

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, June 25, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

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

ABSENT: Councilmember McConnell

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.

Councilmember McGlashan moved to excuse Councilmember McConnell for City Business. Councilmember Roberts seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

(a) Proclamation of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Month

Mayor Hall read a proclamation declaring July as Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Month in the City of Shoreline. He invited members of the Youth Outreach Leadership Opportunity (YOLO) Program to come forward to accept the proclamation.

Cindy Yang, a recent graduate of Shorewood High School, shared how the City's Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services programs, and particularly the service opportunities provided by the YOLO Program, have impacted her life.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

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

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor Hall announced that the Council had a joint meeting with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services/Tree Board prior to the regular meeting. He also announced that a few Councilmembers would attend a meeting of the Association of Washington Cities starting June 26th.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

John Cole, Shoreline, voiced concern that the pool of people who would be served by the types of facilities allowed by Ordinance No. 824 would be primarily Medicaid patients, with some Medicare patients and veterans. He pointed to a recent study commissioned by the Department of Social and Health Sciences that indicated the adult family home supply and demand is roughly equal, with adequate production.

Ken Maaz, Executive Director of Ashley House, the applicant for the zoning code amendment outlined in Ordinance No. 824, voiced support for staff's recommended Option 2. He shared details about the project Ashley House is working on with Seattle Children's Hospital for property located at 18904 Burk Avenue N, which would serve medically-fragile children who are transitioning from the hospital to their homes. He pointed out the existing City regulations that provide a natural barrier to prevent unsavory operations and added that the required Conditional Use Permit would allow for community input and additional restrictions could be imposed to mitigate concerns.

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 May 7, 2018**
Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 14, 2018

- (b) Approving Expenses and Payroll as of June 1, 2018 in the Amount of \$1,153.458.02**

Payroll and Benefits:

Payroll Period	Payment Date	EFT Numbers (EF)	Payroll Checks (PR)	Benefit Checks (AP)	Amount Paid
5/6/18-5/19/18	5/25/2018	78334-78579	15593-15611	70458-70464	<u>\$831,275.55</u>
					<u>\$831,275.55</u>

Accounts Payable Claims:

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
5/31/2018	70405	70421	\$63,111.46
5/31/2018	70422	70438	\$30,331.65
5/31/2018	70439	70457	\$59,930.53
6/7/2018	70465	70482	\$16,767.33
6/7/2018	70483	70496	\$152,041.50
6/7/2018	70167	70167	<u>(\$130.00)</u>

6/7/2018

70497

70497

\$130.00

\$322,182.47

(c) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute the Ronald Bog Wetland Mitigation Conservation Easement

(d) Adopting Ordinance No. 827 – Amending the SMC 3.30 (Gambling Tax) and 3.32 (Utility Tax) Relating to Principal and Interest Rates, Delinquency Schedules and Minimum Penalty of \$5 Regardless of Delinquency Level

(e) Authorizing the city Manager to Execute a Construction Contract with Redtail, LLC in the Amount of \$339,825 for the 2018 Surface Water Small Projects

8. ACTION ITEMS

(a) Adopting Ordinance No. 824 – Community Residential Facility Code Amendment

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, made the staff presentation. He provided a brief history of the Ordinance, noting the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Development Code amendments as presented to the City Council on June 11th in proposed Ordinance No. 824. The proposed amendments clarify definitions for Adult Family Homes (AFHs), Residential Care Facilities (RCFs), Residential Treatment Facilities (RTFs) and Nursing Facilities (NFs). In addition, the use table would be updated with the new uses and where they are allowed, index criteria would be added for RCFs, and the parking and sign standards would be updated.

Based on feedback from the Council and public, as well as additional research, Mr. Szafran said staff is recommending that Council also consider five additional amendments:

1. To address concerns about the types of facilities that might be allowed in the residential zones based on the proposed definition for RCFs, staff is proposing amended language that distinguishes RCFs from AFHs, RTFs and Enhanced Service Facilities (ESFs).
2. In order to provide a clear distinction between ESFs and RTFs, staff is recommending to modify the definition for RTFs to cite the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and Washington Administrative Code (WAC) regulations for license and operation of this type of use.
3. The staff and Planning Commission originally recommended that RTFs be located outside of the residential zones and permitted only within the most intense zoning category (Mixed Business). However, after additional research, staff found that many jurisdictions include RTFs within the hospital definition since the function of both facilities are similar. Staff is recommending this same approach.
4. Staff inadvertently omitted striking the phrase “and personal care” from the Nursing Facilities use in the Station Area Use Table. The amendment would delete this phrase, consistent with what was done in other use tables.

5. Staff inadvertently excluded AFS and RCFs from the Station Area Use Table. Staff recommends adding ADFs as a permitted use in the MUR-35' zone and excluding them from the MUR-45' and MUR-70' zones. Currently, single-family homes are a permitted use in the MUR-35' zone but not in the MUR-45' and MUR-70' zones.

Mr. Szafran summarized that the Planning Commission and staff recommend approval of Ordinance No. 824, with the amendments proposed by staff.

Councilmember Roberts moved for adoption of Ordinance No. 824, with the amendments proposed by staff. Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion.

Councilmember Roberts commented that the staff's recommended amendments address the concerns raised by the Council on June 11, as well as some additional issues that were recently identified.

Councilmember Scully voiced some concern that Amendment 1 could inadvertently result in a proliferation of "super" AFHs. He recognized that in order to qualify as a licensed AFH, the facility must comply with the WAC and RCW requirements, which limit the number of residents in an AFH, but he asked what services a facility without a license could provide that are similar to those provided by a licensed AFH. City Attorney King pointed out that, in addition to the WAC and RCW limitations, the City's definition for "Single Family Residence" limits the number of unrelated people living in a home to 8.

Mayor Hall asked what would prevent someone from operating an RCF with up to 15 residents that looks similar or just like an AFH. City Attorney King pointed out that the WAC and RCW restrictions differentiate between the two types of uses, and that is why staff is recommending Amendment 2, which references the State requirements that restrict the number of residents allowed in an AFH. Mayor Hall voiced concern about deferring to State law to restrict these uses without having specific provisions in the City's code. The list of services that can be provided in both RCFs and AFHs are very similar. He said he would prefer that provisions be included in City code to protect neighborhoods, but he is willing to support the Ordinance, given that it is not likely to become a significant issue. However, he suggested the City watch closely for the potential of abuse.

Mayor Hall asked where the City's code requires a license for RCFs. He noted that in SMC 20.20.044, an RCF is defined as a state-licensed facility, which means that a license is required. However, the definition also has a list of excluded facilities that provide services that are similar to an RCF. Providing this list of exclusions leaves it open for the State to come up with a new category that the City would be stuck with until the code is amended again.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

9. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussing Seattle City Light Billing Concerns

John Norris, Assistant City Manager, advised that Councilmembers McGlashan and Scully asked staff to reach out to Seattle City Light to request they present information and answer questions from the Council regarding billing concerns they have been hearing from residents.

Kelly Enright, Customer Care Director, Seattle City Light (SCL), provided an overview of SCL's customer response program, noting that Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) manages the customer contact center (billing issues, payment plans, setting up and closing accounts, outage responses, etc.), and SCL takes care of back office tasks (billing, credit and collections, streetlight response, meter reading, etc.).

Ms. Enright reviewed the various responsibilities of the Account Services Department, which is responsible for managing all \$450,000+ SCL customers and explained the changes that have occurred over the past three years that impacted the department's work. She described some of the issues that contributed to the backlog and problems that frustrated customers. She also reviewed the steps that SCL is taking to get its programs back on track. The steps include extra resources, suspending disconnection notices and redeploying collection teams, and using reads from advanced metering when manual meter reads were not available.

Ms. Enright announced that SCL was able to fulfill its commitment to reduce the backlog to 10 business days by early March, and it is now back on track. She provided some facts associated with Shoreline customers, noting that most Shoreline customers have had their meters exchanged, with only 2,500 more to exchange. About 170 Shorelines customers have opted out of the program. At this time, it is too soon to determine if Advanced Metering has had a billing impact.

Councilmember McGlashan said he requested this presentation based on his own experience and after hearing and reading comments from constituents about bills increasing dramatically after the new meters were installed. He asked how the customers can know that the meters are functioning correctly. Ms. Enright explained that in some cases, the estimated bill that was sent out previous to the meter exchange was low, and the bill needed to be updated based on the correct reads. In addition, many of the old meters were slowed down by age, and the new meters provide a more accurate reading of the normal use. She emphasized that SCL will gladly work with customers who have concerns and questions about their bills.

Councilmember Scully said his understanding is that the average increase is due to a variety of factors, but primarily because the current meters are more accurate. Ms. Enright added that there was also a small rate increase. Councilmember Scully voiced concern that some customers have received extremely large bills. In a perfect world, this would not have happened because estimates would be followed by meter reads to true the bills up and there would not be long spans of time where estimates are used. Ms. Enright added that in some cases, the meters malfunctioned or were inaccessible. These are special circumstances, and SCL will take steps to help mitigate the impact on these customers.

Councilmember Scully pointed out the significant impacts the increased bills can have on some families and suggested that SCL should absorb these additional charges, bill customers based on the estimate, and then move forward with the fair rate using the new meters. He asked who

customers should contact if they have a bill they can't pay. Ms. Enright responded that customers who have concerns about their bills can contact SCL at www.seattle.gov/light and select the "Contact Us" box. They can also call the Contact Center at (206) 684-3000.

Councilmember Chang said she has heard from people who have repeatedly received high bills, and there is really no recourse. She asked if there is an independent way to check usage and that the meters are working properly. She also suggested that a 5-year energy audit be done. Although last winter was colder than normal, only 20% of the homes in Shoreline use electric heat. Ms. Enright pointed out that electricity is required to run the blowers associated with other heating systems. SCL will provide an audit for any customer that has a concern. If someone suspects a faulty meter, a meter electrician can be sent out to check.

Councilmember Roberts voiced frustration that although most residents are customers of both SCL and SPU, there is no way for the City to participate in the rate structure discussions in an organized fashion. There needs to be more communication between the utility's governing authority and its partnering jurisdictions. He commented that SCL's explanation that "it was an extremely cold winter," was insufficient to justify the extremely large bills that some customers received. He suggested that sharing the explanation that bills were based on estimates over a long period of time and catch up was needed, as well as SCL's offer to allow people to pay their bills in installments, would have gone a long way to ease customer concerns.

Ms. Enright agreed that the City of Shoreline deserves an opportunity to participate in rate structure discussions, and she will work to make sure they have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

Councilmember Roberts asked about the lifespan of the new meters. Ms. Enright said the estimated life of the meters is about 20 years. The electromechanical meters are no longer manufactured, and SCL has been installing plain digital meters since 2007. The advanced meters will provide customers more real-time data and improve power-outage response.

Councilmember Roberts asked how a renter could take advantage of the energy audits that SCL provides. Ms. Enright responded that anyone with concerns about a bill should contact SCL, and they will send someone out to help them on a case-by-case basis. Councilmember Roberts suggested that SCL do outreach specific to renters, advising them on how to achieve energy efficiencies, etc.

Mayor Hall asked if the meters are independently tested and certified to make certain they are functioning properly. Ms. Enright answered that the supplier, Landis and Gear, has a very extensive process to ensure the meters operate properly from a factory-installed perspective. When each meter is installed, the vendor provides supervisors to take pictures and validate each installation, and SCL does an independent review of some of the meters, as well. Now that the meters have all been exchanged, SCL has a very robust audit program for periodically testing various meters to make sure they are in good operating order.

Ms. Enright briefly explained why SCL switched over to the Advanced Metering System. She also provided a status report on the new system and described the many benefits it provides to

both the customers and the utility. She summarized that the new system allows for accurate and timely billing, empowers customers to make energy-saving choices, improves outage response and enhances service. It also improves safety, improves load forecasting and results in operational efficiencies.

Ms. Enright concluded her presentation by pointing out that the Advanced Meter System allows meters to be read every day and eliminates the need for validation staff to verify every read. They are also working on a self-service portal that will allow customers a number of options, and they are working on other billing system automations that will reduce the need for manual entries. Again, she reminded the Councilmembers of the contact information she provided earlier to either call or email SCL. She also left her contact information.

(b) Discussing Ordinance No. 830 – Amending Ordinance No. 703 Vacating
Westminster Way North Right-of-Way Between N 155th Street and N 160th Street

Tricia Juhnke, City Engineer, made the staff presentation. She reviewed that on June 1, 2015, the Council adopted Ordinance No. 703, which approved the vacation of right-of-way along the eastern edge of Westminster Way N. This original agreement was never executed, and a new investment firm is now in position to purchase the property and move forward with development. However, there have been significant increases in property values since the original ordinance was adopted in 2015, and the conditions of the agreement need to be modified. Ordinance No. 830 would still vacate the 7,908 square feet of Westminster Way N right-of-way, and in return the property owner would provide \$200,000 in cash and 5,548 square feet of dedicated property that can be used to provide a connection to Aurora Avenue N and better circulation in the general area. She summarized that, with exception of the cash component, Ordinance No. 830 is nearly the same as Ordinance No. 703. Ordinance No. 703 also included an agreement to demolish the building on the dedicated parcel, which is no longer necessary because the site has been cleared.

Ms. Juhnke summarized that the proposed vacation would directly support redevelopment within the Community Renewal Area, improve traffic circulation with the connection to Aurora Avenue N., and the updated proposal results in an increased compensation to the City. The item was placed on the Council's agenda for discussion purposes only. Final adoption of the ordinance is scheduled for July 16th.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the road connection provided on the property to be dedicated to the City would be one-way only. Ms. Juhnke responded by providing a diagram to illustrate the design of the proposed new street.

Mayor Hall said he was pleased to see the new appraisal, which appears much more reasonable. He also noted that the land swap would directly contribute to improving the traffic connections that are identified in City plans.

The Council agreed to place Ordinance No. 830 on the July 16th Consent Calendar for final approval.

(c) Discussing the Annual Traffic Report

Kendra Dedinsky, City Traffic Engineer, and Mark Konoske, Shoreline Police Operations Captain, presented the Annual Traffic Report.

Ms. Dedinsky explained that the objective of the Annual Traffic Report is to provide Council a summary and analysis of the traffic data collected throughout the year. The goal is to use the data to improve traffic safety in the City by identifying some collision reduction strategies. The report is used to prioritize improvement and enforcement resources and identify Transportation and Capital Improvement Plan projects. It is also used to guide where the City pursues grant opportunities.

Ms. Dedinsky shared a variety of data from the report relative to traffic volumes and collisions, including fatal and serious injury collisions, bicycle collisions, and pedestrian collisions. She also reminded them of the contributing circumstances, noting that impairment-related collisions decreased significantly in 2017, but driver-distraction continues to be a significant factor.

She provided a map that illustrates the location of reported collisions (vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle) in the City of Shoreline over the past three years. She pointed out the high-collision areas and briefly described the conflicts and some of the operational strategies and Transportation/Capital Improvement Projects that are intended to reduce the number of collisions and improve safety. She explained that the collision reduction strategies are based on the Washington State Target Zero Plan, which sets forth strategies for reducing collisions based on engineering, education and enforcement, as well as police and emergency medical service strategies. She briefly reviewed the list of projects that were completed in 2017 to address safety and announced that the City applied for seven traffic safety related grants in 2018 based on the results of the analysis.

Captain Konoske described a number of projects that were funded in 2017 by Washington Traffic Safety Grants, as well as funding from the Washington Impaired Drivers Advisory Council. He also provided information on the outreach program the Police Department provides to the high schools and Shoreline Community to emphasize the potential impacts of impaired driving. Lastly, he reported that enforcement statistics have increased.

Ms. Dedinsky advised that speed differential maps are provided to the Police Department twice per year. These maps illustrate the traffic data that is gathered throughout the City to identify the 85th percentile speed, which is the speed that 85% of the traffic is traveling at or below in comparison to the posted speed limits. Captain Konoske explained that the maps are used to enable the Police Department to administer a more data-related approach towards enforcement and safety instead of doing random enforcement with random results. He commented that the combination of enforcement and education has resulted in positive behavioral changes toward safety.

Ms. Dedinsky advised that staff is seeking guidance on whether or not the Council would like to pursue the following policy topics: automated school speed zone enforcement, 20-mph speed limit as a tool for the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP), and an update of the Arterial Speed Limit Study.

Councilmember Roberts referred to the Speed Differential Maps and asked for clarification of the term “segment.” Ms. Dedinsky said the way they look at segments in the collision analysis is the exact length between two intersections, but the Speed Differential Map uses one counter location to represent multiple blocks of a street. There is a different application, as well, in that speed emphasis on a particular corridor will be visible for those traveling through from Point A to Point B and will accomplish the goal of getting people to slow down.

Councilmember Roberts asked if the Speed Differential Map maps the same spots on the corridors year-after-year. Ms. Dedinsky answered that there are a variety of traffic data collection sites, some are routine and others are monitored quarterly or yearly. They also do some supplemental counts in between.

Councilmember Roberts noted that the report compares vehicular collisions in Shoreline to those in Seattle and King County, but there is not a similar comparison for bicycle and pedestrian collisions. Ms. Dedinsky said the actual report includes a comparison to comparable cities, but it was not highlighted in the presentation. The City is doing relatively well in terms of rate of collision per capita. Councilmember Roberts asked how confident staff is that the data captures all of the pedestrian and bicycle collisions. Ms. Dedinsky felt they do a decent job, but the City has no way of knowing about accidents that go unreported.

Councilmember McGlashan said he supports automated school speed zone enforcement and updating the Arterial Speed Limit Study, but not the 20-mph speed limit until he can see a map showing the roads where it would be applied. He does not believe that changing the signs to a reduced speed would make much difference, and the City does not have the police capacity to patrol the streets for that purpose. He also has some concerns about implementing automated school speed zone enforcement because it tends to upset the residents. He agreed they need to slow traffic down in school zones, but he is not sure that automated enforcement is the best approach.

Deputy Mayor Salomon asked what accounts for Sammamish’s low rate of serious and fatal injuries over the last three years, and what accounts for Issaquah’s low rate of bicycle and pedestrian collisions. Ms. Dedinsky said it is important to note that Sammamish does not have state routes within its jurisdiction, which is where most of the City of Shoreline’s serious collisions occur due to speed and volume, and she agreed to research Issaquah’s situation and report back. Deputy Mayor Salomon asked if the increase in distracted driving cases is related to cell phone use. Ms. Dedinsky said that is what the Target Zero Plan indicates and Captain Konoske agreed that the vast majority is cell phone use.

Deputy Mayor Salomon asked what the Arterial Speed Limit Study would look at. Ms. Dedinsky said it would take a fresh look at the 2007 plan in light of the newly-framed guidelines and criteria from the Federal Government for setting speed limits. In addition, a few main arterials were reconfigured and the update could evaluate whether the current speeds are appropriate given the reconfiguration. Changes in adjacent land uses would also be a factor in updating the speed limits on arterials. The City could consider raising or lowering speed limits based on the study. Deputy Mayor Salomon questioned the value of spending staff time to update the study.

He also agreed with Councilmember McGlashan regarding automated school zone enforcement. If the Council chooses to implement this option, he suggested that notice be provided much further away to give adequate warning for drivers to slow down. He also said he might be inclined to support a 20-mph speed limit as a tool for the NTSP because his impression is that people in the single-family neighborhoods feel powerless to manage what they perceive to be dangerous traffic.

Councilmember Roberts said he supports an Arterial Speed Limit Study update, as long as it does not require an inappropriate amount of staff time to complete. While he felt a 20-mph speed limit should be the target goal, installing signs will not solve the problem. As they redesign the streets and add sidewalks, they should encourage a rethought on how the streets are designed. He said he is opposed to automated school speed zone enforcement. He referred to the Speed Differential Chart, noting that there are only two schools that have corridors with traffic traveling more than 5 mph over the posted speed limit so he is not sure that the problems are sufficient to warrant the cameras. Ms. Dedinsky said that if staff brings the concept back to Council for additional discussion they would provide more information and specific data that shows significant speed differentials within school zones.

Councilmember Chang said she supports further discussion about automated school speed zone enforcement, particularly if staff has data to support its implementation. She is not in support of using a 20-mph speed limit as a tool for the NTSP. In looking at the collision statistics, it seems most of the accidents occur on arterials, and that is where the City should focus its efforts. She said she supports updating the Arterial Speed Limit Study.

Mayor Hall reminded the Council that safety has been identified as one of their top goals, and he is pleased to see that, overall, the City's streets are quite safe compared to its peers. He agreed that some residents dislike automated speed enforcement programs, but they have also heard from members of the community who are really concerned and believe that speed is a big problem. While it is not a top priority for him, he would support further consideration of an automated program. He said he does not support implementing a 20-mph speed limit in neighborhoods since the data suggests that 94% of the collisions occur on arterials. Lastly, he agreed with Councilmember Roberts that the size and context of the road plays a significant role in how fast people feel they can safely drive. There are other options to improve safety in residential neighborhoods by slowing people down. He said he supports an update of the Arterial Speed Limit Study to incorporate new criteria, land use changes, etc.

Councilmember Scully said he supports an update of the Arterial Speed Limit Study to incorporate new criteria, land use changes, etc. He also agreed with other Councilmembers relative to implementing a 20-mph speed limit on some neighborhood streets. He said he would like to see how often speed over the existing posted limits is a factor in collisions. Regarding automated school speed zone enforcement, he would like to see available data from other jurisdictions as to whether it would actually lower speeds or simply become a revenue collection tool.

Councilmember Roberts commented that implementing a 20-mph speed limit on existing roads does not make sense. However, he suggested that as roads are redone or new roads are permitted,

they should be designed with the thought that 20 mph is the ideal speed limit on residential roads. Ms. Dedinsky commented that when the engineering standards are updated, staff will target more context-sensitive design. Mayor Hall added that the adopted Green Streets Policy also suggests less pavement for the traffic lanes and more attention to the street and pedestrian scape.

Councilmember McGlashan said he does not see that a 20-mph speed limit and narrower roads would be that affective. Deputy Mayor Salomon said he understands Councilmembers' concerns about reducing the speed limit to 20 mph, but he felt a sign would have some impact at virtually no cost. While putting in chicanes and narrowing roadways may help, he does not foresee funding for this work to be done in the near future given other priorities.

Ms. Tarry summarized that there was very little interest in pursuing 20-mph speed limits as a tool for the NTSP. There was some interest in updating the Arterial Speed Limit Study, but it was not a high priority. There was mixed opinion regarding automated school speed zone enforcement, recognizing that there are other issues of higher priority.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:13 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk