

**DRAFT**

## **CITY OF SHORELINE**

### **SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**

#### **Summary Minutes of 2001 Annual Planning and Budget Retreat**

Friday, August 18, 2000  
12:00 noon

Shoreline Community College  
Board Room

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

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Robert Deis, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager; Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager; Eric Swansen, Management Analyst; Debbie Tarry, Finance Director; Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director; Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager; Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director; Bill Conner, Public Works Director; Denise Pentony, Police Chief; Rob Beem, Health and Human Services Manager; Patty Rader, Senior Budget Analyst; and Carol Dawson, Budget Analyst

The meeting convened at 12:30 p.m. All Councilmembers were present, with the exceptions of Deputy Mayor Hansen and Councilmember Ransom, who arrived later.

1. **Budget Retreat Memo and Agenda Overview**

Robert Deis, City Manager, discussed the purpose of the retreat: to review the financial capacity of the organization, to identify program needs and to adopt a 2000-2001 work plan. He went on to review the agenda for the remainder of the day and for Saturday, August 19.

2. **Update 1999-2000 Work Plan Progress**

- *Update on Progress of the 2000 Plan*

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, described the progress toward completing the Development Code (work plan goal 1).

Councilmember Gustafson asked about costs for implementing the Development Code.

Next, Mr. Stewart proposed that Council combine work plan goal 2, concerning economic development, with work plan goal 7, "Develop a sub-area plan for North City." He explained how the goals interrelate.

Mr. Deis suggested that staff present the results of the North City design charrette at a joint workshop of City Council and the Planning Commission on September 21. There was Council consensus in support of this suggestion.

Deputy Mayor Hansen arrived at 1 p.m.

Mr. Stewart described elements of the North City design plans that resulted from the charrette.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 1:10 p.m.

Mr. Stewart and Mr. Deis described other economic development efforts in the community.

Next, Mr. Deis discussed progress on developing a Municipal Services Strategic Plan and on reviewing utility franchises (work plan goal 3).

Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem reviewed efforts to "Define City's role in supporting youth vis a vis other providers" (work plan goal 4). He went on to describe efforts to fulfill Council direction to develop budget proposals for 2001 to help implement the City's new Youth Services Policy.

Public Works Director Bill Conner reviewed progress to advance projects on the existing Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (work plan goal 5). He explained timelines, funding levels and associated policies that affect the projects.

Mr. Deis reviewed City progress in strengthening intergovernmental relations (work plan goal 6). He discussed issues concerning Snohomish County and Point Well in particular.

Mr. Stewart discussed progress on work plan goal 8, "Develop a code enforcement program reflective of City values."

3. Overview of the City's Financial Position

Finance Director Debbie Tarry explained the 2000 year-end budget projections of revenues and expenditures. She discussed the issue of utility tax revenue projections. She went on to review issues concerning a variety of other revenue sources.

Councilmembers inquired about specific revenue sources and about changes from 2000 to 2001. Councilmembers went on to discuss gambling tax rates and whether current rates should be reconsidered.

In response to questions from Councilmembers, Ms. Tarry explained legally-required changes in reserves as part of the six-year financial plan.

Ms. Tarry reviewed the potential financial implications of Initiative 722.

# DRAFT

## 4. Existing and Emerging Issues Affecting 2000

Mr. Deis introduced the staff analysis of emerging issues.

Mr. Stewart addressed the first issue, economic development.

Mr. Deis described the concept of creating an economic development opportunity fund to assist in funding off-site improvements or purchasing key parcels of land for redevelopment.

Mr. Stewart discussed the emerging issues for the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code: Shoreline Master Program and the Historic and Cultural Resources Program.

Mr. Conner described emerging issues involving the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Mr. Stewart discussed impacts of the adoption of the Development Code (e.g., the need to hire an Administrative Assistant and the need for contract services for urban forestry and biological services).

Mr. Deis described emerging issues for implementing youth services and for the Teen Program.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if the City can avoid incurring overtime costs for police officers assigned to the Teen Program.

Mr. Deis discussed emerging issues in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department: parks maintenance; caretaker services at Richmond Beach Saltwater Park; replacement of parks ordinance signs; replacement of athletic field lights; purchase of a truck; training; and a chemical application trailer.

Mr. Stewart addressed the potential for enhancing code enforcement.

Mr. Deis discussed issues for utilities, the Public Works development plan, City communication enhancements and funding for outside organizations (e.g., the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce).

Mr. Deis went on to address issues involving Local Improvement Districts (LIDs), the undergrounding of utilities and street lighting.

Next, Mr. Deis discussed public safety issues, including School Resource Officers (SROs) in middle and high schools, traffic enforcement and supervision for street crimes.

Senior Management Analyst Eric Swansen addressed issues of jail costs.

Mr. Deis described issues concerning Information Services.

5. City Council's Input on Emerging Issues

Councilmembers identified the following additional emerging issues:

- Development of a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) program (at a cost of \$10,000 to \$15,000)
- Evaluate alternatives to King County Animal Control
- Research and develop a fish hatchery at Boeing Creek
- Evaluate options for addressing the Interurban Trail crossing at Westminster Avenue
- Completing the Little League ball field, Paramount Park improvements, Shoreline Pool improvements and implementing maintenance standards
- Evaluate and determine long-term policy goals regarding utilities
- Design development, with timeline and funding source, in support of North City public improvements for the sub-area plan
- Evaluate CIP designs and pursue for Council add-ons that build pride in the community
- Pursue options to mobile home park
- Develop multi-year schedule for parks master plans
- Pursue alternate access to transfer station

Councilmembers identified the following potential budget issues:

- Contribute to completion of elevator at the Shoreline Historical Museum (\$50,000)
- Develop possible matching fund program for non-profits, e.g., Shoreline Arts Council, Center for Human Services, Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Senior Center

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Saturday, August 19, 2000  
8:00 a.m.

Shoreline Community College  
Board Room

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

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Robert Deis, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager; Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager; Eric Swansen, Management Analyst; Debbie Tarry, Finance Director; Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation

# DRAFT

and Cultural Services Director; Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager; Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director; Bill Conner, Public Works Director; Patty Rader, Senior Budget Analyst; and Carol Dawson, Budget Analyst

The meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m. Councilmember Ransom arrived at 9:20 a.m.

1. Recap of Friday Discussions

Mr. Deis reviewed the discussions of the previous day. He noted that only \$129,000 is available for new initiatives, unless the City uses some of the funding the State provided to backfill revenues lost upon passage of Initiative 695. He went on to identify emerging issues that are General Fund ongoing expenses.

2. Develop 2000-2001 Workplan

Mr. Deis suggested that Council carry over the following goals from its 1999-2000 work plan to its 2000-2001 work plan:

- Develop and adopt an economic development program with strategies and program components
- Determine which services to provide by analyzing requirements, methods of delivery, changes in other governments, Council preferences, and:
  - participate in regional policy and governance
  - analyze utility franchises
- Advance CIP projects, e.g.:
  - Aurora
  - Interurban Trail, including the evaluation of options for addressing the crossing at Westminster Avenue
- Accelerate City Hall planning

(City Council 1999-2000 Work Plan goals 1, 4, 6, 7 and 8 were judged to be complete and, therefore, were not carried over.)

Mr. Deis asked about the process that Council wanted to follow to add new goals to the 2000-2001 work plan.

Councilmembers decided to add the following goals without further vote:

- Pursue alternate access to transfer station
- Develop complete strategy for ESA and Shoreline Master Plan

Council decided to create a work plan of ten goals for 2000-2001. Council allotted four "votes" to each Councilmember to use to identify his or her preferences. Through this process, Council identified the following additional goals for the 2000-2001 work plan:

- Enhance communications through technology (government access channel, City web site)

# DRAFT

- Implement the first phase of a multi-year North City sub-area plan for public improvements
- Develop program for payment in lieu of development requirements, including sidewalks and, potentially, surface water facilities
- Evaluate and determine City roles vis a vis utilities

After additional discussion, there was Council consensus in favor of informal discussion, beginning with staff and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee, of the following additional goal:

- Develop a multi-year schedule for master plan development of each park

Council asserted its understanding that initial discussions, excluding formal analysis, could provide information for the 2002 Annual Planning and Budget Retreat next year.

Mr. Deis requested Council direction regarding the potential budget issues that Council identified before adjourning the previous day.

Councilmembers discussed the possibility of funding capital needs of other organizations in the community (e.g., human service, arts and other cultural resource organizations). Four Councilmembers discussed a \$50,000 contribution to the Shoreline Historical Museum.

Mr. Deis said staff will review funding options for other agencies.

Mr. Deis went on to discuss other emerging issues. He asked whether Council wants to use a portion of the \$1.4 million State backfill funding. Council decided to allow the use of up to approximately half (\$700,000) of the State backfill funding to address emerging issues. If additional revenues come in unexpectedly, e.g., utility tax, then the use of the backfill revenues should decrease commensurately.

### 3. Goal 9 - Accelerate City Hall Planning

Mr. Swansen provided an overview of the methodology used in the City Hall space needs analysis.

Marilyn Brockman of Bassetti Architects described some of the elements of the space needs analysis that her firm completed for the City.

Mike Hassinger of Seneca Group discussed his cost analysis of the project.

Councilmembers discussed costs and financing options for City Hall space needs

Based on the Council feedback, Mr. Deis offered to further develop options for City Hall and to bring additional information back to Council in the future.

August 18/19, 2000

**DRAFT**

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

---

Larry Bauman  
Assistant City Manager

August 21, 2000

**DRAFT**

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING**

Monday, August 21, 2000  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

**ABSENT:** Councilmember Montgomery

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

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

**Councilmember Grossman moved to excuse Councilmember Montgomery. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.**

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

City Manager Robert Deis noted the success of Celebrate Shoreline on Saturday, August 19.

4. **COUNCIL REPORTS**

Councilmember Ransom related information from the King County Jail Advisory Committee: County staff projected a four percent increase in the overall budget and increases in individual cities' court costs of six to eight percent. Councilmember Ransom explained that misdemeanors effect court costs more than jail costs.

Mayor Jepsen noted the Council retreat Friday and Saturday, August 18 and 19. He mentioned that he signed letters to the Shoreline School Board, the Shoreline Fire District, the Shoreline Wastewater District and the Shoreline Water District encouraging them to budget funds to videotape their meetings for broadcast on the government access cable television channel.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**



# DRAFT

(a) Dwight Stevens, 1606 N 197<sup>th</sup> Place, thanked Council for choosing him to be the grand marshal of the Celebrate Shoreline parade.

(b) Ken Howe, 745 N 184<sup>th</sup> Street, provided photographs of Car 53 of the Interurban Trolley System. He requested assistance to purchase the trolley for restoration and display in Shoreline. Also, he advocated that Council invite Megan Kelly, Certified Local Government Coordinator for the State of Washington, to provide a presentation at a future Council workshop.

(c) Bill Bear, 2541 NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street, distributed copies of the Briarcrest Neighborhood Newsletter. He expressed appreciation for the participation of Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony at the August 17 neighborhood meeting.

## 6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

### (a) Presentation of the proposed Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program

Public Works Director Bill Conner reviewed the staff report. He explained that the first phase of the proposed Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program focuses on education and enforcement of traffic laws and that the second phase involves engineering solutions to safety problems.

Deputy Mayor Hansen arrived at 6:50 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193<sup>rd</sup> Street, asserted that the redevelopment of Aurora Avenue, as proposed, will force more traffic onto north-south neighborhood streets.

(2) Ken Howe, 745 N 184<sup>th</sup> Street, said the posted speed limit on Shoreline-area streets during the 1930s was 35 miles per hour. Noting greater population density, he asserted that this speed is now too fast. He advocated the inclusion of stop signs in Phase 1 of the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program.

3) Dale Wright, 18546 Burke Avenue N, supported the proposed program. He suggested two additions: 1) the creation of a review committee to monitor the effectiveness of the program and to recommend changes; and 2) the inclusion of sufficient flexibility in the program to give staff the authority to make necessary changes.

4) Richard Johnsen, 16730 Meridian Avenue N, questioned the results of staff consideration of 167<sup>th</sup> Street between Aurora Avenue N and Meridian Avenue N and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between 145<sup>th</sup> and 165<sup>th</sup> Streets. He asserted that Meridian Avenue is part of his neighborhood, not an arterial that can be ignored. Finally, he opposed any limitations on east-west traffic flow on 167<sup>th</sup> Street.

# DRAFT

5) Margie King, 20307 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, thanked the City for including citizens in the development of the program. She said many people who attended the public open house meetings advocated the use of existing resources (e.g., enforcement of existing traffic laws).

Mr. Conner commented that the City has a program in place (the Manual for Uniform Traffic Codes and Devices [MUTCD]) to address stop signs. He acknowledged traffic speed as part of existing neighborhood traffic safety problems. He advocated the education in Phase 1 as a means of achieving compliance with traffic laws "without having to put a cop on every corner." He supported Mr. Wright's suggestion for a review committee. He said staff will consider this idea. He explained that staff used existing data on 167<sup>th</sup> Street to verify the "Selection and Prioritization Criteria for Phase 2 Program" (page 15 of the Council packet).

Mayor Jepsen asserted that the City must address both residential and arterial streets. He said the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program, which deals with residential streets, interrelates with other City initiatives focusing on arterial streets (e.g., the Capital Improvement Program [CIP] and the Aurora Corridor Project). Mr. Conner agreed.

Councilmember Gustafson arrived at 7:10 p.m.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Deis explained that the City purchased its own radar reader board several years ago and that the City shares a second radar reader board with three other cities.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Conner said the 2000 City budget included approximately \$130,000 to establish the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program. He explained that staff has budgeted \$210,000 annually over subsequent years to execute the program.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern about the navigability of traffic circles. He noted an intersection with a traffic circle in Portland, Oregon that includes recessed corners. He said these make it easier to navigate the intersection, while the center island improves traffic safety. Mr. Conner acknowledged the difficulty of navigating traffic circles. He said traffic circles are especially problematic for emergency vehicles. He explained that each traffic safety device the City installs will be site designed to accommodate emergency vehicle traffic. Mr. Deis noted that physical devices must both slow traffic and permit it to flow efficiently.

Councilmember Grossman supported the phased approach of the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Conner confirmed that the other communities that staff researched use temporary physical devices. He also explained that

the Traffic Advisory Committee includes representatives of the Public Works, Police and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Departments.

Mayor Jepsen said the proposed program will help in City efforts to determine the appropriate amount of police enforcement of traffic laws. He supported Mr. Wright's suggestions for a review committee and for enough flexibility for staff to make necessary changes.

Mr. Deis suggested that the City reconvene the original Citizen Advisory Committee after a year to review the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program.

(b) Discussion regarding King County Wastewater Treatment Division's Draft Siting Criteria for Wastewater Facilities

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager, distributed the most recent draft siting criteria from King County Wastewater Treatment Division staff. He introduced Michael Popiwny, King County Siting Manager, and Christie True, King County Project Manager.

Mr. Bauer discussed the process by which County staff and the North Treatment Facilities Siting Advisory Committee developed the draft siting criteria. He said the committee debated whether criteria should function as constraints, eliminating consideration of potential sites. He highlighted three concerns about the draft criteria:

- Prioritization—County staff asserts that this is not the time to prioritize criteria; but how do stakeholders communicate which criteria are most important?
- Grammatical issues—Mr. Bauer noted the wording of F-1A as an example. He commented that "reasonable lifetime" is sufficiently flexible and that the additional flexibility of "seek" is unnecessary.
- Consistent application—Mr. Bauer mentioned the difficulty of ranking sites using criteria composed of several elements (e.g., "avoid, minimize or allow for mitigation" in E-1A).

Mayor Jepsen discussed the difference of opinion between Siting Advisory Committee members who want to leave the criteria open-ended to prevent sites from being eliminated from consideration and those who want to begin prioritizing the criteria to provide an objective way to evaluate sites.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Ms. True identified September 27 as the target date for transmitting the siting criteria to the County Council. Mayor Jepsen explained that the Siting Advisory Committee will reconvene in 2001 to review County staff's application of the criteria in the selection of potential sites.

Mayor Jepsen said he and other committee members advocated at the July 27 meeting that the committee identify some of the criteria as absolutes (e.g., revise T-1A to read "King County shall ~~seek~~ select NTF sites that provide sufficient area to accommodate the proposed facilities. . .").

# DRAFT

Ms. True said the County already identified environmental and engineering constraints (e.g., avoiding sites located on a fault line or on farmland preservation property). She explained that application of these constraints will be one of the first steps in the consideration of sites, followed by application of the policy criteria. She acknowledged the need to prioritize the policy criteria. She said County staff expects prioritization once it begins to apply the criteria and to receive public input on priorities.

In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, Mr. Bauer said staff provided the list of environmental and engineering constraints to Council with the first draft of the policy criteria.

Mayor Jepsen recommended the revision from "shall seek" to "shall select" of the following policy criteria: T-1A; T-3A; T-3C; T-5A; E-1A; E-1B; and E-3A. He noted that these criteria seem non-negotiable; whereas, the other policy criteria seem more flexible.

Councilmember Ransom asserted the need to establish the relative rank or value of the criteria.

Mayor Jepsen agreed. He explained that he considers the criteria that he recommended revising to be more important. He suggested the collection of these revised criteria into one group at the beginning of the list.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mayor Jepsen said he would not categorize the criteria that he recommended revising as "pass/fail" criteria, like the engineering and environmental constraints.

Councilmember Ransom advocated that Council recommend a point-value system to prioritize the policy criteria. For example, he asserted that criteria F-1A is particularly important and that it should be weighted as such.

Councilmember Lee noted the large number of jurisdictions involved in the North Treatment Facilities Siting Decision Process. She said the City should help advance the process. She supported Mayor Jepsen and Deputy Mayor Hansen to advocate Council positions in their participation on the Siting Advisory Committee. She commented that she does not want to prolong the process.

Mayor Jepsen agreed. He said he, Deputy Mayor Hansen and staff work to see the process from a regional perspective, as well as from the City's unique perspective.

Councilmember Gustafson asserted that the revisions that Mayor Jepsen recommended are reasonable. He supported the changes.

Deputy Mayor Hansen expressed ambivalence about the revisions. However, he agreed that prioritization is important. He supported a point system to weight the policy criteria.

# DRAFT

Mr. Deis said staff will draft a letter to the King County Council and Executive that addresses the need for some type of prioritization of the siting policy criteria.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Popiwny noted the expectation of County staff that the Siting Advisory Committee will continue meeting monthly and that it will be involved in the application of the policy criteria.

## (c) Endangered Species Act Response—Program Assessment

Mr. Conner reviewed the staff report. He said the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a final 4(d) rule regarding threatened Chinook salmon on July 10. He noted key points of the rule, including the desire of NMFS to reestablish historic stream flows.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Conner said "historic" usually translates to "pre-European settlement conditions."

Mr. Conner went on to discuss developments since NMFS issued the 4(d) rule, including: Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) interlocal agreements; City of Seattle Tri-County Proposal for a Built-Area Option (published July 17); memo from County Executive Rob Sims offering County staff presentation on the Tri-County rule; Suburban Cities Association (SCA) letter (dated July 21); and the City request for proposals for stream inventory.

Continuing, Mr. Conner said the status of the City regarding the ESA listing of Chinook salmon is comparable to many other area cities. He reviewed steps the City will likely need to take to address the NMFS 4(d) rule and the Tri-County framework. He referred to a potential program, "A Median Response to ESA listings of Salmon," included in the Council packet (pages 35-39).

Councilmember Grossman said the City is being much more proactive than some communities. He asked what the NMFS 4(d) rule means for the trade-off between the protection of fish and individual property rights. Mr. Conner said the City has the flexibility to make a case on how it intends to protect fish while preserving property development rights. He remarked that NMFS seeks general, negotiated settlements with individual jurisdictions.

Councilmember Gustafson noted the "good news" of proactive City efforts to address the issues raised by the ESA listing. He identified the costs to the City as the "bad news." He said the ESA listing represents "another unfunded mandate." He advocated that the City talk with County, State and federal legislators about financial support needed to address the issues the listing raises.

Continuing, Councilmember Gustafson advocated that staff review the proposed WRIA interlocal agreement, assess its impacts on Shoreline and identify the likely costs of

participating. He noted his understanding that NMFS will target jurisdictions that do the least. He reiterated the value of City participation in the WRIA reforms and other proactive efforts. He commented that the burden of the ESA listing on local jurisdictions is unreasonable.

Mr. Conner said the financial cost of City participation in the WRIA 8 proposal ranges from \$9,000 to \$17,900 annually. He noted the proposed WRIA 8 annual budget of \$433,000. He mentioned that staff has included the cost of City participation in the WRIA 8 forum in its 2001 budget request.

Councilmember Gustafson said some cities may choose not to participate in the WRIA 8 program. He explained that this would increase costs to the remaining cities.

Councilmember Ransom supported a proactive City response, including participation in the WRIA 8 program. He asserted that restoration of "pre-European settlement conditions" is unrealistic. He said the City should work with legislators to implement more reasonable federal standards.

Councilmember Gustafson noted his understanding of the goal of the 4(d) rule to restore salmon runs to harvestable levels. Mr. Conner verified this understanding. He said this goal differs from previous actions under ESA to prevent the extinction of species. He said NMFS concerns itself with the recovery of the threatened salmon, not the cost of doing so.

Councilmember Lee commented that additional review and monitoring of waterways will lead to expensive mitigation. She said no one has identified a budget for such mitigation. Mr. Deis agreed. He said the City has consistently noted the "resource drain" of habitat acquisition.

Mayor Jepsen confirmed Council consensus in support of a median approach in response to the ESA listing, as well as ongoing participation in regional planning. He acknowledged that the City will face difficult decisions as it learns more.

Mr. Deis said the 2001 City budget will likely include funding for City participation in the WRIAs and funding for staffing (e.g., to assess City surface water facilities).

Councilmember Gustafson said the City is protecting itself from liability by "progressing in the proper mode."

## 7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Bill Bear, 2541 NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street, noted the 60-foot building height in the North City Sub-Area Plan. He expressed concern that developers will argue for the same right elsewhere in the City. He compared "healthy growth," based upon attracting people to a desirable area, to growth "driven by an insatiable need to make more money faster." He feared that Shoreline is pursuing the latter type of growth in some cases.

August 21, 2000

# DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen said the purpose of the sub-area plan is to focus development in a particular area under specific rules. He said the City seeks to "focus growth smartly."

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:35 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

August 28, 2000

**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING**

Monday, August 28, 2000  
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: Mayor Jepsen

STAFF: Robert Deis, City Manager; Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager; Joyce Nichols, Manager, Community and Government Relations

The meeting convened at 6:13 p.m.

Deputy Mayor Hansen discussed the proposal of the Highland Water District to optimize its water supply by using its aquifer for storage.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 6:17 p.m.

Councilmember Montgomery discussed concerns about Sound Transit that are leading her to consider not supporting the project. Cost overruns represent her principle concern.

Councilmember Grossman expressed concern about a lack of alternative analysis.

Council and staff discussed concerns being raised about the Regional Transit Authority (RTA). Council and staff also discussed transportation alternatives to light rail and the potential for a cost-benefit analysis.

Councilmember Lee arrived at 6:35 p.m.

Joyce Nichols, Manager, Community and Government Relations, suggested that Council focus on costs and benefits to Shoreline and on getting cost and funding questions clarified.

Council and staff discussed how best to seek better information about RTA and how best to serve the transportation needs of Shoreline. Councilmembers mentioned examples of transit alternatives they had experienced in other communities.

Council and staff discussed avenues for raising concerns about RTA expenditures.



# DRAFT

*August 28, 2000*

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

---

Kristoff Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

### SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, August 28, 2000  
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

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

**ABSENT:** Mayor Jepsen

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2. **FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

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

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to excuse Mayor Jepsen. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

3. **REPORT OF CITY MANAGER:** None

4. **REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:** None

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(a) Earl Hines, Manager, Westminster Manor Apartments, 14701 Dayton Avenue N, expressed concerns about the health effects and the impact on values of neighboring properties of a proposal to mount wireless telecommunication antennas on the water tower at N 145<sup>th</sup> Street and Dayton Avenue N.

(b) Christy Cameron, 14356 Evanston Avenue N, suggested that the Shoreline Municipal Code includes a loophole. She said the code requires that ground-mounted wireless telecommunication facilities be set back at least 50 feet from residential property. She advised that the structure-mounted antennas proposed at N 145<sup>th</sup> Street and Dayton Avenue N will be closer to residential property than 50 feet and that the proposed equipment enclosure will be five to six feet from neighboring residential property.

(c) Eric Snyder, 14509 Evanston Avenue N, said the water tower stands eight feet from his property line. He said the facility will be visible from residences and that it will have a large impact on the value of his home and on his personal safety and health.

City Manager Robert Deis recalled that the City revised its wireless telecommunication facilities ordinance to require the industry to be more sensitive to community concerns. He explained that the federal government has precluded local jurisdictions from prohibiting wireless telecommunication facilities based on alleged health effects.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, said the City has received an application for the co-location of cellular antennae on the water tower at N 145<sup>th</sup> Street and Dayton Avenue N. He explained that this is a Type B permit, that staff posted notice at the site and notified neighboring property owners. He noted that City staff has received comments, that staff is processing the application and that the City decision can be appealed to the Shoreline Hearing Examiner.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Stewart agreed to provide information to Council about the applicant's compliance with the neighborhood meeting requirement.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Lee moved approval of the agenda. Councilmember Montgomery seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Councilmember Ransom moved adoption of the consent calendar and corrected the number of the Puget Sound Energy franchise to read Ordinance No. 248. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the following items were approved:**

**Minutes of Workshop Meeting of July 17, 2000  
Minutes of Joint Dinner Meeting of July 24, 2000  
Minutes of Regular Meeting of July 24, 2000**

**Approval of expenses and payroll as of August 18, 2000 in the amount of \$2,114,622.54**

**Ordinance No. 248 extending the franchise provided to Puget Sound Energy (OKA Washington Natural Gas) for the provision of natural gas services**

**Motion to authorize \$1,915 in 2000 Mini-Grant funds for the Parkwood Neighborhood Association to purchase picnic tables and a trash receptacle for Twin Ponds Park**

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

- (a) **Ordinance No. 246 approving a reclassification and short plat of property at 18042 Stone Ave. N.**

# DRAFT

Jeff Thomas, Planner, reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Montgomery sought confirmation that Council is voting whether to approve the reclassification to R-8, not between a reclassification to R-8 and a reclassification to R-12. Mr. Thomas said the Planning Commission recommended reclassification to R-8 rather than R-12. Deputy Mayor Hansen explained that Council may reject any reclassification or approve reclassification to R-8 or R-12.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Thomas confirmed that Council approved the reclassification of the adjacent (Elena Lane) property to R-8.

Councilmember Montgomery commented that she had not opposed the reclassification of the Elena Lane property to R-12. She said she reviewed the materials for the proposed reclassification, and she had difficulty distinguishing a difference between the results of the R-12 designation and those of the R-8 designation.

Mr. Thomas said a reclassification to R-12 would permit construction of three dwelling units at the site. He indicated that three structures would crowd the property, which slightly exceeds 9,600 square feet in size. In addition, he said the standards for R-12 development under which the application vested include 20-foot setbacks.

In response to Councilmember Grossman, Mr. Thomas said each of the three dwelling units permitted under an R-12 designation could be no more than 28 feet in width (given the 68-foot width of the property and the 20-foot setbacks).

Councilmember Gustafson commented that the Planning Commission and City staff analyzed the proposed reclassification "in line with our Comprehensive Plan." He supported the proposal.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to adopt Ordinance No. 246, approving a reclassification of property at 18042 Stone Avenue N from R-6 to R-8 and preliminarily approving the creation of a two-lot short plat. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Ransom noted considerable neighborhood opposition to the proposed reclassification of the adjacent Elena Lane property to R-12 and considerable neighborhood support of the reclassification to R-8. He asserted that zoning along the east side of Stone Avenue should be consistent.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery, Mr. Thomas and Deputy Mayor Hansen explained that the map on page 57 of the Council packet is a conceptual drawing of what a single-family residence and a duplex might look like on the property.

Councilmember Grossman commented that the drawing on page 57 does not reflect 20-foot setbacks. He expressed concern about the impact of City decisions on the availability of affordable housing in Shoreline. He favored an R-12 designation for the

# DRAFT

property given the 20-foot setback requirement—he mentioned his perception that neighbors are most concerned about the size of setbacks. Noting the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the lengthy Council deliberation on the adjacent Elena Lane property, he said he could support the R-8 reclassification.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asked when the City will address the zoning of this area on a block-by-block basis. Mr. Stewart said the City will unify the zoning map and the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that staff has completed the preliminary comparative analysis of the two documents. He noted that unification may entail adjustments to both. Rachael Markle, Senior Planner, said staff will begin meeting about such adjustments next week. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan amendment process will begin October 5.

**A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 246, approving a reclassification of property at 18042 Stone Avenue N from R-6 to R-8 and preliminarily approving the creation of a two-lot short plat. The motion carried 6-0.**

Councilmember Ransom suggested that Council should have allowed the property owner to speak about the application. Mr. Deis said State law and the City code specify a single public hearing. He explained that that hearing took place before the Planning Commission and that Council makes its decision based upon its review of the record.

- (b) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a Joint Use agreement between the City of Shoreline and the Shoreline School District

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, reported that the School Board unanimously approved the joint use agreement at its August 21 meeting. She reviewed changes made to the agreement since Council reviewed the document June 5. She identified the foundation of the agreement as: joint cooperative scheduling; joint usage, maintenance and operation; and joint planning and development of public facilities. She asserted the purpose of the agreement to provide the best services with the least possible expenditure, to maximize the use of public facilities and to insure their maintenance as sustainable community assets.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved that Council authorize the City Manager to enter into the joint use agreement between Shoreline School District #412 and the City of Shoreline. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Ransom referred to "Scheduling" on page 62 of the Council packet and asked how the City and the District will handle this task. Ms. Barry said City and School District staff will meet and jointly schedule facilities.

Councilmember Gustafson highlighted positive elements of the agreement, including: flexibility; cooperation of City and School District staff; the provision of the best services with the least possible expenditure of public funds; mutual program publicity within facilities; and avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities.

# DRAFT

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Barry confirmed that the School District will not charge the City for rental of rooms in the Shoreline Center. She said the City has previously charged the School District for use of the Shoreline Pool; whereas, in the future, the City will not bill the School District for use of the Shoreline Pool for three hours of time between pool opening and 6 p.m. for daily swim team practices during the high school swim season.

Councilmember Grossman expressed his hope that the agreement will be the first of many mutual relationships between the City and the School District.

Councilmember Ransom expressed his support and appreciation for the agreement.

**A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the City Manager to enter into the joint use agreement between Shoreline School District #412 and the City of Shoreline. The motion carried 6-0.**

Councilmember Gustafson advocated that the City and the School District jointly review facility maintenance to identify potential savings. For example, he noted that both the City and School District perform field maintenance at Einstein Middle School.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Ms. Barry said the City deferred its participation in classroom remodeling at the Shoreline Center until completion of the joint use agreement. She anticipated that City and School District staff will address the project as they work to implement the agreement.

On another topic, Councilmember Gustafson said he attended a meeting last week of the King County Community Development Block Grant Consortium Joint Recommendations Committee, where he learned that City staff assisted the Kenmore Homeless Shelter to receive \$26,000 in grant funding to repair its facility.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None


10. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:29 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk

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

**AGENDA TITLE:** Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of August 24, 2000  
**DEPARTMENT:** Finance  
**PRESENTED BY:** Al Juarez, Financial Operations Supervisor 

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of \$1,096,914.98 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for August 6 through August 19, 2000 in the amount of \$253,448.69 paid with ADP checks 2890, 4675-4738 vouchers 340001 through 340112 benefit checks 5681 through 5690 and

**the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on August 24, 2000:**

Expenses in the amount of \$20,250.44 paid on Expense Register dated 8/21/00 with the following claim checks: 5589-5605 and

Expenses in the amount of \$30,433.91 paid on Expense Register dated 8/22/00 with the following claim checks: 5606-5631 and

Expenses in the amount of \$684,451.49 paid on Expense Register dated 8/23/00 with the following claim checks: 5632-5659 and

Expenses in the amount of \$74,817.35 paid on Expense Register dated 8/23/00 with the following claim checks: 5660-5674 and

Expenses in the amount of \$33,288.10 paid on Expense Register dated 8/23/00 with the following claim checks: 5675-5678 and

Expenses in the amount of \$225.00 paid on Expense Register dated 8/23/00 with the following claim check: 5679

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



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

**AGENDA TITLE:** Motion to Accept the Lowest Responsive Construction Bid for the 2000 Curb Ramp and Sidewalk Repair Program and Authorize the City Manager to Execute Change Orders up to 10% of the Contract Amount.

**DEPARTMENT:** Public Works

**PRESENTED BY:** William L. Conner, Public Works Director *wlc*

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

The 2000 Capital Improvement Program includes funds for the construction of curb ramps and sidewalk repair. The 2000 program would construct approximately 75 curb ramps, 20 bus pads, and 5,800 square feet (1,160 linear feet of 5 foot sidewalk) of sidewalk repair. Curb ramp and bus pad construction corridors include: Meridian Avenue N. from 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 205<sup>th</sup> Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from 148<sup>th</sup> Street to 174<sup>th</sup> Street, and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from 160<sup>th</sup> Street to 172<sup>nd</sup> Street. Ramps will also be constructed at the intersection of Richmond Beach Road and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. Sidewalk repair corridors include Meridian Avenue N. from 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 205<sup>th</sup> Street, 185<sup>th</sup> Street from Aurora Avenue to Corliss Avenue N., and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 172<sup>nd</sup>.

On August 29, 2000, the City Clerk's Office received and opened four bids from qualified contractors for construction of the 2000 Curb Ramp and Sidewalk Repair Program.

The following bids were received:

<u>Bidder Name</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
1. West Coast Construction Co.	\$185,766.00
2. GMT	\$223,882.00
3. Tydico	\$248,600.00
4. Dennis R. Craig	\$406,881.85

The budget for construction is \$276,683. The Public Works engineer's estimate for this project is \$234,592 and the lowest responsive bid is \$185,766.00.

## **Schedule**

Staff anticipates that the project would begin early October 2000 and would be completed within 45 working days (weather contingent). Staff will closely monitor the contractor to minimize any inconvenience to curb ramp and sidewalk users.

Due to the low bid, staff will look into the possibility of adding additional work to this year's program.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that your Council accept the low bid and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with West Coast Construction Co. in the amount of \$185,766.00, and to execute change orders up to 10% of the contract original amount.

Approved By:      City Manager KB      City Attorney N/A

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

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Conduct a Public Hearing to Consider the Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee Recommendations for 2001-2002 Health and Human Services Funding Plan (including General Fund and Community Development Block Grant) and Authorize the City Manager to Sign the Contracts Implementing Approved Recommendations
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Health and Human Services
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Rob Beem, Health and Human Services Manager Bethany Wolbrecht, Grant Specialist

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

**Health and Human Services Funding**

In April 2000, your Council made the decision to allocate all funding for Health and Human Services in the City of Shoreline through a semi-annual competitive application process. This year's H&HS Funding Plan covers two-year's worth of human services funding, 2001 and 2002, and one year of capital funding, in 2001, subject to budget approval each year. Continuing the process begun last year, the H&HS Funding Plan includes both CDBG and General Funds. Your Council also made the decision to add \$25,000 to this competitive application process to assist in the expansion of services to youth (See Attachment D) which implements the recently adopted Youth Services Policy ("Goal 4"). The total available dollars for competitive allocation to human service projects annually are approximately \$237,274.

The City of Shoreline will receive approximately \$378,876 in Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in 2001. Due to the fact that CDBG funds are allocated annually through the Federal government, we do not know what our allocation will be for 2002. As a result, we are estimating identical revenues for 2002 until we receive additional information. These amounts are also contingent upon the passage of the City's budget. Funds for 2002 cannot be allocated until 2001, and all providers will be informed that funding may be subject to change resulting from Federal and City budget decisions. This funding is recommended to be allocated to the following areas at the indicated levels: 1) The maximum amount allowed under Federal CDBG guidelines, 15% of the total, is available for public (human) services programs: \$54,274. These funds are allocated through the competitive process; 2) A maximum allowable amount of \$47,990 is available for CDBG program planning and administration, reimbursing the General Fund, i.e. CDBG project contracting, reporting, and monitoring; 3) An amount of \$150,612 recommended by staff to be allocated to the King County Housing Repair Fund. This program is administered through King County on the City's behalf. It provides local home owners with low to moderate incomes or special needs with loans or grants of up to \$20,000 to make emergency, health, and safety related home repairs; and 4) The remaining \$126,000 is available for capital projects which benefit low- and moderate-income Shoreline residents and are allocated through the competitive process.

By combining General Funds with CDBG funds, the total estimated amount of funds available for competitive allocation is as follows:

Capital Projects:	est. 2001 <b>\$126,000</b>	CDBG	est. 2002 <b>\$126,000</b>	CDBG
Human Service Projects:	\$ 54,274	CDBG	\$ 54,274	CDBG
	\$158,000	General Fund	\$158,000	General Fund
	\$ 25,000	Goal Four	\$ 25,000	Goal Four
	<b>\$237,274</b>		<b>\$237,274</b>	

This year the City received 17 public service applications and 4 capital project applications. Agencies were notified of the availability of these funds through direct mailings, local advertisements, and an applicant workshop for the 2001/2002 cycle. The 17 public service application requests totaled \$283,162. The 4 capital project requests totaled \$175,793. (Please see Attachment A: Detailed Recommendation for 2001-2002 CDBG and Human Service fund Allocations). A listing of projects not recommended for funding is also included in the Background/Analysis section of this report.

The Human Services Allocations Committee, consisting of both community representatives and City staff, evaluated all of the applications submitted. The Committee used Rating Criteria Sheets (Attachment B), which attach numerical values to questions for the purpose of assessing the application's merit and need. In April 2000 your Council confirmed the priority ranking of the 15 Desired Outcomes recommended by the Health and Human Services Task Force in its report Proposed Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline. These Desired Outcomes (Attachment C) served as a guide for the Committee's recommendations, in conjunction with the following criteria.


- Level of need for the proposed service in Shoreline;
- Whether the purpose of the service fits with the City's goals for human services;
- Ability to address at least one of the City's "Desired Outcomes" (Attachment C) and "Capital Projects Priorities" (Attachment C);
- Level of collaboration and planning initiated by the applicant;
- Diversity of services and persons served;
- The financial and staffing feasibility of the applicant to successfully implement the project;
- Level of request in comparison to the level of service provided to Shoreline residents; and
- (Where applicable) An applicant's performance history on past contracts.

The Human Services Allocations Committee's recommendation to your Council is to fund the attached list of projects, 14 public service programs and 3 capital projects. A contingency plan has been developed in case of changes in the amount of available Federal funds, local funds, and/or an agency's decline of allocated funds. A public hearing is scheduled as part of this agenda item to receive public comment on the Committee's recommendation.

The Committee recommendation includes four new human services projects, Teen Link - Crisis Clinic, King County Sexual Assault Center, Harborview Children's Response Center, and Congregate Meals - Senior Services of Seattle and King County. The funding recommendation developed by the Human Services Allocations Committee is in Table 1 in the attached report.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council hold a public hearing and adopt the Human Services Allocations Committee's recommended 2001/2002 Health and Human Service Funding Plan and the recommended allocations for CDBG Planning/Administration and the King County Housing Repair Fund, as well as the contingency plan; and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing these projects. These funding levels are contingent on the passage of the City of Shoreline budget, as well as the passage of the Federal budget.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney N/A

## **BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS**

### **Health and Human Services Funding**

In April 2000, your Council made the decision to allocate all funding for Health and Human Services in the City of Shoreline through a semi-annual competitive application process. This year's H&HS Funding Plan covers two-year's worth of funding, 2001 and 2002. Continuing the process begun last year, the H&HS Funding Plan includes both CDBG and General Funds. Your Council also made the decision to add \$25,000 to this competitive application process to assist in the expansion of services to youth (See Attachment D) which implements the recently adopted Youth Services Policy ("Goal 4"). The total available dollars for competitive allocation to human service projects annually are approximately \$237,274.

Applicants fill out the same applications, with the same deadline, and are reviewed and ranked as a whole by the Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee. The process for requesting funding from the City for human services was streamlined by combining General Funds with CDBG funds. Staff determined which projects could be funded with CDBG dollars based on the project's ability to meet Federal funding requirements. The remaining projects are to be funded using General Funds. The total estimated amount of funds available for competitive allocation is as follows:

	est. 2001		est. 2002
Capital Projects:	<u>\$126,000</u> CDBG		<u>\$126,000</u> CDBG
Human Service Projects:	\$ 54,274 CDBG		\$ 54,274 CDBG
	\$158,000 General Fund		\$158,000 General Fund
	\$ 25,000 Goal Four		\$ 25,000 Goal Four
	<u>\$237,274</u>		<u>\$237,274</u>

### **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding**

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.

As an entitlement community, Shoreline determines the allocations to eligible projects according to locally developed policies and the King County Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. For 2001 and 2002, the Health and Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee selected the most feasible projects that best addressed local needs and purpose while supporting the Health and Human Services Strategy "15 Desired Outcomes" and the "Capital Project Priorities" (Attachment C).

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has not yet confirmed the 2001 or 2002 fiscal year budget. Therefore, the following figures represent a close estimate of the CDBG funds that will be available to the City. These funds will be confirmed or adjusted after the adoption of the Federal budget. For 2001 and 2002, Shoreline's estimate of available CDBG funds is as follows:

1. Public (human) services*	\$ 54,274
2. Planning & Administration**	\$ 49,990
3. King County Housing Repair Fund***	\$150,612
4. Capital projects****	<u>\$126,000</u>
	<b>\$378,876</b>

\* 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.

\*\*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.

\*\*\*By allocating the recommended \$150,612 the City's Housing Repair account will have an estimated \$175,000 available in 2001 for other housing projects.

\*\*\*\*This amount represents the remainder of the CDBG funds after public service, planning and administration, and King County Housing Repair Fund allocations are determined.

### **Application Process**

In April, letters were sent to a list of over 60 "interested parties" announcing the availability of applications for Shoreline's 2001-2002 Health and Human Service funds. An announcement of application availability was also placed in the Seattle Times and The Enterprise in April. A bidder's conference was held in conjunction with the North and East Funders Group.

A total of 21 applications were received by the application deadline of June 12, 2000. The City received 17 public service applications, totaling \$283,162 in requests, which exceeded the available funds by \$45,888. We received 4 capital project applications, totaling \$175,793 in requests, exceeding the available fund by \$49,793. Based on a King County CDBG Consortium requirement, no applicant may be funded for less than \$5,000.

For comparison purposes, in 1999 the City received 24 public service requests and 4 capital project applications. The public service requests totaled \$397,487, exceeding the available funding of \$181,684. The capital project requests totaled \$238,865, exceeding the amount of available funds by \$89,889. In addition, \$74,000 in capital funds was allocated to the King County Housing Repair program.

### **Special Emphasis on Youth Services**

In January, your Council adopted a new policy that guides the City's involvement in youth services. This new policy identifies three roles for the City: direct service provider/lead, partner or advocate. This policy calls for the City to use H&HS competitive funds, which address youth's needs only in those areas where it plays the partner role. (See Attachment D: City of Shoreline, Youth Services Policy). This more sharply focused policy provided greater direction and clarity to the H&HS Advisory Committee's deliberations.

Following these policy decisions, in April, your Council included an additional \$25,000 H&HS funding specifically targeted to increasing access to services for Shoreline's children and youth. To be eligible for this \$25,000, proposals had to address certain specific Outcomes where the City fulfills the role of "partner." The H&HS Advisory Committee's recommends funding the following programs that include Goal 4 services: the Center for Human Services, TeenHope, Harborview Children's Response Center, and Crisis Clinic-Teen Link. The table of funding recommendations in this report shows whether projects are funded by CDBG, General Fund, and/or Goal 4 (General Fund) monies.

## Advisory Committee

In order to evaluate the 21 applications, a Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee was formed. The Committee had six community representatives and one staff representative.

Community representatives were recruited through newspaper advertisements (Seattle Times, Asian Weekly, and Shoreline Enterprise), notices in neighborhood newsletters, announcements to the Council of Neighborhoods, and posting on the City's web page. The advertisements outlined the following three requirements for serving on the Committee as a community representative:

1. Must be a resident of Shoreline;
2. Knowledge of or interest in human services, low-income or special needs housing, or other capital projects; and
3. Not currently employed by or a member of the Board of Directors of an agency which is applying for funds from the City.

The third requirement is used to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

Applicants were then asked to describe their educational and occupational background, their interest in serving on the Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee, and their involvement in the City of Shoreline. A total of 12 applications were received. The number and caliber of the applications impressed staff. Staff reviewed the applications and forwarded their recommendations to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for review and approval. The Committee members were appointed on June 9, 2000. Six applicants were chosen and able to serve on the Advisory Committee:

1. **Brian Clark** has a master's degree in social work and public administration and has 12 year's experience in social services. Mr. Clark has a strong interest in human services and wanted to be more involved in the community where he lives.
2. **Ron Greeley** is presently employed as a psychotherapist. His occupational experience includes mental health therapy, paramedics, and secondary/college level instruction. Mr. Greeley is interested in serving on the Committee to encourage funding of under-served populations. This is Mr. Greeley's second year on this Committee.
3. **Scott Keeny** has been a resident of Shoreline since 1979 and has been involved in many ways in the Shoreline community including the Richmond Beach Community Council, the Public Services Incorporation Committee, and the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council. Mr. Keeny is currently a Fire Commissioner for the Shoreline Fire Department
4. **Toni Lindquist** is presently employed as a Grant and Contract Specialist at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, and has been involved in other grant allocation processes while employed at a national organization. She has been a resident of Shoreline for 17 years.
5. **Edith Loyer Nelson** has lived in Shoreline for 31 years. She is currently employed by the State of Washington in the Native American Child Welfare Services Unit of the Division of Children and Family Services.
6. **Christine Smith** has served previously on this Committee, and is currently employed by the US Department of Education. In her current position, she works with programs that deliver services to people with disabilities.



In order to include perspectives of City staff involved in planning and community issues, one staff member was also included on the Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee. The following City staff member served on the Committee:

**7. Eric Swansen:** Senior Management Analyst, City Manager's Office

**Review/Selection Process**

The Committee met four times during July and August. Each member of the Committee reviewed all 21 applications. They independently reviewed each application prior to any discussion by the group. The Committee used Rating Criteria Sheets (Attachment B), which attached numerical values to questions for the purpose of assessing the following:

- Level of need for the proposed service in Shoreline;
- Whether the purpose of the service fits with the City's goals for human services;
- Ability to address at least one of the City's "Desired Outcomes" (Attachment C) and "Capital Projects Priorities" (Attachment C);
- Level of collaboration and planning initiated by the applicant;
- Diversity of services and persons served;
- The financial and staffing feasibility of the applicant to successfully implement the project;
- Level of request in comparison to the level of service provided to Shoreline residents; and
- (Where applicable) An applicant's performance history on past contracts.

Any additional questions that the Committee had during their deliberations were noted by staff and the agencies were requested to provide information. Each member provided their scores for each project and the projects were then ranked. A discussion on each project was held to answer questions, provide additional information, etc. Committee members were then able to revise their scores, and the rankings were revisited. Funding levels for the projects were then assigned.

**Changing Environment of Emergency Services**

Work done by the City H&HS staff in conjunction with United Way and King County recognized the need for a more accessible and more comprehensive set of emergency human services in Shoreline. In 2000, City funding helped Hopelink (formerly Multi-Service Centers of North and East King County) add hours of services to Shoreline for their emergency services (energy assistance, emergency housing/shelter, and clothing bank). This resulted in bringing Hopelink staff to Shoreline where they are delivering services out of the Center for Human Services. United Way's recent funding also supports expansion of these services. Even with this expansion of service availability, Shoreline was lacking a fully functional system of emergency services. In recent months, Neighbors in Need, the local foodbank, and Hopelink have completed a merger of the two organizations. As a result we will see an increase in the availability of foodbank and other emergency services, especially for working families. The H&HS Advisory Committee recognized that with these new services Shoreline residents have greater access to emergency services. This area is however, in transition. The Committee recommends that the City review the system of emergency services and the roles of various service providers before entering the next 2003-2004 funding process.

In the coming year, staff will be completing assessments of the City's roles, and develop specific strategies to address the Desired Outcomes not included in the Youth Services Policy. This work will be similar to analysis completed for the Youth Services Policy. In response to the H&HS Allocations Advisory Committee's recommendation, staff will undertake an assessment of

the role each of the emergency services providers will undertake in sustaining an effective set of services for Shoreline residents. The result of this analysis will guide the allocations for the 2003-2004 funding cycle.

## Results

The Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee has reviewed and ranked the 21 applications for 2001-2002 CDBG/Human Services funding. The recommendations of the Committee have been summarized in the following list. A public hearing to solicit public comment will be held on September 11, 2000.

The Committee recommended 14 human service projects for funding in 2001-2002 and 3 capital projects for funding in 2001. The amounts listed refer to the amount that the City of Shoreline will enter into agreement with the agency for each year (2001 and 2002). More complete descriptions of each project can be found in Attachment A, along with brief descriptions of the Committee's rationale for its recommendation.

The Funding Plan allocates funding for capital projects in 2001 only. Though the application process invited agencies to apply for two years' worth of funding staff and the Committee did not feel there were two years' worth of funding requests. The Committee felt they were able to adequately fund all requests that well satisfied the funding criteria set forth by your Council. Upon reflection, staff concluded that it is unlikely that the City will receive two years' worth of capital project applications unless an applicant is in the midst of a major capital campaign.

**Table 1.**  
**Human Service Projects Recommended for Funding, 2001 and 2002**

(Applicant)	Project Description	2000 Funding	Agency Request	Recommendation/ per year	DO*
Senior Services of Seattle/King County: Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Senior Center	Provides nutrition, recreation & socialization, educational classes; financial/legal counseling; in home assistance; events, & volunteer opportunities.	\$65,368	\$67,329	\$67,329 (all GF)	8, 15
Center for Human Services	CHS provides information and referral services, Family Skill Building sessions, Parent Child Activities, Emergency Feeding program, the Family Counseling Program and Substance Abuse Program will provide, individual sessions, assessments, group sessions, case management services and outreach.	\$68,801	\$93,542	\$83,925 (Goal 4: \$12,480, CDBG: \$9,427, GF:\$62,171)	3, 4, 6
TeenHope	Provides safe shelter, referrals, counseling, case-management and transportation. The Mediation Program recruits, trains, & supervises teams of mediators to work with families in crisis.	\$15,000	\$25,000	\$15,000 (Goal 4: \$7,500, GF:\$7,500)	6, 9

\*indicates Desired Outcomes

**Human Service Projects Recommended for Funding, 2001 and 2002, cont.**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2000 Funding</b>	<b>Agency Request</b>	<b>Recommendation/ per year</b>	<b>DO*</b>
Crisis Clinic-Telephone Services	Provides information & referral, crisis intervention, and short-term phone counseling to 3,600 Shoreline residents.	\$5,250	\$5,355	\$5,000 (all CDBG)	6, 9
King County Sexual Assault Center	Provides crisis intervention or information/referral, legal advocacy, & prevention education.	None	\$5,000	\$4,000 (all GF)	5, 14
Senior Services of Seattle/KC: Shoreline-Congregate Meals	Provides hot, nutritious meals to seniors served at S/LFP Senior Center, nutrition education, and socialization.	None	\$2,775	\$2,500 (all GF)	6, 8
East/North Healthy Start (Formerly Shoreline 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.	\$7,085	\$9,120	\$9,000 (all CDBG)	3, 5, 12
Hopelink (Formerly Multi-Service Centers of North & East King County)-Emergency Services	Provides to 3000 low-income Shoreline residents basic and emergency needs including food, financial assistance, shelter, as well as information and referral.	\$5,000	\$24,000	\$18,000 (CDBG: \$6,500, GF:\$11,500)	6
Harborview Children's Response Center	The Center provides comprehensive sexual assault services to the communities it serves, including Shoreline, with both direct client and community oriented services offered.	None	\$5,000	\$5,000 (all Goal 4)	5, 14
Hopelink (Formerly Multi-Service Centers of North & East King County) - Kenmore Shelter	Provision of nine units of emergency shelter in Kenmore Shelter; case management services; and first months rent payments for homeless families.	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$8,000 (all CDBG)	6
The Homelessness Project of The Church Council of Greater Seattle	THP provides transitional housing and case management to homeless single-parent families.	\$5,300	\$5,459	\$5,000 (all CDBG)	6, 12, 15
Food Lifeline	Supplies food to Neighbors in Need Food Bank, solicitation of donations from the food industry and the public.	\$9,000	\$5,000	\$5,000 (all CDBG)	6

\*indicates Desired Outcomes

### Human Service Projects Recommended for Funding, 2001 and 2002, cont.

Applicant	Project Description	2000 Funding	Agency Request	Recommendation/ per year	DO*
Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline	Provides an emergency response to the nutritional needs of people in crisis hunger situations and resource counseling.	\$5,000	\$9,450	\$6,500 (all CDBG)	6
Crisis Clinic-Teen Link	A telephone helpline for teens that is answered by teens each evening from 6-10 p.m. Teen & adult volunteers & staff provide suicide prevention training in middle and high schools.	None	\$5,000	\$3,020 (Goal 4:\$20, GF:\$3,000)	5, 6, 9, 14
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$237,274</b>	

\*indicates Desired Outcomes

### Capital Projects Recommended for Funding, 2001

Applicant	Project	Request	Recommendation	Capital Priority
Center for Human Services	Project would add safety, program, and building improvements, including new entrance door, office space, and carpet.	\$50,793	\$45,000	2
Shoreline Public Works Department	ADA improvements to sidewalks	\$100,000	\$71,000	3
Inland Empire Residential Resources	Purchase and, if needed, renovation of five, four-bedroom houses to provide shared housing for developmentally disabled adults.	\$10,000	\$10,000	1
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$126,000</b>	

### Human Service Applications Not Recommended for Funding

Applicant	Project Description	Request	Recommendation
Child Care Resources	Telephone and Internet information & referral service for parents seeking childcare.	\$5,000	No funding
AtWork!	Coordination and implementation of work experience and transition services for high school students with disabilities.	\$4,980	No funding
Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens	The program provides one-on-one job counseling including job referrals, job workshops, 24-hour job line, job fairs, resume preparation, job development, and referrals to other senior services.	\$1,152	No funding
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$11,132</b>	

### Capital Projects Not Recommended for Funding

Applicant	Project Description	Request	Recommendation
AtWork!-Capital Improvement	Renovation of their building to provide safety improvements and other improvements.	\$10,000	No funding
Total		\$10,000	

### CONTINGENCY PLAN

1. 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.

- a. **Public Services**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are increased in 2001 and/or 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 (bringing their total to their requested level.) Additional funds would then be provided to King County Sexual Assault Center (\$1,000) and Hopelink-Shelter (\$1,000), in that order.

- b. **Capital Projects**

If additional CDBG Capital funds become available to the City in 2001, the Committee recommends awarding funds to the Center for Human Services to a total award of \$50,793 (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 \$50,793 become available or the Center for Human Services is unable to use these funds, the balance should be added to the City of Shoreline Public Works ADA Sidewalks Improvement Program.

2. If funding reductions are necessary, the Committee recommends:

- a. **Public Services:**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are reduced in 2001 and/or 2002, the Committee recommends that the first loss of funds (up to \$1,445) come from the Center for Human Services allocation. The agency received a substantial increase in the level of funding from 2000, and the Committee felt that the decrease would not significantly impact their ability to provide services. If additional funds are reduced, then the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center would be reduced by up to \$1,329. In the case of further reductions, after funds are reduced from the Center for Human Services and Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center as outlined above, any additional reductions would essentially cancel the Crisis Clinic-Teen Link program (any funds remaining would be programmed into Crisis Clinic-Telephone Services).

- b. **Capital Projects.** In the event the City's 2001 CDBG Capital Service Funds are reduced, the Committee recommends reducing the amount allocated to each project the percentage to which the funding was reduced. (Example: if funding was reduced by 2%, then each project would be reduced by 2%).

### 3. Use of CDBG or GF funding:

The Committee ranked projects on the basis of merit. Staff determined which projects to fund with CDBG or General Funds. This determination is based on how well a project meets and can document low- to moderate-income benefit and whether or not it was funded with General Funds in prior years. In addition, if there is increase or reduction in funds, staff may shift the source of funding for projects from General Fund to CDBG, or vice versa.

### **SUMMARY**

The Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee has met and reviewed 21 applications for Shoreline's 2001-2002 CDBG and Human Service funding. There were 17 applicants for human service projects and 4 applicants for capital projects. The Committee recommends funding 14 human service applicants for a total of \$237,274 and 3 capital project applicants for a total of \$126,000. The recommended projects are described in Attachment A, along with a contingency plan in case federal funds are either increased or decreased up to 10% from the current estimates. The Committee's recommendation is based on a careful review and ranking of the applications and by using the Rating Criteria Sheets.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that your Council hold a public hearing and adopt the Human Services Allocations Committee's recommended 2001-2002 Health and Human Service Funding Plan and the recommended allocations for CDBG Planning/Administration and the King County Housing Repair Fund, as well as the contingency plan; and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing these projects. These funding levels are contingent on the passage of the City of Shoreline budget, as well as the passage of the Federal Budget.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A: 2001-2002 Human Services Allocations Advisory Committee Funding Plan
- Attachment B: Rating Criteria Sheets
- Attachment C: Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline: Desired Outcomes and Priorities for Capital Projects
- Attachment D: City of Shoreline Youth Services Policy
- Attachment E: Glossary of Terms

## ATTACHMENT A

### 2001-2002 HUMAN SERVICES ALLOCATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING PLAN

#### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) and HUMAN SERVICES CAPITAL AND PUBLIC SERVICES

*In order of the Committee's Recommendations*

#### Recommended Public Service Projects

**1. Senior Services of Seattle/King County – Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center**

**Project:** Program provides nutrition, recreation & socialization, educational classes; financial & legal counseling; in-home assistance; community events, and volunteer opportunities.

**Requested:** \$67,329

**Recommended:** \$67,329

**Source of funding:** General Fund

**1998 General Fund Contract:** \$67,739

**1999 General Fund Contract:** \$67,739

**2000 General Fund Contract:** \$65,368

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- Projected to serve 1,581 Shoreline seniors
- 24,097 person hours (duplicated hours of service to Shoreline senior citizens: ex. 25 seniors attend a workshop on estate planning = 25 person hours)

**Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 8.
- The agency has met all goals in previous contracts with the City.
- The applicant has made an effort to supplement its budget with fundraisers.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs and Feasibility.
- Agency has demonstrated quality service to the community.

**Rating Criteria score: 583 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 67,329</b>	<b>(recommended)</b>
City of Lake Forest Park	\$ 9,453	
Agency Fundraising	\$ 181,552	
United Way	\$ 24,433	
Grants	\$ 8,750	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 291,517</b>	

---

## **2. Center for Human Services**

**Project:** Provision of information and referral services, family support, family counseling and substance abuse services to Shoreline residents. This program now covers the core services the agency provides to Shoreline youth, families and adults, including case management, family counseling, anger management, and substance abuse services. The increase from previous year funding is to provide youth outreach services.

**Requested:** \$93,542

**Recommended:** \$83,925

**Source of funding:** CDBG: \$12,480

Goal 4: \$12,480

General Fund: \$62,171

**1998 General Fund Contract:** \$40,000

**1999 General Fund Contract:** \$66,000

**2000 General Fund/CDBG Contract:** \$68,801

### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- Projected to serve 1,775 Shoreline residents
- 65 parent/child activities
- 190 hours of family skill building
- 12 months of distributing emergency food packets and providing information and referral
- 284 hours of family counseling
- 1,363 hours of substance abuse counseling
- 624 hours of services through a youth advocate(new service, Goal 4)

### **Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 3, 4, and 6.
- Increase in funding well justified because of new service (youth advocate) relating to Goal 4 and demonstrated need levels in substance abuse services.
- Agency provides essential services to Shoreline residents, and does so locally.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs, Purpose, Outcomes, and Diversity.
- Agency has been working well with City staff in resolving some financial and operational processes. The agency has reduced use of their line of credit to virtually zero, and has been providing the City with regular updates on agreed upon milestones in this process.

**Rating Criteria score: 636 points out of a possible 700 points**

### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 83,925</b>	(recommended)
City of Shoreline (2% alcohol)	\$ 9,200	
City of Shoreline Rec. Center	\$ 3,000	
City of Lake Forest Park	\$ 5,000	
King County	\$ 377,200	
Title XIX	\$ 30,000	
Highline Mental Health	\$ 197,500	
All other	\$ 251,156	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 956,981</b>	



---

### **3. Teen Hope: Youth and Family Mediation and Youth Shelter (adds the Youth Shelter to the program)**

**Project:** The Youth and Family Mediation program will assist families in managing conflict, particularly conflict occurring between adolescents and their parents or guardians, preventing problems from escalating to the point that requires more costly intervention, and reconnecting youth with their families. The program is co-mediated by adult and teenage peer – both professionally trained in basic and parent/teen mediation. The Emergency Shelter Program provides safe shelter, all basic necessities, counseling, case-management, transportation and referrals to family mediation to seven youth at a time, ages 13 to 17.

**Requested:** \$25,000

**Recommended:** \$15,000

**Source of funding:** General Fund: \$7,500  
Goal 4: \$7,500

**1998:** None

**1999:** None

**2000 General Fund:** \$7,500 (mediation program only)

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- Serve up to 50 Shoreline youth in mediation
- Serve 10 Shoreline Youth in the Shelter
- 100 hours of mediation
- 750 hours of mediation training
- 250 hours of shelter counseling and case-management

#### **Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 6 and 9.
- The Committee felt that funding at the recommended level allows for healthy expansion of funding for these programs.
- The Agency provides innovative and unique programs and has broad community support.
- The Agency was recently accepted as a United Way Member Agency.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs, Purpose, and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 611 points out of a possible 700 points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 15,000</b>	(recommended)
Other Government Support	\$ 27,500	
Boeing Community Fund	\$ 25,000	
Private Fundraising	\$ 187,500	
Private Grants	\$ 65,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 320,000</b>	

---

#### **4. Crisis Clinic-Telephone Services**

**Project:** Provides information and referral, crisis intervention, and short term phone counseling to 3,600 Shoreline residents.

**Requested:** \$5,355

**Recommended:** \$5,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG funding:** \$5,000 for telephone support services

**1999 CDBG funding:** \$5,350 for telephone support services

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$5,250 for telephone support services

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 3,600 calls from Shoreline residents
- 44 calls will be made by the agency on behalf of Shoreline residents
- 4,000 referrals will be given by the agency to other agencies, local shelters, and mental health services on behalf of Shoreline callers

#### **Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 6 and 9.
- Program has extensive community outreach to market the service.
- The services provided by this agency are a core piece of all other public service provisions.
- The agency has met and exceeded all performance outcome measures on past contracts.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs, Outcomes, and Funding.

**Rating Criteria score: 608 points out of a possible 700 points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	<b>(recommended)</b>
Other Suburban Cities	\$ 90,050	
Seattle DSHS	\$ 35,177	
Salvation Army-RACE	\$ 25,000	
Fremont HSP	\$ 46,750	
UBH/King County I&R	\$ 344,946	
United Way of King County	\$ 410,710	
Program Service Fees	\$ 176,155	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,133,788</b>	

---

### **5. King County Sexual Assault Resource Center – New Project**

**Project:** KCSARC will provide the following services to Shoreline residents: (1) Crisis intervention or information and referral, (2) Legal advocacy, and (3) prevention education to professionals working with students in Shoreline schools. I & R and crisis intervention are provided via a 1-800 line, and legal advocacy services are provided at County Courthouse (Seattle) and when appropriate, at law enforcement headquarters; prevention education will take place at various locations in the Shoreline School District.

**Requested:** \$5,000

**Recommended:** \$4,000

**Source of funding:** General Fund

**1998:** None

**1999:** None

**2000:** None

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 15 Shoreline residents will receive crisis intervention and information/referral
- 40 hours of legal advocacy
- 20 hours of prevention education to professionals working with students in Shoreline schools
- 45 total unduplicated Shoreline residents served

#### **Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 5 and 14.
- Agency well-documented their current service in Shoreline in their application, providing up-to-date information.
- This project addresses Goal 4 priorities.
- Request of funding is appropriate for percentage of Shoreline residents served.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs and Outcomes.
- Though new to Shoreline, the agency has demonstrated an ability to serve Shoreline residents.

**Rating Criteria score: 591 points out of a possible 700 points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 4,000</b>	(recommended)
Auburn, Federal Way, Burien	\$ 103,160	
Redmond, Issaquah, Kirkland	\$ 25,750	
Other Cities	\$ 119,963	
State	\$ 379,226	
King County	\$ 445,684	
United Way	\$ 69,000	
Contributions/Revenue	\$ 649,099	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,795,882</b>	

---

**6. Senior Services of Seattle/King County – Congregate Meals**

**Project:** Provides hot, nutritious meals to seniors served at Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center and nutrition education as well as socialization. Meals are provided five days per week at the Center.

**Requested:** \$2,775

**Recommended:** \$2,500

**Source of funding:** General Fund

**1998:** None

**1999:** None

**2000:** None

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 225 Shoreline residents to be served
- 11,100 total meals to be served

**Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 6 and 8.
- Agency clearly demonstrated ability to achieve the Desired Outcomes.
- This request represents the first from Senior Services for this program, due to increasing costs and flat funding from other sources.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs and Purpose.

**Rating Criteria score: 589 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 2,500</b>	(recommended)
Other suburban cities	\$ 21,400	
City of Redmond	\$ 2,425	
City of Issaquah	\$ 1,500	
City of Kirkland	\$ 1,525	
South King County Cities	\$ 13,750	
Federal	\$ 967,574	
Fees, United Way, other	\$ 464,866	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,456,340</b>	

---

**7. East/North Healthy Start (formerly Shorenorth Parent Education Center)**

**Project:** East/North Healthy Start provides voluntary home-based support services to new young families 22 years of age or younger, who are pregnant or have an infant six months of age or younger. Home visiting services continue for three years and a support group is also available.

**Requested:** \$9,120

**Recommended:** \$9,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1997 CDBG funding:** none

**1998 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

**1999 CDBG/General Fund funding:** \$7,085

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$7,085

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 31 families from Shoreline will receive family support services by an experienced therapist through home visits and group support sessions
- 144 hours of direct service

**Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 3, 5, and 12.
- The agency has met and exceeded the performance measures for past contracts with the City.
- Services are prevention based.
- Committee felt the services provided were comprehensive and provide guidance during a crucial time for parent and child.
- The application scored well on: Local Needs, Outcomes, and Purpose.

**Rating Criteria score: 586 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 9,000</b>	(recommended)
Other suburban cities	\$ 29,440	
KC Child/Family Commission	\$ 280,080	
DCFS Region II(Sno Co)	\$ 40,000	
United Way Investment	\$ 20,000	
United Way	\$ 25,000	
Foundations	\$ 34,323	
Restricted Carry-over	\$ 18,175	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 456,018</b>	

---

**8. Hopelink – Emergency Services (formerly Multi-Service Centers of North and East King County)**

**Project:** Provides to 3000 low-income Shoreline residents basic and emergency needs including food, financial assistance and shelter, as well as information and referral. Services will be available at the Center for Human Services approximately 4 ½ days a week.

**Requested:** \$24,000

**Recommended:** \$18,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG: \$6,500

General Fund: \$11,500

**1998:** none

**1999:** none

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 2,250 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- \$25,000 in emergency financial assistance to be provided from agency resources
- 1,000 information and referral calls

**Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 6.
- The expansion in funding will allow a full-time staff person to be in Shoreline, which the agency documented is needed by the amount of financial assistance provided in 2000.
- The Committee recognized that there is a gap in the provision of emergency services to Shoreline residents in need.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 572 points out of a possible 700 points**

<b>BUDGET</b>	(just for Shoreline emergency services program)
<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 18,000</b> (recommended)
<b>Agency Resources</b>	<b>\$ 146,857</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 164,857</b>

---

### **9. Harborview Children's Response Center – New Project**

**Project:** The Center provides comprehensive sexual assault services to the communities it serves, including Shoreline, with both direct client and community oriented services offered. A majority of the services will be provided at the Center for Human Services.

**Requested:** \$5,000

**Recommended:** \$5,000

**Source of funding:** Goal 4

**1998:** None

**1999:** None

**2000:** None

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 20 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 10 information and referral calls
- 6 crisis intervention calls/visits
- 4 medical advocacy cases

#### **Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 5 and 14.
- The Committee felt that these services could best be provided through a regional approach with local presence, as is outlined in this application.
- The agency provided well-documented information on level of need and the complexity of services.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs, Outcomes, and Collaboration.
- Meets a Goal 4 priority.

**Rating Criteria score: 568 points out of a possible 700 points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	(recommended)
Other suburban cities	\$ 89,500	
State Core/Spec. Services	\$ 188,129	
King County Women's Prog.	\$ 67,104	
HMC Traumatic Stress Svs.	\$ 2,311	
United Way	\$ 18,900	
Partners/Healthier Comm.	\$ 10,000	
Project Safe Child	\$ 10,000	
Overlake Hospital (in-kind)	\$ 28,000	
Client Fees	\$ 86,790	
Restitution	\$ 500	
Community Ed./Training Fees	\$ 500	
Fundraising	\$ 50,517	
Operational Reserve	\$ 155,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 712,251</b>	

---

**10. Hopelink – Kenmore Shelter (formerly Multi-Service Centers of North and East King County)**

**Project:** Provision of nine units of emergency shelter in Kenmore Shelter; case management services, and first months rent payments for homeless families.

**Requested:** \$10,000

**Recommended:** \$8,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG funding:** \$6,000

**1999 CDBG/General Fund funding:** \$7,000

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$6,000

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 30 Shoreline residents will be assisted
- 693 shelter bednights will be provided
- 200 information and assistance calls
- 120 hours of case management

**Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 6.
- The applicant has met its goals on past contracts with the City.
- The Kenmore shelter is the closest shelter to Shoreline. 9% of the Shelter's clients are from Shoreline, and the recommended amount is comparable with this percentage.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 557 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

City of Shoreline	\$	8,000	(recommended)
City of Bothell	\$	17,500	
Emergency Shelter Grant	\$	3,000	
KC CDBG	\$	60,000	
Agency Resources	\$	70,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>158,500</b>	



---

**11. The Homelessness Project of the Church Council of Greater Seattle**

**Project:** The Homelessness Project provides transitional housing and case management to homeless single-parent families.

**Requested:** \$5,459

**Recommended:** \$5,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

**1999 CDBG funding:** \$5,150

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$5,300

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 17 Shoreline residents will be assisted
- 148 hours of case management will be provided

**Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 6, 12, and 15
- The Committee liked the use of following up case management for families who secure permanent housing and the effort to keep Shoreline families in this community.
- The applicant has met its performance measures for past contracts with the City.
- The applicant has a high success rate (approximately 90%) of placing families in permanent housing.
- This application scored well on: Outcomes and Funding.

**Rating Criteria score: 554 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

City of Shoreline	\$	5,000	(recommended)
City of Seattle	\$	25,140	
Group Donations	\$	24,439	
Individuals	\$	49,000	
HUD-McKinney/THORA	\$	151,103	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>254,682</b>	

---

## **12. Food Lifeline**

**Project:** Gathering/collecting of donations from the food industry and the public; distribution of food and essentials to neighborhood food banks and meal programs. Food is allocated to Neighbors in Need in Shoreline. Service is provided to the largely volunteer-driven member agencies by a professional warehouse, office, and technical assistance staff at Food Lifeline.

**Requested:** \$5,000

**Recommended:** \$5,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998:** None

**1999 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 766 Shoreline residents will be served
- Provide 3,731 meals

### **Key points of Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 6.
- The Food Lifeline distribution center is located in Shoreline (1702 NE 150th) at the Neighbors in Need Food Bank, which has been a staple in this community for almost three decades.
- The applicant has met and exceeded its goals to date for the 2000 contract with the City.
- This application scored well on: Local Needs, Purpose, and Funding.

**Rating Criteria score: 533 points out of a possible 700 points**

### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	<b>(recommended)</b>
City of Seattle	\$ 70,880	
Donations & Contracts	\$1,820,839	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,896,719</b>	

---

### **13. Emergency Feeding Program/Shoreline**

**Project:** Provides an emergency response to the nutritional needs of people in crisis hunger situations and resource counseling. Meals can be picked up locally at the Center for Human Services.

**Requested:** \$9,450

**Recommended:** \$6,500

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG funding:** \$5,000

**1999 CDBG/General Fund funding:** \$10,812

**2000 CDBG funding:** \$9,000

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 536 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 3,731 meals to be provided

#### **Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 6.
- Ranked lower this year as more emergency services/food bank resources are available in Shoreline.
- The application scored well on: Local Needs and Purpose.

**Rating Criteria score: 527 points out of a possible 700 points**

<b>BUDGET</b>	(for Shoreline program only)	
<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 6,500</b>	(recommended)
Private Donations	\$ 6,590	
Foundations	\$ 399	
FEMA	\$ 210	
EFAP	\$ 71	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 13,770</b>	

---

#### **14. Crisis Clinic – Teen Link – New Program**

**Project:** A telephone helpline for teens that is answered by teens each evening from 6–10 p.m. Teen and adult volunteers and staff provide suicide prevention training in middle and high schools.

**Requested:** \$5,000

**Recommended:** \$3,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG: \$3,000

Goal 4: \$20

**1998 funding:** None

**1999 funding:** None

**2000 funding:** None

This request will fund a portion of the office and operating expenses for this program.

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 536 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 3,731 meals to be provided

**Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 5, 6, 9, and 14.
- The application scored well on: Local Needs and Purpose.
- Program is valuable both for the teen callers as well as the teen volunteers.
- The Committee felt that the reduction from the amount requested is more appropriate when looking at the amounts budgeted for other suburban cities.

**Rating Criteria score: 518 points out of a possible 700 points**

**BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 3,000</b>	(recommended)
Other suburban cities	\$ 20,000	
County CSD	\$ 34,284	
County Council	\$ 10,000	
Agency Fundraising	\$ 42,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 109,284</b>	

## Human Service Projects Not Recommended for Funding

### **15. Child Care Resources**

**Project:** Customized and standard training programs, technical assistance, and support services for child care providers in Shoreline. Phone information and referral for Shoreline families; on-site resources for member and community use.

**Requested:** \$5,000

**Recommended:** \$0

**1999:** None

**2000:** None

#### **Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 195 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 35 information and referral calls
- 30 workshops for child care providers
- 9 hours of technical assistance

#### **Key points of Committee's deliberation:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 10 and 15.
- The service is preventative in nature and appears to be secondary to many of the needs expressed through other applications.
- This application did not score well on: Local Needs and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 516 points out of a possible 700 points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	(requested)
Federal Grants	\$ 414,782	
State Grants	\$ 15,450	
King County Grants	\$ 234,923	
City of Seattle	\$ 189,900	
North & East KC Cities	\$ 47,812	
South King County Cities	\$ 56,000	
United Way	\$ 108,362	
Service Fees	\$ 225,200	
Special Projects	\$ 24,152	
Contributions	\$ 101,500	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,453,081</b>	

---

**16. AtWork! – School to Work Transition Coordinator – New Project**

**Project:** Coordination and implementation of work experience and transition services for high school students with disabilities.

**Requested:** \$4,980

**Recommended:** \$0

<b>First application to the City of Shoreline</b>
---

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2000:**

- 7 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 576 hours of employment services to Shoreline residents

**Key points of Committee's deliberation:**

- This agency's services address Outcome 15.
- The Committee did not feel that the agency adequately addressed how this project will have a positive impact in Shoreline.
- This application did not score well on: Local Needs, Purpose, and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 478 points out of a possible 700 points**

<b>BUDGET</b>		
City of Shoreline	\$	4,980 (requested)
North & East KC cities	\$	40,292
Agency Res./United Way	\$	24,906
Contributions	\$	940
Service Fees	\$	204,605
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>275,723</b>

---

**17. Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens – Age 55+ Employment Resource Center – New Program**

**Project:** The Age 55+ Employment Program targets seniors with low- to moderate-incomes. The program provides one-on-one job counseling including job referrals, job workshops, 24-hour job line, job fairs, resume preparation, job development, interviewing techniques, mock interviews, Center Puget Sound & Eastside Diversity Task Force "live resume" program, Older American's Act – Title V employment program, labor trend information, referrals to other senior services and Healthy Aging Gold Card.

**Requested:** \$1,152

**Recommended:** \$0

---

**First application to the City of Shoreline**

The requested funds would be used for personnel costs.

**Agency goals for service to Shoreline clients in 2001:**

- 13 Shoreline residents to be assisted
- 25 placements in employment
- 39 hours of employment services per client

**Key points of Committee's deliberation:**

- This agency's services address Outcomes 8 and 15.
- The Committee did not feel that the agency adequately addressed how this project did effective outreach in Shoreline or collaborated with Shoreline agencies.
- The Committee also felt that the location of the service (in Bellevue) presented a barrier to Shoreline citizens accessing the service.
- This application did not score well on: Local Needs, Purpose, and Outcomes.

**Rating Criteria score: 447 points out of a possible 700 points**

---

**BUDGET**

City of Shoreline	\$	1,152	(requested)
City of Bellevue	\$	14,401	
City of Kirkland	\$	2,496	
City of Redmond	\$	1,152	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>19,201</b>	

## Recommended Capital Projects

### **1. The Center for Human Services – Facility Enhancements**

**Project:** 1) Put a new door in the front of the building to restrict the entrance to an area that would be observed (safety issue). This would also require an extension of the front stoop. This would make the front entrance wheelchair accessible while doing this project. (2) Add an office in the education department to provide private space for counseling services (3) Put a window in the reception area for the youth substance abuse department so the youth can be observed in the lobby area (safety issue). (4) Re-carpet a portion of the building.

**Requested:** \$50,793

**Recommended:** \$45,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**Capital funds were allocated in 1999 for a facility study, but were not used.**

The requested funds will be used to fund the following items in their entirety, in this order: the entry door, office space, window, carpet.

#### **Key Points of Committee's deliberations:**

- The need for these improvements was clearly demonstrated in the application; safety being a top need.
- 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:** 594 points out of a possible 700 points.

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 45,000</b>	(recommended)
CHS	\$ 5,000	
Additional Fundraising	\$ 5,793	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 55,793</b>	



---

## **2. Shoreline Public Works**

**Project:** Construct curb ramps and wheelchair pads at bus stops within the City of Shoreline for increased accessibility for persons with disabilities. Construct 35-45 curb ramps. Improvements will be made throughout the City in the following locations: 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street, and Richmond Beach Road.

**Requested:** \$100,000

**Recommended:** \$ 71,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG Funding:** \$59,749

**1999 CDBG Funding:** \$100,000

**2000 CDBG Funding:** \$65,316

### **Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- The Committee was satisfied with the implementation of past awards for the construction of curb ramps.
- The project is a direct investment in the City's infrastructure.
- The project scored well on Accessibility, Feasibility, Purpose, and Local needs.

**Rating Criteria score: 591 points out of 700 possible points**

### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 71,000</b>	(recommended)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 71,000</b>	

---

### **3. Inland Empire Residential Resources:**

**Project:** Purchase and, if needed, renovation of five, four-bedroom houses to provide shared housing for developmentally disabled adults.

**Requested:** \$10,000

**Recommended:** \$10,000

**Source of funding:** CDBG

**1998 CDBG funding:** None

**1999 CDBG funding:** \$5,000 (added to current project)

**2000 CDBG funding:** None

#### **Key points of the Committee's deliberations:**

- Provides an opportunity for disabled persons to become independent.
- The project has secured ongoing operational funding.
- Project already received Shoreline support in 1999.
- Scored well on Purpose and Local Need.

**Rating Criteria score: 643 points out of 700 possible points**

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>	(recommended)
City of Shoreline	\$ 5,000	(funded in 1999 through CDBG)
King County HFP	\$ 583,343	
State Housing Trust Fund	\$ 659,129	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,257,472</b>	

## **Capital Projects Not Recommended for Funding**

### **4. AtWork! – Improvements to AtWork!'s Issaquah Facilities**

**Project:** (1) Construct five rooms within the metal shop, above each will be storage; (2) Erect a metal canopy over AtWork!'s Recycling Yard; (3) Erect a metal canopy over AtWork!'s Accessible Transportation Transfer Area; and (4) Erect a metal canopy over a ramp, the front entry and a walkway.

**Requested:** \$15,000

**Recommended:** \$0

#### **Key Points of Committee's deliberations:**

- The agency estimated that three Shoreline residents would benefit from these improvements (1.3% of their clientele at this location).
- Agency did not demonstrate sufficient impact to Shoreline residents.
- The application did not score well on: Local Needs, Purpose, and Funding.

**Rating Criteria score:** 402 points out of a possible 700 points.

#### **BUDGET**

<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>	(requested)
City of Bellevue	\$ 175,000	
City of Redmond	\$ 35,846	
King County CDBG	\$ 250,000	
Agency Resources	\$ 12,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 482,846</b>	

## 2001-2002 CDBG Funding Contingency Plan

---

1. 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.

- a. **Public Services**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are increased in 2001 and/or 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 (bringing their total to their requested level.) Additional funds would then be provided to King County Sexual Assault Center (\$1,000) and Hopelink-Shelter (\$1,000), in that order.

- b. **Capital Projects**

If additional CDBG Capital funds become available to the City in 2001, the Committee recommends awarding funds to the Center for Human Services to a total award of \$50,793 (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 \$50,793 become available or the Center for Human Services is unable to use these funds, the balance should be added to the City of Shoreline Public Works ADA Sidewalks Improvement Program.

2. If funding reductions are necessary, the Committee recommends:

- a. **Public Services:**

In the event CDBG Public Service Funds are reduced in 2001 and/or 2002, the Committee recommends that the first loss of funds (up to \$1,445) come from the Center for Human Services allocation. The agency received a substantial increase in the level of funding from 2000, and the committee felt that the decrease would not significantly impact their ability to provide services. If additional funds are reduced, then the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center would be reduced by up to \$1,329. In the case of further reductions, after funds are reduced from the Center for Human Services and Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center as outlined above, any additional reductions would essentially cancel the Crisis Clinic-Teen Link program (any funds remaining would be programmed into Crisis Clinic-Telephone Services).

- b. **Capital Projects.** In the event the City's 2001 CDBG Capital Service Funds are reduced, the Committee recommends reducing the amount allocated to each project the percentage to which the funding was reduced. (Example: if funding was reduced by 2%, then each project would be reduced by 2%).

3. Use of CDBG or GF funding:

The committee ranked projects on the basis of merit. Staff determined which projects to fund with CDBG or General Funds. This determination is based on how well a project meets and can document low- to moderate-income benefit and whether or not it was funded with General Funds in prior years. In addition, if there is increase or reduction in funds, staff may shift the source of funding for projects from General Fund to CDBG, or vice versa.

**ATTACHMENT B**

**RATING CRITERIA 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
<b>1. LOCAL NEEDS: point range 0-15 (questions 2,5)</b> 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?		
<b>2. ACCESSIBILITY: point range 0-10 (question 11)</b> 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?		
<b>3. PURPOSE: point range 0-15 (questions 3,4)</b> 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>		
<b>4. OUTCOMES: point range 0-10</b> a. Will the project or the services provided by the agency requesting funding for the project assist the City in obtaining any of its <b>Desired Outcomes</b> for Health and Human Services?		

Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>5. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 (question 7)</b> a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the project?		
<b>6. DIVERSITY: point range 0-10</b> 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.)		
<b>7. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-20 (questions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13)</b> 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> )?		
<b>8. FUNDING: point range 0-10 (questions 5, 8)</b> 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?		

# CITY OF SHORELINE 2001-2002 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC SERVICE APPLICATION 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 1-7 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. Rating criteria are based on the Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline.

Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>1. LOCAL NEEDS: point range 0-15 (questions 3,4)</b> 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?		
<b>2. PURPOSE: point range 0-15 (question 8)</b> a. Does the project help Shoreline to develop as a healthy, safe, and economically prosperous community? b. Does the project build on the strengths and assets in the Shoreline community to reduce risks that lead to undesirable outcomes?		
<b>3. OUTCOMES: point range 0-25 (question 8)</b> a. Does the project adequately address two or more of the <i>Desired Outcomes</i> ? b. How well will the proposed project facilitate the obtainment of the <i>Desired Outcomes</i> ?		
<b>4. COLLABORATION: point range 0-10 (question 9)</b> a. Is the agency working with other agencies, cities, etc. that are relevant for the program/project? b. Does this project represent duplication in services?		
<b>5. ACCESSIBILITY: point range 0-10 (question 6)</b> 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.)		



Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>6. FEASIBILITY: point range 0-15 (questions 7, 14)</b> 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 applicant been funded before? If yes, how have they performed ( <i>refer to summary information</i> )?		
<b>7. FUNDING: point range 0-10 (questions 4, 10, 13)</b> a. Is the request reasonable, given the services provided? What is the cost benefit ratio (#of Shoreline residents served/cost of project)? b. If this is a regional project, is the request to Shoreline reasonable, relative to what others are paying? c. What appears to be the agency's need for resources based on the resources already secured? How would the program or service be delivered in the absence of Shoreline funds? Would Shoreline residents still be served and at what level if Shoreline were unable to grant requested funds?		

## **ATTACHMENT C**

### **Health and Human Services Strategy for the City of Shoreline: Desired Outcomes and Priorities for Capital Projects**

#### **Desired Outcomes**

1. More youth involved in structured, positive activities during non-school hours
2. Reduce delinquency, violence, and crime
3. More young people more skilled and prepared
4. Reduce substance abuse
5. Reduce child abuse and neglect
6. More people have adequate food, shelter, and clothing
7. More youth have contact with caring adults
8. Preserve the independence and quality of life for seniors
9. More community members work together to solve problems
10. Increase affordable childcare
11. Increase affordable housing
12. Increase employment
13. Reduce teen pregnancy
14. Reduce domestic and dating violence
15. Increase overall levels of academic, vocational, and self-improvement learning for people of all ages, to ensure employability and personal growth

#### **Priorities for Capital Projects**

1. Housing development
2. Repairs to human service agency facilities
3. City projects addressing the needs of specific populations

## ATTACHMENT D

### City of Shoreline Youth Services Policy

The City of Shoreline places a high priority on the healthy development of its children and youth. In January of 2000, the Shoreline City Council endorsed a policy that clearly outlines how the City will relate vis-a-vis others in the community that also provides support and programming to meet the needs of children and youth. This policy is based on a review of the needs of children and youth, the availability of services and the roles that various governments, agencies and organizations play in meeting those needs.

YS Policy 1: The City will fulfill the role of Direct Service Provider/Lead Agency in pursuit of Outcomes 1, 2 and 7.

YS Policy 2: The City will fulfill the role of a Partner in pursuit of 3, 4, 5, and 13. In its role as a partner, the City may from time to time fill critical gaps in services when it finds that support from other appropriate organization(s) is not providing adequate levels of service to the City's residents. In such instances the City's support will be temporary.

YS Policy 3: The City will fulfill the role of advocate in pursuit of all Outcomes. In this capacity as an advocate the City will seek the creation of community partnerships and non-City funding that improves service levels. As an advocate the City will also work to see that other appropriate levels of government and organizations provide adequate resources to fill critical gaps in services to Shoreline residents.

#### City's Role in Youth Services

Area of Service/Desired Outcome	City	County	Schools
1. More youth in structured activities	D/L	P	D/L
2. Reduce delinquency, violence and crime	D/L	P	A
3. More young people who are skilled and prepared	P	D/L	D/L
4. Reduce substance abuse	P	D/L	A
5. Reduce child abuse and neglect	P	D/L	P
7. More youth have contact with caring adults	D/L	P	P
9. Increase affordable child care	A	D/L	D/L
12. Reduce teen pregnancy	A	D/L	P
13. Reduce domestic and dating violence	P	D/L	A

D/L Direct Service Provider/Lead Agency: Fulfilling this role includes funding and/or direct service provision. Decisions about what services to provide or to fund in this area will be made through the City's regular budget processes. In instances where the City finds it to be more effective to contract for a service, the City will use its regular purchasing/contracting process to identify and select a qualified provider.

P Partner: Fulfilling this role may include funding to fill critical gaps in services when the City finds that support from other appropriate organization(s) is not providing adequate levels of services to Shoreline residents. In such instances the City's support will be temporary. Funding decisions in this area will typically be made through the City's biannual H&HS funding process.


A Advocate: Fulfilling this role does not include direct funding of services to achieve this outcome.

## ATTACHMENT E

### Glossary of Terms

Term	Meaning	Additional Information
ADA	American with Disabilities Act	
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant	HUD program
CDC	Centers for Disease Control	
COC	Continuum of Care	HUD program (often referred to as McKinney funds)
CPS	Child Protective Service	a division of DSHS
CSBG	Community Services Block Grant	State source (originates federally) for Community Action Agencies
CTED	Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development	State program, involved in State housing trust funds
DOL	Department of Labor	
DSHS	Department of Social and Health Services	State agency
EFAP	Emergency Food Assistance Program	
ESAP	Emergency Shelter Assistance Program	State source of funding for emergency shelters and emergency assistance
ESG	Emergency Shelter Grant	HUD program (often referred to as McKinney funds)
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	Federal agency that provides very limited funds for emergency services
HFP	Housing Finance Program	Through King County
HOME	HOME Investment Partnership Program	HUD program
HUD	US Department of Housing and Urban Development	
King County CSD	Community Services Division of King County	The department responsible for funding many of the discretionary services supported through King County e.g., childcare. Recently the CSD sponsored a planning effort that identifies areas of need and appropriate strategies for response.
NUHSA	North Urban Human Services Alliance	An association of agencies, governments and United Way convened to advocate for services in the Shoreline/LFP/Bothell areas.
LIHEAP	Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	
TANF	Temporary Aid to Needy Families	The successor program to welfare. Provides time limited financial and job training assistance to families with children.
UW	United Way	

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

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Adoption of Budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Plan Policies
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Finance
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director 

**EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY**

Attached are recommended Budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Plan policies to be adopted by the City Council which were reviewed with your Council on July 17, 2000. This represents only one section of the City's overall Financial Management Policies.

Financial Management Policies provide guidance for staff when developing work products and conducting City business and help provide a roadmap for obtaining goals. In 1995 the City Council adopted a set of Financial Management Policies that provided broad guidance in the areas of budgeting, accounting and financial reporting, investments, fixed asset management, and purchasing. Since that time the City's processes have matured and as a result, the original policies need to be reviewed and updated. Over the next year the Finance Department will be reviewing these financial policies and bringing recommended revisions or enhancements to the City Council for adoption.

The City is in the initial phases of the 2001 budget process and therefore it is appropriate to begin the policy update process with the Budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Plan policy section only (see Attachment A). These policies provide overall guidance in the development of the City's operating and capital budgets. The policies are based on State Statute, recommended best business practices of the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), and the recommended budget practices of the National Advisory Council on State and Local Budgeting (NACSLB).

Although there was general consensus from the Council at the July 17 City Council Workshop to proceed with adoption of the recommended budget and CIP policies, there were some questions regarding the policy guidance on reserves and contingency funds. Basically, the recommended policies provide for the following guidance for unreserved fund balances and budgeted contingency funds:

### **Unreserved Fund Balance**

The following policy guidelines are supported by industry standards and recommended best practices of GFOA and NACSLB.

- *General Fund Unreserved Fund Balance:* A minimum unreserved fund balance (not dedicated to a specific purpose) equal to 10% of budgeted operating revenues will be maintained. This unreserved fund balance will be comprised of the balance of the Contingency Reserve Fund (limited to the equivalent of \$.375/\$1,000 of assessed valuation) and the undesignated fund balance of the General Fund. For Year 2000 the Contingency Reserve and the budgeted undesignated fund balance totaled approximately 11.1% of the budgeted operating revenues. This does not include the General Fund Contingency Account (\$250,000) or the Insurance Reserve (\$255,000) which are explained below.
- *Other Operating Funds* (i.e., City Streets, PADS Development Fees Fund, Arterial Streets, etc.): A minimum unreserved fund balance equal to 5% of budgeted operating revenues will be maintained.

### **Budgeted Contingency Funds**

#### **General Fund**

- *General Fund Budgeted Operating Contingency:* The City's General Fund budget will include a line-item appropriation of \$250,000 to provide for unforeseen expenditures or new opportunities throughout the year. Expenditures from this account must be pre-approved by the City Council. Funds that are unexpended are carried forward to the next fiscal year as part of the unreserved fund balance.
- *General Fund Budgeted Insurance Contingency:* The City's General Fund budget will include an insurance contingency line-item appropriation to be used for potential substantial events (street damage, inverse condemnation, etc.) and infrastructure repair not covered by insurance policies or other sources such as FEMA. The budgeted amount should approximate 2% of the City's assets (not including roads and surface water utilities). For year 2000 this amount approximated \$255,000. This policy is recommended by the Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA), the insurance pool that the City belongs to for liability and property insurance coverage.

#### **Capital Funds**

- *The City has three Capital Funds:* General Capital, Roads Capital and Surface Water Capital. As part of the year 2000 budget process the City adopted a policy to provide for a contingency account within each of the capital funds. This information was included in the budget document and discussed during your November 22, 1999, budget and CIP Workshop. The purpose of this policy was to allow the City to make minor adjustments to capital projects as unforeseen issues arise during the year without having to amend the budget to address minor issues. This allows the City to more efficiently design and construct already budgeted and approved capital improvement projects. The contingency account in each fund is \$200,000. The City Manager has the authority to authorize expenditures from these Contingency accounts in an amount up to 10% of the project budget or \$50,000, whichever is smaller, as long as it does not change the project scope.



The \$200,000 in each capital fund represents a very small portion of the overall CIP budget. In the Surface Water Capital fund the contingency account

represents 6.3% of the budgeted capital expenditures, in the General Capital Fund the contingency account represents 2.2% of budgeted capital expenditures, and in the Roads Capital Fund the contingency account represents 1.3% of budgeted capital expenditures. Although most individual capital projects contain a budgeted contingency, this contingency is based on 10% of the projected construction costs. Non-construction related costs of capital projects can equate to 10 to 25% of the total project costs depending on design, environmental review, or right-of-way acquisition costs. Currently there is no contingency for these items built into the individual project budgets.

The \$200,000 contingency accounts are intended to be used when there is an immaterial cost overrun and the project would be delayed by waiting for Council approval.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Motion adopting the Budget and CIP policies.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

## **BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS**

In 1995 the City Council adopted a set of Financial Management policies. These policies provided overall guidance for financial practices related to budgeting, accounting and financial reporting, investments, fixed asset management, and purchasing. Since that time the City's financial operations have matured and as a result, the policies need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to provide policy guidance for best financial business practices.

Since the City is in the initial phases of the 2001 budget process, it is appropriate to begin the policy review with those related to budget and CIP planning. NACSLB defines the budget process as activities that encompass the development, implementation, and evaluation of a plan for the provision of services and capital assets. The goal of the budget process is to help decision makers make informed choices about the provision of services and capital assets and to promote stakeholder participation in the process. NACSLB recommends that the key characteristics of the budget process include the following:

- Long-term perspective;
- Linkages to broad organizational goals;
- Focus of budget decisions on results and outcomes; and
- Effective communication with stakeholders.

With these recommended characteristics in mind, the previously adopted policies were reviewed and revised to develop the policies included in this packet. In addition, the policies formalize much of the budget criteria and practices used by the City over the last few years.

The following is a brief summarization of each of the broad categories of the policy document itself.

### Financial Planning

The first policy statement states that the City intends to have long-term financial plans and this financial planning will be for a six year planning horizon. This sets the stage for balancing long-term financial stability with meeting the need for municipal services to Shoreline's citizens. The City has been following this practice.

### General Budget Policies

General Budget policies include the basic criteria that staff will follow when developing budget proposals for the City Council. The most significant criteria requires that a balanced budget be submitted, and that operating expenditures will be supported by operating (on-going) revenue sources. This policy provides that one-time unanticipated additional resources will not be used to fund operating expenditures. In addition it makes it clear that the budget will be adopted by the Council at the "fund" level (i.e., General Fund). This has been the past practice of the City, and it is important to make this clear, as it determines at what level staff can administratively make adjustments within the budget structure. The remainder of this section formalizes the budget criteria that staff has used in developing previous budgets.



### Formulation and Approval of Budgets

This policy statement outlines the required time frame for the budget development process as provided by State law. To date, the City has used a more accelerated time frame in budget development, than that mandated by the State. In addition, this policy provides for some of the basic components that should be included in the budget document.

### Budget Adjustment and Amendment Process

This policy differentiates between two methods of altering the City's budget. An adjustment is when changes are made within or between departments, but there is not an increase in overall expenditures at the fund level (i.e., General Fund). Adjustments may be made administratively with City Manager approval. Amendments, on the other hand, are changes in expenditures at the fund level and require City Council approval through the adoption of a budget amendment ordinance. In either case, if a proposed change in budget were to change the overall budget program, prior City Council approval would be required.

### Reserve and Contingency Fund Policies

These policies formalize and enhance some of the general practices that the City has followed in developing previous budgets. This policy specifically designates that the City will maintain a Contingency Reserve and Unreserved Fund Balances in operating funds. Council has had a policy of maintaining a General Fund Reserve of 10% of operating revenues. As was shared with the Council in year 2000 budget submittal, State Law (RCW 35.33.145) limits a contingency reserve to no more than 37.5 cents per one thousand dollars of assessed valuation of property within the City. In 2000 this would limit a Contingency Reserve to \$1,278,952. To comply with the State law, the City created a designated Contingency Reserve Fund, which is separate from any undesignated General Fund balance. This new policy would suggest that the combination of the Contingency Reserve and the undesignated General Fund Balance be a minimum of 10% of the General Fund budgeted operating revenues. Other operating funds should maintain a minimum unreserved fund balance of 5% of budgeted operating revenues.

The year 2000 budget provided that for the General Fund, the combination of the Contingency Reserve, Unreserved Fund Balance, budgeted General Fund Operating Contingency, and budgeted Insurance Reserve, were approximately 14% of budgeted General Fund expenditures. Since the Contingency Accounts (Operating Contingency and Insurance Reserve) are not reserves carried forward from year to year, but rather a budgeted line-item, it is recommended that these accounts not be included in determining adequate on-going reserve levels. The combination of the Contingency Reserve and budgeted undesignated Fund Balance in the General Fund totaled 11.1% of budgeted revenues in the year 2000 budget.

The policy also provides for budgeting an operating contingency and insurance contingency line-items in the General Fund and a capital contingency in each of the Capital Project Funds.

### Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Policies

These policies outline the general process and criteria that will be used by staff in developing the CIP for submission to the City Council. In addition, it provides guidelines for some of the financial aspects of financing of the CIP. Most importantly it recognizes the CIP as an integral part of the City's long-term financial and programmatic planning and integrates the CIP as part of the budget process.

Some of the main components within the policies include:

- Establishment of Capital Improvement Plan Coordination Team. This is a cross department team that will review and analyze proposed capital projects for the CIP plan.
- General guidance for the CIP process including updates and amendments to the CIP plan.
- General guidance for defining the types of projects included in the CIP document.
- Provision of maintenance and operational costs, associated with the CIP project, be included as part of the CIP and that those costs be integrated into the City's long-term financial plans.
- General guidance for the use of Local Improvement Districts (LID).
- General guidance for the criteria in balancing the need for additional infrastructure against the maintenance of the existing infrastructure and the inclusion of appropriate costs in planning CIP projects.
- General guidance on financial matters related to the implementation of the CIP.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Motion adopting the Budget and CIP policies.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

A. Budget and Capital Improvement Program Plan Policies

\\CITY\_HALL\SYS\DEPT\FIN\Debbie\2000\Staff Reports\Budget and CIP Policies0911.dot

# ATTACHMENT A



## BUDGET AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) PLAN POLICIES

### I. Financial Planning Policies

### II. General Budget Policies

- A. No Operating Deficit
- B. Resources Greater than Estimates
- C. Budget Adoption Level
- D. Necessary to Implement City Council Goals Identified in Annual Workplan
- E. Public Safety Protection
- F. Degradation of Current Service Levels
- G. Investments that are Primarily funded by Additional Fees or Grants
- H. Investments that delay Future Cost Increases
- I. Investments that Forestall Adding Permanent Staff
- J. Commitments that can Reasonably be Maintained over the Long Term
- K. Overhead and Full Cost Allocation
- L. Maintenance of Quality Service Programs
- M. Distinguished Budget Presentation

### III. Formulation and Approval of Budgets

### IV. Budget Adjustment and Amendment Process

- A. Adjustment
- B. Amendment

### V. Reserve and Contingency Fund Policies

- A. Contingency Reserve
- B. Unreserved Fund Balance
- C. Budgeted Operating Contingency
- D. Budgeted Insurance Reserve
- E. Budgeted Capital Improvement Contingency.

**VI. Capital Improvement Program Plan Policies**

- A. Relationship of Long-Range Plans to the CIP
- B. Capital Improvement Plan Coordination Team
- C. Establishing CIP Priorities
- D. Types of Projects Included in the CIP
- E. Scoping and Costing Based on Predesign Study
- F. Required Project Features and Financial Responsibility
- G. Predictability of Project Timing, Cost and Scope
- H. CIP Maintenance and Operating Costs
- I. Local Improvement Districts (LID)
- J. Preserve Existing Capital Infrastructure Before Building New Facilities
- K. New Facilities Should be of High Quality, Low Maintenance, Least Cost
- L. Public Input at All Phases of Projects
- M. Basis for Project Appropriations
- N. Balanced CIP Plan
- O. Use of Debt in the CIP
- P. Finance Director's Authority to Borrow
- Q. CIP Plan Update and Amendment
- R. Usage of County-Imposed Vehicle License Fees
- S. Formalization of Monetary Agreements
- T. Applicable Project Charges

## I. FINANCIAL PLANNING POLICY

The City shall develop and maintain a 6-year financial forecast that estimates resource and expenditure behavior for the five years beyond the current budget period. This forecast will provide the City's decision makers with an indication of the long-term fiscal impact of current policy and budget decisions. This planning tool must recognize the effects of economic cycles on the demand for services and the City's resources. To this end, the forecast should differentiate between revenue associated with one-time economic activities and revenues derived as a result of base economic growth. City financial planning should ensure the delivery of needed services (many of which become more critical during economic downturns) by assuring adequate reliance on ongoing resources in order to support continued City services during economic downturns.

## II. GENERAL BUDGET POLICIES

These general budget policies are the basis on which staff develops budget recommendations and establishes funding priorities within the limited revenues the City has available to provide municipal services.

- A. No Operating Deficit: Current revenues will be sufficient to support current expenditures. Revenue estimates will be realistic and debt financing will not be used for current operating expenses.
- B. Resources Greater than Budget Estimates: Resources (fund balance) greater than budget estimates in any fund shall be considered "one-time" resources and shall not be used to fund ongoing service delivery programs.
- C. Budget Adoption Level: Budget adoption by the City Council shall be at fund level. Any changes in appropriations at fund level require City Council approval.
- D. Necessary to Implement City Council Goals Identified in Annual Workplan: The City Council identifies specific goals as part of its work-plan, and departmental budgets should include adequate resources to accomplish those goals in the expected timeframes.
- E. Public Safety Protection: Public safety is a top priority, and as such, unmet needs in this area should have a priority over other service areas.
- F. Degradation of Current Service Levels: When increased service demands are experienced over a sustained period of time, resources should be provided to prevent service level degradation below an acceptable level.
- G. Investments that are Primarily Funded by Additional Fees or Grants: Programs and investments that are funded through a dedicated revenue source (i.e., non-tax revenue), that meet the goals of the City Council, will receive priority consideration.
- H. Investments that Delay Future Cost Increases: When practical, resources should be allocated for selective preventative investments that can be made to avoid even larger costs in the future.
- I. Investments that Forestall Adding Permanent Staff: Recognizing that personnel related expenditures represent the largest portion of the City's budget, methods to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of City services through technology improvements should receive priority funding if it can forestall the addition of permanent staff.
- J. Commitments that can Reasonably be Maintained over the Long-Term: Funding for new programs and services in operating funds should be limited to the extent

that they can be reasonably funded over the near-to-long-term given the current revenue stream.

- K. Overhead and Full Cost Allocation: Department budgets should be prepared in a manner to reflect the full cost of providing services.
- L. Maintenance of Quality Service Programs: The City of Shoreline will offer quality service programs. If expenditure reductions are necessary as a result of changing economic status, selective service elimination is preferable to poor or marginal quality programs that are caused by across the board cuts.
- M. Distinguished Budget Presentation: The City will seek to comply with the suggested criteria of the Government Finance Officers Association in producing a budget document that meets the Distinguished Budget Presentation program criteria as policy document, as an operations guide, as a financial plan, and as a communication device.

### III. FORMULATION AND APPROVAL OF BUDGETS

In accordance with RCW 35A.33, departments shall be requested by the Finance Director to prepare detailed estimates of revenues and expenditures for the next fiscal year by no later than the second Monday of September. Responses will be due by no later than the fourth Monday in September, and by no later than the first business day in October, the Finance Director will present to the City Manager a proposed preliminary budget setting forth the complete financial program, showing expenditures requested by each department and sources of revenue by which each program is proposed to be financed.

Although the schedule outlined above meets the requirements of the Revised Code of Washington, the Shoreline budget process usually follows an accelerated time schedule. The Finance Director typically requests departments to prepare their detailed estimates of revenues and expenditures for the next fiscal year in July, with those responses due in August.

By no later than the first Monday in October, the City Manager will provide the City Council with current information on estimates of revenues from all sources as adopted in the budget for the current year. The City complies with this requirement by providing the City Council with a quarterly report and a comprehensive overview of the City's current financial position at a summer Budget Retreat.

The administration will analyze program priorities and needs and recommend funding levels for each program in a proposed operating budget and six-year capital improvement program, which will be submitted to the Council by no later than 60 days prior to the end of the fiscal year. The City Manager typically presents the proposed budget to the City Council in late October.

As part of the budget document, a budget message will be prepared that contains the following:

- An explanation of the budget document.
- An outline of the recommended financial policies and programs of the City for the ensuing fiscal year.
- A statement of the relation of the recommended appropriation to such policies and programs.

- A statement of the reason for salient changes from the previous year in appropriation and revenue items.
- An explanation of any recommended major changes in financial policy.

The operating budget proposal for the general fund will include a financial plan that shows projected revenues and expenditures for at least the next five fiscal years. The financial plan will provide an explanation of the assumptions used in projecting future year expenditure and revenue levels, such as growth in tax revenues, inflation, cost of services, and other factors that may impact the financial condition of the City.

The operating budget will be classified and segregated according to a standard classification of accounts as prescribed by the State Auditor.

The Council will hold public hearings as required and approve operating and capital budgets prior to the end of the fiscal year in accordance with State law.

#### IV. BUDGET ADJUSTMENT & AMENDMENT PROCESSES

Under the provisions of State law and the City's operating procedures, the operating budget may be adjusted or amended in two different ways. Adjustment of the budget involves a reallocation of existing appropriations and does not change the budget "bottom line." Amendment of the budget involves an addition to or reduction of existing appropriations.

##### A. Adjustment

The City departmental expenditures and program goals are monitored throughout the year. Certain departments may develop the need for additional expenditure authority to cover unanticipated costs that cannot be absorbed within the budget, while other departments may unexpectedly not require their full budget authorizations. The Finance Department reviews and analyzes all department and/or fund budgets to determine what adjustments are necessary and whether the adjustments can be made within existing appropriation limits and within the City Council and Departmental goals as provided in the budget. Necessary adjustments are then reviewed with the affected department and/or fund managers. When an adjustment is needed, the Finance staff will look first to savings within the department and then consider budget transfers between departments. The Finance Director, in conjunction with the Department Directors and the City Manager, reviews and decides if any specific budget reductions are needed. No City Council action is needed as State law allows budget adjustments to be done administratively and approved by the City Manager. As a matter of practice, staff will include any adjustments made between departments with the quarterly financial information provided to the City Council.

##### B. Amendment

Amending the City's budget occurs whenever the requested changes from departments and/or funds will cause the existing appropriation level for the fund to change. This situation generally occurs when the City Council authorizes additional appropriation. This is done by an ordinance that amends the original budget and states the sources of funding for the incremental appropriations.

## V. RESERVE AND CONTINGENCY FUND POLICIES

### A. Contingency Reserve

It is the City's policy to maintain a contingency reserve in accordance with RCW 35A.33.040. The reserve will be available for unforeseen urgent or emergency needs. The contingency reserve is intended to provide for unanticipated expenditures or revenue shortfalls of a non-recurring nature. The maximum allowable amount in the contingency reserve is 37.5 cents per thousand dollars of assessed valuation.

### B. Unreserved Fund Balance

It is the City's policy to maintain a unreserved balance in each of the operating funds of the City (i.e., General, City Streets) at a level sufficient to provide for cash flow needs, a reasonable amount for emergent or unforeseen needs, and an orderly adjustment to adverse changes in revenues, including termination of revenue sources through actions of other governmental bodies. The Finance Director, in conjunction with the departments and the City Manager, will analyze fund balance requirements and recommend formal fund balance policies for each of the principal City funds. Fund balance policies will be reviewed at least every three years to ensure all relevant factors are being considered. Until such time as a thorough analysis has been completed for each fund, the City's policy will be to provide a minimum fund balance (combination of Contingency Reserve and Unreserved Fund Balance) of at least 10% of budgeted operating revenues for the General Fund and a minimum unreserved fund balance of 5% of budgeted operating revenues for other City operating funds.

### C. Budgeted Operating Contingency

In order to provide for unforeseen expenditures or new opportunities throughout the year, the General Fund budget will have an operating contingency of \$250,000 that will be used only with City Council approval. Savings within departmental budgets throughout the year will be the first source for funding unforeseen expenditures or providing for new opportunities before the Operating Contingency is accessed.

### D. Budgeted Insurance Reserve

A separate insurance reserve account will be budgeted within the General Fund budget to be used for potential substantial events (street damage, inverse condemnation, etc.) and infrastructure repair not covered by insurance policies or other sources such as FEMA. The budgeted amount should approximate 2% of the City's assets (not including roads and surface water utilities).

### E. Budgeted Capital Improvement Contingency

A separate capital contingency account will be budgeted within each of the three capital improvement funds to be used for capital project adjustments and for project acceleration. The amount to be budgeted in each of the capital contingency accounts is equal to 10% of the total budgeted capital improvement projects within each fund for that year or \$200,000, whichever is less.

The City Manager may administratively approve expenditures from the contingency fund for any project, without changing the project scope, regardless of the percentage of the project budget, if the amount does not exceed \$10,000.



In addition, the City Council delegates the authority to the City Manager to administratively approve dollar adjustments to individual capital projects that do not change the scope of project in an amount up to 10% of the project's adopted budget, not to exceed \$50,000.

#### VI. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PLAN POLICIES

A number of important policy considerations are the basis for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Plan. These policies provide guidelines for all financial aspects of the CIP, and ultimately affect the project selection process.

##### A. Relationship of Long-Range Plans to the CIP

The CIP will be updated annually as part of the City's budget process. The City Council may amend the CIP Plan at any time as required.

Virtually all of the projects included in the CIP are based upon formal long-range plans that have been adopted by the City Council. This ensures that the City's Capital Improvement Program, which is the embodiment of the recommendations of these individual planning studies, is responsive to the officially stated direction of the City Council as contained in the Comprehensive Plan, Council work goals, and supporting documents. Examples of these supporting documents: Pavement Management System Plan and the Parks and Open Space and Recreation Services Plan. There are exceptions, but they are relatively small when compared to the other major areas of expenditure noted above.

##### B. CIP Coordination Team

A CIP Coordination Team is a cross-departmental team which participates in the review and recommendation of the CIP program to the City Manager. The Team will review proposed capital projects in regards to accurate costing (design, capital, and operating), congruence with City objectives, and prioritize projects by a set of deterministic criteria. The Public Works Director, or his/her designee, will serve as the lead for the team.

##### C. Establishing CIP Priorities

The City uses the following basic CIP project prioritization and selection process:

1. Each CIP program area establishes criteria to be used in the prioritization of specific projects submitted for funding. These specific criteria are developed by staff in conjunction with City Council priorities and input from citizens, associated City boards and commissions. The criteria is identified in the City's budget document. The City has divided its CIP projects into the following program areas: General & Parks Capital Projects, Roads Capital Projects, and Surface Water Capital Projects.
2. Designated personnel within City departments recommend project expenditure plans to the Public Works Department. The project expenditure plans include all capital costs and any applicable maintenance and operation expenditures along with a recommended funding source.
3. The CIP Coordination Team evaluates the various CIP projects and selects those with the highest priority based on input from citizens, project stakeholders, appropriate advisory committees, and City Council goals.

4. A Preliminary CIP Plan is developed by the Public Works Department and is recommended to the City Council by the City Manager along with the operating budget recommendations.
5. The City Council reviews the Operating and Preliminary CIP Plan, holds a public hearing(s) on the plan, makes their desired alterations, and then officially adopts the CIP and establishes related appropriations as a part of the City's budget.
6. Within the available funding, the highest priority projects are then selected and funded in the CIP.

D. Types of Projects Included in the CIP Plan

The CIP Plan will display, to the maximum extent possible, all major capital projects in which the City is involved. It is difficult to define precisely what characteristics a project should have before it is included in the CIP Plan for the public's and City Council's review and approval. While the following criteria may be used as a general guide to distinguish among projects which should be included or excluded from the CIP Plan, there are always exceptions which require management's judgment. Therefore, the City Manager has the administrative authority to determine which projects should be included in the CIP Plan and which projects are more appropriately contained in the City's operating budget.

For purposes of the CIP Plan, a CIP project is generally defined to be any project that possesses all of the following characteristics:

1. Exceeds an estimated cost of \$10,000;
2. Involves totally new physical construction, reconstruction designed to gradually and systematically replace an existing system on a piecemeal basis, replacement of a major component of an existing facility, or acquisition of land or structures; and
3. Involves City funding in whole or in part, or involves no City funds but is the City's responsibility for implementing, such as a 100% grant-funded project or 100% Local Improvement District funded project.
4. Involves the skills and construction needs beyond those needed for a general repair and maintenance project.

These should be considered general guidelines. Any project in excess of \$25,000 meeting the criteria of (2), (3) and (4) above, or various miscellaneous improvements of a like nature whose cumulative total exceeds \$25,000 (i.e., street overlays) should be considered as part of the CIP process.

Program area managers are responsible for the cost estimates of their proposed programs, including future maintenance and operations costs related to the implementation of completed projects.

E. Scoping and Costing Based on Predesign Study

For some projects it is difficult to develop accurate project scopes, cost estimates, and schedules on which no preliminary engineering or community contact work has been done. To address this problem, some projects are initially proposed and funded only for preliminary engineering and planning work. This

funding will not provide any monies to develop final plans, specifications, and estimates to purchase rights-of-way or to construct the projects. Future project costs are refined through the predesign study process.

- F. Required Project Features and Financial Responsibility: If a proposed project will cause a direct impact on other publicly-owned facilities, an equitable shared and funded cost plan must be coordinated between the affected program areas.
- G. Predictability of Project Timing, Cost and Scope: The predictability of timing and costs of projects is important to specific private developments, such as the provision of street improvements or the extension of major sewer lines or water supply, without which development could not occur. These projects generally involve significant financial contributions from such private development through developer extension agreements, LIDs, and other means. Once a project has been approved by the City Council in the CIP, project scheduling is a priority to maintain.

The City Council authorizes the City Manager to administratively approve the acceleration of project schedules so long as they can be accomplished within budgeted and any allowable contingency expenditures, with the understanding that all controversial issues will be brought before the City Council. All project additions or deletions must be approved by the City Council.

- H. CIP Maintenance and Operating Costs: CIP projects, as approved by the City Council, shall have a funding plan for maintenance and operating costs identified in the project description. These costs will be included in the City's long-term financial planning.
- I. Local Improvement Districts (LID)  
Examples of when future LIDs may be formed are as follows: 1) where old agreements exist, committing property owners to LID participation on future projects; 2) when a group of property owners wish to accelerate development of a certain improvement; 3) when a group of property owners desire a higher standard of improvement than the City's project contemplates; or 4) when a group of property owners request City assistance in LID formation to fund internal neighborhood transportation facilities improvements, which may or may not have City funding involved. If City funding is proposed by the project sponsors (property owners), they shall so request of the City Council (through the City Clerk) in writing before any LID promotion activity begins. The City Manager shall analyze such request and report his conclusions and recommendation to Council for their consideration. The Council shall by motion affirm or deny the recommendation. The Council's affirmative motion to financially participate shall expire in 180 days, unless the project sponsors have submitted a sufficient LID petition by that time.

In the event that the request is for street resurfacing in advance of the City's normal street resurfacing cycle, the City's contribution, if any, will be determined based on a recommendation from the Public Work's Department and a financial analysis of the impact of completing the project prior to the City's original timeline.

On capital projects whose financing depends in part on an LID, interim financing will be issued to support the LID's portion of the project budget at the same time or in close proximity to the issuance of the construction contract. The amount of the interim financing shall be the current estimate of the final assessment roll as determined by the administering department.

In the event that the project is 100% LID funded, interim financing shall be issued either in phases (i.e., design phase and construction phase) or up front in the amount of the entire estimated final assessment roll, whichever means is estimated to provide the lowest overall cost to the project as determined by the Finance Department.

The City will recapture direct administrative costs incurred by the City for the LID project by including these in the preliminary and final assessment roles.

- J. Preserve Existing Capital Infrastructure Before Building New Facilities: It is the City's policy to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to preserve the City's existing infrastructure before targeting resources toward building new facilities that also have maintenance obligations. This policy addresses the need to protect the City's historical investment in capital facilities and to avoid embarking on a facility enhancement program which, together with the existing facilities, the City cannot afford to adequately maintain.
- K. New Facilities Should Be of High Quality, Low Maintenance, Least Cost: The intent of this policy is to guide the development and execution of the CIP Plan through an emphasis on lowest life-cycle cost. Projects should only be built if the necessary funding to operate them is provided. Also, priority is given to new facilities that have minimal ongoing maintenance costs so as to limit the impact upon both the CIP and the operating budget.
- L. Public Input at All Phases of Projects: The City makes a serious commitment to public involvement. The City's long-range plans are developed through an extensive citizen involvement program.
- M. Basis for Project Appropriations: During the City Council's CIP Plan review, the City Council will appropriate the full estimated project cost for all projects in the CIP Plan. Subsequent adjustments to appropriation levels for amendments to the CIP Plan may be made by the City Council at any time.
- N. Balanced CIP Plan: The CIP Plan is a balanced six-year plan. This means that for the entire six-year period, revenues will be equal to project expenditures in the plan. It is anticipated that the plan will have more expenditures than revenues in single years of the plan, but this imbalance will be corrected through the use of interim financing, if actually needed. Over the life of the six-year plan, however, all planned interim debt will be repaid and all plan expenditures, including interest costs on interim debt will be provided for with identified revenues. Any project funding plan, in which debt is not retired within the current six-year plan, must have specific City Council approval.
- O. Use of Debt in the CIP: The CIP is viewed as a long-term program that will continually address capital requirements far into the future. As such, the use of

long-term debt should be minimized, allowing the City to put money into actual projects that benefit Shoreline residents and businesses rather than into interest payments to financial institutions. There may be exceptions to this policy for extraordinary circumstances, where voted or non-voted long-term debt must be issued to achieve major City goals that otherwise could not be achieved, or would have to wait an unacceptably long time. Issuance of long-term debt must receive City Council authorization.

Staff monitors CIP cash flow regularly and utilizes fund balances to minimize the amount of borrowing required. Funds borrowed for cash flow purposes are limited to short-term obligations. Projected financing costs are included within a project in the administrative program area.

- P. Finance Director's Authority to Borrow: The Finance Director is authorized to initiate interim and long-term borrowing measures, as they become necessary, as identified in the CIP Plan and approved by the City Council.
- Q. CIP Plan Update and Amendment: The CIP Plan will be updated at least annually as a part of the City's budget process. The City Council may amend the CIP Plan at any time if a decision must be made and action must be taken before the next CIP review period. All project additions or deletions must be approved by the City Council.
- R. Usage of County-Imposed Vehicle License Fees: The City's share of the King County-imposed Vehicle License Fees is a component of "Transportation Funding" and can therefore be assumed to be part of the annual Transportation Funding contribution to the CIP Plan as pursuant to State Law.
- S. Formalization of Monetary Agreements: All agreements between the City and outside jurisdictions, where resources are exchanged shall be in writing specifying the financial terms of the agreement, the length of the agreement, and the timing of any required payments (i.e., Joint CIP projects where the City is the lead agency, grant funded projects, etc.). Formalization of these agreements will protect the City's interests. Program areas shall make every effort to promptly request any reimbursements that are due the City. Where revenues from outside jurisdictions are ongoing, these requests shall be made at least quarterly, unless alternative arrangements are approved by the City Manager or City Council.
- T. Applicable Project Charges: CIP projects should reflect all costs that can be clearly shown to be necessary and applicable. Staff charges to CIP projects will be limited to time spent actually working on those projects and shall include an overhead factor to cover the applicable portion of that person's operating cost.