

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, August 24, 2015
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Winstead, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Winstead led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclamation of Women's Equality Day

Mayor Winstead read a proclamation declaring August 26, 2015 as Women's Equality Day in the City of Shoreline. Dr. Cheryl Roberts, Shoreline Community College President, and Liz Vivian, Women's Funding Alliance Executive Director, accepted the proclamation. Dr. Roberts commented on the importance of public good, public service, and being a good citizen. She shared that her parents' first opportunity to vote was in 1965, and she has voted in every election. She encouraged everyone to vote for the vitality of the community and nation. Ms. Vivian shared that her organization advances leadership and economic opportunities for women and girls. She commented that they are looking toward 2020 and the 100th year marker of the 19th Amendment. She said their focus will be on narrowing the wage gap, increasing the number of elected women officials, and supporting more women on the path to economic self-sufficiency and sustainability. She announced a new collaboration project with the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and invited everyone to participate.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

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

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hall reported attending the Association of Washington Cities Board of Director's Meeting. He said they discussed the 2015 Legislative Session and developing strategies for the next session. He noted they will focus on getting more local officials engaged in developing relationships with legislators to help ensure that the State continues to provide funding to communities.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Lance Young, Shoreline resident, Interurban Trail Preservation Society, expressed concern about Seattle City Light's (SCL) tree removal proposal on the Interurban Trail. He requested Council's assistance to preserve the intent of the SCL Franchise Agreement. He commented that the Agreement cites the preservation of all trees and now SCL is proposing to only preserve significant trees. He said SCL is redefining what a significant tree is and soliciting neighborhood signatures supporting the removal of trees. He submitted pictures and letters from the neighborhood requesting that the trees be preserved. He requested that SCL postpone tree removal until the matter can be resolved.

Patty Pfeifer, Shoreline resident, commented that SCL's tree removal plans are in violation of the Letter of Understanding and the Franchise Agreement. She said the original Agreement included all trees and now SCL is trying to redefine what a tree is. She expressed disappointment that City Administration rubber stamped SCL's reinterpretation of the Agreement and said the City has a right to hold SCL accountable to the Agreement. She said SCL is planning to remove the trees in early September and asked the City to say no to the new tree definition, and/or postpone tree removal.

Nancy Morris, Shoreline resident, commented on the destruction of the forest canopy in Eastern Washington and the need to preserve Shoreline's trees and tree canopies. She said SCL should honor the Agreement and preserve the trees on the Interurban Trail. She advised Council to require SCL to honor the Agreement and not allow them to cut trees, or that they postpone any action until issues are resolved. She then read a quote, "Why Trees Matter" by Kim Robins.

Lorn Richey, Shoreline resident, urged Council to stop SCL from removing trees on the Interurban Trail.

John Osborne, Shoreline resident, thanked Council for installing signs on the Interurban Trail for bicyclists. He said the signs should be treated like a new street sign and flags should be placed on them. He noted that he did not know about the tree issue, but said it is nice to have a tree canopy.

Nola Maore, Shoreline residents, said she recently became aware of SCL's Interurban Trail tree removal plan and said SCL is going back on their word. She spoke in favor of trees and said that they are needed for clean air and beauty.

Janet Way, Shoreline Preservation Society, talked about the preservation of the tree canopy and the definition of a tree. She asked Council to direct Staff to abide by the Agreement and request SCL to honor their word.

CJ Hines, Shoreline resident, talked about clean-up efforts on the Interurban Trail. She said she participated in the discussions for the Franchise Agreement and commented that the Tree Board dropped the ball. She said SCL is inappropriately approaching neighbors requesting they sign a document to have trees removed.

John Norris, Assistant City Manager, explained that SCL regularly performs vegetation management, working along feeder (distribution) lines, and that they typically complete around four areas a year, on a two year vegetation management cycle. He explained that trees can affect continuity of electrical service and said 14 abutting property owners received notice of the planned work. He said the work entails pruning, and removing brush, stems, and undergrowth. He said SCL will also be removing significant trees as requested by 5 property owners. He commented on collaborating with SCL on the definition of trees and low lying vegetation and stressed that this is about the continuity of electrical services. He said the ancillary benefit to the tree removal is improving safety by reducing the opportunity for illegal activity.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Mayor Eggen moved to add a new Study item 8(a) to discuss vegetation management performed by Seattle City Light. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roberts.

Deputy Mayor Eggen commented on the SCL Agreement and said the broad cutting seems contrary to the spirit of the agreement they made.

Councilmember Hall commented on adding items to the Agenda without appropriate public process and notice. Mayor Winstead concurred asked the City Manager when this item could be added to the agenda for discussion.

Councilmember McGlashan stated Council should be directing Staff to hold SCL accountable to the Franchise Agreement.

Councilmember Salomon commented that he has concerns over the way the City is interpreting a tree versus a shrub. He said he would like to discuss the matter this evening.

Ms. Tarry responded that SCL is planning to perform the work in early September and said the item can be placed on tonight's Agenda for discussion or added to next week's agenda.

The motion passed unanimously.

The agenda was approved, as amended, by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Roberts, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and unanimously carried, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

(a) Minutes of Business Meeting of July 20, 2015

(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of August 7, 2015 in the amount of \$2,966,492.56

***Payroll and Benefits:**

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
7/5/15-7/18/15	7/24/2015	61946-62192	13954-13984	60694-90701	\$661,149.89
					<u>\$661,149.89</u>

***Wire Transfers:**

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
7/28/2015	1096	\$11,707.51
		<u>\$11,707.51</u>

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
7/28/2015	60645	60645	\$119.97
7/29/2015	60646	60656	\$29,603.46
7/29/2015	60657	60676	\$330,049.85
7/29/2015	60677	60693	\$1,755,155.82
7/30/2015	60702	60702	\$44,534.24
8/6/2015	60703	60731	\$86,560.92
8/6/2015	60732	60766	\$899.78
8/6/2015	60767	60802	\$42,406.32
8/6/2015	60531	60531	(\$5,000.00)
8/6/2015	60803	60803	\$5,000.00
8/7/2015	60804	60804	\$4,304.80
			<u>\$2,293,635.16</u>

8. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussion of Seattle City Light (SCL) Vegetation Management

Ms. Tarry provided history leading up to the 2012 Letter of Understanding and the 2014 Seattle City Light Franchise Agreement Vegetation Management Plan. She explained that SCL was previously exempt from the City’s Tree Regulations and not required to apply for a permit to cut trees. She said the question on how to define a tree arose when SCL was preparing to perform vegetation management, and it was discovered that the definition was not covered in the

Franchise Agreement. She explained that both parties agreed to apply the City's Significant Tree definition contained in Municipal Code.

Deputy Mayor Eggen asked why feeder lines trigger vegetation removal. Mr. Norris responded that feeder line assets belong to the City of Seattle. He recalled Council's previous discussion on vegetation management in the SCL Franchise Agreement and acknowledged receiving push back from the community regarding tree removal. Sandi Fukumoto, Seattle City Light, said stems are threatening the power lines. The options are trimming the vegetation now and then having to repeatedly come back to trim, or completely removing the vegetation.

Councilmember Roberts thanked the Interurban Trail Society and others for bringing this issue to Council's attention. He said language matters and Agreements need to be specific and precise. He read Shoreline's Development Code definition of a tree and said he believes if the contract language says tree, it says tree, and should be defined according to the Code.

Councilmember Hall said it is unfortunate that the City did not define significant tree in the Franchise Agreement, and shared that having tree inventory data would assist in this matter.

Councilmember Salomon asked how high the power lines are and commented that he does not understand why non-significant trees need to be cut. He commented that he does not agree with the way the City is administratively reading the definition of tree and that the text of the Agreement needs to be honored. He said he would rather see the vegetation pruned and commented that SCL has heard from neighbors about safety concerns.

Councilmember McConnell said she attended the 2011 meeting, with at least 50 people present, and recalled that there was satisfaction with the Agreement. She said for residents to come out again tonight means there must be a problem. She agreed with Councilmember McGlashan to ask the City to hold SCL accountable to the Franchise Agreement.

Mr. Norris presented images of the vegetation in question.

Mayor Winstead said the definition of trees is important and more clarification in the Agreement would be helpful. She said she does not favor removal of trees unless they are a hazard, and also commented on the calls she receives when trees take out power lines. She shared that her major concern is safety on the trail. She asked the City Attorney to clarify procedures resulting from a dispute with the Franchise Agreement. Ms. King responded that the Agreement is valid and the discrepancy is with the interpretation of the definition of trees. She said Staff will present Council's interpretation to SCL.

Brent Schmidt, Seattle City Light Vegetation Management Manager, explained that the trees in question have the propensity to get very large and that the best practice in vegetation management is to address them when they are small. He commented that SCL has heard from neighbors on safety concerns and as a property owner SCL has the responsibility of keeping the property maintained.

Deputy Mayor Eggen asked about the growth rate of trees under the power lines and if a replacement schedule can be implemented to plant trees that will be allowed to grow before existing vegetation is removed. Mr. Schmidt responded that the trees can grow 10-15 feet in a year, and that SCL tries to keep a 10 foot clearance. He said they can work with property owners regarding the appropriate trees to plant that do not require trimming every two years.

Councilmember Hall moved to direct staff to ask Seattle City Light to delay tree and shrub removal to allow time for the City, SCL and, the affected neighborhood to evaluate options for tree replacement, defining a tree, and for the purposes of vegetation management in the Franchise Agreement, with goals to ensure the safety and reliability of the electrical distribution system, and preservation of tree canopy for benefits to the community. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnell.

Councilmember Salomon said he will not support the motion and commented that the motion invalidates what is contained in the Franchise Agreement. He said Staff should be provided with a clear interpretation.

Ms. King advised that the Franchise Agreements gives SCL authority to remove vegetation if it poses a risk.

Councilmember McGlashan commented on the need for SCL to provide vegetation management and questioned why SCL is responsible for buffering residential homes from the Trail. He shared that SCL allowed the City to include a Vegetation Management Plan in the Franchise Agreement which is not standard practice.

Councilmember McConnell added that she hopes SCL considers the public comments.

The motion passed, 5-2, with Councilmembers McGlashan and Salomon voting no.

(b) Discussion and Update of Promote Shoreline Project

Dan Eernisse, Economic Development Manager, presented Promote Shoreline goals and said that PRR was the successful firm awarded the contract. Denise Walz, Co-President & Principal in Charge, introduced Jen Rash, Senior Account Manager, and Katherine Schomer, Senior Research Associate. Ms. Walz provided information about PRR and said that they are the pioneers in market transformation. She talked about campaign objectives and strategies, and presented target market segments. Ms. Schomer presented the research plan, reviewed potential-resident survey questions, and presented key findings and messaging ideas. She shared that the respondents like what Shoreline has to offer but stated Shoreline has perception obstacles. She said respondents that viewed Shoreline as a less favorable place to move believe Shoreline is too expensive, not safe, lacks culture, and has commuter and traffic issues.

Ms. Rash provided the following marketing recommendations to promote Shoreline:

- Focus on the most interested first and reach them where they already get their information

- Focus on those that could be receptive to Shoreline by debunking myths and generating positive buzz
- Continue elevation and investment in Placemaking

Ms. Walz said the next step in the process is to provide effective promotional tools and launch the initial marketing campaign.

Councilmembers expressed appreciation for the techniques used in the survey, suggested leveraging Shoreline Community College in the marketing plan, and commented that respondents did not value rent as an encouragement to move to Shoreline but did indicate there was value in purchasing a home in Shoreline. They commented on hearing from Human Services providers that as people with more money move in to an area that the affordable housing stock is upgraded, resulting in lower income residents being pushed out, and being mindful of these issues.

Councilmembers asked about the drop in attributes when the survey respondents found out the place being described was "Shoreline"; how consultants plan to implement their strategy of developing messages/mediums to debunk misperceptions and tout achievements; if the messages have been tested; and if the housing type question was asked separately. They requested data on single family respondents. Ms. Schomer responded that the question regarding attributes was unique to this survey and that it is usually administered to residents in their own city. She said it is good information to know and will help address the perception problem. Ms. Rash responded that the messages will be tested in focus groups to find out how effective they are in debunking misperceptions, and Ms. Walz added that a messaging hierarchy will be developed. Ms. Schomer responded that housing was broken out and that it can be further drilled down.

Mr. Eernisse recounted the goal of helping Aurora Square become a cohesive unit and said "Shoreline Place" has been selected as the new name. He presented images of the logo on various signs. He shared that Shoreline Community College (SCC) is a strategic partner and a participant in the promote Shoreline campaign. He said SCC is having challenges with poor visibility on Aurora. He proposed placing SCC 50th Year Celebration banners on Aurora Avenue, from 155th to 165th, and a ceremonial street name designation of "College Way" on North 160th, which will all be funded by the College.

Councilmembers asked about ceremonially changing the name of Aurora Ave to Shoreline Boulevard. They asked why the SCC banners do not mention "50 Years" and how long they will be up. Ms. Tarry responded that the intent is to put the banners up prior to the start of classes and leave them up year round.

(c) Discussion and Update - Code Enforcement Program

At 9:31 p.m. Mayor Winstead called for a 5 minute recess, and at 9:35 p.m. she reconvened the meeting.

Kristie Anderson, Code Enforcement Officer, introduced Jarrod Lewis, Permit Services Manager, and Randy Olin, Customer Response Team Supervisor. Ms. Anderson provided a

historical overview of the code enforcement program in Shoreline. Mr. Olin provided an overview of the code enforcement process and explained how code violations are handled. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Olin then reviewed sample cases of code violations and remedies. Mr. Olin reviewed 2014 Service Request violation data and cited the top five code issues. Ms. Anderson presented data on property maintenance and chronic nuisance violations. Mr. Lewis reviewed highlights of the presentation.

Councilmembers thanked Staff for cleaning up graffiti so quickly. They discussed Councilmember Hall's proposal to hold the Community accountable to the Sign Code, and the merits of applying a citywide uniform sign intermittency of 10 seconds, and then contacting people that are in violation.

Councilmember McConnell moved to extend the meeting 10 minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Roberts, and passed 6-1, with Councilmember McGlashan voting no.

Councilmembers discussed the appropriate process to address signs in the right-of-way and electronic sign code compliance issues. They commented that businesses are operating in violation of City Code and should be notified that they need to comply. They suggested that those issues be classified as a more urgent code issue and addressed first.

Councilmembers asked if the City tracks the time it takes to resolve code enforcement violation issues and how often CRT returns to ensure that a condemned property remains vacant. Ms. Anderson replied issues are not tracked on an annual basis because they are variable and based on different circumstances. She said she often checks that condemned properties remain vacant.

Councilmember Hall moved to direct Staff/CRT to contact business owners of non-compliant signs and work with them to get into voluntary compliance with City Code and look at revisiting the hold time or the sign regulations as a future work plan item. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan and passed unanimously.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk