

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, November 21, 2011
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Hall, and Councilmembers Eggen, McConnell, Roberts, and Scott

ABSENT: Councilmember Winstead

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 Winstead

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

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

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

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen reported on his attendance at the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference. Deputy Mayor Hall reported on the Puget Sound Partnership meeting. Councilmember Roberts reported on the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) Legislative Committee Hearing. Mayor McGlashan reported on NLC Community & Economic Development Steering Committee issue and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Charlotte Haines, Shoreline, invited the community to attend the Holiday Tree Lighting in North City on December 3 at 6:30 p.m.

b) Bob Allen, Shoreline, said the damage and erosion continues at Storm Creek and highlighted a letter that was sent by Innis Arden Club President Mike Jacobs to the City.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

7. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussion of the Surface Water Master Plan

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, Jesus Sanchez, Public Works Operations Manager, and Brian Landau, Surface Water Manager, presented the staff report. Mr. Relph discussed Boeing Creek and Storm Creek drainage issues. Mr. Sanchez discussed the recommended level of service (LOS), the associated rate structure for the utility, and the asset inventory and management plan. Mr. Landau discussed the seven sections of the Surface Water Master Plan Update, including repair/replacement, low impact development (LID), and the differences between LOS1 vs. LOS2. He noted that the City staff recommends LOS1 through 2012, with Mr. Relph explaining that it will allow the City staff to continue work on basin plans.

Councilmember Eggen asked for an estimate of the costs of responding to a catastrophic event in Storm Creek. Mr. Sanchez replied that consultants have looked at the mouth of Storm Creek, but have not identified a cost because there is a number of considerations and complexities that would come in later analysis. He added that if something immediate needed to be done, the City could declare an emergency, and state and federal funds would become available.

Councilmember Roberts inquired about Storm Creek piping and Mr. Landau replied that there is very little piping and most of it is open channel above the Reserves. Mr. Sanchez replied to Councilmember Roberts that the basin analysis will determine detention/retention opportunities upstream. Councilmember Roberts added that he wants to ensure the City has the capital to fix these problems and that the surface water utility is driven by fees. Mr. Relph noted that the Council has the authority to change circumstances and the basin planning information will give the Council more information to make informed decisions.

Mr. Relph replied to Councilmember McConnell that City staff is recommending staying the course with the basin plan. He added that engineering, geology, and working with the railroad, to include permitting with them, will be a difficult process. Mr. Sanchez stated he would hate to give the Council an arbitrary number, have the Council vote to raise rates, and then come back at a later date and inform them that a rate increase was not necessary. Councilmember McConnell confirmed with staff that 80% to 90% of the watershed is within Shoreline and that this is typical of what occurs around the Puget Sound. Mr. Relph said that his opinion is that this erosion is on private property and that the City has managed the public property flows appropriately and legally through the City's development regulations and the storm water utility since Shoreline's incorporation.

Councilmember Eggen summarized the discussion and Mr. Relph replied that he isn't sure an emergency declaration is the answer or even an alternative. He said the City needs more information. Mr. Sanchez provided concluding remarks about declaring an "emergency" and felt there are serious concerns, but it may not rise to the level of an emergency.

Mayor McGlashan noted that a "pipe and fill" seems to be the easiest solution, but the Washington State Department of Ecology and Department of Fish and Wildlife probably would not allow it. Mr. Sanchez responded that it may be an answer and Mayor McGlashan questioned what is legal to do in bluff areas. He noted that the solution may be concrete or anchors depending on the soil types. It was noted that the study is being expedited but it is dependent on weather conditions.

Mayor McGlashan added that he is leaning towards LOS2 and Mr. Relph stated that based on conversations with the Council, LOS1 is recommended by the City staff. However, it depends on whether the Council wants to be more focused on capital.

Ms. Underwood said that the City is comfortable having that conversation for the 2013 budget, but there needs to be a discussion with the County.

Deputy Mayor Hall expressed concern about collecting and banking money for this. He said the City should do some basin planning now and that sometimes the best thing is to not do so many things simultaneously. He added that he would rather see the City forego an increase in surface water management fees and delay starting new plans.

Councilmember Eggen confirmed that the City utilized a Public Works Trust Fund loan when the catastrophic event in 2008 occurred at Ronald Bog.

8. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING

- (a) Public hearing to receive citizens' comments on the 2012 Proposed Budget and continued budget discussion

Debbie Tarry, Assistant City Manager, presented a brief staff report to help facilitate the budget discussion.

Mayor McGlashan opened the public hearing.

- a) Susan Aker, Shoreline, communicated that she is not going away and has a letter from Mr. Sanchez sent 10 years ago stating that Storm Creek is a serious problem.

- b) Judy Allen, Shoreline, noted that Innis Arden is 2% of the Shoreline population and pays 8% of the City's taxes. Storm Creek, she warned, is an accident waiting to happen.

Mayor McGlashan closed the public hearing.

Deputy Mayor Hall said he appreciated the City staff budget work and responses to his questions. He noted that revenue impacts due to state budget cuts will prompt him to propose an amendment to not add the City Engineer position.

Councilmember Roberts said he has trouble understanding why the City Engineer position is needed because there is nothing about the workload for this position and how much time will be spent on engineer duties or on public works director duties. He discussed the levy and highlighted that the City is not allowed to exceed the statutory limit of \$1.60 and confirmed with Ms. Tarry that the City may not be stuck at that rate for the duration; it depends on what happens with assessed valuation. Discussion continued on projections, inflation, assessed valuations, and the possibility of the City collecting a 2% increase each year.

Deputy Mayor Hall added that assessed values have fluctuated wildly. He verified with Ms. Tarry that the City cannot bank anything in excess of the \$1.60 maximum rate.

Councilmember Eggen inquired if the City will have to start at a new levy baseline if things continue. Ms. Tarry responded that she would have to ask the King County Assessor's Office.

Councilmember McConnell favored the City Engineer position and preferred to have cuts elsewhere. She felt that if the City staff and the City Manager are concerned about quality, then it is justified. She also stated that she doesn't feel she should dictate how the City Manager runs the organization. Additionally, the Public Works Director will be heavily involved in the SPU acquisition. She added that the duties are specific and she recommends approval of the City Engineer.

Mr. Relph responded that the City Engineer functions are simply not getting done and there is a consistent lack of time being spent on key engineer functions. He added that a City Engineer is an enormous benefit to the community and will make the City more efficient and reduce conflict.

Councilmember Eggen noted that the Council has said they want to make the City more compatible with business and wanted to know if the lack of a City Engineer is impacting the City's ability to expedite permits. Mr. Relph replied that there are gaps in the City's process that he cannot fill. Councilmember Eggen added that reduced permitting and development staff alone would not expedite processes.

Councilmember Scott commented on the City Engineer position and said it applies to Council Goal #1 to make things more timely and predictable. However, he stated that a better cost/benefit analysis would be helpful for Council.

Councilmember Roberts confirmed with Ms. Tarry that the law is clear about banking the capacity of the \$1.60 levy and that the loss of revenues the City would incur would be about \$400,000 per year based on certain assumptions. Councilmember Roberts commented that he will propose an amendment to limit or eliminate the COLA in order to preserve City services.

Councilmember Eggen noted that the Council should think long and hard about revisiting the COLA policy to determine under what circumstances the City could implement it.

Deputy Mayor Hall pointed out that there is a limited amount of money and the City will either have to pay less or have fewer employees. He noted that the policy is to pay people close to the median of salaries of comparable cities, but if the COLA is not employed that might mean increasing salaries when the next salary survey is done.

Mayor McGlashan supported the addition of the City Engineer and agreed with Councilmember Eggen about Council review of the COLA policy in the future.

Ms. Underwood asked if the Council was comfortable with the proposed sidewalk funding.

Councilmember Eggen stated that he never sees anyone on the side of street on 15th near Hamlin Park and wondering if it's truly the highest priority sidewalk project in the City right now. Councilmember Roberts explained his support of the item and Deputy Mayor Hall agreed, noting his approval of the existing process to prioritize sidewalks. Councilmember Eggen reiterated that he rarely sees anyone walking at this location, he does not see it as a connection, and there are no significant safety issues that need to be addressed. Ms. Underwood noted that this project will help fill gaps in the sidewalk network in the southwest, Hamlin Park area, and assist in connecting the City's sidewalk system.

Councilmember McConnell noted that she does not favor the elimination of 2012 COLA for the same reasons as other Council members. She noted that the last COLA was 2009. She urged the Council and City staff to stay on track with Storm Creek and the March 2012 report for basin planning.

Councilmember Eggen said he heard an option to implement the COLA halfway through the year and now Councilmember Roberts's idea to eliminate the COLA. Ms. Tarry replied that it is the Council's decision and she can come prepared to present both options next week. Council discussion followed about the amendment process and Ms. Underwood clarified the option concerning implementing COLA mid-year. She confirmed that the amendments could be voted on one by one.

RECESS

At 9:05 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a four-minute break. The meeting was reconvened at 9:12 p.m.

(b) Public hearing to receive citizens' comments on the Draft Transportation Master Plan, including related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments

Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager, and Alicia McIntyre, Senior Transportation Planner, provided the staff report. Mr. McKinley highlighted the elements and the major change areas from the last Transportation Master Plan (TMP). He explained that the major changes include the level of service (LOS) standard, the detail in the transit element, and system plans for pedestrians, bicycle, and transit. He discussed the integration of stormwater into the

transportation and the master street plan. He concluded that Ms. McIntyre put together the entire master plan.

Ms. McIntyre noted that this was a staff-driven process and highlighted the four documents: 1) the TMP; 2) the Comprehensive Plan (CP); 3) the Development Code (DC); and 4) the Errata packet. She noted that the guiding direction of the TMP is established with goals, policies and implementation strategies. She reviewed the ten chapters of the TMP and the Council adoption schedule.

Mayor McGlashan opened the public hearing.

a) Tom Jameson, Shoreline, suggested the Council defer adoption of the TMP until after December because the Point Wells issue makes it premature. He said the changes in the TMP are conducive to the negotiation and shouldn't be negotiated prior to any agreement.

Mayor McGlashan closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Roberts discussed street classifications and questioned why the section on 15th Avenue Northeast between 145th and 150th is not designated a bike corridor. Ms. McIntyre replied that there is not much room to add bike lanes due to a fairly restricted right-of-way. She added that the area is very congested. He inquired on how many City streets have intact sidewalk segments without corners and expressed concern about the congruity of language in this document and that of the potential annexation area language in the CP. Ms. McIntyre replied that by adopting the TMP it becomes the newest standard for this area. She noted that unless an alternative LOS has been adopted in a subarea plan, the LOS in the CP is adopted. Mr. McKinley added that Point Wells was called out to make sure that concern was addressed. He added that the City did not model any growth at Point Wells at all because once the development proposal comes in, the City needs to model it and through SEPA figure out the impacts and mitigate them.

Councilmember Eggen discussed the bike lane question and noted that on 155th the bike lanes continue further than 5th Avenue. He said on 185th the bicycle lane terminates going west to east on 1st Avenue. Ms. McIntyre noted that there are no striped facilities on the road at those locations at this time. She discussed the criteria used to prioritize sidewalks and said there are specifics as you go through the actual recommended project. Councilmember Eggen noted that there is clear evidence of unsafe conditions and they are not flagged here. He highlighted the Ballinger area and said kids pour out of the apartment complex and safety is not covered by any of the policy items when it comes to sidewalks.

Deputy Mayor Hall discussed the relationship between this and the CP. He said that this is updating our CP concurrently and noted that he chose to review the CP amendments before the TMP. The result of this, he pointed out, is to reduce the number of policies from 69 to 54, yet still some overlap. For instance, he pointed out that T-16, T-21 and T-51 are similar and two can be eliminated. He said he has a handful of minor revisions he sent to the City staff. He discussed the unimproved right-of-way sections in the City which are not mentioned in the project list, but are covered in these strategies. Ms. McIntyre replied that these projects are small in scale and are not large sidewalk projects that could qualify for community block grants. Deputy Mayor Hall

discussed speed limits and pointed out the language concerning working with legislature on reducing speed limits. He noted that this is something the Council has not discussed and he would like that language dropped from the plan. He requested a policy discussion concerning the concurrency language on page 37 and asked the City staff to highlight the pros and cons.

Councilmember Eggen highlighted page 40, the policy of bicycle and advocacy groups, and wondered if legislative action in general should be excluded from this document.

Ms. McIntyre summarized the discussion and said the City staff would return to the Council with a smaller errata sheet and amendments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:04 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.