

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, April 22, 2019
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor McConnell, Councilmembers McGlashan, Scully, Chang, Robertson, 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.

(a) Proclaiming Earth Day

Mayor Hall read a proclamation declaring April 22, 2019 as Earth Day in Shoreline. Bettelin Brown, a Shoreline resident and active volunteer, was on hand to accept the proclamation and shared reflections on the years of volunteer work done in South Woods Park to protect Shoreline's natural environment.

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 recognized Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, for her leadership in Green Building and shared that she had been given the Green Globe Award by King County earlier in the day.

Councilmember McGlashan said he attended the Sound Transit System Expansion Committee meeting to speak on behalf of the five-city coalition on the 522/523 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. He said he thanked the Sound Transit Board and Staff for the work they are doing to meet the needs of all cities and reminded them of the work still to be done on 145th and 5th Avenue NE and the Lake City Way and NE 145th Interchanges. He informed Council that the

Committee moved forward with a contract with David Evans and Associates for the conceptual engineering and environmental review services for the BRT route.

Councilmember Chang said she attended the Regional Transit Committee meeting and reported that they discussed income inequality and electrification of the bus fleet.

Councilmember Roberts said he attended the Sound Cities' Association Public Issues Committee (PIC) Meeting. He said he heard a report on a request from King Conservation District to raise rates beyond what the inflation policy dictates. He added that the PIC adopted a policy proposal which calls on cities to review their policies for affordable housing.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Kelly Dahlman-Oeth, Kirkland resident and pastor at Ronald Methodist Church, spoke in strong support of a Community Court. He said in February the church opened its doors to people who had been living unsheltered under the overhang of the church building. He said they are all cycling through the legal system and that he and some volunteers have accompanied them to court appearances.

Alan Charnley, Shoreline resident, thanked the Council for the bike lanes in Richmond Beach. He urged the Council to approve the Salmon-Safe Pre-condition Agreement.

George Maurer, Shoreline resident, said the elimination of a traffic lane on Richmond Beach road constitutes fraud and said efforts are underway to hold the City politically and legally accountable for the mismanagement of a major public asset.

Janet Way, Shoreline resident, spoke on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society. She stated her concern with the expansion of the proposed City Maintenance Facility if it requires tree removal. She said since trees are being removed for the Light Rail, the City should not take down any more trees for City projects.

Laethan Wene, Shoreline resident, invited the community to support the May Special Olympics events at Shoreline Stadium.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- (a) Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of March 4, 2019**
- Approving Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of April 8, 2019**

(b) Approving Expenses and Payroll as of April 5, 2019 in the Amount of \$800,685.94

***Wire Transfers:**

Expense Register Dated	Wire Transfer Number	Amount Paid
3/25/2019	1144	\$2,501.06
		<u>\$2,501.06</u>

***Accounts Payable Claims:**

Expense Register Dated	Check Number (Begin)	Check Number (End)	Amount Paid
3/28/2019	73481	73503	\$137,583.00
3/28/2019	73504	73522	\$171,477.59
3/28/2019	73523	73533	\$1,650.50
3/28/2019	73534	73545	\$38,301.18
3/28/2019	73546	73573	\$184,645.98
3/28/2019	73015	73015	(\$200.00)
3/28/2019	73574	73579	\$1,679.12
4/3/2019	73580	73606	\$206,055.31
4/3/2019	73607	73612	\$13,129.01
4/3/2019	73613	73634	\$24,651.04
4/3/2019	73635	73648	\$19,212.15
			<u>\$798,184.88</u>

(c) Adoption of Ordinance No. 855 – 2019-2020 Biennial Budget Amendment – Amending Ord. No. 854 by Increasing Appropriations in Certain Funds (2019-2020 Biennial Budget Amendment)

(d) Adopting Ordinance No. 854 – 2019-2020 Biennial Budget Amendment – Amending Ord. No. 852 for Uncompleted 2018 Operating and Capital Projects by Increasing Appropriations in Certain Funds (2018 to 2019 Carryovers)

8. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute the Salmon-Safe Certification Pre-condition Agreement

Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, summarized the Salmon-Safe pre-certification report and reviewed the two pre-conditions, twelve conditions, and implementation process. She said if the City Council authorizes the City Manager to commit to fulfilling the conditions, Salmon-Safe would declare Shoreline the first Salmon-Safe certified city in Washington.

Councilmember Roberts moved to authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Salmon-Safe that reflects the pre-conditions and conditions of certification as

reviewed and authorized by the City Manager. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chang.

Councilmembers generally expressed support for the motion. There was a shared awareness and concern expressed about unidentified costs that may arise from the motivation to meet certification standards.

Councilmember Roberts stated that he is proud of the work done to get to this point and excited to see Shoreline become the first city in Washington to receive Salmon-Safe certification. He said the pre-certification work has helped target areas for improvement.

Councilmember Chang said she appreciated the opportunity to identify ways in which Shoreline can improve its practices.

Councilmember Scully said that although he supports the motion, he would have preferred to spend the money on infrastructure improvements rather than on certification. He stated that he hopes the City will be able to maintain a good balance of priorities when addressing environmental concerns and not be overly influenced by the certification standards.

Councilmember Robertson asked how the certification would impact staff's motivation and innovation in the work they do. Ms. Redinger replied that staff is focused on best practices for the region and the checklists will be used to encourage consideration of alternatives and identify appropriate locations for implementation. She said the Surface Water Master Plan will present big opportunities to evaluate and review the scope of the plan. The money already invested in Salmon-Safe offers the continued benefit of their expertise for the duration of the contract. She said she looks forward to seeing improvements in species and habitat recovery.

Mayor Hall reflected on how receptive and supportive the community has been to improvements in environmental issues. He said the Salmon-Safe certification process was more informative than he thought it would be and incorporating these standards will help the City improve conditions for salmon, and therefore whales.

The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

9. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Discussing Shoreline Community Court

Christina Arcidy, Management Analyst, delivered the staff presentation. She was joined by King County District Court Chief Presiding Judge Donna Tucker, who acknowledged Shoreline District Court Judges Joe Campagna and Marcine Anderson, who were in attendance to show support for Community Court. Ms. Arcidy described Community Court as an alternative, problem-solving court that seeks to address the underlying challenges of court participants. She identified King County District Court as the lead agency and said the Court believes many of Shoreline's defendants could benefit from a Community Court model. She said the research on this was driven by one of Council's established Goals.

Judge Tucker described Community Court as a voluntary program that is a rethinking of criminal justice. She said it is a way to support individuals who might have personal challenges that make them more likely to cycle in and out of court. The goal is to problem-solve and break the cycle of lower level offenses in the system. She defined the model as compassionate accountability and shared examples of the approach and outcomes. She described Community Court as a neutral, safe space without the stigma of a courthouse and emphasized that a critical component is the co-located Resource Center that houses community partners who offer needed services to all community members. She said the Community Court cases are limited to misdemeanor violations and each community determines qualifying offenses.

Judge Tucker shared success stories and said participants recognize the value of the support. She said it is too early to tell if the Court is making changes to regional recidivism rates but said results from other parts of the United States are promising. She described the roles and importance of the volunteers in the resource centers and said the Community Court does not have a community service supervisor. She said the Court coordinators do a good job reaching out to organizations in the community to compile a list of appropriate opportunities.

Judge Tucker outlined the steps of the Community Court planning process and shared funding resources. She said she has secured funding for a third Community Court and is prepared to offer the opportunity to Shoreline. If Shoreline were to decide to pursue this option, the next step would be convening a steering committee and creating workgroups to plan the court.

Councilmembers expressed support for the Community Court concept, but several questioned whether a reduced recidivism rate would cover the increase in cost.

It was asked how the treatment plan for participants is determined. Judge Tucker described the needs assessment and said that prior to meeting with the judge, the prosecutor and defense attorney create a contract of what the defendant will be accountable for. She explained that the incentive for the defendant to follow a treatment plan is to avoid more impactful persecution. Most defendants who are referred to Community Court are motivated to follow through with their commitment if given adequate support through the process.

Upon questioning, Judge Tucker explained that creating the list of misdemeanors would be in collaboration with the Police Department, the Public Defender, and community stakeholders. Councilmember Scully encouraged the City to keep the list of Community Court eligible offenses as broad as possible. He said his belief is that with misdemeanor crimes, efforts should be made to keep violators from becoming repeat offenders.

When asked for details, Judge Tucker described the space requirements of the Community Court and Resource Center and said it is nice to have the distinct meeting spaces co-located.

It was asked how the Community Court works with individuals who might have active proceedings in more than one jurisdiction. Judge Tucker responded that the Resource Center could help support them in their processes in other cities, but that anyone with other Court involvements would still be accountable for those proceedings.

Councilmember Robertson asked if eligible individuals usually accept the offer of participation when made available. Judge Tucker described the steps to qualifying to participate in Community Court and said once a referred individual visits the Court they typically opt in.

Judge Tucker revealed that while the Community Court option would be available for both the City of Kenmore and City of Shoreline, Kenmore has decided that the Community Court concept is not a good fit for their community and she doubts they would take advantage of the opportunity to use it.

When asked for data on the measurements of success, Judge Tucker said that the issue is complicated because of the breadth of unique needs of the participants. She said she thinks this model will ultimately save money in court costs and emphasized that it will improve the health of the community. Mayor Hall said it would be easier to support the idea if the two pilot programs had some measurable, reportable outcomes.

When asked if the Shoreline Courthouse has space to host the Community Court, Judge Tucker explained the space limitations and reiterated how critical it is to have adequate space for the Resource Center. She said Shoreline Community College is interested in hosting it on their site, but she was concerned about how the limited transportation options might impact the accessibility. It was stated that site selection for a Community Court could become very community-intensive and Mayor Hall expressed concern about the short timeline for decision-making without a location identified. Judge Tucker said there has been no community backlash at the Burien and Redmond Courts. She said the planning process includes communication and education for those close by.

Mayor Hall said Community Court directly ties into the Vision 2029 goal of community sustainability, but financial sustainability is a concern since it would become an additional ongoing cost. He said before moving forward, he would like to hear where the potential location is and provide time for staff and the Community Court to document the savings potential.

Ms. Arcidy said that one of the suggested next steps is to assess the activity in the Courts in Redmond and Burien and report back to Council with more documented expenses and savings.

It was established that the site would only be used as a Community Court and Resource Center three hours a week. Councilmember Roberts said that if Shoreline Community College is willing to offer a space, it is a relatively good location. Mayor Hall said he does not want to overlook the complicated aspects of siting a Court. Deputy Mayor McConnell brainstormed possible alternative locations.

There was a request for data showing a comparison of a defendant going through Community Court versus traditional court and what the difference in jail bed days would be for both outcomes. Councilmember Scully said he does not mind taking educated guesses on the costs and savings, and said he hopes the City does not get too fixated on the cost because for him, the effectiveness is the value.

Ms. Tarry reminded Council that the purpose of the presentation was simply to have an initial discussion to make sure that Council was comfortable with staff moving forward with next steps.

(b) Update Discussion of the City Maintenance Facility

Randy Witt, Public Works Director; and John Featherstone, Capital Project Manager; delivered the staff presentation. Mr. Witt shared background on the City Maintenance Facility Project and reviewed the process that led to a distributed facilities approach analysis.

Mr. Featherstone reviewed the five sites that were considered in the analysis. He reminded Council that the addition of the new Grounds Maintenance Crew added an additional component to the needs and briefly touched upon the parameters for the facility as established by Council. He listed the program needs and shared the analysis results and the suggested best placements for operations as determined for each site. He said that Hamlin Park has been determined to be the optimal site for a new combined maintenance building. He reviewed the distributed facilities alternatives and displayed images of the existing facility, significant tree locations, and explained the details of the best two potential scenarios (A and D) for the facility development.

Mr. Featherstone listed the additional project elements to consider, and shared images related to project options and scenario comparisons. He said the estimated costs are virtually identical for either scenario.

Mr. Witt explained the elements and timeline of the three project phases for the City Maintenance Facility improvements. He reviewed the lists of potential projects that would be possible after the City Maintenance Facility project is completed. He stated the estimated cost of the project is \$30.6 Million and explained how the costs would break out in Phase 1 by fund and by activity. He said \$392,000 is funded through the current Capital Improvement Plan and listed the proposed funding for the remaining \$4.5 Million. Mr. Witt displayed a list of discussion questions for Councilmembers to consider.

Councilmembers discussed the covered parking plan at Hamlin Yard, and it was suggested that an investigation of alternative parking locations for City vehicles and a reduction in what is set aside for staff parking be considered. Mr. Witt clarified that the proposed number of staff parking spots does not accommodate all current, much less future, projections for needs.

Mayor Hall and Councilmembers Chang, Robertson, and McGlashan expressed a preference for Scenario A because it requires fewer trees to be removed. Mr. Featherstone said that the two presented scenarios impact the least number of trees while fulfilling the same amount of programming. It was mentioned that tree removal is a sensitive subject as Light Rail construction begins.

Councilmember Roberts asked if fleet projections have been considered, and if carports could be built in a manner that would support future electrification of the fleets. Mr. Witt explained that staff has attempted to estimate the future needs and he would note the electric charging suggestion. Councilmember Roberts asked if the standards of Salmon-Safe certification had been considered in this proposal, and Mr. Witt shared details on how they had been considered.

Councilmember Scully said he supports beginning Phase 1. He does not support Scenario A because it takes away park space and wondered if Scenario D could be adjusted to reduce impacts even further. He said he would like the design to work around existing trees as much as possible and suggested a reevaluation of design elements for Phases 2 and 3.

Deputy Mayor McConnell said she would prefer to keep the footprint of the facility as low-impact as possible.

Mayor Hall stated that he is comfortable moving forward with the project, and that it meets big picture needs while showing environmental benefits. He said one of the real wins is that there is not a huge impact on Hamlin Park and it opens up green space restoration opportunities at the North Maintenance Facility.

The benefits of related sidewalk improvements that would come in conjunction with the project were mentioned, and Mr. Witt said a more detailed discussion on sidewalks would be part of the design process.

Ms. Tarry confirmed that this topic would return to Council for discussion. Councilmember Scully asked that the topic be publicized so the community has ample opportunity to comment.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk