

August 20, 2001

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, August 20, 2001
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Lee

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Deputy Mayor Hansen, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

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

Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Grossman and unanimously carried, Mayor Jepsen and Councilmember Lee were excused.

3. **REPORT OF CITY MANAGER**

City Manager Steve Burkett noted that Council has a revised copy of Resolution No. 179 to consider this evening. It is based on comments from Mayor Jepsen and others. Mr. Burkett also noted a letter from the Shoreline School District inviting the City to participate in its master planning process for surplus property. Continuing, Mr. Burkett said Council has a letter from Puget Sound Energy (PSE) related to the proposed natural gas franchise. Finally, he commented on the success of "Celebrate Shoreline" and the possibility that the parade will be moved to North City next year.

Councilmember Ransom reported on his attendance at the Association of Washington Cities budget retreat last week, where he learned about performance measurements for program analysis. He distributed copies of a strategic financial planning model and of a computer program on CD that can be used to provide instant financial modeling. He said this would be valuable at budget retreats so that the ramifications of proposals made by Councilmembers could be considered on the spot. He recommended that staff learn to use the program for future retreats.

DRAFT

Councilmember Gustafson complimented Wendy Barry, Director, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services, and department staff for the success of "Celebrate Shoreline." Council concurred.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Susie McDowell, 1606 NW 198th Street, Shorewood High School swimming coach, commented on the October 24 projected opening date of the Shoreline Pool. She said swim season has begun and Shorewood and Shorecrest teams are swimming at other pools. She asked that Council do what it can to ensure that a temporary occupancy permit is issued so the pool can be used while the remodel is being completed. She said the team needs to be using the pool no later than September 17.

(b) Daniel Mann, 17920 Stone Avenue N, commended the City on behalf of the Aurora Improvement Council and the Concerned Citizens of Shoreline for moving to a full environmental impact statement on the Aurora Corridor project. He felt this step will result in a better project. He suggested this approach of "full disclosure" of all environmental impacts be taken for all projects. He said citizens must have information in a timely manner during the public process in order to provide input.

Public Works Director Bill Conner gave the background on the renovation of the Shoreline Pool. He explained how a temporary occupancy permit can be issued prior to completion. This will allow the teams to use a part of the pool while the remainder of the improvements are being done. The temporary occupancy permit should allow use of two thirds of the pool shortly after Labor Day.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Montgomery moved adoption of the consent calendar. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett commented that the letter Council received from PSE indicating that PSE cannot accept the franchise with the current indemnification language should not deter Council from passage of Ordinance No. 280. This action will give PSE 60 days to decide whether to enter into the franchise, to attempt to resolve the indemnification issue or to operate in the City without a franchise.

August 20, 2001

DRAFT

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt the consent calendar, which carried 5 - 0, and the following items were approved:

Minutes of the Workshop Meeting of July 16, 2001
Minutes of the Dinner Meeting of July 23, 2001
Minutes of Regular Meeting of July 23, 2001

Approval of expenses and payroll as of August 3, 2001
in the amount of \$2,538,168.38

Motion to authorize the expenditure of \$5,000 in Mini-grant funds for the Meridian Park Neighborhood Association to purchase trees, shrubs, and herbaceous and wetland plants for Meridian Park

Motion to accept the low responsive bid and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with RAS for the Richmond Highland Community Center project in the amount of \$446,631 including the three bid alternatives and to execute change orders up to 15% of the original contract amount

Motion to authorize the City Manager to sign the Commute Trip Reduction Implementation Interlocal Agreement with the State of Washington

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a memorandum of agreement with Seattle City Light relating to the City's use of its Interurban right-of-way for a public trail

Resolution No. 178 designating the City Clerk as agent for the filing of claims for damages

Ordinance No. 280 granting Puget Sound Energy, Inc. a non-exclusive franchise to operate a natural gas distribution system in the City of Shoreline

Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an option to extend the current lease with B.A.M. for the Eastside Police Storefront

8. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Shoreline Water District—City of Seattle Water Supply Contract

DRAFT

Mr. Burkett commented that the Shoreline Water District (District) has been reviewing options for several years with regard to water service and water supply. The District has completed negotiations with the City of Seattle regarding its water contract. He said staff is generally comfortable with the agreement, with the exception of Section II.B.3 (page 93 of the Council packet) regarding "Assumption of Transfer of Responsibilities." This condition provides that if the City, or any other provider, were to assume the District, the contract would have to be renegotiated. Mr. Burkett said the City opposes this provision.

Cynthia Driscoll, District Manager, provided background on the District's analysis of its options and its regional activity in support of the formation of the Water Supply Association (WSA), a group of water purveyors. The contract for water supply under consideration was negotiated between Seattle and the WSA and is now available for signature by any purveyor.

Guillemette Regan, Regional Water Policy Manager for Seattle Public Utilities, summarized the contract:

- Seattle makes a 60-year commitment to provide all water needed by the District;
- Seattle's customers will pay the same wholesale rates and surcharges as its purveyors;
- the District has the right to reduce the purchase commitment or even terminate the contract after giving Seattle written notice;
- the District has the right of first refusal to renew the contract after 60 years;
- Seattle will provide water service to the purveyors in "parity" with service provided to its own retail customers;
- an Operating Board will be created to oversee the operation of the water system—it will consist of three members from Seattle, three members from the purveyors, and a seventh chosen by the other six;
- Seattle remains responsible for water quality within the regional water supply system;
- Seattle's one percent conservation program will be implemented by the purveyors;
- regional project costs will be shared equally;
- rates will be structured to encourage efficient use;
- costs will be allocated into cost pools: supply, transmission, new facilities, and existing facilities;
- facility charges will be based on a "growth-pays-for-growth" mechanism;
- "old water" rates will be transitioned to become equal with "new water" rates over the next 12 years; and
- Seattle, as lead agency, will confer with the Operating Board for future water supply requirements, capital facilities plans, and emergency response planning.

Ms. Regan concluded by outlining the process for dispute resolution.

Mr. Burkett clarified that the District is interested in Council comments but that the item is not before the Council for approval. He felt this contract represents an outstanding accomplishment in long-range water supply planning.

DRAFT

Ms. Regan said she is checking with the Seattle City Attorney regarding the provision Shoreline is concerned about, which was initially added to the contract by the City Attorney.

Ms. Driscoll said the fact that Seattle is willing to have one rate for all customers is a very significant step. She reviewed the projected rates, which show no substantial change until 2012. She noted that zoning changes made by the City will impact structures and costs for the District. However, at this point, the District has a growth rate of less than one percent per year. Ms. Driscoll concluded that the District has a good chance to become a member of the Operating Board representing the small purveyors.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Driscoll assured him that this contract will allow for the addition of new service areas, such as the Highlands and even larger areas such as the west side of Shoreline.

Responding again to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Driscoll said the discussion was just initiated regarding the contract voiding provision, and the District is waiting to hear from the Seattle City Attorney. She has asked to have this provision removed.

Councilmember Ransom had concerns about how conservation is applied to consumption per household. Ms. Regan explained how conservation rates are assessed. The one percent rate is assessed per capita but based on a regional total, not individual houses. She said most utilities have a block rate that increases rates for higher consumption. She explained that in most cases this does not affect families.

Responding to another question from Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Driscoll said the members of the Operating Board not from Seattle are selected from among the purveyors of small, medium and large utilities. Seattle does not care whether the individual will be an elected official or staff member.

Councilmember Ransom commented on the newly-adopted North City Subarea Plan, which includes substantial growth. It is hoped some of this may occur prior to 2012. Ms. Driscoll reiterated that growth will pay for growth and impact developers but not current ratepayers.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Driscoll said the use of water from Lake Washington is still under consideration by the region. Water reuse is a potential source of supply, but how far this is developed is between King County and the region.

Councilmember Gustafson supported the formation of an Operating Board but had a concern about Seattle having the full authority to impose emergency surcharges. Ms. Regan responded that Seattle has the ultimate responsibility to provide and pay for the service. Since this is not delegated, the decision-making authority must remain with Seattle. Councilmember Gustafson expected that the Operating Board will have the ability to provide input.

DRAFT

Deputy Mayor Hansen said the surcharge provision seems fair, since it will be applied regionwide.

Councilmember Grossman thanked Ms. Driscoll and Ms. Regan for their report and for making the Council feel a part of the process. He reiterated that the assumption clause should protect Seattle but not prohibit assumption of the contract by a larger, financially stable organization, such as the City.

Deputy Mayor Hansen commended the Water District Commissioners for a good contract and the hard work done on this over the years.

Mr. Burkett said he would follow up and officially convey the approval of the overall contract and the desire to resolve the outstanding issue.

- (b) Discussion regarding the joint operation of the Spartan Gym by the City of Shoreline and Shoreline School District

Ms. Barry described the Shoreline School District (SSD) renovation of the Spartan Gym, noting it is retaining exclusive use of about 7,200 square feet. Approximately 4,000 square feet remains to be developed by the City. She reported that the joint operations plan has already been endorsed by the School Board.

Ms. Barry outlined the key points of the plan:

- SSD provides the land, building and the newly-renovated facility;
- the City operates, supervises and schedules recreation programs and collects and retains fees;
- costs and usage will be reviewed on an annual basis;
- generally, SSD will have priority for use during school hours and the City at other times;
- the City commits to supervision of 68 percent of the facility initially and to completion of a \$650,000 renovation that will add multi-purpose rooms and other support facilities;
- once these improvements are completed, the City will provide supervision of 80 percent of the building;
- the City will pay for all utilities; and
- SSD will pay for routine maintenance and custodial services, with major maintenance costs being shared.

Ms. Barry reviewed the fiscal impacts and the implementing steps to be brought back to Council: 1) an addendum to the Joint Use Agreement; 2) an amendment to the City's fee ordinance to include Spartan Gym rental/drop-in fees; and 3) an agreement for project management for design and construction of the multi-purpose rooms.

Deputy Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

DRAFT

(a) Paul Lesch, SSD Athletic Director, commented that the Shoreline Conference Center is meant to be a community gathering place. This joint use plan moves in this direction. He commended the City staff for the outstanding job it did in putting the proposal together.

(b) Ros Bird, speaking on behalf of the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council, asked that part of the multi-purpose space be devoted to visual arts. She asserted the need for such a space and noted that the City offers some classes that could use such a space.

(c) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, praised the remodel and asked about the use of the gym floor by folk dancing groups.

Ms. Barry said the planning for the undeveloped space will be worked through with all stakeholders and policies and procedures for all users and spaces will be developed.

Councilmember Montgomery supported the proposal. She asked about repair of vandalism and the provision for City payment for utilities. Ms. Barry explained that the City will supervise the building most of the time, which is why it will take responsibility for repair of vandalism. When identifiable, damages will be assessed to the rental group responsible for the damage. She reiterated that costs and uses will be reviewed annually to assure the agreement continues to give each party "a fair shake."

Councilmember Ransom was also pleased by the agreement, which culminates many years of effort. Noting the remaining remodeling is basically to the interior of the building, he felt the projection of \$160/square foot is high. Ms. Barry said the proposed improvements include a kitchen, locker rooms and perhaps traffic revisions, increased parking and other exterior improvements. Therefore, the calculation will involve more than the 4,000 square feet.

Councilmember Ransom supported visual arts space and perhaps a place for music. Ms. Barry explained that the rooms created in the 4,000 square feet will probably be the size of average classrooms.

Councilmember Grossman was glad to see the City and the School District working together. His concern was that the City's recreation programs are focused on parks and outdoor activities. He did not want to see operation of the Spartan Gym distract from this focus. He was surprised at the extra operating costs and felt the Spartan Gym should be self-supporting. He also wished to ensure that Lake Forest Park residents pay the same fees as Shoreline residents, since they are part of the SSD and paid their share of the bond issue that funded the remodel.

Ms. Barry said the City's policy has been to have one fee for residents and non-residents. The proposed rental fees are based on SSD policies. Private groups pay more than City or SSD groups. Councilmember Grossman felt this is appropriate. He asserted that the language in the packet does not reflect this.

DRAFT

Councilmember Gustafson said this joint operating agreement reflects the vision of many people since 1986 who worked to make the Shoreline Conference Center a community facility. He said the operating plan is a working document, and he has items he would like to see added or changed. However, he was proud to be working with the SSD to develop outstanding facilities for the community.

Councilmember Gustafson recommended that the City join SSD in upgrading the equipment in the weight room. He hoped Council would discuss this at the retreat. He also wanted to see the involvement of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee in the development and use of the Spartan Gym.

Deputy Mayor Hansen expressed Council consensus to move forward.

9. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) Ordinance No. 283 amending Ordinance No. 224 contract Zone 1999-01 (Shoreline Village Townhomes)

Rachael Markle, Senior Planner, reviewed the background on the contract zone for the Shoreline Village Townhomes at the west side of 15th Avenue NE and NE 166th Street. The amendment, which is being considered under the new Development Code, replaces 32 parking spaces with 16 two-car garages and replaces eight duplexes with four buildings containing a total of sixteen units. The changes in the site plan open up approximately 4,000 square feet of additional open space. Ms. Markle reviewed the conditions in the contract zone that are deleted, added or amended and gave the reasons for doing so. She concluded that the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposal, at which only the property owner and his agent testified. The Planning Commission unanimously recommends the amended contract zone.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to pass Ordinance No. 283. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.

Councilmember Grossman supported the changes and expressed some concern that the original proposal was approved in January 2000 and that the project is still not completed.

Councilmember Ransom wished to ensure that the Planning Commission reviewed all the information presented to Council. Ms. Markle said the only change to the Council material was that the project was vested under the 1995 Storm Water Design Manual rather than the 1998 version.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and Ordinance No. 283, amending contract zone 1999-01 for Shoreline Village Townhomes, was approved.

- (b) Resolution No. 179 opposing the inclusion of Pt. Wells

DRAFT

on King County's list of final candidates for the Brightwater Wastewater Treatment Plant

Mr. Burkett explained that the resolution before Council follows up on the July 16 workshop discussion of the possible listing of Pt. Wells as a final candidate site for the Brightwater Wastewater Treatment Plant. He noted that he and Mayor Jepsen had met with King County Executive Ron Sims on this issue. Executive Sims recommended that the Shoreline City Council formalize its position in a resolution.

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, briefly reviewed the elements of the revised resolution, noting it emphasizes why the site does not meet the siting criteria and is not a good choice from a regional perspective, as well as what the impacts would be to the City of Shoreline. It also highlights the other regional facilities that Shoreline already hosts. He concluded that staff has written a transmittal letter for Resolution No. 179, which all Councilmembers will be asked to sign.

Deputy Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

(a) Koreen Balluff, 20121 24th Avenue NW, wished to add other points to the resolution: 1) soil contamination at the site might increase costs; 2) the need for an easement across the Burlington Northern tracks might complicate siting and increase costs; and 3) it is questionable that the site can meet the threshold requirement under the Shoreline Management Act that it be a water dependent use. She asked why the County would wish to use shoreline for a wastewater treatment facility. She also asked for further information on "dewatering". Finally, she noted that there was some discussion of "hiring a professional" to lobby for the City in this matter. She wondered if this should be included in the resolution.

Councilmember Montgomery moved to adopt Resolution No. 179 (as presented in revised form this evening). Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.

Councilmembers Grossman and Montgomery asked about the addition of the points raised by the speaker. Deputy Mayor Hansen responded that Ms. Balluff raised good points via e-mail as well, but the City is out of time in terms of finalizing the resolution.

Mr. Bauer added that the resolution is not meant to be exhaustive. He agreed Ms. Balluff brought up other points that can be included in the discussion.

Councilmember Gustafson wished to ensure that these additional points, particularly the question regarding the Shoreline Management Act, be brought up in the future.

A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 5 – 0, and Resolution No. 179, opposing the inclusion of Pt. Wells on King County's list of final candidates for the Brightwater Wastewater Treatment Plant, was adopted.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

DRAFT

(a) Kelly Swenson, 2308 N 149th Street, spoke in support of the Aurora Corridor improvements.

(b) Dale Wright, 18546 Burke Avenue N, represented "Citizens for a Safer Aurora," a group that supports the Aurora Corridor concept because it will improve all of the following: 1) pedestrian safety; 2) traffic safety and capacity; 3) the business environment; 4) transit flow and usage; 5) drainage systems; and 6) aesthetics. He said it was difficult to achieve these goals through a design that also satisfies the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. He emphasized that the design was arrived at through an open public process and it represents a consensus of what the citizens of Shoreline want the Aurora Corridor to be. He opposed changes to the design because then many of the goals and objectives of the project would not be achieved.

(c) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, commented that the room in the Spartan Gym designated for dancing is too small for some folk dance groups. He gave an example of a contra dance group looking for a new floor that would need a larger space. Noting dancing is a healthy and athletic activity, he hoped this space need will be taken into consideration in future planning.

11. ADJOURNMENT


At 9:15 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: September 10, 2001

Agenda Item: 7(b)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of August 31, 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 \$5,086,304.48 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for July 22 through August 04 in the amount of \$309,736.82 paid with check/voucher numbers 2930, 6029-6096, 320001-320137, and benefit checks 9739 through 9749.

Payroll and benefits for August 05 through August 18 in the amount of \$335,263.78 paid with check/voucher numbers 2931-2933, 6037 (voided), 6097-6146, 340001-340126, and benefit checks 9951 through 9962.

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on August 10, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$87,492.83 paid on Expense Register dated 08/03/01 with the following claim checks: 9642-9662 and

Expenses in the amount of \$3,044,878.45 paid on Expense Register dated 08/03/2001 with the following claim checks: 9663-9677 and

Expenses in the amount of \$32,144.89 paid on Expense Register dated 08/07/2001 with the following claim checks: 9678-9702 and

Expenses in the amount of \$28,206.41 paid on Expense Register dated 08/08/2001 with the following claim checks: 9703-9712 and

Expenses in the amount of \$4,329.52 paid on Expense Register dated 08/09/2001 with the following claim checks: 9713-9720.

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on August 17, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$43,427.07 paid on Expense Register dated 08/10/2001 with the following claim checks: 9721-9738 and

Expenses in the amount of \$8,220.60 paid on Expense Register dated 08/14/2001 with the following claim checks: 9750-9761 and

Expenses in the amount of \$64,533.42 paid on Expense Register dated 08/14/2001 with the following claim checks: 9762-9772 and

Expenses in the amount of \$19,372.09 paid on Expense Register dated 08/14/2001 with the following claim checks: 9773-9788 and

Expenses in the amount of \$13,613.86 paid on Expense Register dated 08/16/2001 with the following claim checks: 9789-9802 and

Expenses in the amount of \$31,985.21 paid on Expense Register dated 08/16/2001 with the following claim checks: 9803-9818 and

Expenses in the amount of \$524,265.50 paid on Expense Register dated 08/17/2001 with the following claim checks: 9819-9834.

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on August 24, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$19,405.28 paid on Expense Register dated 08/20/2001 with the following claim checks: 9835-9853 and

Expenses in the amount of \$54,297.70 paid on Expense Register dated 08/20/2001 with the following claim checks: 9854-9875 and

Expenses in the amount of \$12,522.84 paid on Expense Register dated 08/21/2001 with the following claim checks: 9876-9892 and

Expenses in the amount of \$11,691.76 paid on Expense Register dated 08/22/2001 with the following claim checks: 9893-9908 and

Expenses in the amount of \$214,242.22 paid on Expense Register dated 08/22/2001 with the following claim checks: 9909-9923 and

Expenses in the amount of \$48,749.94 paid on Expense Register dated 08/24/2001 with the following claim checks: 9924-9933 and

Expenses in the amount of \$6,786.21 paid on Expense Register dated 08/24/2001 with the following claim checks: 9934-9950.

The following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on August 31, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of \$93,884.47 paid on Expense Register dated 08/27/2001 with the following claim checks: 9963-9972 and

Expenses in the amount of \$5,149.11 paid on Expense Register dated 08/28/2001 with the following claim checks: 9973-9980 and

Expenses in the amount of \$72,104.50 paid on Expense Register dated 08/28/2001 with the following claim checks: 9981-9989.

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

Council Meeting Date: September 10, 2001

Agenda Item: 7(c)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Design Services Contract with KPG in the Amount not to Exceed \$525,000 for the North City Business District Improvement Project |
| DEPARTMENT: | Public Works |
| PRESENTED BY: | William L. Conner, Public Works Director |

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: Council took action on July 23rd to approve the addition of the North City Subarea Plan to the City's Comprehensive Plan. The implementation of this plan will require the design and construction of capital improvements relating to required transportation changes and traffic mitigation. The City also included capital improvement support for this program in the City's adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The City is ready to initiate the design process and is proposing to contract with KPG for the North City Business District Improvement Project.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED: The following provides a brief summary of the alternatives available for Council's consideration:

- Authorizes the City Manager to execute a design services contract with KPG in the amount not to exceed \$525,000.
- Reject all of the proposals and direct staff to re-advertise for engineering design services for the project.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The 2001 CIP Budget for design is \$700,000 from the Roads Capital Fund. The project budget provides sufficient funding to pay for the design services contract with KPG.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a design services contract with KPG in an amount not to exceed \$525,000 for the North City Business District Improvement Project.

Approved By:

City Manager 

City Attorney 

INTRODUCTION

The North City Business District Improvement Project is identified in the City's Capital Improvement Program. Staff prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from professional engineering services firms to complete the design aspect of the project. The RFP was published in the Seattle Times on August 1, 2001 and the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce on August 1 and August 6, 2001. A total of four proposals were received. Staff evaluated the qualifications of the consultants and selected one firm with qualifications and experience that are in accordance with the City's requirements and standards. Staff has identified the consulting firm of KPG and is recommending that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a design services contract with this firm.

BACKGROUND

On July 23, 2001, Council approved Ordinance No. 281 amending the City's Development Code and adding the North City Subarea Plan. Ordinance No. 281 included comments and mitigation recommendations from the State Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). The adoption and implementation of the North City Subarea Plan is Goal No. 7 of your Council's 2000 – 2001 Work Plan.

Since approval of the North City Subarea Plan, staff prepared the RFP to solicit proposals from professional engineering firms to design the street improvement aspect of the project. The highlights of the scope of work for the project identified in the RFP for the North City Business District (NCBD) (15th Ave NE from approximately NE 172nd St. to NE 182nd St.) include: the under-grounding of overhead utilities, reconfiguring the present four lane cross section to include one travel lane in each direction with a two-way left-turn lane, the addition of parallel on-street parking that may be converted to a travel lane for peak hour commuting hours, and modification of existing traffic signals and street lighting.

The 15th Avenue streetscape will encourage redevelopment of the area by creating a pedestrian friendly atmosphere for residents, business owners and customers visiting the NCBD. The City has also adopted design criteria as part of this process.

Other services associated with this project that may be included in future phases of the proposed design contract include the preparation of grant application packages, right-of-way acquisition, and/or construction engineering. The consultant teams that responded to the City's RFP were informed that they may be asked to continue into these subsequent phases of the project if funded and were asked to structure the consultant teams accordingly. The City has reserved the right to solicit for statements of qualifications from interested consultants for these subsequent phases of the project at a later date should your Council determine it would be in it's best interest to do so.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Staff received proposals from four engineering consulting firms. The following provides a summary of the firms that submitted proposals and the criteria used to select the finalist.

- KPG
- Perteet Engineering Inc.
- KPFF
- INCA Engineering

The proposals were evaluated using the following criteria:

- Consultant's experience in performing the type of work requested
- Demonstrated ability to perform the work requested within an established budget and schedule
- Method and approach to providing the requested services
- Experience of key personnel assigned to this project
- Previous experience on similar municipal projects
- References

Based on the evaluation of the proposals, staff recommends the firm of KPG to design the street improvement aspect of the North City Business District Improvement Project. The completion of the street design fulfills a key role in the development of the overall project. KPG possesses the expertise and the proven reputation of completing projects of this nature. They have prior experience of completing these types of projects for the City.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a design services contract with KPG in an amount not to exceed \$525,000 for the North City Business District Improvement Project.

Council Meeting Date: September 10, 2001

Agenda Item: 7(d)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Passage of Resolution No. 180 Approving the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of Ronald Wastewater District with Comments
DEPARTMENT: City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY: Kristoff T. Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: State law requires that special purpose districts prepare comprehensive system plans every six years and submit those plans to the city(ies) in which they operate for review and comment. The Ronald Wastewater District provided the City with a copy of their proposed system plan in April, 2001. The District has requested that the City pass the proposed resolution approving their comprehensive plan in order to place the District in a favorable position for acquiring bond financing for the acquisition of Seattle Public Utilities' sewer service system within Shoreline.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED: Staff has reviewed the District's comprehensive system plan for consistency with City policies adopted as part of the City's comprehensive plan. Staff identified two issues for clarification with the District. These are discussed in the letter included as Exhibit A to the proposed resolution. Staff has analyzed the following alternatives:

- Pass the proposed resolution, which specifically references the two issues raised by staff. This should allow the District to obtain its financing and create an appropriate record to facilitate resolution of these issues. (Recommended)
- Take no action on the proposed resolution and direct staff to take more affirmative action to seek changes in the District's comprehensive system plan to address issues. This may interfere with the District's efforts to finance the proposed acquisition of additional service territory.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: None.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council pass Resolution No. 180 Approving the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of Ronald Wastewater District with Comments

Approved By:

City Manager  City Attorney 

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A – Resolution No. 180 Approving the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of Ronald Wastewater District with Comments

RESOLUTION NO. 180

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON,
APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE SEWER PLAN OF RONALD
WASTEWATER DISTRICT, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of Ronald Wastewater District, King County, Washington (the "District") by Resolution No. 01-19, adopted the District's Comprehensive Sewer Plan, as added to and amended, and set forth as Exhibit A to such resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District was provided to the City of Shoreline on April 13, 2001, as required by RCW 57.16.010; and

WHEREAS, the City has reviewed such plan and provided comments to the District as attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to approve the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District;

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

Section 1. After due consideration, and fully being advised, the City Council finds that the Comprehensive Sewer Plan of the District should be, and it hereby is, approved subject to the comments articulated in the letter attached hereto as Exhibit A.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk



EXHIBIT A

City of Shoreline

17544 Midvale Avenue North
Shoreline, Washington 98133-4921
(206) 546-1700 ♦ FAX (206) 546-2200

August 21, 2001

Diane Pottinger
Ronald Wastewater District
PO Box 33490
Shoreline WA 98133

RE: City of Shoreline Comments regarding Ronald Wastewater District
Comprehensive Sewer Plan, Vol. I, Dated April 2001

Dear Diane,

The intent of this letter is to provide you with City of Shoreline comments regarding the Ronald Wastewater District Comprehensive Sewer Plan, Volume I, dated April 2001. In addition, we have tentatively scheduled a City Council consent calendar item on September 10, 2001 to consider a resolution on your plan. Although it is a consent item, which typically are not discussed, it may be prudent to have a representative attend the meeting should the Council elect to pull the item from consent calendar for discussion. For the record, the transmittal letter (April 13, 2001 from Rodney Langer) that accompanied this plan did not clearly identify a specific action requested or a timeframe for that action; hence our confusion over the process.

Our comments on this plan are focussed on consistency between your plan and the City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan policies, and land use assumptions.

The following policies from the City of Shoreline Utility Element should be addressed in your plan, and followed as you implement your plan:

U-1: Promote the provision of utility services city-wide that meet service levels established in the Capital Facilities Element at reasonable rates.

U-4: Support the timely expansion, maintenance and replacement of utility infrastructure at designated service levels in order to match and meet expected demand for service.

U-17: Support efforts which will correct existing water and wastewater system deficiencies where deficiencies exist and ensure adequate infrastructure and services for all areas of the City.

The following comments respond to your *Population and Land Use* section. The comments are organized by the page number of your plan and we have included the portion of the text of that we are commenting on in italics followed by our comments.

3-5 Current zoning maps do not reflect the approved land use designations throughout the City of Shoreline.

We have been working with the Planning Commission and City Council since last fall to reconcile the two maps. The City Council adopted a consistent set of Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning maps on July 23, 2001.

3-6 Table 3.2 Land Use Population Density

The units per acre listed in your table assumed the "worst case" scenario for each land use designation. For example the table indicates that "Medium Density Residential" would result in 12 dwelling units per acre. Consistent zoning districts for this designation can either be R-8 (8 dwelling units/acre) or R-12 (12 dwelling units/acre). In the Final EIS (November 2, 1998) that was prepared for our Comprehensive Plan, the City assumed that on average (because both R-8 and R-12 designations would be used) we would see a density of 9 dwelling units per acre. We have included a copy of page 85 of our Final EIS so you are aware of all of our density assumptions for each Land Use Designation. Perhaps a statement could be added to your report indicating that "the highest intensity use was assumed for each land use designation in the City of Shoreline."

7-1 At this time there are only 19 known homes not connected to the District's system...16 are located in the City of Shoreline.

Your plan identifies a number of alternatives that current septic system owners could choose to utilize in order to secure sewer services from the District. We are concerned that this falls short of providing a plan to "correct existing wastewater system deficiencies where deficiencies exist and ensure adequate infrastructure and services for all areas of the City" consistent with policy U-17 above. The development of such a plan and how the City can support such an effort is a key issue that needs to be addressed.

We have no further comments at this time. Please contact Kristoff Bauer for information relating to our Council actions. Kristoff's number is 546.1297. If you have any other questions please call me at 546.3901.

Regards,



Kirk McKinley
Planning Manager

c. Phil Montgomery, General Manager, RWD

Attachment: Page 85 City of Shoreline Final EIS dated November 2, 1998.

LAND USE OPTION DETAILS - FEIS

| Description | Max FAR | DUs per Acre |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|
| R-1 - Low Density Residential (Single Family) | 0.5 | 6 |
| R-2 - Medium Density Residential (Duplex/Townhome) | 0.6 | 9 |
| R-3 - High Density Residential (Multi Family) | 0.7 | 20 |
| Mixed Use (3 separate in FEIS, combined in comp plan) | 0.75 | 8 |
| • MU1 | 1.0 | 12 |
| • MU2 | 2.5 | 15 |
| • MU3 | | |
| Comm1 - Community Business | 2.5 | 1.5 (avg.) |
| Comm2 - Regional Business | 2.5 | 1.5 (avg.) |
| Public Facilities, Single Family Institution | projections case-by-case | |
| Public Open Space, Private Open Space | 0 | 0 |
| Special Study Area | to be determined | |

The process for determining redevelopable land is as follows.

RDV Factors

RDV (Redevelopment) Factors were assigned to every parcel. Because of the different development potentials for each of the three land use options, each parcel actually has three RDV Factors for this project. The RDV Factor was determined by determining a Value Ratio (Building Value divided by Total Value). The Value Factor was then given to each parcel based upon the Value Ratio, per the following table:

| Value Ratio | Value Factor |
|----------------------|--------------|
| 0 | 0.99 |
| $0 < x \leq 0.20$ | 0.95 |
| $0.20 < x \leq 0.30$ | 0.90 |
| $0.30 < x \leq 0.40$ | 0.80 |
| $0.40 < x \leq 0.50$ | 0.71 |
| $0.50 < x \leq 0.75$ | 0.60 |
| $0.75 < x \leq 1.00$ | 0.30 |
| > 1.00 | 0.10 |

FARs (Floor-Area Ratios) were then calculated for each parcel by dividing the building floor area by the land area. The FARs then needed to be adjusted by the potential land use option. For example single family developments generally are allowed a maximum FAR of 0.5. If a parcel has a FAR of 0.49, the FAR would be adjusted by dividing the actual by the maximum allowed, to result in an adjusted FAR of 0.98, to show that it is very close to the

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Commute Trip Reduction Agreement with King County
DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY: Tim Stewart, Planning & Development Services Director
Sarah Bohlen, Transportation Planner

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT

The state Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) law directs city governments to manage programs that encourage commuting by carpool/vanpool, public transit and alternative forms of transportation. In the past, Shoreline has complied with this law by contracting with King County to provide Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) assistance, program development and review services. This contract, which will continue the relationship, is for \$12,372, and is valid for one year retroactive to July 1, 2001. Council took action on August 20th to accept funding from the state to cover the cost of this program.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

- Execute the proposed interlocal agreement – The City will be in compliance with State Law by maintaining a CTR program. (Recommended)
- Reject the proposed interlocal agreement – The City would still be required to comply with the CTR law, and would need to assign staff to perform the legal requirements for site surveying, compliance monitoring, and technical support.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The City has previously accepted two grants from the State of Washington for the total amount of \$15,274.43. By approving this contract the City will agree to spend \$12,372 of this grant money, as well as comply with the terms of the grants. Unexpended grant funds will be utilized for commute trip reduction purposes.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to sign a CTR Implementation Act Agreement with King County for Commute Trip Reduction services.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

INTRODUCTION

The proposed Commute Trip Reduction Act Implementation Agreement with King County is intended to continue an existing program whereby King County Commute Trip Reduction Services provides Shoreline with assistance in ensuring that Shoreline and Shoreline sites are in compliance with the State CTR law. The sequence of funding to support CTR in Shoreline is outlined as follows:

- Shoreline receives funding from the State to implement the CTR law. On August 20th, Council considered the Interlocal Agreement with the State of Washington to receive \$9,231.63 in State grant funding to administer the Commute Trip Reduction law in Shoreline.
- Shoreline was awarded a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant to enhance our CTR program, which your Council has already accepted. The grant amount is \$6,042.80 and requires a local match of \$943.07, for a total of \$6,985.87. This money must be spent by September 30, 2002. This year's contract with King County will utilize 75% of these funds, and the remaining 25% will be used to supplement next year's program.
- Shoreline contracts with King County to provide CTR Act Implementation Services (the current agenda item). The Council has approved similar contracted services with King County CTR Services the past several years. This year's program cost is \$12,372, compared to last year's annual cost of \$11,067 for the same time period. The increase is due to the additional program items supported by the CMAQ funds.

Any remaining money from the State grant not spent on the implementation agreement with King County will be spent by the Planning and Development Services Department on CTR related work. This may include the administration of contracts, regional coordination, and transportation tasks or programs related to improving alternative access to the six CTR sites. Through King County Metro CTR Services we send the Employee Transportation Coordinators for each site to training classes to keep them up to date with the CTR law and with incentives and programs aimed at reducing single occupant vehicle use.

King County Commute Trip Reduction Services provides services to most cities in King County. They will provide technical assistance to the six CTR sites in Shoreline, as well as promotional materials, and will ensure that all sites meet all requirements of the state CTR law. This includes ensuring that annual reports are submitted on time and accurate, conducting site surveys, and holding quarterly meetings with all six Employee Transportation Coordinators. In addition, Metro attends, monitors and shares information and issues with staff from all regional and state CTR forums, including the Governors CTR Task Force, and King County Coordinating Committee meetings. They also track CTR related legislative issues for us. The six CTR sites in Shoreline include: Shoreline Community College, Washington State Department of Transportation, Crista Ministries Campus, State of Washington Public Health Lab (Fircrest), Fircrest School, and City of Shoreline City Hall campus.

The City is required by State law to ensure that CTR programs are maintained year round. The proposed contract covers the time period from July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to sign a CTR Implementation Act Agreement with King County for Commute Trip Reduction services.

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider the Proposed Use of 2002 Community Development Block Grant Funding and Authorize the City Manager to Sign the Contracts to Implement Approved Programs and Projects |
| DEPARTMENT: | Health and Human Services |
| PRESENTED BY: | Rob Beem, Health and Human Services Manager Bethany Wolbrecht-Dunn, Grant Specialist |

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: Each year the City must hold a public hearing and adopt the proposed use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding. In September of 2000 Council adopted the 2001/2002 Health and Human Services Funding Plan directing the use of CDBG and General Funds to support Public Services through 2002 and CDBG Capital funding for fiscal year 2001. In July 2001, staff reconvened the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee that developed the 2001/2002 funding plan to make recommendations for 2002 CDBG Capital funding.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED: After holding a public hearing on proposed 2002 CDBG spending, Council has two alternatives to consider:

1. Council could take action to approve the 2002 CDBG spending plan for services and capital projects as recommended by the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee and authorize the City Manager to take the actions necessary to implement these spending objectives. (Recommended)
2. Council could make changes to the recommended spending plan in response to public testimony or to reflect a change in Council policy objectives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The City of Shoreline will receive approximately \$363,848 in Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in 2002 (which includes \$40,000 from a canceled 2000 project). Final amounts are contingent upon the passage of the City's budget and the federal budget.

RECOMMENDATION

After holding a public hearing, staff recommends that Council adopt the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee's recommended 2002 CDBG allocations in accordance with Attachment A and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing the funded projects.

Approved By:

City Manager

KJD

City Attorney

U/A

INTRODUCTION

Each year, the Council must hold a public hearing on the proposed use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and take action to adopt the allocation. This year's allocations implement the 2-Year HHS Funding Plan for services and new applications received for capital spending. CDBG funding is proposed to be used for Planning & Administration, Housing Repair, Public Services and Capital Projects.

BACKGROUND

On September 11, 2000, the Council adopted the 2001/2002 Health and Human Services Funding Plan that directs the use of CDBG and General Funds to support Public Services for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 and CDBG Capital funding for fiscal year 2001. On May 14, 2001, Council approved the process for the review and recommendation of CDBG Capital projects for 2002. As approved by Council, staff reconvened the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee that developed the allocation plan for 2001/2002 to review and recommend CDBG Capital projects for funding.

While the Council adopted the allocation plan for the support of Public Services through 2002, the City is required to hold a public hearing each year on the proposed use of all CDBG funded projects. As part of this report, you will see the CDBG Public Service projects previously approved for 2002 and the CDBG Capital Projects that have been recommended for funding for 2002.

Community Development Block Grant Program

The Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program was created under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The primary objective of the community development program is the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income. CDBG funds can be used for the following activities: acquisition and rehabilitation of housing for low-income and special needs populations; housing repair for homeowners and renters; acquisition and rehabilitation of community facilities; public infrastructure improvements; delivery of human services; historic preservation; planning; CDBG program administration; and economic development. CDBG funds can serve households with incomes up to 80% of the King County median income.

The following figures represent a close estimate of the CDBG funds that will be available to the City in 2002. These funds will be confirmed or adjusted after the adoption of the Federal budget. Shoreline's estimate of available CDBG funds is as follows:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Public (human) services ¹ | \$ 55,909 |
| 2. Planning & Administration ² | \$ 44,883 |
| 3. King County Housing Repair Fund | \$155,000 |
| 4. Capital projects ³ | <u>\$108,056</u> |
| | \$363,848 |

2002 CDBG Public Services Allocation

In April 2000, Council made the decision to allocate all funding for Health and Human Services in the City of Shoreline through a bi-annual competitive application process. On September 11, 2000, Council approved the 2001/2002 Health and Human Services Funding Plan that outlined the funding amounts for Public Service projects using both General Fund and CDBG funding. The yearly amounts for projects are listed in Attachment A along with the proposed capital spending. The amounts listed for 2002 were contingent on successful performance of the project's performance measures and funding availability. The projects recommended for funding with CDBG in 2002 are listed below.

CDBG Public Service Projects Recommended for Funding, 2002

| Applicant | Project Description | 2002 |
|--|---|----------|
| Center for Human Services-Anger Management | CHS provides anger management services for Shoreline youth and their families. | \$10,909 |
| East/North Healthy Start | Provides voluntary home-based services to new parents under the age of 22 who are pregnant with or parenting an infant 6 months or younger. | \$9,000 |
| Hopelink – Emergency Services | Provides to 3000 low-income Shoreline residents basic and emergency needs including food, financial assistance, shelter, as well as information and referral. | \$11,500 |
| Hopelink – Kenmore Shelter | Provision of nine units of emergency shelter in Kenmore Shelter; case management services; and first months rent payments for homeless families. | \$8,000 |

¹ Federal regulations mandate that not more than 15% of the total CDBG entitlement can be allocated to public service projects. This amount represents the maximum CDBG funds that the City can allocate to public services, as determined by the CDBG Consortium.

² This amount represents the maximum allowable percentage for planning and administration under the Department of HUD regulations. In order to fund the administration of the City's CDBG program, this is the staff recommended funding level.

³ This amount represents the remainder of the CDBG funds after public service, planning and administration, and King County Housing Repair Fund allocations are determined. This amount also includes \$40,000 from a FY2000 project that was cancelled.

| Applicant | Project Description | 2002 |
|---|--|-----------------|
| The Homelessness Project of The Church Council of Greater Seattle | THP provides transitional housing and case management to homeless single-parent families. | \$5,000 |
| Food Lifeline | Supplies food to Neighbors in Need Food Bank, solicitation of donations from the food industry and the public. | \$5,000 |
| Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline | Provides an emergency response to the nutritional needs of people in crisis hunger situations and resource counseling. | \$6,500 |
| Total | | \$55,909 |

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

After holding a public hearing on the 2002 proposed CDBG spending plan, Council has two main alternatives, i.e. it can accept the spending proposal as recommended by the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee and staff, or revise that spending plan based upon testimony provided during the public hearing or other concerns. The process for developing the capital spending portion of the proposed plan is discussed in detail in the following section.

2002 CDBG Capital Allocation

The 2001/2002 Health and Human Services Funding Plan allocated CDBG Capital funding for 2001 only. To allocate 2002 CDBG Capital funding, the City sent letters to a list of over 60 "interested parties" announcing the availability of applications for Shoreline's 2002 CDBG Capital funding. An announcement of application availability was also placed in the Seattle Times and The Enterprise in April. An applicants' conference was held in conjunction with the North and East Funders Group. Five eligible applications were received, requesting a total of \$305,736 (\$197,680 more than is available).

