

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, May 3, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor McGlashan led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Deputy Mayor Hall.

Councilmember McConnell moved to excuse Deputy Mayor Hall. Councilmember Tracey seconded the motion, which carried 6-0 and Deputy Mayor Hall was excused.

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Roberts, Councilmember Scott, and Councilmember Tracey

ABSENT: None

(a) Proclamation of Building Safety Month

Mayor McGlashan read the proclamation declaring the month of May as "Building Safety Month" in the City of Shoreline. Ray Allshouse, Building Official and Mark Bunje, Shoreline Fire Marshal and Fire Chief-Elect, accepted the proclamation and commented on the importance of building inspection and safety.

3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen said he attended the Ballinger McAleer Creek Forum regarding a proposed interlocal agreement to prevent flooding.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Laethan Wene, Shoreline, noted that it is a good idea to allow public comment at study sessions and allow public announcements.

b) Bruce Titcomb, on behalf of the Center for Human Services announced that the organization received \$121,000 from City in 2010 and \$63,000 was used by the family support program.

c) Bill Meyers, Shoreline, discussed the rules restricting citizen comments and an increase on real estate taxes.

Mr. Olander clarified that the Council will still be taking public comment on study session items.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) SE Neighborhood Subarea Plan

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, and Ben Perkowski, Vice Chair of the Planning Commission, presented the Planning Commission (PC) recommendation for the SE Neighborhood Subarea Plan.

Ms. Redinger highlighted the roles of the various documents pertaining to the Subarea Plan, how they interrelate and how they can be implemented. She displayed and discussed in detail the current Subarea Comprehensive Plan map, current zoning map, and the proposed Subarea Comprehensive Plan map. She also reviewed the recommendation of the SE Subarea Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).

Vice Chair Perkowski reviewed the PC recommendation and the process which led them to it. He noted that there was a public hearing on February 4 and continued deliberations on March 4. The PC removed items, he said, that they felt were appropriate for this to be a citywide application and noted that the amended item was adopted by the PC unanimously.

Mayor McGlashan opened this item to public comment.

a) Bettelinn Brown, Shoreline, favored a moratorium on further development in the subarea and limitations on unplanned development.

b) Sigrid Strom, Shoreline, urged the Council to adopt the recommended plan and focus on zoning after adoption. She also favored a temporary moratorium on development until the regulations are in place.

c) Janet Way, Shoreline, commented on elements of the plan that related to 145th Street and said it is dangerous as a bike corridor. She urged the Council to direct the City staff to work on it.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, responded to Council questions about the potential moratorium and pointed out that the Council can adopt interim regulations which do not require an emergency declaration.

Councilmember Scott asked if there was any discussion in the PC meetings about offering a moratorium and Vice Chair Perkowski responded that there wasn't. He pointed out that the moratorium was brought up in public comment and the PC can produce a position paper if the Council desires.

Councilmember Scott noted that two people brought it up as a concern and if residents want to avoid it, the Council should consider it.

Councilmember Tracey clarified with Mr. Cohn that the zoning issue will be heard by the PC in July, then by the Council in August. Mr. Cohn also noted that the moratorium issue seems to focus on design regulations, which will not come forward to either decision-making body soon.

Councilmember Eggen supported Councilmember Scott's request for background information on a moratorium.

A member of the public revealed that Arthur Peach suggested the moratorium and he is the Chair of the CAC.

Councilmember Roberts asked for an explanation of the discussion about creating a Planned Area from 30th Avenue to Bothell Way on page 119 of the Council packet and Mr. Cohn responded.

Councilmember Roberts referred to Deputy Mayor Hall's comments about the level of complexity in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cohn added that there are two ways to do a Comprehensive Plan, through narrative or through policy, or through a combination of both. He stated that Mr. Tovar executed a mostly narrative one with Point Wells, which is more of the traditional approach.

Councilmember Eggen questioned the areas identified as park expansion because he thought no one could build there. Mr. Cohn replied that the base zoning would remain and the owners have the right to build, but things could change. Councilmember Eggen added that perhaps the City could purchase it and create a green corridor down to Jackson Park.

Mr. Perkowski highlighted that the PC wants to support the creation of contiguous ecosystems and to address the aspirational aspect of turning the area into a green corridor.

Councilmember Eggen asked if zones MUZ-1, MUZ-2, and MUZ-3 on the zoning map are being worked on.

Mr. Cohn replied that when the implementation occurs the City staff will bring those zoning ideas to the PC and that these zones of varying density came from the CAC.

Ms. Redinger clarified that the moratorium was discussed by the PC, in response to an inquiry from Councilmember McConnell.

Mr. Cohn verified with Councilmember Roberts that there is a requirement at Paramount Open Space for some connection to 145th.

Councilmember Roberts highlighted that one of the biggest concerns in the City is 145th and inquired about the CAC and PC discussions about how to deal with it. Mr. Cohn replied that there was a lot of discussion and concerns brought up early on. However, the City doesn't own any of 145th and the best solution is to work with the City of Seattle to find a solution to traffic congestion and pedestrian safety issues. Mayor McGlashan added that he met with Seattle Council President Richard Conlin who said he is willing to work with us on 145th. Mr. Olander also submitted that it is an unfortunate and difficult situation and the possibility of a feasibility study has been raised. The best place to start is an interjurisdictional study, said Mr. Olander.

Mr. Roberts also communicated that there has been a 20-foot setback on 145th and he didn't see any discussion about it in the packet. Additionally, he pointed out that the Seattle's goals for Jackson Park need to be corrected.

Councilmember Eggen said he tried to get 145th on the list of unfunded projects for the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) to be eligible for grants, but it didn't get on the list. He added that there are other factors that would make it difficult to expand 145th and it doesn't matter what the land use is in terms of Planned Areas (PLA).

Mr. Cohn explained that PLA is a special zone which would override any land use designation and that the PC will want to make sure there is good reason to do whatever is proposed.

Mr. Olander added that Ridgecrest was done in the same manner.

Councilmember Eggen felt that the underlying land use would be the general direction.

Mr. Olander applauded the many months that the CAC and PC put into this. He noted that two of the policy statements on page 20 seem out of place, PR-5 and PR-6.

Ms. Redinger explained that they were specific recommendations from some members and public and the idea was to use them to integrate into a Parks Master Plan.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment. There was no one wishing to provide comment on this item.

Mayor McGlashan noted that the Park n' Ride and light rail have been discussed and it would be the next area to look at after this plan is worked on. Mr. Cohn said tonight is the first time he has heard about that and isn't sure if having a light rail station on the east side would impact the City's decision. Ms. Redinger added that the CAC discussed improving mass transit in this area and ways to make it more likely when the discussion begins with Metro.

Mr. Olander clarified that this item comes back to the City Council on May 24.

RECESS

At 7:36 p.m. Mayor McGlashan called for a five minute break. The Council meeting reconvened at 7:44 p.m.

(b) City's Long-Term Financial Challenges

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, provided the staff report. She reviewed the anticipated budget gaps, cost increases, and noted that the main issue is the property tax growth rate limitation. She pointed out that the City only gets 10% of property tax collections and neither property nor sales tax has kept pace with inflation. She highlighted the community prioritization exercise, the recommendations by the citizen committee, especially the recommendation in May 2009 to have a property tax levy lid lift in 2010. She stated that there is support amongst the community for a 30 cent versus a 20 cent levy. She highlighted the ballot measure requirements. The City staff, she noted, recommends consideration of a six-year levy to maintain basic public safety and to maintain, not expand, service levels. The City staff recommends a levy rate between 25 to 28 cents and is looking for counsel and direction on bringing an ordinance forth in July to place a levy measure on the ballot.

Mr. Olander noted that the background work with the community started over two years ago and they felt the City was doing an effective job, but strongly recommend we put this to the voters in 2010. He said it would be irresponsible not to ask the voters if they want to maintain that quality of life instead of making the decision for them. He said he has some concern that 25 cents would still leave budget gaps. However, 27 to 28 cents would still cover the future budget gaps, but the actual rate can vary depending on the actual assessed value. Additionally, he stated that the King County Council may ask for a two-tenth of a percent sales tax which might allow the City to propose the lower end of the range.

Mayor McGlashan opened this item to public comment.

a) Arthur Peach, Shoreline, communicated that if the City increases the allocated amount it still looks like there will be budget gaps in future years.

Ms. Tarry clarified Mr. Peach's comment and said he was correct because in the earlier years the City would collect more and in later years less would be collected.

Councilmember Roberts asked for an explanation on the assumptions in the baseline model.

Ms. Tarry explained that the six-year financial projections focus on the operating budget, not the capital budget. However, the current budget has been reviewed in areas that can be forecasted, like the jail usage trends. She said best judgment was used such as five-year averages, etc. Additionally, she noted that inflationary measures were utilized when looking at salaries and benefits. She also said the City looked at police cost trends, significant contracts, projects in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and maintenance impacts. She also highlighted that revenue projections were based on several sources.

Councilmember McConnell suggested that a dollar amount go out to voters and be communicated that more will be collected in the early years which will be saved for the later years when less is collected. She supported allowing the residents of Shoreline to decide and this matter going forth on the ballot.

Councilmember Tracey stated that she served on the CAC and the ballot measure was one of the City's only options to bridge the structural gap. She said she also wants to give the residents the opportunity to vote on this, because a lot of them don't want to lose services. She added that animal control, acquiring Seattle Public Utilities, and other issues on the horizon could cost the City money. She supported this item.

Councilmember Eggen said he attended the community presentations and said that a King County Councilmember has said that there will be a .02% public safety sales tax. He also noted that gambling tax is used for the General Fund and it is also decreasing consistently. Additionally, he stated that Shoreline businesses have had large increases in property taxes recently and some assessment of that would be helpful. He added that the City's median home value will be increasing with time and that is based on the effect of the consumer price index (CPI). These issues and this proposed ballot measure are good reasons to ask citizens about the future of the City. He felt that a resolution should be brought forward, but he isn't certain how he will vote.

Councilmember Roberts stated that the City won't know if the King County measure passes before this ballot measure is decided.

Ms. Tarry pointed out that the .02% public safety sales tax measure would bring in about \$1.1 million.

Councilmember Roberts continued and said that there are fundamental problems with how revenues are collected because they aren't keeping up with inflation. He suggested that citizens talk to state legislature about revenues and that he is concerned about how this levy would affect local businesses and homeowners.

Councilmember Scott said that this is democracy at work and an opportunity for voters to decide what they want the City to do. He supported this.

Councilmember Tracey stated that the Council packet touched on a senior citizen exemption and Ms. Tarry explained that there are some exemptions based on state law related to income levels.

Councilmember McConnell said there have been vigorous debates about the dollar amount of the levy based on citizen surveys and hopes the residents know that the City staff has made cuts.

Mayor McGlashan supported the item, although he expressed concern about the dollar amount. He felt a 25 cent levy may not be enough and there is still no guarantee that 27 to 28 cents will do either.

Mr. Olander clarified that the City staff would be recommending a six-year levy with a CPI escalator with a levy rate between 25 and 28 cents.

Councilmember Eggen commented that the City should consider human services funding if the King County measure passes.

Mayor McGlashan highlighted that King County hasn't made that determination yet and they don't know if they're going to designate those funds. Additionally, he pointed out that the law requires a certain percentage of those funds be used for public safety. He stated that the City has to mirror what they use as the purpose.

Mr. Olander commented that as this gets closer and a better idea of the polling is generated may influence the City staff recommendation.

Councilmember McConnell supported a six-year levy.

Councilmember Roberts stated that the cost to put a measure on the ballot is \$100,000.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:25 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.