

# SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING STUDY SESSION

	onday, ( 80 p.m.	October 2, 2006		onference Center t. Rainier Room
1.	CALI	L TO ORDER	Page	Estimated Time 6:30
2.	FLAC	G SALUTE/ROLL CALL		6:30
3.	CITY	MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS		6:31
4.	COU	NCIL REPORTS		6:40
5.	GENI	ERAL PUBLIC COMMENT		6:45
whic unde mint limit	ch are no er Item S utes on o ted to 20 erded. Sp	poportunity for the public to address the Council on topics other the of of a quasi-judicial nature. The public may comment for up to the will be limited to a maximum period of 30 minutes. The public ragenda items following each staff report. The total public comme minutes. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the front of peakers should clearly state their name and city of residence.  [ON ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, 1986]  Resolution No. 250, revising Personnel Policies regarding Definitions of Immediate Family and Domestic Partner and adding Domestic Partner Benefits	ree minutes; th may also comm nt period on ed the room to ha	ne Public Comment yent for up to three such agenda item is twe their comments
<u>67</u> .	STUE	DY ITEMS		
<del>-</del>	<del>(a)</del>	Presentation on Transit Now Proposal by King County Metr Transit Staff (This item has been moved to October 16)	֥ <u>1</u>	7:05
	(b)	Urban Forest Assessment Discussion	<u>11</u>	7:25
	(c)	Business License Program Update	<u>23</u>	7:55
7 <u>8</u> .	ADJO	DURNMENT		8:25

The Council meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 546-8919 in advance for more information. For TTY service, call 546-0457. For upto-date information on future agendas, call 546-2190 or see the web page at <a href="https://www.cityofshoreline.com">www.cityofshoreline.com</a>. Council meetings are shown on Comcast Cable Services Channel 21 Tuesdays at 12 noon and 8 p.m., and Wednesday through Sunday at 6 a.m., 12 noon and 8 p.m.

Agenda Item: 7(b) Council Meeting Date: October 2, 2006

# CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE. WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: **Urban Forestry Assessment** 

Parks & Recreation DEPARTMENT:

PRESENTED BY: Dick Deal, PRCS Director /Maureen Colaizzi, PRCS Project Coord.

## **INTRODUCTION:**

The City recognizes the need to create a comprehensive management plan to guide future management of urban park forests within the city. A critical first step in the creation of a city-wide management strategy is to conduct an inventory of existing vegetation resources in our parks.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

- The City Council approved \$50,000 for an Urban Forestry Assessment in the 2006 Parks Department budget to conduct an inventory of existing vegetation resources within our public parks to guide future forest management decisions. Additionally the preparation of an Urban Forestry Assessment meets Goal #6 of the 2007-2008 City Council Work Plan, Create an "environmentally sustainable community".
- The Parks & Recreation Department (Parks) has contacted the Seattle Urban Nature Project (SUNP) to provide a draft proposal for habitat mapping, vegetation surveys and management recommendations. Based on available budget, the proposed scope includes approximately fifty percent of Shoreline's public parks to begin the City's goal of completing an Urban Forest Assessment of City-Owned property.

## **DISCUSSION:**

- Seattle Urban Nature Project is a nonprofit organization founded in 1998 to document natural resources on public lands, to inform civic decision-making and support improved stewardship of these lands. SUNP is currently moving towards a focus on empowering people in Puget Sound to improve urban habitat through science-based information and methods.
- A seven member board of directors, in concert with three staff experienced in performing botanical and biological surveys, developed a system to survey plant communities and wildlife habitats and store the information in geographic information system (GIS) data for mapping. Maps and data have been used by public agencies to help make better-informed decisions about how to manage invasive and native species on public lands, and where to undertake restoration.

- A resource inventory will give the City information regarding existing forest habitat types and structure, and native and invasive species distributions. This information can be used to make planning and management decisions for both forest stewardship and recreational needs.
- SUNP proposes to conduct resource inventories for Hamlin (80 acres), South Woods (16 acres), Shoreview (48 acres) and Boeing Creek (40 acres). These four parks comprise the largest forested tracts in the park system with a majority of our public parks' important stream corridors, upland forest and wetland natural areas.
- Based on data that will be collected in the field, SUNP will produce a GIS layer that
  delineates existing habitat types throughout each of the four parks. A database with
  collected vegetation data will be linked to the GIS files and management
  recommendations will be developed for each of the four areas surveyed. Additional
  information in the final report will include:

Identification of invasive plant species and a species list of appropriate plants to replant on each site.

Recommendations on methods of removal for invasive trees and suggested species to replace removed trees.

Recommendations for preserving and increasing the number of large downed logs and underplanting shade-tolerant conifers

Recommendations for erosion control and re-establishing understory vegetation that has been removed or disturbed by over use

- This information will be used to implement the City's forest management strategy
  within these parks and provide a template for future survey efforts in the remaining
  forested public parks and open spaces.
- If City Council approves this implementation strategy, work will commence this fall and be completed summer of 2007. A completed report will be presented to the council in the fall of 2007.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

- \$50,000 has been allocated in the 2006 Capital Improvement budget for an
  Urban Forestry Assessment. \$7,000 will be expended in 2006 and the remaining
  \$42,500 will be carried over to 2007 for expenditure. Based on the City of
  Shoreline's purchasing policies, professional services \$50,000 and under do not
  require a competitive proposal. Formal quotes are not required.
- An administrative selection was conducted for this non-architectural and engineering service. With City Council approval of this proposal a contract will be finalized and signed by the City Manager.
- A statement of work was provided to SUNP. SUNP was chosen because of their qualifications and experience preparing urban forest assessments.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment A: Draft Proposal from Seattle Urban Nature Project.

|--|

•	Staff recommends the City Council approve the implementation of the urban
	forest assessment strategy as prepared.

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

# Attachment A: Proposal to provide habitat mapping, vegetation surveys and management recommendations for the City of Shoreline

Prepared for:
Dick Deal
Maureen Colaizzi
City of Shoreline
17544 Midvale Ave N., Ste. 100
Shoreline, WA 98133

Seattle Urban Nature Project



Revised, September 22nd, 2006

5218 University Way NE Seattle, WA 98105-4495 (206) 522-0334

Seattle Urban Nature Project © 2006 All rights reserved.

Seattle Urban Nature Project 5218 University Way NE Seattle, WA 98105 (206) 522-0334

## Attachment A

## 1. Introduction

The City of Shoreline owns and manages more than 340 acres of parks and natural areas, and is in the process of purchasing additional land through the recently passed Park Bond. The task of managing these areas for a variety of uses falls to the Parks and Recreation Department. The Department has recognized the need to create a comprehensive management plan to guide future management of urban parks and forests within the city.

A crucial first step in the creation of a city-wide management strategy is to conduct an inventory of existing vegetation resources on public lands. A resource inventory will give the City information regarding:

- 1) The locations and extents of habitat types throughout the city
- 2) Structural conditions in forested areas such as tree density, size, composition and regeneration
- 3) Native species distributions
- 4) Invasive species distributions

This information can then be used to make planning and management decisions for both forest stewardship and recreational needs.

Seattle Urban Nature Project (SUNP) proposes to conduct a resource inventory in the following four parks in Shoreline:

- 1) South Woods (16 acres)
- 2) Hamlin Park (80 acres)
- 3) Shoreview (48 acres)
- 4) Boeing Creek (40 acres)

These four parks comprise approximately 50% (184 acres) of Shoreline's public parks, and contain important wetland and natural areas. This assessment will provide the City of Shoreline with valuable information and analysis on a significant portion of city forest lands.

Based on the data collected in the field, SUNP will produce a GIS layer that delineates existing habitat types throughout each of the four parks. A database with collected vegetation data will be linked to the GIS shapefile and management recommendations will be developed for each of the four areas surveyed. This information will allow the City of Shoreline to make informed management decisions and will be the first step towards creating a unified and comprehensive management plan for the city's parks and natural areas.

# 2. Project Objectives

# Primary Objective

The primary purpose of this project is to provide the City of Shoreline with key natural resource information regarding four parks of interest within the city. This information will help to inform the city's management within these parks and provide a template for future survey efforts in other Shoreline Parks and open spaces.

Specifically, this effort will produce the following information for the City of Shoreline:

1) Location and extent of habitat types in four parks within the city
Habitat types in forested areas can include conifer forests, deciduous forests, madrone
forests, mixed conifer/deciduous forests, riparian forests, forested wetlands, streams, and
other types. Habitat types in developed areas can include landscaped grasslands,
landscaped forests and more developed areas such as playgrounds and parking lots. This
information will allow city managers to understand the location and extent of different
forest and habitat types within the selected parks.

2) Current forest structure and composition present in these parks

Forest composition is defined as the types and species of trees, shrubs and herbaceous species present in forested areas. Forest structure includes information about tree age, tree density, the amount and type of regeneration present in the forest, as well as information about snags and downed wood. The combined information provides a comprehensive ecological picture about the state and health of a forest. For instance, the amount and size of snags in a forest provides important information about wildlife habitat for birds and animals that use these habitat features. The amount of downed wood provides information about suitable habitat for conifer tree regeneration, an important indicator of forest health. Knowing the type and distribution of native and non-native species provides important information about the current condition of the forest. This information is crucial to developing appropriate management strategies and planting plans.

## 3) Location and extent of invasive species infestations

Since the end of the last ice age approximately 10,000 years ago, plants in the Puget Sound region have co-evolved with animal, bird, fish and insect populations to create many different and unique communities. With the arrival of European settlers approximately 150 years ago, many non-native species have been introduced to this region. Species were introduced for agriculture, to provide animal feed, for medicinal and textile purposes and also for horticultural reasons. Today, thousands of different species are available at nurseries and are planted widely for ornamental value. While the majority of these species are fairly harmless and remain confined to the areas they are planted, a small number of them are capable of escaping into the forest and natural environment and reproducing. Without the constraints of conditions found in their native countries such as cold winters, diseases or predators, these species are capable of reproducing rapidly and displacing the native species present. These types of species are considered to be **invasive**. Examples of common invasive species in the Pacific

Northwest include ivy (*Hedera helix*), scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), English holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), cherry laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*) and Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*). In forested areas, infestations of invasive species such as ivy can be very widespread, killing trees and suppressing all other species on the forest floor. It is important to understand the types, locations and extent of these infestations to make appropriate management decisions.

# 5) Management strategies based on an analysis of collected data

Once the above data has been collected and analyzed, a report will be written for each park presenting a comprehensive picture of the ecological condition of the forested lands present. Key management issues will be identified and solutions will be presented to allow Shoreline park managers to create their own site specific plans and timelines. Examples of the types of information that will be provided in the report include best management practices for removing invasive species, and suggested lists of plants to revegetate cleared sites.

Over the past several years SUNP has conducted detailed surveys and written management plans for several parks in Seattle. Some examples of important findings that have come from these surveys are:

- In Deadhorse Canyon (Lakeridge Park), a 40 acre park in Southeast Seattle, our survey showed that very few native conifer or deciduous trees are regenerating in the park. Instead, invasive trees such as English holly, cherry laurel and Portugal laurel are regenerating in large numbers (in some cases, over 1,000 per acre). If these trees are not removed, in the next 30-40 years they will substantially alter the makeup of the native forests in Deadhorse Canyon. Recommendations included methods of removal as well as a list of suggested species to replace the removed trees.
- In Deadhorse Canyon, SUNP ecologists located two large and previously unknown infestations of yellow archangel (*Lamiastrum galeobdolon*), which is listed as a Weed of Concern by the King County Noxious Weed Control Program. This information has provided park managers with advance warning and an opportunity to tackle this problem before it becomes unmanageable.
- In Llandover Woods, a 9 acre open space just south of Shoreline, our survey revealed the location of a significant new area colonized by invasive species that was not known to park managers. Best management practices and suggestions were provided for removing these species, as well as a species list of appropriate plants to replant on the site.
- In addition, in Llandover Woods, very low amounts of conifer regeneration were found. The low amounts of downed wood found during the survey were identified as an important contributing cause. Downed wood provides an important substrate for regenerating conifers. Recommendations included preserving and increasing the numbers of large downed logs and underplanting shade-tolerant conifers such as Western hemlock and Western red cedar.

The provided data and management recommendations can be used to: 1) develop specific management or action plans for these parks; 2) produce overall forest management policies for the city and 3) develop educational materials for decision-makers and the public.

# Objective 1

Delineate habitat types in four parks throughout the City of Shoreline. Habitat types will include both developed and natural areas within the parks. Habitat delineations will be based on dominant plant associations. The information will be collected by both digitizing aerial photos and collecting data in the field with a GPS unit. The final product will be a GIS layer and maps depicting the various habitat types in the four selected parks.

## Objective 2

Characterize the structure and condition of each delineated habitat type. Assessment plots will be established throughout each forested habitat type (developed areas will not be considered) and sampled using appropriate scientific protocols. The collected data will be made available to the City of Shoreline in a geo-referenced Access database at the end of the project.

## Objective 3

Analyze data and identify management issues and concerns for each park. The final report will summarize the data gathered during sampling and will contain detailed maps depicting: 1) habitat types for each park; 2) locations of significant invasive species infestations; and 3) locations of assessment plots.

## 3. Timeline

SUNP will initiate this project in November of 2006. Field work will be completed between April and August of 2007. The estimated completion date of this effort is October 2007.

# 4. Detailed Approach

# Task 1. Delineate habitat types in four parks in Shoreline

SUNP will map habitat types in four parks in Shoreline using a combination of digitizing orthophotos for developed areas and field reconnaissance of forested areas using a GPS unit. Habitat types will be placed in the following categories:

- Developed (light, medium or heavy)
- Landscaped (grassland, shrubland, forest)
- Open canopy (non-landscaped shrubland, tree savannah, unmown grassland)
- Wetland (forested wetland, scrub-shrub wetland, emergent wetland, stream)
- Forest types (conifer, deciduous, madrone, riparian)

Additional habitat designations will be made for forest types based on the predominant overstory species compositions. In addition to the habitat maps included in the final report, a GIS shapefile depicting the collected information will be provided to the City of Shoreline.

# Task 2. Vegetation survey

SUNP will establish vegetation plots in each forested habitat type delineated in Task 1. These plots will be used to characterize the vegetation and forest structure found in each habitat type. Approximately 125 acres of forested lands are present within the four selected parks. SUNP estimates that approximately four to five percent of this area will be surveyed for this effort. Vegetation management plans generally aim to sample three to ten percent of the area of interest.

Information collected will include:

- Tree densities, DBH (diameter at breast height) and height by species
- Percent cover of native and invasive shrub, herbaceous and vine species
- Snag densities, coarse woody debris volume and overstory canopy cover

Plots will be randomly stratified across each forested habitat type. The geographic coordinates of each of the plots will be recorded so that they may be revisited in the future. In addition, the locations of prominent infestations of invasive species will be identified.

This data will be housed in an Access database, which will be provided on CD or DVD media to the City of Shoreline upon completion of the project.

## Task 3. Develop management recommendations for forested areas in selected parks.

SUNP will analyze data and produce a vegetation assessment detailing the current forest conditions within the selected parks. Key management issues and concerns for each park will be identified and prioritized and management approaches outlined. The report will also contain maps depicting habitat types for each park and locations of significant invasive species infestations and other management issues. This report will enable the City of Shoreline to develop effective forest management policies.

## 5. Deliverables

The following items represent the consulting services and licensed materials that SUNP agrees to deliver to Client pursuant to the terms of this Agreement:

- 1. A geographic shapefile depicting habitat types present in four selected parks, provided on CD or DVD media.
- 2. An Access database containing data collected during the vegetation survey and locations of vegetation plots, provided on CD or DVD media.
- 3. Ten copies of a final report with data analysis, management recommendations and maps. Additional copies may be ordered based on the city's needs.
- 4. Five poster-sized maps, including four maps depicting habitat types in each of the selected parks and one city overview map.

# 6. Budget

The following outlines the costs associated with each of the project tasks, based on an hourly rate of \$70 per hour.

#### **Labor Costs**

The following descriptions of labor costs represent not to exceed estimates of the work required to complete the deliverables described above in Section 6. In the event that SUNP becomes aware that the estimated labor costs set forth in this Section are less than the actual labor costs needed to complete the deliverables, SUNP will notify Client of the additional labor required to complete the deliverables and the parties shall negotiate in good faith to reach a mutually agreeable price for completion of the deliverables.

#### **Materials Costs**

The following descriptions of materials costs represent estimates of the materials needed to complete the deliverables described above in Section 6. In the event that SUNP becomes aware that the estimated materials costs set forth in this Section are less than the actual materials costs needed to complete the deliverables, SUNP will notify Client of the additional materials required to complete the deliverables and the parties shall negotiate in good faith to reach a mutually agreeable price for completion of the deliverables.

## **Project Budget**

Tasks	Units	# of Staff	Labor Cost	Materials and/or Mileage	Task Total
Task 1			5		
1a. Conduct habitat delineation in four parks	40 hours	2	\$5,600	150 miles @ .445 cents/mile =\$66.75	\$5,666.75
1b. Process GIS data and create shapefile with preliminary habitat delineations	16 hours	1	\$1,120		\$1,120
Task 2					
2a. Research & planning prior to field work	10 hours	2	\$1,400		\$1,400
2b. Establish plots and conduct vegetation surveys in four parks	200 hours	2	\$28,000	500 miles @.445 cents/mile = \$222.50	\$28,222.50
2c. Two check-in meetings with Shoreline staff	4 hours	3	\$840		\$840
Task 3					
3a. Data analysis and report with management recommendations	100 hours	1	\$7,000		\$7,000
3b. Creating maps for report and finalizing GIS shapefile of habitat delineations	24 hours	1	\$1,680		\$1,680
3c. Final project meeting with Shoreline staff	2 hours	3	\$420		\$420
Task 4					
4a. Report printing	10 reports			\$150	\$150
4b. Map printing	5 maps			\$200	\$200
Project Management					
Overall Project Management	40	1	\$2,800		\$2,800
Totals					
Totals:		J	\$48,860	\$639.25	\$49,500

## 7. Schedule

The proposed schedule of tasks required to complete the deliverables.

Tasks	Dates
Task 1. Conduct habitat delineation in four parks	November 2006
Task 2. Establish plots and conduct vegetation surveys in four parks	April 2007–August 2007
Task 3. Data analysis and report with management recommendations	September 2007–October 2007
The estimated completion date for deliverables is:	October 2007

# 8. Project Team

# **Project Lead:**

Jeff Bash Executive Director Seattle Urban Nature Project (206) 522-0334 jeff@seattleurbannature.org

#### **Science Staff:**

Ella Elman Ecologist Seattle Urban Nature Project (206) 522-0334 ella@seattleurbannature.org

Nelson Salisbury Ecologist/GIS Analyst Seattle Urban Nature Project (206) 522-0334 nelson@seattleurbannature.org

Work under this contract will be performed by Seattle Urban Nature Project Staff with the following qualifications:

Jeff Bash, Seattle Urban Nature Project's Executive Director, has a range of experience in environmental and natural resource management. Before joining the staff of SUNP, he served for 3 years as the watershed coordinator of the Yamhill Basin Council, a regional watershed council serving the Yamhill River Basin in McMinnville, Oregon. This regional group conducted water quality monitoring, watershed outreach and education, and advised public officials on water quality and land management issues. Prior to this, Bash worked at the University of Washington's Center for Streamside Studies, Ross and Associates Environmental Consulting, and the Washington State Department of Ecology. Bash has a B.S. in Natural Resources from the University of Michigan and an M.S. in Forestry/Natural Resource Management from the University of Washington. Bash serves as the project manager for all

SUNP efforts.

Ella Elman, Field Ecologist, earned a B.S. in Natural Resources from Cornell University and a M.S. in Forest Ecosystem Analysis from the University of Washington. Her Master's degree focused on the effects of post-harvest treatments on high-elevation forests of the North Cascade Range. Elman most recently served as a Research Analyst for the US Forest Service PNW Research Station, focusing on fuel loadings for various types of forest ecosystems. Elman also served as a Noxious Weed Specialist for the King County Noxious Weed Control Program in Seattle. Elman has served as an Ecologist and Database lead for SUNP on a variety of projects focusing on vegetation survey, analysis and management recommendations since 2005.

Nelson Salisbury, Assistant Ecologist, earned his Bachelor of Science degree with a major in botany from Humboldt State University. Since his graduation he has had the opportunity to experience a variety of disciplines within the natural sciences through work with the Bureau of Land Management, The Pacific Lumber Co., and the Student Conservation Association. His duties have included monitoring range and riparian areas on federal lands in Southern Idaho, surveying for rare and endangered plant species on private timber holdings in Coastal Northern California, and managing teams of volunteers collecting native plant seeds for the Millennium Seed Bank Project in Southern and Central Oregon. Salisbury has served as an Ecologist and GIS Project Lead for Seattle Urban Nature Project on a variety of forest survey and mapping projects since 2003.

Council Meeting Date: October 2, 2006 Agenda Item: 7(c)

# CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Business License Program

**DEPARTMENT:** Finance

PRESENTED BY: Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

## PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The Council's 2005-2006 work plan includes the implementation of an active economic improvement plan. One of the milestones included in this goal is the implementation of a City business license/registration program. In February 2006 the Council reviewed business license policy issues and gave direction to staff to proceed with developing a regulatory business license program and to partner with the Washington State Department of Licensing Master Licensing Service to administer the program.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The 2007 proposed budget includes \$90,000 in business license revenue. At \$50 per license, the City would need to issue 1,800 business licenses. At \$60 per license the City would need to issue 1,400 licenses. At this time staff does not have a complete list of all businesses that will be required to license, but based on our sales tax records a minimum of 1,400 businesses should register, and we anticipate that the actual number of licenses issued will exceed this number.

At this time staff has not included additional staffing to implement the business license program. We have discussed the staffing impacts of administering the business license program with other cities that are partnering with MLS and found that each City is different. Sammamish felt that they had very minimal staffing impact once the initial business letters were distributed. Bellevue and Tumwater, on the other hand, have additional staff to assist with the business license program, but it appears that much of the work done by staff is a result of the business and occupation tax that these cities also levy. Although staff is not recommending additional staffing at this time, Council should be aware that as we implement this program we will continue to monitor and may have to request additional staffing support if the workload becomes too burdensome for existing staff.

## RECOMMENDATION

On October 9, 2006, the Council is scheduled to adopt the business license ordinance. Staff recommends that Council clarify any issues during this evenings workshop so that any required changes can be made to the ordinance prior to the October 9, 2006 City Council meeting.

Approved By:	City Manager	City Attorney
• •		• —

## INTRODUCTION

The Council's 2005-2006 work plan includes the implementation of an active economic improvement plan. One of the milestones included in this goal is the implementation of a City business license/registration program. In February 2006 the Council reviewed business license policy issues and gave direction to staff to proceed with developing a regulatory business license program and to partner with the Washington State Department of Licensing Master Licensing Service to administer the program.

# **BACKGROUND**

## **Business Licenses**

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Chapter 35A.82.020 authorizes code cities to exercise the authority authorized by general law for any class of city to license and revoke the same for cause, to regulate, make inspections and to impose excises for regulation or revenue in regard to all places and kinds of business, production, commerce, entertainment, exhibition, and upon all occupations, trades and professions and other lawful activity.

Based on this authorization the City of Shoreline is authorized to assess business taxes and licenses in three forms:

- 1. Excise (percentage) taxes levied on different classes of business to raise revenue. These are commonly called general business and occupation taxes.
- 2. Licenses for the purposes of regulation only.
- 3. Licenses to regulate and raise revenue.

The City Council has given staff direction to develop a business license program for regulatory purposes.

Purposes for implementing a regulatory business license for all businesses include:

- Provide the City with a record of the owners and other contact information;
- Provide a master list of businesses and types of businesses that conduct business within Shoreline:
- Help ensure compliance with City ordinances (for example, zoning, fire and life safety, etc.); and,
- Provide a listing of businesses that can be used to audit against sales tax receipts to ensure that the City is receiving sales tax from all applicable businesses.

Regulatory business license fees are set at a flat rate per license in an amount designed to recover both the direct and indirect costs of registering the businesses and the issuing the licenses, maintaining the files, and inspecting businesses to make certain that all have a license.

# State of Washington Master License Services (MLS)

The City Council agreed with staff's recommendation to pursue a business license partnership with MLS.

The MLS is a program within the state Department of Licensing that provides a centralized "one-stop" combined-licensing service to state and local agencies and the business community. The combined-licensing allows MLS to provide a single, centralized process on behalf of many different licensing agencies. Businesses indicate the licenses they need on a Master Application form that addresses the questions common to most applications, along with some specific information required of individual agencies. Applicants complete the single application and pay all required fees for the various agencies with a single check. A separate application must be filed for each physical business location, a common requirement of city business license programs. The application is processed at MLS, where the appropriate fees and information are then distributed through an automated process to each licensing agency affected by that application.

MLS then issues a single "Registrations and Licenses" document, commonly referred to as the 'Master License.' The license document is specific to a particular business location. Each of the licenses that have been granted to the business owner at that physical location appears as a line item "endorsement" on the Master License. Licensing agencies retain full regulatory control over their own license and continue to approve or deny the applicant as appropriate; the individual license endorsement is not printed on the 'Master License' until all of the regulating office's requirements are met. The 'Master License' includes a single, common expiration date for all licenses with a renewal requirement held by the licensee. This allows MLS to issue a single, annual renewal notice.

MLS allows cities to partner with them to issue their business licenses through this single common method and in fact they have developed a grants program to assist in meeting the cost of the partnership process. The grants program is to be available in 2006. To date five cities have partnered with MLS to issue their city business licenses: Bellevue, Richland, Sammamish, Tumwater, and Spokane Valley. City staff has already visited the City of Sammamish and Bellevue to discuss and review the process they use to issue licenses in conjunction with MLS.

MLS is supported through the processing fees it charges applicants and licensees directly for the combined licensing services provided. These processing fees are currently \$15 to a file a Master Application, regardless how many licenses are requested on the application; and \$9 to file a renewal, again regardless of the number of licenses being renewed. For Shoreline businesses that are already obtaining a license through the Department of Licensing, the business is already paying this processing fee when they file their master license application.

#### **Process**

The City has entered into a contract with the Department of Licensing Master Licensing Services (MLS) to provide business license services. In order to participate in this program the City needed to agree to certain conditions in order to have a timely implementation of the business license program. These conditions include:

- Establishing a flat fee for all businesses, including home occupations
- Continuing the issuance of any specialty licenses, such as massage parlors, by the City. Currently these licenses are administered by the City Clerk's office.

- Allowing only one class of businesses to be exempt from any fee requirements, such as non-profit agencies.
- Utilizing the standard City addendum, used by MLS with other participating cities, as the City's business license application.
- Establishing a field office at City Hall to accept Master Application forms. This will be handled by the City Clerk's office.
- Using the MLS database system to track the business licenses issued within the City; and
- Developing an initial list of businesses to notify of the need to obtain a City of Shoreline business license.

Currently staff is working with both MLS and the Department of Revenue (DOR) to get a listing of the businesses that have reported doing business within the City of Shoreline so that the City can begin notifying businesses that they must obtain a City of Shoreline business license.

The City and MLS are working under the following schedule to implement the license program:

## To be completed by October 13, 2006:

- 1. The Department of Revenue is currently compiling a list of all businesses, that have registered with them, that have a physical location within the City of Shoreline, or businesses that have reported sales tax activity to the City of Shoreline, but that may not be physically located within Shoreline. This information should be made available soon.
- 2. The City will review this list and add any businesses that can be identified as existing in Shoreline. The City will use this list to develop an initial mailing list.
- 3. The City sends a "free application" letter to all the businesses on the mailing list. (Attachment A Sample Letter). At this time businesses are not required to pay any fee as the information returned by the businesses will be used to establish the initial business license database and used by MLS to match against any businesses that already have a MLS account. The "free" period will expire on January 31, 2007.

# To be completed by December 8, 2006:

1. MLS processes incoming letters into the MLS system (performs a "match conversion") using an assumed 1/31/07 expiration date.

## To be completed by mid-December 2006:

1. MLS will send renewals for the City businesses, based on the 1/31/07 assumed expiration for the accounts. As businesses complete these renewals they will pay their first City of Shoreline business license fee. Businesses that currently have an account with MLS, because they are required to obtain other State licenses, will pay a pro-rated fee that corresponds with the remaining timeframe that their existing State licenses are valid. Businesses that do not have an account with MLS will pay for and receive a City license that lasts a full calendar year. MLS staff will process renewals filed by the City licensees.

To be completed after February 9, 2007:

- Any accounts not renewed by February 9, 2007 will be sent a delinquency notice (mailed automatically by the MLS system, and any returned will be processed by MLS).
- 2. After this initial conversion/proration/renewal process, the City's accounts will be on the regular MLS annual renewal cycle, based on their specific common expiration date.
- 3. The City will continue to monitor sales tax information, applications for permits, and business listings to ensure that all businesses obtain the required business license.

# **Business License Regulations**

The City Attorney is currently reviewing the business license ordinance that Council will be asked to adopt. The primary regulations contained within the ordinance include:

- All businesses doing business within the City will be required to obtain a City business license with the following exceptions:
  - o Government agencies
  - o Sales by farmers or gardeners of their own farm products raised and grown exclusively upon lands owned or occupied by them.
  - Casual and isolated sales, such as garage sales conducted at a residence, provided, that not more than four such sales are made during the calendar year.
  - Delivery of goods by a vehicle to a customer by a business where the sale occurred on a business premises outside of the city and only event occurring within the City is a delivery.
  - Sales of daily newspapers.
- All businesses applying for a business license will pay the same flat fee except nonprofit and not-for-profit activities and fundraising sales by organizations which the Internal Revenue Service has determined that their charitable contributions would be deemed tax deductible. MLS will verify with the Secretary of State that a business that claims to be exempt from the license fee has received this designation.
- The City license expiration date will be coordinated with the expiration date of all other licenses or permits required by the State for each business.
- Businesses that are required to obtain a specialty business license from the City will still be required to do so.
- A separate business license is required for each individual location within the City.
- Businesses that conduct business within the City, but do not have a physical location within the City, will be required to obtain a City license.
- A separate license is required for each business operated on a single premises. (i.e, Starbucks and Fred Meyer)
- A business license shall be personal and nontransferable.

#### **Fees**

Business License Fee: Council will amend Chapter 3 of the Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) to adopt the business license fee. In February staff recommended that a twelve

month license cost \$65. At that time, there was Council consensus to charge \$50 for a business license. Unless Council provides different direction to staff, the Ordinance amending SMC Chapter 3 will have the business license fee as \$50. Fees collected by MLS will be remitted to the City on a regular basis.

At this time there are no City delinquent fees proposed as MLS has its own delinquent fees and will handle that paperwork for the City as well.

MLS Processing Fee: An existing business that is adding a City of Shoreline license to their account after the initial conversion process will pay the \$15 fee and file a Master Application and City Addendum. After that, new businesses that do not have an account with MLS will pay a \$15 processing fee the first time they obtain any required State and/or a City of Shoreline business license. A single handling fee is assessed for all the required licenses for each physical location.

The processing fee is not a new fee for any businesses which already obtain State or other city licenses through MLS. MLS retains all processing fees. Processing fees are in addition to the City's business license fee.

# Stakeholders

Staff is contacting the Shoreline Business Chamber and the North City Business District to provide information on the business license program.

## **SUMMARY**

The recommended policies of the City's business license program align closely with the requirements of many other cities. The City's business license program will enable the City to monitor the number and types of businesses doing business in the City, provide an additional method to assure that the City is receiving sales tax from appropriate businesses and information to ensure that businesses are in compliance with City regulations. The partnership between the City and MLS will allow the City to implement the business license program with a lower administrative cost than if the City were to implement this program independently.

# RECOMMENDATION

On October 9, 2006, the Council is scheduled to adopt the business license ordinance. Staff recommends that Council clarify any issues during this evenings workshop that any required changes can be made to the ordinance prior to the October 9, 2006 City Council meeting.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A – Sample Letter notification to businesses.





UBI Number: {UBI Number}

October 13, 2006

{BUS\_OWNER\_NAME}
{MAIL\_ADD\_1}
{MAIL\_ADD\_2}
{MAIL\_ADD\_3}
{MAIL\_CITY} {MAIL\_STATE} {MAIL\_ZIP} {MZIP4}

Dear City of Shoreline Business:

The City of Shoreline has established a city business license program. You have been sent this letter because you appear to have conducted business during the past year that requires the city license. You must apply for the city license in order to continue to conduct business inside the City of Shoreline. Even if your business is located outside the City of Shoreline, you are required to have a city license to conduct business in Shoreline.

Shoreline has partnered with the state Department of Licensing's Master License Service (MLS) for administration of the city business license. The city license will be added to your existing MLS business account, which assists the city in keeping the licensing program costs low.

## Please complete the form on the back of this letter and return it to MLS.

There is no initial fee due if you send your completed form to MLS by November 15, 2006. If you submit your form after November 15<sup>th</sup>, you will be charged a \$15 processing fee.

After your initial application is processed, MLS will mail a renewal notice to you in mid-December 2006. At the time that you complete your renewal you will be charged a license fee. The full annual Shoreline license fee is \$XX. If you currently have licenses with the State of Washington and an MLS account, your first city license renewal may be prorated in order to match the expiration date already on your MLS account. Two to four weeks after your renewal has been received, MLS will send you a "Registrations And Licenses" document displaying all your licenses and registrations on file for your business.

You must post your license document in your place of business. If your business is located outside of Shoreline, you must carry a copy of the license, or the wallet card, with you while conducting business inside the city limits.

For more information, please contact the Shoreline City Clerk's office at (206) ###-###, or visit the website at: www.ci.shoreline.wa.us

# APPLICATION FOR CITY OF SHORELINE BUSINESS LICENSE

If you have more than one business location requiring the Shoreline business license, please copy this form and complete a separate application for each location.

1.	Write the nine-digit "UBI Number" printed on the front of this letter:	<b>-</b>			
2.	If you corrected the owner name, mailing address or UBI number on the	front of this	letter, ma	rk this box:	]
3.	Write the physical address of the business location where you conduct business in Shoreline.				
	Physical Street Address Where Business is Located (not the mailing address, do not use a	PO Box)			
	City	State		zip code	plus four
	My business is not physically located in Shoreline, but I need to add the already have licensed is:	Shoreline lie	cense to m	y existing acco	ount. The address I
	Physical Street Address Where Business is Located (do not use a PO Box)	City		State	Zíp
4.	What is the Firm Name (doing business as name) of your business at this	s location?			
5.	Provide a brief description of your business, products or services, at this	location:			
6.	☐ Exempt 2 ☐ Exempt 3 ☐	p to Question Exempt 5 Exempt 6 Exempt 7 ease note that	n 13, and n	mail the form t	o MLS. eceive a Shoreline license.
7.	When (date) did you first conduct business in Shoreline:				
8.	Do you use or store hazardous or flammable materials at this location?	☐ Yes	☐ No		
9.	Do you conduct this business at your residence?	☐ Yes	☐ No		
10.	Are you a general or specialty construction contractor?	☐ Yes	□No		
	If yes, provide the Dept. of Labor & Industries registration number (if	known): _		<del></del>	
11.	Give t he name and phone number of two after-hours Emergency Contact	t persons for	this busin	ess location:	
	Name:				
	Name:	Phone N	lumber (_	)	
12.	Mark an y of the following activities that you conduct at or from this business  Sexually oriented business  Adult entertainment  Charging admission Utility (telephone/cell			Ambulance	r Hire Service / Dispatch e Service / Dispatch e)
13.	Print your Name and Phone Number (the person completing this form), i	in case we no	ed to cont	tact you:	
	Name:	Phone N	umber (_	)	
Ma Pos	omit this completed application by fax or in the return envelope provided baster License Service st Office Box 9034 ympia Washington 98507-9034	oy <b>Novemb</b>		License Servone: (36	ice: 0) 664-1400 0) 570-7875

Council Meeting Date: October 2, 2006 Agenda Item: 6(a)

# CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Add Domestic Partner Health Benefits and Revise the Personnel

Policies Regarding Definitions of Immediate Family and Domestic

Partner

**DEPARTMENT:** Human Resources

PRESENTED BY: Marci Wright, Human Resources Director

ISSUE STATEMENT: Currently the City of Shoreline does not offer dependent health care coverage for domestic partners. The Association of Washington Cities (AWC) Trust, in which the City participates to receive health care coverage, now allows cities to provide coverage for domestic partners. During the past year, we have received requests from some City employees to add dependent coverage for domestic partners. Staff believes adding this benefit could aid our recruitment efforts, staff retention, and increase staff morale. It would also provide for equitable treatment for all employees. Adding this benefit requires City Council approval. If the Council were to decide to add domestic partner coverage, we also recommend amending our sick leave and bereavement leave policy to include domestic partners.

## **ANALYSIS:**

Background: When the City of Shoreline began purchasing health care coverage from the AWC Trust, the Trust did not offer the option of dependent coverage for domestic partners. In order to qualify for coverage, the dependent needed to be either a legal dependent or spouse. The Trust now allows employers to choose to include non-married partners as dependents—adding this coverage is an option for each city to determine on its own. Cities choosing to add this option must decide whether to offer this benefit to same sex partners, opposite sex partners or both. During this past year we have received requests from individual employees to add this benefit.

<u>Criteria for Domestic Partner</u>: The AWC Trust has established criteria for domestic partner:

- Must share the same regular and permanent residence; and
- Must have a close, personal and exclusive relationship; and
- · Be jointly responsible for "basic living expenses"; and
- · Are not married to anyone; and
- · Are each 18 years of age or older; and
- Are not related by blood closer than would bar marriage in the State of Washington; and

- Were mentally competent to consent to contract when the domestic partnership began; and
- Are each other's sole domestic partner and are responsible for each other's common welfare

In order to qualify, the employee must complete an affidavit attesting to the domestic partnership. In completing the affidavit, the employee also agrees to notify the City if there is any material change of circumstances within 30 days of the change. If an employee terminates a domestic partnership, the employee is not eligible to file a new Affidavit of Domestic Partnership until 90 days after the termination of the former partnership.

<u>What Other Employers are Doing</u>: In our defined labor market, two of our standard comparable jurisdictions (Kirkland and King County) offer domestic partner coverage; the other eight do not. In addition, one of the two jurisdictions that we substitute for top level management comparables offers domestic partner coverage. (That jurisdiction is Olympia). One of our adjacent cities, Seattle, offers domestic partner benefits. All of these jurisdictions consider both same sex and opposite sex couples as domestic partners.

Recruitment/Retention/Staff Morale Impact: Staff believes the provision of an additional benefit, especially one not offered by many of our comparable jurisdictions could give us a competitive edge in recruiting for new employees. Offering this benefit could also assist us in retaining staff and maintaining employee morale for those employees requesting this benefit. The domestic partner benefit promotes the City's policy of equal treatment of employees regardless of marital status or sexual orientation.

Since a majority of our comparable jurisdictions do not offer this benefit, declining to offer domestic partner coverage will not put us at a competitive disadvantage with most of our public sector competition. If we choose not to add the coverage, it will be disappointing to employees who have requested it.

<u>Other Factors:</u> Staff recognizes this issue may be controversial within the community and that some individuals may have strong views that impact their opinion on this subject. Staff is addressing this issue solely as a recruitment/retention/benefit issue and as an issue of equal treatment.

<u>Policy Implementation:</u> If Council chooses to add this benefit, we recommend adding domestic partner coverage for both same sex and opposite sex couples. We also recommend amending our definition of "immediate family" in our personnel policies to add "domestic partner". The primary impact of this change in "immediate family" would be to allow employees to use sick leave and bereavement leave for their domestic partners. Current policy allows this leave usage by specific permission of the City Manager; the definition change would allow it automatically.

Staff has attached draft Resolution 250, which would be used to implement the recommended policy changes.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Because of the City's method for paying for health related benefits, the fiscal impact of adding domestic partner coverage is minor. The City currently pays each full time regular employee \$764 a month to spend on benefit coverage. If an employee selects family health care coverage that costs more than \$764, the City pays for some additional cost (up to a maximum of \$1,073 and not more than the actual cost of premiums).

For an employee with no other dependents, the 2006 cost for adding a domestic partner to medical coverage may be less than \$764 (and thus, no fiscal impact to the City). If an employee chose to also add dental coverage for a domestic partner, the City's additional cost is likely to be approximately \$75 a month.

# **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council adopt Resolution No. 250 Revising personnel policies regarding definitions of immediate family and domestic partner and adding domestic partner benefits

# **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A – Resolution 250

Approved By:

City Manager City Attorney

## **RESOLUTION NO. 250**

CITY OF RESOLUTION **OF** THE SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING REVISIONS TO **PERSONNEL** REGARDING **DEFINITIONS OF IMMEDIATE** POLICIES FAMILY AND DOMESTIC PARTNER AND ADDING DOMESTIC PARTNER BENEFITS

WHEREAS, the City of Shoreline has been operating under Personnel Policies last revised on May 8, 2006 by Resolution No. 243; and

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to revise its Personnel Policies to add domestic partner to its definition of immediate family and to add domestic partner medical benefits; now therefore

# BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON:

- **Section 1.** Revision. The City Manager is authorized to implement a revised *Personnel Policies*, filed with the City Clerk under receiving number 3942, which shall include an amended section 3.06 as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto.
- Section 2. Health Benefits Extended to Domestic Partners. Health related benefits are authorized for domestic partners as defined in new section 3.06.
- **Section 3. Effective Date.** The domestic partner coverage and the revised *Personnel Policies* shall take effect January 1, 2007.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON OCTOBER 9, 2006.

	Mayor Robert L. Ranson
ATTEST:	
Scott Passey City Clerk	

# 3.06 Immediate Family

Unless defined otherwise in these policies, the employee's grandparent, parent, parent-in-law, foster parent, spouse, <u>domestic partner</u>, child, step child, foster child, grandchild, sister, sister-in-law, brother or brother-in-law. <u>Domestic Partner is an individual named in a current, valid Affidavit of Marriage/Domestic Partnership on file with the City's Human Resources Department and the Partnership shall satisfy the following criteria:</u>

- Partners may be of the same or opposite sex;
- Partners shall be unmarried, mentally competent, 18 years of age or older and not related by blood closer than permitted for marriage under RCW 26.04.020;
- Share a regular and permanent residence and living expense; and
- Partners shall not be a part of another Domestic Partnership.

In appropriate circumstances, an employee may believe that another individual should be considered a member of the immediate family for the purpose of applying these policies. The employee shall make a written request explaining to Human Resources why the employee believes that this individual should be considered a member of the immediate family. If Human Resources concurs, they shall forward a recommendation to the City Manager for approval. The City Manager shall decide to approve or deny the request. (If tThe definition of immediate family may be is different in certain approved benefit plans or policies; in those cases, the provisions of those plans or policies will govern.)