

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, January 6, 2003
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 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.

Mayor Jepsen introduced staff member Kris Stouffer-Overleese and explained that she won the right to be "Mayor for the Day" at the staff holiday party. Ms. Overleese had accompanied the Mayor to his various meetings throughout the day.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Steve Burkett, City Manager, distributed copies of the Shoreline staff calendar and the latest version of the Shoreline Owner's Manual.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hansen reported that this week the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) will conduct elections for appointments to various regional committees.

Mayor Jepsen announced the death on January 3rd of Mareen Kruckeberg, an internationally known horticulturist and Shoreline resident. He described her many accomplishments and contributions to the quality of life in the Puget Sound area, including the operation in Shoreline of the 4-acre Kruckeberg Botanical Garden and the MsK Rare Plant Nursery.

Mayor Jepsen also reported on discussion topics at the Northend Mayors' meeting, among them: Brightwater; appointments to SCA committees; upcoming legislation regarding the expansion of electronic gambling; and 2004 budget approaches by the various cities in response to decreased funding. He mentioned that Lake Forest Park has began a process of surveying residents' interest in restoring lost funding.

5. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) City Hall Space Needs Analysis Revisions

Eric Swansen, Senior Management Analyst, reviewed the staff report and summarized the revisions of the space needs analysis done by Bassetti Architects in 1999. He reviewed the assumptions listed in the staff report and outlined the key differences from the Bassetti report, which include the following points:

- The space needs standards adopted in 1997 are adequate and serve as the basis for allocated space by various positions.
- The City's population will grow (at approximately 0.5% annually) to 60,000 residents in the next 15-20 years, creating a target for staffing to accommodate these residents.
- Spartan Gym would continue to house a significant portion of the Parks staff. This is a major departure from the assumption in 2000 that no new facilities would be constructed for this purpose.
- The City's stormwater utility would be included, along with customer service and engineering facilities for other utility providers. The revision provides for assumption of water and sewer utilities within 15 to 20 years.
- City Council chambers would be available after hours for use by the community.
- The City would use the Shoreline Fire Department Training Center Conference Room as the City's Emergency Operations Center. This is a major departure from the assumption in 2000, where the City was incorporating this complicated facility into the program.
- Existing plans, programs and policies would continue to be carried out. This includes the CIP, Comprehensive Plan, Development Code and other adopted documents.
- No space would be allocated to our Legislative Delegation; however, there is the potential to co-locate with them as part of a partnership project.
- The City's organization will continue to respond to community requests for services in a manner similar to other cities of comparable size and within available or empowered resources. This is a departure from the Bassetti version, which did not constrain staffing based on available resources.
- The City's police station would continue to operate at its current location, using contracted services. However, internal services functions (human resources and finance) will be sized to accommodate any future decision or necessity to provide support to this function.
- Future staff growth could be accommodated by constructing a separate maintenance facility and relocating maintenance staff spaces.
- Based upon all assumptions about population, service levels, and resources, the estimated need is for a total of 57,745 square feet. This total includes a 20% increase

DRAFT

added to the usable space to account for core building requirements, including electrical, telecommunications, mechanical, and plumbing spaces, exterior wall sections, elevators, stairs and passageways.

Mr. Burkett said the revision's key difference is that it anticipates lower than expected future revenues, so building a larger City Hall to accommodate higher staff levels is not realistic.

Mr. Swansen reiterated that the revision assumed no police station in the facility, and also assumed that future maintenance staff growth would be housed in a separate maintenance facility, thereby freeing up additional space in City Hall. He explained that core building requirements (roughly 30% of the project), new common areas, Council chambers, and the lack of current space account for the growth in estimated space needs.

Mr. Burkett mentioned that a conscious decision was made to avoid leasing additional space or making improvements in anticipation of constructing a new facility.

Continuing, Mr. Swansen noted that modest staff growth and the addition of utilities customer service and engineering account for the remainder of growth in overall space needs. Citing projected economic constraints, he explained that resources are directly proportional to the amount of space the City will need. He then described the breakdown of potential new positions impacting space needs. He explained that while there is an overall increase from 121 to 151 Full Time Equivalent positions (approximately 25%), staff growth only accounts for 14% of the new space needs.

Tom Beckwith, Beckwith Consulting Group, described the process used to arrive at the space needs and adjacencies. He said his company employs functional programming, which considers space needs in relation to time periods and population growth. He explained that both people and equipment drive the amount of functional space that is required, noting that staff changes can create equivalent changes in equipment space needs. He said the process included designing an ideal City Hall and then working out adjacencies based on a prioritization scale of 1 to 3. He described three types of building layouts: 1) on a single floor with ground-level parking; 2) on 1.5 floors with ground-level parking; and 3) on two floors with underground parking. He explained the ramifications of each layout in terms of the amount of land needed and the cost of both land and construction.

Responding to Councilmember Chang, Mr. Beckwith explained that the single-level, surface parking layout is the least-expensive to construct, however, it occupies more land area. By contrast, the two-story/underground parking layout is more expensive to construct, but it occupies less land.

Mr. Swansen noted that staff will address delivery methods and site analysis at upcoming Council meetings.

Mr. Burkett asked for Council's direction on the various build options, noting that the site will largely determine which options can be considered.

Councilmember Ransom expressed the need to consider potential future growth as Shoreline moves toward becoming a full-service city. He favored a long-term solution, noting that 57,000 square feet would not adequately accommodate thirty or more years of growth. He disagreed with the assumption that decentralization between two buildings automatically adversely affects the quality of customer service, noting that the Spartan Gym is a separate, yet effective, facility. He acknowledged that the chosen site will largely determine the final design. He mentioned that Cromwell Park could accommodate the single-level design, although long-term growth may require up to eight acres of land.

Mr. Burkett recognized the importance of considering future needs, commenting that it may be wise to view the project in terms of phases. He agreed that acquiring more than enough space would be a good approach, but he also stressed affordability and short-term needs.

Councilmember Ransom speculated that 80 square feet per employee, as stated in the space needs analysis, is not an adequate amount, noting that other governments provide more space for employees. He favored acquiring more land for potential expansion.

Councilmember Hansen remarked that the 80 square feet of space does not include space allocated for equipment, which will increase the total work space per employee. He expressed support for moving ahead with the project, noting that the City cannot afford NOT to build when financing rates are good. He favored the multi-level layout because of land constraints, adding that although it is not as convenient as the single-level model, it is a good use of vertical space and will be more efficient in the long run.

Councilmember Chang commended staff for its clear analysis, noting that the site will be the most important criteria. He agreed with the underground parking/multi-level building approach, unless a more expansive area, such as Cromwell Park, is an option. Mr. Burkett confirmed that Cromwell Park is one of six locations the City is currently studying.

Responding to Deputy Mayor Grossman, Mr. Swansen explained that the City currently has approximately 24,000 square feet of net usable space, but the project requires 16,000 more feet due to common areas and core building requirements. He described the inefficiencies of current space at City Hall, noting that existing supply does not meet demand.

Deputy Mayor Grossman expressed support for moving ahead because rents will continue to increase and long-term lending rates are low. He expressed support for a multi-story building in order to preserve open spaces, whether the building is constructed on a small or large parcel.

DRAFT

Councilmember Montgomery concurred, noting that it is not fiscally responsible to continue renting when conditions are right for owning. She expressed concerns about current rental costs and the inadequacy of space.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed that the City cannot afford to delay the project any longer. He agreed with the multiple-level concept, but said he would reserve final judgment until the site is chosen, since the structure will depend on the site.

Councilmember Ransom clarified he is in favor of moving forward with the proposal. He emphasized he would like Council to consider larger sites to accommodate parking and future growth.

Mayor Jepsen expressed a preference for a multi-story facility, but noted that he will reserve final judgment until he sees the land options.

- (b) Update on Shoreline's Emergency Management Plan Update
- (c) Statewide Law Enforcement Emergency Mutual Aid and Mobilization Plan

6. ACTION ITEM

- (a) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute the King County Regional Disaster Plan for public and private organizations in King County, including the Omnibus Legal and Financial Agreement associated with the Plan

There was Council consensus to treat these three reports as one item, since the various plans are interrelated.

Mr. Swansen introduced these items and discussed the various county, state, regional, and federal levels involved in coordinating emergency management. He explained that most emergency management plans are designed to use local resources first before appealing to other jurisdictions.

Police Chief Denise Pentony updated Council on Shoreline's Emergency Management Plan and said that it should be ready for adoption in April. She then outlined the background on the Law Enforcement Mutual Aid legislation that will be before the State Legislature this season. She asked Council for support of the effort of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs to develop and implement this statewide mutual aid and mobilization plan and to support legislative efforts to formalize it. Her presentation included the following points:

- Originally adopted in 1998, the Emergency Operations Plan is a regional disaster plan that must be updated every biennium.

- The City has created several partnerships in developing guidelines and defining specific roles and responsibilities for emergency planning. These partners include the Shoreline School District, Shoreline Fire Department, Crista Ministries, Shoreline Community College, and the Shoreline Amateur Radio Association.
- The Emergency Planning Team, comprised of key members of City staff, are currently rewriting the Emergency Operations Plan and identifying the operational details needed to activate the Emergency Operations Center (EOC).
- The Emergency Management Council, comprised of key City staff as well as other City entities, will work from the new EOC location at the Fire Training facility to plan and coordinate emergency response procedures per the Emergency Operations Plan.
- In the event of an emergency, the City of Shoreline and the Zone One EOC (located in Bellevue) would simultaneously activate their Emergency Operations Plans to coordinate resources. The City would ensure that its own needs are met before providing resources to other jurisdictions.
- Adoption of the Shoreline compact, which includes emergency management/response/recovery plans, is essential in obtaining grant and mitigation funding through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Without such a plan, cities will not qualify for FEMA reimbursement.
- Key 2003 objectives include: staff and community training, conducting emergency exercises, and promoting 72-hour preparedness in the community. The goal is that Shoreline residents will be able to manage their own affairs for at least 72 hours in the case of an emergency.
- The Statewide Law Enforcement Emergency Mutual Aid and Mobilization Plan is necessary to mobilize state/interstate resources and mitigate jurisdictional problems in the event of an emergency. The plan will allow local governments to access the \$3.5 billion in federal funding reserved for homeland defense. The current mutual aid plan places a significant burden on local agencies, as it does not cover reimbursement or liability issues. The draft proposal follows the state fire mobilization plan, which will establish predictable, uniform policies for every jurisdiction.

Mr. Swansen introduced Item 6(a), noting that the Regional Disaster Plan first submitted to Council in May of 2002 now includes the Omnibus Legal and Financial Agreement associated with the plan. He briefly discussed the following four problems the Regional Disaster Plan attempts to address during any potential widespread disaster:

- The lack of guidance regarding the role and planning requirements of special districts (school, water, fire, wastewater) in an emergency;
- The lack of uniformity in reporting relationships between cities and counties during a disaster;
- The likelihood that one agency alone is unable to coordinate an effective program of resource-sharing in an emergency;
- The inadequacies of formal resource-sharing arrangements.

DRAFT

Continuing, Mr. Swansen explained that the Financial Agreement will provide added strength to the plan by outlining standard terms and conditions for resource-sharing policies. He emphasized that although the financial impacts are unknown because they are directly related to disasters or emergencies, local resources will be managed locally through the Shoreline EOC before they are made available outside the City. He mentioned that most cities are eager to sign on to the agreement.

Mayor Jepsen opened the public comment.

(a) Bob Phelps, Shoreline, team manager for Shoreline Auxiliary Communication Service (aka Shoreline Amateur Radio), was pleased to be participating in the Emergency Management Plan. He noted that his group of trained volunteers have been providing emergency communications for the fire department for the past five years.

Mr. Swansen said the City has been working with Shoreline Amateur Radio to certify its members to meet national standards on emergency message handling. He pointed out that the sooner we communicate our needs, the sooner we receive resources.

Councilmember Hansen expressed concern that neither the City of Shoreline nor the Shoreline Water District are included on the list of signatories. It was Mr. Swansen's understanding that the SWD intends to sign the agreement. He assured Councilmember Hansen that the City made every effort to include SWD in the agreement.

Councilmember Gustafson was glad to finally have a solid emergency plan in place, noting that emergency preparedness has been a major priority for him. He expressed confidence in Chief Pentony's leadership and was pleased with Shoreline Amateur Radio's participation in the plan. He emphasized the need to rehearse the emergency plan.

Councilmember Hansen expressed concern that King County had not signed the agreement. Mr. Swansen confirmed that King County expressed an intent to do so.

Deputy Mayor Grossman pointed out that people must be able take responsibility for their own preparedness, noting that government agencies will not be able to respond to all requests for assistance in an emergency.

Upon motion by Councilmember Gustafson, seconded by Councilmember Hansen and unanimously carried, the City Manager was authorized to execute the King County Regional Disaster Plan for public and private organizations in King County, including the Omnibus Legal and Financial Agreement associated with the plan and to support the draft Shoreline Emergency Management Compact.

6. WORKSHOP ITEM

(d) Gateway Master Plan

Tim Stewart, Planning & Development Services Director, reviewed the Gateways Policies and Procedures Manual and explained a minor amendment to the Development Code to exempt gateways from Sign Code requirements. He also asked for Council direction on the scope of design for the site at Westminster and Dayton Ave. N. He said the purposes of gateways include creating a sense of place, identity, character, and to announce City boundaries. He asked for Council concurrence to move forward to 30% design for the six highest priority gateways.

Andrea Spencer, Project Manager, discussed the following four purposes of the Policies and Procedures Manual:

- To identify gateway locations and hierarchy
- To outline policies for theme and design
- To provide direction for implementation
- To summarize significant project events

She explained the four categories of gateway locations, which include primary, secondary, tertiary, and other. Primary locations are considered the most prominent sites that require the most elaborate design solution. Secondary sites have visual importance but do not require highly elaborate solutions. She called attention to six priority sites that were identified during public meetings: 5th NE & 145th; Westminster & Dayton; 175th & I-5; Meridian & 205th; and 15th NE at 145th; and 15th NE at 205th.

Mr. Stewart noted the Planning Commission's unanimous recommendation and outlined the next steps, which include Council adoption of Gateway Policy, amendment of the Development Code, and direction on proceeding with 30% design drawings for the top sites identified in the Gateways Manual.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Richard Johnsen, Shoreline, asked for clarification about what constitutes a gateway. He expressed support for constructing gateways on City boundary lines, noting that some proposed sites are not located on Shoreline's borders.

(b) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, opposed the gateways program, characterizing it as a low priority. He advised Council not to amend the Development Code to exempt gateways from the Sign Code.

(c) Edsel Hammond, Shoreline, called the gateways program a waste of time and money, noting that there are more important things to be done in the City. He urged Council to let civic organizations build gateways in the City if they so desire.

(d) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, characterized gateways as a waste of money. He said gateways funding could be used to restore the lost funds in the roads maintenance budget.

DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen said gateways do not necessarily have to be located at the entrance to the City, noting that the project is about creating variety and a sense of place. He expressed support for including the pedestrian overpass at 175th Street & Interstate 5 in the project. He also favored proceeding with 100% design drawings for the priority sites. He said it makes sense to use the entire site at Westminster & Dayton, although costs should be compared with other sites on the funded list.

Councilmember Hansen expressed support for distinctive gateways. He explained that other cities such as Edmonds, Arlington, and Vancouver B.C. do a good job using gateways at locations other than at city borders. He noted that the \$350,000 budgeted for gateways is merely a placeholder. He was skeptical about proceeding with 100% of design drawings and expressed interest in viewing specific plans. He said gateways would become a tremendous asset similar to the Edmonds flower program.

Councilmember Ransom had some reservations about costs but expressed general support for gateways. He liked the idea of creating a "pocket park" at Westminster & Dayton, and supported gateway treatments at 175th Street & I-5 and 145th Street & I-5. He suggested that population figures be included in gateway signage.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said gateways will identify Shoreline as a distinctive community. He cautioned about ongoing maintenance costs depending on the design options. He requested intermediate information about design alternatives and rough cost estimates. He expressed support for plantings that require less maintenance and designing gateways based on individual sites.

Mayor Jepsen clarified that he recommended proceeding to 100% design because he wanted to ensure there is a plan to achieve 100% design.

Mr. Stewart noted that the department chose the 30% figure because that is what the contract covers. He said additional work would be moved into the Capital Improvement budget.

Councilmember Chang was opposed to the gateways project, noting that there are higher priority needs for the funds. He said the money could be used to serve the needs of seniors, the business community, the disabled, and schools. Pointing out that Walgreens paid for its own gateway, he suggested that the City should not use its own funds, particularly in tough economic times.

Councilmember Gustafson expressed support for gateways. He suggested that the City work with community groups to become participants in the project. He noted that the Planning Commission and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee favored the project. He expressed support for gateway treatments at overpasses and for the "pocket park" concept at Westminster & Dayton. He suggested the City include the Council of Neighborhoods in the discussion.

DRAFT

Councilmember Montgomery concurred with Councilmember Gustafson in support of gateways.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, expressed general opposition to the way the City has been conducting business. He mentioned the Development Code, the Aegis project, the stream inventory, and Gateways to illustrate that the City is trying to change its own laws. He noted that the City Hall project will not conform to 35-foot height restrictions. He said the Council must adhere to the same rules it establishes for its citizens. He said neighborhoods are unified in considering dissolution of the City.

(b) Clark Elster, Shoreline, said the cost estimates for underground utilities as contained in the Aurora Corridor Project Final Environmental Impact Statement are misleading and dishonest. He said Seattle City Light (SCL) has not agreed to pay for partial undergrounding, and in any case, it will raise rates to cover the costs. This means that Aurora Corridor improvements will be paid for by the citizens through increased utility rates.

(c) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, said Gateways are not a high priority for the City, noting that there will be recurring maintenance costs. He opposed the staff's recommendation to amend the Sign Code, noting that the Council should not be able to change the law whenever it feels like it. He said Council passed the Aurora design plan even though citizens opposed it.

(d) Richard Johnsen, Shoreline, clarified that he supports the Gateway project, although he favors building gateways only at City borders. He said additional clarification is needed to distinguish between gateways and works of art. He suggested that the pedestrian bridge at 175th Street and I-5 be cleaned up before the City considers it for a gateway. He favored additional signage on I-5 to differentiate between Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. He encouraged the City to keep designing and come up with different concepts.

(e) Daniel Mann, Shoreline, expressed appreciation to Shoreline residents and the Council for input and discussion of the Aurora Corridor project. He acknowledged the City's attempt to accommodate business concerns and asked for continued dialogue on the project. He expressed hope that the City will be open to additional discussion and compromise, noting that the full costs of the project have not been adequately considered. He speculated that the costs for underground utilities in the first phase could total \$10 million.

Responding to Mr. Poland's comments, Mayor Jepsen clarified that the City would not be violating its own code if it built City Hall on Aurora Avenue because the height limitation on Aurora is 60-feet, not 35-feet. He was glad to hear Mr. Mann's appreciative comments, but was disappointed to learn that the Shoreline Merchants Association appealed the Aurora Corridor Notice of Action.

DRAFT

Councilmember Hansen reiterated that other areas in Shoreline allow buildings in excess of 35 vertical feet, including the North City area. He thanked Mr. Mann for his comments, noting that the City is committed to continuing the Aurora Corridor dialogue and make accommodations where necessary.

Responding to Mr. Elster, Mr. Burkett explained that SCL will be required to relocate its facilities on the City's right-of-way according to the franchise agreement, if the Aurora Corridor project proceeds as planned. He explained that the process operates in the same way from city to city and for all utilities, including water, sewer, telephone, and cable. He said the costs for such relocations are passed along to consumers through utility rate increases, noting that SCL maintains long-range funds to do relocations. He presumed that Shoreline residents have paid large sums of money in utility rates for relocated utility lines throughout the City of Seattle.

Councilmember Chang asked for clarification, noting that City literature implies that undergrounding costs will be assumed by SCL. He understood from Mr. Burkett's comments that Shoreline electricity consumers will be charged for electrical undergrounding through increased utility rates.

Mr. Burkett explained that the franchise agreement requires SCL to treat Shoreline the same way it treats its own residents. He assured Council that rate increases based on utility relocations are assumed by all rate-payers, not just Shoreline rate-payers. He noted that Shoreline residents have paid for utility relocations, whether they occur in Shoreline or Seattle. He described it as part of SCL's rate calculation, just like any other cost of doing business.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:32 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.