

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, June 7, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Hall, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember Roberts, Councilmember Scott, and Councilmember Tracey

ABSENT: Councilmember McConnell

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 Councilmember McConnell.

Councilmember Tracey moved to excuse Councilmember McConnell. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events. Following the report, a video was shown highlighting the projects, programs, and services that contribute to the quality of life in the City of Shoreline.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen reported on another Regional Transit Task Force (RTTF) meeting and said the group is moving into a more deliberative phase.

5. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussion of Aldercrest and Cedarbrook

Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager, provided a staff report and background on the two sites known as Aldercrest and Cedarbrook. She noted that discussions have taken place with all parties and that trust of public lands issues, grant funding, and zoning options have been explored.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

a) Tami Johnson, Shoreline, on behalf of the Coalition for the Preservation of Cedarbrook, stated that it is reasonable to expect elected officials to ensure open spaces remain a part of Shoreline neighborhoods. She urged them to make a firm commitment to explore all options.

b) Janne Kaje, Shoreline, on behalf of Friends of Aldercrest, urged the Council to secure Aldercrest as permanent park space for the growing population. He urged the Council to form a committee to discuss this option.

c) George Piano, Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Coalition for the Preservation of Cedarbrook, urged the Council to look at Cedarbrook as a new opportunity to serve an entire neighborhood with a park and to work creatively to realize its public benefit for the future.

d) Nancy Moreyra, Shoreline, submitted a petition requesting the City work with the Shoreline School District (SSD) on Aldercrest. She urged the Council to consider all the educational benefits.

e) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, stated that Friends of Aldercrest and Friends of Cedarbrook have both submitted plans and it is in the best interest of the SSD and the City to add it to the Parks Master Plan.

f) Katie Rohs, Lake Forest Park, wanted the Council to consider making Cedarbrook an accessible park for disabled kids.

g) Betsy Piano, Lake Forest Park, stated that she collected 800 signatures when Cedarbrook was to be surplus by the School District. She said there aren't any soccer fields or playgrounds in the north end.

h) Rich Osborne, Shoreline, said he is proud to see this area become something other than "Seattle's stepchild" adding that this is a great opportunity for parks and recreation.

Mayor McGlashan recognized Lake Forest Park Councilmember Stanford in the audience.

Responding to Councilmember Eggen, Ms. Underwood clarified that the Parks and Recreation Open Space (PROS) plan update is due in 2011. Councilmember Eggen felt that the Council should definitely put Aldercrest on the PROS plan or take some course of action before the properties go on the market in August.

Responding to Council questions, Mr. Tovar discussed the differences between the Aldercrest site and the Cedarbrook site, adding that Cedarbrook has limited development potential. Councilmember Eggen discussed possibilities regarding Cedarbrook and

encouraged the formation of a small committee that can discuss these issues before August. Councilmember Scott expressed interest in both properties and said he needs clarity from the School District regarding what they want from the Council.

There was Council discussion regarding the update of the PROS plan and stormwater issues associated with both sites. Mr. Olander noted that the Council can update the master plan now in order for the two groups to attain funding through amending the current PROS plan. Councilmember Roberts commented on the various properties within the City that are in flux. Mr. Olander noted that the City has had briefings with SSD and discussed the topic about opportunities, but not as one comprehensive package. Councilmember Tracey commented on the importance of having a partnership with SSD.

There was discussion about the process of including these properties in a Comprehensive Plan update and the need the shift priorities if that is the desired direction. There was also discussion about funding and the fact that the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) grants require a 50% matching funds. The Council then discussed possible drainage issues associated with both sites as well as potential development options and timing. Councilmember Scott noted that SSD is selling these properties as a part of their long-term strategic plan to create an endowment for education. He noted there may be no immediate pressure to sell if this is a long-term plan. Ms. Underwood said there is some pressure because the SSD considers the properties liabilities.

There was Council discussion about potential land use rezones and whether a task force is needed to consider the options for these properties. After further discussion, Mr. Olander expressed concerns about proceeding unilaterally without consulting the School District. Councilmember Scott stated that forming a task force would send a signal that the City Council is interested in the sites, but adding these to the PROS sends too strong a message. Mayor McGlashan said he has had conversations with SSD and LFP and a task force may be the right direction, but it may not change anything. Deputy Mayor Hall concurred.

There was Council consensus to direct staff to form a task force with a defined scope and outcomes. Mr. Olander noted that if a more detailed work plan comes out of the task force it will require more direction.

RECESS

At 8:23 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a five minute break. The meeting reconvened at 8:28 p.m.

(b) Discussion of the Economic Development Advisory Committee

Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager, and John Norris, Management Analyst, provided the staff report. Ms. Underwood outlined the problems and issues related to the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC).

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

a) Doug Palmer, Mountlake Terrace, stated that the Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) agreed that the group needs to be restructured, but not with proposals or timelines.

b) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, read the purpose statement of the EDAC and said they have developed strategies and set priorities. She said the committee should be allowed to do what it was formed to do.

c) Jack Carney, Shoreline, asked if there was a hidden agenda or political structure in the EDAC and if the Council and City staff is insecure about past successes.

d) Diana Stephens, Snohomish, said the EDAC uses its business expertise to advise the City but she felt the committee was delayed by other issues introduced by City staff.

e) Rick Stephens, Snohomish, on behalf of the Shoreline Merchants Association (SMA), said the EDAC was never created as a sounding board for the Economic Development Program Manager (EDPM). He stated that the members feel blindsided and this isn't the way to treat volunteers.

Responding to Council questions, Dan Earnisee, Economic Development Program Manager, said although he is new to the City it appears City staff is trying to create a streamlined version of the EDAC.

The Council discussed the role and purpose of the EDAC and addressed the fact that there seems to be no clearly defined work plan. They also discussed the size of the committee and the fact that a smaller group might be more conducive to effective meetings. Councilmember Roberts referred to the original ordinance and said the Council consensus was that it wanted an independent committee to do its own work. It was noted that large groups tend to be less collaborative because everyone reacts to an agenda, whether the City staff or committee is setting it. There were also concerns about how absenteeism and turnover impact the effectiveness of the committee.

The Council then discussed the merits of restructuring the committee and the relative lack of flexibility as written in the original ordinance. Mr. Olander noted that the Council wants multiple inputs, and strong community input comes from organizations. He noted that the City staff receives direction under the Council-Manager form of government. The EDAC is one source of input and it is important for the Council to receive multiple points of access and not have it constrained through one body.

A discussion followed regarding the purpose and responsibilities of the EDAC as outlined in the Council packet. Ms. Underwood stated that the City staff thinks the purpose and the type of work the committee is responsible for needs work, and both should be determined by the Council. She added that the EDAC is tasked with advising and that staff is responsible for administering the program. Councilmember Scott noted that the EDAC is

tasked with updating the Economic Development Strategic Plan and budget allocation, which is a large responsibility. Based on that alone, he felt this deserves more discussion. After further discussion, the Council agreed it would be wise to bring this item back for another study session.

(c) Discussion of the Apprenticeship Utilization Program

Eric Bratton, Management Analyst, provided a brief staff report about the question of whether the City should implement apprenticeship utilization programs on public works projects. He discussed the apprenticeship utilization requirements (AUR) and summarized that the proposed resolution would require contracts for the City of Shoreline that exceed \$500,000 to include AURs requiring no less than 15% of the total labor hours per trade be performed by apprentices.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

a) Eric Talley, Shoreline, spoke in favor of apprenticeships as a means to grow and retain the local work force.

b) Jesse Salomon, Shoreline, spoke in favor of apprenticeship utilization as a means to provide education and living-wage jobs to workers.

c) Bobbie Peterson, Kenmore, spoke in favor of apprenticeship utilization and said this is the perfect time to put it in place for students.

d) Dale Bright, Seattle, spoke in favor of apprenticeship utilization, noting that the program is self-governing, self-reporting, and the costs are minimal.

e) Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, encouraged the Council to vote for the resolution.

Mr. Bratton responded to Council questions. He said there are ways to mitigate the costs and have bidders do a certification process, and that other cities put the burden on contractors. It was noted that the State audits the program to ensure the City has controls in place to monitor compliance.

The Council then discussed the merits of utilizing an apprenticeship program and the associated requirements including prevailing wage, monitoring, and reporting. It was noted that the City could duplicate the State's apprenticeship program, but it would vary by project and trade. Councilmember Eggen agreed with all six modifications to the resolution as outlined on page 46-48 with the exception of number 3. It was noted that apprenticeship programs ensure the City will have skilled workers and it seems beneficial for companies to have them. However, there was a question of why the City needs to mandate the program.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hall moved to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m. Councilmember Eggen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0 and the meeting was extended.

Councilmember Roberts felt the Council should be leaders on this because it ensures the City has the skills for our future. After a brief discussion, Councilmembers commented that additional time is needed to discuss this issue in more detail. There was Council consensus to continue discussing this item at a future Council meeting.

RECESS

At 10:08 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a two minute break. The meeting reconvened at 10:10 p.m.

(d) Presentation of the 2011 - 2016 Capital Improvement Plan

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, distributed a copy of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to each Councilmember and provided an overview of the content. She also provided the suggested schedule for review and adoption of the Plan. She highlighted that the City has 44 projects in the CIP at a total cost of over \$90 million with most of them relating to the Aurora Project, 166th – 205th Avenue North. She noted that annual road service maintenance is \$6 million and that 60% of the total CIP funding comes from grants. She also noted that the Transportation Benefit District (\$20) license tab fee is being used for pavement management. Ms. Tarry reviewed all of the proposed capital allocations.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

a) Janet Way, Shoreline, commented that there needs to be a mechanism in the CIP to fund the tree issue because of all the cross-departmental coordination involved.

Deputy Mayor Hall said he is interested in how to adopt this without looking at entire General Fund balance and capital funds, adding that he would rather cut capital than operations and services. Ms. Tarry replied the six-year CIP represents the intended spending and the Council can still modify the budget during the budget process in the fall. Councilmember Eggen felt that if the financial situation gets worse the Council will be amending the entire budget.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:30 p.m. Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk