

# **CITY OF SHORELINE**

## **SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, June 4, 2018  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor Salomon, Councilmembers McGlashan, Scully, McConnell, Chang, and Roberts

ABSENT: None.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

### 2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

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

### 3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

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

### 4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember McGlashan reported that he and Councilmember McConnell attended the Sea Shore Forum on June 1<sup>st</sup> where Seattle Port Commissioner Peter Steinbrueck reported on Port activities, including projects that will increase SeaTac Airport's capacity.

Mayor Hall reported that he and a few other Commissioners attended a groundbreaking event for Shoreline Community College's new student housing project. He also attended the Puget Sound Regional Council's general assembly meeting where Snohomish County Executive Dave Somers was re-elected to serve as president for the next year. On Friday, he met with elected officials from Shoreline, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Everett and Snohomish County regarding the Sound Transit North Quarter Development.

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Christina Jones, Shoreline resident, asked that the Council delay approval of the Sidewalk Prioritization Plan in order to solicit additional public feedback and support. She also asked that

the plan provide at least an asphalt walkway along 190<sup>th</sup> Street between 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW and Richmond Beach Road where pedestrian safety is already a concern.

Fred Seidel, Shoreline Resident, voiced concern that the agenda places the discussion on the Sidewalk Prioritization Plan (Item 9a) after adoption of Resolution No. 822, which is the funding mechanism to improve sidewalks (Item 8a). He also voiced concern that it would take over 100 years to implement the plan using the proposed funding mechanism.

John Cole, Shoreline Resident, asked that the City Council postpone action on proposed Development Code amendments related to Community Residential Facilities, which will come before them on June 11<sup>th</sup>, and remand the issue back to the Planning Commission for further review of potential impacts.

Deborah Damaz, Shoreline Resident, asked that the Council vote against Ordinance No. 822. She voiced concern that an additional \$20 Vehicle License Fee would create additional hardship for fixed-income residents.

Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline Resident, submitted a letter requesting clarification about the new bike lanes on Richmond Beach Road.

Tom McCormick, Shoreline Resident, voiced support for Ordinance No. 822, which would provide funding for existing sidewalk repair. He also expressed his belief that the re-channelization project on Richmond Beach Road has improved safety for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Tom Petersen, Shoreline Resident, also voiced support for Ordinance No. 822, which will fund existing sidewalk repair.

Shirish Nair, Shoreline Resident, questioned why 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue between NW 195<sup>th</sup> and NW 205<sup>th</sup> Streets was lowered to medium priority when it is a main street leading to Einstein Middle School and cars travel up to 50 miles per hour.

Ms. Tarry clarified that Ordinance No. 822 (Item 8a) is for the purpose of funding repair and maintenance of existing sidewalks. The final Sidewalk Prioritization Plan (Item 9a) is for developing new sidewalks in the future. The City Council is scheduled to have discussions about a potential sales tax ballot measure to fund sidewalk construction starting on June 18<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Tarry referred to Ms. Scantlebury's questions and advised that it is legal to use the center lane to go around vehicles or obstructions that are stopped. However, it is not legal to use the center lane to pass a moving vehicle.

Ms. Tarry advised that reprioritization of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue between 195<sup>th</sup> and 205<sup>th</sup> Streets can be discussed as part of Item 9a.

## 6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Upon motion by Councilmember Roberts and seconded by Councilmember McGlashan and unanimously carried, 7-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

- (a) Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of April 16, 2018  
Approving Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of May 14, 2018**
- (b) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Construction Agreement with Hellas Construction, Inc. in the Amount of \$1,364,325.74 and Authorizing a 10 Percent Contingency of \$136,433.00 for a Total Authorization of \$1,500,758.74 for the Shoreline Park Fields A & B Turf Replacement Project**
- (c) Authorizing the City Manager to Executive a Contract with Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc. in the amount of \$722,347 for Phase 2 of the Hidden Lake Dam Removal Project**
- (d) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Local Agency Agreement with the Washington State Department of Transportation to Obligate \$3,546,500 of Surface Transportation Program Grant Funds for the N 175<sup>th</sup> Street, Stone Way to Interstate 5 Project**

8. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Adopting Ordinance No. 822 – Authorizing an Additional Vehicle License Fee (VLF) for Twenty Dollars to Preserve, Maintain and Operate the Transportation Infrastructure of the City of Shoreline, Including Funding for Sidewalk Repairs and Retrofits**

Tricia Juhnke, City Engineer, provided the staff presentation. She briefly reviewed the current sidewalk conditions and needs, and reminded Council that in 2009 the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District (TBD) levied a \$20 VLF to provide funding for roadway asphalt maintenance. Under current State Law, the City Council has councilmanic authority to impose up to a \$50 VLF. The proposed Ordinance would increase the fee by \$20, to a total of \$40 per vehicle, and the additional funding would be used for sidewalk repair.

Ms. Juhnke reminded Council that sidewalk repair was identified as the top priority by the Sidewalk Advisory Committee (SAC) and, although the VLF is not their preferred source of funding, they have indicated support for the Ordinance. She concluded that staff is recommending approval of Ordinance No. 822, which would generate about \$830,000 per year for the sidewalk maintenance program, with collection of the additional revenue beginning March 1, 2019.

**Councilmember Scully moved adoption of Ordinance No. 822 as proposed by staff. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chang.**

Councilmember Scully recalled that he voted against the proposed VLF when it was presented earlier because he wanted a more comprehensive plan for sidewalks. He recognized the comprehensive plan will not likely happen this year, and the VLF is a mechanism to get some additional funding to fix the worst of the problems. Sidewalks are an essential service that the City must provide to its citizens. He recognized that the VLF is a regressive tax and not nearly enough, but it a step in the right direction towards making the existing sidewalk network safe and useable for all.

Councilmember Chang recalled the video provided by the SAC to illustrate the problems associated with lack of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. Since its incorporation, the City has not devoted enough funding to address the significant ADA issues that exist. She supports Ordinance No. 822, which will provide a steady source of funding for priority sidewalk projects.

Deputy Mayor Salomon said he also voted against the VLF when it was presented earlier, and he will maintain that position. He agreed that it is important to fund sidewalks, but he is concerned that property taxes in King County have increased by about 43% in recent years. He has talked to a large number of City residents who are struggling with this tax burden, and he cannot support an additional tax increase at this time.

Councilmember McConnell observed that it is right for staff to recommend approval of the Ordinance, however, she cannot support it because she does not believe it is what the community wants. Whenever money is involved in a Council decision, she must think of other people, outside of what she can afford. She said she would prefer sending the issue to the citizens as a ballot measure for them to decide. She recalled that she voted for the initial VLF to preserve the City's ability to tax at some point in the future, but she is opposed to any additional VLF at this time because the community is getting very "taxed out."

Councilmember McGlashan observed that via the Citizen's Satisfaction Survey and personal discussions with Councilmembers, citizens have indicated that sidewalks are a high priority. However, he cannot support constructing new sidewalks until the City finds a way to make the existing sidewalks safe and useable. They must come up with a funding source to at least keep moving in a positive direction of making the sidewalks safe and ADA compliant. He recognized that the VLF is a regressive tax, but he will vote in favor of the Ordinance because they have to start somewhere.

Mayor Hall agreed with concerns about the current tax structure, but State law leaves the City very few options. The Council received a written comment suggesting that the fee be based on the value of the car. While he would prefer this option, too, it is not currently allowed under State law. He agreed that they must be able to maintain existing sidewalks before new ones are built, and the City is currently falling behind. He has heard from a lot of people that being able to move safely on sidewalks is very important. In addition to repair needs, many of the sidewalks are unsafe and could result in injury. For these reasons, he will support the Ordinance.

**The motion passed 4-3, with Deputy Mayor Salomon, Councilmember McConnell and Councilmember Roberts voting no.**

9. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussing the Final Sidewalk Prioritization Plan and Sidewalk Advisory Committee Final Recommendations

Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner, provided the staff presentation. She advised that the proposed Plan is an update of the 2011 Transportation Master Plan (TMP), and staff was assisted throughout the update process by the 15-member Sidewalk Advisory Committee (SAC). She explained that while the data in the 2011 TMP was mostly based on safety and equity, the updated Plan calls out criteria in four categories: safety, equity, proximity and connectivity. She noted the various opportunities for public outreach throughout the process and described how public input and available data was analyzed and incorporated into the draft Plan.

Ms. Daley-Peng reviewed the SAC's Final Recommendation Memorandum, which includes recommendations in the following key topics: Prioritization Scorecard and Plan, additions to the plan, sidewalk treatments, funding, plan implementation, communications, and performance measures. She also reviewed two tables included in the Staff Report, which summarize the recommended adjustments and additions to the draft Plan that were identified by staff following the Plan's initial presentation to the City Council on April 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Ms. Daley-Peng summarized that the Plan identifies 33 high-priority projects, which equates to 16 miles of improved sidewalk for \$95 million. Accomplishing all of the improvements identified in the Plan would cost \$414 million. She recommended approval of the 2018 Sidewalk Prioritization Plan to allow staff to move the Plan into the Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

Deputy Mayor Salomon said he was happy to see that sidewalk improvements on 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE were identified as high-priority areas. However, he asked if NW 190<sup>th</sup> Street would receive a higher prioritization if safety was weighted more heavily than equity. Mayor Hall pointed out that NW 190<sup>th</sup> Street, from Richmond Beach Road to 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, only received one point for safety and zero points under equity.

Councilmember McGlashan asked staff to provide clarification on the letter the Council received relative to parking concerns on NW 196<sup>th</sup> Street between 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue NW. Ms. Daley-Peng advised that Project 6a would prioritize access to a community destination (library), but she does not know what the on-street parking situation is in that location. She agreed to provide additional clarification at a later time.

Councilmember McGlashan asked why NW 195<sup>th</sup> Street between Aurora Avenue North and Echo Lake has been identified as a high priority when the street, itself, is utilized primarily for condominium parking. Randy Witt, Public Works Director, suggested that the prioritization is likely based on the park and its connection to Aurora Avenue North. If the City wants to improve this connection to the lake, parking adjustments would be needed.

Councilmember Roberts voiced concern about categorizing projects as high, medium, and low priorities. As an example, he noted that NW 195<sup>th</sup> Street and N 200<sup>th</sup> Street received equivalent scores. If asked to choose between the two streets, the Council would most likely place NW 195<sup>th</sup> Street above N 200<sup>th</sup> Street given its proximity to the school. However, that does not mean N 200<sup>th</sup> Street should be moved to a lower category. He cautioned that it is not helpful to change the categorization of a project without changing the score. The scorecard needs to speak for itself, and future Councils should be able to make decisions about where and how sidewalks will be funded. He also suggested that perhaps the four types of parks (regional, urban, community and neighborhood) should be treated differently on the scorecard. Ultimately, his preference would be to have a fully-transparent scorecard without making too many adjustments to the prioritization.

Councilmember Roberts asked if the SAC considered a similar scorecard for sidewalk maintenance and repair. Ms. Daley-Peng answered affirmatively, but it is still an ongoing process. This winter, they will beta test and provide guidance on the criteria that was developed for the ADA Transition Plan.

Councilmember Chang expressed concern that not enough weight was placed on the safety criteria. If equity and safety carry the same weight, it would be impossible for certain neighborhoods to have a high-priority sidewalk. She observed that the measures that went into the scorecard are easy to get from the geographic information system and census data, but they do not address other factors such as usage. She would also like a higher score to be given for proximity to schools. She summarized that it is difficult to come up with a scorecard that captures all of the details, and commonsense adjustments will be necessary to ensure geographic distribution, a sense of usage, etc.

Councilmember Scully commented that he is happy with the SAC and Council's level of diligence, and he will support the Plan as currently proposed. He cautioned against getting so embroiled in trying to make it perfect that they end up not taking action on it.

Councilmember McConnell suggested that re-channelization of Richmond Beach Road and the stop sign may lead to more people using the cut-through road from 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She suggested it would help to have a designated shoulder with signage to identify where people will be walking.

Mayor Hall said he could support Councilmember Robert's suggestion that it would be cleaner to base priorities on the numeric scores until the Council makes funding decisions. However, he is more comfortable moving the plan forward with this product than just the numeric product because it exercises a little judgement. The Council will have another opportunity to consider prioritization as part of the Capital Budget each year, and they will undoubtedly deviate from the sequence of numeric scores as they have in the past.

Councilmember Roberts said he would prefer to have the prioritization based on the scorecard and let the Council exhibit its judgements about which projects should be funded. The intent of the Plan was to rank the projects, not make judgments about whether a project is high priority or not. These judgments will be made as funding opportunities come up.

Mayor Hall summarized that having numeric scoring provides clear data that is not colored by staff or Council's judgement. However, as they move forward with funding packages in the future, the Council needs to provide direction to staff as to what projects should be included.

Ms. Daley-Peng clarified that the 2018 Pedestrian Improvement Prioritization Matrix (Attachment F) shows both the base score from the scorecard and the adjusted score based on categorization. Councilmember Roberts expressed his preference for removing the adjusted score from any formal documents. Mr. Witt explained that the adjusted score was used as a tool for mapping (Attachment E). They will have a similar conversation in two weeks as they review the list of projects and identify those they want to put forward in the sales tax initiative.

Mayor Hall suggested removing the adjusted score from Attachment F and going back to the map that was based on the original scorecards. A separate list and/or map could be provided to identify the high, medium and low priority projects based on a combination of the scorecard, public input, geographic equity, etc.

Councilmember McConnell said she respects the due diligence done by the SAC. It is important to keep a paper trail of the process, recognizing that every Council will deal differently with the nuances of the plan based on their own neighborhood agendas. She supports moving the Plan forward as presented.

Councilmember Chang said she supports the Plan as currently proposed because the categorization considers other criteria not included in the scorecard that are more difficult to measure. She does not support moving the Plan forward based solely on the scorecard.

Councilmember McGlashan expressed his belief that the previous numerical plan was inequitable throughout the City, and he supports the proposed update. The City is not likely to find community support for implementation funding if the projects are not spread equitably throughout the City. He did not believe that adopting the Plan would hold any future Council to the decisions that are made now.

Deputy Mayor Salomon asked if adopting the Sidewalk Prioritization Plan into the Comprehensive Plan would allow future Councils to modify the prioritization schedule. Mr. Witt responded that the Comprehensive Plan provides guidance but does not dictate the Council's funding choices.

Deputy Mayor Salomon commented that, without seeing Mayor Hall's recommendation in writing, he is not sure it is the right approach. While he is not in favor of delaying the process, he hopes staff will consider how the re-channelization of Richmond Beach Road might impact the scoring for NW 195<sup>th</sup> Street project.

Mayor Hall summarized that the majority of the Council is comfortable enough with the final product to move it forward to the next step, and conversations about funding packages will take place in the future. Ms. Tarry commented that both the map that identifies the categorization of projects and the matrix that keeps the original scorecard scores intact will be included in the plan that moves forward.

- (b) Discussing Ordinance No. 826 – Amending the 2018 Budget to Include Additional Personnel for the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Department and Amending Fee Table, Chapter 3.01 of the Shoreline Municipal Code to Eliminate a Fee

Mary Reidy, Recreation Superintendent, Amanda Zollner, Recreation Supervisor, and Sara Lane, Administrative Services Director were present to provide the staff presentation. Together, they described the variety of youth programs the City currently offers and explained the new and existing issues that will impact how the City is able to serve youth and the demand level for its services. The issues include the Shoreline School District (SSD) implementing an early release schedule on Wednesdays for every school in the district starting in the fall of 2018, a workload imbalance between direct service and administrative duties, and the challenge of hiring and retaining extra-help given the current economic climate.

The recommended program changes include opening the Shoreline Teen Center at the Richmond Highlands Recreation Center early on early release days, eliminating the drop-in fee for youth at the Spartan Recreation Center, offering a lifeguard class at the Shoreline Pool free of charge for district students only, starting Hang Time at both middle schools early on early release days, and hiring two 0.5 FTE Recreation Specialist I's to bring staffing balance back and meet programmatic needs. She also reviewed alternative approaches for Council's consideration.

Councilmember Scully said his understanding is that the cost of the changes would come from excess revenue in 2018. Staff answered that no budget amendment would be needed at this time. Councilmember Scully voiced support for the proposed program changes and Ordinance No. 826, but he would like the lifeguard classes to be open to all and not limited to district students.

Councilmember Chang asked the proportion of non-resident youth versus resident youth who participate in the drop-in program at the Spartan Recreation Center. Staff agreed to provide this information at a later time.

Councilmember McConnell commended staff for being proactive in addressing potential problems associated with the Shoreline School District's change. She said she particularly supports elimination of the drop-in fee and the offer of free lifeguard training. She supports the staff's recommendation as presented.

Mayor Hall asked if the School District has added any activities or if they are relying on the City and the YMCA to fully meet the needs they have created. Staff agreed to get back to him with information about programs at the elementary school level, but the District not offering any programs at the secondary school level. Mayor Hall said he supports Ordinance No. 826 because it is important to provide programs for children in the community during that time, but he shares the disappointment he has heard from parents and he would have liked to see the School District provide alternatives.

Ms. Tarry advised that Ordinance No. 826 is scheduled to come back to the Council for final approval as part of their June 11<sup>th</sup> Consent Calendar.

## 10. EXECUTIVE SESSION



At 9:08 p.m., Mayor Hall recessed the meeting into an Executive Session for a period of 30 minutes as authorized by RCW 42.30.110(1)(b) and RCW 42.30.110(1)(i) to consider the selection of a site or the acquisition of real estate by lease or purchase and to discuss with legal counsel matters relating to agency enforcement actions or litigation. The Council is expected to take final action following the Executive Session. Staff attending the Executive Session included Debbie Tarry, City Manager; John Norris, Assistant City Manager; Margaret King, City Attorney; Eric Friedli, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director; and Paula Itaoka, Human Resources Director; Ted Parry; and Bob Stowe. At 9:38 p.m., Mayor Hall emerged and announced a 20-minute extension to the Executive Session. The Executive Session ended at 9:55 p.m.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to approve and authorize the City Manager to sign settlement agreements relating to EEOC Charge No. 551-2018-00225. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnell and passed unanimously.**

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:58 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk