Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Agenda Item: 2(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Proclamation of Neighbor Appreciation Day 2001
DEPARTMENT:	Community/Government Relations
PRESENTED BY:	Ellen Broeske, Neighborhoods Coordinator Joyce Nichols, C/GR Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The Council of Neighborhoods has adopted February 24, 2001 as "Neighbor Appreciation Day". Council of Neighborhoods Chair Darlene Feikema would like to provide your Council information about the event and distribute "Thank you Neighbor" greeting cards. This will be the third year that Neighbor Appreciation Day is observed in the City of Shoreline.

Approved By: City Manager KTB City Attorney

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Council of Neighborhoods has adopted February 24, 2001 as "Neighbor Appreciation Day"; and

WHEREAS, Shoreline is gifted with neighbors who watch out for one another and lend a hand as needed; and

WHEREAS, neighbors beautify our community by caring for community parks, trees, and waterways; and

WHEREAS, neighborhood volunteers make our community safer by serving at storefront police offices and as Block Watch Captains; and

WHEREAS, neighborhood businesses make our lives easier by providing valuable services and supporting our community; and

WHEREAS, neighbors guide and advise the City through participation on boards, commissions, advisory committees, neighborhood associations and other aspects of civic life,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Scott Jepsen, Mayor of the City of Shoreline, do hereby proclaim February 24, 2001

NEIGHBOR APPRECIATION DAY

in Shoreline, a day to "celebrate the goodness in those around us."

Scott Jepsen, Mayor

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, January 16, 2001
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmember Grossman

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 by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exceptions of Councilmembers Lee and Ransom, who arrived later in the meeting, and Councilmember Grossman.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to excuse Councilmember Grossman. Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman reported that King County Metro plans to restore Richmond Beach and Ridgecrest bus service cut in response to Initiative 695. He said the Council of Neighborhoods will be asked for feedback on specific route changes, and then Council will discuss this item at its March 12 meeting.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Gustafson mentioned the Youth Summit on February 3 and hoped there would be Council representation there. He also mentioned a meeting regarding the future of human services in the north end on Wednesday, January 31. He said he would attend and invited other Councilmembers to do so.

Councilmember Montgomery said she attended KOMO's "Town Hall" on Sunday night, along with Shoreline residents Walt Hagen and Ken Howe. She said Mr. Howe mentioned the possibility of a monorail on the Interurban Trail right-of-way.

Mayor Jepsen noted speaking about the state of the City at the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Ken Howe, 745 N 184th Street, addressed three topics: 1) his advice to the Sound Transit Board that there is room for a monorail in the 100-foot Seattle City Light right-of-way; 2) the Aurora Village Transit Center, which is owned by Metro and which he feels should be studied before the 192nd Street Park and Ride for a Transit Oriented Development (TOD); and 3) factual errors in the Comprehensive Plan—he noted the statement in the Housing Element that half of the housing units built before 1939 are in the Richmond Beach area, and he said this figure is actually less than 20 percent. He asked that such errors be corrected.

(b) Don Gilbertson, 16727 5th Avenue NE, asked if Councilmembers had received his petition regarding street trees. He reiterated his testimony last week that no one from the City has met with him face-to-face on his property regarding the problems created by the street trees on 5th Avenue between 167th and 170th Streets. He said he also represents his neighbor on this problem, and he protested the lack of City response.

(c) Clark Elster, 1720 NE 177th Street, informed Council that a depression is forming under 192nd Street just west of Meridian Avenue.

Mayor Jepsen commented that Council is committed to locating the TOD at the 192nd Street Park and Ride site.

Mr. Bauman pointed out that several staff members have spoken with Mr. Gilbertson about his concerns and considerable time has been spent analyzing this situation. Mr. Bauman confirmed that the City needs a comprehensive tree replacement program in order to fairly and appropriately begin replacing the street trees that are causing problems.

Mayor Jepsen commented that Deputy Mayor Hansen had noticed another depression on 200th Street Mr. Bauman said both problems have been rectified.

Councilmember Lee arrived at 6:55 p.m.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(d) North City Sub-Area Plan Update

Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Services, explained that four major issues crystallized at the Planning Commission's discussion of the North City Sub-area Plan: 1) residential densities; 2) traffic and reducing the four travel lanes on 15th Avenue NE to three; 3) mitigation of cut-through traffic and development of a State

Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Planned Action Ordinance; and 4) integrating this effort into the economic development program.

Anna Kolousek, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services, reviewed the two documents before Council tonight: a Comprehensive Plan amendment called the "North City Sub-Area Plan;" and a Development Code amendment creating a special district for North City. She described the goal of the plan to create a "Main Street" along 15th Avenue NE between 172nd Street and 180th Street by moving the buildings closer to the street and permitting retail and residential uses to be denser than currently allowed under the Development Code. Parking will be located behind the buildings, possibly with additional residential units above the parking lots.

Continuing, Ms. Kolousek described the two overlay zones to be created within the Main Street district. Zone #1 would require retail to be located on the first floor. Zone #2 would allow either residential units or retail on the first floor. She said the Planning Commission reviewed this concept and recommended the elimination of the density limitations in both zones. The reasoning was that it is actually the bulk of the buildings, rather than the number of units, that affects the character of the area. The bulk of the buildings would not change in the proposed Main Street zones. Building height would remain capped at 60 feet. Additional standards are proposed to make development more compatible with the surrounding area, but it would be left to the market to determine the number of units in the building. Ms. Kolousek then described the supplemental design standards in the amendment to the Development Code.

Turning to traffic considerations, Ms. Kolousek said there are two issues to be considered. No change is recommended to the physical dimension of the rights-of-way on 15th Avenue NE. However, there will be reduction of the distance between future buildings due to the elimination of the front yard setback. It is also recommended that 15th Avenue NE be tapered down to three lanes, with two travel lanes (one in each direction), center left-turning lane, and parallel parking on both sides of the street.

Noting that this design could create more potential for cut-through traffic, Ms. Kolousek said that as part of the SEPA Planned Action Ordinance, a mitigation plan for the entire North City area will be developed. The State allows such an approach in growth areas. It will be carefully designed to enhance opportunities for pedestrians and bicycles and to reduce the number of necessary car trips within the neighborhood. She pointed out that the Council has already acted to allocate over $5 million for improvements to 15th Avenue NE.

Ms. Kolousek said development is slowed by the amount of time required by the plan review process. The Planned Action SEPA review will be based on providing detailed environmental analysis for a build-out in 2015 of the demonstration projects that are in the sub-area plan. The analysis will consider traffic, land use, and all the other items that are reviewed in a draft environmental impact statement (EIS). She said that once this Planned Action SEPA review is completed, any developer who complies with the plan would be able to apply for a building permit without the Type B permit review process.

This would reduce review time and therefore save money for the developer. She emphasized that the mitigation measures will be prepared in advance and approved by Council as part of the Planned Action Ordinance and the Final EIS.

Ms. Kolousek reviewed the next steps in the process, noting that staff is working on the EIS, which will be completed in March. After public review, some changes to the sub-area plan may be necessary. The EIS and the Planned Action Ordinance will be prepared simultaneously and brought to Council in June 2001.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Gretchen Atkinson, President of the North City Business Association, said the Business Association is very pleased with the proposal and is looking forward to further development of North City.

(b) Rob Mateko, 17127 15th Avenue NE, representing Anderson Community, was concerned that the Anderson driveway is at the edge of the development area. He pointed out the number of emergency vehicles that use this driveway and hoped this would be taken into account.

(c) Dennis Lee, 14547 26th NE, said this is a fine plan; however, he was concerned that it is business-driven. He wanted to be sure residents are not left out of the planning.

(d) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193rd Street, was concerned about narrowing 15th Avenue NE. He was glad to hear that cut-through traffic will be mitigated. He emphasized that traffic congestion is a major problem for Shoreline. He didn't want to see a plan that generates more traffic congestion.

(e) Charlotte Haines, Chair of the North City Neighborhood Association, responded to the comment about informing North City residents. She described neighborhood mailings. She said people are very excited about this plan because it will upgrade the entire area. It will allow more businesses that residents won't have to drive to, which is particularly important as the population ages.

Councilmember Ransom arrived at 7:29 p.m.

Mayor Jepsen spoke in support of the Planned Action SEPA. He said this approach helps the region balance growth goals and concerns from the community. This process allows planning for the worst-case scenario so that as development occurs, the City has already addressed what will happen. The challenge is to make sure as many people as possible get involved as early in the process as possible. He said an effort has been made by the Business Association and the Neighborhood Association to do that and will undoubtedly continue.

Ms. Kolousek confirmed for Mayor Jepsen that the mixed use requirement in Zone #1 will not be eliminated by the proposal. He wished to ensure that the recommendation does not dilute the intent to get mixed use development.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Ms. Kolousek said construction on 15th Avenue NE should begin in 2002.

Noting the Planning Commission did a very good job of asking the right questions, Councilmember Montgomery supported their recommended changes. She also commented that although her initial response to narrowing 15th NE to three lanes was negative, she has been surprised at how well the three lanes have worked on 185th Street.

Councilmember Lee commented on the amount of cut-through traffic already occurring through neighborhoods. She wished to ensure that the mitigation is adequate and advised researching what other communities, such as Everett, have done.

Mayor Jepsen raised the issue of traffic enforcement in neighborhoods, noting that early on, the Council decided that Shoreline should not become a "speed trap" like Lake Forest Park or Woodway. This policy has not been revisited, while the City has grown in its radar-enforcement capacity. He asked that a discussion on traffic enforcement be scheduled to determine whether Council wishes to see policy changes.

Noting he did not wish to minimize the problem of cut-through traffic, Deputy Mayor Hansen asserted there are no "good" north-south cut-through routes in North City.

Ms. Kolousek confirmed for Councilmember Gustafson that the recommendation from the Planning Commission was unanimous. He said he had concerns about density and traffic, but he would await the EIS to "fill in the holes." He asked where the City is in its growth management goal of adding 1,600 to 2,400 housing units and how the elimination of the density limitations in North City will impact this.

Mr. Stewart said staff is working on evaluating how many units have been produced since incorporation and the potential for growth in the future. He said one of the elements of the analysis is how development opportunities in North City and elsewhere may provide for much higher densities than anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan provided for the addition of 66 units per year in the next 20 years. Under the proposal, ten times as many units might be added without impacting the adjoining neighborhood. This raises questions about whether all the conversions to higher densities in some neighborhoods are really needed. One area that staff is looking at is the one-lot deep high-density residential zoning that goes down 15th Avenue NE. Mr. Stewart said the Planning Commission will wrestle with this issue in the spring. He concluded that currently the City is just about on target, producing between 80 and 100 new units per year. However, new targets will be coming out shortly based on the 2000 Census. These will be a challenge not only for Shoreline, but for the entire region.

Councilmember Gustafson said he was excited about the North City plan because it may allow the City to protect the integrity of the neighborhoods and still accommodate growth management goals.

Mr. Stewart said "firmer" numbers will become available through the environmental analysis.

Councilmember Ransom said everyone he has talked with has been supportive of the proposal. He was also impressed by the unanimity on the Planning Commission. Therefore, he had no concerns about the proposal.

Mayor Jepsen summarized that everyone supports the plan and is looking forward to seeing the results of the environmental review and the Planned Action Ordinance.

(b) Water Service Report

Kristoff Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager, and David Parkinson of CH2MHill, recalled that the five options Council originally heard for water service in Shoreline have been narrowed down to three: 1) supporting the Shoreline Water District's (District's) efforts to annex the west side of the City, served by Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), to its system; 2) assumption of the District's system; or 3) acquiring both service systems and serving all of Shoreline through a City utility. Tonight staff is recommending some policy positions that will serve as the basis for completion of the analysis of these options.

Continuing, Mr. Bauer said the key policy decisions are in three areas: 1) cooperation with Lake Forest Park (25 percent of the District's customers live in Lake Forest Park); 2) long-term water supply; and 3) rates and financial management decisions.

With regard to Lake Forest Park customers, Mr. Bauer said the recommendations are based on how Shoreline would have liked to be treated by SPU. They would give the Lake Forest Park City Council some authority over policy decisions about how services are provided and how rates are set in its area.

Discussing the other two issues, Mr. Parkinson said staff recommends following the current District policy of attempting to negotiate a long-term water supply contract when the current contract with the City of Seattle expires in 2012. In terms of rates and financial management, he focused on capital improvement issues. He said the analysis is based on the District's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Water Plan rate model. He described the key assumptions of the analysis. Then he reviewed four alternative comparisons for projected capital project costs. The District's CIP contains extensive budget allocations for water supply projects and water system replacement/expansion projects. By scaling back the water supply projects and modifying the pipe replacement program, the District's CIP can be reduced by 22 percent. He noted that the reduced pipe replacement option is based on the concept that some of the pipe scheduled for

replacement by the District has not reached the end of its useful life and replacement can be delayed without impacting the quality and reliability of service.

Mr. Parkinson reviewed other recommendations, including: 1) centralize administrative services and apply the City's allocation model; 2) share equipment between utilities to decrease overall costs to the ratepayer; 3) repay debt according to the existing District schedule; 4) apply the six percent utility tax for Shoreline customers; 5) keep current District assets; and 6) maintain a minimum capital reserve balance of $1,000,000.

In conclusion, Mr. Parkinson said the estimated cumulative quantifiable impacts of all the recommendations would result in a nine percent reduction in 2010 water service rates, an additional $190,000 in General Fund revenue per year and a $275,000 reduction per year in administrative expenses allocated to existing City services.

Mr. Bauer said a number of ideas, such as sharing equipment, may have impacts, but they are not of sufficient magnitude to be visible in this analysis. He also noted that any sharing of equipment or use of property between a City "water utility" and another department would have to be compensated to the water utility fund to keep ratepayers whole.

Mr. Bauer said staff will complete the impact analysis based on tonight's discussion. Then Council can provide direction about which alternative it prefers.

Mayor Jepsen asked for public comment.

(a) Bill Bear, 2541 NE 165th Street, commended the District for planning ahead and thinking about water reutilization. He said tonight's report seems to eliminate reutilization, which he felt is essential in any future plan.

(b) Dennis Lee, 14547 26th NE, was bothered that the only option on the table is assumption of the District and the only information about options is coming from staff and consultants. He advocated another workshop at which the District could respond to the analysis. Noting the District has been serving Shoreline for a long time and has not had any problems, he advised a better choice might be to let the District continue to provide water service and let it help the City take over the Seattle side.

(c) Don Gilbertson, 16727 5th Avenue N, commented that he has been served by the District since the early 1950s, that he has always been happy with the District and that he has not had any problems.

On another topic, he commented that the trees on 5th Avenue are very unstable. He said he wished to be on record that if any of the trees fall and cause damage, he will "be after" the City.

(d) Rick Harbert, Water District Engineer, represented the District, saying he could not address all of the issues on the table in the short time available. He asked the

Council to give the District the opportunity to make a presentation addressing each of the relevant points. He commented that the District has been working on a renegotiated agreement for long term water supply. It has received its water from the City of Seattle since 1935 and feels it has paid for its share of the supply. It is not in the citizens' best interests to continue to pay for this forever. This is one of the reasons that an alternative was put on the table. This alternative has water reuse at its core. He also contested the statement that the District goes out and repairs pipelines whenever a new standard is adopted. However, sometimes requirements change, mandating improvements to the system.

(e) Walt Hagen, 711 N 193rd Street, noted that Deputy Mayor Hansen attended the January 5, 2001 Water Commissioners meeting, where there was a lively exchange. Mr. Hagen said the maintenance the District provides is superior to that of SPU. He did not support only replacing equipment when "we have to." He feared Shoreline might follow the Seattle model, with the resultant lowering of service levels.

Councilmember Montgomery said if the City annexes the District, it should protect Lake Forest Park's jurisdictional authority. Mr. Bauer said the analysis is based on this recommendation. He said there are many variables over time, including what Lake Forest Park might do. Some decisions will increase rates; some will decrease rates. The analysis is based on what the District is doing and plans to do. However, this could be changed tomorrow.

Responding to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Bauer explained that under the District's current CIP, the accumulated CIP reserve will be spent down in five years. Of course, the District could decide to change this policy. The staff recommendation is to establish a minimum CIP reserve amount of $1 million. Doing this would create a two percent increase in the rates.

Mayor Jepsen commented that assumption is not the only option on the table. He said he would like to have SPU and the District consolidated to serve the City of Shoreline. He wanted to focus on how to move the process forward so that both the City and the District are working together to accomplish the goal. He was encouraged by the District's new direction in looking at long-term water supply.

Councilmember Ransom stated that municipalities are attempting to consolidate all utilities under the umbrella of city government. In his view both water and sewer service should be provided by the City in order to provide comprehensive service. He wished to assure District users that they will continue to have service equal to what they have now. He said the District can be absorbed by the City and then a system can be built to integrate the SPU area into the City as well. The end result will be a better system for everyone. He said that even if there is a final vote for assumption, it will take at least two years for the integration to finally happen. Then it will take another two years for things to "settle down." He recommended starting now to accomplish this integration.

Deputy Mayor Hansen commented on his meeting with the District Commissioners. He said his interest is in acquiring the SPU service area and consolidating service in one provider. Whether this is a separate district or a department of the City is not terribly important to him. He believed that in the long run the City will acquire the District, but right now he would like to enter into a cooperative venture with it to acquire the SPU service area. He said he would welcome a joint meeting and workshop with the District Commissioners. He said there will be multiple joint meetings before action is taken.

Councilmember Gustafson concurred with Deputy Mayor Hansen. He welcomed a joint workshop to hear the District's point of view and have an open discussion.

Mayor Jepsen added that Councilmembers have participated in a number of meetings with the District. Numerous reports have been shared with both Lake Forest Park and the District as the process has moved forward. He wanted to see the report completed so that Council can make a decision.

Mr. Bauer asked if Council supports the specific recommendations listed in the Council packet as a starting point for the remainder of the staff analysis. Mayor Jepsen commented that in general they make sense.

Councilmember Ransom also generally liked the recommendations but said he might take exception to one or two. He noted that Lake Forest Park has not responded with any specific requests regarding its role.

Councilmember Montgomery asked if the analysis is completely objective. Mr. Bauer assured her that it attempts to be neutral in evaluating how the District is run and the impact of different decisions. He said staff has tried to provide all the options, not drive the result.

Deputy Mayor Hansen said the final report should contain an explanation of exactly what legal processes are established by State law for assumption of the District. He mentioned questions asked by the District and said they could best be discussed in a joint workshop. He questioned items related to reducing costs, noting he did not believe that Commissioners' expenses could have much of an impact. He also wondered whether the figure of $125,00 per year is realistic for reduced staffing costs and costs of engineering and legal expenses. He reiterated his long term goal that the District will eventually be assumed by the City. However, the primary goal is to have all of the citizens of Shoreline served by a single water district at the same service level. He asserted that the District could help the City achieve this goal.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the map of the boundaries of the District. Mr. Bauer said the map is inaccurate in identifying annexation areas, although it does show the accurate boundaries of the District.

Councilmember Gustafson asserted that a nine percent decrease in rates would appeal to citizens as long as quality of service is maintained. He generally agreed with the

recommendations. He expressed concern about reductions in the CIP, noting the District is doing a good job with maintenance and water supply equipment. He wished to revisit this recommendation when the report is completed. He reiterated the need for open discussion.

Mr. Bauer clarified the issue of reserves. The District maintains reserves for different purposes. The only one that is projected to decrease to zero is the capital reserve. The other reserves will be maintained. The recommendation is to maintain the capital reserve fund at $1 million.

Mayor Jepsen expressed consensus to move forward to complete the analysis based on the recommended assumptions and to clarify the legal process established by State law. A joint meeting with the District will take place after the report is completed.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Andrew Maron, Water District Attorney, did not wish the Council to believe that following the recommendations will result in a 22 percent reduction in costs compared to the District. He said most of the savings are based on items the District itself is considering as well.

Mayor Jepsen assured Mr. Maron that the Council understands that these figures are simply projections at this point. No decisions will be based on them.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:42 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, January 22, 2001
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: Councilmembers Lee and Montgomery

STAFF: Larry Bauman, Interim City Manager; Kristoff T. Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager; Bill Conner, Public Works Director; and Rob Beem, Health and Human Services Manager

The meeting convened at 6:19 p.m. There was a general discussion regarding labor markets and trends impacting the City.

At 6:25 p.m., Councilmember Ransom arrived.

Councilmember Ransom indicated his concerns regarding proposed changes in the City's Compensation Plan.

Interim City Manager Larry Bauman responded with additional information regarding the process staff followed to develop the proposal.

Moving on to another topic, Mr. Bauman responded to Councilmember Ransom's question that staff had only received one comment during the two-week delay of Council action on the Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual.

Councilmember Grossman commented that he had received a call raising a concern that the manual contains references to unattached documents.

Public Works Director Bill Conner responded that this was a conscious decision made to shorten the document and avoid unintended conflicts. He also described the process that staff followed for public review of the proposed document.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Bauman described the impact of the manual on business signs, clarifying that this impact results from Development Code regulations rather than the manual. He added that the Code could be amended if Council desires to do so.

At 6:45 p.m., Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem arrived.

Councilmember Grossman expressed concern regarding the City's ability to place a value on a sign reliably and equitably.

Mr. Conner added that business owners could apply for variances and staff would assist with this process during property acquisition negotiations.

Mr. Conner described recent events related to the sidewalk repair project on 5th Avenue NE.

Mr. Bauman discussed a petition from some residents to remove all trees on a section of 5th Avenue NE. Mr. Conner added that staff is working on a tree replacement program. Mr. Bauman clarified that the program would replace problem trees, not remove complete City blocks of trees.

Mr. Bauman introduced a memorandum from Mr. Beem describing recent developments related to City cooperation on human services since the dissolution of the Human Services Roundtable. Mr. Beem stated that King County cities south of Seattle have formed a South County group that intends to hold limited meetings. He described efforts of north-end cities to hold an organizational meeting to determine whether there is interest in forming a North County forum.

Councilmember Ransom added that a number of area churches are meeting to discuss community needs. He suggested that Mr. Beem attend.

Mayor Jepsen recognized a number of recent efforts by local groups to raise funds, food, and resources.

Councilmember Gustafson stated that he would be attending the north-end organizational meeting and invited other Councilmembers to participate.

Mayor Jepsen stated his preference that staffs work together regularly with intermittent check-ins with elected officials. He added that the effort should focus on coordinating services and filling gaps.

Deputy Mayor Hansen recognized that the formation of a north-end group would likely be a positive evolution in human services planning.

Councilmember Grossman supported working with Snohomish County cities.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Kristoff Bauer, Interim Assistant City Manager

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, January 22, 2001
7:30 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 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmember Gustafson, who arrived shortly thereafter, and Councilmember Montgomery.

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

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

In response to Interim City Manager Larry Bauman, there was Council consensus to cancel the February 5 workshop for lack of agenda items.

Councilmember Gustafson arrived at 7:34 p.m.

Wendy Barry, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, noted that the terms of four of the members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee are expiring. In addition, she said the alternate member of the committee has served for two years. She discussed a schedule under which Council would consider and make new appointments to the committee by the end of March.

Mr. Bauman mentioned that Council has previously designated an ad hoc subcommittee to review applications and make recommendations for appointments.

Mayor Jepsen noted that the terms of Planning Commissioners and Library Board members expire during even-numbered years. He said this schedule allows newly-elected Councilmembers the opportunity to participate in the appointment process. He

expressed concern that newly-elected Councilmembers must wait more than a year to participate in the appointment of members to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee. He acknowledged the "huge burden" of attending to the expiring terms of all City boards and commissions during one year.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Gustafson and Ransom volunteered to participate on an ad hoc subcommittee. Mayor Jepsen said he would talk with Councilmember Montgomery about the possibility of her participating on the subcommittee as well.

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Ransom moved to approve the agenda and requested that Council change item 7 (e) to be item 8 (c). Deputy Mayor Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the agenda, as amended, was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to approve the consent calendar, as amended. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion, which carried 6-0, and the following items were approved:

Minutes of Regular Meeting of December 11, 2000
Minutes of Dinner Meeting of January 8, 2001
Minutes of Regular Meeting of January 8, 2001

Approval of expenses and payroll as of January 4, 2001 in the amount of $628,448.13

Motion to authorize the Interim City Manager to execute the Commute Trip Reduction Implementation Act Agreement with King County for Commute Trip Reduction services in the amount of $5,235

Ordinance No. 259 reclassifying an administrative support position in the City Manager's Office and the Department of Planning and Development Services, and amending the 2001 Proposed Budget adopted by Ordinance No. 254

8. ACTION ITEMS: OTHER ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Motion to direct staff to proceed with a scope to undertake a sub-area planning effort in the area between 175th and 192nd along Aurora Ave.

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, and Kirk McKinley, Planning Manager, reviewed the staff report.

Mr. McKinley reviewed the issues that sub-area planning between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue could address. He went on to address three other potential locations for economic development related sub-area planning and the issues related to each: Aurora Square and vicinity; Echo Lake bounded by Aurora Avenue, 192nd Street and 200th Street; and Ballinger Commercial District, north and south of Ballinger Way from Interstate 5 to 25th Avenue NE. He noted that staff and the Planning Commission recommend the area between 175th and 192nd Street along Aurora Avenue as the focus for 2001 sub-area planning.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Cynthia Wills, 18205 Fremont Avenue N, said she had expected City economic development efforts to focus on Aurora Square and Aurora Village as "economic hubs." Noting several unresolved issues related to the area along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets (e.g., the Aurora Corridor and Interurban Trail alignment), she said economic development in the area seems premature. She mentioned that neighboring residents are concerned about traffic and inadequate infrastructure.

Mayor Jepsen said the unresolved issues related to the area between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue represent "one of the arguments" for a sub-area plan for the area. He asserted the need for sub-area planning for Aurora Square and vicinity as well. Noting the City's limited resources, he said he was "torn" about which of the two areas the City should focus on.

Referencing the minutes of the December 7, 2000 Planning Commission meeting, Councilmember Lee noted a lack of in-depth discussion of the other potential locations for sub-area planning.

Mr. Stewart said Economic Development Coordinator Jan Briggs will soon present information to Council regarding Aurora Square. He mentioned that efforts already underway at Aurora Square will occur even without City sub-area planning this year. He explained that the land-use issues related to Aurora Square are simpler than those related to the area along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets. He noted the greater uncertainty of the land uses along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets as part of the staff rationale for recommending the area for 2001 sub-area planning.

Councilmember Lee commented that in the minds of Shoreline businesses and citizens the City has yet to deliver on Aurora Corridor planning. She said the Westminster-Aurora Square area "is much more scalable." She advocated it as a demonstration project for citizens and businesses. She asserted the need to take advantage of the momentum created by Central Market. She said she would like "to capture the opportunity of how to position the Interurban Trail."

Councilmember Ransom noted the prediction of the previous Economic Development Coordinator that the combination and development of the ten parcels at Aurora Square could take as long as ten years. Given this time frame, Councilmember Ransom said the City should not delay sub-area planning for Aurora Square to complete sub-area planning between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue first. He advocated a major City emphasis on Aurora Square coincident with the construction of the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project. He said the City could otherwise lose the opportunity for retail development at Aurora Square. He asserted that major retail stores are more likely to locate at Aurora Square or Aurora Village than along Aurora Avenue. In addition, he noted that focusing now on Aurora Square would provide "a little more time" for the businesses between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue to adjust.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed with the comments of Councilmembers Lee and Ransom. He acknowledged that the area between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue is a priority. He advocated attention to Aurora Square coincident with construction of the first phase of the Aurora Corridor Project. He recommended the following prioritization of the four potential areas for economic development related sub-area planning: 1) Aurora Square and vicinity; 2) approximately 175th to 192nd Streets (both sides of Aurora Avenue); 3) Echo Lake bounded by Aurora Avenue and 192nd and 200th Streets; and 4) Ballinger Commercial District (both sides of Ballinger Way from I-5 to 25th Avenue NE).

Councilmember Grossman said sub-area planning for Aurora Square should have little impact on the location of the Interurban Trail. By contrast, he asserted the importance of sub-area planning to determining the location of the trail along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets and to addressing the anxiety of small business owners. He said redevelopment is more likely to occur sooner at sites along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets than at Aurora Square. He advocated the prioritization of the four potential areas in the order presented by staff (pages 49 and 50 of the staff report).

Deputy Mayor Hansen asserted that the City must do "some planning" concurrently for both Aurora Square and the area along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets. He agreed with Councilmember Grossman that Shoreline small business owners are most anxious about City handling of the latter area. He advocated the prioritization presented by staff.

Mayor Jepsen noted his long-standing concern about the impacts of the redesign of Aurora Avenue and the design of the Interurban Trail on adjacent areas. He asked the following questions: 1) How does the Interurban Trail crossing of Aurora Avenue help or deter development of Aurora Square? 2) How does vacation of Westminster Way help or deter development of Aurora Square? and 3) What is the timing of the Aurora Corridor and the Interurban Trail Projects relative to adjacent areas?

Mr. McKinley said current planning efforts regarding the Aurora Corridor concern the vacation of Westminster Way. He noted the following questions in particular: to which

adjoining properties will the vacated property go? how should the triangle-shaped property be tied into the larger, 20-acre site? how should access to Aurora Square from Aurora Avenue via 155th Street work and how will changing the access affect operations at Aurora Square? He mentioned the need to determine "a circulation plan" within Aurora Square. He said staff will present information to Council in early March about City economic development efforts with the owners of the private properties at Aurora Square. He indicated the possibility of a privately-initiated master plan for the site.

Mr. McKinley noted "big question marks" regarding the area along Aurora Avenue between 175th and 192nd Streets: the Seattle City Light right-of-way—how to underground power lines and what to do with current uses in the right-of-way; what to do about Ronald Place; the interrelationship of the Interurban Trail and the myriad rights-of-way and private properties in the area; what to do about Midvale Avenue.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. McKinley said sub-area planning between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue would address whether, and where, to vacate Midvale Avenue. He acknowledged Councilmember Ransom's concern about maintaining access to parcels along Midvale Avenue. He said the City must study alternate access and conduct a traffic analysis in its consideration of vacating Midvale Avenue.

Councilmember Ransom noted that the City has funding for the north and south ends of the Interurban Trail in Shoreline. He said he understood the City would at least continue the basic planning and design of the Interurban Trail. Mr. McKinley mentioned the four conceptual designs for the alignment of Aurora Avenue and the Interurban Trail between 175th and 185th Streets that staff presented at the November 20, 2000 Council workshop. He said a sub-area plan would assess which option works best to support the land uses.

Councilmember Gustafson questioned the time line of the Aurora Corridor Project. He commented that if construction north from 175th Street will not begin for many years the City may have time to complete sub-area planning for Aurora Square first. Mr. McKinley said staff does not know when the City will have the funding to construct the second phase of the Aurora Corridor Project. He also pointed out that Council has not specifically directed staff on which section of Aurora Avenue the next phase will focus.

Mayor Jepsen suggested that staff develop the sub-area plan scope, study area and time line for the area between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue for presentation to Council at the same meeting in March at which it will address economic development activities at Aurora Square. He said Council can then decide whether it is sufficiently satisfied with efforts at Aurora Square to proceed with sub-area planning between 175th and 192nd Streets along Aurora Avenue. He restated Council concern that the first phases of the Aurora Corridor and Interurban Trail Projects support the future of Aurora Square and vicinity.

Councilmember Lee asked if economic development efforts at Aurora Square could make sub-area planning for the location unnecessary. Mr. McKinley said staff may "come

back with a master plan, as opposed to a sub-area plan." He explained that this depends, in part, on the scope of area that Council would want a plan to address.

Mayor Jepsen said he would want the plan to address more than just the Aurora Square site. He advocated a plan that takes both sides of Aurora Avenue into account. Councilmember Gustafson agreed.

Councilmembers Ransom and Gustafson supported Mayor Jepsen's direction to staff. Councilmember Grossman did as well, but he went on to note the numerous obstacles to redevelopment at Aurora Square.

Councilmember Lee favored the larger scope that Mayor Jepsen advocated for planning in the vicinity of Aurora Square. She reiterated the opportunity of how to position the Interurban Trail.

(b) Motion to approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual"

Anne Tonella-Howe, Aurora Corridor Project Manager, reported that staff distributed copies of the draft "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual" at the January 10 Shoreline Chamber of Commerce meeting. She received feedback from Terry Green, the Chamber of Commerce President and a member of the Aurora Improvement Council. Ms. Howe related Ms. Green 's comment that the business community appreciated the extra effort the City made to address business community issues (e.g., the extra benefits for displaced businesses that choose to relocate in Shoreline). Ms. Howe said Ms. Green identified "grandfathering signs" as a remaining issue of concern. Ms. Howe explained that the City will negotiate compensation for the removal of non-conforming signs and that property/business owners may apply to Planning and Development Services for variances to retain such signs.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) Russ McCurdy, Owner, Aurora Cold Storage and Seattle's Finest Exotic Meats, "applauded" the City for exceeding minimum federal requirements in preparing the draft manual. He restated the concern of Aurora business owners that the 12-foot sidewalks proposed for the Aurora Corridor Project are excessive.

(2) Daniel Mann, 17920 Stone Avenue N, said he looks forward, as the owner of a business on Aurora Avenue, to seeing the City honor its commitment to give strong consideration during the implementation of the Aurora Corridor Project to the impacts of the project on businesses. He advocated that the City also address the construction phase "very critically" to insure that businesses do not suffer.

Mayor Jepsen stated that the following motion, postponed from the January 8, 2001 meeting, was on the table: **Councilmember Gustafson moved, and Deputy Mayor**

Hansen seconded, to approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines Manual."

Councilmember Ransom thanked Council and staff for distributing the draft manual to the business community and for providing the extra time for review and feedback. He said he received input from representatives of the business community. He noted the outstanding concern regarding "grandfathering signs."

A vote was taken on the motion to approve the "Aurora Corridor Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Policy, Procedures and Guidelines Manual", which carried unanimously, and the manual was approved.

(c) Ordinance No. 260 adopting revisions to the City's Classification and Compensation Plan

Human Resources Director Marci Wright reviewed the staff report.

Deputy Mayor Hansen moved approval of Ordinance No. 260 adopting revisions to the City of Shoreline Classification and Compensation Plan. Councilmember Grossman seconded the motion.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Wright said the original classification and compensation plan included "benchmark" classifications (those compared to pay practices of other jurisdictions) and other classifications linked as percentages to the benchmark classifications. For example, she noted that the Administrative Assistant II position is a benchmark classification, that the Administrative Assistant I position is set ten percent lower and that the Administrative Assistant III position is set ten percent higher. She explained that the recent salary survey simply carried forward the relationships between classifications established in the original plan.

Councilmember Ransom identified the Administrative Assistant classifications as his primary concern. He stated that the Administrative Assistant I is an entry-level clerical position. He said other businesses find the pay range for the position very high.

Councilmember Ransom referred to the Administrative Assistant II as the primary position in the series. He said the recommended revision would result in a 7.5-percent salary increase, on top of the cost-of-living adjustment that all City employees received January 1, 2001. He stated the salary range for the Administrative Assistant II as $31,700 to $38,500. He said "other, comparable businesses" are "rather astounded that our pay standards are that high."

Continuing, Councilmember Ransom said some organizations use a compensation system with a minimum, maximum and mid-point for each range, and "almost nobody gets to the maximum." He compared this to the City plan in which "almost everybody gets to the maximum." He asked how staff performed comparisons involving the other type of system. Ms. Wright explained that, consistent with the original study, staff asked the

jurisdictions in the City's designated labor market to report the maximum salary that would normally be achieved through progression through the range.

Councilmember Ransom said the State includes a comparison with private industry in its salary survey. Ms. Wright said the City's designated labor market only includes public sector jurisdictions. She mentioned that one or more of these jurisdictions may include the private sector in its compensation analysis.

Councilmember Ransom said private businesses concerned about the difference in the City's pay standards need to suggest that Council change the City labor market to include private businesses.

Councilmember Lee said Council chose a labor market of public sector jurisdictions when it established its policy.

Mayor Jepsen said the City competes with the Shoreline School District for a number of its positions. He suggested that the City may want to consider adding the District to the list of jurisdictions in the City's designated labor market in the future.

Councilmember Ransom said the process staff followed in conducting the recent salary survey is very typical for a government agency. He stated that criticisms that salaries for entry-level City clerical positions are high are correct. He acknowledged that staff followed the process that Council established.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve Ordinance No. 260 adopting revisions to the City of Shoreline Classification and Compensation Plan, which carried 6-0.

9. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Discussion of Proposed False Alarm Ordinance

Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony reviewed the staff report.

Mayor Jepsen invited public comment.

(1) LaNita Wacker, 19839 8th Avenue NW, said it is not possible to measure "how many of the so-called false alarms are actually interrupted burglaries." She stated that an alarm may actually be doing what it is supposed to be doing.

Chief Pentony explained that police officers only categorize a call as a false alarm if "there's absolutely no indication of criminal activity."

Mayor Jepsen said the framework of the revised false alarm ordinance makes sense. However, he questioned whether a $75 fee for a second false alarm is too aggressive. He favored the approach of the City of Edmonds: a requirement for inspection and

certification after the second and subsequent false alarms and a fine of $50 after the third response.

Councilmember Grossman agreed with Mayor Jepsen's comments. He favored the City of Edmonds approach.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Chief Pentony did not have statistics on the number of false alarms resulting from human error versus mechanical problems. She stated that the department intends to track such data. She said the City of Phoenix, which has tracked such data, has targeted training to address the most frequent problems.

Councilmember Lee supported the inspection and certification of alarms. Chief Pentony confirmed that the City will allow exceptions for false alarms related to inclement weather.

Councilmember Ransom commented that alarms help to identify criminal activity and focus police resources. He asked if large fines for false alarms might discourage the use of alarms and necessitate higher police costs to deter crime. He said burglaries represent a large percentage of crime in Shoreline. He supported the City of Edmonds approach to false alarms as a good compromise. Chief Pentony acknowledged the value of security alarms. However, she noted that 277 locations in Shoreline had two or more false alarms in 2000. She said these problems drain police resources from other issues in the community.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested a $25 fine for a second false alarm, with increases of $25 for each subsequent false alarm. While he supported the proposed framework for the revised ordinance, he said a fine of $75-$100 seemed too harsh.

Deputy Mayor Hansen expressed concern that court costs to the City of collecting fines could exceed the amount collected. Chief Pentony mentioned a provision in the revised ordinance which makes an alarm user who goes to a hearing and loses the case responsible for the court costs as well as the fine. In response to Deputy Mayor Hansen, she explained that the revised ordinance would be based on a six-month period. Deputy Mayor Hansen favored being "quite lenient" on false alarms, except in cases of repeat offenses.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the cost to the user of the alarm inspection and certification that other jurisdictions require after subsequent false alarms. Chief Pentony said the revised ordinance would require the alarm user to notify the Shoreline Police of the cause of the false alarm and the necessary corrective action but would not necessarily require an inspection and certification.

Councilmember Lee stressed that cost savings are not the only impetus for the proposed ordinance. She noted that Chief Pentony mentioned that the frequency of false alarms affects the attitudes of officers responding to alarm calls. She stated that educating alarm users is the most important piece of the proposed strategy.

Mayor Jepsen confirmed Council consensus in support of proceeding with the proposed ordinance with an emphasis on reconsidering the civil penalties.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Agenda Item: 7(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of January 26, 2001
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Al Juarez, Financial Operations Supervisor

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

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

RECOMMENDATION

Motion: I move to approve Payroll and Claims in the amount of $3,622,615.10 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for December 24,2000 through January 06, 2001 in the amount of $287,413.58 paid with check/voucher numbers 5249 through 5295, and 20001 through 20105 and benefit checks 7102 through 7110.

Payroll and benefits for January 07,2001 through January 20, 2001 in the amount of $261,573.04 paid with check/voucher numbers 2908 through 2912, 5257, 5277, 5286, 5296 through 5347, 20043, 40001 through 40111 and benefit checks 7207 through 7215.

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on January 11, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of $20,492.23 paid on Expense Register dated 01/09/2001 with the following claim checks: 7044-7058 and

Expenses in the amount of $196,607.80 paid on Expense Register dated 01/10/2001 with the following claim checks: 7059-7079 and

Expenses in the amount of $85,373.30 paid on Expense Register dated 01/10/2001 with the following claim check: 7080 and

Expenses in the amount of $104,816.91 paid on Expense Register dated 01/10/2001 with the following claim checks: 7081-7097 and

Expenses in the amount of $122,640.83 paid on Expense Register dated 01/11/2001 with the following claim checks: 7098-7101 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on January 22, 2001:

Expenses in the amount of $202,903.03 paid on Expense Register dated 01/17/2001 with the following claim checks: 7112-7130 and

Refunds in the amount of $2,328,565.36 paid on Expense Register dated 01/22/2001 with the following claim checks: 7132-7143 and

Expenses in the amount of $11,729.02 paid on Expense Register dated 01/22/2001 with the following claim checks: 7144-7159 and

Expenses in the amount of $500.00 paid on Expense Register dated 01/22/2001 with the following claim check: 7160 and

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Agenda Item: 7(c)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion To Accept the Lowest Responsive Construction Bid for the 15th Avenue N.E. at NE 165th Street Project wzc
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval of a low and responsive construction bid for the 15th Avenue NE at NE 165th Street Project. This project is included in the City's 2001 – 2006 Capital Improvement Program.

The project scope of work includes constructing a fully actuated traffic signal at the intersection of 15th Avenue NE at NE 165th Street, incorporating pedestrian-activated push buttons and in-pavement detection loops on 165th Street for vehicles turning onto 15th Avenue NE, and constructing sidewalk improvements and curb ramps at the intersection in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The construction of this project will increase safety at this intersection for pedestrians and vehicles crossing or entering onto 15th Avenue NE from NE 165th Street by providing a traffic signal that controls oncoming traffic. During the period from August 1992 through July 1995, ten accidents were reported at this intersection. The majority of these accidents occurred when vehicles were attempting to make left turns onto 15th Avenue NE.

This project was advertised on November 27, 2000. On December 19, 2000, the City Clerk's Office received and opened the following bids from qualified contractors:

Bidder Name	Bid Amount
1. Mer-Con, Inc.	$151,077.70
2. Transtech Electric	$151,263.20
3. Totem Electric	$156,341.75
4. Potelco	$158,287.75
5. Signal Electric	$163,882.95
6. GMT Inc.	$163,972.00
7. Moose City Electric	$180,772.90
8. Precision Earthworks	$183,701.98

The engineer's estimate for the project is $190,000. Staff has reviewed the low bidder's qualifications and recommends that Mer-Con, Inc. be awarded the contract. Staff anticipates construction will begin in April or May following procurement, testing and acceptance of signal equipment materials, and completed by July 2001. The contractor has 90 calendar days for acquisition of critical materials and 45 working days to complete the project. Staff will closely monitor the contractor to minimize any inconvenience to the general public.

The award of the contract was temporarily delayed by the protest of one of the unsuccessful bidders. This protest was withdrawn on January 30, 2001.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council accept the low bid and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract with Mer-Con, Inc. in the amount of $151,077.70, and to execute change orders up to 10% of the original contract amount.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Consent Item: 7(d)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Consideration of a Contract in the Amount of $303,364 for Parks Landscaping and Maintenance Services
DEPARTMENT:	Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services
PRESENTED BY:	Kirk Peterson, Parks Superintendent K.P. Wendy Barry, Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On March 2, 1998, your Council authorized the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department to begin contracting park maintenance and landscape services with Evergreen Services, now referred to as TruGreen Landcare. This contract was for three years and expired on January 1, 2001. Staff issued a Request for Bid (RFB) for the parks landscaping and maintenance services on November 29, 2000. The purpose of this report is to present staff's findings and award the parks landscaping and maintenance services contract.

The Parks Landscape and Maintenance Contract has been formulated so the contractor is paid for services rendered. Staff has the option to withhold payment for services not rendered and this contract can be terminated with thirty (30) days notice. This contract has provisions to add services as the park system is improved through capital improvements and by the work of maintenance staff. This is accomplished through an amendment to the contract. The City has the option to acquire park and landscape maintenance services from another contractor if additional services are required.

A total of five contractors obtained bid packages after the RFB was issued on November 29, 2000. Staff held a guided tour of the City's parks to describe maintenance activities and locations outlined in the RFB on December 12, 2000 and December 13, 2000. All five contractors attended the guided tour on December 12, 2000. The contractors in attendance for the December 12, 2000 tour were:

- Dariotis Construction
- DG Landscaping, Inc.
- Facilities Maintenance Contractors
- Myers Master Lawn Care & Construction
- TruGreen Landcare

Staff held a Pre-Bid Conference on December 14, 2000 for the purpose of answering any questions and to consider suggestions of the potential bidders. On December 19, 2000 the City Clerk's office received bids. Of the five companies that obtained the Request for Bid two submitted bids for the Parks Landscaping and Maintenance Services Contract. The following list identifies the two firms and their cost proposals for annual maintenance services beginning March 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001.

- Dariotis Construction Company $495,763.22
- TruGreen Landcare $303,363.55

Future year costs for this base service level are projected to increase by $37,000 in 2002 and 2003. This increase in cost is anticipated in order to support additional services needed as capital projects are completed in the park system.

An interview panel selected TruGreen Landcare based on savings to the City's budget, reference checks, site inspections of their work, and their ability to provide the services specified in the RFB. Staff has also had the benefit of working with TruGreen Landcare, formerly Evergreen Services, for three years. During this time, TruGreen Landcare has been responsive and able to meet the requirements of the Landscape and Maintenance Contract.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the Interim City Manager to sign a contract for Parks Landscaping and Maintenance Services with TruGreen Landcare for $303,364.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The evaluation criteria in selecting a recommended contractor for your Council's approval include cost, references, demonstrated ability to perform the services, and experience working with municipal government agencies.

The most prevalent criteria in selecting a recommended contractor for your Council was the bidder's ability to perform the maintenance tasks described in the RFB, which include:

- *Mowing at 2 – 2-1/2 inches.* This type of mowing occurs two times per week on athletic fields March through November.
- *Mowing at 2 – 5 inches.* This type of mowing occurs once per week on turf areas outside of athletic fields.
- *Trimming.* This service is performed one to two times per month around areas that mowers cannot reach, March through November.
- *Edging.* This service is performed once per month next to sidewalks and other highly maintained areas March through November.
- *Fertilization.* Occurs two times annually on athletic fields in the early spring and late fall.
- *Chemical Application.* These applications occur only in selected, highly maintained landscapes. The application consists of ROUNDUP or an approved equivalent. Herbicides with a high residual toxicity, such as Casoron, are not permitted under this contract.
- *Aeration, Overseeding and Oversanding.* These services are performed two times annually, in the early spring and late fall.
- *Baseball Field Maintenance.* This activity occurs twice a year, once prior to the first scheduled league game and again at the season's end. This service requires the contractor to till into the existing infield soil 10 to 20 yards of sandy loam. This keeps the infield surface soft and safe for play.
- *Baseball Game Prep.* 758 baseball game preparations occur throughout the season. This task involves dragging and wetting down field, setting bases and lining foul lines.
- *Baseball Practice Prep.* 232 practice preparations occur throughout the season. This task involves wetting down fields, filling in holes and dragging infields.
- *Baseball Field Quick Prep.* 15 quick preparations are reserved for the year. This task is reserved for unscheduled or make-up games and involves dragging and wetting down fields, setting bases and lining foul lines.
- *Soccer/Football Maintenance.* This service occurs twice per year prior to the season opening and after the season's end. This service involves measuring and lining fields, and installation of goal posts.
- *Soccer/Football Field Prep.* 339 soccer/football field preparations are required in this RFB. This service requires that the fields are free of depressions and safety hazards. Fields are lined and the all-weather fields are dragged.
- *Tennis Court Maintenance.* This service is performed on a weekly basis and requires the contractor to remove all debris from courts and remove vegetation from all surfaces. This task also requires that the contractor maintain the nets at 36-inches high.
- *Power Washing.* This service requires that the contractor power wash all tennis courts in the park system, as well as the bleacher units at Hamlin Park, annually in the spring.
- *Hard Surface Maintenance.* This service requires hard surfaces to be blown or swept free of debris. This task occurs after each mowing.

- *Landscaped/Planted Areas.* This service requires shrubs and planted beds be free of leaves, litter, debris, weeds, spent blooms, disease or insect infestations, or dead plants or trees. This service occurs on a monthly basis.
- *Litter Removal.* This service occurs only at the Medians on 175th and I-5 and is performed four times per week throughout the year.

An interview panel selected TruGreen Landcare based on savings to the City's budget, reference checks, site inspections of their work, and their ability to provide the services specified in the RFB. Staff has also had the benefit of working with TruGreen Landcare, formerly Evergreen Services, for three years. During this time, TruGreen Landcare has been responsive and able to meet the requirements of the Landscape and Maintenance Contract.

During the past three years TruGreen Landcare has been providing landscape and maintenance services to the City of Shoreline. Staff has had the opportunity to review the contractor's level of service versus cost for the service rendered. The first Park Landscape and Maintenance Services Contract was designed to contract for approximately 75% of maintenance services, with the other 25% of services to be provided by City staff. The contract presented to your Council differs from the first Parks Landscaping and Maintenance Services Contract in that it is written to contract for approximately 55% of maintenance services, with the other 45% of services to be provided by City staff. The changes in the contract are listed below:

- In 1999 staff thoroughly analyzed the Parks Landscape and Maintenance Contract and concluded the service of litter removal should be removed from most sites in the contract. Analysis showed that the contracted service of litter removal was costing $114,000 annually for every-other-day service at most sites. After review staff concluded that City staff could perform this service on a daily basis for $2,000 less cost on an annual basis with the benefit of doubling litter removal services. In addition, staff has greatly increased its response time to the removal of graffiti and vandalism. During the winter time when litter removal slows down, staff can devote time to other various projects that greatly benefit the park system.
- Landscape maintenance for the new Shoreline Pool parking lot, the Shoreline Police Station, the newly annexed Brugger's Bog and Ballinger Open Space Parks, and the recently improved Bluff Trail is included.
- Aeration, Overseeding and Fertilization of athletic fields have been doubled. This was needed due to the fact that the City fields experience high volumes of use. This level of service is necessary to maintain healthy, safe turf.
- A number of herbicide applications are not included that were in the previous contract. This service has been replaced in a number of locations with line trimming. This was changed in an effort to reduce pesticide use in the City's parks.
- Athletic field preparation (22 times per year) at Shorecrest High School has been added to the contract as part of the Joint Use Agreement between the City and the School District.
- Additional areas of mowing have been included in the contract. This is due to staff's reclamation of overgrown land where previously unusable land has been cleared, reseeded, and turned into passive recreational space, through the use of North Rehabilitation Facility crews.

The City's Capital Improvement Program will be making a number of significant changes to four parks in 2001. These parks include Paramount School Park, Richmond Highlands Recreation Center, Shoreline Pool, and Shoreview Park. The improvements made to these parks include:

- addition of a new Little League baseball field
- frontage improvements
- addition of parking spaces
- a number of new plant beds and landscape improvements
- addition of a number of site amenities
- installation of a number of infrastructure systems i.e., irrigation, drainage

The Parks Landscape and Maintenance Services Contract is structured so additional authorized services can be added for maintenance once construction is completed.

The Parks Landscape and Maintenance Contract has been formulated so the contractor is paid for services rendered. Staff has the option to withhold payment for services not rendered and this contract can be terminated with thirty (30) days notice.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council authorize the City Manager to sign a contract for Parks Landscaping and Maintenance Services with TruGreen Landcare for $303,364.

Council Meeting Date: **Consent Item: 7(e)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Adoption of Ordinance No. 263 amending Ordinance No. 167 creating the Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee
DEPARTMENT:	Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services
PRESENTED BY:	Wendy Barry, Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On July 27, 1998, your City Council passed Ordinance No. 167 creating the Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Advisory Committee; prescribing its membership, organization and responsibilities. The purpose of this report is to request your Council's adoption of Ordinance No. 263 revising Ordinance 167 to reflect the bylaws of the PRCS Advisory Committee as amended.

Ordinance No. 167 allows the PRCS Advisory Committee to establish rules for the conduct of their meetings and the business of the Committee. On February 24, 2000, the PRCS Advisory Committee voted unanimously to modify their bylaws to more accurately reflect the actual composition and practices of the Committee. The PRCS Advisory Committee and staff recommend the following changes that are reflected in Ordinance No. 263:

a. Increase the number of regular meetings from four to eight meetings per year.

   The PRCS Advisory Committee met nine times in both 1999 and 2000 to address various PRCS Department issues. This required the scheduling of five special meetings in addition to the four regular meetings of the PRCS Advisory Committee each year. This level of workload for the PRCS Advisory Committee is expected to continue. This change will eliminate the need to call special meetings and will allow Advisory Committee members and the public the opportunity to anticipate and plan for regular meetings. The following schedule is proposed: January, February, March, April, May, June, July, and September.

b. Add information regarding Alternate Member duties to the Ordinance.

Your Council appointed an Alternate Member to the PRCS Advisory Committee in 1998. However, no language was included in Ordinance No. 167, or the bylaws, referencing this position. The PRCS Advisory Committee amended their bylaws in 2000 to reflect the position and its duties. The proposed language in Ordinance No. 263 includes reference to the existence of the Alternate Member. It also indicates the Alternate Member shall have all of the duties and requirements of the rest of the Advisory Committee including attendance and verbal participation in meetings, with the exception of voting. The Alternate Member will be called upon to cast a vote on an action item in the event a full voting member is absent from a meeting. The Alternate Member may be considered one of the five (5) members required to constitute a quorum.

c. Establish a term for the Alternate Member

On September 28, 2000, the PRCS Advisory Committee discussed the length of term for the Alternate Member position. The Committee consensus was two years was optimum and would allow a person to learn about the PRCS Department and the PRCS Advisory Committee, as well as, understand the commitment required to serve on the PRCS Advisory Committee.

d. Modify term limit for Committee members from eight years to ten years.

Staff recommends modifying the maximum number of years a Committee member may serve from eight years to ten years to allow an Alternate Member to serve two four-year terms as a regular member, if selected.

A copy of Ordinance No. 263 (Attachment A) is attached, reflecting the changes to Ordinance No. 167. The Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Advisory Committee By-Laws are provided for your reference as well. Please see Attachment B.

This proposed Ordinance No. 263 amending Ordinance 167 will align the documents to more accurately reflect the composition and practices of the PRCS Advisory Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend adoption of Ordinance No. 263 amending Ordinance No. 167 creating the Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee, prescribing its membership, organization and responsibilities.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Ordinance No. 263
Attachment B: Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Advisory Committee By-Laws (Strikeout version)

ORDINANCE NO. 263

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON AMENDING THE MEMBERSHIP, MEMBER TERMS AND MEETING SCHEDULE OF THE SHORELINE PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE; AND AMENDING CHAPTER 2.55 OF THE SHORELINE MUNICIPAL CODE

WHEREAS, THE City Council appointed an alternate member to the Parks, Recreation and cultural Services (PRCS) Advisory Committee when it was established but the organizational ordinance for the Committee does not include this member, the member's duties nor a term of office; and

WHEREAS, issues relating to the operation, maintenance and design of parks, and activities in sports, recreation and cultural services have required the PRCSA to meet on a more frequent basis than presently set forth in SMC 2.55.040;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Amendment. SMC 2.55.010 is amended to read:

.010 Created--Purpose. The Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee is hereby created. ~~The Committee shall consist of nine (9) members.~~ The Committee is to provide additional citizen input on park maintenance and operations, design matters, programs and services in sports, leisure and cultural activities.

Section 2. Amendment. SMC 2.55.020 is amended to read:

.020 Membership. Only persons who reside in the City of Shoreline, own property there, or are employed in Shoreline shall be eligible for membership on the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee. The Committee shall consist of nine (9) regular members and one (1) alternate member. The alternate member shall have all the duties of regular members and fully participate in Committee meetings, except the alternate member may not vote on action items unless a regular member is absent. Members shall serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses pursuant to City ordinances and policies. The position of a member shall become vacant upon such member's ceasing to reside within, own property within, or be employed within, the Shoreline City limits. The position of a member shall be forfeited and become vacant for failure to attend three regular consecutive meetings of the Committee, unless such absence is excused by a majority of the Committee. Vacancies occurring other than through the expiration of terms shall be filled for the unexpired terms in the same manner as for appointments as provided in this ordinance.

Regular ~~Committee~~ members shall serve four-year terms; the alternate member shall serve a two-year term. To allow for the staggering of terms for the initial Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee and appointment or reappointment as appropriate, the initial terms for regular members shall be as follows: 4 members for terms of two years and 5 members for terms of four years. Terms shall expire the 31st day of March. No Committee member shall serve more than ten (10) ~~eight (8)~~ consecutive years.

Section 3. Amendment SMC 2.55.040 is amended to read:

.040 Meetings and organization. The Committee should hold meetings at regular intervals as provided in the bylaws adopted by the Committee after City Council review. The Committee shall schedule eight (8) regular meetings per year during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, and September. ~~meet not less frequently than every ninety (90) days.~~ A more frequent meeting schedule may be established by the Committee as the need arises. Members of the Committee shall select a chairperson and such other officers as they may deem necessary, and may establish rules for the conduct of their meetings and the business of the Committee.

Section 4. Effective Date and Publication. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City. This ordinance shall take effect five days after passage and publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 12, 2001.

_____
Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

_____
Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Ian R. Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication:
Effective Date:

Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Advisory Committee BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I - MEMBERSHIP

The Shoreline Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee shall consist of nine (9) members and one (1) alternate member, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council.

ARTICLE II - STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Shoreline Park and Recreation Advisory Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the City Council. It will be their responsibility to provide additional citizen input on park maintenance and operations, design matters, programs and services in sports, leisure and cultural activities.

ARTICLE III - OFFICERS AND DUTIES

SECTION 1: OFFICERS

Officers shall be a Chair and Vice-Chair, both elected by the Advisory Committee from members of the Advisory Committee. In absence of both, members may elect a Chair *pro tem*. All officers will serve one-year terms.

SECTION 2: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(a) The Advisory Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity.

(b) The full Committee may make reports and recommendations to the City Council concerning park maintenance and design of parks, and program activities in sports, leisure and cultural services. Cultural service activities refer to instructions programs versus performances or displays, which are to be done by the Arts Council. The Committee will make recommendations concerning the acquisition, care, maintenance, utilization and disposition of buildings, property and equipment related to parks programs,

(c) The Committee may review, advise and make recommendations to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director and the City Council concerning the development and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning the use of parks, buildings and equipment, and rules of conduct and behavior of persons using the same. The Committee shall advise and make recommendations relative to the scope and quality of services provided or to be provided, including instructional and park materials.

(d) The Committee shall ~~report to the~~ forward meeting minutes to the City Council and provide a quarterly review of their activities.

SECTION 3: DUTIES OF THE OFFICERS AND ALTERNATE MEMBER

~~——~~A. CHAIR

The Chair shall preside at all meetings and call special meetings when necessary. The Chair shall be a full voting member of the Advisory Committee. The Chair shall sign minutes and official papers, appoint all committees and their respective Chairs, and act as an *ex-officio* member of each, but without voting privileges. The Chair may delegate duties to other Advisory Committee members with the consent of the Advisory Committee. The Chair shall speak on behalf of the Advisory Committee before the City Council and to the public.

~~——~~B. VICE CHAIR

The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the same. The Vice Chair may also serve as convener of special committees. The Vice Chair shall gather all requests for staff work and communicate those to staff.

C. ~~——C.~~ ALTERNATE MEMBER DUTIES

The Alternate Member will have all of the duties and requirements of the rest of the Committee including attendance, verbal participation in meetings, with the exception of voting. The Alternate Member will be called upon to cast a vote on an issue in the event a full voting member is absent from a meeting.:

D. ELECTIONS

Generally, officers shall be elected and take office annually at the first regular public meeting of the Advisory Committee. - In the event of the departure of an officer from the Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee shall elect a new officer to fill out the term at the next regular meeting.

ARTICLE IV - MEETINGS

SECTION 1: SCHEDULE

The Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee shall hold eight regular meetings per year, which shall include meetings in the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, and September. ~~The Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee shall hold quarterly meetings (dates to be determined).~~ The meetings shall begin at 7:00 p.m. and end at 9:00 p.m., unless extended by the Advisory Committee. Should a regular meeting day be a legal holiday, the scheduled meeting shall be canceled, unless a majority of the Advisory Committee votes to select another day.

A special meeting may be called by the Chair of the Advisory Committee, the Director of Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services, the City Council or Mayor or by the written request of any five (5) Advisory Committee members, providing a 10 day public notice period.

SECTION 2: ORDER OF BUSINESS

The order of business for each meeting of the Advisory Committee shall be as follows:

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
5. REPORTS

   (a) Director's Report
   (b) Quarterly Report from Staff

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
7. NEW BUSINESS
8. PUBLIC COMMENT
9. ADJOURNMENT

ARTICLE V - RULES OF MEETINGS

SECTION 1: ABSENCES

Unexcused absence from more than three (3) consecutive meetings shall be cause for removal. Members shall communicate with the Chair of the Advisory Committee or the Vice Chair prior to the meeting with requests for excused absences. Emergency requests may be considered. The Chair of the Advisory Committee may approve the excused absence.

SECTION 2: QUORUM

The presence of five (5) members constitutes a quorum, and is required for the Advisory Committee to take any action other than to adjourn.

The Alternate Member may be considered one of the five (5) members constituting a quorum and may vote on any action item when one or more members of the Advisory Committee are absent.

SECTION 3: RULES OF PROCEDURE

The current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall provide the basis for meeting structure and official decisions shall be made by motion and vote of the Advisory Committee.

SECTION 4: VOTING

In instances where a vote is necessary, the present majority is sufficient to act (providing a quorum is present). Each member shall have one vote and no proxies shall be allowed. The Chair may vote on any issue, and shall vote in the event of a tie. No action is taken if the Chair votes and the tie continues. A majority vote shall carry, and minority opinions shall be formally registered in the summary minutes and reported to the City Council.

SECTION 5: CONTINUATIONS

Continuations of meetings shall be to a definite time and place, by majority vote of present members.

ARTICLE VI - COMMITTEES

The Advisory Committee Chair may appoint standing and ad hoc committees. Standing committees shall serve at the pleasure of the Advisory Committee and special committees shall also serve for such purposes and terms as the Advisory Committee approves. Committees shall establish their own meeting schedule and the deliberations thereof shall take the form of written reports, submitted to the entire Advisory Committee.

ARTICLE VII - AMENDMENTS

These By-laws are to be approved by the City Council. They may be amended or repealed and new By-laws may be adopted at any regular meeting or special meeting by a majority vote of the membership. A copy of the proposed By-laws, or amendments thereto, shall be furnished to each member at least three (3) days prior to the date of the meeting. All amendments to the by-laws shall be submitted to the Mayor and City Council for their information.

SIGNED BY:

_____	_____
Advisory Committee Chair	Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
_____	_____
Date	Date

Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Agenda Item: 8(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Motion To Accept The Lowest Responsive Construction Bid for the Shoreline Swimming Pool Improvement Project
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
PRESENTED BY:	William L. Conner, Public Works Director WLC

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to obtain your Council's approval of a low responsive construction bid for the Shoreline Swimming Pool Improvement project. This project is included in the City's 2001- 2006 Capital Improvement Program.

The scope of work for this project includes the following:

Base Bid:

- Expanding the women's dressing room, and lobby
- Adding work and storage space
- Adding a family changing room
- Adding a restroom in the Natatorium
- Extending the life of the HVAC, electrical, plumbing, boiler and pool filtering system
- Improving and replacing deteriorated fixtures
- Upgrading the interior finishes

Alternate Bid:

- Add an upper level meeting/classroom

The project was advertised on January 2, 8 and 10. On January 23, 2001, the City Clerk's Office received and opened the following bids that included the base bid and the upper level meeting/classroom:

Bidder Name	Bid Amount
1. Pennon Construction	$959,387
2. Cree Construction	$974,000
3. CDK Construction Services	$990,800
4. R. Miller Construction Company Inc.	$1,016,000
5. Triple D Construction Inc.	$1,039,309

6.	Briere & Associates, Inc.	$1,042,000
7.	Artus Construction Company	$1,305,000

In addition to the base bid, the plans and specifications also included alternate bids for the following:

- Replacement of the roof at the Shoreline Pool

  During the design process, staff completed an analysis to determine the condition of the existing roof. Based on the analysis, there are 7-8 years (at a minimum) remaining until the roof should be replaced. Staff recommends we replace the roof at a later date and use the savings for other CIP projects at this time.

- Addition of an Upper Level Meeting/Class Room

  Pool staff has very limited space for general meetings, first aid/life guard training classes and other staff gatherings. The upper level room will allow for these gatherings. Staff recommends adding the upper level meeting/classroom alternate bid to this project.

The engineer's estimate for the project including the base bid and the upper level meeting/classroom is $1,150,000. The 2001 Capital Improvement Program provides funding totaling $1,319,500 for design, construction and construction administration. Staff has reviewed the low bidder's bid amount and qualifications, and recommends that Pennon Construction be awarded the contract. Staff anticipates construction will begin early March and be completed by late summer 2001. The contractor has 110 working days to complete the project. Staff will closely monitor the contractor to minimize inconvenience to the public.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council accept the low bid and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract including the alternate bid to include the upper level meeting/classroom with Pennon Construction, in the amount of $959,387, and to execute change orders up to 15% of the original contract amount.

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney _____

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The contract documents include the improvements identified in the Swimming Pool Master Plan adopted by your Council on October 18, 1999. Due to uncertainty of the bidding climate, staff identified two features of the Master Plan that are desirable but not critical to the function of the pool. These feature include 1) replacement of the roof and, 2) the construction of the second story meeting/classroom for staff training and other classes. These two features were advertised as alternates to the base bid. Since the bids came in at an amount allowing the additional work, staff recommends building the upper level meeting/classroom.

The alternate bids include the following:

- Replace the roof

  Analysis of the roof during the design process for this project determined that there are 7-8 years (at a minimum) remaining until the roof should be replaced. Staff recommends we replace the roof at a later date and use the savings for other CIP projects at this time.

- Upper Level Meeting/Classroom

  Pool staff has very limited space for meetings, first aid/life guard training and other staff gatherings. The upper level room will allow for these gatherings.

The upper level meeting/classroom will be 340 square feet and be located behind the existing bleachers. To construct the room, the open area above the lobby currently occupied by Mort the DragonFly (A paper mache Dragon Fly) will be enclosed.

The new meeting/classroom will include:

- Storage room for water safety class materials
- Floor space for training and meeting
- Space for a TV/VCR for training videos
- A new wash sink

If the upper room isn't constructed, the following will continue to occur:

- Staff will continue to train in the laundry/maintenance room of the pool facility
- Water safety classes will continue to be limited to 10 students due to the size of the laundry/maintenance room
- Staff meetings will continue to be held at pool side, the bleachers or in the public lobby

SUMMARY

The following provides a breakdown of the seven submitted bids by base bid, replacing the roof and adding the upper level meeting/classroom:

Summary of Bid Results

Contractor	Cree Const.	Pennon Const.	CDK Const.	Triple D Const.	Artus Const.	Briere & Associates	R Miller Const.
Base Bid	927,000	934,153	974,300	999,166	1,240,000	1,017,000	988,000
Replacing Roof	72,300	53,970	67,000	62,151	147,000	88,900	90,000
Second Story Class-room	47,000	25,234	16,500	40,143	65,000	25,000	28,000

Summary of Low Bidders with Alternate Bid Items

Options	Contractor	Low Bid
A) Base Bid	Cree Construction	$927,000
B) Base Bid + Replacing Roof	Pennon Construction	$988,123
C) *Base Bid + Upper Level Classroom	Pennon Construction	$959,387
D)Base Bid + Replacing Roof + Upper Level Classroom	Pennon Construction	$1,013,357

* Denotes staff's recommendation for this project.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council accept the low bid and authorize the Interim City Manager to execute a contract including the alternate bid to include the upper level meeting/classroom with Pennon Construction, in the amount of $959,387, and to execute change orders up to 15% of the original contract amount.

Council Meeting Date: February 12, 2001 **Action Item: 9(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Update Regarding Options for Celebrate Shoreline in 2001 and 2002
DEPARTMENT:	Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services K. P.
PRESENTED BY:	Wendy Barry, Director

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek consensus from your Council on the venues for the 2001 and 2002 Celebrate Shoreline events. Since 1996, the City has celebrated its incorporation anniversary with a parade and other community events. In 1997 and 1998, Celebrate Shoreline included an antique car show, a twilight parade on Aurora Avenue, and a street dance at the Chuck Olson Chevrolet dealership.

In February 1999, your Council reviewed options for Celebrate Shoreline and a potential Fourth of July event. At that time, your Council's consensus was to focus on the Celebrate Shoreline community event, continue the parade on Aurora Avenue, and not pursue a Fourth of July event.

In 2000, the North City Business Association and the North City Neighborhood Association expressed interest in hosting Celebrate Shoreline and moving the parade to North City. At that time, there was potential for Aurora Avenue to be under construction in 2001. Your Council's consensus was to continue the parade on Aurora Avenue until such time as Aurora Avenue was closed for construction in 2001. In 2000, the parade was staged on Aurora Avenue and the festival followed at Shorewood High School with a children's play area, main stage, and food and community booths.

However, partially due to ongoing design issues being discussed with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Aurora Avenue is not expected to be under construction in 2001. Construction documents are not scheduled to be ready for another year. The North City road improvements will be under design in 2001 and construction is projected for late 2002.

The Chamber of Commerce is celebrating its 25th Anniversary this year. The Chamber has expressed interest in collaborating with the City on the Celebrate Shoreline event. They are interested in organizing a food fair in conjunction with Celebrate Shoreline as a self-supporting event. In order to achieve that goal, they would begin the food fair at noon. If the event were held at Hamlin Park, the Chamber would look to the City to provide appropriate utilities and support facilities for food vendors similar to what is available at the Shorewood High School site. City staff has made preliminary contact with the Chamber to begin joint planning for this year's event.

In January, your Council expressed interest in reviewing the Celebrate Shoreline North City venue option for 2001 in an effort to recognize and support the North City economic development efforts. As a result, staff explored three options:

1. Move the Celebrate Shoreline event to the North City Business District and Hamlin Park and collaborate with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce 25th Anniversary Food Fair. (Parade 11:00 a.m. followed by Chamber Food Fair and City festival at Hamlin Park noon – 7 p.m.)

Staff researched this option and has found that the most likely locations to stage the parade in North City are not available for 2001. Eleven o'clock parade starts are preferred at these sites to reduce conflicts with other regularly scheduled functions. Use of Hamlin Park for the festival site would require added costs for expanded entertainment and activities, and for bringing in canopies, water and utility hook ups for food vendors. Hamlin Park is a beautiful park with a broad assortment of facilities. A disadvantage is that it is not feasible to disperse the parade into Hamlin Park. Possible 15th Avenue dispersal site options include the Northwest Church of Christ, Fircrest School and Ridgecrest School. Parade participants would need to park a minimum of two blocks away from the event site. Construction of North City is not scheduled until late 2002. If your Council wishes, we can begin planning now for an event in North City in 2002.

2. Continue the Celebrate Shoreline event with parade on Aurora and festival at Shorewood High School: (Parade 5:00 p.m. followed by City festival)

The 2001 budget is approved and provides an event of similar size and scope to the 2000 Celebrate Shoreline event. The public is familiar with this venue. Site amenities such as parking, utility hook ups, parade staging and dispersal areas and community booth areas work well. The 5:00 p.m. parade provides the least interruption of businesses in the parade corridor. A disadvantage is the three-hour length of the festival hinders recruitment of food vendors.

3. Continue event with parade on Aurora and festival at Shorewood High School and collaborate with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce Food Fair. (Chamber Food Fair noon – 8:30 p.m., Parade 5:00 p.m. followed by City festival activities)

The addition of the collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce organizing a food fair to begin earlier in the day at the festival site has the potential to enhance the event by attracting more food vendors. A disadvantage is that the City has not budgeted for entertainment and attractions for the extended event, nor has the Chamber. The Chamber has indicated its intent to operate the food fair as a self-supporting event. Vendors providing inflatable toys for the children's area are able to start earlier in the day without extra cost to the City.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff seeks no formal action at this time. Staff is seeking consensus of your Council to continue the Celebrate Shoreline event in the Aurora venue in 2001 in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce; and, your Council consensus for staff to begin planning Celebrate Shoreline 2002 in the North City venue.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

In January, your Council expressed interest in reviewing Celebrate Shoreline North City venue option for 2001 in an effort to recognize and support the North City economic development efforts.

Staff has explored three Celebrate Shoreline options:

1. Move the Celebrate Shoreline event to the North City Business District and Hamlin Park and collaborate with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce 25th Anniversary Food Fair. (Parade 11:00 a.m. followed by Chamber Food Fair and City festival at Hamlin Park noon – 7 p.m.)

2. Continue Celebrate Shoreline event with parade on Aurora and festival at Shorewood High School: (Parade 5:00 p.m. followed by City festival)

3. Continue event with parade on Aurora and festival at Shorewood High School and collaborate with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce Food Fair. (Chamber Food Fair noon – 8:30 p.m., Parade 5:00 p.m. followed by City festival activities)

Each option is outlined below with a discussion of advantages and disadvantages.

OPTIONS:

1. Move Celebrate Shoreline event to North City Business District and Hamlin Park and collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce Food Fair.

Advantages:

a. Parade Route: The parade route would travel through the North City Business District. The parade would begin at St. Mark's Catholic Church at NE 180th Street and 15th Avenue NE and end at the Northwest Church of Christ at NE 158th Street and 15th Avenue NE. City staff has made preliminary contact with St. Mark's Catholic Church regarding availability of the parking lot for the parade staging area. It is not available due to a wedding that is scheduled in 2001. St. Mark's pastor is very supportive of the event. The church staff will be scheduling August 2002 events at the church in the next month or so. There are no alternative staging areas in the North City area that are large enough to accommodate an event of this size.

b. Festival Location: The festival portion of the event would take place at Hamlin Park at NE 160th Street and 15th Avenue NE. This would give the City greater control over the scope of the event and vendors.

c. Partnerships: We anticipate there would be support and participation by the North City Business Association and the North City Neighborhood Association. The Chamber's interest in highlighting their 25th Anniversary has provided them with incentive to participate in Celebrate Shoreline. At this time, we do not know if the Chamber will be interested in participating in this event on a continuing basis.

d. The Celebrate Shoreline event could be timed to celebrate and highlight the 2002 improvements that are projected to commence late in 2002.

Disadvantages:

a. Parade Staging area is not available in 2001.

b. The parade and festival location: Once site and program logistics are worked out, staff will need to increase marketing and public information efforts to minimize confusion for the public and participants.

c. Parade route approval and assistance: To secure assistance from Seafair Marshals, the City will need to secure Seafair Marshals' approval of the parade route. We believe the route we have identified would be approved.

d. Site amenities: Shelter for food and community booths, water and electricity hook ups for food vendors, and parking would need to be provided. This will add expense to the event.

e. It is not feasible to disperse the parade into Hamlin Park. Parade participants would need to park a minimum of two blocks away from the event site.

2. Continue the parade on Aurora and the festival at Shorewood High School in 2001

Advantages:

a. Location: The public and participants from previous years are familiar with this venue.

b. Parade Route: The parade route is approved by Seafair Marshals and there is a large parade staging area at the park and ride. The parade can disperse at the festival site. The 5:00 p.m. parade time allows traffic access during peak business hours.

c. Site Amenities: There is ample parking for the parade and festival. There is a covered area for community booths for protection against inclement weather. The school site provides a large hard surface area for food vendors with access to electricity, as well as, Health Department required facilities, i.e., three-compartment sinks and hot water.

d. Partnerships: The School District partnership to provide the festival site has worked well.

Disadvantages:

a. Traffic control: The parade disrupts State Highway 99, which is the only alternative route for I-5 traffic. The parade does not feel as intimate as it would

on a smaller street, and independent promoters may establish separate events in the vicinity that have the potential to detract from the City of Shoreline event.

b. Event Duration: The three-hour length of the festival hinders recruitment of food vendors.

2. Continue the parade on Aurora and the festival at Shorewood High School in 2001 and collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce Food Fair.

Advantages:

a. The advantages identified in option #2 regarding location, parade route, site amenities, and partnerships apply to this option.

b. Event Duration: Chamber of Commerce has expressed interest in organizing a food fair in conjunction with this event. This would extend the length of the event and likely attract more food vendors. The Chamber may generate enough funds from the food vendors to make the Food Fair self-supporting. The children's inflatable toys vendor can set up earlier without additional costs to the City.

Disadvantages

a. The disadvantage identified in option #2 regarding traffic control applies.

b. Resources: The City budget for the event did not include additional entertainment for an expanded event, nor did the Chamber. The Chamber may not generate enough resources to provide other attractions to the event.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff seeks no formal action at this time. Staff is seeking consensus of your Council to continue the Celebrate Shoreline event in the Aurora venue in 2001 in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce, and your Council consensus for staff to begin planning Celebrate Shoreline 2002 in the North City venue.