

April 9, 2001

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, April 9, 2001  
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 T. Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager; Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager; Bill Conner, Public Works Director; Anne Tonella-Howe, Aurora Corridor Project Manager; and Kirk McKinley, Planning Manager

The meeting convened at 6:20 p.m.

Councilmember Ransom recommended three revisions to the proposed City Manager employment contract with Steven Burkett. Council discussed the suggestions, but there was consensus that, while thoughtful, they were not necessary at this stage. It was noted that Councilmember Ransom could propose changes at the Council meeting if he chose.

Anne Tonella-Howe, Aurora Corridor Project Manager, discussed potential strategies for treating surface water in the Aurora Corridor. Specific uncertainties related to regulatory requirements were discussed. A program schedule for the Aurora Corridor project was distributed and discussed. Uncertainties related to the environmental process and regulations, including their impacts on the program schedule, were explored.

Kirk McKinley, Planning Manager, reviewed planned economic development activities related to the Aurora Square area. There was discussion of the potential to change the character of this area.

Mayor Jepsen requested an update on the Interurban Trail at a future Council meeting.

Councilmember Grossman arrived at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Tonella-Howe distributed a memorandum regarding the Westminster Triangle area and discussed issues related to the proposed vacation of Westminster Avenue between 155<sup>th</sup> Street and 160<sup>th</sup> Street. She reviewed comments from the Washington State Department of Transportation regarding an interim step of simply changing the access to Westminster Avenue. The eventual consideration and design of the vacation would be delayed until more is known about the potential re-development of the Aurora Square area.

April 9, 2001

# DRAFT

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Bill Conner, Public Works Director, discussed progress toward installing new signal controls at the intersection of 175<sup>th</sup> Street and Meridian Avenue.

Mr. McKinley announced that on May 17 the Puget Sound Regional Council will present a "Walkable Communities" workshop. It will look at pedestrian and bicycle issues at the Aurora Square site and address how the Interurban Trail can cross Aurora Avenue before the pedestrian overpass is constructed. The workshop will include an informational piece on walkability, a walking field trip and a mini design charrette.

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

---

Kristoff Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager

April 16, 2001

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, April 16, 2001  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

**ABSENT:** Councilmembers Grossman and Gustafson

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 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, who arrived shortly thereafter, and Councilmembers Grossman and Gustafson.

**Councilmember Lee moved to excuse Councilmembers Grossman and Gustafson. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

3. **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS**

City Attorney Ian Sievers reviewed the status of appeals of the Paramount School Park Improvements Project. He said one appeal has been withdrawn. The other is being addressed through an alternate dispute resolution process.

Kristoff Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager, recapped the April 12 meeting of the BrightWater Siting Advisory Committee. He noted the April 25 workshop at Shorewood High School regarding Pt. Wells as a potential site for the new wastewater treatment facility. Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Ransom said they planned to attend the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Hansen arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman distributed a news release regarding the outcome of the King County Superior Court hearing of an appeal regarding the Aegis Assisted Living Project.

# DRAFT

Finally, Mr. Bauman proposed, and Council agreed, to substitute a public reception for new City Manager Steve Burkett for the May 21 City Council Workshop.

## 4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Montgomery said the Puget Sound Regional Council will act on its long-range transportation plan, Destination 2030, on May 24. Also, she reported that changes to Metro bus routes in Shoreline anticipated to occur in June have been canceled.

Mayor Jepsen noted that King County Executive Ron Sims would visit Shoreline and Lake Forest Park April 18. He said he had reiterated to County staff the City request that the County identify roles and responsibilities regarding the Shoreline Transit-Oriented Development Project.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

## 6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Clarification of Council direction regarding potential interlocal agreement with Shoreline Water District

Mr. Bauer reviewed the staff report. He noted the list of nine potential objectives and the matrix (page seven of Council packet) illustrating possible combinations of objectives.

Mayor Jepsen said the first objective—"Create a City water utility as soon as possible"—is not a priority. He asserted the importance of the second, third and fourth objectives:

- 2) Move toward the eventual creation of a City water utility serving all of Shoreline.
- 3) Assist the City in acquiring Seattle Public Utilities' water service area within Shoreline.
- 4) Take action to improve the consistency and quality of water service within the area of Shoreline currently served by Seattle.

He commented that the wording of the fifth objective—"Assert control over key policy decisions before the District Board. . . ."—may be too strong and that the wording of the sixth objective—"Influence key policy decisions before the District Board. . . ."—may be too weak. He expressed his hope that the City and the Shoreline Water District will work together closely enough to insure that each is fully informed of options, decisions and impacts.

Continuing, Mayor Jepsen asserted the importance to the City of gaining a meaningful voice in regional water supply discussions (Objective 7). Acknowledging that the ninth objective—"Consolidate services and seek operational efficiencies"—may be "a longer-term" goal, he stated that it is also important.

Mayor Jepsen said Council concluded at its March 19 workshop that it supports an interlocal agreement that will allow the District to work with Seattle Public Utilities

(SPU) to consolidate water service in Shoreline and that will allow the City to participate in discussions and decisions. He said Council also concluded that the interlocal agreement should identify City assumption of the District as an option in the future.

Mr. Bauer requested clarification of Council support for Objective 7. Mayor Jepsen asserted that communication is critical to the City having "a meaningful voice in regional water supply discussions." He mentioned Shoreline Fire Chief J. B. Smith's regular updates of Council regarding the Emergency Medical Services Levy as an example of communication through which Council has had "a meaningful voice" in discussions of concern to the City.

Councilmember Lee said moving toward the eventual creation of a City water utility (Objective 2) must be part of the overall plan. Assuming this is a City goal, she asserted that the City must begin the necessary planning and allocating the necessary resources. She said she would not support City assumption of water service delivery until the City is able to assume and support the transition of the services.

Regarding Objective 3, Councilmember Lee explained her understanding that one path to eventual creation of a City water utility is for the City to assist the District in acquiring the SPU water service area within Shoreline.

Mr. Bauer requested clarification of Council support of a future option for City assumption of the District. He asked if Council seeks a different option at the conclusion of the consolidation process. Mayor Jepsen said he supports a cooperative process between the City and the District. He asserted that City assumption of the District is an available option if a cooperative process is not possible and as a choice at the end of a cooperative process.

Councilmember Ransom asserted his understanding that a majority of Councilmembers supported City assumption of the District as the "end goal" of a successful cooperative process between the City and the District.

Mr. Bauer commented that an interlocal agreement between the City and the District could address a cooperative process to consolidate water service in Shoreline, as well as other issues, and not address City assumption of the District. Assuming the interlocal agreement does not limit City activity, he said the City would always have the option to assume the District.

Deputy Mayor Hansen reiterated his support of the City becoming a full-service city. He acknowledged that this entails eventual City assumption of the District. However, he advocated that the City and the District work collaboratively to achieve their common goal of assuming the SPU service area in Shoreline and ensuring that it functions well.

Mr. Bauer asked Council about a check-in or completion point. He noted that in the case of the Wastewater District assumption of SPU facilities this occurred when the Wastewater District became legally responsible to provide service to the area previously

served by SPU. Mayor Jepsen criticized the lack of communication with the City in the Wastewater District's assumption of SPU wastewater facilities. He asserted that the Water District should seek Council input and concurrence at strategic points, when addressing policy or funding decisions.

Councilmember Montgomery suggested the revision of Objective 3 to read, "Assist the District in acquiring Seattle Public Utilities' water service area within Shoreline." She asserted the importance, upon completion of District assumption of the SPU service area, of City participation in District policy decisions. She recommended the revision of Objectives 5 and 6 to read, "Participate in key policy decisions before the District Board, e.g. capital investment, facility development." She asserted that the water service area on the west side of Shoreline should not "look exactly like the east side in terms of capital investments and rates." She said the City should pursue assumption of the District if it offers a significant advantage to Shoreline citizens.

Mayor Jepsen and Deputy Mayor Hansen supported Councilmember Montgomery's recommended revision of Objectives 5 and 6.

Councilmember Montgomery supported Mayor Jepsen's emphasis on communication between the City and the Water District. She advocated regular meetings or reports of the outcomes of decisions as the consolidation process proceeds.

Councilmember Ransom stressed the importance of a "very clear and tight relationship" between the City and the Water District to achieve the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and other City goals. He noted that other cities have had difficulty trying to meet infrastructure needs through interlocal agreements with separate districts. He said the City of Bellevue eventually identified assumption as the only way to meet its goal to build infrastructure. He commented that the City has had difficulty obtaining cooperation from the District in the past. He attributed the District's current cooperativeness to the threat of assumption by the City. He stated that the interlocal agreement must be very clear about the cooperation necessary between the City and the District. He said Councilmembers should occasionally attend meetings of the Cascade Water Alliance because City representatives participating in discussion of water issues at the Suburban Cities Association will otherwise be uninformed.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Councilmember Ransom said he is not pursuing Objective 1 because there is not a Council majority to support it. He reiterated that an interlocal agreement must be "very, very clear" about the amount, the degree and the level of cooperation between the City and the District.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauer said there will be no penalties to enforce an interlocal agreement between the City and the District. Mayor Jepsen asserted, and Mr. Bauer confirmed, that the City could always opt to assume the District.

Deputy Mayor Hansen stated that the current City Council cannot bind future City Councils. He said he agreed with some of Councilmember Ransom's comments.

# DRAFT

However, he stressed that the City must cooperate with the District just as the District must cooperate with the City. He noted his intent to attend some District meetings to become more familiar with District operations.

Mr. Bauer said the City and the District can draft an interlocal agreement that establishes contractual authority limiting future Councils and future District Boards of Commissioners during a certain term. He reiterated the issue of enforcing an interlocal agreement.

Mr. Bauer said he understood the primary Council objective to be to work with the District to support the consolidation of the water systems in Shoreline and to create mechanisms for regular communication between Council and the District Board on policy issues of mutual concern. Mayor Jepsen asserted the need for more frequent communication between District and City staff.

Councilmember Lee asked if the overarching goal of consolidating water systems in Shoreline is the provision of equal levels of service. Mayor Jepsen said some residents on the west side of Shoreline are concerned that capital investment and rates on the east side of Shoreline are too high. He added that some east-side residents may be concerned about the quality of the water system on the west side of Shoreline. He asserted the need to discuss such issues.

Councilmember Lee said the key goal is to insure the best possible water service to Shoreline citizens and the operational efficiency of service delivery. Mayor Jepsen mentioned the goals of local decision making and consistency (not equality) of water service. Councilmember Ransom emphasized the importance of insuring sufficient infrastructure, especially along Aurora Avenue and in other areas that the City has designated for business development and higher housing density.

Mr. Bauer asked about a process for resolving disagreements between the City and the District. Councilmember Ransom noted the Council assumption that sufficient dialogue between Councilmembers and District Commissioners will minimize differences between the two bodies. Mayor Jepsen said the City and the District could part ways in the event they disagree.

In response to Mr. Bauer, there was Council concurrence in support of consolidating services and seeking operational efficiencies (Objective 9).

Mr. Bauer asked about a term or timeline for the interlocal agreement. Councilmember Ransom asserted a lack of Council consensus. Commenting that the interlocal agreement will be the "communication bridge" between the City and the District, Deputy Mayor Hansen said it must remain in effect until the City assumes the District. Mayor Jepsen asserted the need to establish, and to endeavor to meet, milestones.

Mayor Jepsen referred to the schedule the Water District presented at the March 19 meeting as a potential timeline for the interlocal agreement.

# DRAFT

Mr. Bauer noted his understanding that the interlocal agreement should focus on the consolidation of the water systems in Shoreline, not on the consolidation of the City and the District. Councilmember Lee expressed her adamant support for retaining the option to assume the District. Deputy Mayor Hansen asserted full Council agreement in support of retaining the option. Mayor Jepsen noted that at the conclusion of the discussion of water service delivery March 19 four Councilmembers supported an interlocal agreement leading to City assumption of the District.

In response to Mr. Bauer, Mayor Jepsen agreed that the interlocal agreement does not need to address City assumption of the District, providing it does not preclude assumption. He suggested a statement in the "preamble" to the agreement indicating Council intent that the City eventually assume the District.

Cynthia Driscoll, Manager, Shoreline Water District, asserted that the City and the District "are already on the same page." She distributed a draft document, "Issues for Interlocal Agreements ('ILAs') between Shoreline Water District and Cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park." She said the Board of Commissioners is committed to open communications between the District and the City.

- (b) Addressing single family design through regulation of bulk, scale and impervious surface

Rachael Markle, Senior Planner, reviewed the history of discussion in Shoreline of the need for design standards in single-family zones. She described the process by which the Planning Commission arrived at a recommendation to amend the Development Code to address design issues through regulation of bulk, scale and impervious surface rather than design standards. She said the Planning Commission came to the conclusion that requiring structures to be compatible with the bulk and scale of existing housing is as important to neighborhood character as specific design standards. Therefore, it recommends a Development Code amendment to reduce bulk by decreasing lot coverage and impervious surface for single family detached residences in R-8 and R-12 zones. The amendment would reduce the maximum building coverage to 45 percent in the R-8 zone and 55 percent in the R-12 zone. It would also reduce the maximum impervious surface to 65 percent in the R-8 zone and 75 percent in the R-12 zone. The Commission also recommends adding an exception to Table 20.50.020 ("Densities and Dimensions") to read as follows: "the maximum building coverage shall be 35 percent and the maximum impervious surface shall be 50 percent for single-family detached development, excluding cottage housing, located in the R-12 zone."

Ms. Markle used diagrams to illustrate the alternatives the Planning Commission considered and the impacts of the recommended changes. She concluded that staff is drafting design guidelines to address other design issues. The guidelines will be non-regulatory, but they will provide developers with ideas on how to design homes that are compatible with neighborhood character.



Mayor Jepsen thanked the Planning Commission for its careful consideration of the issue. Councilmember Lee concurred.

Councilmember Ransom said he did not object to the provisions of the amendment. However, he said it exemplifies an attempt to prevent change in the community. He opposed the imposition of regulations to do this. He said the City has already developed many more regulations than the County had. He reported that his neighbors want to be allowed to develop their property as they wish. He said new regulations should only be adopted when there is a problem to solve.

Mayor Jepsen responded that the new regulations are designed to reflect Shoreline values. He said Council is being responsive to the community's desires.

Councilmember Lee added that the design guidelines are non-enforceable. They simply describe how to build in the context of neighborhood character.

Councilmember Ransom noted that a clear majority of the Planning Commission supported the recommendation.

Mr. Bauman pointed out that neither the intent nor the affect of the recommendation is to prevent change. The goal is to balance the rights of private property owners with community values.

Deputy Mayor Hansen wondered what percentage of Shoreline land use is R-8 and R-12. He thought it was probably fairly small. He said he was, like Councilmember Ransom, "wary of overregulation." However, he said the proposal is not unreasonable. He asserted the importance of limiting the amount of impervious surface, given that it contributes to drainage problems.

There was Council concurrence to bring this item forward.

(c) Transit Policy Guidance for Metro's Six Year Transit  
Development Plan for 2002 - 2007

Sarah Bohlen, Transportation Planner, explained that King County is in the process of creating its Six Year Transit Development Plan and is seeking Councilmembers' input on the draft plan. She reviewed the issues as seen by Metro: 1) new service and capital investments; 2) allocation of future system growth; and 3) system performance and evaluation. She concluded with a summary of her recommendations regarding the plan:

- support King County's work effort on the Six Year Plan and congratulate staff on this effort;
- convey to King County that Shoreline's adopted policies suggest a transit system that provides a full range of services to Shoreline residents, with more transit priority to higher-density neighborhoods and a strong focus on Aurora Avenue and inter-county connections;

- support a system with a primary emphasis on coverage and a secondary emphasis on ridership;
- support a flexible route evaluation system that recognizes that different areas of the County have different service needs;
- support the usage of transit route restructuring as a means of gaining efficiency and ridership; and
- discuss at the SeaShore Forum the possibility of changing sub-area boundaries.

Ms. Bohlen introduced Victor Obeso, Transit Planner for King County Metro and the Project Manager for the Six Year Transit Development Plan update. Mr. Obeso explained Metro's approach to transit planning. He distributed a document entitled "Discussion of Issues and Areas for Policy Development and Direction." He noted that three objectives guide the current Transit Plan: mobility, market share, and cost and efficiency. He emphasized the significant increase in transit ridership during the last Six Year Plan, with over 100 million riders in 2000. The basic assumption for the new plan is that there is not a significant need to change course.

Continuing, he explained that the discussion focuses on choices about whether to emphasize "growth management" (emphasizing improvements to Metro's core service connections), "coverage" (addressing gaps in service coverage) or "ridership" (improving services that provide frequent core service connections and higher speed, long-distance connections). He said another key would be improving the transit service operating environment, such as Shoreline's improvements to the Aurora Corridor. He said the plan will have to address tradeoffs, but in all three alternatives there is an assumption that expansion of Park and Rides will occur and additional service hours will be allocated to address capacity increases at these locations. Mr. Obeso concluded by reviewing the results of the Survey of Priorities for the Six Year Plan contained in his handout.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, asked Mr. Obeso about Transit Route 301. He provided background on his transit ridership and recommended a route change for 301. He commented on the crowded conditions at the Northgate Transit Center and the Northgate Park and Ride. He said he lives on the 317 route and does not wish to see Metro eliminate it, even though ridership appears low.

Mayor Jepsen stated that it is impossible to choose between the three alternatives and that the Six Year Plan should be a combination. He said although Shoreline wishes to be regionally focused, Councilmembers also want to ensure that Shoreline residents are "getting something back." He noted that the service cuts made in response to Initiative 695 have never been restored. He added that the north-end mayors have been discussing creation of a new sub-area, and he asserted the need for more information to understand the benefits and detriments of this proposal. He also pointed out that there is a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) planned for the Shoreline Park and Ride. He said it should be named in the Six Year Plan, and service improvements to go along with this development called out in the plan. He said the link between service improvements and

# DRAFT

capital investments should be clearer. He used the example that improvements are occurring at the Aurora Village Transit Center without service enhancements.

Responding to Councilmember Montgomery, Mr. Obeso commented on the complexity of the sub-area boundary issue. He said it is difficult to distribute services because people do not travel neatly within jurisdictions. He explained that Metro tries to design services to meet local, as well as regional, needs. While Shoreline wishes to receive a fair share of resources, it is difficult to identify what this should be given the large amount of north-south through travel. He pointed out there are service issues among the cities in each of the sub-areas. However, there are generally enough common interests that three sub-areas work well for planning purposes.

Mayor Jepsen advised that if combinations of the three alternatives are applied to each sub-area, they could be applied in different percentages. The coverage emphasis might be used on a sub-sub-area (or jurisdictional) basis. This emphasis could provide transit service even on routes where ridership is low. Mr. Obeso responded that the challenge in balancing the alternatives is to identify the criteria for making choices about where to make high-coverage investments.

Councilmember Ransom commented on two key issues for Shoreline residents: east-west service and frequency of buses on Aurora Avenue.

Mr. Obeso said the restructuring of services currently on the drawing board might improve some of these connections. With respect to route frequency on Aurora Avenue, the 358 bus currently runs as frequently as every seven minutes during the peak period. He noted the postponement of additional increases to frequency. The Aurora Corridor is a high priority; however, again, it becomes a question of choices about the allocation of resources.

Mayor Jepsen said the staff recommendations are acceptable. He highlighted the importance of Comprehensive Plan policies T-14, T-17 and T-19.

Ms. Bohlen added that she will forward Council's desire to see the Shoreline TOD added to the Six Year Plan.

Mr. Obeso thanked the Councilmembers for their input and thanked Ms. Bohlen for her participation and attention to the process.

## 7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, asked if Mr. Obeso would have Metro look into his proposal regarding Route 301. He provided more background on this route. He expressed the view that people would start riding this route if it connects to the 307 route and if Metro educates people about the service. Mr. Johnsen also briefly addressed the issues of water supply and lot size.

April 16, 2001

# DRAFT

Mr. Obeso said he would look into Mr. Johnsen's suggestion, but he could not commit to planning a transit route.

8. ADJOURMENT

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

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

April 23, 2001

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, April 23, 2001  
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Larry Bauman, Interim City Manager; Kristoff T. Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager

The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m. with Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmembers Gustafson and Lee present.

Councilmembers discussed recent travel.

Councilmember Montgomery arrived at 6:15 p.m.

Larry Bauman, Interim City Manager, reviewed recent staff steps to resolve the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group, Inc. appeal of the Paramount School Park Improvements Project.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Bauman summarized the recent King County Superior Court ruling regarding the Crawford appeal of the Aegis Assisted Living project.

Councilmember Grossman arrived at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Bauman discussed the status of the Shoreview Preservation Committee appeal of the Shoreview Park Improvements Project. He reviewed alternatives available in the event the Hearing Examiner upholds the appeal. In the event the Hearing Examiner denies the appeal, he asked how many Councilmembers could attend a groundbreaking at Shoreview Park on Friday, April 27. Several Councilmembers indicated their availability, and staff and Council designated a tentative time of 4 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen advised that he will not be able to attend the April 25 King County Brightwater Treatment Facility workshop.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:35 p.m.

# DRAFT

Mr. Bauman distributed the results of a February 2001 survey of city councilmember salaries. The survey included the comparable jurisdictions the City uses in staff salary surveys. Councilmembers discussed the comparison of Shoreline City Council salaries with those in other jurisdictions.

Councilmember Ransom suggested the creation of a citizen commission to advise on Council compensation. He discussed the King County process for setting salaries. He noted several cities not included in the survey. He advocated an increase in Council salaries and the addition of medical benefits.

Mayor Jepsen advocated either an increase in salaries to the median of those of the comparable jurisdictions or the addition of benefits, but not both.

Councilmember Grossman advocated a decrease in salaries and the addition of benefits consistent with those in the current City benefits package.

Deputy Mayor Hansen suggested that Councilmembers have the choice of an increase in salary or additional benefits.

Staff clarified that any increase in Councilmembers' salaries would not take effect until the beginning of the next elected term.

Councilmember Lee supported the addition of benefits for each Councilmember, not including family members. She agreed to a decrease in salaries if necessary to offset the addition of benefits.

Councilmember Gustafson supported some increase in Council salaries. He also supported a combination of a small increase in Council salaries with the addition of benefits for Councilmembers only (i.e., not including family members).

Councilmember Ransom asserted that higher salaries and/or additional benefits would attract more high-quality candidates for future Council positions.

Mr. Bauman committed to research: 1) the possibility of creating a new benefit option for Councilmembers and increasing Councilmembers' salaries to \$900 per month; and 2) the alternative of Councilmembers receiving full benefits but no additional salary.

Deputy Mayor Hansen discussed the City of Lynnwood policy of limiting council-member expense reimbursements to a flat \$3,000 per year.

Councilmembers discussed the expense of medical insurance coverage.

Mr. Bauman committed to research the potential for annual rate increases.

On another subject, Councilmember Gustafson expressed his gratitude for the monthly update that staff prepares for Council.

April 23, 2001

# DRAFT

Councilmembers went on to discuss the progress of work on the Interurban Trail.

At 7:20 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Kristoff Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, April 23, 2001  
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.

(a) Proclamation of "Boys High School Basketball Week"

Mayor Jepsen proclaimed the week of April 23 "Boys High School Basketball Week" in Shoreline. King's High School Basketball Coach Marv Morris and player Mark Freise spoke briefly. Mr. Friese introduced the other members of the Kings High School boy's varsity basketball team in attendance.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Planning Manager Kirk McKinley distributed and discussed a draft document outlining roles, responsibilities, principles and the schedule through June 2001 for the Shoreline Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Project. Mayor Jepsen suggested that staff and Council revisit the document at the May 7 Workshop.

Referring to the fourth page of the draft document, Mayor Jepsen asserted his understanding that Council had agreed that a staff-level letter was sufficient. Councilmember Lee said she proposed a second letter of elected officials expressing mutual commitment to the project. Mr. McKinley concurred with this understanding from the April 2 stakeholder briefing.

Mr. McKinley went on to discuss the annual amendment process to the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the Planning Commission review of more than 800 discrepancies between the Comprehensive Land-Use Map and the Zoning Map. He mentioned the May 17 public hearing concerning the Commission's review. Staff mailed notices of the



# DRAFT

hearing to owners and tenants at the addresses of properties subject to zoning changes or revised designation under the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Works Director Bill Conner reported the installation of new traffic signal loops at Meridian Avenue N and N 175<sup>th</sup> Street.

Finally, Interim City Manager Larry Bauman distributed copies of the Washington State Patrol letter to Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony indicating the department's successful completion of a recent systems audit.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Lee moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the agenda was approved.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Councilmember Ransom asked that Item 7(c) be pulled from the consent calendar. It became Item 8(c). Councilmember Montgomery moved approval of the consent calendar as amended. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, and the following items were approved:**

**Minutes of Joint Dinner Meeting of March 19, 2001  
Minutes of Workshop Meeting of April 2, 2001  
Minutes of Regular Meeting of April 9, 2001**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of April 6, 2001  
in the amount of \$ 473,764.47**

**Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute  
a contract amendment to increase the professional design  
and inspection support services contract for the Shoreline  
Swimming Pool Project in the amount of \$13,567.00**

**Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute  
an agreement in the amount of \$26,203.00 with New  
Beginnings for Battered Women and Their Children  
to provide domestic violence services to Shoreline residents**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

# DRAFT

- (a) Motion to accept the lowest responsive bid and adopt Ordinance No. 269 amending the General Capital Fund for the Shoreview Park Improvements Project

Mr. Conner reviewed the history of the Shoreview Park Improvements Project from July 1999 to the present. He also reviewed the staff report, which addressed alternatives, costs and funding for the project. He went on to discuss the environmental impacts of the project and the proposed mitigation.

**Deputy Mayor Hansen moved that Council approve Option 3 and adopt Ordinance No. 269 amending the budget to increase the appropriation from the General Capital Fund balance to \$2,583,166 to provide funding to complete the Shoreview Park Improvement Project, and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract including the two alternative bids with Ohno, in the amount of \$1,989,885.70 and to execute change orders up to ten percent of the original contract amount. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

Noting the appeal of the clearing and grading permit for the project, Councilmember Ransom asked staff to identify the area the appellant had advocated for mitigation. He also questioned the cost of the second, smaller restroom.

Mr. Conner said the appellant, Shoreview Preservation Committee, is concerned about storm water deposits to Boeing Creek and advocates the location of mitigation in the lower bench area of Shoreview Park. He asserted that this area is "excellent transitional habitat right now," including many native plant species and migratory birds. He said the proposed mitigation will augment this habitat and increase the overall environmental value of the park.

Continuing, Mr. Conner said the second, smaller bathroom will cost approximately \$150,000. He pointed out that all of the construction companies bid similar amounts on alternative 1, which included the restroom.

Councilmember Gustafson commented that the cost of the project in 1990 was \$1 million. He supported Option 3. He said the hill east of the tennis courts is a good place to view tennis matches. He expressed concern about fencing the area off to establish the mitigation area. He suggested a plan to incorporate seating on the hillside. Mr. Bauman proposed the use of portable bleachers outside of the mitigation area. Mr. Conner said transitional space is likely to be available for seating on the hillside after the mitigation area is established. He said staff will consider spectator seating on the hillside and in the area between the tennis courts and the parking lot.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Conner confirmed that the budget for Option 3 includes the cost of the equipment for the play area adjacent to the existing soccer field.

Councilmember Lee questioned the amount of increased parks maintenance costs resulting from the improvements at Shoreview Park. Mr. Bauman said staff had

# DRAFT

increased parks maintenance costs in the 2001 City budget to accommodate the potential completion of the Shoreview Park Improvements Project and the resulting new expenses.

Mayor Jepsen supported Option 3. He noted that the option includes approximately \$146,000 for mitigation. Mr. Conner said the City will implement the mitigation through a separate contract. He explained that staff worked with Adolfsen Associates Inc. to develop a detailed mitigation plan and to determine a realistic budget for it.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Bauman confirmed that staff considers, estimates and budgets expenses to maintain all Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects at a high level upon their completion.

Noting that the City has not yet undertaken the Paramount School Park Improvements Project, Mayor Jepsen expressed concern that the City will use 75 percent of the 2001 General Capital CIP Contingency Fund on the Shoreview Park Improvements Project. Mr. Conner explained that staff has already adjusted the cost of the Paramount School Park project to reflect scope changes. He said staff had not previously adjusted the cost of the Shoreview Park project. After reviewing the status of the other projects in the 2001 CIP, he stated that the City is "basically done for 2001" with \$50,000 remaining in the CIP contingency fund.

Councilmember Gustafson said the Richmond Little League is likely to ask about incorporating a concession stand into the second restroom. Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, said electrical and water hookups will be available for portable concessions.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Bauman said the Shoreview Parks Improvement Project budget does not include resurfacing the tennis courts. Ms. Barry said staff is completing the contract for resurfacing the tennis courts. She estimated completion of the resurfacing within the next month and a half.

Councilmember Gustafson noted community feedback that the City is making positive efforts to prepare Little League and soccer fields and maintain other facilities. He asserted the need to assure the ongoing involvement of the School District, the Shoreline Community College and the Little League in these efforts.

**A vote was taken on the motion that Council approve Option 3 and adopt Ordinance No. 269 amending the budget to increase the appropriation from the General Capital Fund balance to \$2,583,166 to provide funding to complete the Shoreview Park Improvement Project, and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract including the two alternative bids with Ohno, in the amount of \$1,989,885.70 and to execute change orders up to ten percent of the original contract amount. The motion carried 7-0.**

- (b) Motion to authorize staff to proceed with the design phase of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW Drainage Improvements Project

# DRAFT

City Engineer Chuck Purnell reviewed the staff report.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Stephen J. Cook, 521 NW 175<sup>th</sup> Court, expressed concern about the engineering of the proposed storm water conveyance and detention systems. In addition, he stressed that the project will funnel 900 to 1,600 acres of "non-point source pollution" into the two-acre detention area. Finally, he asked the following questions: a) Why didn't the City notify him, as an adjoining property owner, of the project? b) Who will do the engineering? c) What about damage to surrounding homes from the construction? and d) Will the City obtain the proper State permits?

(2) LaNita Wacker, 19839 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, said one of the proposed detention mitigation options will require removal of six trees, and the other will require removal of 30 trees. Noting that trees absorb a great deal of water, she questioned the removal of any trees.

(3) Ken Cottingham, 350 NW 175<sup>th</sup> Street, provided a three-page letter from Friends of Boeing Creek-Shoreview Park. He advocated that Landau Associates review the engineering calculations for the proposed storm water conveyance and detention systems. He said a 24-inch sanitary sewer runs diagonally under the area of the North Pond.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Conner advised that staff mailed invitations to the March 14 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW Drainage Improvements Project open house to addresses in a wide area from Richmond Beach Road to south of 170<sup>th</sup> Street. He mentioned that Mr. Cook and Mr. Cottingham were both on the mailing list.

Mr. Conner acknowledged Mr. Cook's concerns about the engineering and execution of the proposed improvements. He said the project involves a large amount of water, and it must be moved without damage to the conveyance system, the detention pond or Boeing Creek from high amounts or rates of flow or from pollution. He stated that the City will implement the project in accordance with State and federal permits. He explained that the City must remove trees to implement the detention mitigation but that the City will replace the trees with others in another part of the park. He reiterated the staff recommendation to incorporate the detention facility as part of the "overall public environment." He acknowledged the potential for flood damage to amenities at the site. He asserted that such damage is a "fair trade-off" for the "99 percent of the time" that the area will be dry. He agreed that sanitary sewer and utility lines run through the area of proposed detention mitigation. He said staff must take these facilities into account as it proceeds with the project.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Purnell said Otak assisted with the preliminary design study for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW drainage project. He noted that Otak will designate a geotechnical engineer to participate in the final design of the project.

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about the capacity of the North Pond alone to contain runoff from a 100-year storm and about the potential damage if a larger North Pond detention facility were to fail. He asked if construction of a new facility in the Boeing Creek Open Space would reduce the risk and damage of a failure by creating a separate detention area. Mr. Purnell indicated that the two detention mitigation options are equally viable. He noted that reconstruction of the North Pond following the washout on January 1, 1997 included an emergency spillway capable of handling flows from a 500-year storm. He indicated that a new facility in the Boeing Creek Open Space would either drain to the North Pond to take advantage of this spillway or have a separate spillway, which would also meet the 500-year-storm criteria.

Councilmember Ransom asked if staff had presented information about the storm water management aspects of the two detention mitigation options to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee. Mr. Purnell said staff discussed the two options with the committee and responded to committee questions.

Councilmember Ransom noted citizen concern about pollutants in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue drainage. Mr. Purnell said the Shoreline Municipal Code requires that any major drainage project include water quality features. He explained that staff would incorporate passive mechanical devices to separate oils and trash from storm water before it enters the detention pond. He asserted that the project will provide a net benefit in pollution prevention. He said appropriately designed and properly maintained systems will preclude any pollution hazards.

**Deputy Mayor Hansen moved that Council authorize staff to proceed with the design of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Drainage Improvements consisting of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue conveyance solution (Option 1) and the North Pond detention mitigation (Option A). Councilmember Lee seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Grossman noted 1987 litigation referred to in the letter from Friends of Boeing Creek-Shoreview Park. City Attorney Ian Sievers said he is not familiar with the lawsuit. Councilmember Grossman asserted the need to determine the applicability of the litigation before Council decides how to proceed.

Continuing, Councilmember Grossman noted a citizen comment that the City has not followed through on a January 1997 commitment to provide trees as part of the reconstruction following the washout. He asserted the need to meet previous commitments.

Finally, Councilmember Grossman noted that mailing lists for invitations to public meetings such as the March 14 open house differ from those for Council meeting agendas. He recommended that staff notify citizens when an issue, about which it has notified them previously, is due to come before Council.

# DRAFT

Noting his ongoing unease over the January 1, 1997 flooding event, Councilmember Ransom said he favored the construction of a second facility in the Boeing Creek Open Space.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Purnell said the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee unanimously supported detention mitigation Option A.

Mayor Jepsen said he first favored detention mitigation Option B—he noted that the City has not revegetated the open space since reconstructing it following the 1997 washout. He explained that the staff report caused him to reconsider and instead favor the expansion of the existing facility (i.e., Option A). He stressed the need to investigate the implications of the 1987 litigation referenced in the letter from Friends of Boeing Creek-Shoreview Park.

Councilmember Grossman supported the approach of considering detention ponds as amenities instead of as functional but unaesthetic solutions to surface water management. Mayor Jepsen agreed.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Purnell confirmed that staff will continue to consider both the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue conveyance solutions. He said staff thinks the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue conveyance solution may be more cost effective.

Mayor Jepsen proposed that Council postpone the motion pending research of past litigation.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved that Council postpone until May 14 the motion to authorize staff to proceed with the design of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Drainage Improvements consisting of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue conveyance solution (Option 1) and the North Pond detention mitigation (Option A). Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0.**

- (c) Ordinance No. 270 adding "Information System Project Manager" as a new position and as a new classification to the City's Classification and Compensation Plan

**Councilmember Lee moved that Council approve Ordinance No. 270 adding "Information System Project Manager" as a new position and as a new classification to the City's Classification and Compensation Plan. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Ransom said the staff report did not include information about a salary survey or alternate process by which staff arrived at the suggested pay range. Human Resources Director Marci Wright explained that staff surveyed the City's ten comparable jurisdictions. Staff received responses from seven of the ten jurisdictions, and two of the responding jurisdictions reported no match. The median of the maximum annual salaries

# DRAFT

of the five other jurisdictions was \$61,896. Usually, staff would recommend the range that meets or exceeds the median (i.e., range 51). However, Ms. Wright said staff identified the Network Administrator position in Finance as a comparable, internal position and, therefore, recommended range 50.

**A vote was taken on the motion to approve Ordinance No. 270 adding "Information System Project Manager" as a new position and as a new classification to the City's Classification and Compensation Plan. The motion carried 7-0.**

## 9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) LaNita Wacker, 19839 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, opposed cyclone fencing around storm water detention areas as unaesthetic. She supported a multiple-use approach to detention ponds that considers them as park amenities as well as surface water management facilities. She went on to advocate discussion of public use and historic preservation of the current Richmond Beach Library building.

(b) Stephen Cook, 525 NW 175<sup>th</sup> Court, clarified that the January 1, 1997 flooding event at NW 175<sup>th</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW was not a "sinkhole" but "an engineering error and resulting blowout." He noted the difference between a retention pond, which slows the rate of water flow, and a detention pond, which holds water and discharges it gradually to "recharge the aquifer." He went on to explain the flooding event at NW 175<sup>th</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW.

(c) Ken Cottingham, 350 NW 175<sup>th</sup> Street, expressed concern about the proposal, included in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Conveyance Solution (Option 1), to "trench" from 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW at the base of a steep slope. He also expressed concern about detention mitigation Option A expansion of the existing facility from eight acre-feet to 12 acre-feet. He noted the downstream damage that resulted from the previous failure of the North Pond. He said failure of an enlarged pond would result in greater downstream damage. He advocated the construction of a new facility in the northwest corner of the intersection of NW 175<sup>th</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW and the development of Boeing Creek Open Space into a park.

Mayor Jepsen said the current Richmond Beach Library building is not the original library location. He explained that the City relies on the Shoreline Historical Museum for historic preservation and that the City uses the King County landmarks list. He noted efforts to preserve the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW water tower.


## 10. ADJOURNMENT

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

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b> Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of April 27, 2001
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b> Finance
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b> 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 \$988,324.82 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for April 01 through April 14 in the amount of \$286,043.40 paid with check/voucher numbers 5591-5633, 160001-160115, and benefit checks 8369 through 8377.

**The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on April 13, 2001:**

Expenses in the amount of \$85,585.87 paid on Expense Register dated 04/06/01 with the following claim checks: 8186-8198 and

Expenses in the amount of \$8,292.51 paid on Expense Register dated 04/09/01 with the following claim checks: 8199-8213 and

Expenses in the amount of \$139,265.69 paid on Expense Register dated 04/09/01 with the following claim checks: 8214-8225 and

Expenses in the amount of \$71,997.40 paid on Expense Register dated 04/09/01 with the following claim checks: 8226-8238 and

Expenses in the amount of \$4,659.55 paid on Expense Register dated 04/10/01 with the following claim checks: 8239-8247 and

Expenses in the amount of \$882.65 paid on Expense Register dated 04/11/01 with the following claim checks: 8248-8251 and



Expenses in the amount of \$9,309.52 paid on Expense Register dated 04/12/01 with the following claim checks: 8252-8264 and

Expenses in the amount of \$35,916.46 paid on Expense Register dated 04/12/01 with the following claim checks: 8265-8275 and

Expenses in the amount of \$28,003.41 paid on Expense Register dated 04/12/01 with the following claim checks: 8276-8282 and

Expenses in the amount of \$6,105.52 paid on Expense Register dated 04/13/01 with the following claim checks: 8283-8296 and

Expenses in the amount of \$-1,094.68 reversed on Expense Register dated 04/06/01 with the following claim checks voided: 7658 and

Expenses in the amount of \$-27.60 reversed on Expense Register dated 04/06/01 with the following claim checks voided: 8186 and

**The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on April 20, 2001:**

Expenses in the amount of \$11,235.58 paid on Expense Register dated 04/17/01 with the following claim checks: 8297-8321 and

Expenses in the amount of \$40,371.67 paid on Expense Register dated 04/17/01 with the following claim checks: 8322-8335 and

Expenses in the amount of \$35,271.88 paid on Expense Register dated 04/18/01 with the following claim checks: 8336-8343 and

Expenses in the amount of \$5,938.06 paid on Expense Register dated 04/19/01 with the following claim checks: 8344-8357 and

**The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on April 27, 2001:**

Expenses in the amount of \$35,160.20 paid on Expense Register dated 04/20/01 with the following claim checks: 8358-8368 and

Expenses in the amount of \$1,596.62 paid on Expense Register dated 04/23/01 with the following claim checks: 8378-8385 and

Expenses in the amount of \$39,967.66 paid on Expense Register dated 04/23/01 with the following claim checks: 8386-8391 and

Expenses in the amount of \$23,736.96 paid on Expense Register dated 04/24/01 with the following claim checks: 8392-8410 and

Expenses in the amount of \$66,116.09 paid on Expense Register dated 04/26/01 with the following claim checks: 8411-8431 and

Expenses in the amount of \$56,499.88 paid on Expense Register dated 04/26/01 with the following claim checks: 8432-8443 and

Expenses in the amount of \$-2,339.48 reversed on Expense Register dated 04/24/01 with the following claim checks voided: 8398 and

Expenses in the amount of \$-170.00 reversed on Expense Register dated 04/13/01 with the following claim checks voided: 7758.

Approved By: City Manager \_\_\_\_\_ City Attorney \_\_\_\_\_

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
**CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON**

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Amending the Development Code to Reduce Maximum Building Coverage and Impervious Surface in the R-8 and R-12 Zones
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Planning and Development Services
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Services Rachael Markle, Senior Planner

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

In response to your Council's request to revisit single family design standards following the adoption of the Development Code in June 2000, the Planning Commission conducted a workshop on single family design standards on January 4, 2001. The Planning Commission and members of the public present at the workshop indicated that neighborhood character could not be adequately addressed on a citywide basis with the application of specific design standards. A consensus was reached that structures that are compatible with the bulk and scale of existing development in single family neighborhoods are as important to neighborhood character as specific design standards. At the April 16<sup>th</sup> Workshop, your Council asked staff to prepare an Ordinance to adopt the reductions in building coverage and impervious surface for the R-8 and R-12 zones including the exception for single family detached development other than cottage housing occurring in the R-12 zone as recommended by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission found that development occurring on lots that are 5,000 square feet or less, which meet the minimum lot size standard in the R-8 and R-12 zones, have the potential to be out of scale with existing development if the maximum building coverage and impervious surface are utilized. Currently, an estimated 1.4% of the City's land area is designated for R-8 or R-12 zoning. The current maximum building coverage and impervious surface coverage in R-8 and R-12 zones is as follows:

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Building Coverage</b>	<b>Impervious Surface</b>
Residential 8-units per acre/R-8	55%	75%
Residential 12 units per acre/R-12	60%	85%

The Planning Commission recommended amending the Development Code to reduce the maximum building coverage to 45% in the R-8 zone and 55% in the R-12 zone and to reduce the maximum impervious surface to 65% in the R-8 zone and 75% in the R-12 zone.

The Planning Commission also found that the minimum setbacks for the R-12 zone create a smaller building envelope than the application of building coverage and impervious surface percentages on lots smaller than 3,500 sq. ft. Therefore, the existing

and proposed percentages for building coverage and impervious surface have no effect on lots in the R-12 zone that are less than 3,500 square feet. In response, the Planning Commission recommended adding an exception to Table 20.50.020 Densities and Dimensions in Residential Zone under maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface that reads as follows:

The maximum building coverage shall be 35% and the maximum impervious surface shall be 50% for single family detached development located in the R-12 zone, excluding cottage housing.

This exception will discourage the construction of large single family homes on small lots and is intended to encourage attached housing in the R-12 zone.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Move to adopt Ordinance 266 amending the Development Code to reduce the maximum building coverage and impervious surface in the R-8 and R-12 zones and to add an exception to Table 20.50.020.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

## **BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS**

The Planning Commission reviewed and held a public hearing on the draft Development Code document and proposed amendments in February of 2000. The draft Development Code contained a proposal for single family design standards. The Planning Commission recommended not adopting the proposed standards. Council supported the Planning Commission's recommendation. However, Council requested that the Planning Commission revisit the issue of single family design standards.

In response to Council's request, the Planning Commission conducted a workshop on single family design standards on January 4, 2001. The Planning Commission and members of the public present at the workshop indicated that neighborhood character could not be adequately addressed on a citywide basis with the application of specific design standards such as those presented in each of the options. It was articulated that structures that are compatible with the bulk and scale of existing development in single family neighborhoods are as important to neighborhood character as design and are achievable through the application of general development standards. Bulk and scale are addressed in the Development Code via maximum building coverage, height, and impervious surface.

The message received from the Planning Commission was that the Development Code appears to adequately regulate bulk and scale in the R-4 and R-6 zones with the adopted percentages for building coverage and impervious surface in conjunction with the increased minimum lot sizes to 7,200 square feet for both zones. However, development occurring on lots that are 5,000 square feet or less, which meet the minimum lot size standard in the R-8 and R-12 zones, have the potential to be out of scale with existing development if the maximum building coverage and impervious surface are utilized. Therefore, at the conclusion of the January 4, 2001 Workshop, the Planning Commission directed staff to prepare an Ordinance that focused on bulk, lot coverage and impervious surfaces for single family detached residences in residential 8-units per acre (R-8) and residential 12-units per acre (R-12) zones.

The intent of reducing the maximum building coverage is to regulate the building bulk by limiting the size of the building footprint. The intent of reducing impervious surface is to allow an adequate portion of the lot for landscaping and/or open space. The purpose of bulk standards is to create developments that are more compatible with the building bulk/scale and character/setting of the surrounding neighborhood.

The recommended reductions for building coverage and impervious surface do have an effect on the bulk, scale, and availability of space for landscaping for development in the R-8 zone. The proposed reductions for building coverage and impervious surface in the recommended Ordinance 266 do not have an effect on bulk and scale on the smallest allowable lots (lots less than 3,500 sq. ft.) in the R-12 zone. The existing setbacks in the R-12 zone dictate a smaller building envelope than the existing or proposed maximum building coverage percentages when applied to lots that are less than approximately 3,500 sq. ft.

Therefore, the Planning Commission recommended adding an exception to Table 20.50.020 (1) Densities and Dimensions in Residential Zones under maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface as follows:

The maximum building coverage shall be 35% and the maximum impervious surface shall be 50% for single family detached development located in the R-12 zone, excluding cottage housing.

This exception would create a disincentive to build single family detached residences in the R-12 zone. The existing and proposed maximum building coverages and maximum impervious surface coverages in the R-12 zone are more applicable to attached single family and multi family development. It is also important to remember that attached single family dwellings and multi family dwellings then become subject to the multi family and single family attached standards detailed in the Development Code 20.50.120-210.

The availability of draft ordinances for public comment and the date of the Public Hearing were noticed in the Seattle Times on January 22, 2001 and the Shoreline Enterprise on January 24, 2001. The comment period ended on February 6, 2001. Only one comment letter was received. A SEPA Checklist was prepared in accordance with State law, specifically the Growth Management Act. A threshold determination of non-significance (DNS) was issued on February 22, 2001.

Following the close of the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission voted 6-1 to recommend to your Council an amendment to the Development Code to reduce the maximum building coverage to 45% in the R-8 zone and 55% in the R-12 zone and to reduce the maximum impervious surface to 65% in the R-8 zone and 75% in the R-12 zone and to add an exception to Table 20.50.020 Densities and Dimensions in Residential Zones under maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface that reads as follows:

The maximum building coverage shall be 35% and the maximum impervious surface shall be 50% for single family detached development located in the R-12 zone, excluding cottage housing.

After a presentation by staff at the April 16, 2001 Council Workshop, your Council requested the preparation of an Ordinance to adopt the above Planning Commission recommendation. Attached for your review is this Ordinance.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Move to adopt Ordinance 266 amending the Development Code to reduce the maximum building coverage and impervious surface in the R-8 and R-12 zones and to add an exception to Table 20.50.020.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment I** Ordinance No. 266

**ORDINANCE NO. 266**

**AN ORDINANCE DECREASING MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE AND MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE IN RESIDENTIAL 8 UNITS PER ACRE (R-8) AND RESIDENTIAL 12 UNITS PER ACRE (R-12) ZONES BY AMENDING CHAPTER 20.50 OF THE DEVELOPMENT CODE**

WHEREAS, The City adopted a new Title 20 in the Shoreline Municipal Code on June 12, 2000; and

WHEREAS, single family design regulations were not adopted as part of Title 20 and were referred back to the Planning Commission by City Council for additional analysis and consideration; and

WHEREAS, Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy 25 supports the establishment of infill standards for single family houses that promotes the quality of development and reflects the character of the existing neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy 29 supports the establishment of design standards for units occurring at 7-12 units per acre; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a workshop on January 4, 2001 to analyze and reconsider the inclusion of single family design standards in Title 20 which resulted in a motion to direct staff to prepare an Ordinance addressing bulk, lot coverage and impervious surfaces for single family detached residences in R-8 and R-12 zones; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on February 15, 2001 and recommended to City Council to amend Title 20 of the Shoreline Municipal Code to reduce the maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface in the Residential 8 units per acre and Residential 12 units per acre zones; and

WHEREAS, The Council finds that the amendment adopted by this ordinance is consistent with and implements the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan and complies with the adoption requirements of the Growth Management Act, Chapter 36.70A. RCW;

**NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE,  
WASHINGTON DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1. Amendment.** Shoreline Municipal Code 20.50.020 Standards – Dimensional requirements (A) Table 20.50.020 (1) – Densities and Dimensions in Residential zones as follows:

STANDARDS	Low Density		Medium Density		High Density		
	R-4	R-6	R-8	R-12	R-18	R-24	R-48
Base Density: Dwelling Units/Acre	4 du/ac	6 du/ac (1)	8 du/ac	12 du/ac	18 du/ac	24 du/ac	48 du/ac
Min. Density	4 du/ac	4 du/ac	4 du/ac	6 du/ac	8 du/ac	10 du/ac	12 du/ac
Min. Lot Width (2)	50 ft	50 ft	50 ft	30 ft	30 ft	30 ft	30 ft
Min. Lot Area (2)	7,200 sq ft	7,200 sq ft	5,000 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft	2,500 sq ft
Min. Front Yard Setback (2)(3)	20 ft	20 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft
Min. Rear yard Setback (2)(4)(5)	15 ft	15 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5ft	5 ft
Min. Side Yard Setback (2)(4)(5)	5 ft min. and 15 ft total sum of two	5 ft min. and 15 ft total sum of two	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Base Height	30 ft (35 ft with pitche d roof)	30 ft (35 ft with pitched roof)	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft
Max. Building Coverage (6)	35%	35%	55% 45%	60% 55%	60%	70%	70%
Max. Impervious Surface (6)	45%	50%	75% 65%	85% 75%	85%	85%	90%

Exceptions to Table 20.50.020(1):

- (1) In order to provide flexibility in types of housing and to meet the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the base density may be increased for cottage housing in R-6 (low density) zone subject to approval of a conditional use permit.
- (2) These standards may be modified to allow zero lot line developments.
- (3) For exceptions to rear and side yard setback requirements, please see SMC 20.50.070.
- (4) For exceptions to rear and side yard setbacks, please see SMC 20.50.080.
- (5) For developments consisting of three or more dwellings located on a single parcel, the setback shall be 15 feet along any property line abutting R-4 or R-6 zones. Please see SMC 20.50.130
- (6) The maximum building coverage shall be 35% and the maximum impervious surface shall be 50% for single family detached development located in the R-12 zone, excluding cottage housing.



**Section 2. Severability.** Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this regulation, or its application to any person or circumstances, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this regulation be pre-empted by state or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this regulation or its application to other persons or circumstances.

**Section 3. Effective Date.** This ordinance shall be published in the official newspaper of the City, and shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

**PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON May 14, 2001.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Scott Jepsen

**ATTEST:**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Mattioli  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ian Sievers  
City Attorney

Date of Publication:  
Effective Date:

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

**AGENDA TITLE:** Approval of a King County Ballot Measure Proposing a Property Tax Levy Rate at 25 cents per \$1,000 Assessed Valuation for County Emergency Medical Services  
**DEPARTMENT:** City Manager  
**PRESENTED BY:** Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager *LB*

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

On March 19, Council received a report regarding the progress of the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Task Force from Shoreline Fire Department Chief J.B. Smith, who your Council appointed to represent the City for this effort. Since that time, the Task Force has issued its final report and recommendations for a ballot measure. The recommendations include a new levy rate and a set of programmatic and service improvements, as well as continuing existing EMS program, all to be funded by the new levy. The EMS program, also known as Medic One, provides a countywide emergency response system through Basic Life Support (BLS) and Advance Life Support (ALS) emergency aid cars. The Shoreline Fire Department (previously known as King County Fire District No. 4) provides this service for Shoreline and for areas extending to Lake Forest Park and Kenmore.

As you know, all cities with population of 50,000 and above must approve the levy proposal for it to be placed on the ballot. The measure is proposed for the November 2001 ballot, and in addition to Shoreline, the city councils of Seattle, Bellevue, Federal Way, Kent and Renton will also review the measure for approval. Renton is a new member of this group, having only recently increased its population above 50,000.

The plan proposed by the EMS Task Force contains the following elements:

- A six-year EMS levy at 25 cents per \$1,000 assessed property value.
- A financial plan that includes funding for anticipated additional 4.3 (ALS) paramedic units in all regions of King County, in order to keep pace with growing demand for service, driven by an aging population.
- Continuation of support for Basic Life Support (BLS) services provided by fire departments and regional operational and medical support programs.
- Provision for continued emphasis on EMS strategic initiatives designed to improve efficiency and cost-effectiveness, with prominence given to the role of dispatch in managing growth in EMS calls.

There are basically two options for the City Council (as well as for the city councils of Seattle, Bellevue, Kent, Renton and Federal Way). These options are to either support the renewed EMS levy ordinance by the County as recommended by the Task Force or deny the County authority to place the levy on the ballot. If the latter option were chosen then an alternate means of local or regional EMS funding would have to be found before January of 2002. Shoreline Fire Department would then be likely to approach the City of Shoreline, Lake Forest Park and Kenmore (Shoreline Fire Department's current ALS service area), to discuss how to provide an alternate plan. Staff believes the Task Force proposal meets the objectives previously endorsed by your Council and recommends Council now approve the ballot measure.

A full copy of the 63-page EMS Task Force report is available at the City Council office at City Hall for your review.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends Council approve the EMS Task Force proposal to place a measure on the November 2001 ballot for a new property tax levy of 25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to fund EMS services.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

## **BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS**

The EMS system provided in King County was based upon a model system created in the Seattle Fire Department. By the mid-1970's this system had been adopted throughout the region as a means to provide emergency medical response in King County. The system as it exists today is one of the most highly regarded in the nation as a regional medically based program for tiered, out-of-hospital services. For the past 30 years this system has maintained the highest reported survival rates nationally for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients.

In 1997, a levy ballot measure for the continued funding of the countywide EMS program failed to receive sufficient votes for approval. At the time, many associated with the EMS program considered the vague ballot title and the language of the levy measure as possible contributing factors for its failure. It was apparent that a more clearly written ballot measure might have a better chance of success. However, the fact that the ballot measure did not pass at this time was also seen as an opportunity to review the EMS funding system and its programs. This review has led to the current set of proposed improvements and the levy being considered for the November 2001 ballot.

The process of reaching the current proposed improvements and levy for EMS began in May of 1999 with the creation of the EMS Financial Planning Task Force. The Final Report of this group was issued outlining four options for funding EMS in King County. Based on that report the County Council passed motion number 10779 accepting and modifying the report and establishing a new EMS 2002 Task Force. The purpose of the new Task Force was to develop inter-jurisdictional agreement on an updated EMS Strategic Plan and financing package for the next funding period in 2002 and report that plan to the County and cities with populations over 50,000 no later than March 31, 2001.

On December 20, 1999 Mayor Scott Jepsen appointed Fire Chief J.B. Smith as his representative to this task force. The task force has met periodically through the year 2000 and monthly during 2001. During this time it has reviewed the EMS system, it's funding alternatives, service level projections, demographic issues concerning EMS, strategic plan initiatives, as well as discussing the potential levy duration and supplemental funding issues.

At the Council's updates, provided on October 23, 2000 and March 19, 2001, Council expressed consensus support for the following positions:

- A minimum six year levy term
- A future study of transport fees with no implementation during the next levy period
- Support of ALS growth needs, including a half-time unit (one full unit of equipment mobilized 12 hours per day only for peak service time, 8 a.m. until 8 p.m.) added to the Shoreline Medic One System
- The need for CPI based funding increases to prevent cost shifting

The emergency medical system levy supports three main areas - Basic Life Support, Advanced Life Support, and Regional Programs. The Task Force issued its report and recommendations on April 16, 2001. The following is a brief description of each major topic and what is included in the final recommendation of the Task Force:

**Basic Life Support (BLS)** – Basic life support funding has traditionally supplemented fire department direct costs of providing first on-scene EMS response. Currently, there are 35 different fire departments that receive funding based on the EMS levy. It will be recommended to continue the current BLS allocation formula and provide annual increases based on the CPI.

**Advance Life Support (ALS)** – Advance life support is currently provided by five agencies in King County: Shoreline Fire Department, Evergreen Hospital, The City of Bellevue, The City of Seattle, and King County. It is projected that ALS call volume will continue to increase, although at a reduced rate due to strategic initiatives being implemented, requiring an addition of 4.3 units during the levy term. The Shoreline area is projected to gain one-half of a unit in 2002. It will be recommended that ALS funding be set at 100% of average provider standard unit cost for 2002 and that the funding then receive annual increases based on the CPI. Historically, the unit cost has funded 95 percent of the average standard unit cost of providing a medic unit. The hosting agency (in our case Shoreline Fire Department) has supplemented the remaining cost. In 2001 this funding level has fallen to 87%. To reduce this cost shifting to the providers the request to re-set the funding at 100% is being made. It is expected that during the term of the levy the percentage will again drop to approximately 95%. This is caused by the fact that providers' costs, dominated by medical system costs and uniformed personnel costs, historically increase at rates greater than the rate of increase in the CPI.

**Regional Services Funding** – Included in regional services are training programs, quality improvement programs, strategic initiatives, data collection and overall administration and medical oversight. The recommendation will likely include continued funding for these programs with an increased focus on strategic initiatives in the area of dispatcher training, data collection, and injury prevention and public education.

**Transport Fee Issues**—The Task Force reviewed the concept of adopting transport fees for ALS services. Currently, no fees are charged to the customers for ALS transports. The Task Force determined that the administrative and operational issues for implementing transport fees require further review. The Healthcare Financing Administration (HFCA) is currently negotiating a Medicare ambulance fee schedule, which is anticipated to be completed sometime later this year. The Task Force recommends implementing a study during the next funding cycle to consider the legal, financial, administrative and operational issues of transport fees as an additional source of revenue for future funding.

**The Levy** –The final recommended levy rate is set at 25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (AV) for a period of six years. The previous levy rate was 0.29 cents per \$1,000/AV. The reduction is made possible by a countywide increase in AV as well as the implementation of some of the previous strategic plan initiatives, which have helped reduce costs. The impact on property taxes at the proposed new rate of 25 cents per \$1,000/AV would be \$50 for the tax bill for a home valued at \$200,000. The previous rate of 29 cents per \$1,000/AV would have generated a \$58 charge on the tax bill of the same property. At the proposed 2002 full funding level, Shoreline Fire Department would receive approximately \$1.2 million per ALS unit vs. the

\$1.01 million projected for 2001. With the addition of a half-time unit in Shoreline the funding amount would increase to \$1.8 million, allowing a substantial increase in service levels without jeopardizing other fire department programs.

Shoreline, Kent, Federal Way, Bellevue, and King County supported levy duration of six years. Discussions of a ten-year and permanent levy were met with resistance from multiple agencies. It is felt that this traditional term was likely to receive the greatest support.

The staffs of both the City and the Fire Department recommend Council support the levy measure for the November 2001 ballot. The Task Force's proposal supports the consensus your Council reached on the key issues. At this point in the process no other acceptable alternatives exist. However, staff will monitor the future study of the one major issue that remains unresolved: the use of transport fees as a means of revising the way EMS service costs are supported in King County.

Council received copies of the Task Force report in the April 30, 2001, correspondence packets. The general public may access the full report online at the King County website:  
[www.metrokc.gov/health/ems/taskforce](http://www.metrokc.gov/health/ems/taskforce)

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends Council approve the EMS Task Force proposal to place a measure on the November 2001 ballot for a new property tax levy of 25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to fund EMS services.