Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item: 4(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Report of Library Board
DEPARTMENT:	Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services
PRESENTED BY:	Wendy Barry, Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

Library Board Chair Michael Derrick will attend your January 8 meeting to present the annual report of the Library Board.

RECOMMENDATION

N/A

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney N/A

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, November 27, 2000
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Hansen, Councilmembers Grossman, Gustafson, Lee, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmembers Lee and Montgomery, who arrived later in the meeting.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem presented a memorandum on the transition of the Human Services Roundtable. The organization will disband December 31. Mr. Beem mentioned meetings to be held from January through March to address common interests of former participants in the Human Services Roundtable and proposals for proceeding. He noted the interim objective to maintain advocacy for regional human services issues before the Washington State legislature. He requested Council concurrence to allocate $800 to participate with other cities to retain a legislative advocate.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Beem said King County will not retain any funds to serve as the fiscal agent of the cities retaining the legislative advocate. He confirmed that representatives of the participating cities will need to meet and approve any change to the "Recommended Priorities for Legislative Advocacy, 2001 Legislative Session."

Councilmember Gustafson supported participation with other cities to retain a legislative advocate.

Councilmember Montgomery arrived at 7:38 p.m.

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman reported the certified election results for Shoreline precincts on Initiative 722 (I-722): 52 percent voted against the initiative, and 48 percent voted in favor of it. He mentioned the annual visit of the Christmas Ship at Richmond

Beach Saltwater Park on December 11 at 8:20 p.m. He reminded Council of the cancellation of the December 4 workshop. He said the executive session on tonight's agenda will not be needed.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Janet Way, 940 NE 147th Street, represented the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group. She presented a letter objecting "to the process currently being implemented by the Development Services Group in regard to the Paramount Park swale project which has been proposed."

(b) Chris Eggen, 15104 11th Avenue NE, read from a letter regarding a proposed creek in the north end of Paramount Park.

(c) Cecilie Hudson, 15233 11th Avenue NE, opposed the swale plan in the Paramount Ridge Development proposed by CCA, Inc.

Planning and Development Services Director Tim Stewart confirmed that final approval of the Paramount Ridge development is contingent upon resolution of the downstream drainage issue. He said staff instructed the applicant to file for a new Type B permit to construct improvements to address downstream drainage. He explained that an applicant for a Type B permit must hold a neighborhood meeting before submitting the application. He said the developer has yet to apply for the permit for the drainage improvements.

Mayor Jepsen asked if the developer indicated at the neighborhood meeting that the Type B permit for the downstream improvements is related to the Paramount Ridge development. Mr. Stewart said the Type B permit for downstream improvements would be one way to satisfy the third condition of the Paramount Ridge plat. He noted that staff favored the additional public process necessitated by a new Type B permit over an expansion of the original preliminary plat to include this scope of work.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Stewart agreed that Council must confirm that the applicant has met the conditions and approve the plat.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to approve the agenda, deleting the executive session. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6–0, and the agenda, as amended, was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved approval of the consent calendar. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the following items were approved:

Minutes of Workshop of November 6, 2000
Minutes of Special Meeting of November 13, 2000

Approval of expenses and payroll as of November 9, 2000 in the amount of $1,585,821.47

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute lease extensions for the Eastside and Westside Police Storefronts

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to amend the lease agreement with Highland Plaza LLC at a monthly rate of $100 to acquire additional lease storage area located in the Highland Plaza Annex

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a professional services contract not to exceed $282,345 with Tetra Tech/KCM, Inc. for the inventory and characterization of stream and wetland resources

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with INCA Engineers, Inc. for the North City Sub-Area Planned Action SEPA

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute consultant agreements with the consulting firms of OTAK, INCA Engineers, Inc., KPG, and Perteet Engineering, Inc. for professional engineering services with work to be later assigned on each operations or capital project

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Cancelled

9. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

(a) Public hearing to consider citizens' comments regarding adoption of the 2001 User Fee Schedules for the City's Fee Based Services and the revised utility tax ordinance

Finance Director Debra Tarry presented the staff report.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to address the Council on this issue, Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion, which carried 6–0, and the public hearing was closed.

Deputy Mayor Hansen noted recent comments that Council does not provide opportunities for public input. He stressed that public hearings provide such opportunities.

Ordinance No. 256 adopting fees for services for land use and building permit development applications, for parks and recreation, and for public records charges

Councilmember Ransom moved adoption of Ordinance No. 256. Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom pointed out that the proposed ordinance is meant to maintain current fees, not to increase them.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Tarry said the proposed fees for land use and building permit development applications will maintain a cost recovery rate of approximately 80 percent in the area of development services. She confirmed that the proposed fees are comparable to those that other cities charge. She said the City reviews its fees biennially.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if staff needs to adjust the information under "Pool Rentals," "School Districts" in Exhibit B (page 83 of the Council packet) to reflect the recently-implemented interlocal agreement between the City and the Shoreline School District. Ms. Tarry said the City will "track in-kind services" under the interlocal agreement. She pointed out that the "School District" information in Exhibit B does not specify the Shoreline School District.

Ms. Tarry confirmed Deputy Mayor Hansen's assumption that Ordinance No. 256 is meant to reestablish City fee schedules in case the courts uphold I-722 as constitutional.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 256 adopting fees for services for land use and building permit development applications, for parks and recreation, and for public records charges. The motion carried 6-0.

Ordinance No. 257 establishing utility taxes and establishing utility tax relief for eligible citizens

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved that Council adopt Ordinance No. 257. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen commented on the similarity of Ordinance No. 257 to Ordinance No. 256—he said Ordinance No. 257 is a reaffirmation of the Council position on utility taxes in case the courts uphold I-722 as constitutional.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Bauman and City Attorney Ian Sievers confirmed that Section 11 of Ordinance No. 257 provides citizens the opportunity to overturn the ordinance by referendum.

Councilmember Gustafson mentioned that the City of Seattle notified him by mail of new water, sewer and drainage rates for 2001 and 2002. He asked whether and how such rate changes affect the City. Noting that the City cannot tax another municipality that provides services within Shoreline, Mr. Sievers said the City of Seattle rate increases will not affect City utility tax revenues. Mayor Jepsen commented that Shoreline customers have little voice regarding City of Seattle decisions on water, sewer and drainage rates and services.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Bauman explained that Shoreline residents receive wastewater services from either the City of Seattle or the Shoreline Wastewater Management District and that the City provides drainage services. He suggested that staff clarify the impacts of the City of Seattle rate increases on Shoreline residents in an upcoming issue of the City newsletter.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Tarry confirmed that Ordinance No. 257 does not increase utility taxes higher those established in 1999.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Tarry explained that the one-percent utility tax on cable television service in Ordinance No. 257 is in addition to the five-percent franchise fee the City applies to cable television services. She confirmed that Ordinance No. 257 simply reestablishes the one-percent utility tax on cable television that Council established last year.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 257 establishing utility taxes and establishing utility tax relief for eligible citizens. The motion carried 6-0.

(b) Public hearing to consider citizens' comments on the proposed 2001 budget

Mr. Bauman noted the previous staff recommendation that Council set aside $3 million from capital funds in 2001 to cover the cost of tax and fee refunds that passage of I-722 could necessitate. He said staff now suggests the reduction of this reserve to approximately $800,000. He explained that it is highly unlikely the City will need to refund the $2.2 million in taxes and fees it collected in 2000.

Ms. Tarry provided an overview of the 2001 proposed City budget. She also reviewed the provisions and potential impacts of I-722. She explained that an $800,000 reserve would accommodate the following potential impacts: the rollback of property taxes to 1999 assessed valuations (a financial impact of approximately $333,000) and the gap in the collection of utility tax revenues (a financial impact of approximately $404,000). Staff recommends that Council establish the $800,000 reserve from funds designated in the 2001-06 Capital

Improvement Program (CIP) for the Shoreline Community College sports fields. Ms. Tarry noted that the CIP still includes funds to complete the pre-design work on the sports fields. She said construction of the fields had not been scheduled to begin until 2003.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing.

(1) Janet Way, 940 NE 147th Street, represented the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group. She expressed the thanks of the group for the proposed open space expenditures in Paramount Park Neighborhood. She asserted that the retention of water in Paramount Park enhances the health of the downstream ecosystem and helps to prevent flooding. She also highlighted the value of investments at Ronald Bog.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to close the public hearing. Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the public hearing was closed.

Mayor Jepsen expressed support for the reduction to $800,000 of the reserve to accommodate potential impacts to I-722. He advocated that Council designate the $30,000 budgeted under Citywide Services for a special election toward Council goal number eight, "Enhance Two-Way Communication through the Use of Technology (Government Access Channel and Web Site)."

Councilmember Montgomery concurred with Mayor Jepsen's comments.

Councilmember Ransom noted his support for additional funding for social and cultural services. He said such additional funding is not reasonable in light of I-722. He advocated that Council reconsider additional funding later in 2001 if the courts determine I-722 unconstitutional and City revenues permit.

Deputy Mayor Hansen sought concurrence of other Councilmembers in favor of the reduction from $3 million to $800,000 of the reserve to accommodate potential impacts of I-722.

Councilmember Grossman supported the reduction of the reserve to $800,000. Councilmember Gustafson concurred. Councilmember Ransom said he is "very comfortable" with the $800,000 reserve and with the budget as presented.

Finally, Mayor Jepsen clarified that although the proposed 2001 City budget amounts to approximately $80 million, it includes less than $27 million in General Fund expenditures (i.e., discretionary spending).

(c) Public hearing to consider citizens' comments on the Proposed 2001-2006 Capital Improvement Program

Bill Conner, Public Works Director, provided the staff report. Noting that Council reviewed the 2001 CIP projects at its November 13 workshop, he focused on the CIP projects scheduled for 2002-2006.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public hearing.

(1) Janet Way, 940 NE 147th Street, represented the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group. She noted City participation in the Thornton Creek Watershed Action Plan and on the Thornton Creek Watershed Management Committee. She said the City will eventually consider approving the action plan and contributing to it through CIP projects. She mentioned that Seattle Public Utilities will use revenues from the utility taxes it levies on capital projects for the action plan.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to close the public hearing. Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Ransom advocated the creation of a clear, one-page overview (e.g., identifying the different funding sources) for the public.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed his enthusiasm for the proposed CIP. He supported all of the capital projects listed. He noted missing text under "Project Scope" on page 53 of the CIP 2001-06 document.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Conner confirmed that the North 175th Street project on page 53 of the CIP 2001-06 involves the construction of sidewalks from Meridian Avenue N to Aurora Avenue N on both sides of N 175th Street. Noting that many children walk along N 175th Street, Councilmember Gustafson advocated future reconsideration of the schedule for the project. He also supported reprioritization of the North 160th Street @ Greenwood Avenue North project (page 55 of the CIP 2001-06).

Councilmember Grossman expressed appreciation for the staff work on the 2001-06 CIP.

Mayor Jepsen underscored the value to the community of even relatively small projects, such as the sidewalk improvements underway on Meridian Avenue N.

10. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Ordinance No. 252 levying the general taxes for the City of Shoreline in King County for the fiscal year commencing January 1, 2001, on all property both real and personal, in said City which is subject to taxation for the purpose of paying sufficient revenue to conduct City business for the ensuing year as required by law

Ms. Tarry reviewed the staff report. She went on to discuss the updated assessed valuation (AV) data that staff received from King County earlier in the day. Using the updated data, if Council chose a 102 percent levy for 2001:

- the City would receive approximately $185,000 more revenue compared to that in the proposed 2001 budget;
- the tax rate would be a little over $1.49 per $1,000 AV; and
- the total levy increase, compared to the 2000 levy amount, would be approximately $335,000 (5.65 percent).

Ms. Tarry distributed copies of proposed Ordinance No. 252 revised to include the updated AV data.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Ms. Tarry confirmed that Section 1 of proposed Ordinance No. 252 is based on the 1996 levy, the City of Shoreline "statutory maximum levy."

Ms. Tarry said the tax rate per $1,000 AV may continue to fluctuate until the County establishes final AV figures. She explained that Council must identify a tax rate per $1,000. She said the County will adjust the rate, if necessary, based on its final AV figures.

Mayor Jepsen asked what the tax rate would be if Council chose to increase the levy to reflect the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 3.9 percent. Ms. Tarry said the tax rate would be $1.5225 per $1,000 AV, and the actual levy would be $6,384,125, an increase of 7.59 percent over the 2000 levy amount. Mayor Jepsen supported this rate as a means of keeping pace with local inflation.

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to adopt Ordinance No. 252 as revised to include the updated AV data. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Hansen noted his understanding that a 102 percent levy limit, based on the 1996 levy, would result in an amount exceeding the 1999 levy by approximately $86,000. He noted that the proposed ordinance specifies $5,933,565 as "the amount levied in 1999 for collection in 2000." He asserted a contradiction between the staff analysis and the proposed ordinance. Ms. Tarry explained that in addition to the $5,933,565 levied in 1999 for collection in 2000 the City proposes to levy an additional $335,000 to attain the full 102 percent of the statutory maximum levy plus new construction and annexation.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Sievers said the ordinance must state the dollar amount of the increase over that levied in 1999 (for collection in 2000), even though the increase is based on the 1996 levy.

Using the tax rate of $1.4807 per $1,000 AV from the version of proposed Ordinance No. 252 included in the Council packet (page 152), Deputy Mayor Hansen calculated that the City of Shoreline share of 2001 Shoreline property taxes will decrease to approximately 9.5 percent.

Deputy Mayor Hansen supported Ordinance No. 252 as revised to include the updated AV data. He acknowledged that the City can justify the "substantial need" necessary to adopt a levy of 106 percent. However, he said the City could fund outstanding capital projects by bond issue, if necessary, in the future.

Councilmember Ransom agreed that the City can justify a "substantial need." He noted the listing of over $62 million in unfunded capital projects (page 125 of the Council packet). He estimated the cumulative impact over the next 20 years of foregoing the maximum (106 percent) levy in 2001 at $6 million. He advocated that Council at least adopt a 103.9 percent tax levy to reflect the CPI, if not the maximum levy of 106 percent. He disagreed with the proposal to adopt a property tax levy of only 102 percent. He noted that Shoreline voters rejected I-722.

Councilmember Grossman supported the proposal to adopt a property tax levy of 103.9 percent to reflect the CPI. He asserted that the City manages its money frugally, that the economy has been good and that Shoreline has many unmet, unfunded capital needs.

Noting high property taxes in Shoreline, Councilmember Montgomery opposed any property tax levy in excess of 102 percent.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed with Councilmember Ransom. He asserted the substantial need. He noted that the property tax rate will decrease from $1.60 per $1,000 AV to approximately $1.53 per $1,000 AV. He asserted that rejection of I-722 by Shoreline voters shows the desire for "quality" City services and parks. He supported a property tax levy of 103.9 percent at the minimum, and he noted his inclination to consider a levy of 106 percent.

Councilmember Ransom moved to amend Ordinance No. 252 to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.

Mr. Sievers distributed copies of proposed Ordinance No. 252 revised to include a recital of the finding of substantial need, a levy limit of 103.9 percent and a 2001 levy rate of $1.5225 per $1,000 AV.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauman explained the necessity of a finding of substantial need for any property tax increase in excess of the implicit price deflator (IPD) of 2.61 percent.

Councilmember Gustafson supported the amended ordinance as a reasonable compromise.

A vote was taken on the motion to amend Ordinance No. 252 to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. The motion failed 4-2 (for lack of a supermajority), with Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Montgomery dissenting.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asked if Ordinance No. 252 as revised to include the updated AV data (with a levy limit of 102 percent) requires a finding of substantial need, given that it provides $86,000 in excess of the I-722 limit. Mr. Sievers responded that a finding of substantial need is not necessary.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to table further action on Ordinance No. 252 until the last item on the agenda. Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

(b) Ordinance No. 255 amending Shoreline Municipal Code 12.25.090, and establishing a fee of 6% of gross revenues for franchises and right-of-way use agreements

Ms. Tarry reviewed the staff report.

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to adopt Ordinance No. 255 amending SMC 12.25.090 and establishing a fee of six percent of gross revenues for franchises and right-of-way use agreements. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Tarry confirmed that Ordinance No. 255 maintains the existing six-percent franchise fee and represents no change to the public.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 255 amending SMC 12.25.090 and establishing a fee of six percent of gross revenues for franchises and right-of-way use agreements. The motion carried 6-0.

There was Council consensus to suspend the rules to take public comment before further action on agenda item 10 (a).

MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:55 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to extend the meeting until 10:15 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5–1, with Councilmember Montgomery dissenting.

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Janet Way, 940 NE 147th Street, read a letter from Donna M. Eggen, 15104 11th Avenue NE. Ms. Eggen advocated that the City take responsibility for correcting surface water management problems in Shoreline and that the City consider the Paramount Ridge development and the proposed swale in combination, as connected projects. Ms. Way advocated that Council schedule the issue as an agenda item for consideration at a future meeting.

(b) Sharon Cass, 2320 N 149th Street, distributed and discussed photographs she took earlier in the day at Twin Ponds Park. She also provided photocopies of notes on past dumping at the park and of information from the King County Noxious Weed Control Program and the Washington Administrative Code about nightshade.

(c) Dale Wright, 18546 Burke Avenue N, represented the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association. He said the November 21 association meeting concerned the Aurora Corridor Project. He read from a statement in which association members unanimously agreed to accept and support the Aurora Corridor concept and encouraged Council "to stay the course in its implementation."

Mayor Jepsen expressed appreciation for Mr. Wright's comments.

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, said staff contacted and received information from the Noxious Weed Board Specialist who inspects the City parks system. She agreed to provide the information to Ms. Cass. Mr. Bauman said the City will address surface water management problems at Twin Ponds Park as part of master planning scheduled for 2002.

At 10:10 p.m., Mayor Jepsen turned the gavel over to Deputy Mayor Hansen and left the Council table.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:15 p.m., Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 5–0.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that standing water at Twin Ponds Park will damage the wood fence on an adjoining property before master planning begins in 2002. Mr. Bauman said staff will assess whether the topography of Twin Ponds Park is driving surface water onto adjoining properties.

At 10:16 p.m., Mayor Jepsen returned to the Council table and resumed the gavel.

Councilmember Grossman expressed support for the process that the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association followed to educate its members about the Aurora Corridor Project. Councilmember Montgomery concurred. She noted that the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association provided valuable input on the rechannelization of N 185th Street as well.

Mr. Wright mentioned that those members of the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association in attendance at the November 21 meeting unanimously approved of the rechannelization of N 185th Street.

Mayor Jepsen addressed the comments regarding the Paramount Ridge development and the Paramount Park swale project. He expressed interest in whether the separate storm

water permit process will "tie back" to the instructions of the Hearing Examiner and the conditions set out as part of the preliminary plat approval. However, he did not favor an agenda item to consider the issue.

Mr. Sievers reiterated that Council will review whether the applicant has complied with the conditions in the preliminary plat and will decide whether to approve the final plat. He advised that Council could consider the swale project, given that it involves a City facility (i.e., Paramount School Park).

Deputy Mayor Hansen said he did not object to Council consideration of the issue at a future meeting.

Councilmember Lee arrived at 10:21 p.m.

Councilmember Grossman suggested that Council discuss the larger issue of City handling of building permitting and environmental concerns at a future workshop.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauman said he will discuss the issue with staff and report back to Council at the December 11 meeting.

10. ACTION ITEMS (CONTINUED)

(a) Ordinance No. 252 levying the general taxes for the City of Shoreline in King County for the fiscal year commencing January 1, 2001, on all property both real and personal, in said City which is subject to taxation for the purpose of paying sufficient revenue to conduct City business for the ensuing year as required by law

Mayor Jepsen announced that action on the original motion to adopt Ordinance No. 252 as revised to include the updated AV data was back on the table.

Deputy Mayor Hansen reiterated his opposition to the motion to amend Ordinance No. 252 to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. However, he supported reconsideration of the motion "with every Councilmember having a voice."

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to reconsider the amendment to Ordinance No. 252 to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion to reconsider, which carried unanimously.

Deputy Mayor Hansen explained to Councilmember Lee the positions that he and the other Councilmembers expressed earlier regarding the 2001 levy rate. Mayor Jepsen noted that the County Assessor will restate the levy to be in compliance with I-722 if necessary.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:30 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to extend the meeting until 10:45 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Councilmember Grossman noted that the total property tax rate is lower than it would be if Shoreline were still part of unincorporated King County. He said the $1.5225 per $1,000 AV levy rate will enable the City to address more unfunded capital projects.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry explained that neither property tax levy rate under consideration ($1.4949 per $1,000 AV or $1.5225 per $1,000 AV) would require reductions in the proposed 2001 budget. She said the difference in the revenue resulting from the two rates is $115,000.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Ms. Tarry said the $1.4949 per $1,000 property tax levy rate will result in an owner of a $180,000 home paying $12 more in City property tax in 2001 than in 2000; whereas, the $1.5225 per $1,000 property tax levy rate will result in the same owner paying $16 more in 2001.

Councilmember Ransom mentioned that the City faces expenditure increases for salaries and supplies in keeping with the CPI. He asserted that citizens support the completion of the proposed capital projects. He noted the cumulative impact over the next 20 years of establishing the higher property tax levy rate in 2001. He asserted that the community commitment of the finding of substantial need and the 103.9 percent property tax levy will reflect well on City applications for grant funding for capital projects. Councilmember Gustafson agreed. He referenced the election results for Shoreline precincts on I-722.

Councilmember Montgomery said the difference in the revenue resulting from the two rates will not be enough to meet any substantial need, but the lower rate will send a message that the City "is trying to live within the limits of I-722." She commented that the decision for her is a matter of principle. Deputy Mayor Hansen concurred. He noted that 48 percent of Shoreline voters supported the property tax reduction of I-722.

Mayor Jepsen commented that either of the City property tax levy rates under consideration represents a decrease from the current rate of $1.60 per $1,000 AV.

A vote was taken on the motion to amend Ordinance No. 252 to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. The motion carried 5-2, with Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Montgomery dissenting.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 252, as amended to make a finding of substantial need, to use a levy limit of 103.9 percent and to set the 2001 levy rate at $1.5225 per $1,000 AV. The motion carried 7-0.

DRAFT

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:40 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

December 11, 2000 **DRAFT**

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, December 11, 2000
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Highlander Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Grossman, Gustafson, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Lee

STAFF: Larry Bauman, Interim City Manager; Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager; Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager; and Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director

GUEST: State Senator Darlene Fairley

The meeting convened at 6:12 p.m. and began with a general discussion of efforts to decorate for the holidays.

Mayor Jepsen discussed his extensive travel for business purposes and the nature of his profession.

State Senator Fairley discussed some of the impacts of the education initiatives passed by the voters in November. She commented that these new spending measures will draw increasing resources at a time when State revenues may be falling due to a downturn in the economy.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Senator Fairley expressed the opinion that property tax initiatives and other measures restructuring property taxes may pass the House but were not likely to pass the Senate.

Councilmember Gustafson arrived at 6:30 p.m.

General discussion followed regarding the recent burglary at Councilmember Gustafson's home.

Senator Fairley discussed some steps she has taken to determine why the Aurora project was not funded in the State Transportation Budget. She commented that breaking the project into smaller funding requests may improve the chances for success.

Mayor Jepsen discussed the City's progress in addressing surface water problems, but expressed concern regarding the cost of remaining large projects such as Ronald Bog.

Larry Bauman, Interim City Manager, commented that the City had recently been notified that it had received a Public Works Trust Fund loan for the Ronald Bog project. Senator Fairley added that the fund's budget comes through her Capital Committee.

There was general discussion of the City's efforts to fulfill its responsibilities vis-à-vis the Growth Management Act (GMA). Senator Fairley warned that there may be an effort to amend the GMA this year, which might result in costs to the City.

There was general discussion of the difficulties associated with the continuation of a divided House of Representatives.

In response to a question from Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager, Senator Fairley stated that the majority leader of the Senate is supportive of addressing the impacts of Initiative 695 on smaller cities.

Senator Fairley reinforced her earlier comment regarding the resource crunch that will likely result from the education initiatives that recently passed. She also reviewed other potential areas of interest to the City.

At 7:00 p.m., Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, arrived and discussed the 3rd Avenue Water Tower. He presented options for dealing with the deterioration of the structure. There was general discussion of the proposed options. The meeting concluded with an expression of support for the City playing a larger role in preserving the water tower. Staff committed to returning to Council in the future with cost estimates.

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

_____

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, December 11, 2000
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Grossman, Gustafson, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Lee

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Lee.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to excuse Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Lee. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried 5-0.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman reported on an abatement at 15035 26th Avenue NE. He distributed before-and-after photographs of the scene. He also noted that the City's new Code Enforcement Officer is Jeff Thomas, a former planner in the Planning and Development Services Department.

Continuing, Mr. Bauman said the City's annual chipping event is scheduled for January 6, 2001 at both Hamlin Park and the Richmond Beach Lutheran Church.

Next, he explained that the City has applied for a $16,000 grant from the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program. This is the first time the City has been eligible to receive these funds, which will be used for the School Resource Officer (SRO) program. He noted that the City of Lake Forest Park was asked to participate in the SRO program but declined. In future years, the School District is expected to share equally in the costs of the SRO program.

Council supported moving forward on the grant application.

Continuing, Mr. Bauman updated Council on the court decision on Initiative 722 (I-722). He said the King County Assessor has been enjoined from implementing it. This means the Council's adopted property tax levy rate will stand. He said staff feels there is no compelling need for the City to intervene in the lawsuit. The Mayor asked that this matter be scheduled for discussion by the full Council on January 8, 2001.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, provided an overview of issues regarding the proposal to use Paramount Park Open Space for a drainage swale. He explained how the existing drainage system works in the area and how the proposal for a swale in Paramount Park arose as a solution to one of the conditions for approval of the Paramount Ridge plat. The condition requires that downstream drainage cannot be aggravated by construction of the new homes.

Mayor Jepsen recalled that this issue had been brought to the Council's attention at a recent meeting. He felt no Council discussion could take place until an application is filed. Mr. Stewart responded that an application was filed on Friday. However, the Development Code requires the owner of the property to sign the application. Since in this case the property owner is the City, the application was not accepted. It has been concluded that the appropriate process for reviewing this proposal is to send it to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee. Mr. Stewart concluded that the proposed swale may be one way to meet the condition on the plat, but there may be other ways as well.

Councilmember Ransom asked if the diversion of water would affect the wetlands downstream recently enhanced by Paramount Park neighborhood residents. Mr. Stewart affirmed there is a connection to the downstream flows. He hypothesized that the more natural swale system might help filter and slow the flows.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Stan Terry, 15811 28th Avenue NE, thanked the Council for supporting the Mini-Grant program and advocated approval of the project on tonight's consent calendar. He said the Mini-Grant projects have been well-received in the neighborhoods and have helped to instill pride in the community and give a sense of belonging to the City.

(b) Matt Howland, 19237 Aurora Avenue N, spoke as a business owner and property owner in Shoreline, as well as a partner in the Paramount Ridge subdivision. He asked about tax incentives for improvements on under-improved property, a proposal advocated by the former Economic Development Coordinator. He hoped this would continue to be considered. Regarding the Paramount Park subdivision, he said the developers will be following the steps outlined by Mr. Stewart to pursue the swale idea. He suggested that all drainage issues related to improvements to Paramount Park be considered together with his proposal. He noted the drainage improvements required for his project will also benefit the public. Therefore, development of the swale might be a public/private partnership of some type.

Mayor Jepsen noted that one of next year's Council goals is to spur economic development and that Council will consider various ideas to achieve this goal.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Montgomery moved to approve the agenda. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and the agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved that Council adopt the consent calendar. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the following items were approved:

Minutes of Workshop Meeting of November 20, 2000
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of November 27, 2000

Approval of expenses and payroll as of November 22, 2000 in the amount of $560,480.70

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute legal contracts for 2001: Kenyon Dornay Marshall for prosecution services, civil litigation and administrative support not to exceed $8,900/month plus expenses for prosecution, $40,000 for civil; King County Interlocal agreement for jail calendar prosecution services; Buck and Gordon, LLC for land use/ environmental litigation and support not to exceed $75,000; and Foster, Pepper and Shefelman for municipal law litigation and support, not to exceed $50,000

Motion to approve the expenditure of $3,600 in Mini-Grant funds for the Briarcrest Neighborhood Association to purchase trees for the Briarcrest Neighborhood

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Ordinance No. 254 adopting the annual budget of the City of Shoreline for the year 2001

Debra Tarry, Finance Director, reviewed the budget process that has taken place over the past few months and the various ordinances already adopted by Council. She explained the adjustments made to the budget originally proposed at the end of October: 1) the $30,000 special election funding was re-directed toward Council Goal #8; and 2) $811,574 has been set aside in reserve to address I-722 shortfalls. This reserve was created by the difference between the property tax levy in the proposed budget and the one adopted by Council ($196,000) and an adjustment to the capital budget to reduce

funding for the Shoreline Community College sports field project ($614,790). She affirmed that funding still remains to do the design work on this project and to continue discussions with the college. There was also an adjustment to the Surface Water Management Fund to do a stream assessment required by the Endangered Species Act. Funds to pay for the assessment came from carryover and a King Conservation District grant, as well as funding from the Shoreline Wastewater District. She concluded that the revised 2001 capital and operating budget totals $80,519,682.00.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to approve Ordinance No. 254. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.

Councilmember Grossman referred to earlier budget conversations regarding unanticipated gambling revenue and Councilmember Ransom's suggestion to take $150,000 of this to provide one-time money for different service agencies in Shoreline. At the time this was discussed, a simple, equitable proposal on how to do this was not determined. The only item that was funded was an additional $15,000 for the Shoreline Historical Museum.

Councilmember Grossman put forward the idea of amending the budget to address the disparity he perceived that one agency received additional funding while others did not. He felt this disrespects the process the Council went through to determine those agencies of value to the community. He supported the museum funding, but wanted to pull this $15,000 out and put it into a pool with an additional $60,000 that would come out of the General Fund reserve and be allocated to non-profits either located in Shoreline or providing over fifty percent of their services in Shoreline. The allocation could be done based on a pro-rata share already determined through the human services funding process.

Councilmember Ransom supported this concept.

Councilmember Montgomery noted that Deputy Mayor Hansen would be concerned about taking the $15,000 from the historical museum, but Councilmember Ransom responded that the $15,000 for the historical museum would still be there.

Councilmember Grossman said the goal is to be fair to other agencies. He felt it would set an inconsistent precedent to fund the historical museum outside the process developed to fund agencies doing excellent services in Shoreline.

Councilmember Gustafson did not oppose allocation of additional money to needy human services agencies, but he said the budget has been discussed in depth over the past few months and the one-time funding for the historical museum was agreed upon by the Council. He was not willing to allocate additional dollars with all the unknowns related to I-722. He concluded that perhaps the matter could be raised later on.

Mayor Jepsen reminded Council that the goal of going through the budget discussions is to have Councilmembers bring forward ideas for staff to research in order to avoid last-

minute responses. He wondered whether this proposal would reduce the General Fund Reserve below that established by Council policy.

Ms. Tarry said that even with a deduction of $60,000, the reserve fund would meet Council's ten-percent policy. She said the unanticipated gambling revenues were allocated to capital improvement projects, as dictated by Council policy.

Councilmember Ransom stated that it has been a good year in many ways and that the City should share the benefit to the public not only through capital projects but through social service, Arts Council, and other human service and cultural programs that benefit citizens. He felt the public would appreciate this. He noted this had been discussed on several occasions. He said Councilmembers Montgomery and Gustafson heard Councilmember Lee's approval of this recently at a dinner meeting.

Mayor Jepsen acknowledged that this is a worthwhile goal, but he asserted that tonight is not the right time to bring it up.

Based on these comments, Councilmember Grossman agreed that this should have been brought up earlier in the process, and he declined to make a motion on his proposal. He asked that this be discussed again.

Mayor Jepsen noted that at the Council's budget retreat there was consensus that something should be done in this area, but there was no consensus about what to do. He said the discussion will continue.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve Ordinance No. 254, which carried 5 – 0, and the 2001 budget appropriating funds for the operating and capital budgets for the City was adopted.

(b) Ordinance No. 253 approving and adopting the 2001 – 2006 Capital Improvement Program

Chuck Purnell, City Engineer, provided a brief overview of the 2001 – 2006 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). He reiterated the changes made during the budget process that reallocated funds in order to do the stream assessment and reduced funding for the Shoreline Community College sports field project.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Kenneth E. Cottingham, 350 NW 175th Street, felt that some projects in the CIP are questionable in terms of their cost-benefit ratios. He referred to the project at Richmond Beach Road and 3rd Avenue NW. He said in his experience in dealing with intersection improvements, he had never seen anything like the $1.5 million allocated to make that intersection safe. He suggested phasing the left-turns eastbound and westbound. He felt safety could be improved without massive right-of-way acquisitions. He also mentioned 175th Street at Midvale, where he felt the developer of the property on the south side of the intersection should contribute to the improvement. He mentioned

projects on pages 54, 55 and 56 of the CIP, saying these projects have not had intermediary studies.

Mayor Jepsen responded that most CIP projects go through a design analysis. The CIP is readjusted every year based on information about solutions and more refined cost figures.

Mr. Purnell agreed that once the project analysis begins, more effective ways of addressing a problem might be found. In such cases, Council is presented with alternatives to consider.

Mr. Bauman directed staff to take specific note of Mr. Cottingham's comments to ensure the options he suggested are considered.

Councilmember Gustafson moved approval of Ordinance No. 253. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

Councilmember Gustafson emphasized that there is an opportunity each year to discuss prioritizations and alternatives within the CIP.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and Ordinance No. 253 adopting the Capital Improvement Program for 2001 – 2006 was passed.

9. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:30 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that Council would recess into executive session for 20 minutes to consider an item of potential litigation. At 8:50 p.m., the executive session concluded, and the regular meeting reconvened.

8. OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTION AND MOTIONS

(c) Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with Waste Management for City Solid Waste Collection Services

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, reviewed the long process which culminates this evening in approval of a contract with Waste Management. He said the goals of the process were to equalize services across the City and to give citizens the services they desire. He reviewed the benefits of the proposed contract, and he said the new service will be implemented on March 1, 2001. He described the educational efforts and the changes that west side residents of Shoreline will experience. He concluded that service in the annexation areas will be delayed because of legal issues involved in the previous contract.

Councilmember Ransom moved to authorize the Waste Management contract. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the prices look "great" compared to current rates, but the contract also involves a reduction in service. However, this does accomplish consistent City service.

Councilmember Gustafson was enthusiastic about certain elements of the contract, such as collection of bulky items and white goods and the vacation suspension. He suggested developing a video to be shown on the government access channel about the service changes. He also suggested looking at a senior-citizen package that would provide additional services for free, such as having the garbage picked up closer to the residence. Councilmember Gustafson concluded with technical questions about tipping fees and illegal weights.

Councilmember Ransom commented that the contract only provides for less service if all the services were used before. If the customer does not use all the services, there might be a savings under the new contract.

Mr. Bauer clarified that yard waste collection is the service that may be perceived as being reduced. However, yard waste collection has been implemented well on the east side of the City, and the hope is that the same thing will occur on the west side.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with Waste Management for City Solid Waste Collection Services, which carried unanimously.

(d) Ordinance No. 251 establishing regulations relating to the disposition, collection and transportation of garbage

Mr. Bauer explained that these regulations are needed to deal with the solid waste contract just approved. They have already been reviewed by Council. At that time, Councilmember Lee expressed concern about enforcement and penalties. Mr. Bauer explained that the fees were based predominantly on State law and the City of Seattle's ordinance. The ordinance before Council tonight has been changed since Council last saw it to make it a public health ordinance. This changes the penalties to those in the Code Enforcement section of the Shoreline Municipal Code. Code enforcement is based on a three-strikes approach that escalates through a process of education, warning and discussion, with penalties as a last resort.

Councilmember Montgomery moved to approve Ordinance No. 251. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the penalties listed in the staff report on page 105. He questioned what "illegal dumping of a hazardous substance" would involve. He felt it should be clarified whether dumping something like anti-freeze would qualify for the $5,000 fine and a year in prison. Admitting that this is a misstatement in the staff report, Mr. Bauer responded that the public health code has no gross misdemeanor offense with these penalties. The maximum penalty under this code will be a $250 fine and 90 days in jail.

Mayor Jepsen wished to ensure that the penalties for dumping hazardous materials in Shoreline are severe enough that no one is tempted to do this and pay a relatively low fine. Mr. Bauer said this law brings an additional level of protection above what is currently in place. He agreed this would not address a major offense. He said this issue could be brought back after additional research if Council wishes.

Mayor Jepsen said he would not like to get caught in a situation where the City does not have an appropriate penalty. He asked staff to review this to ensure the code includes a penalty proportional to the severity of the offense.

Councilmember Ransom asked how a typical action, such as the dumping of anti-freeze, would be covered. It was clarified that purposefully dumping would be covered under the ordinance but malicious intent would be required for assessment of a penalty.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, added that the prosecutor has the option of applying the misdemeanor penalty rather than filing any of the classes of infraction. This could be used with repeaters or serious offenses. Application of the ordinance would not prohibit prosecution under other laws if the action warranted.

Councilmember Gustafson mentioned the $50 fine for putting up signs on utility poles. He said people in Shoreline put up various types of signs (garage sale, lost pet, etc.) Mr. Bauer said this provision is patterned on Seattle's ordinance. It was adopted because Seattle City Light workers were being injured by tacks and nails in the poles.

Councilmember Ransom agreed that people use utility poles to inform neighbors. He said people usually remove the signs in a timely fashion. He felt the fine was excessive.

Mr. Bauer reiterated that the ordinance is part of the health code. The approach provides an opportunity to educate people before assessing a fine. Furthermore, this ordinance is consistent with other regulations that deal with signs in the right-of-way.

Mayor Jepsen concluded that the regulations will be enforced with common sense.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and Ordinance No. 251 establishing regulations relating to the disposition, collection and transportation of garbage was passed.

(e) Ordinance No. 258 further defining and regulating gambling uses and amending chapters 20.20 and 20.40 of the Development Code

Rachael Markle, Senior Planner, reviewed the background on the City's effort to define and clarify gambling uses under the Development Code. She said Ordinance No. 247 addresses this, but it sunsets at the end of December. The ordinance before Council tonight readopts the provisions of Ordinance No. 247 on a permanent basis.

Councilmember Montgomery moved to adopt Ordinance No. 258. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Markle said that the definition of "card room" has been deleted because a broader definition of "gambling use" has been provided. Mr. Bauman added that this ordinance defines what is regulated broadly and then lists only those things excepted from regulation. Card rooms fall under the definition of what is regulated.

For the record, Councilmember Ransom stated that gambling has been discussed at a number of meetings over the past two years. At those meetings, testimony and studies on gambling and pari-mutuel betting were presented that were not included as part of the Council packet information. Councilmember Ransom said that several weeks ago a 3 – 3 vote occurred on whether there should be an exemption for pari-mutuel gambling establishments. He said although these meet the criteria for serious gambling, the original concerns were parking and other secondary effects of a more criminal nature. He asserted these secondary effects were not found to be present for pari-mutuel establishments. Furthermore, only one such establishment is allowed per county.

Councilmember Ransom pointed out that the parking requirements in the ordinance penalize a pari-mutuel establishment because it is required to have both one space per 75 square feet of net useable area as well as one parking space for every three seats available to gambling or viewing gambling activities.

Concluding, he said that there is not majority Council support for treating pari-mutuel establishments differently. Therefore, he would not propose any amendments to the ordinance.

Mayor Jepsen said staff has brought forward Ordinance No. 258 based on the direction given at the last workshop.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and Ordinance No. 258 further defining and regulating gambling uses and amending chapters 20.20 and 20.40 of the Development Code was passed.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: none

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item: 7(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of December 21, 2000
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Al Juarez, Financial Operations Supervisor

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

It is necessary for the Council to approve expenses formally at the meeting. The following claims expenses have been reviewed by C. Robert Morseburg, Auditor on contract to review all payment vouchers.

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of $1,500,094.69 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for November 12 through November 25, 2000 in the amount of $280,115.91 paid with check/voucher numbers 2901 through 2092, 5069 through 5138, vouchers 480001 through 480111 and benefit checks 6725 through 6734.

Payroll and benefits for November 26 through December 9, 2000 in the amount of $256,909.11 paid with check/voucher numbers 2903 through 2904, 5139 through 5197, and 500001 through 500114 and benefit checks 6828 through 6835.

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on November 29:

Expenses in the amount of $110.50 paid on Expense Register dated 11/22/00 with the following claim checks: 6683-6684 and

Expenses in the amount of $269,007.97 paid on Expense Register dated 11/29/00 with the following claim checks: 6685-6707 and

Expenses in the amount of $6,482.49 paid on Expense Register dated 11/29/00 with the following claim check: 6708 and

Expenses in the amount of $27,979.91 paid on Expense Register dated 11/29/00 with the following claim checks: 6709-6719 and

Expenses in the amount of $33,600.20 paid on Expense Register dated 11/29/00 with the following claim checks: 6720-6723 and

Expenses in the amount of $45.00 paid on Expense Register dated 11/29/00 with the following claim check: 6724 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on December 6:

Expenses in the amount of $19,817.31 paid on Expense Register dated 12/4/00 with the following claim checks: 6735-6736 and

Expenses in the amount of $159,932.51 paid on Expense Register dated 12/6/00 with the following claim checks: 6737-6767 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on December 12:

Expenses in the amount of $28,181.40 paid on Expense Register dated 12/11/00 with the following claim checks: 6768-6783 and

Expenses in the amount of $31,749.35 paid on Expense Register dated 12/12/00 with the following claim checks: 6784-6810 and

Expenses in the amount of $243,522.48 paid on Expense Register dated 12/13/00 with the following claim checks: 6811-6826 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on December 21:

Expenses in the amount of $10,000.00 paid on Expense Register dated 12/15/00 with the following claim check: 6827 and

Expenses in the amount of $460.00 paid on Expense Register dated 12/19/00 with the following claim check: 6836 and

Expenses in the amount of $39,659.87 paid on Expense Register dated 12/19/00 with the following claim checks: 6837-6860 and

Expenses in the amount of $17,175.59 paid on Expense Register dated 12/20/00 with the following claim checks: 6861-6875 and

Expenses in the amount of $170.32 paid on Expense Register dated 12/20/00 with the following claim checks: 6876-6877 and

Expenses in the amount of $75,174.77 paid on Expense Register dated 12/21/00 with the following claim checks: 6878-6905

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item: 7(c)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	**Adoption of Resolution No. 172 Amending Resolution No. 166 Government Access Channel Use Policies**
DEPARTMENT:	**City Managers Office**
PRESENTED BY:	**Kristoff T. Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager**

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On April 10, 2000, your Council authorized funding and policies to support a basic implementation of the City's Government channel. As discussed with your Council at that time, the policies adopted restricted use of the channel to City departments. This restriction was recommended in order to keep demand for use of the channel to a manageable level as City staff worked through the implementation of this new technology. In response to interest expressed by your Council and other public agencies, staff has worked with the School District to make this resource available. An amendment to the City's government channel utilization policies is proposed for adoption in order to support this additional use of this public resource.

Your Council has expressed your support for cablecasting Council meetings and otherwise utilizing the Government channel provided by current Cable TV franchises as important tools for keeping Shoreline residents informed of City activities on a number of occasions. Your Council has made the enhancement of this communication methodology a priority by including it in your 2000-2001 workplan and providing additional funding. In response to that interest, staff has worked to develop the equipment and expertise necessary to support this communication medium. Narrowly tailoring utilization policies has been a consistent element of the implementation plan in order to ensure that demands for usage do not overwhelm the City's growing, but still nascent, technical abilities.

The School District is an important community partner for the City and we have been engaged in preliminary discussions with the District regarding cooperation and coordination on Government and Education cable programming for some time. The District has some questions, however, regarding how this new communication tool fits with existing communication strategies and technical resources. Allowing the District to pilot this form of communication on the City's channel is believed to be an easy and appropriate means of allowing them to better understand the capabilities of this technology. As a result, in late November the City began cablecasting slides generated by the District between *:30 and *:45 of each hour. City and District staff continue to meet to explore options for cooperation in this area and to work toward the potential development of an channel dedicated to educational use.

The City has also received requests from the Fire District for use of the Government channel to cablecast video Public Service Announcements. While infrastructure

limitations currently interfere with the City's ability to increase its utilization of video content, staff believes that this limitation will be resolved in the first quarter of 2001.

The proposed policy revisions are designed to open the door slightly to additional cooperation with other governmental agencies operating in the community, but to not open the door so wide that scarce City resources are likely to be over taxed or unintended consequences result. The amended policies allow content from those entities in addition to the City that have authority to levy property taxes within the Shoreline; i.e. the School District, the King County Library District, and the Fire District.

City staff is moving forward with the addition of resources approved by your Council for 2001 to focus on this service, and on options to improve the City's ability to communicate effectively with its residents. City and District staffs will also be working on the development of a joint vision for cooperation in this area with the intent of bringing that vision forward for consideration by both your Council and the School Board.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council move to adopt Resolution No. 172 Amending Resolution No. 166, Government Access Channel Use Policies.

Approved By: City Manager KB City Attorney ___

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Resolution No. 172 Amending Resolution No. 166 Government Access Channel Use Policies

Attachment B – Exhibit A to Resolution No. 172, "Government Access Channel Use Policies."

RESOLUTION NO. 172

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 166 GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL USE POLICIES

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 166 on April 10, 2000 establishing policies for the operation of the City's government channel; and

WHEREAS, the City Council believes that it is in the best interests of the Shoreline community to expand the utilization of that channel to include information from other governmental agencies operating within the community;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Amendment of Established Government Channel Use Policies. The City Council hereby amends the "Government Access Use Policies" adopted on April 10, 2000 in accordance with the revised document attached hereto as "Exhibit A".

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON JANUARY __, 2001.

_____
Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

_____
Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF SHORELINE
GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL USE POLICIES

The City of Shoreline coordinates through the City Clerk's office, the gathering, formatting and programming of information from Governments for display on the Shoreline Government Cable Television Channels.

The Shoreline Government Cable Television Channels (channels 421 ~~and 47~~) ~~are~~is used to distribute information concerning government activities and services. Authorized government users would be defined as federal, state and local government agencies including Fire Districts and Libraries.

Channels 421 ~~and 47~~ enables communication directly to all City of Shoreline cable subscribers to keep them better informed and is displayed throughout the day, seven (7) days a week, 24 hours a day, with both alphanumeric (text) and video information.

Procedures for Use of Channel 421 ~~and 47~~ for Character Generated Information

A. General Rules

1. The information is updated during the workday, Monday through Friday, as needed.

2. The Government Channel (21) and City equipment, including ~~The~~ Character Generators ~~(channel 42 and 47) are~~, are only available for use by City of Shoreline departments for providing information regarding City services and activities, or by the Shoreline School District, the Shoreline Fire Department, or either branch of the King County Library system operating in Shoreline to provide information regarding their services and activities.

3. No information shall be transmitted which involves any advertising by or on behalf of candidates for public offices, lottery information, or obscene or indecent matter.

4. When requests for message space exceed availability, priority shall be given to users from the geographic area served by the Shoreline cable system.

5. Announcements of events must indicate whether they are free or there is an admission charge. An information number should be provided. Dollar figures will not be announced.

6. All applicable FCC rules apply to use of the Character Generator and are on file at the Shoreline City Clerk's office.

7. The City Clerk will make the decision whether messages comply with these rules and are to be placed on the channel with input from the Department Director of the requesting department.

8. Disputes regarding use of the Character Generator shall be resolved by the City Manager or designee. A disagreement with the findings of the City Manager or its designee can be appealed to the Shoreline City Council.

B. Procedures for Preparing Alphanumeric Information for Display on Channels 421 ~~and 47~~.

1. The Request for Use of the Character Generator (CG) forms must be used when submitting messages for display. All of the required information at the top of the form must be filled in and the form signed by the director of the requesting department before the message can be displayed on channels 421 ~~and 47~~. Forms are available from the City Clerk's office, City Hall.

2. Message information shall be composed in Microsoft Word, attached to the CG Form and e-mailed directly to the City Clerk's office. All messages attached to a single CG form should be scheduled to begin and end display on the same dates. If events occur on various dates, a separate form should be used for each message.

3. When composing each message, it should be brief.

4. Each message should contain a headline. The headline should briefly convey the main idea of the message. It should attract attention and encourage the viewer to read the message.

5. The following examples may help in designing your messages:

FREE CONCERT: Monday, June 7,
Downtown City Park, Noon - 1:30
Questions? Call 205-546-1700

6. The City Clerk's office will, when necessary, conform your message to accommodate page format and style.

7. The message form must be received by the City Clerk's office at least five (5) working days before the display date.

Procedures for Submission of Video Tapes to be Aired on Channels 421 ~~and 47~~

A. General Rules

1. Programming shall comply with FCC rules regulating cablecasting.

2. All users shall permit the City Clerk to preview the programs they wish to present on the cable system so that a determination may be made as to whether the program material or any part thereof is prohibited by the rules set forth.

3. If it is determined that any program, or part thereof, is prohibited by the rules or requires a viewer discretion disclaimer, the user will be given the opportunity to revise the program so as to delete the objectionable portion and comply with the City Clerk's request. If the user chooses not to do so, she/he may do one of the following:

   a. Withdraw the program.
   b. Appeal the staff decision to the City Manager.

4. No live programming should be cablecast on the channel in the absence of prior approval of format by the City Clerk's office.

5. Channel use operating policies, application forms, licenses, facilities and equipment are subject to change at any time.

B. Use of Pre-Recorded Material

1. A completed Pre-Recorded Cablecast Request as supplied by the City Clerk shall be submitted with the video tape recording at least two (2) weeks prior to the date requested for cablecast.

2. All material shall be delivered to the City Clerk's office and shall be subject to preview to assure conformity with rules and procedures adopted by the City of Shoreline.

3. At the discretion of the staff the two (2) week submission rule may be waived to provide the airing of coverage of bonafide newsworthy events in a timely manner.

4. The City of shoreline requires producers to sign a waiver indemnifying the City of Shoreline and the cable operator from liability for potential copyright infringement.

C. Quality Standards

1. Program Airing Procedures - All video tapes for airing on channels 42<u>1</u> ~~and 47~~ will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

   a. Technical Standards - Video tapes must be of a quality suitable for cablecast. Staff screens the submitted tape to see whether the tape meets minimum quality standards when aired over the cable system. For example, problems with chroma, contrast, etc. which may be cause for rejection by a broadcast TV station will not usually be rejected by the staff. However, those tapes which, in staff's opinion, will consistently tear or otherwise not carry a stable signal over the cable system will not be aired.

   All video tapes supplied for airing will be on professional quality video cassettes. Audio quality of all video tapes will be constant throughout the video tapes and of sufficient level to permit adequate reproduction on the City's transmission equipment.

D. Access Priorities

1. Availability of the Channel

   a. Such channel, or channels, shall be available for exclusive use by City Department in cablecasting pre-recorded meetings of standing City of Shoreline committees and/or regional government committees or public service announcements cablecast at the request of the City Department.

   b. When requests for air time exceed availability, priority shall be given to the cablecast of Shoreline City Council meetings. The City reserves the right to preempt any programming scheduled to be cablecast and replace it with programming of local interest.

2. All professionally produced video content must be submitted to the City Clerk's office, with the appropriate signed forms required by the City. A signed statement releasing the cable operator and the City of Shoreline from liability and holding the same harmless from claims of third parties will be required.

Shoreline Government Access Channel

Request For Use Of Character Generator

Department: _____

Submitted By: _____

Extension: _____ Date Submitted: _____

Department Authorization:

_____

Signature Date

Clerk's Office Use

Filename: _____

Format Assigned to: _____

Date Assigned: _____

Book Assigned To: _____

Date Activated: _____ By: _____

Date Removed: _____ By: _____

Storage Location: _____

Message content is attached and has been e-mailed or otherwise provided to the City Clerk's office in Microsoft Word format.

The Message(s) is:

- ❑ **A one time announcement**
  - The display dates for the attached message(s) are
    - ❖ Begin _____ End _____
  - **This message will be deleted after the End date above.**
- ❑ **A periodic announcement**
  - This message should be displayed on a specific day(s) – Circle as appropriate
    - ❖ Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday
  - This message should be displayed in accordance with the following schedule
    - ❖ _____
  - This message should be displayed initially during the following period, and redisplayed upon 7 days advance notice
    - ❖ Begin _____ End _____
  - **Message will be saved until replaced or an authorization to delete it is received from the requesting Department**
- ❑ **A replacement message for a previous periodic message**
  - File name of previous message _____
  - Replacement effective date _____
- ❑ **An emergency message to be saved for on demand notice**
  - To be added to the following emergency notice packet _____
  - **Message will be retained until replaced or an authorization to delete it is received from the requesting Department**

Special Instructions: _____

Shoreline Government Access Channel

Prerecorded Cablecast Request

Department: _____

Submitted By: _____

Extension: _____ Date Submitted: _____

Department Authorization:

_____

Signature Date

Clerk's Office Use

Tape Label: _____

Tape Length: _____

Insertion Date: _____

Insertion Time: _____

Date Delivered: _____ By: _____

Date Returned: _____ By: _____

Storage Location: _____

Requested Cablecast Date: _____ Preferred Time: (Morning Noon Afternoon Evening Night)

Program Title: _____

Length (exact running time): _____ Target Audience: _____

Brief Description: _____

_____

Two Copies of the Program must be provided and the program cannot exceed two VHS format tapes in length.

The Sponsoring department has reviewed the material to ensure that:

- The content is comprised of no material prohibited by the Federal Communications Commission Rules and is consistent with the City's Government Access Channel Use Policies
- The department has taken all necessary steps to ensure that the City has the right to cablecast the requested material

The Program is:

☐ **A one time announcement (see cablecast date above)**

☐ **A periodic announcement**

- The program should run on a specific day(s) – Circle as appropriate
  - ❖ Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday
  - ❖ Beginning:_____ Ending: _____
- This program should be displayed in accordance with the following schedule
  - ❖ _____

At the completion of its run, the tapes shall be:

☐ Returned to the Submitter (Date returned: _____ By: _____)

☐ Erased and returned to the City's tape inventory

Program Run Date(s): _____

Start Time: _____ End Time: _____

Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item:** 7(d)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Contract with the North Rehabilitation Facility for Landscape Maintenance for an Amount not to Exceed $80,000
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director WLC

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to request your Council to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with the King County North Rehabilitation Facility (NRF) for landscape maintenance in 2001 for an amount not to exceed $80,000. This contract will provide for the continuation of vegetation removal support for the Roads and Surface Water Programs for 2001.

On June 23, 1997, your Council approved a pilot program with NRF to provide landscape maintenance by hand mowing the planted areas of the right-of-way. The pilot program proved successful and a full year contract was approved on January 26, 1998 for $80,000. On December 14, 1998 your Council increased the amount to $100,000 to include $20,000 for vegetation removal in the City Parks.

Between January and February 2000, NRF crews removed over 225 tons of vegetation from right-of-way and/or planter strips clearing approximately 75 linear miles of the City's arterial streets. In addition, NRF crews cleaned retention/detention facilities including Storm Creek, Pan Terra Pond, Pump Station (#30) and the M-1 Dam.

This report recaps the Roads and Surface Water Programs for 2000. The Parks Department will provide a recap of 2000 Parks Program services and present the 2001 Parks Program to Council in early 2001.

NRF continues to have a positive impact on the community and the improvement in the appearance of several City gateways has continued to receive positive comments from citizens.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with the North Rehabilitation Facility for landscape maintenance in 2001. This contract amount is not to exceed $80,000.

Approved By: City Manager KP City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item: 7(e)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion To Accept the Lowest Responsive Construction Bid for the 15th Avenue N.E. at NE 165th Street Project and Authorize the Interim City Manager to Execute the Construction Contract Including Authority To Execute Change Orders Up to 10% of the Contract Amount
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director wlc

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval of a low and responsive construction bid for the 15th Avenue N.E. at NE 165th Street Project. This project is included in the City's 2001 – 2006 Capital Improvement Program.

The project scope of work includes constructing a fully actuated traffic signal at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE at NE 165th Street, incorporating pedestrian-activated push buttons and in-pavement detection loops on 165th Street for vehicles turning onto 15th Avenue NE, and constructing sidewalk improvements and curb ramps at the intersection in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The construction of this project will increase safety at this intersection for pedestrians and vehicles crossing or entering onto 15th Avenue NE from NE 165th Street by providing a traffic signal that controls oncoming traffic. During the period from August 1992 through July 1995, ten accidents were reported at this intersection. The majority of these accidents occurred when vehicles were attempting to make left turns onto 15th Avenue NE.

This project was advertised on November 27, 2000. On December 19, 2000, the City Clerk's Office received and opened the following bids from qualified contractors:

Bidder Name	Bid Amount
1. Transtech Electric	$151,263.20
2. Totem Electric	$156,341.75
3. Potelco	$158,287.75
4. Signal Electric	$163,882.95
5. GMT Inc.	$163,972.00
6. Moose City Electric	$180,772.90
7. Precision Earthworks	$183,701.98

The engineer's estimate for the project is $190,000. Staff has reviewed the low bidder's qualifications and recommends that Transtech Electric be awarded the contract. Staff anticipates construction will begin in March or April following procurement, testing and acceptance of signal equipment materials, and completed by July 2001. The contractor has 90 calendar days for acquisition of critical materials and 45 working days to complete the project. Staff will closely monitor the contractor to minimize any inconvenience to the general public.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council accept the low bid and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with Transtech Electric in the amount of $151,263.20, and to execute change orders up to 10% of the original contract amount.

Approved By: City Manager KTB City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: January 8, 2001 **Agenda Item:** 8(a)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion to Approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual" for the Aurora Corridor Project
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director WLC Anne Tonella-Howe, Aurora Corridor Project Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval to use the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual" (Attachment A) as the manual for the right of way acquisition process for the Aurora Corridor project. This manual will serve to guide the process of negotiation, acquisition and compensation to business and property owners along Aurora Avenue.

Guidance on a fair and equitable right of way acquisition and relocation process is included in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Local Agency Guidelines (LAG manual). These three defined processes, as well as policies and procedures important to accommodate the specific needs of City business and property owners on Aurora are combined into this single manual. It is Staff's intent to update and amend the manual as policies and procedures pertaining to the Aurora Corridor are updated. This will allow staff to make recommendations for changes to the manual based on direct contact with individual property owners and businesses. These recommended changes would be brought back to your Council for review in the future.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual" to be used as the manual for the right of way acquisition process for the Aurora Corridor project.

Approved By: City Manager /B City Attorney ___

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

The "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines" (manual) will serve to guide the process of negotiation, acquisition and compensation to business and property owners along Aurora Avenue.

Several types of property will be needed for this project. These include right of way purchases (fee simple) for road widening and sidewalks; permanent easements for items such as utilities, retaining walls, and signal equipment; and temporary easements for items such as construction access, private property restoration and grading and paving of driveways. In some instances relocation of businesses may be necessary. This manual contains policies and procedures to guide the acquisition and relocation process for the Aurora Corridor project that are in keeping with Federal and State guidelines, as well as added policies and procedures important to accommodate the specific needs of City business and property owners.

At the November 20, 2000 Council meeting, staff presented the manual for your Council consideration. The draft manual has been available since that time for public review and comment, and was available at the November 30, 2000 Aurora Corridor Open House. Staff received the following comments pertaining specifically to this manual. Staff responses to the comments are in bold italics.

1. Perfect. If everything is designed as outlined I have no objections to the right of way policies (as outlined on aerial map of Shoreline).

2. What is fair compensation? If one business gets a large profit as a result, why not divide that with business that have a loss?

   Fair market value is based on appraised land value. Business owners who do not own property are entitled to relocation benefits. Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the manual describe the real property acquisition and relocation processes. The City may not legally redistribute private profit.

3. A. What happened to the retention of grandfathered rights?

   Section 7 of the manual addresses these types of redevelopment questions. The policy refers to the City Code and allows property's to be reviewed individually, since each property owner will have redevelopment questions unique to their property.

   B. At the 8/23/99 Council meeting a couple of Councilmembers spoke up in favor of incentives for businesses that chose to stay. I don't see this addressed here.

   This is a policy added as an extra benefit to accommodate the specific needs of City business and property owners. Please refer to Section 1.8 of the manual.

   C. Under "Construction" section there is no reference to how much of the street will be constructed at a time. Will the whole section be disrupted?

It is too early to know how much of Aurora will be constructed at a time. It is not Staff's intent to allow the contractor to disrupt the entire corridor at one time. Construction phasing will be required, as well as detour routes and signing to direct motorists to businesses and through the construction zone as described in Section 9.0 of the manual.

4. If necessary to take part of a building, then government should pay for the remodel; but not for adult use buildings.

   Section 4.0 of the manual addresses real property acquisition and compensation when buildings are impacted. The City may not discriminate based on type of business.

5. A larger right of way will kill Shoreline as a community, as well as killing pedestrians trying to cross it. Our locally owned businesses will be driven out. With active oppositions from the business owners to this project it should be a red light to planners that it is the wrong idea. Visit the Satsop Nuclear Power site if you want to see how far a failing idea can be pushed.

   The purpose of the project is to improve safety for both pedestrians and drivers. Elements such as sidewalks and new signals with pedestrian crossings will improve walking conditions. Medians, consolidated driveways and street lighting will improve driving conditions. The design concept also improves aesthetics and the image of the street with the use of landscaping and urban design elements and supports existing and future business investments along the street.

Right of Way Steps within Project Phases

Preliminary design and environmental review has begun. Staff and the consultant team continue to meet with business and property owners to discuss the project and anticipated property impacts. Business and Property Owner Workshops for the south section (145th Avenue to 165th Avenue) and the north section (185th Avenue to 205th Avenue) are complete. A workshop for the middle section (165th Avenue to 185th Avenue) will be scheduled during the first Quarter 2001.

Individual meetings are being scheduled with business and property owners that were unable to attend the workshops. Meetings will be scheduled with owners located in the south phase first to ensure that staff has contacted all business and property owners prior to beginning final design of the first phase. Of the 40 properties in the south section, staff met with 17 owners, left messages with 3 of them and discovered that 9 owners are not listed and one owner is selling. Staff continues to make contact with the 10 remaining property owners. Of the 63 businesses in the south section, staff contacted 43 and met with 13 business owners. Other than property owners that also own businesses most business owners appear to be less interested in meeting. Staff continues to make contact with the remaining business owners. Individual meetings with owners located in the second and third phases will be scheduled later this year.

Preliminary discussions with property owners located in the south phase have been generally positive. Comments appear to focus on access to properties (where will the U-turns be located, and how will it work), parking impacts (how will lost parking be recovered), building and property impacts (what will happen to a building, will impacted buildings be remodeled, will retaining walls be built) and construction duration. Staff will continue to meet with business and property owners, as the project design is refined and work through identified issues. If appropriate, changes to the manual based on information gathered during these meetings will be brought back to your Council at a future date for consideration.

Once the environmental review has been approved and the design adopted, final design will begin. During final design, right of way acquisitions will occur. Precise maps and descriptions of the right of way needed, by parcel, will be developed, property values will be appraised and agreements for acquisition will be negotiated.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual" to be used as the manual for the right of way acquisition process for the Aurora Corridor project.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual

Aurora Corridor Real Property

Acquisition and Relocation

Policy, Procedures and Guidelines

CONTENTS

CONTENTS II

1. SUMMARY 1

1.1 Purpose 1

1.2. Summary of Policy and Procedures for the Aurora Corridor 3

1.3. Project Description 4

1.4. Applicability 5

1.5. Accountability, Delegation, and Decision Authority 5

1.6. What Owners/Tenants are Entitled To 6

1.7. What Owners/Tenants are not Entitled To 7

1.8. Extra Benefits for Owners/Tenants 7

1.9. Right of Way Process Flow Chart 7

2. GENERAL PROCESS INFORMATION 9

2.1. State and Federal Law Certification 9

2.2. Pre-Negotiation Process 9

2.3. Notices 9

2.4. Record Keeping 9

2.5. Contracts for Services 9

2.6. Characterization of Payments 9

3. REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS 12

3.1. Construction Easements 12

3.2. Rights of Entry 12

3.3. Environmental Concerns 12

3.4. Permanent Easements 12

4. REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROCEDURES 14

4.1. Appraisals. 14

4.2. Review of appraisals. 16

4.3. Independent Evaluations Conducted by Owner 17

4.4. Making an Offer to Acquire Property and Negotiating for Purchase. 17

4.5. Acquisition of tenant-owned improvements. 18

4.6. Acquisition of uneconomic remnants. 18

4.7. Notices to Owners. 19

4.8. Donations. 19

4.9. Administrative Settlements 19

5.1. Payment for Moving and Related Expenses 21

5.2. Relocation Assistance 26

5.3. Re-establishment Expenses 32

5.4. Payments for Replacement Housing 33

5.5. Relocation Appeals Process 43

6. CONDEMNATION 45

6.1 Voluntary Possession and Use Agreements 45

6.2. Initiation of Condemnation Proceedings. 45

6.3. Expenses Incidental to Transfer of Title. 46

7. REDEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS 47

7.1. Signing Standards 47

7.2. Overhang and Setback 47

7.3. Frontage Requirements 47

7.4. Driveway Width and Spacing 47

7.5. Parking and Circulation Requirements 47

8. UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING 48

8.1. Coordination 48

8.2. Service Connections 49

9. TRAFFIC CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION 50

9.1. Construction Staging Plans 50

9.2. Maintenance of Access During Construction 51

9.3. Construction Signing 51

9.4. Communications 51

10. PROCESS TO AMEND THIS DOCUMENT 51

APPENDIX A. – DEFINITION OF TERMS 54

APPENDIX B. – CATF RECOMMENDATION 64

APPENDIX C. - FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS 67

APPENDIX D. CASE STUDIES 70

Case Study #1 - Partial Acquisition 70

Case Study #2 - Relocation Assistance - Partial Acquisition 72

Case Study #3 - Partial Acquisition with six feet taken off the front of a video store 74

1. SUMMARY

1.1 Purpose

The City of Shoreline intends to construct improvements to Aurora Avenue North within the City of Shoreline. These improvements will include maintaining two general-purpose lanes in both northbound and southbound directions, adding a business-access and transit lane, also in both directions and other intersection improvements. Continuous sidewalks will also be provided for the entire length of the corridor. In order to accomplish these improvements it will be necessary for the City to acquire real property along the corridor. This may result in the dislocation of property owners, businesses, tenants, and individuals located within buildings on such real property. It is the City's intent to treat such property owners and their tenants fairly, to minimize hardships of displacement by equitable treatment of persons and businesses displaced as a direct result of the Project, and to seek cooperative settlements of property acquisitions and relocation claims. These Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines (herein referred to as the "Procedures") are written to provide the City the ability to accomplish these goals within the City's limited resources, schedule constraints, grant/loan provisions as well as State and Federal laws.

Regional and local transportation facilities are developed on publicly owned land or right of way (see definitions in Appendix A). As transportation facilities are expanded, additional right of way may be needed to support the expanded facilities. In the case of Aurora Avenue North, the existing right of way in the corridor is at a minimum 90 feet wide and varying to a maximum of 110 feet wide.

When arterials, such as Aurora Avenue North, are expanded, several types of property are needed. These types include right of way purchases to fit roadway widening and sidewalks; permanent easements to fit utilities, retaining walls, bus zones, signal equipment, etc.; temporary easements to allow construction of street improvements, regrading and paving of driveways, utilities, installation of landscaping, and restoration of private property. Table 1.1 lists many of the right of way issues to be considered during the roadway development process.

Table 1.1						
Right of Way Needs	**Storm Drainage and Utilities Issues**	**Access and Circulation**	**Parking**	**Landscaping and Irrigation**	**Grading and Interface**	**Signage and Lighting**
Bus Shelters	Coordination	Driveway consolidation / relocation	Head-in "on-street" parking	Private systems	Driveway	Relocation
Construction easements	Undergrounding of overhead systems	Circulation requirements	Existing parking encroachments	Future developments	Drainage	Development Standards compliance
Signal equipment	Private storm drain systems	Left-in / out restrictions and tradeoffs	Loss of parking spaces	Visual buffer	Retaining walls	Temporary signing during construction
Utility easements	Service connections	Shared access	Parking and circulation reconfiguration	Compatibility with existing	Slopes	
Sidewalks				Fences, railing, and planters		
Road widening						