The Committee received the applications prior to their meeting on July 24th, scored the individual applications, and then met to discuss and recommend allocations. The members of the Committee are listed in Attachment B. When they met, the Committee reviewed and evaluated each application based on a set of criteria that address the project need, feasibility, and collaboration (Attachment C). A detailed review of the scoring and decision rationale can be found in Attachment D.

CDBG Capital Projects Recommended for Funding, 2002

| Applicant | Project | Request | Recommendation |
|---------------------------|--|----------|----------------|
| Center for Human Services | Project would provide building improvements, including HVAC system and signage | \$69,662 | \$58,056 |
| Compass Center | Transitional housing for veterans | \$36,074 | \$5,000 |

| Applicant | Project | Request | Recommendation |
|------------------------------------|--|----------|------------------|
| Hearing, Speech, & Deafness Center | Community facility to provide services | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
| King County Housing Authority | Fire alarm system in Northridge apartments | \$40,000 | \$40,000 |
| Total | | | \$108,056 |

CDBG Capital Projects Not Recommended for Funding, 2002

| Applicant | Project | Request | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Shoreline Public Works Department | Aurora Avenue N. curb ramps | \$150,000 | No funding |
| Total | | \$150,000 | |

RECOMMENDATION

After holding a public hearing, staff recommends that Council adopt the Health and Human Services Allocation Committee's recommended 2002 CDBG allocations in accordance with Attachment A and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing the funded projects.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: 2002 CDBG Funding and Contingency Plan
- Attachment B: Health and Human Services Allocation Committee
- Attachment C: CDBG Capital Scoring Sheets
- Attachment D: 2002 CDBG Capital Project Scoring and Funding Recommendation

ATTACHMENT A

2002 CDBG Funding and Contingency Plan

2002 CDBG Proposed Allocations

| Project | Funding Amount |
|---|------------------|
| CDBG Planning & Administration | \$44,883 |
| CDBG Housing Repair | \$155,000 |
| Center for Human Services-Anger Management | \$10,909 |
| East/North Healthy Start (Formerly Shoreline Healthy Start) | \$9,000 |
| Hopelink – Emergency Services | \$11,500 |
| Hopelink – Kenmore Shelter | \$8,000 |
| The Homelessness Project of The Church Council of Greater Seattle | \$5,000 |
| Food Lifeline | \$5,000 |
| Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline | \$6,500 |
| Center for Human Services-Facility Improvements | \$58,056 |
| Compass Center- Transitional Housing for Veterans | \$5,000 |
| Hearing, Speech, & Deafness Center-Community Facility | \$5,000 |
| King County Housing Authority-Fire Alarm System | \$40,000 |
| Total | \$363,848 |

2002 CDBG Funding Contingency Plan

Since the CDBG funds are an estimate from the federal government, Shoreline must also adopt a contingency plan to deal with possible variations in the amount available. Plans must be made in case the amount available increases or decreases by up to 10% of the amount currently estimated. In addition, if an applicant later declines funds, the adoption of a contingency plan of action will expedite the process of reallocation.

1. If additional funding becomes available:

a. **Public Services**

In the event CDBG Public Service funds are increased in 2002, any additional funds would be provided to the Center for Human Services, up to \$3,280. After that amount is met, the next \$120 would be provided to East/North Healthy Start. Additional funds would then be provided to the Hopelink-Emergency Services (\$2,100).

b. Capital Projects

If additional CDBG Capital funds become available to the City in 2002, the Committee recommends awarding funds to the Center for Human Services to a total award of \$69,662 (their requested amount). This project scored well among the capital projects and was the only local community agency not fully funded. If funds in excess of the amount needed to fund the Center for Human Services at \$69,662 become available or the Center for Human Services is unable to use these funds, the balance should be added to the Compass Center's Transitional Housing Project.

c. Planning & Administration

First, If additional CDBG Planning & Administration funds become available to the City in 2002, it is recommended that the City use these funds for planning and administration purposes. Secondly, if the City is allowed to use additional Planning & Administration funds if they are available in King County's planning ceiling (the maximum amount allowed by HUD for planning and administration activities which cannot exceed 20% of the County's additional entitlement plus program income), they City will do so up to \$5,000 and will reduce the amount allocated to the Housing Repair Program to \$150,000.

2. If funding reductions are necessary:

a. Public Services:

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are reduced in 2002, the Committee recommends that the first loss of funds (up to \$1,500) come from the Center for Human Services allocation. The next reductions would come from Emergency Feeding Program (up to \$1,000), Hopelink-Shelter (\$2,000), and Hopelink-Emergency Services (\$1,000).

b. Capital Projects. In the event the City's 2002 CDBG Capital Funds are reduced, the Committee recommends first reducing King County Housing Association-Northridge (up to \$5,000 reduction). If any further reductions are necessary, it is recommended that the Hearing, Speech, & Deafness Center project is cancelled.

c. Planning & Administration. If a reduction is necessary in CDBG Planning & Administration funds in 2002, it is recommended that the City reduce the amount to be used funds for planning and administration purpose.

ATTACHMENT B

Health and Human Services Allocation Committee

Citizen Members

- Ron Greeley
- Scott Keeny
- Toni Lindquist
- Edith Loyer Nelson
- Christine Smith

Staff Member

- Eric Swansen

ATTACHMENT C

CDBG Capital Scoring Sheets

CITY OF SHORELINE 2001-2002 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CAPITAL APPLICATIONS

RATING SHEET

Applicant Name: _____ Project Name: _____

Instructions: Please complete a rating sheet for each application. Please fill in the agency information at the top of this page.

Please assign point values to criteria 1-8 below. The point range for each criterion is listed to the left: ex. 1. Local Needs: point range 0-15. For the purposes of this rating process, zero is the lowest value with values increasing according to the proposal's ability to address the criteria. Please add comments in the space provided, if you wish. Comments will help staff understand ratings.

| Criteria | Score | Comments |
|---|-------|----------|
| 1. LOCAL NEEDS: point range 0-15 (questions 2,5) a. Does the applicant adequately state the need and how this proposal will positively affect that need? b. Will this project have a positive impact in Shoreline? If so, how much of an impact? How many Shoreline residents will be served by this project? c. Will this project strengthen the City of Shoreline's infrastructure and community facilities? | | |
| 2. ACCESSIBILITY: point range 0-10 (question 11) a. Is the agency meeting ADA requirements? b. Does the project meet ADA requirements or seek to minimize physical barriers to access public facilities for persons with disabilities? | | |
| 3. PURPOSE: point range 0-15 (questions 3,4) a. Does the project help Shoreline to develop as a healthy, safe, and economically prosperous community? b. Does this project strengthen the City of Shoreline's infrastructure and community facilities? c. Does this project assist in creating opportunities for affordable housing creation and/or rehabilitation? d. Does this project support economic development projects, which contribute to the enhancement of the community's tax base and market vitality? <i>(Note: Projects are not expected to address each item above, but should address either a, b, c, or d. In order to rate the applications, it should be determined how well each project could potentially address either a, b, c, or d.)</i> | | |
| 4. OUTCOMES: point range 0-10 a. Will the project or the services provided by the agency requesting funding for the project assist the City in obtaining any of its Desired Outcomes for Health and Human Services? | | |

| Criteria | Score | Comments |
|---|-------|----------|
| 5. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 (question 7) a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the project? | | |
| 6. DIVERSITY: point range 0-10 a. Does the proposal help to ensure that health and human services reflect and are sensitive to the cultural, racial, economic, age, ability level, and social diversity of Shoreline? b. Does the proposal work at reducing programmatic barriers to services and supports? (e.g., language/interpretation, provide childcare, transportation, alternate service hours, etc.) | | |
| 7. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-20 (questions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13) a. Does the applicant provide evidence that the project will succeed? b. Is the applicant stable and does the agency have the capacity to implement/maintain the program/project? c. Has the agency identified all of the resources necessary to complete the project? d. Is the project ready to proceed? e. Has the applicant been funded before? If yes, how have they performed (<i>Refer to summary information</i>)? | | |
| 8. FUNDING: point range 0-10 (questions 5, 8) a. Is the request reasonable, given type of project requested? Were accurate estimates obtained for proposed work? b. What is the cost benefit ratio (# of Shoreline residents served/cost of project)? c. If this is a regional project, is the request to Shoreline reasonable, relative to what others are paying? | | |

ATTACHMENT D

2002 CDBG Capital Project Scoring and Funding Recommendation

Priorities for Capital Projects

- Housing development
- Repairs to human service agency facilities
- City projects addressing the needs of specific populations

Recommended Capital Projects *Projects are listed in alphabetical order.*

1. The Center for Human Services – Facility Enhancements

Project: (1) Replace 6 electrical HVAC units with new energy-efficient mechanical HVAC units, including electrical work to bring up to current code; (2) Replace a portion of the outdoor neon sign to accurately portray services provided; (3) Re-paint exterior wood surfaces of building; and (4) Add sign with agency name on the awning over the front entrance of the building. This project is located in Shoreline.

Requested: \$69,622

Recommended: \$58,056

Source of funding: CDBG

Capital funds were allocated for 2001 (\$50,793) for other facility improvements. The project is progressing at a satisfactory rate.

The requested funds will be used to fund their listed items, in order.

Key Points of Committee's deliberations:

- The need for these improvements was clearly demonstrated in the application.
- Improvement will benefit a local Shoreline agency with a long history of serving Shoreline residents.
- Programs at the Center meet many of the City's Desired Outcomes.

Rating Criteria score: 521 points out of a possible 600 points.

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| BUDGET | | |
| City of Shoreline | \$ 58,056 | (recommended) |
| CHS | \$ 3,000 | |
| Additional Fundraising | \$ 11,606 | |
| TOTAL | \$ 72,662 | |

2. Compass Center-Transitional Housing

Project: To construct a new 26-unit transitional housing project for formally homeless and disabled veterans, earning up to 30% of King County median income. The project will feature a community center and program offices where residents can access a range of social services including case management funded through the US Department of Veterans Affairs and the King County Veterans program, employment and vocational training, and life skills services. This project is located in Shoreline.

Requested: \$36,074

Recommended: \$5,000

Source of funding: CDBG

No previous funding.

Key points of the Committee's deliberations:

- Local financial support is a condition of King County Housing Finance Program funding (\$700,000).
- The project has operational funding in place.
- Clearly addresses community needs.
- Allows Shoreline to participate in a regional effort.

Rating Criteria score: 378 points out of 600 possible points.

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| BUDGET | | |
| City of Shoreline | \$ 5,000 | (recommended) |
| US Dept of VA | \$1,003,391 | |
| Federal Home Loan Bank | \$ 182,000 | |
| KC Housing Finance Prog. | \$ 700,000 | |
| Private Fundraising | \$ 558,109 | |
| WA Housing Trust Fund | \$ 685,000 | |
| TOTAL | \$3,133,500 | |

3. Hearing, Speech, & Deafness Center-Community Center Facility

Project: New construction of 30,000 square foot facility and 96 units of affordable housing. The project will include an internal courtyard and an underground, low-level, structured parking garage with 147 stalls. One building in the project will include 2 levels of project space and 5 floors of housing. A second building will include housing

and a large community room. This project is proposed for construction in Seattle, but will be accessible to, and will provide services to Shoreline residents.

Requested: \$10,000

Recommended: \$5,000

Source of funding: CDBG

No previous funding.

Key points of the Committee's deliberations:

- Funding proportionate to Shoreline residents' benefit.
- Agency capable of completing project.
- Strong and diverse funding support.
- Agency addresses a critical need.

Rating Criteria score: 379 points out of 600 possible points.

BUDGET

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| City of Shoreline | \$ 5,000 | (recommended) |
| City of Bellevue | \$ 25,000 | |
| City of Bothell | \$ 10,000 | |
| City of Kirkland | \$ 10,000 | |
| City of Redmond | \$ 10,000 | |
| City of Auburn | \$ 5,000 | |
| City of Renton | \$ 19,000 | |
| City of Federal Way | \$ 10,000 | |
| KC Small Cities CDGB | \$ 75,000 | |
| City of Seattle | \$ 165,000 | |
| WA Com. Reinvestment | \$3,214,620 | |
| Contribution from Agency | \$1,080,000 | |
| Capital Campaign | \$1,066,000 | |
| TOTAL | \$5,694,620 | |

4. King County Housing Authority Fire Alarm Installation for Northridge I & Northridge II

Project: Installation of a fire system in two-mid rise buildings housing the elderly and disabled. This project is located in Shoreline.

Requested: \$69,622

Recommended: \$58,056

Source of funding: CDBG

No previous funding.

The requested funds will be used to fund their listed items, in order.

Key Points of Committee's deliberations:

- Project addresses a life-safety issue.
- Agency is capable of completing project in a timely and efficient manner.
- High degree of local benefit.

Rating Criteria score: 515 points out of a possible 600 points.

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| BUDGET | | |
| City of Shoreline | \$ 40,000 | (recommended) |
| KC Housing Authority | \$ 268,750 | |
| TOTAL | \$ 308,750 | |

Capital Projects Not Recommended for Funding

5. Shoreline Public Works-Aurora Avenue N. Curb Ramps

Project: Construct curb ramps within the City of Shoreline along Aurora Avenue for increased accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Requested: \$150,000

Recommended: \$ 0

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| 1998 CDBG Funding: \$59,749 |
| 1999 CDBG Funding: \$100,000 |
| 2000 CDBG Funding: \$65,316 |
| 2001 CDBG Funding: \$80,622 |

Key points of the Committee's deliberations:

- Project addresses an important need.
- The amount requested would be a small portion of a very large project.
- CDBG funding not critical to project success.
- Construction not to begin until 2003.

Rating Criteria score: 521 points out of 600 possible points.

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| BUDGET | | |
| City of Shoreline CDBG | \$ 150,000 | (requested) |
| TIB, TPP | \$ 4,900,000 | |
| FHWA Regional TEA-21 | \$ 1,500,000 | |
| Shoreline 2002 TIP | \$ 813,410 | |
| FHWA Statewide TEA-21 | \$10,800,000 | |
| FHWA Demo Program | \$ 4,980,000 | |
| FHWA TCSP | \$ 938,500 | |
| TOTAL | \$24,081,910 | |

Council Meeting Date: September 10, 2001

Agenda Item: 9(a)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Authorize The City Manager To Execute An Addendum To The Joint Use Agreement Between The Shoreline School District And The City Of Shoreline Providing For The Joint Operation Of The Spartan Gym. |
| DEPARTMENT: | Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services |
| PRESENTED BY: | Wendy Barry, Director |

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT: The School Board and City Council both reviewed and concurred with the joint operation plan for the Spartan Gym in August 2001. School District and City senior staffs have drafted an Addendum to the Joint Use Agreement to document the partnership roles and responsibilities regarding operation of the Spartan Gym facility. This addendum is proposed for adoption. See Attachment A.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The financial impact to the City of implementing the Spartan Gym Joint Operations Plan as proposed will result in a net increase in expenses of \$28,600 in 2001 and \$83,200 in 2002. Due to extensive closures of several facilities in the park system in 2001, there are sufficient funds in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services budget to address the estimated costs in 2001 and funds will need to be included in the 2002 budget. It is estimated that the net increase in costs to the City will range from \$50,000 to \$66,000 in the following three years and on an annual basis thereafter.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff seeks City Council authorization for the City Manager to execute the Addendum to the Joint Use Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline School District regarding joint operation of the Spartan Gym facility substantially in the form attached.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



INTRODUCTION

The City Council and the School Board have agreed to jointly operate the Spartan Gym facility owned by the School District for community recreation purposes. The City and School District executed the Joint Use Agreement with seven addenda on August 29, 2000. An Addendum to this Joint Use Agreement is proposed to document and formalize the roles and responsibilities between the City and School District regarding operation of the Spartan Gym.

BACKGROUND

The proposed joint operation plan was discussed and unanimously approved by the Shoreline School District School Board on August 6, 2001. City Council discussed and unanimously approved the proposed joint operation plan on August 20, 2001. City and School District senior staffs developed the attached Addendum to reflect the key points as outlined previously to the School Board and City Council.

The Joint Use Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline School District consists of a global agreement whose terms apply to all City and School District facilities. The Addenda outline specific site related issues, and roles and responsibilities specific to individual sites.

ANALYSIS

The Addendum for the Spartan Gym includes sections on Removal of Property, Option to Buy, Maintenance and Operations, Supervision and Facility Development. The language in the Addendum is consistent with terms and conditions outlined in previously executed addenda.

The Addendum provides for the City to collect and retain fees to offset the City's cost of operation of the facility. In addition, it provides for revenues that exceed the City's expenses to be applied to the School District's costs associated with operation of the facility. If there are any net gains after the expenses of both agencies have been covered, the net gains will be shared equally. It is unlikely that this circumstance will surface in the near future. However, the provisions articulate the nature and intent of the partnership to operate this facility.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff seeks City Council authorization for the city Manager to execute an Addendum to the Joint Use Agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline School District regarding joint operation of the Spartan Gym facility substantially in the form attached.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A - Addendum To Joint Use Agreement For Spartan Gym

ADDENDUM TO JOINT USE AGREEMENT

SPARTAN GYM

The Shoreline School District #412 and the City of Shoreline have entered into a Joint Use Agreement dated 8/29/00 ("Agreement"). This Addendum to that Agreement relates to Spartan Gym facility (hereafter "Facility") as described below, located at the Shoreline Center at 18560 1st Ave. NE, Shoreline WA, and the terms and conditions of this Addendum supplement the application of the Agreement to the Spartan Gym facility defined herein.

A. Context and History

The School District passed a bond issue that included funding for renovation of the gymnasium facility at the Shoreline Center. The design and construction focused on a vision of creating broader community access to the Facility for public recreation. Prior to 2000, the School District Athletic Department operated this Facility at the Shoreline Center complex. The dance room and gym were available for public use. King County Parks, City of Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department, and youth and community organizations used the Facility for community recreation purposes.

In 2000, the City and the School District entered into a joint use agreement for City and School District facilities with a vision and intent to maximize public use of public facilities while maintaining them as sustainable assets.

The School District completed the \$2 million renovation of the Facility and renamed it Spartan Gym in May 2001. The Spartan Gym facility has a total of 34,727 square feet. Newly renovated spaces total 23,500 square feet or 68% of the building including a double gym, dance room, weight room, fitness room, office and lobby spaces, and ADA accessible restroom. In addition, men's and women's locker rooms were partially renovated and are available for public use.

The School District has exclusive use of 7,200 square feet or 20% of the building for School District purposes. This includes one locker room in the northwest corner of the building for visiting teams using the Stadium adjacent to the Spartan Gym. It also includes a former locker room located on the north side of the gym that has been modified, but largely unimproved, that is being used for storage for a local youth athletic association.

The remaining 4,000 square feet or 12% of the building is unimproved. This includes an old locker room on the south side of the gym that is vacant. The City's 2001 – 2005 Capital Improvement Program has \$650,000 included for investment in the Spartan Gym. The funds are targeted to renovate this 4,000 square foot area for multipurpose rooms and support areas that would compliment the gym and fitness rooms. Once this is completed, the City will oversee 80% of the building footprint for community recreation purposes. The City's program use of the facility is expected to expand with the added facilities.

THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Facility Subject to Joint Use Agreement.

The Spartan Gym facility is added to those properties subject to the Agreement as of the date this Addendum is fully executed. The Spartan Gym facility is a separate building located on the Shoreline Center campus.

2. Removal Of Facility

A. The District does not currently need the Facility for a school building. However, pursuant to RCW 28A.355.040, the District may declare the **Spartan Gym facility** again needed for school purposes and thus remove this Facility from this Joint Use Agreement. In such case, the District shall give the City twelve (12) months advance notice prior to said removal. The removal of this Facility from this Agreement shall be a partial termination of the Agreement entitling the City to reimbursement of the depreciated value of improvements by the City.

B. Option To Buy

If the District elects to sell any or all of the Facility during the period of this Agreement, it shall first notify the City. For ninety (90) days thereafter, the City shall have the option to buy the Facility at issue. The terms of any purchase by City pursuant to such election shall be as follows:

- (a) The purchase price shall be fair market value set pursuant to RCW 28A.335.120 for the portion of property being sold, less the remaining depreciated value of the City's improvements being sold;
- (b) Cash at closing;
- (c) Closing within ninety (90) days of City's exercise of the option;
- (d) Insurable fee simple title.

2. Maintenance and Operations

The School District shall provide and pay for routine maintenance and repair of the interior and exterior of the Facility. The City shall pay for repair of vandalism to the building interior associated with program use administered by the City. Major building maintenance repair and restoration shall be shared on a prorata basis according to use by School District and City operated programs.

The School District will provide custodial services.

The City shall pay for all utilities beginning June 2002. The City shall reimburse the School District for utility payments made for June 2001 to the end of 2001 in three annual payments beginning January 2002.

The City will administer public recreation programs for the community. The City will provide supervision, scheduling, development and implementation of recreation programs and collection and receipt of fees. The City shall operate this Facility, including facility additions developed under section 4, in the same manner and to the same degree as other park and recreation facilities operated by the City. All fees collected by the City shall be retained by the City to offset its program expenses and

utilities. The City and School District will review costs and use on an annual basis, and make recommendations for modifications in cost sharing on a bi-annual basis.

The School District and City shall meet quarterly to develop the program schedule. The School District will generally have priority scheduling during regular school hours. The City of Shoreline will have priority scheduling at all other times.

The School District will receive credit for their initial capital investment in weight room equipment as the proportionate costs are calculated on an annual basis until the City's replacement costs add up to the amount the School District funded initially.

3. Supervision

It is provided further that each party shall prepare/set-up, supervise, and clean up facilities used by that party after regular hours of operation.

It is also provided that District administrative and security staff will have authority to supervise student behavior in Spartan Gym during the school year.

4. Facility Development

The City commits to pay the District up to \$650,000 for additional improvements to the building for multi-purpose rooms and related support facilities. Reimbursement of any project costs in excess of this amount is subject to further approval of the Shoreline City Council.

The City and District shall collaborate in the planning and design process for the additional improvements to the Facility. The plans, specifications and standards for the placement of all equipment, facilities and improvements at the Spartan Gym facility (whether permanent or temporary), and the type, design and construction thereof, shall be approved in writing by the School District prior to any installation thereof, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld. If the School District objects to any public planning process in writing within 30 days of notification and the stated objections are not timely resolved, the City will cancel the public planning process.

The City will pay Shoreline School District for construction of improvements as progress payments are due and the direct costs of the District's Project Manager, not to exceed \$650,000.

In WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed on their behalf:

Dated: _____

CITY OF SHORELINE

BY _____

Steven Burkett, City Manager

Approved as to form

BY _____

Ian Sievers, City Attorney

Dated: _____

SHORELINE SCHOOL DISTRICT (#412)

BY _____

Dr. James Welsh,

Superintendent, Shoreline School District

Approved as to form:

BY _____

Lester "Buzz" Porter, Shoreline School Board
Attorney

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| AGENDA TITLE: | Adoption Of Fee Ordinance No. 285 Adding And Amending Fees For The Spartan Gym, Development Permits, Public Document Production And Returned Checks |
| DEPARTMENT: | Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services/ Finance Department |
| PRESENTED BY: | Wendy Barry, Director/ Debbie Tarry, Director |

PROBLEM / ISSUE STATEMENT: There are two issue areas addressed by the proposed ordinance.

A. Spartan Gym. The City of Shoreline and the Shoreline School District have agreed to jointly operate the Spartan Gym facility. The agreement calls for the City to schedule, supervise, and collect fees associated with the operation of the Spartan Gym. Spartan Gym revenues will come from general recreation program fees, rentals of the gym and dance room, and drop-in use of the gym and weight room. The City's Fee Ordinance addresses general recreation program fees. However, it does not include pricing for rentals or drop-in use of facilities at the Spartan Gym.

B. Miscellaneous Fee Additions or Corrections. There are four additional fees proposed for addition to the current fee schedule. These are a fee to set the costs for producing large size maps in the Department of Planning and Development Services, a fee for producing publications on compact disk, a collection fee for returned checks, and a fee for showering at the pool. In addition to these, it is recommended that the Building Permit fees be revised by incorporating fees adopted in the most current Uniform Building Code to avoid frequent amendment and a redundant CPI multiplier. The fee for Commercial Mechanical permits is also changed to a \$342 minimum to correct an error and language describing other development or building fees is clarified.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED: The following provides a brief summary of the alternatives available for Council's consideration:

- Adopt the proposed ordinance. (Recommended)
- Take no action at this time and request additional information. The City's ability to collect fees to recover costs will be hampered.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The financial impact to the City of implementing the Spartan Gym Joint Operations Plan as proposed will result in a net increase in expenses of \$28,600 in 2001 and \$83,200 in 2002. These projections include revenues generated from the fees identified in the proposed Fee Ordinance. Due to extensive closures of several facilities in the park system in 2001, there are sufficient funds in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services budget to address the estimated costs in 2001.

Additional funding will be proposed for inclusion in the 2002 budget. It is estimated that the net increase in annual cost to the City will range from \$50,000 to \$66,000 thereafter.

While the other proposed additions and corrections in the fee ordinance will increase City revenues, the expected magnitude of that impact has not been quantified.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt Ordinance No. 285 Adopting Revised Fees For Services For Parks And Recreation, Development Permits, Public Records, And Returned Checks; And Amending Chapter 3.01 Of The Shoreline Municipal Code.

Approved By:

City Manager

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'K. B.', written over the printed name 'City Manager'.

City Attorney

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. P.', written over the printed name 'City Attorney'.

INTRODUCTION

The City Council and the School Board have agreed to jointly operate the Spartan Gym facility owned by the School District for community recreation purposes. The City and School District have fee policies in place that determine fees and charges associated with various services. City and School District senior staffs have developed the proposed fee schedule that is in alignment with City and School District policies and factoring market demand. This fee schedule is proposed for addition to the City's fee ordinance.

Upon review of the City's fee ordinance in preparation of amendment for inclusion of fees relating to the Spartan Gym, a number of errors and omissions were identified corrections for which are also recommended.

BACKGROUND

The proposed joint operation plan was discussed and unanimously approved by the Shoreline School District School Board on August 6, 2001, and City Council on August 20, 2001. The City has fees in place for general recreation programs. It does not have pricing established for rentals or drop-in use. City and School District Senior staffs have collaborated to develop the pricing that is reflected in the proposed Fee Ordinance.

ANALYSIS

There are three revenue sources identified for the Spartan Gym including general recreation programs, rentals of the gym and dance room, and drop-in use of the gym and weight room. Proposed changes to existing fee policy in these areas and others to resolve outstanding errors and omissions are discussed below.

General Recreation Programs

No adjustments are recommended at this time. A wide variety of general recreation programs are offered to youth, teens, adults, seniors, and families throughout the year. Fees are based on the City of Shoreline fee policies. A general formula is utilized to include direct costs plus a percentage for overhead. The City Fee Ordinance allows for a maximum of 50% overhead to be charged for a general recreation program based on direct costs. Direct costs include the full cost of all instructors, facility rentals, supplies, transportation, and promotional efforts related to the offering of the class or program. However, the 50% overhead is an upper limit. City Council concurred with the staff recommendation that youth recreation class fees are calculated including up to 25% overhead and 30-35% overhead for adult recreation classes. Teen programs are subsidized heavily, as are the youth summer playground program and the newly established after-school program at Briarcrest School.

Spartan Gym Facility Rentals

The rental fee policy and schedule for rentals is in alignment with existing School District policy. It includes four levels of fees ranging from City and School District use at no charge to private for-profit organization use being the most expensive. Market comparisons were considered as well. The School District and the City senior staffs

have also proposed that the Senior Center be provided use of the facility for up to 10 hours/week free of charge.

Gym and Weight Room Drop-In Use

Casual drop-in use is limited to the gym and the weight room when programs and rentals are not scheduled. As a result, it is not expected to be a large income generator. The gym has more revenue potential. The Spartan Gym operation can fill the market niche of introducing individuals to basic weight training and fitness programs. Given the market, and the amount and quality of the existing weight room equipment, the proposed drop-in prices are below market for the weight room for adults. Pricing is at market for adult use of the gym and 37-cents below market for youth use of the gym.

The estimated financial impacts of operating the Spartan Gym facility reflect the rental and drop-in pricing and assumptions, as outlined in the joint operation plan and the proposed Fee Ordinance. Pricing for future facilities, such as the multi-purpose rooms, utility kitchen, and support facilities, was also identified in the joint operations plan. As the design process is completed these facilities may change somewhat. Additional analysis will be done prior to construction completion to ensure that pricing is appropriate.

Pool Shower Fee

This fee was inadvertently omitted from the original fee ordinance. The shower fee provides a fee for individuals that wish to shower only. Adults that are runner/joggers are the most typical users of this service.

Building Permit Fees

The current fee schedule sets building permit fees by incorporating Table 1-A from the 1997 Uniform Building Code and adds a fixed CPI of 3% annually. This fee is a product of construction valuation multiplied by a set rate. Valuation of construction accurately reflects inflationary increases in the City's costs of this service, therefore the CPI escalator is unnecessary. It is also redundant of the provision in the fee ordinance that establishes a mechanism to adjust all City fees annually through the budget process based on actual rates of inflation. The proposed Building Permit Fee simply incorporates the fee table in the most currently adopted Uniform Building Code adopted in the State Building Code. The rate in this table is typically adjusted every three or four years to reflect the increasing complexity and effort involved in issuing permits.

Development Permit Minimum Fees

Fees for development fees are either a fixed amount or based on hours spent in processing the permit application. The current code has inconsistent language for stating a minimum fee payment that may be increased by time spent at a rate of \$114/hour. Some fees state the fee as the hourly rate with a specific minimum fee, others state the minimum fee as a deposit that may require accounting and refunds, and still others state a fixed amount "plus \$114 an hour" which may be read to include a charge for the first hour in addition to the set fee. All fees that are not fixed are described in the proposed amendments to be at the hourly rate with a fixed minimum. The minimum fee for Commercial Mechanical permit fees is increased from \$114 to \$342 to correct an error in the current fee schedule.

Large Map Production

The Department of Planning and Development Services has received an increasing number of requests for large scale maps. The department has calculated a reasonable reproduction cost for paper, inks and labor per square foot of map reproduced. This fee is added to provide notice to the public and consistent charging practices.

CD Fee

Certain large publications such as the development code and the comprehensive plan can be reproduced more economically for the public in electronic format. The schedule for public records fees already contains a fee for providing records on computer diskette. The new fee for CD production of publications takes advantage of the technology that allows copying to this format.

NSF Check Fee

RCW 62A.3-515 allows vendors in commercial transactions to charge a reasonable collection fee for checks that are returned for insufficient funds or a closed account. This fee may be set up to the face value of the check not to exceed \$40. The proposed ordinance adopts a fee of \$25 or the face value of the check received by the City for services, whichever is less, and is an amount that is common among businesses and adopted by other jurisdictions. This fee is needed as a disincentive for passing bad checks and a means of recovering the City's costs of collection.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt Ordinance No. 285 Adopting Revised Fees For Services For Parks And Recreation, Development Permits, Public Records, And Returned Checks; And Amending Chapter 3.01 Of The Shoreline Municipal Code.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Proposed Ordinance No. 285 Adopting Revised Fees For Services For Parks And Recreation, Development Permits, Public Records, And Returned Checks; And Amending Chapter 3.01 Of The Shoreline Municipal Code.

ATTACHMENT A

ORDINANCE NO. 285

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING REVISED FEES FOR SERVICES FOR PARKS AND RECREATION, PUBLIC RECORDS, DEVELOPMENT PERMITS AND RETURNED CHECKS; AND AMENDING CHAPTER 3.01 OF THE SHORELINE MUNICIPAL CODE.

WHEREAS, the City Parks Recreational and Cultural Services Department has begun operating the Spartan Gym for recreational programs and public use and use fees are needed for this facility to offset operating costs;

WHEREAS, the City fee schedule should include fees for large map reproduction and compact disc copies should be added to Public records fees, SMC 3.01.050, to cover these document production cost;

WHEREAS, a collection fee should be approved within statutory limits to process returned checks;

WHEREAS, Building Permit and other land use fee provisions should be corrected to accurately reflect minimum fees and inflationary costs; now therefore

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

Section 1. Amendment. SMC 3.01.010 *Development services*, Building Permit, is hereby amended to read as follows:

3.01.010 Development Services. Fees based on \$114.00 per hour

| Type of Permit Application | Fee |
|----------------------------|---|
| Appeals | \$350.00 |
| Accessory Dwelling | \$114.00 |
| Binding Site Plan | \$228.00 deposit plus \$114.00/hour |
| Lot Line Adjustment | \$570.00 deposit plus \$114.00/hour |
| Building Permit | Table 1-A of Current Edition of the Uniform Building Code adopted in the State Building Code, ch 19.27 RCW 1997 Uniform Building Code Plus CPI Increase (3.0%) |
| Valuations | |
| \$1—\$500 | \$23.50 |
| \$501—\$2,000 | \$23.50 for the first \$500.00 + \$3.25 for each additional \$100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000 |

| Type of Permit Application | Fee |
|---|--|
| \$2,001 - 25,000 | \$71.25 for the first \$2,000 + \$14.50 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000 |
| \$25,001 - 50,000 | \$403.00 for the first \$25,000 + \$10.50 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000 |
| \$50,001 - 100,000 | \$633.00 for the first \$50,000 + \$7.25 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000 |
| \$100,001 - 500,000 | \$1,023.50 for the first \$100,000 + \$5.75 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000 |
| \$500,001 - 1,000,000 | \$3,330.75 for the first \$500,000 + \$5.00 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000 |
| \$1,000,001 + | \$5,777.00 for the first \$1,000,000 + \$3.75 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof |
| Plan Review Fee | 65% of the Building Permit Fee |
| All Other Plan Reviews or work | Hourly Rate, 1 hour minimum |
| Construction Permit for Work Commenced Without a Building Permit | Twice the Applicable Building Permit Fee |
| Conditional Use Permit | \$3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required) |
| Continuation and/or Minor Alteration of Nonconforming Use | \$114 deposit plus \$114/hour Hourly Rate, 1 hour minimum |
| Home Occupation | Hourly Rate, 1 hour minimum |
| Residential Furnace | \$114 |
| Residential Fireplace (up to two) | \$114 |
| Commercial Mechanical | \$342/44 |
| All other Mechanical (Residential and Commercial) | \$114 Hourly Rate, 1 hour minimum |
| Environmental Review | |
| Environmental Checklist: Single-Family Multifamily/Commercial | \$1,140 \$1,710 |
| Environmental Impact Statement Review | Hourly Rate, 35 hour minimum (\$3,990) deposit plus \$114/hour |
| Grading Permit | Hourly Rate, 3 hour minimum (\$342) deposit plus \$114/hour |
| Sensitive Area Permit | Hourly Rate, 8 hour minimum (\$912) plus \$114/hour |
| Rezone | \$6,840 plus public hearing \$1,750 |

| Type of Permit Application | Fee |
|---|--|
| Shoreline Substantial Development: | |
| Shoreline Exemption | \$228 |
| Substantial Development Permit (based on valuation) | |
| up to \$10,000 | \$1,710 |
| \$10,000 to \$500,000 | \$3,876 |
| Over \$500,000 | \$6,840 |
| Shoreline Variance | \$3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required) |
| Sign Permit | Hourly Rate, 2 hour minimum (\$228) plus \$114/hour |
| Special Use Permit | \$5,700 plus public hearing \$1,750 |
| Street Vacation | \$4,560 plus public hearing \$1,750 |
| Subdivisions: | |
| Preliminary Short Plat | \$3,420 for two lot shortplat, plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required) |
| Final Short Plat | \$342 for each additional lot |
| Site Development (Engineering Plans Review and Inspections) | \$912 |
| Short Plat Change | \$1,368 |
| Preliminary Subdivision | \$1,368 |
| Final Subdivision | \$4,332 plus \$31/lot plus public hearing \$1,750 |
| Variances | \$3,420 plus \$19/lot |
| | \$3,420 plus public hearing \$1,750 (if required) |
| Right-of-Way: | |
| Minimum Administrative Fee | Hourly Rate, 1 hour minimum \$50 plus \$114 per hour |
| All Other Work: | |
| All Other Fees Per Hour | \$114/hour |
| Pre-Application for Rezone | \$114/hour |

Section 2. Amendment. SMC 3.01.030 *City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule* is hereby amended to read :

3.010.030 City of Shoreline Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule

SHORELINE POOL

| Public Swims: | Fee |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Children 4 & Under | Free |
| Youth 5 to 17 years | \$1.75 per person per session |
| Senior 60+ years | \$1.75 per person per session |
| Disabled | \$1.75 per person per session |
| Adult | \$2.75 per person per session |
| Family, Parent & Their Children | \$7.00 Family, Parent & Their Children |
| Reduced Swim Nights | \$0.75 per youth; \$1.50 per adult |
| Shower Only | \$1.75 per person |

SPARTAN GYM

| Activity | Fee |
|--|---|
| 1. Hourly facility rental: | |
| A. School District/City sponsored groups | \$0 |
| B. Non-profit groups organized in support of District/City programs | \$12.00 Gym \$8.00 Dance-Aerobic Rm \$7.00 Fitness Rm |
| C. Non-profit groups not included in B. above or B users after regular hours | \$30.00 Gym \$19.00 Dance-Aerobic Rm \$18.00 Fitness Rm |
| D. Commercial or private users not included in B or C above. | \$60.00 Gym \$38.00 Dance-Aerobic Rm \$36.00 Fitness Rm |
| 2. Drop in Fees: | |
| Gym, weight room and/or shower per visit | |
| Adult | \$2.00 |
| Adult ten punch card | \$16.00 |
| Adult three month pass | \$42.00 |
| Youth | \$1.00 |
| Youth ten punch card | \$8.00 |
| Youth three month pass | \$20.00 |
| 3. Combination Shoreline Pool-Spartan Gym Discount Card | |
| Adult 10 pool visits with ten Spartan Gym drop in visits | \$34.00 |
| Youth 10 pool visits with ten Spartan Gym drop in visits | \$18.00 |

Section 3. Amendment. SMC 3.01.050 *Public Records* is amended to read as follows:

3.01.050. City of Shoreline Public Records Fee Schedule

Public Records

| | |
|---|--|
| Publications Copied on the Copier | \$0.15 per page if more than five pages |
| Publication on CD | \$3.00 per CD |
| Video Tapes | \$11.55 per tape |
| Audio Tapes | \$2.00 per tape |
| Photos/Slides | \$2 - \$20 depending on size and process |
| Colored Maps (up to 11 inches by 17 inches) | \$1.50 |
| Maps Larger than 11 inches by 17 inches | \$1.50 Per square foot |
| Large Copies (24 inches by 36 inches) | \$3.00 |
| Mylar Sheets | \$5.00 |
| Clerk Certification | \$1.00 per document |

Section 4. New Section. A new section 3.01.040 *Financial Fees* is added to chapter 3.01 SMC to read as follows:

3.01.40 Financial Fees.

The maker of any check that is returned to the City due to insufficient funds or a closed account shall be assessed a collection fee of \$25.00.

Section 5. Severability. Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this ordinance be preempted by state or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances.

Section 6. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City and this ordinance shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2001.

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication:

Effective Date:

Council Meeting Date: September 10, 2001

Agenda Item: 9(c)

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| AGENDA TITLE: | The Passage of Resolution No.176 Embracing Diversity And Multiculturalism Within The City And Ensuring A Safe And Respectful Community For All People |
| DEPARTMENT: | City Council |
| PRESENTED BY: | Councilmember Cheryl Lee |

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

- The City has a policy of enforcing regulations against hate crimes in the community.
- Councilmember Lee and other members of the City Council have expressed interest in adopting a resolution that publicly states the Council's position of zero tolerance toward hate crimes.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- There are no financial impacts.

RECOMMENDATION

Councilmember Lee recommends the adoption of the attached Resolution No.176 Embracing Diversity And Multiculturalism Within The City And Ensuring A Safe And Respectful Community For All People.

Approved By:

City Manager 

City Attorney 

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Resolution No. 176 Embracing Diversity And Multiculturalism Within The City And Ensuring A Safe And Respectful Community For All People

RESOLUTION NO. 176

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON,
EMBRACING DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURALISM WITHIN THE
CITY AND ENSURING A SAFE AND RESPECTFUL COMMUNITY FOR
ALL PEOPLE**

WHEREAS, the City of Shoreline is a community that is becoming increasingly diverse and multicultural; and

WHEREAS, the diversity of its people and cultures is valued in making Shoreline a stronger and more vital community; and

WHEREAS, the City has encouraged the widest possible participation of individuals and groups within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City has zero tolerance for criminal activity that is motivated by hate or intolerance;

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

Section 1. The City of Shoreline is committed to embracing the increasing wealth of diversity that we are. We value mutual respect, collaboration, tolerance and inclusiveness across the growing tapestry of our community. The vitality of Shoreline is founded on and is enhanced by a richness of backgrounds and perspectives, and we will work together for the best future Shoreline for all. We support a safe, fair and equitable environment for all, beginning with our own actions and community behavior.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk