

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, May 7, 2001
6:30 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 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 exception of Councilmember Montgomery, who arrived later in the meeting.

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

Mayor Jepsen welcomed City Manager Steve Burkett.

Mr. Burkett requested that Council consider the "Capital Improvement Program Quarterly Update" as the first workshop item. Council later concurred.

Mr. Burkett mentioned that the West Police Neighborhood Center has moved three storefronts east and that the police department has hired a new officer for the neighborhood center.

Finally, Mr. Burkett distributed photographs of the April 27, 2001 groundbreaking of the Shoreview Park Improvements Project.

Mayor Jepsen thanked Larry Bauman for his service as Interim City Manager.

4. **COUNCIL REPORTS**

Councilmember Ransom said the recent meeting of the King County Jail Advisory Committee concerned ongoing increases in jail populations. He said County staff proposes cuts in services and increases in fees to contract cities to address increasing

DRAFT

costs. He suggested that the Suburban Cities Association meet to discuss priorities and alternatives.

Councilmember Lee said she attended the Asia Pacific Cities Summit, a meeting of business, government and education representatives from approximately 90 cities. She noted information and technology as the theme of the summit with a focus on improving communities through economic development and e-government. She suggested that Council review the City's progress in these areas.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested consideration at a future Council workshop of developments with Water Resource Inventory Area 8 (WRIA 8) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing of Puget Sound salmon species.

Mayor Jepsen reported that the King County Council will hold a public hearing May 14 regarding the Brightwater Facilities. He said the County Council intends to adopt an ordinance designating seven sites for consideration and establishing the siting criteria for use in the evaluation process. He noted that the criteria returned to the Siting Advisory Committee from the County Council had changed from that the Siting Advisory Committee had recommended. He suggested a Council letter to County Councilmember Maggi Fimia stating its support for the language originally recommended by the Siting Advisory Committee. Councilmembers Grossman, Ransom and Gustafson concurred.

Next, Mayor Jepsen noted his participation earlier in the day in a meeting of the north end mayors group. He said the group continues to discuss how to replace the Human Services Roundtable.

Councilmember Montgomery arrived at 6:48 p.m.

Finally, Mayor Jepsen said the County has issued the solid waste management plan. He mentioned issues of importance to Shoreline, including Interstate 5 access to the transfer station located at 1st Avenue NE. He noted that Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, will represent the City at a meeting about the plan requested by Renton City Councilmember Kathy Keolker-Wheeler.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(c) Capital Improvement Program Quarterly Update

Public Works Director Bill Conner reviewed the staff report. He described the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project management process, including project milestones (study, pre-design, design, right-of-way [ROW], permits, construction and maintenance), process milestones (Council, public and environmental processes) and variable factors (e.g., contract process, construction and design market, agency input and emerging issues).

DRAFT

Mr. Conner went on to discuss previous staff commitments regarding nine priority CIP projects—Aurora Corridor; Interurban Trail; North City Sub-Area; Shoreview Park; Paramount Park; Shoreline Pool; Recreation Center; Ronald Bog Study and 3rd Avenue NW Drainage—and the current status of the projects.

Councilmember Ransom said some Councilmembers were concerned previously that staff was overly optimistic about project schedules. He asked whether staff is “comfortable” that the City will meet the revised project schedules. Mr. Conner said he is comfortable with the revised project schedules.

Mr. Burkett noted that Councilmembers have asserted the importance of the CIP during his meetings with them. He acknowledged the value of realistic project schedules—including best, most-likely and worst-case scenarios—and quarterly project updates to Council.

Noting that many of the CIP projects are controversial, Deputy Mayor Hansen said the City is doing well. He commented that problems are inevitable, especially with controversial projects. He stressed the importance of informing Council of such problems as they arise. Councilmembers Gustafson and Montgomery agreed.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Conner explained the construction schedule for the Shoreview Park Improvements Project. Regarding the nine priority CIP projects, he said the City has the staff and ability to accomplish the projects.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed concern with the statement in the staff report that “staff took longer than planned to obtain a building permit” (page 46) for the Shoreline Pool Improvement Project. Mr. Conner said he underestimated the amount of time necessary to obtain the permit.

Councilmember Gustafson asked about ROW negotiations with Seattle City Light (SCL) for the Interurban Trail Project. Mr. Conner anticipated that staff will achieve an agreement with SCL before May 29. Mr. Burkett discussed the difficulties of CIP projects involving other jurisdictions and strategies for addressing such difficulties.

Councilmember Ransom asserted the public’s need to see visible progress. He said the City is doing well, in comparison to the performance of King County in the Shoreline area before the City incorporated and compared with other jurisdictions. He commended staff for the progress it has made.

Mayor Jepsen acknowledged the variable factors outside City control in some of the CIP projects. He stated that the Shoreline Pool, Shoreview Park and Paramount Park projects are within City control. He asserted the need to recognize the delays in these projects and to learn from the delays. He expressed hope that staff will recognize that the Ronald Bog and 3rd Avenue NW drainage projects will involve other large agencies outside City control and anticipate how to proceed. He asked what the City is going to do to reach an

DRAFT

agreement with SCL about the Interurban ROW and to address the Aurora Corridor Channelization Plan with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). He asserted that the City must be more aggressive and strategic. He advocated realism and progress.

Mr. Conner discussed five key steps necessary to reach the design phase of the Aurora Corridor Project:

- WSDOT Channelization Plan Approval
- Documented Categorical Exclusion Submission to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Lighting Concept to Council for Approval
- Value Engineering Study Draft Completed
- Design Contract to Council for Approval

He went on to review the timeline for final design, ROW acquisition and construction for the project (page 63 of the Council packet).

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Conner explained that the City will reach the final design phase of the Aurora Corridor Project (which will include the preparation of bid documents) via the Council-approved design contract.

Mayor Jepsen said he does not want the City to succumb to a time-consuming, bureaucratic process. He asserted that the City can do much better than to imitate other governments. He advocated that the City "replicate the private-sector attitude."

Councilmember Lee agreed. She stressed the need to insure that the City executes projects well and within budget.

Councilmember Grossman expressed concern about the difficulty of obtaining a building permit for the Shoreline Pool Improvement Project. He noted that Planning and Development Services Director Tim Stewart reported to Council last year about efforts to improve the permit review process, and he advocated that Council revisit those issues. He asserted the need to be well coordinated and responsive to public and private customers.

Deputy Mayor Hansen advocated that the City proceed with projects as quickly as possible, but he said it is even more important to "do things right." He asserted the need to understand that "outside forces" will sometimes alter expectations.

Noting the length of time necessary to build the Richmond Beach Library and the Little League field at Shoreview Park, Councilmember Ransom warned of potential delays in the Aurora Corridor Project. He said community groups are meeting with the WSDOT and the FHWA to try to appeal City plans. He advocated careful attention to the planning process. He asserted the likelihood of an appeal given the amount of interest in the project.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Conner anticipated that staff will begin the ROW acquisition process for the Aurora Corridor Project August 30. He reported that the City will not need to acquire and demolish any buildings in the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project. He noted the need for façade work on several buildings, but he said this will not necessitate any business closures. He explained that the Channelization Plan, which the City has submitted to WSDOT for approval, establishes the outer limits of the project and indicates no need to acquire and demolish buildings.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Conner confirmed that progress toward the design phase of the Aurora Corridor Project is dependent upon WSDOT approval of the Channelization Plan.

(a) 2000 Fourth Quarter Financial Report

Finance Director Debra Tarry reviewed the staff report.

Ms. Tarry corrected an error in the first sentence of the last paragraph on page two of the Council packet: "The Surface Water Capital Fund had revenues of \$1,284,589, which were \$179,589 ~~under~~ over projected revenues. . . ."

Ms. Tarry said the 2000 General Fund ending fund balance exceeded earlier staff projections by approximately \$1.4 million. She explained that staff will request that a little more than \$590,000 of this amount be carried forward into 2001 to complete projects initiated, but not completed, in 2000.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry explained that staff budgeted \$75,000 in 1999 and in 2000 as an anticipated annual payment to SCL for street lighting. She said staff will establish these amounts as a reserved portion of the fund balance for future use.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the future outlook for the City budget. He asked about retail sales tax and sales tax equalization in particular. He noted that: 1) retail sales tax revenues are projected to be "somewhat less" than in the past; 2) State legislators have indicated the possible elimination of sales tax equalization revenue after the next biennium; 3) gambling tax revenues are likely to level off or decline; and 4) the State Republican party has endorsed a proposed ballot initiative to limit annual property tax increases to one percent.

Mr. Burkett acknowledged the sensitivity of many City revenues to economic and political forces. He said the consideration of the long-term financial outlook is an important staff responsibility.

Ms. Tarry said staff will likely estimate a more conservative growth rate for future retail sales tax revenues. (She mentioned that the City's most recent collection, representing February sales tax revenues, is the first that represents a decline from revenues over the same period the previous year.) She explained that staff had projected that "I-695 backfill monies" would decrease over time.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen suggested the following discussion topics for the Council budget retreat this summer: the revenue growth that Council wants to anticipate; and what to do with the ending fund balance.

Deputy Mayor Hansen acknowledged the larger-than-projected 2000 General Fund ending fund balance. He asserted that even the 2000 Fourth Quarter Financial Report is conservative (e.g., he pointed out that staff excluded \$500,000 in December sales tax revenues for accounting reasons). He commented that sales tax revenue continues to increase. Referring to current proposals before the State Legislature, he said the City should receive approximately \$1.2 million from the State during the next two years. He pointed out that the City would receive an additional \$460,000 under Governor Gary Locke's proposed budget.

Continuing, Deputy Mayor Hansen said the City received approximately \$1 million in local sales tax revenue and \$4 million in sales tax equalization revenue in 1995. Projecting that the City will receive \$5 million in local sales tax revenue this year, he commented that "the City could run out of the equalization formula" within one or two years. He favored this possibility, noting that the City would be much less dependent on the State and able to look forward to revenue growth for use on other projects. He pointed out that utility tax collections are larger than projected. Finally, he stated that he is "nothing but encouraged" by the report.

(b) Shoreline Park and Ride TOD Roles and Responsibilities

Planning Manager Kirk McKinley reviewed the staff report, including the draft attachments.

Mayor Jepsen recommended that Attachment A include a schedule. He said Attachment D could serve this need, except that it ends with June 29. Mr. McKinley said staff is working with the consultants to develop a schedule for Phase Two and Phase Three of the project. He mentioned difficulty obtaining a response from the State to be able to proceed to the second and third phases.

Mayor Jepsen suggested an addition to item 7 to state "and should be incorporated into King County Metro's Six-Year Plan."

Continuing, Mayor Jepsen acknowledged County Councilmember Fimia's strong support for Attachment F. He reiterated his ambivalence about it. He expressed confusion about the final paragraph of the letter, and he recommended deleting it in favor of the continuation of stakeholder meetings in conjunction with Shoreline City Council meetings. He also recommended the inclusion of the project schedule as an attachment to the letter.

Referring to Attachment F, Deputy Mayor Hansen favored the deletion of the final paragraph. He advocated that staff chair the meetings. He went on to suggest the

revision of item 1 in Attachment C to read, "The project should be mixed use. Housing should could be a component of the project."

Councilmember Gustafson supported the revision of item 1 in Attachment C to read that "Housing should could be a component of the project." Regarding item 3, he said the examples listed reflect the issues that citizens raised at the public hearing concerning the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) project. He favored the deletion of language in the last paragraph of Attachment F that requires rotation of responsibilities for facilitating stakeholder meetings.

In response to Mr. McKinley, there was Council consensus to delete the last paragraph of Attachment F.

Councilmember Ransom advocated the addition of County Executive Ron Sims as a signatory to Attachment F. He also recommended better representation in Attachment C of the intent of the project to increase the number of parking stalls and of the objective to include retail sales uses.

Mayor Jepsen asserted that mixed use and shared parking are goals of the project. He noted that these will necessitate compliance with parking requirements.

Councilmember Grossman said County Councilmember Fimia, WSDOT Area Administrator Maureen Sullivan and State Representative Carolyn Edmonds stated that, at a minimum, current parking capacity at the site should be maintained. He noted County and State efforts to identify funding to increase the parking capacity of the Shoreline Park and Ride.

Councilmember Ransom asserted the need for increased park and ride capacity as well as increased parking to serve new uses.

Councilmember Lee asserted that item 2 in Attachment C states the need for additional park and ride capacity. She said increased parking to serve new uses is a matter of course not a guiding principle, which Attachment C is meant to address. Councilmember Gustafson agreed.

Councilmember Grossman supported increased park and ride capacity; however, he expressed concern about requiring it at the Shoreline Park and Ride. He mentioned potential development of increased park and ride capacity at the Aurora Village Transit Center as an alternative.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Councilmember Ransom agreed that he favors the revision of the first sentence of item 2 in Attachment C to read "The park and ride function should remain be enhanced." Mayor Jepsen supported this revision. He said he opposes the required growth of the park and ride, given that the type and continuation of service by King County Metro is uncertain; whereas, "enhanced" could

DRAFT

mean many things (e.g., more parking, better pedestrian access). Councilmembers Gustafson and Lee also supported the revision.

Councilmember Montgomery expressed concern about requiring additional park and ride capacity at the Shoreline Park and Ride given the uncertainty about future uses at the site.

Noting that the Shoreline Park and Ride was "overflowing" earlier in the day, Deputy Mayor Hansen supported the addition of more parking at the site. He asserted that item 2 in Attachment C adequately addresses this issue as written.

There was Council consensus to revise item 2 in Attachment C to read "The park and ride function should ~~remain~~ be enhanced."

Councilmember Grossman favored the retention of housing as an explicit goal of the project (Attachment C, item 1). He expressed concern about how to fund such housing (e.g., the feasibility of market-rate housing over structured parking), but he asserted its importance to "tie (the project) into the neighborhood."

Mayor Jepsen summarized that Attachment A is acceptable as written. He clarified that he and Councilmembers Grossman, Lee and Ransom favor the current wording of item 1 of Attachment C (i.e., "Housing should be a component of the project"). He reiterated Council consensus to revise item 2 to read "The park and ride function should ~~remain~~ be enhanced." He confirmed Council support to revise item 7 to add "and should be incorporated into King County Metro's Six-Year Plan."

Continuing, Mayor Jepsen noted Council support to extend the schedule of Attachment D beyond June 29 and to eliminate the last paragraph of Attachment F. Mayor Jepsen confirmed Council consensus in support of adding the Office of the King County Executive as a signatory to Attachment F. He reiterated his suggestion to add a schedule to Attachment F.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None

Councilmember Gustafson suggested an informal Council tour of the Shoreline Community Athletic Facility before the May 21 community reception for Mr. Burkett.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:51 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

May 14, 2001

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, May 14, 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: Steve Burkett, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager; Jan Briggs, Economic Development Coordinator

The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m.

Councilmembers discussed King County Council actions concerning potential sites for the BrightWater Treatment Plant.

Councilmember Grossman distributed photographs of the fiberglass salmon sculptures that Einstein Middle School students created. He discussed the process for accepting art in City parks. He suggested that Council consider options for accepting the sculptures.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee review policies for accepting art in City parks.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the School District could display the salmon sculptures at the Shoreline Conference Center.

Economic Development Coordinator Jan Briggs distributed and discussed the draft Economic Development Program. She noted strategies included in the program, and she described opportunities and problems for economic development in Shoreline. She went on to identify projects in which she is participating to promote redevelopment in Shoreline.

Councilmember Ransom commented that there are 63 Korean businesses in Shoreline and that most of the businesses do not participate in the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce.

Councilmember Lee said many Korean businesses cannot afford to close during the day to participate in Chamber of Commerce meetings. She went on to suggest the consolidation of existing economic data to provide market analysis for the City. She said the City could survey residents to collect additional market data.

May 14, 2001

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen asked what impact the City can have within the next few years to encourage economic development. City Manager Steve Burkett said successful developers are capable of making investments in anticipation of increases in property values.

Council discussed options for the 2002 Annual Planning and Budget Retreat. Council elected to schedule the retreat for August 27 and 28.

Assistant City Manager Larry Bauman discussed Council salaries and benefits for the 2002 budget.

Council agreed to invite the Board of the Shoreline Wastewater District to one of its June dinner meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, May 14, 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.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

City Manager Steve Burkett asked that Item 7(e) be pulled from tonight's consent calendar. He also reported that a suspect has been charged in a series of commercial burglaries along the southern part of Aurora Avenue in Shoreline.

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, reported that the King County Council had a public hearing today regarding potential sites for the new wastewater treatment facility. Then it took action to delete the Woodinville site and the Kenmore gun range site from the list. He said he delivered the Council letter regarding the recommendations of the Siting Advisory Committee during the public testimony.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Victoria Stiles, Executive Director of the Shoreline Historical Museum, reported that the exhibit "Fresh Voices of the Community: Korean-American Youth" will be at the Folklife Festival. She also said the museum is celebrating its 25th anniversary in June and invited Council to an event on June 15th. In conjunction with the anniversary, an exhibit will open called "Making Tracks: Linking Seattle to Everett by the Interurban Railway."

DRAFT

(b) Councilmember Lee introduced Linda Campbell, the Community Services Manager of Shellharbor, Australia. Ms. Campbell said she is representing the Local Government Community Services Association of Australia in her travels around North America. She is looking at ways cities provide opportunities for citizens to participate in decision making.

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 Gustafson moved to approve the consent calendar with the deletion of Item 7(e). Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion. He also asked that the minutes of the Dinner Meeting of April 9, 2001 be amended to show that he was in attendance. A vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously and the following items were approved:

Minutes of Dinner Meeting of April 9, 2001 (as amended)
Minutes of Workshop Meeting of April 16, 2001
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of April 23, 2001
Minutes of Regular Meeting of April 23, 2001

Approval of expenses and payroll as of April 27, 2001
in the amount of \$ 988,324.82

Ordinance No. 266 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

Motion to approve the Emergency Medical Services
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

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the Public
Works Trust Fund Loan Agreements for the Ronald Bog
Drainage and the 3rd Avenue Drainage Projects

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a professional
Services contract with Reid Middleton for the Shoreview Park
Improvement Project in the amount not to exceed \$143,536
and to execute amendments up to an additional 10%

DRAFT

Ordinance No. 271, amending Ordinance No. 254, as amended, by increasing the appropriation from the General Capital, Roads Capital, and Surface Water Capital Funds and authorizing expenditures for the completion of 2000 capital projects; and increasing the appropriation in the General Fund, Street Fund, and Surface Water Management Fund for completion of operating projects and contracts

Motion to confirm the cancellation of the 2000 YMCA project in the amount of \$40,000 and the reallocation of these funds to the 2002 process; to confirm the City's pass-through status and authorize the City Manager to execute the King County certification form to reflect these estimated amounts: \$58,000 for public services, \$52,000 for planning and administration, \$158,000 for the Housing Repair Program, and \$140,000 for capital projects; and to authorize staff to implement the allocation process for 2002 Community Development Block Grant Capital Improvement funding as outlined in the staff report

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an Interlocal Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the City of Lake Forest Park relating to tennis programs

8. **ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTION AND MOTIONS**

- (a) Motion to authorize the City Manager to submit an application for funding to King County Department of Natural Resources Conservation Futures to purchase additional open space properties adjacent to Paramount Park Open Space

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, explained that staff seeks Council approval to apply for the grant because no matching funds are earmarked in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). She emphasized that the acquisition of additional open space adjacent to Paramount Park Open Space is a top priority in the Park, Open Space, and Recreation Services Plan. The three parcels identified by staff are designated in that plan and would add a little more than an acre to the park system. Their acquisition would also maintain the edge along the park. The CIP lists this project, with \$130,000 to come from grant funding. Of course, the actual costs will reflect appraised values and negotiations with sellers. Ms. Barry concluded that the grant application is due May 23. If the City is successful, it will have two years to find a match for the grant funding.

Referring to the map on page 82 of the Council packet, Ms. Barry described the physical characteristics of the parcels. She pointed out that the owner of parcel B has not made a decision about selling. She described the benefits of acquiring these parcels, including

DRAFT

protection of wetlands in Paramount Park Open Space, enhancement of the neighborhood access to the park, and the addition of passive recreation value to the park.

Councilmember Montgomery moved to authorize the City Manager to submit an application for funding to King County Department of Natural Resources Conservation Futures to purchase additional open space properties adjacent to Paramount Park Open Space. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom suggested that the right-of-way that goes through Paramount Park Open Space be incorporated into the park and that the parcel south of the right-of-way and east of the current park be added as parcel D.

Mr. Sievers said the right-of-way could be vacated by the Council. This would require a traffic study.

Ms. Barry said parcel D has a house on it but she could explore the suggestion.

Responding to Councilmember Montgomery, Ms. Barry confirmed that lots A and C are undeveloped. Lot B has a house on the front of the property. The property owners are deciding whether they wish to go through the process of subdividing in order to sell the undeveloped portion of the parcel.

Councilmember Montgomery asked if the properties are developable, given the wetlands they contain. Ms. Barry said the options would be limited.

Councilmember Grossman said the City should facilitate subdivision of parcel B in order to purchase it, rather than placing the burden on the property owner.

Councilmember Lee asked about the proximity of homes to the proposed purchase. She expressed concern about potential future park development affecting adjacent homeowners. She questioned the purchase of the properties if they probably would not be developed anyway.

Ms. Barry assured her that open space by definition is meant to be fairly undeveloped and used for passive recreation. The purpose of the purchase is to create a permanent buffer from the adjacent neighborhood.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the large parcel at the south end of the open space bordering on 145th Street. Ms. Barry said these southern parcels were not evaluated because they have houses on them.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the City Manager to submit an application for funding to King County Department of Natural Resources Conservation Futures to purchase additional open space properties adjacent to Paramount Park Open Space, which carried unanimously.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen noted that Councilmember Ransom has requested that parcel D be considered for inclusion.

Deputy Mayor Hansen commented that the City should examine any parcel that becomes available. He did not see a need to specifically identify parcel D.

Ms. Barry said potential parcels must be identified in the grant application, but staff can look into the ownership of parcel D in time to determine if it should be included.

- (b) Motion to authorize staff to proceed with the design of the 3rd Avenue NW Drainage Improvements consisting of the 3rd Avenue conveyance solution (Option 1) and the North Pond detention mitigation (Option A)[postponed from April 23, 2001]

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, reminded Council that this motion was postponed to allow staff time to explore the litigation history surrounding the North Pond. He reported that both the litigation files and the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have been reviewed and that they contain nothing to preclude proceeding. He said the EIS prepared for the original project identified the loss or conversion of natural park environment as a key issue. The original North Pond was built on 1.9 acres of meadow. It was subject to Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) covenants against converting parkland to non-recreational uses. A lawsuit challenged the plan to replace the pond site acreage with two pieces located a good distance from Shoreline.

Mr. Sievers explained the background of the federal litigation, which was settled through mediation and the addition of park amenities to the current pond. However, this site is also subject to IAC covenants. He said a boundary line adjustment could be proposed to the IAC board to reshape the parcel to accommodate the new pond design with no net loss in parkland. The slopes of the new pond as designed are at a one-vertical-foot-to-three-horizontal-feet ratio, rather than the existing one-to-four ratio. However, staff feels the proposed amenities to the project would provide acceptable mitigation. Therefore, although the staff report recommends postponement of the item, staff is now confident that Option A is workable and that there are no legal impediments to proceeding. Staff recommends pursuing the consent of the IAC on the boundary line adjustment to design Option A.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

- (a) Ralph Keuler, 801 NW 175th Street, a resident who lives 300 feet west of the washout that occurred in 1997, referred to written comments in which he asked Council to seriously consider all geologic and hydrologic issues before a site is selected for the detention pond. He pointed out that a large spring exists under the intersection of 175th Street NW and 6th Avenue NW. He was concerned that the City's consultant, OTAK, does not have sufficient specific expertise to handle this project.

DRAFT

(b) Ken Cottingham, 350 NW 175th Street, referred to his testimony on April 23 in support of Option B. He addressed the slopes of the proposed pond enlargement, noting that the one-to-four slope was referred to in the final EIS. He felt the EIS requirement is still binding on the City. He believed that a steeper slope would mean the park is not usable for walking and certainly is not comparable to the original proposal. He reiterated his support for Option B.

Mayor Jepsen confirmed that the motion on the floor, as postponed from April 23 is to **authorize staff to proceed with the design of the 3rd Avenue Drainage Improvements consisting of the 3rd Avenue conveyance solution (Option 1) and the North Pond detention mitigation (Option A).**

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Sievers confirmed that this motion would include pursuit of the IAC process. He said the City will not be able to move too far without IAC consent.

Councilmember Ransom supported Option B. He said, after talking to staff and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee members, he is convinced this is preferable.

Mr. Conner explained that staff could support either option. He then commented on the letter from Mr. Keuler. He agreed that Landau and Associates is an excellent firm with a history of work in this area. He said OTAK has received the Landau reports. He agreed that design will be necessary to determine which site, if either, is suitable. However, if both sites go to design, it would double the City's costs. The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee recommended Option A, which would leave the northwest corner undeveloped. Mr. Conner supported the choice of OTAK as the design firm, noting its excellent reputation and its commitment to "sub-out" the specific hydrologic work.

Mayor Jepsen stressed that going back to the IAC will resolve the slope issues. Hopefully, IAC will approve the City's plan to have steeper slopes. Mr. Conner added that if the goal is to provide access to the area for recreation, stairways or differently sloped paths to allow the public to work down into the bottom might meet the requirements.

Councilmember Lee asked if there is a way to assess which site would work better rather than moving forward with engineering for one site and then possibly having to go to the other. Mr. Conner responded that the current OTAK study evaluated the two sites and says from a technical perspective "it's a wash." He said one approach would be to do a 30 percent design on both sites. He said he realizes Council wants to be as confident as possible in its approach.

Deputy Mayor Hansen agreed with Mr. Keuler that the proper study must be done. He supported Option A because the current pond has a properly engineered dam. He said he would consider Option B for additional storage in the future.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen concurred with Councilmember Lee that Council is selecting between two sites without the certainty that one is suitable and the other is not. Although he did not support a dual design, he did not want to "chase something that is not going to happen."

Mr. Sievers pointed out that pursuing Option B would definitely require identification of a significant replacement property, which would be time-consuming and expensive. He believed that enlargement of the current pond will be acceptable to the IAC.

Mayor Jepsen clarified that both options have IAC limitations.

Councilmember Grossman commented that design costs are always a small percentage of the total project. He said this project needs to be successful, and the City should spend whatever it takes from an engineering and research standpoint. He also commented that the courts may look at detention ponds more flexibly now than they did ten years ago.

Councilmember Ransom asked whether replacement parkland will be required in Option A with the expansion of the pond from eight acre feet to 12 acre feet. Mr. Conner said the outline of the pond will be changed slightly and the hole dug deeper. Then the design will have to provide pedestrian access to the park.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize staff to proceed with the design of the 3rd Avenue Drainage Improvements consisting of the 3rd Avenue conveyance solution (Option 1) and the North Pond detention mitigation (Option A), which carried 5 - 2, with Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom dissenting.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Ken Cottingham, 350 NW 175th Street, referred to the siting of the detention pond, noting there is a 24-inch sanitary sewer going through Option A. He said the fact that the sewer will have to be relocated and that the new pond will be lower than the sewer has not been addressed.


Mr. Burkett commented that these are design issues for each option. He said staff will return to Council if there is a need to go in a different direction. Mr. Conner confirmed that the relocation of the sewer will be addressed in the design phase.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:46 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of May 11, 2001
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 \$626,197.11 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for April 15 through April 28 in the amount of \$316,955.60 paid with check/voucher numbers 2923, 5634-5680, 160074, 180001-180116 and benefit checks 8567 through 8576.

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on May 04, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$15,360.18 paid on Expense Register dated 04/27/01 with the following claim checks: 8448 and

Expenses in the amount of \$9,132.55 paid on Expense Register dated 04/30/01 with the following claim checks: 8449-8468 and

Expenses in the amount of \$33,488.00 paid on Expense Register dated 04/30/01 with the following claim checks: 8469-8486 and

Expenses in the amount of \$15,040.82 paid on Expense Register dated 04/30/01 with the following claim checks: 8487-8488 and

Expenses in the amount of \$7,089.51 paid on Expense Register dated 04/30/01 with the following claim checks: 8489-8503 and

Expenses in the amount of \$12,800.60 paid on Expense Register dated 05/02/01 with the following claim checks: 8504-8514 and

Expenses in the amount of \$23,799.54 paid on Expense Register dated 05/02/01 with the following claim checks: 8515-8534 and

Expenses in the amount of \$2,440.00 paid on Expense Register dated 05/02/01 with the following claim checks: 8535-8542 and

Expenses in the amount of \$6,403.92 paid on Expense Register dated 05/04/01 with the following claim checks: 8543-8552 and

Expenses in the amount of \$5,284.56 paid on Expense Register dated 05/04/01 with the following claim checks: 8553-8566 and

Expenses in the amount of \$-70.72 reversed on Expense Register dated 05/02/01 with the following claim checks voided: 8506 and

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on May 11, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$15,735.84 paid on Expense Register dated 05/08/01 with the following claim checks: 8877-8594 and


Expenses in the amount of \$45,250.84 paid on Expense Register dated 05/09/01 with the following claim checks: 8595-8617 and

Expenses in the amount of \$95,726.61 paid on Expense Register dated 05/09/01 with the following claim checks: 8618-8630 and

Expenses in the amount of \$21,759.26 paid on Expense Register dated 05/10/01 with the following claim checks: 8631-8640.

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Authorize the City Manager to execute the School Resource Officer Interlocal Agreement with the Shoreline School District
DEPARTMENT: Police
PRESENTED BY: Chief Denise Pentony 

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The School Resource Officer Program has been provided to the Shoreline School District elementary and middle schools in Shoreline for the past three years. The agreement between the City and the District to share in the cost of the program has not been formalized until now. In 2001 a full time School Resource Officer (SRO) was added to the program and thus requires a formal Interlocal Agreement to define the program and cost sharing agreements. The Interlocal is before your Council for signature authorization.

The SRO program was designed to replace and improve upon the Drug Awareness and Resistance Education (DARE) program that reached a limited audience of students. The need to reach more youth and to provide a flexible curriculum to match the needs of schools and students guided the creation of the SRO program.

Objectives of the SRO program are:

- to build positive relationships with students and staff by teaching safety and awareness curriculum appropriate for all grade levels,
- to serve as mentors to students,
- to coordinate safety planning with the schools and public safety for emergencies, and
- to deal with behavioral or criminal problems on the campus.

The curriculum is responsive to the issues facing youth today, such as, violence, guns, drugs, traffic safety and personal safety. All grade levels are exposed to the SRO's. Officers teaching/co-teaching in the classrooms lend credibility to the course material and create an opportunity for positive police - student relationships.

This topic was previously before your Council during the 2001 budget process as a new budget initiative. However, this is the first time the Interlocal has been presented for approval. The School Board was scheduled to approve the Interlocal on February 5th, 2001; however, the item was moved to the School Board's May 7th calendar for approval. As a good faith step to ensure continued service, the City began the new full time SRO program on January 2nd, 2001, as provided in the City's adopted budget. The School Board approved the signing of the School Resource Officer Interlocal Agreement during their May 7th, 2001 Board meeting.

Staff worked with the City Attorney, King County Sheriff's Office and the School District and their attorney to develop a comprehensive agreement detailing the partnership and program.

Highlights of the proposed Interlocal are as follows:

- Officers will work four (4) hours per week in Shoreline's nine elementary schools
- Officers will work eight (8) hours per week in the two middle schools
- One full time officer will work in the two high schools, splitting time equally
- SRO officers will receive special training for this position and will work with school liaisons to present agreed upon curriculum, or perform functions as specified by the school principal that are consistent with the Interlocal Agreement
- The scope of services includes but is not limited to; staff training, student education, parent education, mentoring, law enforcement security on District property, and rapport building with students
- The program will be reviewed annually to determine the program effectiveness
- The total cost of the program in 2001 is \$159,842. The cost has been reduced by grant funding from the Department of Justice COPS Police in Schools initiative (providing \$125,000 over three years / \$41,667 per year), Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEBG) \$16,124 in 2001, and Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) Program Area 1 "Innovative Law Enforcement Strategies" Criminal Justice Funding of \$11,635. The adjusted program local cost for 2001, after grants, is \$90,416.
- The District will contribute one half of program costs not to exceed \$50,000 in 2001. In following years, the District will contribute one half of program costs after grant funds.
- The duration of the Interlocal will continue in force for three years, through December 31, 2003, which is consistent with the COPS grant period. Thereafter, the agreement may be terminated with 60 days written notice by either party.
- In future years, efforts will continue to be made to obtain grant funds to offset costs to the City and School District; however, regardless of the success of grant applications, the City and School District will share the program costs on a 50 -50 basis.
- Future costs to the City could be as much as \$79,921 (plus any Sheriff's Office contract cost adjustments such as COLA) if all grant funds are eliminated from the program.

The Interlocal Agreement will protect the City's and the School District's interests and by setting forth clear policy to guide the SRO program over the next three years. In January of 2002 the program will be evaluated for its effectiveness and for the value it brings to the community. Annual reports on the program will be made to the School Board and the City.

To this date there has not been a formal written contract between the City, the School District, or the Police Department to provide the SRO program. There was, however, a verbal agreement to share the program costs. In past years, SRO officers worked in an overtime capacity. The annual SRO overtime budget was \$55,000. The School District has reimbursed the City \$10,000 per year for the service (years 1998, 1999 and 2000). Local and State grants helped reduce the cost of the program in past years.

The value of the program from the School District's viewpoint has been and continues to be a benefit to each of the schools. Currently there are no hard/statistical success measures for the program. There has, however, been positive anecdotal feedback. The SRO program is a highly popular program with the Shoreline Schools and it is planned that statistical measures will be developed to help in the annual assessment of the program.

Local officers value this program highly. Officers have become familiar with students in the schools and have developed positive relationships with them. Officers feel that the children get to see them in a non-punitive role and thus develop more understanding of and respect for police.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the City Manager to execute the School Resource Officer Interlocal Agreement.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Contract not to Exceed \$70,000 with Lennertz, Coyle & Associates for Ronald Subarea Plan and Charrette
DEPARTMENT:	Planning and Development Services (PADS)
PRESENTED BY:	Timothy Stewart, PADS Director Kirk McKinley, Planning Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this item is to obtain your Council's approval of a contract for professional design services to conduct a charrette process and to prepare the Ronald Subarea Plan. One of the specific projects identified and funded in your 2001 City Council Goals to adopt and implement a formal economic development program is "\$75,000 for staff and consultants to work on a subarea plan for a retail development in the City." On March 5, 2001, your Council selected the Ronald District as the area in which to develop a 2001 subarea plan. This planning effort is an element of the economic development program developed in response to 2001 Council goals. The basic components of the contract and development of the Ronald Subarea Plan include:

1. **Research and Education:** This initial phase will include a one day kickoff workshop which is intended to introduce the subarea process to the public, and to gather information about the needs and desires of the community, especially from the abutting residential neighborhoods. This phase will also include up to eight individual meetings with stakeholders and consultants under contract on Shoreline projects (e.g., Interurban, Aurora, Shoreline TOD), and the gathering and assembly of information including base maps, and other pertinent data. The kickoff workshop is tentatively scheduled for July 18, 2001.
2. **Design Charrette:** A four day design charrette will bring the key participants together with design professionals, financiers, and staff to develop elements of the Subarea Plan, including Development Code recommendations, and specific demonstration projects with market and feasibility analysis. We will try to arrange this charrette so that the TOD charrette could occur simultaneously. This charrette would occur in late September 2001.
3. **Review and Revise:** This phase includes the development of the draft charrette report, followed by an opportunity for review and revision. There will be two evening meetings with the public and stakeholders to present and discuss the draft document. These meeting would occur in late October 2001.
4. **Finalize Report:** The consultant will submit the final document that will contain the proposed subarea plan, illustrations, and other text for a potential development code overlay.

The Ronald Subarea plan and code standards will be the City's second effort to prepare a subarea plan. It will focus on economic development opportunities together with the land use patterns, urban design, street and other necessary standards for the implementation. The effort will address the interactions between the extensive public rights-of-way in the area (Aurora, Seattle City Light, Midvale, Ronald Place) with privately-owned land. It will consider the implementation of the Aurora and Interurban projects, and will recommend policies and codes supportive of those major capital projects. The subarea plan will not revisit the design concept for Aurora or the Interurban Trail, but may help refine right-of-way issues. The subarea report will be illustrated allowing people to visualize the proposed changes with an additional level of specificity.

Before the public process begins on this subarea plan, staff will work with property-owners and tenants to select three to four demonstration sites. The demonstration projects will allow testing of new standards on specific sites with examples of what is possible today, from an economic, market, technical, and environmental standpoint. A key component to this planning process is involvement and continuous communications with neighborhoods on both sides of Aurora: Hillwood, Richmond Highlands, Echo Lake and Meridian Park.

The 2001 budget includes \$75,000 for the preparation of the Ronald Subarea Plan.

As required by the current City purchasing procedures, staff reviewed the qualifications and performance data filed with the City in its annual solicitation of Architectural, Engineering & Surveyors Roster. Lennertz, Coyle & Associates firm was selected as the firm most qualified to prepare and conduct the charrette and the subarea plan. Additionally, staff is pleased with the effort, expertise, and products that Lennertz, Coyle & Associates provided in the North City Subarea effort. The consultant team is very familiar with City of Shoreline policies, procedures and codes. This team also includes a market analyst (Ed Starkie) who will be hired under a separate contract. Staff negotiated the proposed contract, which it believes to be fair and reasonable given its scope and complexity. The amount for this contract will not exceed \$70,000.

The following is a brief synopsis of the scope of work for the contract:

Task	Date
Education, research, development of preliminary design concepts and strategies. Stakeholder and coordination meetings.	June 1 through July 17, 2001
Public kick-off meeting	July 18, 2001
Design charrette (4 days)	Late September 2001
Illustrative plan (draft). Including drawings, proposed code changes, and other recommendations related to the land uses in the area. Final plan.	October through December 2001
Adoption process	December or early 2002

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorizes the City Manager to execute Agreement for design services for the Ronald Subarea Plan with Lennertz, Coyle & Associates, in the amount not to exceed \$70,000.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Authorize the City Manager to Execute Agreements Valued at up to \$700,000 for the 2001 Road Overlay Program
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director <i>WLC</i> George Dicks, Maintenance Supervisor

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to request your Council's approval of proposed road overlay projects for 2001 (see Attachment A). At your Council meeting on February 1, 1999, Public Works staff introduced the use and concept of Pavement Management systems. Staff presented a long-term strategy to optimize available funds, improve the overall condition of our pavement network and get more work done with limited funds. Council concurred that it would be necessary to increase the overlay budget of \$400,000 adopted during the 1999 budget process. During the 2000 budget preparation process, your council decided to increase the total overlay budget to \$700,000, and to remain at this funding level for the immediate future.

Public Works staff has identified locations for the 2001 Overlay Project and the 2001 Slurry Seal Project utilizing Measurement Research Corporation's Pavement Management System data. This was done in conjunction with staff's work on a four-year plan utilizing the mixed methods approach (overlay, slurry seal coat, etc.). Your Council agreed upon the mixed methods approach on February 1, 1999. This mixed methods approach was executed in 2000 with very good results. Both the overlay and the slurry seal work were completed within the expected time frame. The new slurry seal work has shown no signs of raveling and has a professional paving appearance.

Our primary objective continues to be to effectively maintain or enhance the integrity of the City's roadway system in the most cost efficient manner. Staff is requesting your Council's approval to proceed with the identified overlay program. Due to the cost reductions of including our overlay as part of a larger contract, we would like to contract again this year with King County Department of Transportation, Roads Division for the overlay portion.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorizes the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with the King County Department of Roads and Transportation Division not to exceed the amount of \$550,000 to complete the identified projects listed in the 2001 Overlay Program. Staff further recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Asphalt Maintenance Associates, Inc. not to exceed the amount of \$150,000 to complete the identified projects listed in the 2001 Slurry Seal Program.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



ATTACHMENTS:

- A: Project Map
- B: 2001 Overlay Project
- C: 2001 Slurry Seal Project

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The City of Shoreline has approximately 380 lane miles of paved surfaces with an estimated replacement value of \$380 million. As part of the 2000 Pavement and Rehabilitation Plan, staff reviewed a series of pavement treatment options that could be applied over the life of the pavement to maximize the use of limited funds and extend the life of the pavement.

Staff introduced the use of an automated pavement management system that assists with the monitoring and management of pavement surface conditions. Included in that report was an analysis of our own pavement network utilizing King County distress survey data. This distress survey data was updated through a contract with Measurement Research Corporation during the summer of 1999. This survey was very comprehensive using actual measurements of each foot of street surface as opposed to measuring defects at intersections and applying ratings to the entire road as is done in King County's survey method. This updated survey identified the severity of different types of cracking, the amount of loose rock, rutting and potholes. The City's pavement condition was rated using a scale from 0-100 with 0 being the worst condition and 100 being the best.

The City's overall weighted average score indicated our pavement network system to be in fair (65) condition, but the report showed pavement conditions rated below 65 failed 6 times faster than those rated above 65. The analysis of the condition of pavement surface within Shoreline included a few application alternatives.

The program that staff recommended and that Council approved was a mixed method pavement program. This maintenance strategy proposed overlays on major arterial and high traffic areas and less expensive slurry seal coats on low traffic non-curb and gutter areas. This maintenance strategy provided the best level of pavement condition and the lowest deferred maintenance costs.

This report identifies locations for the 2001 Overlay Program utilizing Measurement Research Corporation's Pavement Management System data. Staff has performed an extensive analysis of the data for accuracy and validity on the roads identified in this year's overlay program. This review included visual inspections. An additional analysis was utilized in selecting this year's candidates. We started with the criteria used to determine the long-term pavement management strategies to keep overall pavement condition scores at a satisfactory level. Additionally, more immediate criteria were added to reflect more immediate needs. For example, we did not want to call for an overlay where a utility plans extensive street cuts in the near future. Below are the criteria we employ in this process:

- Pavement condition rating scores
- Customer request data for multiple issues such as pothole repair, patching and pavement requests

- Complementary projects including drainage improvements, Capital Improvement Program and grant applications that may address pavement conditions through other means
- Needed improvements for pedestrian safety such as wheelchair curb cuts
- Planned development, improvements on street cuts by local utilities
- Location (efforts to complete contiguous areas)

The roads identified in this year's overlay recommendation have eroded to a degree where alternate methods of maintenance (other than overlays) would not result in the successful rehabilitation of the pavement conditions in these areas. In addition, completing these areas would reduce the number of customer requests received and the amount of reactive maintenance costs. Our primary objective is to effectively maintain or enhance the integrity of the City's roadway system in the most cost efficient manner.

This year's Pavement Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program consists of overlay (75%) and Slurry Sealing (25%) as the methods of treatment (see Attachment A). The proposed overlay program includes those roads with pavement conditions with ratings of poor to failing that cannot be effectively repaired using other treatment options. King County's schedule for beginning the overlay project is early summer and slurry sealing will be scheduled for early August.

Staff is requesting to contract with the King County Department of Roads and Transportation Division to include our City's annual overlay program as part of King County's many larger overlay programs. There are adequate funds in the 2001 budget to support this requested action.

SLURRY SEAL

Slurry seal is a preventative maintenance process whereby asphalt oil, aggregate, binders, hardeners, and water are mixed together and laid on the street surface in a "wet" coating of approximately 3/8 inch thick. The applied mix hardens to a degree where we can allow traffic in about 2 to 3 hours. The purpose of this application is to replace the lost surface oil, fill surface voids and to provide a new wearing course. When applied to street surfaces free of structural defects, this wearing course is expected to last for approximately ten years. This application is typically used on roads that have experienced some deterioration but are not sufficiently damaged to merit a complete overlay.

The cost of this alternate maintenance method is approximately 15% that of an overlay. A private contractor, under a separate City contract, will do the slurry sealing. Our recommendations for the 2001 Slurry Seal Program are provided (see Attachment A).

Staff would like your Council's approval to proceed with the identified overlay projects presented in this staff report for the year 2001. These projects will enhance the overall condition of our pavement network and reduce the amount of customer complaints

related to poor pavement conditions. The overlay project proposed for this year's program are roads that have eroded to a degree where significant reconstruction will be required in the future if no repairs are made this year. With respect to the slurry seal projects, we believe a proactive use of this method will save money in the long run by delaying the need for a more expensive overlay.

The Slurry Seal project was advertised on March 28 & April 2, 2001. On April 17, 2001, the City Clerk's Office received and opened two bids from qualified contractors. The following bids were received:

Bidder Name	Bid Amount
1. Asphalt Maintenance Assoc. Inc.	\$134,130.00
2. Blackline, Inc.	\$135,458.85

The Public Works engineer's estimate for the Slurry Seal Program is \$128,768. Staff has reviewed the low bidder's qualifications and recommends that Asphalt Maintenance Associates, Inc. be awarded the contract. Staff anticipates that the project will be done during August 2001. The contractor has 20 working days to complete the project. Staff will closely monitor the contractor to minimize any inconvenience to the general public.

Staff is also requesting to contract with King County Department of Transportation, Road Services Division to complete the City's 2001 Overlay Program. King County uses a formal bid process to choose a contractor. The low bid price is based upon the cost per ton of asphalt. Shoreline pays the appropriate amount based upon the tons of asphalt used. There are adequate funds in the 2001 budget to support this requested action. This year's cost per ton of asphalt is approximately 8% lower than last year's cost.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorizes the City Manager to execute an interlocal agreement with the King County Department of Roads and Transportation Division not to exceed the amount of \$550,000 to complete the identified projects listed in the 2001 Overlay Program. Staff further recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Asphalt Maintenance Associates, Inc. not to exceed the amount of \$150,000 to complete the identified projects listed in the 2001 Slurry Seal Program.

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENTS:

- A: Project Map
- B: 2001 Overlay Project
- C: 2001 Slurry Seal Project

Street Overlay & Slurry Projects

2001

— Overlay
— Slurry

City Limit
Park
Road
Water Body

0 1000 2000 3000 4000 Feet
1" = 2000 feet



City of Shoreline GIS Catalog, Ortho Photo, including outlines, vector data copyright by City of Seattle, 1994. All rights reserved.

No warranties of any sort, including accuracy, fitness, or merchantability, accompany this product.

Snohomish County

Lake Ballinger

City of Seattle

ATTACHMENT B

CITY OF SHORELINE 2001 OVERLAY PROJECT

STREET	FROM	TO	LENGTH	WIDTH	SQUARE YARDS	PMS Rating
11 Ave NE	NE 170 Street	NE 168 Street	486	28	1,512	46
11 PI NE	NE 170 Street	NE 168 Street	489	29	1,576	47
2 Ave NE	NE 167 Street	End Route (N)	520	18	1,040	65
2 Ave NW	NW 180 Street	Endroute (S)	588	22	1,437	55
3 Ave NE	NE 165 Street	NE 170 Street	1533	20	3,407	67
3 PI NE	NE 166 Street	NE 167 Street	240	28	747	64
4 Ave NW	NW 180 Street	Endroute (N)	228	26	659	41
4 Ave NW	NW 180 Street	Endroute (S)	255	22	623	51
4 PI NW	NW 201 Street	Endroute (S)	145	17	274	63
4 PI NW	NW 203 Street	Endroute (N)	145	17	274	63
5 Ave NW	NW 180 Street	Endroute (S)	193	26	558	40
6 PI NW	NW 200 Street	NW 197 Street	720	26	2,080	50
N 200 Street	1 Ave NW	Fremont Ave N	1,742	20	3,871	48
N 200 Street	Fremont Ave N	Aurora Ave N	1,291	32	4,590	48
N 202 Street	Whitman Ave N	Fremont Ave N	1,018	21	2,375	45
N 203 Street	N Park Ave N	Whitman Ave N	742	24	1,979	63
NE 155 Street	15 Ave NE	1 PI NE	3699	40	16,440	61
NE 165 Street	15 Ave NE	16 Ave NE	637	19	1,345	45
NE 166 Street	15 Ave NE	16 Ave NE	744	19	1,571	35
NE 166 Street	3 PI NE	3 Ave NE	240	28	747	65
NE 167 Street	5 Ave NE	End Route (W)	1222	21	2,851	49
NE 168 Street	11 PL NE	11 Ave NE	276	29	889	58
NE 180 Street	10 Ave NE	15 Ave NE	1,572	30	5,240	58
NE 180 Street	5 Ave NE	10 Ave NE	1,304	23	3,332	55
NE 180 Street	5 Ave NE	End Route (W)	348	21	812	68
NW 180 Street	1 Ave NW	6 Ave NW	1,376	28	4,281	55
NW 200 Street	1 Ave NW	3 Ave NW	674	20	1,498	12
NW 200 Street	8 Ave NW	10 Ave NW	467	21	1,090	17

**CITY OF SHORELINE
2001 OVERLAY PROJECT**

33

ATTACHMENT C

CITY OF SHORELINE 2001 Slurry Sealing Project

STREET	FROM	TO	LENGTH	WIDTH	SQUARE YARDS	COST	PMS RATING
11 Ave NE	NE 170 Street	NE 175 Street	1397	21	3,260	\$3,977	85
18 Ave NE	NE 165 Street	NE 168 Street	718	26	2,074	\$2,531	85
18 Ave NE	NE 168 Street	NE 172 Street	1410	22	3,447	\$4,205	85
22 Ave NE	NE 170 Street	NE 168 Street	660	24	1,760	\$2,147	87
22 Ave NE	NE 168 Street	NE 165 Street	660	32	2,347	\$2,863	85
26 Ave NE	25 PI NE	NE 153 Street	3826	28	11,903	\$14,522	86
8 Ave NE	NE 175 Street	NE 180 Street	1,112	23	2,842	\$3,467	76
8 Ave NE	NE 180 Street	NE 185 Street	1,340	24	3,573	\$4,359	77
NE 168 Street	15 Ave NE	End Route (W)	596	24	1,589	\$1,939	88
NE 169 Street	15 Ave NE	25 Ave NE	2499	24	6,664	\$8,130	88
NE 170 Street	10 Ave NE	12 Ave NE	1041	29	3,354	\$4,092	87
NE 170 Street	15 Ave NE	18 Ave NE	1010	27	3,030	\$3,697	86
NE 170 Street	18 Ave NE	25 Ave NE	1584	22	3,872	\$4,724	85
NE 170 Street	8 Ave NE	10 Ave NE	665	25	1,847	\$2,254	80
NE 171 Street	15 Ave NE	22 Ave NE	2036	24	5,429	\$6,624	80
NE 175 Street	NE Serpentine PI	25 Ave NE	2286	22	5,588	\$6,817	88
NE 177 Street	NE Serpentine PI	25 Ave NE	1644	21	3,836	\$4,680	83
26 Ave NE	NE 153 Street	NE 145 Street	1330	22	3,251	\$3,966	87
NE 155 Street	25 Ave NE	27 Ave NE	663	28	2,063	\$2,516	89
NE 153 Street	25 Ave NE	27 Ave NE	666	24	1,776	\$2,167	86
32 Ave NE	NE 145 Street	NE 147 Street	665	24	1,773	\$2,163	83
32 Ave NE	NE 147 Street	NE 149 Street	450	20	1,000	\$1,220	83
NE 149 Street	30 Ave NE	NE 145 Street	1149	24	3,064	\$3,738	82
30 Ave NE	NE 147 Street	NE 149 Street	450	26	1,300	\$1,586	85
30 Ave NE	NE 145 Street	NE 147 Street	665	29	2,143	\$2,614	71
NE 150 Street	25 Ave NE	28 Ave NE	999	24	2,664	\$3,250	86
28 Ave NE	NE 145 Street	NE 150 Street	1340	24	3,573	\$4,359	85
12 Ave NE	NE 175 Street	NE 170 Street	1397	21	3,260	\$3,977	77

CITY OF SHORELINE
2001 Slurry Sealing Project

35

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Amendment to a Professional Services Contract with MacLeod Reckord for Habitat Mitigation Associated with the Shoreview Park Improvement Project
DEPARTMENT: Public Works
PRESENTED BY: William L. Conner, Public Works Director *WLC*

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this staff report is to obtain your Council's approval for an amendment to the mitigation plan design contract with MacLeod Reckord in support of the Shoreview Park Improvement Project. Staff is requesting to increase the existing design contract by an additional \$14,533.

On March 13, 2001, the Interim City Manager entered into a contract with MacLeod Reckord in the amount of \$21,276 to provide design services for habitat mitigation for the Shoreview Park Improvement Project. The original scope of work included:

- Design of Habitat Mitigation on the north and east sides of the existing tennis courts
- Preparation of Construction Documents
- Project Bidding Support

Staff is requesting to amend the consultant's contract to include additional work:

- Design of new stairway on the west side of the tennis courts to prevent slope erosion
- Habitat mitigation and design of the slope west of the tennis courts (a permit appeal request)
- An assessment of bird nesting at the project site (a permit appeal request)
- Additional support to staff during the clearing and grading permit appeal process

In order to complete this work, the existing contract requires amendment from \$21,276 to \$35,809. This represents an increase of \$14,533 to complete the additional scope of services. Your Council approved additional CIP funds for this project on April 23, 2001 to cover these expenses.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council approve the amendment to increase the Professional Services contract with MacLeod Reckord an amount of \$14,533 for design services and authorize the City Manager to execute the amendment.

Approved By: City Manager *YTB* City Attorney *[Signature]*