## **CITY OF SHORELINE**

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, September 10, 2012 7:30 p.m. Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall 17500 Midvale Avenue North

- PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Winstead, Councilmember Salomon, and Councilmember Roberts
- ABSENT: Councilmember Hall
- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- At 7:30 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, except for Councilmember Hall, who was out for personal reasons.

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

(a) Proclamation of Emergency Preparedness Month

Mayor McGlashan read the proclamation declaring the month of September 2012 as "Emergency Preparedness Month" in the City of Shoreline. Gail Harris, Emergency Preparedness Coordinator, accepted the proclamation and emphasized the importance of emergency preparedness.

#### 3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, Assistant City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

#### 4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor McGlashan reported on the various items discussed at the third Mayor's Transportation Forum. Deputy Mayor Eggen noted that the Subarea Boards are urging King County to put together a recommendation for transportation funding for a vote in 2013.

#### 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Dale Lydin, Shoreline, Board Member of Echo Lake Neighborhood Association, expressed support for the Echo Lake Master Plan and thanked staff and the citizens for their input, planning, and contributions.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilmember Winstead, seconded by Councilmember Roberts and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Roberts, seconded by Councilmember Winstead and unanimously carried, the following Consent Calendar item was approved:

(a) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Modify the HDR Construction Management Contract for the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project - N 165th to 185th Streets

(b) Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of August 31, 2012 in the amount of \$6,490,802.54 as specified in the following detail:

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
1 61 100	Date	<u>45903-</u>	(1 K)	(AI )	1 alu
6/24/12-7/7/12	7/13/2012	46127	11853-11889	50856-50861	\$428,373.55
7/8/12-7/21/12	7/27/2012	46128- 46357	11890-11935	50929-50936	\$571,868.71
7/22/12-8/4/12	8/10/2012	46358- 46590	11936-11979	51064-54069	\$447,840.00
	0/10/2012	46591-	11,00 11,17		<i><i><i>q</i> <b>1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</b></i></i>
8/5/12-8/18/12	8/24/2012	46811	11980-12019	51252-51259	\$564,601.20
					\$2,012,683.46
<b>*Wire Transfers:</b>					

\*Payroll and Benefits:

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
7/26/2012	1057	\$3,905.71
8/13/2012	1058	\$238,284.60
8/28/2012	1059	\$2,982.83
		\$245,173.14

\*Accounts Payable Claims:

## DRAFT

Expense	Check	Check	
Register	Number	Number	Amount
Dated	(Begin)	(End)	Paid
7/17/2012	50790	50790	\$1,880.00
7/19/2012	50791	50799	\$42,242.45
7/19/2012	50800	50821	\$194,327.86
7/19/2012	50822	50830	\$1,329.18
7/19/2012	50831	50853	\$322,693.50
7/19/2012	50854	50855	\$37.97
7/23/2012	50862	50863	\$59,195.86
7/24/2012	50864	50864	\$350.00
7/25/2012	50865	50871	\$8,316.21
7/25/2012	50872	50890	\$48,661.58
7/26/2012	50891	50914	\$109,303.96
7/26/2012	50915	50927	\$39,471.20
7/31/2012	50928	50928	\$56,958.05
8/2/2012	50937	50961	\$212,858.72
8/2/2012	50962	50969	\$27,911.31
8/2/2012	50970	50990	\$907,492.48
8/2/2012	50991	50999	\$2,940.36
8/7/2012	50612	50612	(\$10,080.00)
8/7/2012	51000	51000	\$10,080.00
8/7/2012	50704	50704	(\$200.00)
8/7/2012	51001	51001	\$200.00
8/9/2012	51002	51020	\$363,365.55
8/9/2012	51021	51027	\$12,056.29
8/9/2012	51028	51049	\$118,355.44
8/9/2012	51050	51062	\$7,257.54
8/9/2012	51063	51063	\$1,811.75
8/22/2012	51070	51071	\$113,602.24
8/23/2012	51072	51091	\$63,165.76
8/23/2012	51092	51111	\$86,542.54
8/23/2012	51112	51124	\$50,267.92
8/23/2012	51087	51087	(\$971.00)
8/23/2012	51125	51125	\$971.00
8/23/2012	51126	51155	\$191,454.00
8/23/2012	51156	51180	\$64,672.42
8/23/2012	51181	51187	\$2,913.85
8/24/2012	51188	51189	\$21,421.75
8/28/2012	50778	50778	(\$149.50)
8/28/2012	51190	51190	\$149.50
8/29/2012	51191	51209	\$137,574.83
8/29/2012	51210	51218	\$33,024.03
8/29/2012	51219	51219	\$35,760.00
8/30/2012	51220	51233	\$16,163.02
8/30/2012	51234	51246	\$872,856.88
8/30/2012	51247	51251	\$4,709.44
			\$4,232,945.94

#### 8. STUDY ITEMS

#### (a) Discussion of Watershed Investment Districts

Scott MacColl, Intergovernmental Relations Manager, stated that the issue at hand is to find a permanent funding source for Watershed Resource Investment Areas (WRIA's), which are temporarily funded by the King Control Flood Control District. The policy question is whether the Council supports the creation of a Watershed Investment District (WID) by the state legislation, or whether the Council prefers funding through existing resources. The Suburban Cities Association (SCA) Public Issues Committee (PIC) has requested that cities study the question and report back.

The Council discussed the following questions and issues:

- Is WRIA focused on salmon recovery in urban areas that will never produce the amount of salmon we hope to see, or would it be better spent on habitat acquisition in the Skagit River area?
- It is likely that a future solution to salmon recovery would involve combining stormwater with habitat restoration.
- The WRIA-8 salmon recovery plan focuses on areas where population density is relatively low, such as the south end of WRIA-8. The native tribes are contemplating filing a new lawsuit regarding salmon recovery, and it is unclear whether the flood control district will continue to fund WRIAs.
- Is the WID another special purpose district with a new taxing authority?
- There are other avenues that could be utilized for funding sources, but none has been identified.
- The legislature will make the final decision on how WRIAs get funded even if the cities agree on one.
- The Council should be leery about moving forward with establishing a new special purpose district.
- The broader question is if there is a desire to consolidate agencies and bring salmon recovery under one authority. The scientific question is how much needs to be done and who is going to pay for it.
- There is too much uncertainty and the Council needs to have more information before making a decision.
- The Council shouldn't invest its political capital in this due to other issues it is currently facing.
- Collaboration between the agencies might be the best way to manage salmon recovery because the WRIAs are well-organized.
- The Council should not take a position on the item and recommend that the Public Issues Committee remain silent on it.
- If stormwater management is added to salmon recovery, cities, counties, ports, the Department of Ecology, and utilities would be included in the discussions.
- The funding is slated to continue through 2013 with the King County Flood Control District fund.

- The King Conservation District (KCD) funding was found to be invalid because the \$10.00 flat rate per parcel tax rate was not uniform taxing mechanism for parcels of differing sizes and uses. The taxing formula was readjusted and submitted to the King County Council already.
- Salmon recovery is not limited by city or county boundaries and it is unclear if what we are doing today is the most effective approach.

Mayor McGlashan confirmed the Council consensus to not take a position on this issue. Deputy Mayor Eggen stated that he will urge the SCA PIC to take no position.

(b) 2012 2nd Quarter Financial Report

Bob Hartwig, Administrative Services Director, provided the 2nd Quarter Financial Report and an early look at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter data. He noted that the revenue projections have been revised upwards. Additionally, he noted that expenditures are projected at less than budgeted. He stated sales tax revenues are 2.2% higher than projected, as are utility/franchise fees. He noted that there are unfavorable variances, such as property tax, criminal justice sales tax, some utility tax, Seattle City Light contract payment, and the gambling tax. Mr. Hartwig covered revised year-end projections and said the sales tax, development, intergovernmental, and grant revenues are all above projections. He noted that the projected year-end savings is \$1.2 million, but projected year-end revenues are 2.1% lower than previously projected.

Mr. Hartwig highlighted the general, street, surface water utility, general capital, and roads capital funds. He noted that the number of real estate excise tax fund (REET) transactions is up by 93 compared to this time last year in the amount of \$25.35 million or 29% more than last year. He said 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter sales tax revenue is up by 10% from last year and development revenue is about \$217,000 below projections. However, the fund balance should be up by \$400,000 at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter.

Responding to Council questions, Mr. Hartwig confirmed that the fund balance means all of the funds left over by adding the revenues and expenditures. It includes Proposition 1 and equates to retained earnings or assets in private industry. He also confirmed that at the end of last year the City budgeted to use \$1.5 million of the fund balance. However, that isn't the case any longer. Patti Rader, Budget Manager, responded to the Council questions about the fund balance. She noted that the revenue stabilization fund is fully-funded.

Responding to Councilmember Salomon regarding potential funding for sidewalks, Ms. Underwood requested guidance from the Council concerning the expenditure of savings on items related to the Council goals, which will be presented to them next week.

The discussion concluded with brief comments regarding the low amount of interest income, the fact that Parker's Casino is now closed, and the outstanding payments of two casinos.

(c) Discussion of Echo Lake Park Draft Master Plan

Maureen Colaizzi, Parks Planner, was joined by Tricia Juhnke, City Engineer. Ms. Colaizzi outlined the Echo Lake Park Improvement Project, noting that the property is owned by Seattle City Light (SCL). She outlined the efforts to date, which include working with neighborhood, conducting a topographic survey, wetland delineation, critical area review, vegetation assessment, and reviewing police incident reports. She highlighted the community outreach and participation and described existing conditions. She discussed various design ideas, such as a loop path, beach access, lower or no plantings, more seating and picnic areas, improving the lawn, increasing open views, adding a toddler play area with more tree shading, and improving the fishing area. She noted that the City asked an adjacent neighbor if he was willing to sell a portion of his property to the City, but he declined. She stated that the City is working with SCL about the possibility of acquiring property to locate a new restroom. She concluded by highlighting the schedule going forward, which includes Phase 1 construction in 2013 or 2014.

The Council and staff discussed the plan and the following points were made:

- The City should have discussions with anglers about adding plants on the south end near the fishing access.
- It doesn't make sense to buy property further away from the park.
- The intended material for the path is crushed rock, which functions as an impervious surface.
- A crushed gravel path is more impervious than a lawn.
- The City should avoid creating additional impervious surface on the site.
- The purpose of the trail is to solve some of the social problems which occur behind the restroom.
- The existing lawn is not irrigated so the trail would function more like impervious surface.
- Separating the fishing area from the beach is a good idea but the height of the brush could be a problem.
- The City should be forward-thinking and not dismiss the idea of property acquisition.
- Getting rid of the medium-sized plantings is a waste of resources.
- Putting in a restroom would blocks views. The restroom could be moved toward the trailhead to minimize view blockage.
- The City should pursue property acquisition for parking, bike racks, etc.
- The plan could include a swale or catch basin.
- Opening up the treed area may create more access for people from the Transit Center.

Ms. Colaizzi clarified that the idea and location of the restroom is uncertain and said she will bring back more design ideas at the next Council meeting on this topic.

#### 9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:37 p.m., Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk