

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, November 7, 2011
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber · Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Hall, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Roberts, and Councilmember Winstead.

ABSENT: Councilmember Scott

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 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 Scott.

Upon motion by Councilmember Eggen, seconded by Deputy Mayor Hall and carried 6-0, Councilmember Scott was excused.

(a) Proclamation of "Veterans Appreciation Day"

Mayor McGlashan read the proclamation declaring November 11, 2011, as "Veterans Appreciation Day" in the City of Shoreline. Shoreline Veterans Association Chair Dwight Stevens and members Frank Moll, Ray Coffee, Tom Drapac, Bob Grasmick, Les Neu, Richard Sessler, Tom Hamilton, and Gerry Shogren accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for this recognition. Dwight Stevens invited the community to attend the 2nd Annual Veterans Day event on Friday, November 11, 2011.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Julie Underwood, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Winstead reported on the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) Public Issues Committee (PIC) meeting, where voting on a letter regarding Initiative 1183 was tabled. She added that the PIC passed a motion to support Transportation 2040 with amendments. She added

that the PIC supported the continuity of the Veterans Services levy and there was discussion about animal control.

Councilmember Eggen reported on the SeaShore Transportation Forum and stated that Highway 520 tolling will start in December. Mayor McGlashan confirmed with Councilmember Eggen that the Forum felt that the passage of Initiative 1125 would not deter variable tolling on Highway 520.

Councilmember Roberts attended the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) Economic Quality Infrastructure Committee.

Mayor McGlashan reported on the Northend Mayor's meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Sigrid Strom, Shoreline, commented on the Tree Board and would like to see more public process and citizen tree experts involved.

b) Mike Woodbury, Lake Forest Park, supported community efforts to maintain the urban forest and discussed the Lake Forest Park tree management plan.

c) Ian Scott, Shoreline, cautioned against assigning tree management responsibility to the PRCS Director and the PRCS Advisory Board because it would miss the opportunity to promote community stewardship of the tree canopy.

d) John Dixon, Seattle, noted that there was no community input regarding the many trees the Parks department cut and removed from Twin Ponds Park, adding that there could have been a community garden at south end.

e) Janet Way, Shoreline, expressed concerns about the tree proposal and the PRCS Board's lack of expertise to manage it. She suggested having a tree board made up of resident experts.

f) Christine Southwick, Shoreline, stated that a tree board is important and there should be at least one tree expert on it. She felt that the PRCS Director wouldn't have enough time to manage this.

g) Frank Backus, Seattle, spoke in favor of tree board and strong ordinances that maintain forest infrastructure, adding that a different decision should have been made in the Twin Ponds tree cutting issue.

h) Kava Vale, Shoreline, provided a tree study to Council and stated that the City's trees provide \$3.5 million in annual benefits. She noted that she does not want the City to be a Tree City USA in name only.

i) Richard Ellison, Seattle, urged the Council to have a diverse forestry board and said that the Twin Ponds incident is unfortunate because there was not enough public oversight.

j) Debbie Kellogg, Shoreline, opposed the proposal to put the PRCS Department in charge of the tree board, noting past problems with the dog park, Kruckeberg Botanical Gardens, the Trails Committee, and Twin Ponds tree cutting.

k) Ruth Williams, Seattle, encouraged modeling sustainability and educating the public through the planting and preserving of more trees. She also asked PRCS to respect and honor all volunteers.

l) Nancy Morris, Shoreline, agreed with previous speakers concerning trees and said that the structure of the tree Commission should be distinctly different from the PRCS Board.

m) Patty Hale, Shoreline, provided various statistics on hunger and urged people to donate food for Hopelink at Café Aroma during the month of November.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilmember Eggen, seconded by Councilmember Hall and carried 6-0, the agenda was approved.

7. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussion of the Legislative Rezone Implementing the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea

Joe Tovar, Planning and Community Development Director, and Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, outlined the proposed change by Councilmembers Roberts and Eggen to the zoning recommendation forwarded from the Planning Commission for the southeast corner of the SE Neighborhoods Subarea from Community Business (CB) to Mixed Use Zone (MUZ). They recommended that Council determine if the City staff should proceed with traffic and environmental analyses to determine the appropriateness of MUZ designation for implementation of SE Neighborhoods Subarea Plan or if the City staff should schedule the adoption of the Planning Commission recommended rezone implementing the SE Neighborhood Subarea Plan.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

- a) Sigrid Strom, Shoreline, former Southeast Subarea Citizens Advisory Committee member communicated that MUZ is not completely inconsistent with the committee and the committee raised the issue of taxes on current businesses and residents which would be a definite potential impact. She added the committee felt strongly there had to be a multi-jurisdictional corridor study on NE 145th prior to any major development occurring.

b) Diana Herbst, Shoreline, agreed with the prior speaker and spoke in favor of a traffic study, adding that if this proceeds her home will be destroyed and there will be traffic and drainage issues.

c) Bettilynn Krezik-Brown, discussed issues related to infrastructure analysis, density, business zoning, and drainage studies. She felt the entire process should be delayed because it is too complicated.

Councilmember Eggen stated he has always been concerned about legislative rezones. He communicated that business owners are taxed on highest and best use. He said he got the impression that the Council wants to emphasize business activity there.

Councilmember Roberts stated that there has been a disconnect between the vision articulated by the committee and what it is now. He said he would like to have the tools, but needs to make sure it's done right. He noted that there have been proposals and tools that have been pushed to the side and that the committee recommended "MUZ-light" and the Planning Commission did not have time to review it. Therefore, there is CB and MUZ and CB doesn't allow ground floor commercial uses. He also spoke in favor of a traffic study.

Councilmember Winstead asked for a summary of the process and Ms. Redinger noted that the Planning Commission worked on this for a year and a half and the committee walked through a number of ways to implement it. The goal of the committee was to come up with the vision, she said, and many of the goals were to be fulfilled by existing plans.

Deputy Mayor Hall noted that the issue is how to balance maximum community involvement with moving forward. He said he prefers moving ahead, and then making improvements later if needed. He discussed other City priorities that need attention. He noted that it was approved by a 6-1 vote in the Commission and he would prefer not to send it back through another process. He supported the recommendation and explained his rationale based on the differences between CB and MUZ, concluding that he does not want to increase hard surfaces in the City. Councilmember Roberts agreed with moving forward, but said that having the traffic study would not affect the Comprehensive Plan (CP) timeline.

Councilmember Eggen noted that a Council-initiated legislative rezone will increase property taxes and impact businesses and properties. Mr. Tovar replied that zoning maps and the CP must be consistent. He highlighted that the Council, at some point in time, decided to get away from the case-by-case rezone method. People need certainty, he explained, and a legislative rezone has the advantage of doing that. Councilmember Eggen said it has an impact on property owner's taxes, to which Mr. Tovar replied that the King County Assessor's Office is the source for the answer to that question.

Deputy Mayor Hall agreed that property values are important to look at, but there was lots of confusion about zoning and CP land use designations. He discussed Councilmember Eggen's and Robert's issues and said the assessor faces tough calls when there are uncertain zones with no comparable properties. He said that he doesn't feel that delaying this for four months would accomplish anything.

Mayor McGlashan commented on the traffic study and what the State would look at. Mr. Tovar replied that there are traffic implications with an MUZ and many larger issues the State could look at which would affect what improvement would be built there.

Councilmember Roberts said if a potential legislative rezone for MUZ is done for this corner, the study would still have to be done. He communicated that no one has actually opposed an MUZ zone; they are saying it could be considered.

Mayor McGlashan inquired how the process would proceed if the traffic study is done and Mr. Tovar explained the process. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, added that if the Council proceeds this way, it should hold a public hearing to determine if there is any support for an MUZ land use.

Councilmember Winstead communicated that citizens do not want increased density. She highlighted that we are in a bad economy and developers need certainty. She said she is not inclined to support this because it seems to be an attempt to delay. She felt that there should be some thought put to what "MUZ-light" is.

Councilmember Roberts noted that the Commission wanted to examine business zones and this is one step in a process. This process, he said, is just asking to examine whether MUZ would be appropriate.

Councilmember McConnell said she is not willing to dismiss a 6-1 vote so the Council can have more discussion. This, she pointed out, has been vetted through the public hearing at the Commission. She added that there was not enough controversy in the Commission recommendation to delay a decision.

Councilmember Eggen questioned what would occur if "MUZ-light" is designated later, and whether it would require a revised traffic study for the Commission and Council to change the designation. Mr. Tovar responded that the future draft work plan includes consideration of commercial zones. He pointed out that at the end of the public hearings and Commission consideration, the Council could change the zone later. Mayor McGlashan summarized Council consensus to have the City staff bring the Commission-recommended ordinance to the Council. Additionally, Ms. Underwood noted that discussion concerning the scope of work in these commercial zones and the Commission work plan is scheduled for a January study session.

(b) Discussion of Tree City USA

John Norris, Management Analyst, and Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Director, provided the staff report. Mr. Norris explained that the draft tree management ordinance proposes to designate the PRCS Director as the legally responsible tree manager for the City of Shoreline and to have the PRCS Board serve as an advisory Tree Board for city-owned trees, not trees on private property. He concluded that the Council is scheduled to adopt the tree management ordinance that is required for a Tree City USA designation on November 28.

Mr. Deal noted that City staff worked with Sarah Foster, an Urban and Community Forestry Coordinator with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, on all aspects of Tree City USA. Mr. Norris added that Tree City USA is a City designation and it affects public trees only. There was discussion about whether the Arbor Day Proclamation could be tied into the Healthy City Strategy. There was also discussion about having a citizen advisory committee report to the PRCS Board on trees.

Mr. Norris verified for Councilmember Eggen that Tree City USA only applied to public trees. Councilmember Eggen said the responsibilities for the tree board are very vague and he would like to see a stronger assignment of responsibility, a process for getting more expertise on the board, and a plan for utilizing resources in the community. Mr. Deal agreed and discussed PRCS board vacancies. He noted that the City staff could work with the Board and the group of citizens to identify the philosophy and strategy for managing trees. Responding to Council questions, Mr. Norris pointed out that many cities do not have a tree board and that having a citizen oversight committee is a best practice.

Deputy Mayor Hall discussed the beauty of Shoreline's trees and felt that any regulations on private property would have to go through the Commission. He said the Council needs this community feedback and this item is worth moving forward. Councilmember McConnell noted that the tree board should only have a few individual advisors and only work on tree management. She added that responsibilities need to be defined after passing the ordinance. Mr. Norris replied that the ordinance is intentionally flexible so the Council can structure it. There was discussion concerning the tree manager and that this item needs to be kept within the tree management budget previously established, with no additional funding available.

Councilmember Eggen asked Mr. Deal to confirm that there wasn't an Arbor Day proclamation done already this year. He also stated that there have been tree issues on 155th and Twin Ponds and he would like to see some principles for tree management. Mr. Deal noted that there is information in the reading packet concerning the Twin Ponds incident.

RECESS

At 9:42 p.m. Mayor McGlashan called for three minute break. The meeting was reconvened at 9:47 p.m.

(c) Continued Discussion of Proposed 2012 Budget

Debbie Tarry, Assistant City Manager, continued the discussion from the previous week on department budgets. She highlighted the Public Works by program and fund. She reviewed the \$4.3 million budget, to include changes and staff changes. She also reviewed the Surface Water Utility.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:55 p.m., upon motion by Councilmember Eggen, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and carried 6-0, the meeting was extended until 10:15 p.m.

Deputy Mayor Hall expressed concern about adding a City Engineer and said he is even more concerned about the loss of revenue and would like to be able to consider an amendment.

Councilmember Eggen verified the City Engineer duties and inquired if they would work on the Code to allow permits to be completed faster. Mr. Relph responded that the main responsibility of the City Engineer is to coordinate and manage all capital projects to maintain consistency; he said there is a weakness in the City's current process. Councilmember Eggen asked Mr. Relph if he considered designating an engineer on the City staff to perform those duties now. Mr. Relph responded that those responsibilities are the most significant in the Public Works Department and it takes a unique person to be successful as a City Engineer. Councilmember Roberts expressed support for the idea of creating this position and eliminating a different position. Ms. Tarry clarified that funding for recommended positions are there because other positions have been eliminated.

Ms. Tarry continued by highlighting the major facilities and parks capital projects as adopted in the 2012 Capital Improvement Plan. She also reviewed sidewalks, General Fund transfers, the ending fund balance, and concluded that the budget meets all financial policies.

Deputy Mayor Hall wondered if the City has looked at refunding bonds to save money, to which Ms. Tarry responded that there was a five-year waiting period before refunding them.

Councilmember Eggen questioned the 2012 debt service park bond and asked if there was a total amount collected. Ms. Tarry replied that it totals about \$87 per year collected per resident. He inquired about the policy for the General Fund ending fund balance, and Ms. Tarry explained that it was the equivalent of three months of fund expenditures and the insurance and budget contingencies, equaling a minimum of \$3.8 million.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:15 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.