffer. He added that the site met all code requirements for site engineering and zoning and has exceeded the 1998 King County Stormwater manual requirements.

Councilmember Way asked if the landscaping was completed in the buffer. Mr. Cohen replied that it was being finished at the time the staff report was being drafted.

Councilmember Hansen moved to adopt Ordinance No. 504. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion.

Councilmember Way questioned if there has ever been a final plat approval on a Council agenda like this in the past. Mr. Tovar stated that this is a courtesy step and the preliminary approval is the big step. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, said that a substantive decision was made with the preliminary plat approval and state law allows it without a Council action as routine.

Councilmember Way inquired what the remaining details were about this plat. Mr. Cohen stated that there will be ongoing inspections and there will be a final inspection on the plantings and storm drainage. Once the inspections are done the bonds will be released when the work is done. Councilmember Way wanted to know the width of boardwalk. Mr. Cohen responded that it was five feet wide.

Councilmember McConnell arrived at 8:20 p.m.

Councilmember Hansen moved to call the question. Councilmember McGlahsan seconded the motion, which failed 2-5, with Councilmembers Hansen and McGlashan voting in the affirmative.

Councilmember Eggen inquired what work still had to be done in the critical area. Mr. Cohen responded that there is a low concrete wall at water's edge that needs to be removed and it needs to be inspected. Additionally, there are still inspections that need to be done. He added that the site looks fairly complete; however, he needs to go out and inspect everything. Mr. Tovar noted that the certificate of occupancy is the final control point.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired about the bioswales off of 198th Street and wondered if it is collecting water off the other site. Mr. Cohen responded that it was not and that the access road is 198th and the water is coming from 199th Street.

Mayor Ryu supported the motion, even though, she said, R-48 with zero lot line is really approximately an R-17.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 504, Approval of Shoreline Town Homes Final Plat, 1160 N. 198th Street, which carried 7-0.

(b) Ordinance No. 478, Amendments to the Development Code, Section 20.50.020; Residential Density in CB Zones, affecting properties located in the Town Center Study Area and along Ballinger Way

Mr. Tovar introduced this item. He stated that the Planning Commission and the City staff recommend tabling this item indefinitely. He explained that Ordinance No. 478 would remove language in the CB zone as it applies to maximum residential density and listed those properties as not having a maximum just as the RB zone presently reads. He added that Ordinance No. 505 will take up the question of whether the City should adopt a density cap. The Planning Commission, he said, wants to treat RB and CB the same.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired if the staff recommendation to table is only because of the agenda order. Mr. Tovar responded that it makes sense to deal with Ordinance No. 505 first.

Councilmember McGlashan moved to amend the agenda and move this to item 8(c). Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which failed 3-3, with Mayor Ryu, Deputy Mayor Scott, and Councilmember Eggen dissenting.

Steve Szafran presented the City staff recommendation on Ordinance No. 478. He stated the item is a continuation from the March meeting to revise the proposal for removing the density limitations within the CB category and allow the unit count to be governed by height, bulk, parking, and setbacks. These conditions, he pointed out, were unanimously recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) Gretchen Atkinson, Shoreline, favored this Ordinance for the allowance of extra density because it makes sense to have residents near business centers.

b) Scott Thompson, Shoreline, thanked the Council for adopting the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. He said he is shocked at the cost of local housing. He thanked the City staff for their work on both the Housing Strategy and Ordinance No. 478. He urged adoption of Ordinance No. 478.

c) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, supported adoption of Ordinance No. 478. She felt that the City staff recommendation is a political sway. She noted that the Housing Strategy says the CB zone is mixed use (MU) density and the issue deals with unit count. She said if you have a 40 x 60 foot structure that is 2,400 square feet, it can be six (6) studio units of 400 square feet each, four (4) 600 square foot one bedroom units, or three (3) 800 square foot two bedroom units. She said having any designation of a unit count doesn't make sense. She said she has been involved in this for 13 years. She concluded that the City needs more housing.

Councilmember Way asked Ms. Wacker if she felt the way she calculated densities would apply to MU designations. Ms. Wacker responded that it would, but the only difference in the MU and CB zone is that the Planning Department required that the first floor be built to commercial standards. Councilmember Way asked if she felt this should apply to NB and any land use designation. Ms. Wacker responded affirmatively and said the most restrictive zone is R-4 and R-6 and CB, NB, and RB are unlimited uses where the City allows the developers to use the most. Therefore, if the City restricts the usage it will be sued for takings. Councilmember Way asked if Ms. Wacker believed that any land use designation should have any density. Ms. Wacker explained that any designation should be limited by the width, length, and height.

d) Jim Abbott, Shoreline, favored Ordinance No. 478 because it allows increased housing units in select commercial centers. He noted that the Council voted 6-0 on March 24 to adopt the recommendation of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) which was a positive step for affordable housing. Deputy Mayor Scott and Councilmember Eggen were members of the CAC and it was unanimously recommended by the Planning Commission and the City staff. He highlighted that Ordinance No. 478 provides housing near public transportation and consumer retail services. He stated that citizens can walk to services, which reduces the reliance on oil and preserves single family residential neighborhoods. This would also allow the City to comply with the Growth Management Act. This legislation only affects two non-residential zones and doesn't change any other zoning requirements.

e) Peter Steinbrueck, Seattle, said this area is experiencing a population growth. He noted that he spent 10 years on the Seattle City Council and helped rezone the City. He stated that the City of Seattle got rid of density limits. He said Ms. Wacker is absolutely right and form-based zoning is the way to go. He urged the City to talk about compact communities and quality neighborhoods. He said the City should put the emphasis on performance-based zoning rather than restrictive zoning that will harm economic development and prevent the housing that the communities need now. He noted that the best way to predict the future is to plan it. He commended the City of Shoreline for an outstanding piece of work in the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. He said he especially likes the emphasis on expanding housing choices while maintaining neighborhood character, given that over 70% of Shoreline is zoned for single family.

f) Jeffrey Oxner, Seattle, stated that he is a professor at the University of Washington Department of Architecture and holds adjunct appointments in the Department of Urban Design and Planning and the Department of Landscape Architecture. He is also the Associate Dean in the College of Architecture and Urban Planning. He said he teaches a required course on urban design which is the relationship between land use and transportation. He commented that dense development needs to support mass transit which reduces pollution. He favored Ordinance No. 478 and said it clearly aligns with the practices taught at the college every day. He urged the Council to protect single family neighborhoods.

g) Alice Abbott, Shoreline, commented that she supported Shoreline businesses, services, schools, and sports. She expressed support for Ordinance No. 478. She said it addresses unit count in certain CB zones, not the requirements for height, building size, parking spaces, etc. It only affects the number of units. She said she supports density where it makes sense. She urged the Council and residents to prepare for the future, and Ordinance No. 478 has protections

for neighborhoods. She noted that she will want to get rid of her big house someday for something smaller and urged the Councilmembers to vote for it.

h) Michelle Takasaki, Shoreline, supported Ordinance No. 478. She said it coincides with Council goals and the CAC Housing Strategy. She noted page 17, item #5 from the CAC Housing Strategy and read that the City needs to allow greater unit counts in certain places with certain conditions. She said the Council has failed to approve legislation concerning these recommendations that have been approved by the Planning Commission and the City staff on three separate occasions. She noted that Ordinance No. 478 fully embraces this and increases density in those areas that Shoreline can best accommodate.

i) Allison Hoberg, stated that the language of the Comprehensive Plan is not in keeping with the spirit of policies previously adopted. She said the City should encourage efficient use of land and diversity. She continued that there needs to be a variety of quality housing opportunities suitable to the needs of Shoreline's present and future residents. She said the goals also emphasize a mix of uses to serve the neighborhood, commercial, and residential functions together. She concluded that she is concerned that the spirit of the language will never be put into effect.

j) Les Nelson, Shoreline, said this is all about changing the base definition of a CB zone which requires a Comprehensive Plan amendment. He added that this process needs to be a community vision. He explained that you wouldn't take R-12 and change it to 24 dwelling units per acre and just keep the same name. He doesn't favor having unlimited density and said it needs to be done by a Comprehensive Plan change.

k) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, opposed Ordinance No. 478. He felt the City does need density, but it also needs sustainable development. He commented that the Development Code changes got the City into trouble and now it is a faulty process. He stated that the City tried to move along in a hurry and he isn't sure it's legal for the City to zone above R-48 without a Comprehensive Plan review. He said in 2005 there was a CP review and there weren't any real substantive changes then. Now, he felt the CP process needs to start with the visioning. He said this Ordinance looks more like a Band-aid.

l) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, said the Comprehensive Plan says we should change the Aurora Corridor and create a sense of place so the locations have meaning. He said the word "place" is the same in every country in Europe. He said if we're going to have special places in Shoreline, they need to be planned as a part of the larger system. He felt the Aurora Corridor is very narrow and there is no room to do it there.

m) Brian Derdowski, Issaquah, on behalf of Public Interest Associates, stated that land use is technical and has several obstacles. Those obstacles, he explained, are that the GMA housing targets are expressed as units and not form-based. He also said the environmental impact statement (EIS) is expressed in units. He said the Council has an interest in how many bedrooms or units the developments will have and that will drive the market. He noted that there is an oversupply of commercial units and that normally brings forth recession, which is predicted. He

added that in a recession apartments may stand empty. He also stated that putting lots of people in the corridor doesn't make sense and that the Council should approach this as a large CP issue.

n) Harley O'Neill, Shoreline, expressed support for Ordinance No. 478. He stated that if the City wants to preserve character of residences it needs to concentrate density along the corridor and support businesses. He also suggested the City provide affordable housing, i.e., studios and one-bedroom units.

Mr. Tovar understood the position of the speakers but disagreed with the comments concerning the GMA. He said the City staff has spoken to the Council several times about form-based codes, which the Council was not feel comfortable with. Therefore, the City staff recommended a cap in the RB zone of R-110. He added that it makes sense to have greater density in the RB zone. He proposed that another idea the Council may want to entertain is having a maximum unit count for CB that is roughly 90% of the maximum unit count for RB. He felt both zones should have a density cap or both should have no maximum density. However, he pointed out that the Council needs to look at what the market is providing already and what the developers are proposing, which is right around R-110.

Councilmember Eggen said this is a serious motion and worthy of serious consideration. He said he cannot support another motion that does something different.

Councilmember Eggen moved that this item be postponed until May 27, 2008. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which failed 3-3, with Councilmember Hansen, McConnell and McGlashan dissenting and Mayor Ryu abstaining.

Councilmember Hansen stated that he heard a reference that transit is a pollution corridor. He also said he heard the suggestion that a density cap will not provide more units than a form based code because form based code will allow the developer to decide how many units he is going to build. He said based on his calculations, the floor area would be about 1,200 to 1,400 square feet under an R-110 cap, and no developer would build in Shoreline based on that. He commented that he is ready to make a decision. He communicated that an anomaly is created by instituting a density cap, not the fact that the form-based code hasn't been adopted. He said it is time for this Council to make a decision and act. He supported Ordinance No. 478.

Deputy Mayor Scott commented that he would like to support the proposed Ordinance but he cannot. He agreed that there are still some things to work out.

Councilmember Eggen said the maps were confusing and asked how many properties are addressed by Ordinance No. 478. Mr. Szafran stated that he couldn't pinpoint the exact number, but said it would be all the dark red parcels within the dotted black line.

Mayor Ryu said she counted them and there are over 100 between 170th and 200th Street on Aurora Avenue. She added that on Ballinger Way there are over 40 parcels affected.

Councilmember Eggen asked how this will affect property taxes for businesses. Mr. Tovar replied that it will potentially allow more units, so they may be more valuable.

Councilmember McGlashan wanted clarification on the estimation on actual properties affected that are currently zoned CB. Mr. Szafran noted that there are currently over 50 parcels that are zoned CB in the area.

Councilmember Way agreed with all of the speakers and said there needs to be a plan. She felt the City needs to plan so a community can handle density. She hoped the interim controls will be consistent. She added that she is not prepared to support this at this time.

Mayor Ryu stated that this item was introduced on March 15, 2007 and this is the fifth time it has come before the Council. She said there are other ways of offering affordable housing and there is a lot of confusion and concern. She suggested taking a look at cumulative impacts and doing some traffic modeling. She also noted that the SEPA should be reviewed along with the EIS. She felt it is premature to upzone a CB area and cannot support this.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 478, Amendments to the Development Code, Section 20.50.020; Residential Density in CB Zones, affecting properties located in the Town Center Study Area and along Ballinger Way. Motion failed 3-4, with Councilmember McGlashan, Councilmember McConnell, and Councilmember Hansen voting in the affirmative.

RECESS

At 9:55 p.m., Mayor Ryu called for a five minute recess. Mayor Ryu reconvened the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Scott moved to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.

(c) Ordinance No. 505 Adopting a Moratorium for Six Months on the filing or acceptance of any applications for Residential Development of land within the Regional Business Land Use District which exceed a density of 100 dwelling units per acre

Mr. Tovar said this issue was raised by the City Manager last week and the City staff put this ordinance together. He said it will give some context and perspective about RB. He explained that in a City of 11.7 square miles, 3.5% is in an RB zone, and 72% is a single family zone. Overall, he stated, this is a pretty small area, but it is a primary source of revenue and where the retail sales tax resides. He felt this is about value and potential use of property. He added there are other things that control unit number, but there's no "iron cap." He encouraged attendees to look at other projects in order to get an idea what R-110 is like. He commented that it isn't as dense as other places and explained that this is an interim step. He noted that a "taking" is a matter of degree, so he advised the Council to be cautious. He said this Ordinance gives the City staff time to look at permanent regulations for the RB zone and felt that R-110 is reasonable.

Mayor Ryu called for public comment.

a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, opposed the moratorium. She explained that a moratorium can only be instituted if there is an emergency and she felt this wasn't an emergency. She discussed the 110 density cap. She felt restricting the density to 110 is a taking and ignores the rights of RB property owners. The Council, she said, has failed to notify the people who are affected by this in the RB zones. She felt the City cannot take away development rights and this will open the City to legal action.

b) Les Nelson, Shoreline, appreciated the Council looking into the CB, RB density history. He added that the CP already has 48 dwelling units per acre which is already a cap. He felt there needs to be a way to get density into the City and 110 may be a good number, but urged the Council to do it in a planned way. He also stated that there needs to be a true transitional area.

c) Dennis Lee, Shoreline, noted that this is interim development controls. He stated that R-48 is the land use designation maximum in the CP and if it is used he isn't convinced having a 110 density cap could be legal. He supported a density cap lower than 110 and urged the Council to be careful and give staff direction.

d) Dwight Gibb, Shoreline, said the public was shortchanged. He said the City took all week to publish these documents and the public only had three days to review all of them. He said it seems that the CP specifies R-48 as the legal maximum in CB and RB. He felt that R-48 should be the basis from which the City should work from. He felt if a developer wanted to propose something higher it should require some conditions from the City.

e) Brian Derdowski, Issaquah, on behalf of Public Interest Associates, suggested that the Council direct the City staff to enhance the findings of fact to support the moratorium by putting in findings dealing with SEPA documents. He also stated that the traffic modeling needs updating and there are capacity issues. He felt that enunciating the changed circumstances gave rise to the moratorium. He said a history of how the City got to this point would be good. He discussed the downzoning issue and said if the City does the appropriate findings and process these are not takings.

Mr. Tovar stated that the City staff disagrees that R-48 is the maximum. He stated that there is no cap that presently exists. He communicated that R-110 doesn't constitute a severe downzone and R-48 would be severe and reckless. He felt R-48 exposes the City to considerable risk and sends the wrong message. He said the City cares about planning for the future and R-48 reduces the potential of residential development in RB by half. He stated that zoning permits control, not the CP. He highlighted that the properties zoned RB have legal rights. He said that keeping the zoning at R-48 would send a message to investors that this isn't a place to build.

Mr. Sievers clarified that instituting an R-110 density cap isn't a taking as long as there is an economically reasonable use of the property. He said the Council has the power to impose moratoria but it must be reasonable in length and in what they take away. He noted that the Supreme Court upheld a thirty-two month moratorium in a Lake Tahoe case. The Development

Code, he said, went through a public process and so did the "no maximum" language and it should not be disregarded.

Mr. Tovar added that the SEPA for the moratorium has not been done and three days is a lot of time because typically there is no notice given for a moratorium.

Councilmember McGlashan clarified that it has to be an emergency to impose the moratorium. Therefore, he asked how many applications have been submitted in these zones and what constituted the emergency.

Mr. Tovar responded that the court gives broad deference to legislative bodies concerning emergencies. He said this has taken up an enormous amount of Council and Planning Commission agenda time, debate, confusion, controversy, and uncertainty in the City. Therefore, it was deemed an emergency.

Councilmember McGlashan questioned if the courts described contention as emergency. Mr. Tovar said it depends upon how much you reduce the value on this. He said it can be a risk to not address this; thus, it is an emergency that needs to be discussed and corrected.

Councilmember Way pointed out that there was a moratorium in the first year the City was incorporated. She explained that it involved 2,500 square-foot lots getting permitted because of King County Code and the City imposed a moratorium on all short platting. She added that it was harsh but it was necessary.

Councilmember Hansen explained that the problem arose because of a change in 1995 allowed 2,500 square foot zoning under the King County Code. He said the City adopted King County Code in May of 1995 and in June, not realizing this 2,500 limit, had several applications come in and projects built. The moratorium limited it to 5,000 square feet, then it was adjusted to 7,200 square feet per lot.

Mr. Sievers offered that an emergency is a reflection that the market can move quickly when there is a change in market conditions or an inadvertent inclusion in the development code.

Deputy Mayor Scott moved to adopt Ordinance No. 505 Adopting a Moratorium for Six Months on the filing or acceptance of any applications for Residential Development of land within the Regional Business Land Use District which exceed a density of 100 dwelling units per acre. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion.

Councilmember McGlashan commented that he didn't understand how the Council has all the information for this item, but on the other hand understands there is a liability. He felt that the City is already dealing with problems with the previous moratorium and so he doesn't support this legislation.

Councilmember McConnell wanted to know how many properties affected by this moratorium are in the permit stage. Mr. Tovar replied that he can't give a count because the City hears from potential applicants before an application is submitted. He added that the market can turn quickly

based on unforeseen events. He said there have been applications under 110 and ones zoned RB would be affected, but not those in the North City Business District.

Councilmember McConnell said she has a sense that the City staff wants to find some compromise so the Council can get to a vote. Mr. Tovar responded that the City staff is sensing that there is some anxiety, in the public and on the Council, about unlimited density.

Councilmember Hansen said he doesn't support Ordinance No. 505. He said the idea of unlimited density is ridiculous. He said if a developer wanted to build the maximum density they would build a complex with 1,200 square foot units. He said he doesn't see that there is an emergency. He felt the City is discouraging people and developers from investing in Shoreline. He stated that even R-110 sends the wrong message and that there are all kinds of other restrictions on them. He felt this borders on a taking. Mr. Tovar commented that the long-term direction will be to move this towards form-based codes.

Councilmember Eggen said he is much less enthusiastic about 600 square-foot dwellings and that the City will deeply regret huge apartment buildings filled with studios. He asked how 110 units translate into 1,400 square feet when the Ridgecrest legislation worked out to be 600 – 700 square feet. He wondered if the 1,400 feet accounts for hallway, elevator, and common space in the building. Mr. Tovar commented that he wasn't sure how regulating unit size is meaningful. Councilmember Eggen felt it would be good to determine the median square footage of the dwelling.

Councilmember Way made a suggestion about SEPA findings. She asked the City staff to conduct an enhanced findings of fact to explore impacts on utilities and transportation. Mr. Tovar responded that the SEPA hasn't been done. However, even if it was, the City may or may not rely on its results. Councilmember Way continued and discussed this being a step toward form-based code, but she felt that no maximum density is out of step with the community.

Deputy Mayor Scott called for the question. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 7-0. A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 505 Adopting a Moratorium for Six Months on the filing or acceptance of any applications for Residential Development of land within the Regional Business Land Use District which exceed a density of 100 dwelling units per acre. Motion carried 4-3, with Councilmembers Hansen, McConnell, and McGlashan dissenting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:55 p.m., Mayor Ryu declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item: 7(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of June 10, 2008
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 expenses, material, purchases-advancements."

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of $1,386,612.78 specified in the following detail:

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
5/4/08-5/17/08	5/23/2008	24095-24292	7614-7658	36553-36564	$504,344.64
					$504,344.64

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
5/29/2008	36527		$100.00
5/29/2008	36528	36533	$48,190.42
5/29/2008	36534	36552	$15,580.72
5/30/2008	36565	36569	$279,440.74
5/30/2008	36570		$480.00
5/30/2008	36451		($858.38)
6/5/2008	36571	36573	$26,684.51
6/5/2008	36574	36580	$118,155.05
6/5/2008	36581	36604	$122,978.76
6/9/2008	36605	36646	$95,236.78
6/10/2008	36647	36659	$150,867.58
6/10/2008	36660	36669	$25,411.96
			$882,268.14

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

This page intentionally left blank.

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item:** 7(c)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize an Increase in the Construction Contract Authority for Road Construction Northwest, Thereby Allowing the City Manager to Execute a Final Contract Change Order in the Amount of $52,931.05 and Final Payment for the North Central Segment of the Interurban Trail
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Tricia Juhnke, Capital Projects Administrator

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

This agenda item requests the Council authorize the City Manager to approve a change order to Road Construction Northwest in the amount of $52,931.05, to cover all final costs associated with the North Central Segment of the Interurban Trail. The Contractor has completed the work and requests final payment, and closeout is pending a final change order. The change order covers changes in quantities used throughout the project for additional work necessary to complete the work.

BACKGROUND:

In December 2006, Council awarded the construction contract for the North Central segment of the trail to Road Construction Northwest. The contract award amount was $1,551,962.70 with a standard 10% contingency for a contract authorization of $1,707,158.97.

Construction on the North Central Segment started in spring 2007 and was Substantially Completed in October 2007. Several changes were encountered and/or added during construction for items such as additional storm drainage, property restoration, irrigation modifications and utility coordination. In addition, there were additional quantities required on several items such as topsoil, crushed surfacing and asphalt. An increase of authorization in the amount of $28,532.45 is needed to process a final change order of $52,931.05 for final payment and will allow closeout of the project.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The project work was completed in 2007 and the following table summarizes the final project costs:

Project Costs			
Project Administration			
Contracted Services [1]	$628,121		
City Costs[2]	$256,529		
Subtotal		$884,650	
Real Estate Acquisition		$186,343	
Construction			
Original contract	$1,551,962.70		
Prior changes (CO 1-4)	$130,797.67		
This change (CO5)	**$52,931.05**		
Additional Construction[3]	$209,944.87		
Subtotal		$1,945,636	
Total Project Costs			$3,016,629
Project Revenue[4]			
KC 1989 Open Space Bond - RW	$ 129,533		
Department of Natural Resources - IAC	$ 1,215,000		
Partner Contributions	$ 102,056		
Roads Capital Funds	$ 1,570,211		
Total Revenue			$3,016,800
Project Balance (Revenue-Costs)			$171

The final project costs exceed the current authorization in the amount of $28,532.45 The total project costs are accurately represented in the 2009-2014 CIP with a final project cost of $3,016,629, including funding in 2008 to cover staff time associated with closing out the project. The $52,931 for the final change order was accrued as a 2007 expenditure and does not impact the fund balance in the 2009-2014 CIP.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council increase the Construction Contract Authorization for Road Construction Northwest in the amount of $28,532.45 for the North Central Segment of the Interurban Trail, thus enabling the City Manager to execute a change order for $52,931.05 necessary for final payment on the project.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

[1] Contract services includes contracts for design,
[2] City Costs include salaries, printing, permits and other miscellaneous costs
[3] Additional construction includes a separate contract for fencing and KC costs for installation of the signal.
[4] Project revenue is based on the Proposed 2009-2014 CIP

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item: 7(d)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize an Increase in the Construction Contract Authority for Gary Merlino Construction Company, thereby allowing the City Manager to execute a change order and final payment for the Aurora Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project (N 145th Street – N 165th Street) and the Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor Project Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Staff is recommending Council authorize an increase in the Construction Contract Authority for Gary Merlino Construction Company, thereby allowing the City Manager to execute a final change order and final payment for the Aurora Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project (N 145th Street – N 165th Street) and the Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project. The project is complete and final payment is pending approval of this change order. This change order is for the final resolution of quantities for the project.

BACKGROUND:

On June 6, 2005, Council awarded a construction contract with Gary Merlino Construction Company (Contractor) in the amount of $23,606,287.75 with a total contingency amount of $1,386,533. On May 8, 2006, Council authorized a $410,000 increase in contract spending authority to cover design and construction expenses for a new water line for Seattle Public Utilities (these expenses were later reimbursed by SPU). On October 23, 2006, Council authorized an additional increase in contract spending authority of $1,025,973 plus $50,000 (per the current purchasing policies) to cover additional unforeseen issues during construction. The contract spending authority is currently $26,478,793.75.

The change order includes resolution of issues related to payment for drilled shafts for the retaining wall in the vicinity of N 152nd Street and Aurora Avenue N, project delays due to utilities not being relocated in time, relocation of the signal base at N 145th Street and added handholes for pulling wire for the bridge lighting. This change order will also increase quantities for materials that overran projections and credits for the deletion of the plant establishment.

The October 23, 2006 staff report indicated that the total requested increase in contract authority did not include resolution of claims.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
Staff has negotiated several additional work items with the Contractor and has reached a mutual resolution. In addition, the negotiated amount exceeds the approved contract authority. Below is a summary of the project costs and revenues.

Project Costs:	Subtotal	Total
Engineering:		
Contracted Services	$8,816,416	
Direct City Costs	$1,569,157	
		$10,385,573
Real Estate Acquisition:		$2,290,811
Construction (Gary Merlino Construction Co):		
Original Construction Contract	$23,606,288	
Change Orders 1 - 59	$2,851,053	
This Change Order	**$62,761**	
Total Contract		$26,520,102
1% for the Arts		$163,855
Total Costs:		$39,360,341
Project Revenues:		
Aurora Ave N Corridor – N 145th St. to N 165th St. Project[1]		$28,061,283
Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project[1]		$6,112,629
Aurora Corridor Project (145-165) Utilities[2]		$5,451,612
Total Revenues		$39,625,524
Project Balance (Revenue – Costs)		$265,183

To close out the contract with the Contractor and finalize negotiations for this change order, staff is requesting an increase in total construction contract spending authority for the Aurora Project by an amount of $62,761 for a total contract amount of $26,520,102. There are sufficient funds available in the current project budget to cover this increase.

[1] Total revenues are based upon the proposed 2009-2014 CIP

[2] Total revenue is based upon the approved 2008-2013 CIP; this project is not included in the 2009-2014 CIP.

The Contractor has submitted a final payment request which totals $26,520,102. This change order will be the final change order issued for this project and will close out the contract with the Contractor.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that Council increase the Construction Contract Authorization for Gary Merlino Construction Company in the amount of $62,761 for the Aurora Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project (N 145th Street – N 165th Street) and the Interurban Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Project, thus enabling the City Manager to execute a change order necessary for final payment of the project.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

This page intentionally left blank.

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item:** 7(e)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Sungard Public Sector for the purchase of software and consultant services to upgrade the City's financial system
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The City needs to begin implementation of the new version of its financial system as the current version will no longer be supported after December 2010. Sungard Public Sector, the current provider of the City's financial software has completed a major upgrade to a web-based version and will begin to phase out support of earlier versions of the software. They will provide a final tax update in December of 2009 and will end all support for the version that the City is currently using at the end of December 2010. In order to ensure that the City's financial operations continue without interruption, we need to begin the upgrade process now to allow enough time to complete the project before the deadline. This project was anticipated as part of the 2008 budget process.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The 2008 budget contains one-time funding totaling $76,900 for the implementation of the 7i version of the City's Integrated Financial and Administrative Solution (IFAS) software. This contract represents the first phase of the upgrade process. Earlier this year, a portion of this funding was used to perform business process reviews of the City's general financial operations and payroll process.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorizes the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Sungard Public Sector totaling $64,314 for software licensing and consultant services to upgrade the City's financial system.

Approved By: City Manager DTS City Attorney ___

INTRODUCTION

The City needs to begin implementing the new version of its financial system as the current version will no longer be supported after December 2010. Sungard Public Sector, the current provider of the City's financial software has completed a major upgrade to a web-based version and will begin to phase out support of earlier versions of the software. In order to ensure that the City's financial operations continue without interruption, we need to begin the upgrade process now to allow enough time to complete the project before the deadline. Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Sungard Public Sector for the purchase of software and consultant services to begin the upgrade of the City's financial software.

BACKGROUND

The City originally purchased IFAS in October of 1998 and completed the initial implementation in early 1999. The initial implementation focused on the core system modules: general ledger, purchasing, accounts payable and check management. Subsequently over time, additional modules have been implemented including accounts receivable, human resources & payroll, budget, position budgeting, and fixed assets.

Sungard Public Sector, the vendor that provides the City's financial software, has recently released a major upgrade of its governmental financial software. The new version (7.9) of IFAS provides a web-based platform that offers easier access to IFAS functions and to financial information. Sungard Public Sector has notified us that the IFAS version (7.72) which the City is currently using will not be supported beyond December 2010 and the last annual payroll tax update will be provided in December 2009. It is imperative that the City moves toward the implementation of the 7.9 version of IFAS which was released earlier this year. The implementation of the 7i version is the first phase of the migration plan. During the preparation of the 2009 budget, staff will request additional one-time funding to support the final conversion to the 7.9 version of IFAS.

The 7i version of IFAS upgrades the screens that City staff use to perform financial activities and retrieve financial data. During this phase, the City will also enhance the bank reconciliation process and implement automated workflow and on-line document storage functionality. Earlier this year, City staff participated in two separate business process reviews (BPR). This first BPR reviewed the City's current general ledger, purchasing, accounts payable, accounts receivable, bank reconciliation, fixed asset, and budget processes and procedures. The second BPR reviewed the human resource and payroll processes. During these reviews, staff identified several processes that could be streamlined by implementing and using the workflow and online document storage functionality included in the 7i version of IFAS.

The conversion to 7i requires payment for the software since the upgrade to 7i is not within the City's current annual maintenance agreement and professional services for training and implementation support.

If the City does not move forward in upgrading the IFAS software to 7i it will not be in a position to upgrade to 7.9 and will not be able to receive technical support or maintenance of its financial software.

Staff has considered whether it is prudent to upgrade the IFAS software or use this opportunity to explore new software options. Staff believes that the cost to acquire new software from a different vendor, implement, and train staff would make this option cost prohibitive.

The 2008 budget contains one-time funding totaling $76,900 for the implementation of the 7i version of the City's Integrated Financial and Administrative Solution (IFAS) software. Earlier this year, a portion of this funding was used to perform business process reviews of the City's general financial operations and payroll process.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorizes the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Sungard Public Sector totaling $64,314 for software licensing and consultant services to upgrade the City's financial system.

This page intentionally left blank.

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item:** 7(f)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Shoreline Water District Franchise Agreement
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works Department
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Ian Sievers, City Attorney

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Staff has been negotiating with the Shoreline Water District for the renewal of a franchise agreement. Staff continues to make progress and submits this report as a place holder for the June 23, 2008 Council meeting. It is anticipated for that Council meeting a staff request for Council to either approve a new agreement, or an extension of the existing franchise while staff continues to negotiate the final agreement. The current extension expires on June 30, 2008.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends reserving on the June 23, 2008 Council agenda an action item for the Shoreline Water District Franchise Agreement. A revised staff report will be submitted to Council prior to the 23rd meeting date.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ____

This page intentionally left blank.

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item:** 8(a) PT. 1

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

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

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On June 9, 2008, staff presented the proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP to the City Council. The following schedule is being followed to facilitate the adoption of the 2009 – 2014 CIP.

June 16, 2008	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP
June 23, 2008	Public Hearing and Council Discussion on the Proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP
July 7, 2008	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP
July 14, 2008	Council Adoption of 2009 – 2014 CIP

Tonight, a public hearing is being held to give the public a formal opportunity to comment on the proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP. Following the public hearing the City Council will have an opportunity for additional discussion about the CIP. Copies of the proposed 2009 – 2014 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.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Proposed 2009 – 2014 CIP is balanced as required by the Growth Management Act and totals $155.22 million. The General Capital Fund totals $39.1 million; City Facilities/Major Maintenance Fund totals $399,000; Roads Capital Fund totals $105.4 million; and Surface Water Utility Fund capital projects totals $10.3 million. Attachment A is a summary of the proposed 2009 – 2014 Capital Improvement Plan.

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 2009 – 2014 Capital Improvement Summary

City of Shoreline 2009 - 2014 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Proposed 2014	Total 2009-2014
General Capital							
Facilities Projects							
Civic Center/City Hall	$28,903,433	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$28,903,433
Public Facility Study	$0	$50,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000
Parks Projects							
Baseball/Softball Field Improvements	$13,227	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$13,227
Boeing Creek Park Improvements	$35,000	$133,760	$0	$0	$0	$0	$168,760
Cromwell Park Improvements	$1,300,659	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,300,659
Hamlin Park Improvements	$1,108,746	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,108,746
Interurban Park	$20,000	$101,846	$875,000	$125,000	$0	$0	$1,121,846
Kruckeberg Gardens	$607,541	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$607,541
Off Leash Dog Park	$74,398	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$74,398
Parks Repair and Replacement	$323,000	$252,000	$263,000	$273,000	$283,920	$295,277	$1,690,197
Pym Acquisition	$0	$0	$800,000	$0	$0	$0	$800,000
Richmond Beach Area Park Improvements Pump Station	$0	$123,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$123,000
Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Improvements	$137,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$137,000
Trail Corridors	$904,077	$937,608	$110,416	$113,728	$117,140	$0	$2,182,969
Twin Ponds Park Master Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$50,000
Open Space Projects							
Paramount Open Space	$84,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$84,000
Non-Project Specific							
General Capital Engineering	$74,715	$78,077	$81,591	$79,012	$76,318	$73,502	$463,215
General Fund Cost Allocation Charge	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$33,754	$202,524
General Capital Fund Total	**$33,619,550**	**$1,710,045**	**$2,163,761**	**$624,494**	**$511,132**	**$452,533**	**$39,081,515**
City Facilities - Major Maintenance							
Facilities Projects							
Police Station Long-Term Maintenance	$0	$0	$61,000	$16,000	$0	$0	$77,000
Parks Projects							
Pool Long-Term Maintenance	$0	$0	$0	$22,000	$91,000	$137,000	$250,000
Richmond Highlands Community Center Long-Term Mainte	$40,000	$32,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$72,000
City Facilities - Major Maintenance Fund Total	**$40,000**	**$32,000**	**$61,000**	**$38,000**	**$91,000**	**$137,000**	**$399,000**

City of Shoreline 2009 - 2014 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Proposed 2014	Total 2009-2014
Roads Capital Fund							
Pedestrian / Non-Motorized Projects							
Annual Sidewalk Improvements	$0	$0	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$200,000
Curb Ramp, Gutter & Sidewalk Program	$130,000	$138,000	$145,000	$151,000	$157,000	$157,000	$878,000
Sidewalks - Priority Routes	$600,000	$600,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,200,000
Traffic Small Works	$235,000	$248,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$1,483,000
Transportation Master Plan Update	$280,000	$50,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$330,000
System Preservation Projects							
Annual Road Surface Maintenance Program	$888,000	$800,000	$800,000	$600,000	$900,000	$954,000	$4,942,000
Richmond Beach Overcrossing 167AOX	$1,636,000	$1,603,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,239,000
Traffic Signal Rehabilitation	$100,000	$100,000	$50,000	$50,000	$100,000	$100,000	$500,000
Safety / Operations Projects							
145th Dual Left Turn at Aurora	$0	$150,000	$175,000	$175,000	$0	$0	$500,000
Aurora Avenue North 145th - 165th	$23,458	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$23,458
Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program	$192,000	$165,000	$165,000	$150,000	$175,000	$192,000	$1,039,000
Traffic Signal at 170th/15th Ave NE	$429,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$429,000
Aurora Avenue North 165th-205th	$18,592,502	$19,877,697	$17,928,455	$18,607,774	$415,408	$0	$75,421,836
Aurora Avenue North 165th - 205th Utility Improvements	$5,940,000	$6,415,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$12,355,000
Non-Project Specific							
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$334,080
Roads Capital Engineering	$222,206	$228,000	$239,000	$246,000	$262,000	$279,000	$1,476,206
Transportation Planning Program	$170,935	$174,627	$178,242	$181,771	$185,370	$189,208	$1,080,153
Roads Capital Fund Total	**$29,494,781**	**$30,605,004**	**$20,036,377**	**$20,517,225**	**$2,550,458**	**$2,226,888**	**$105,430,733**

City of Shoreline 2009 - 2014 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Proposed 2014	Total 2009-2014
Surface Water Capital							
Flood Protection Projects							
Boeing Creek Basin Plan	$0	$0	$0	$400,000	$260,000	$0	$660,000
Boeing Creek Park Stormwater Project	$5,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$5,000
Cromwell Park Surface Water Enhancement	$778,300	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$778,300
East Boeing Creek Drainage Improvements	$378,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$378,000
N 148th St. Near Linden Ave N Drainage Improvement	$0	$0	$311,000	$0	$0	$0	$311,000
N. 167th & Whitman Avenue N. Drainage Improvements	$23,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$23,000
Pan Terra Pond & Pump Project	$10,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$10,000
Pump Station No. 25	$0	$228,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$228,000
Ronald Bog Park Wetland	$0	$0	$0	$0	$595,000	$0	$595,000
Surface Water Small Projects	$100,000	$87,000	$210,000	$232,000	$244,000	$258,000	$1,131,000
Thornton Creek Basin Plan	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000
Water Quality Facilities							
No 2009-2014 projects proposed							
Stream Rehabilitation/Habitat Enhancement							
Boeing Creek Reach 1 and 8 - Bank Stabilization	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$900,000	$900,000
Green (Shore) Streets Initiative	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Stream Rehab / Habitat Enhancement Program	$67,000	$66,000	$74,000	$79,000	$83,000	$88,000	$457,000
Non-Project Specific							
SWM CIP Project Formulation & Engineering	$250,000	$230,000	$230,000	$240,000	$240,000	$240,000	$1,430,000
SWM Contribution to Transportation Project	$0	$1,300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,300,000
SWM Contribution to City Hall Project	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$300,000
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	$225,351	$225,351	$225,351	$225,351	$225,351	$225,351	$1,352,106
Surface Water Capital Fund Total	**$2,586,651**	**$2,136,351**	**$1,050,351**	**$1,176,351**	**$1,647,351**	**$1,711,351**	**$10,308,406**
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**$65,740,982**	**$34,483,400**	**$23,311,489**	**$22,356,070**	**$4,799,941**	**$4,527,772**	**$155,219,654**

City of Shoreline 2009 - 2014 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES Fund *Project*	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Proposed 2011	Proposed 2012	Proposed 2013	Proposed 2014	Total 2009-2014
RESOURCES							
General Fund Contribution	$993,737	$1,007,173	$1,020,541	$1,033,908	$1,047,349	$1,051,025	$6,153,733
Surface Water Contribution to Gen Cap	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$300,000
Surface Water Funds for Roads	$0	$1,300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,300,000
Real Estate Excise Tax - 1st Quarter Percent	$458,330	$100,497	$118,007	$135,867	$154,084	$172,666	$1,139,451
Real Estate Excise Tax - 2nd Quarter Percent	$858,330	$875,497	$893,007	$910,867	$929,084	$947,666	$5,414,449
Fuel Tax	$615,201	$627,505	$640,055	$652,856	$665,913	$679,232	$3,880,762
Surface Water Fees	$883,660	$1,003,138	$1,050,351	$1,176,351	$1,412,493	$1,560,816	$7,086,809
Investment Interest Income	$578,209	$214,837	$122,595	$119,093	$69,222	$73,760	$1,177,715
Lease Savings & Revenue	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$150,000
Municipal Financing	$20,690,891	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,690,891
King County Flood Zone District Opportunity Fund	*$159,000*	*$80,000*	*$80,000*	*$80,000*	*$80,000*	*$80,000*	$559,000
Grants - Awarded	$18,955,616	$6,450,067	$0	$0	$0	$0	$25,405,683
Future Grants	*$1,627,263*	*$550,000*	*$1,850,000*	*$300,000*	*$0*	*$0*	$4,327,263
Future Grants - Aurora 165th - 205th	*$0*	*$11,906,933*	*$17,002,435*	*$16,743,544*	*$415,408*	*$0*	$46,068,320
King County Mitigation (Brightwater, Hidden Lake)	$137,000	$123,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$260,000
King County Voter Approved Trail Funding	$104,077	$107,200	$110,416	$113,728	$117,140	$0	$552,561
Bond Issue	$2,322,030	$830,408	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,152,438
Utility Reimbursements	$5,940,000	$6,415,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$12,355,000
In-Lieu of Sidewalk Fees	$204,222	$358,689	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$762,911
Use of Accumulated Fund Balance	$10,763,417	$2,533,457	$374,083	$1,039,857	($140,753)	($87,393)	$14,482,667
TOTAL RESOURCES	**$65,740,982**	**$34,483,400**	**$23,311,489**	**$22,356,070**	**$4,799,941**	**$4,527,772**	**$155,219,654**

Council Meeting Date: June 23, 2008 **Agenda Item:** 8(a) PT. 2

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Public Hearing for the Proposed 2009-2014 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program for the City of Shoreline
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	Mark Relph, Public Works Director Phil Ramon, Administrative Services Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: 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 TIP is required to be submitted to the Washington State Department of Transportation before July 31, 2008. A public hearing must be held prior to adoption by resolution of the TIP. The City of Shoreline's TIP is summarized in the attached 2009 -2014 Transportation Improvement Program Summary (Attachment A). The City of Shoreline's TIP is incorporated into the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) adopted TIP and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The Roads Capital Fund provides specific information pertinent to the revenues and expenditures associated with the 2009 -2014 TIP. A combination of financial resources including grants and other City funds will be utilized to fund each of the projects identified in the TIP. The TIP also includes additional unfunded capital projects. Attachment B provides a description for each of the unfunded capital projects. By identifying projects in the TIP, staff will be able to apply for additional grants and other revenues to supplement the City's resources.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council conduct a Public Hearing on the proposed 2009 –2014 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

Approved By: City Manager ___ City Attorney ___

Attachment A – Proposed 2009 –2014 Transportation Improvement Program
Attachment B - Descriptions of Unfunded Projects

Attachment A - Proposed 2009 - 2014 Transportation Improvement Plan
Program Summary
Roads Capital Fund

Project	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	2011 Estimate	2012 Estimate	2013 Estimate	2014 Estimate	2009-2014 Total
Expenditures							
Pedestrian / Non-Motorized Projects							
Annual Sidewalk Improvements			$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$200,000
Curb Ramp, Gutter & Sidewalk Program	$130,000	$138,000	$145,000	$151,000	$157,000	$157,000	$878,000
Sidewalks - Priority Routes	$600,000	$600,000					$1,200,000
Traffic Small Works	$235,000	$248,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$1,483,000
Transportation Master Plan Update	$280,000	$50,000					$330,000
System Preservation Projects							
Annual Road Surface Maintenance Program	$888,000	$800,000	$800,000	$600,000	$900,000	$954,000	$4,942,000
Richmond Beach Overcrossing 167AOX	$1,636,000	$1,603,000					$3,239,000
Traffic Signal Rehabilitation	$100,000	$100,000	$50,000	$50,000	$100,000	$100,000	$500,000
Safety / Operations Projects							
145th Dual Left Turn at Aurora		$150,000	$175,000	$175,000			$500,000
Aurora Avenue North 145th - 165th	$23,458						$23,458
Aurora Avenue North 165th-205th	$18,592,502	$19,877,697	$17,928,455	$18,607,774	$415,408		$75,421,836
Aurora Avenue North 165th - 205th Utility Improvements	$5,940,000	$6,415,000					$12,355,000
Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program	$192,000	$165,000	$165,000	$150,000	$175,000	$192,000	$1,039,000
Traffic Signal at 170th/15th Ave NE	$429,000						$429,000
Unfunded Projects							
Traffic Calming	$220,000	$230,000	$240,000	$250,000	$260,000		$1,200,000
Richmond Beach Road Subarea Study	$77,000						$77,000
Ashworth Ave and N. 200th	$150,000						$150,000
Priority Sidewalks				$600,000	$600,000		$1,200,000
Ashworth Ave. N. @ N. 152nd Street Sidewalk	$275,000						$275,000
Ridgecrest Commercial Center Project	$203,000						$203,000
175th Street - Stone to Meridian				$8,100,000			$8,100,000
Linden Sidewalks				$1,300,000			$1,300,000
Interurban - Burke Gilman Connector				$3,000,000			$3,000,000
Perkins, 10th NE to 15th NE				$2,000,000			$2,000,000
160th/Greenwood/Innis Arden				$1,860,000			$1,860,000
Richmond Beach Rd @ 3rd Avenue NW				$1,970,000			$1,970,000
NE Ballinger Way - NE 19th to 25th, Sidewalk/Side				$1,000,000			$1,000,000
Midvale: 175th - 183rd Reconstruction				$2,500,000			$2,500,000
3rd Ave NW: Richmond Bch Rd to 195th Sidewalk/Side				$1,000,000			$1,000,000
5th Ave. NE: 175th - 185th Sidewalks				$2,000,000			$2,000,000
Non-Project Specific							
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$55,680	$334,080
Roads Capital Engineering	$222,206	$228,000	$239,000	$246,000	$262,000	$279,000	$1,476,206
Transportation Planning Program	$170,935	$174,627	$178,242	$181,771	$185,370	$189,208	$1,080,153
Subtotal Expenditures by Year	**$30,419,781**	**$30,835,004**	**$20,276,377**	**$46,097,225**	**$3,410,458**	**$2,226,888**	**$133,265,733**

Attachment B

Proposed 2009 – 2014 Transportation Improvement Program Descriptions of Unfunded Projects

1. **Traffic Calming** – In 2005 the City Council in response to citizens requests to protect neighborhoods from traffic impacts, allocated $200,000 for the 2006 program year for the installation of traffic calming devices. This one time allocation funded the installation of approximately 40 traffic calming devices such as traffic circles, speed humps, and chicanes, at various locations throughout the city.

   Locations and devices are identified in cooperation with Shoreline Police Department, Fire Department and School Districts. Emphasis will be given to those locations which have actively participated in the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program. The devices will be installed on a temporary basis. After the devices have been in place for one year, the city will determine whether to remove the devices or maintain them on a permanently, based on effectiveness and community input.

2. **Richmond Beach Road Sub area Study** – This project will evaluate motorized and non-motorized needs in the Richmond Beach Road Corridor from approximately Aurora Avenue North to 24th Avenue West.

3. **Ashworth Ave and N. 200th** –This project will complete the portion of the Interurban Trail (North 200th Street & Ashworth Avenue N.) by removing the temporary asphalt ramps and replacing with ADA concrete sidewalks and ramps. The storm upgrade will be completed at the same time as the installation of the 72" type II, currently stored at Hamlin Yard.

4. **Priority Sidewalks** - To construct pedestrian enhancements alongpriority routes identified in the Transportation Master Plan using cost efficient designs such as asphalt sidewalks, extruded concrete curb, and separated walkways as well as standard curb, gutter and sidewalk. Natural storm water features will be included where feasible.

5. **Ashworth Ave N @ N 152nd Street Sidewalk** – Reconstruct corner and add sidewalks on the west/north sides to tie into the existing sidewalks along N 152nd. Corner will be widened to improve safety and visibility through this tight intersection.

6. **Ridgecrest Commercial Center Project** – Explore potential public investments to supplement required developer frontage improvements, such as natural stormwater systems, or improvements to the intersection of NE 165th and 5th NE.

7. **175th Street – Stone to Meridian** - This project will design and construct improvements on 175th Street between Stone and Meridian Avenue that will tie in with the improvements on N 175th that will be constructed by the Aurora project. The improvements include reconstruction of the existing street to provide two traffic lanes consisting of one 11-foot lane and one 14-foot lane in each direction. The existing center two-way left-turn lane will remain between Ashworth Avenue North and Aurora Avenue North. The widened outside lane of 14 feet provides for a Class III bicycle facility. The profile of the roadway between Ashworth Avenue N and Midvale Avenue N will be lowered to meet standard sight distance requirements. Additional improvements include curb, gutter, and sidewalk with planter strip where feasible, illumination, landscaping and retaining walls. The project will include evaluation of the existing School Crossing at Wallingford Avenue N for potential upgrade to a pedestrian actuated traffic signal.

8. **Linden Sidewalks** – Construct sidewalk on the east side of Linden between N 182nd and N 175th. The project will tie into sidewalks constructed by Fred Meyer. Linden has multifamily housing and ties into the pedestrian crossing by Shorewood High.

9. **Interurban – Burke Gilman Connector** – Construct improvements along N 195th to strengthen the connection between Shoreline's Interurban Trail, and the Burke-Gilman Trail to the east. Project may include walkways, separated trail, signage, and improvements to the 195th bridge over I-5.

10. **Perkins, 10th NE to 15th NE** – Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities along this section. Steep slopes will be a challenge.

11. **160th/Greenwood/Innis Arden** - This project will improve the operations and safety of this five-way intersection at North 160th Street, Greenwood Avenue North, and Innis Arden Way. Design will be coordinated with SCC Master Planning and with Metro. Illumination and landscaping will be provided through the realignment area. Bus zone and layover improvements will be included. This project also includes the construction of new sidewalk on the north side of North 160th Street from Dayton Avenue North to Greenwood Avenue North. If grants are obtained, a study will be performed to identify a preferred solution to the current traffic operating problems at this intersection.

12. **Richmond Beach Road @ 3rd Avenue NW** – This project will design and construct a left-turn lane on Richmond Beach Road at the intersection with 3rd Avenue NW and install signal modifications. The improvements will also include storm drainage, pavement widening, curb and gutter and sidewalks with curb ramps meeting the American with Disabilities Act requirements, retaining walls, and street lighting. Richmond Beach Road is a high volume arterial street at this location with high accident rate.

13. **NE Ballinger Way – NE 19th to 25th Sidewalk/Side** – Construct curb, gutter and sidewalk along the south side of Ballinger Way. This will tie into the recently completed WSDOT sidewalk project, and will define driveways, improve drainage, and provide a needed pedestrian sidewalk.

14. **Midvale: 175th – 183rd Reconstruction** – Design, acquire right-of-way and construct Midvale Ave N. Project will move lanes off of SCL right-of-way. The project will include sidewalks on the east side (west side is covered by the Interurban Trail), with parking pockets, and landscaping strip.

15. **3rd Ave NW: Richmond Bch Rd to 195th Sidewalk/West Side** – Complete sidewalks where missing between Richmond Beach Road and NW 195th.

16. **5th Ave NE: 175th – 185th Sidewalks** – Provide sidewalks on one or both sides of 5th NE. This is a key linkage and safety project. It links Shoreline Center with King County Library. Bus route.