January 25, 1999

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING

Monday, January 25, 1999
6:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Highlander Room

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

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Robert Deis, City Manager; Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager

The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m. All Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmembers Hansen and Lee, who arrived shortly thereafter.

Robert Deis, City Manager, noted that he and Mayor Jepsen met with the Shoreline School Board President Paul Grace and the Shoreline School District Superintendent Marlene Holayter.

Mayor Jepsen mentioned Mr. Deis's suggestion that City and district staff provide a joint staff report to Council and the Shoreline School Board during the joint meeting of the two bodies on February 8.

Councilmember Lee arrived at 6:15 p.m.

Councilmember Gustafson said the YMCA is looking for a site for a new facility in the north end. Councilmembers and Mr. Deis discussed potential sites. Councilmember Gustafson suggested that Ross Cutshaw, Economic Development Coordinator, work with the YMCA to identify potential sites.

Councilmember Lee questioned the necessity of providing tapes of Planning Commission meetings to Councilmembers for quasi-judicial items.

Councilmember Hansen arrived at 6:20 p.m.

Mr. Deis proposed that staff create a single set of resource materials that Councilmembers could check out when considering land-use issues and then return.

Mr. Deis discussed the Council of Neighborhoods subcommittee that is discussing the role of the Council of Neighborhoods in recommending policy to Council. He said Community and Government Relations Manager Joyce Nichols attended the organizational meeting of the subcommittee to explain opportunities to get involved in

land-use policy through the Citizens Planning Academy. He noted the Council of Neighborhoods request to hold quarterly potluck dinner meetings with Council, beginning as early as March.

Councilmember Gustafson advised that he will not be available to attend a potluck dinner meeting on March 3, the date of the Council of Neighborhoods meeting in March. Mr. Deis said staff will investigate other possible dates for a meeting of Council and the Council of Neighborhoods.

Mr. Deis asked whether Council wants staff to distribute an informational letter concerning City of Shoreline services to residents of Annexation Area A-2. Councilmembers agreed that it would be appropriate.

Councilmember Gustafson asked if it is appropriate for Councilmembers to attend the meeting in Annexation Area A-3 on Tuesday night. Councilmembers and Mr. Deis agreed it would be appropriate.

Councilmember Hansen said he has reviewed recent billing accounts for the City.

Councilmember King mentioned that several area cities are considering moratoriums for mini-casinos. Councilmember Ransom explained the problems of charitable gambling halls. Councilmembers discussed trends related to gambling casinos in Washington State. Mayor Jepsen suggested an agenda item at a future Council meeting concerning gambling in Shoreline. Mr. Deis confirmed that staff will bring forward an agenda item on this issue.

Councilmember Lee raised the issue of Councilmembers being unable to attend the daytime meetings scheduled by many of the agencies and jurisdictions with which the City does business. Mayor Jepsen agreed to address this issue at an upcoming meeting he will attend with other area councilmembers.

Councilmember Lee suggested that staff develop an electronic mail list to alert Councilmember of the need to contact elected officials of other cities about key issues.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

_____

Larry Bauman
Assistant City Manager

February 1, 1999

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP

Monday, February 1, 1999
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

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 Gustafson and Hansen, who arrived shortly thereafter.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Robert Deis, City Manager, distributed copies of the City's first quarterly newsletter. Councilmember King recommended that the newsletter contain information on the next quarter's agenda items.

Noting that the City uses many volunteers and received almost 9,000 hours of donated labor last year, Mr. Deis asked for Council input on the City's volunteer appreciation event, which will be a breakfast on April 23rd. He asked for Council input on the format of the breakfast and whether to include members of the Planning Commission, Library Board and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Gustafson arrived at 6:35 p.m.

Councilmember King did not favor splitting out groups of volunteers, arguing that this makes certain volunteers seem more important than others. She suggested that department heads and Councilmembers host the tables.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery felt the level of responsibility of the Planning Commission may call for special recognition of that group.

Councilmember Hansen arrived at 6:40 p.m.

Councilmember Ransom spoke strongly in support of volunteer recognition.

Mayor Jepsen pointed out that the Council gets together with the Council of Neighborhoods separately and perhaps it should get together separately with the Planning Commission. He supported the idea of having Councilmembers and department heads serve the breakfast.

Councilmember King agreed that Council should meet with the Planning Commission but she felt the Planning Commission should also be part of the larger event.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested that volunteers who contribute in special ways should be acknowledged at Council meetings throughout the year and urged the City to promote and seek out such groups.

Mr. Deis asked Tim Stewart, Director of the Department of Planning and Development Services, to report on two items recently or soon to be in the news. Mr. Stewart explained that on January 8, 1999 the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearing Board issued a lengthy and complicated decision regarding the Woodway Comprehensive Plan. It said that the plan does not comply with various sections of the Growth Management Act (GMA). The plan was remanded to Woodway with directions to comply with GMA no later than May 11th. Subsequently, Woodway has appealed this decision to Superior Court.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Stewart said the decision does not address how many housing units can be built on the property effected by the Comprehensive Plan change in question. He said that Shoreline will be watching this situation carefully, but Councilmember Gustafson suggested it might be beneficial to be more proactive. Mr. Stewart agreed there are a number of options available, which could be reviewed by Council before a policy decision is made on how to proceed.

Mayor Jepsen noted that Council has supported a moderate number of homes being built, rather than fighting the development. He said the Council can discuss the merits of joining the suit on either side, but he feared the outcome of litigation will be a much greater density than Shoreline had hoped to see. Councilmember Hansen added that the acreage in question has a potential of 360 housing units, so he concurred with Mayor Jepsen that the goal should be cooperation toward a moderate proposal from the developer.

Mayor Jepsen recommended continuing to push for eastern ingress and egress.

Mr. Deis expressed the view that the best strategy is to work with the developer. He felt GMA will prevail and the goal should be something less dense than GMA allows. This will require cooperation between the parties.

Mayor Jepsen concluded that Council can review the information presented at the hearings on this matter held last year to see whether any concerns should be eliminated or added. Councilmember Hansen noted that one change in circumstance is the street vacation by the City of Edmonds.

Turning to a second item, Mr. Stewart briefly noted that the North City Business Association and staff have been working on economic development in the area. He said this presents a good opportunity for the group to show leadership in planning development. A full report on this item will come forward at the next workshop.

Mr. Deis reviewed future agenda items, including "Celebrate Shoreline," a 4th of July event, and the 2000 Census. Councilmember Ransom suggested that Shoreline should be its own statistical metropolitan area.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Hansen noted that at the National League of Cities Conference he observed the operations of Kansas City's Ethnic Commission. He thought it would be a good idea for Shoreline to have something similar.

Councilmember King noted the Council's receipt of her testimony before the King County Council Committee-of-the-Whole regarding wastewater treatment.

Mayor Jepsen reported on a meeting with King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia; a meeting with Mr. Deis and the President of the Shoreline School Board and the Superintendent of the Shoreline School District to prepare for next Monday night's dinner meeting, the main subject of which will be the skate park and Paramount Park; and a meeting of mayors and city managers who discussed how to work together to represent each other's regional issues. He said this group committed to meet at least once each month. Next month's discussion will focus on legislative agendas and identification of the highest legislative priorities to determine where cooperation may be possible.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery reported on a meeting of the Seashore Forum, where she heard a report on the recommendations of the King County Chambers of Commerce on allocation of Referendum 49 (R49) funding for transportation projects. $10 million is recommended for funding Shoreline's portion of the Aurora Corridor.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen's question about whether the decision has been made to allocate R49 funding through the counties, Joyce Nichols, Community and Government Relations Manager, explained that the goal of the group that made the list referred to by Deputy Mayor Montgomery was to try to get the King County legislative delegation to agree on projects to be funded in King County with R49 dollars. The next step is to gather written support for the list in King County and then to go down to the legislative delegation to try to get them to bring some of the funding back to King County. This is where congestion relief is needed and where much of the money comes from in the first place.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS: none

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Pavement Maintenance and Rehabilitation Plan for Shoreline's Road System

Doug Mattoon, Public Works Director, reviewed the staff report, which provided the basis for this policy discussion of how to bring road conditions to an appropriately maintained service level. He explained the "Pavement Life Cycle" found on page 5 of the Council packet, noting that roadway systems usually have pavement in all five categories from "Excellent" to "Failed." Noting Shoreline's roads currently score an average of 64, Mr. Mattoon used overheads to demonstrate the roadways in various categories. He emphasized that the question for Council is whether to maintain the roadways at this level, to improve them or to let them worsen. He also noted that as the pavement life and condition drop to "Poor" and below, the only maintenance options are extremely expensive, and the condition of the roadway deteriorates very rapidly.

Referring to Table 4 on page 8, Mr. Mattoon said that staff ran nine models of differing expenditures on an annual basis with different types of treatments. He said that continuing the status quo of spending $400,000/year over the next ten years will mean that the average condition of the system will continue to decline. Going to all overlays at a cost of $590,000/year will result in a system that declines very slightly. The "mix method" approach at the same $590,000/year will result in a slight improvement of the system.

Explaining the mix method, Mr. Mattoon said $400,000 would continue to be spent in overlays on arterial streets. For the local access residential streets, an alternative treatment, such as seal coat, would be used. This mix method process will maximize the dollars and keep deferred maintenance costs steady from year to year.

Responding to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Mattoon said the staff recommendation was based on selecting the most significant increase in service level for the least amount of money and a point where the deferred rehabilitation costs almost level out. Mayor Jepsen said it does not make sense to ignore the streets and then have to rebuild them, which is an extremely expensive process.

Responding to Councilmember Lee's question about sources of funding, Mr. Deis reminded Council that the Seattle City Light franchise will generate about $500,000 in new revenue.

Commenting on the cost to repair potholes, Councilmember Ransom wished to be sure that this type of maintenance is included. Mr. Mattoon said pothole repair is covered under routine maintenance, and the goal of this program is to reduce this cost.

Councilmember Lee asked how much control the City has in terms of overlays on state highways. Mr. Mattoon responded that the City has limited control over what the State does but that the State has continued responsibility for major maintenance. He reviewed work done in the past year.

Responding to Councilmember King, Mr. Mattoon said road edges are one of the things that will be addressed. He said the report did not study liabilities, but there will be a decrease in operating costs to motorists if rough roads are repaired.

Responding again to Councilmember King, Mr. Mattoon said that the upkeep of private roads is a real issue. There are old private roads in the City that were not built to the same standards as public roads, although now this has changed and the City is getting away from allowing private roads at all. It would be a major liability for the City to take over the old private roads unless they were brought up to current standards. He noted that this situation is not unique to Shoreline.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom's question about what would be needed to appreciably increase the standards, Mr. Mattoon recommended waiting until the City has its own pavement management system and can do a more detailed analysis. At that time, when more data is available, the levels of service can be revisited.

There was Council consensus to move forward with the mix method pavement management program and to direct staff to return to Council with necessary budget amendments.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 7:56 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that the Council would recess into Executive Session for two hours to discuss one item of personnel. At 10:00 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that the meeting and the Executive Session would be extended for one hour. At 10:44 p.m., the Executive Session concluded and the workshop reconvened.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

February 8, 1999

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Monday, February 8, 1999
7:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

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

ABSENT: None

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

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Robert Deis, City Manager, reminded Council that the Aurora Pre-Design Open House will take place at Bethel Lutheran Church on Tuesday evening. He also noted that Council could add Ordinance No. 190 to tonight's agenda.

Mike Gillespie, City Engineer, updated the Council on the four projects associated with 175th Avenue between Meridian Avenue and I-5, one being done by METRO, one by the Washington State Department of Transportation and two by the City. He answered Council questions about these and other possible projects.

Mayor Jepsen made three announcements: 1) the King County Housing Authority has re-opened its Section 8 program; 2) Councilmember Ransom was appointed by the Board of Directors of the Suburban Cities Association to serve as an alternate on the King County Jail Advisory Committee; and 3) Council received a letter from King County Councilmember Fimia, saying that "based on the information I have received, I can support the City's park improvements as shown in the draft plan . . . [for the] Saltwater Park bluff trail."

4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: None

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(a) Nancy Marx, 505 N 200th Street, asked Council to reconsider placement of the ball field at Shoreview Park and the recommendation of the experts, who said that the lower site (the Council's preferred site) will be difficult and costly to mitigate.

Mr. Deis said the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on Shoreview Park will be published this week, and the Richmond Beach Library FEIS will be published the first week in March.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Hansen moved approval of the amended agenda, adding Ordinance No. 190 as Item 8 (c). Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the agenda was approved as amended.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Councilmember Ransom moved approval of the consent calendar. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion, which carried 7-0, and the following items were approved:

Workshop minutes of January 19, 1999
Regular Meeting minutes of January 25, 1999

Approval of payroll and expenses as of January 29, 1999 in the amount of $1,215,978.29

8. OTHER ACTION ITEMS: ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND MOTIONS

(a) Motion to adopt the Citizen Advisory Committee's Recommendation for allocating $50,000 in 1999 General Funds and authorizing the City Manager to enter into agreements for implementing these projects

Rachael Markle, Grants Coordinator, reviewed the staff report and the recommendation of the Citizen Advisory Committee. She noted that the applications were reviewed in the context of the "desired outcomes" of the 1998 Health and Human Service Strategies and that there was a need to expedite the process in order to use the funds in 1999. She said only a select group of providers were invited to apply: 1) those agencies that approached Council for funding from the 1999 General Fund; 2) non-funded applicants for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds; 3) CDBG applicants who did not receive 100 percent funding in 1998; and 4) the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department.

Councilmember Hansen moved to adopt the recommendation of the Citizen Advisory Committee as outlined on page 19 of the Council packet. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Lee felt the recommendation does not address some of the other services the City should be providing because the allocations go to the same type of organizations supported in the past. She also asked about funding from King County Councilmember Fimia for Club Kellogg.

Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager, confirmed the $10,000 King County grant provided to Club Kellogg.

Deputy Mayor Montgomery shared Councilmember Lee's concerns and suggested that the process be redone.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson's question about whether Club Kellogg needs the City's $10,000, given receipt of the King County grant, Mr. Bauman said he has not seen the request, but he believed it was to augment Club Kellogg's program.

Councilmember Gustafson said the 30-35 students originally to be served has been increased to over 80 students. He applauded this and supported funding if there is a need.

Mr. Deis suggested awarding the remaining $40,000 and determining whether the King County grant is for an expanded program. He explained that the City contacted the same group of applicants because this is an interim phase. An expanded process this year would have impacted the timeline for distribution of the funds.

Mayor Jepsen viewed this process as supplemental to the highly competitive process that occurred last year. He supported the Committee's recommendation because it was too late to open the competition this year. He suggested that going to a biennial allocation would provide more stability. He concluded that each funded agency will have a contract with a scope of work and if Councilmember Fimia has provided $10,000 in additional funding, Shoreline will still expect Club Kellogg to perform the items it asked the City to fund.

Mr. Deis supported the consideration of a biennial process.

Councilmember Gustafson moved to withhold the $10,000 funding for Club Kellogg pending a review of need, given the additional funding provided by Councilmember Fimia's Office. Councilmember King seconded the motion.

Councilmember Lee commented that Lutheran Social Services serves a growing group of Shoreline residents and did not receive funding. She further noted that half of the $50,000 will be going to teen programs. She suggested there should be a balance with the emerging needs in the community. She advocated reallocation of the funds and questioned whether the small amounts in some cases will make a difference.

Councilmember Hansen also asked about the small amounts involved in some of the recommendations. Ms. Markle said all applicants who were not funded at 100 percent were given the opportunity to reapply. She said the Committee did not fund any requests under $500.

A vote was taken on the amendment, which carried 6 - 1, with Mayor Jepsen dissenting, and Club Kellogg was deleted from the list of grant recipients.

Responding to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Deis said in the event that staff determines that Club Kellogg does not want or need the additional funding, it will return with an alternative recommendation, which will probably be the next agency on the Committee's list.

A vote was taken on the main motion as amended, which carried 5 - 2, with Deputy Mayor Montgomery and Councilmember Lee dissenting, and the following funding allocations were approved:

Center for Human Services	**$16,000 Substance Abuse**
	$10,000 Family Counseling
City of Shoreline Earthworks	**$10,000**
Emergency Feeding Program	**$ 877**
Multi-Service Center of N/E King Cty.	**$ 1,038**
Shoreline Healthy Start	**$ 2,085**

(b) Motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a consultant agreement with KPFF Consulting Engineers, including future amendments, for design and construction administration services of street improvements on 15th Avenue NE between 146th Street and NE 165th Street

Mr. Gillespie reviewed the 15th Avenue NE project, a $1.6 million project approved in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). He noted that King County has done most of the design work and transferred partial funding for the project. He emphasized the number of accidents, including a fatality, on this strip of roadway. He described the planned improvements, and he explained that although the design was completed by King County, staff has identified several revisions, including a four-foot-wide landscape planter strip, wider sidewalks on the east side, modifying the curb ramp details to meet updated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, and looking at the undergrounding of utilities through the corridor.

Concluding, Mr. Gillespie described the project schedule, which includes community involvement and environmental review. After the design phase, the right-of-way phase will start in June and continue through April, 2000. The City (Hamlin Park) and Fircrest are the primary owners of right-of-way, and Fircrest seems receptive to working with the City. The construction phase should be completed by the end of 2000. Several grants

have been applied for and may help to offset the costs. Furthermore, a company has approached the City to construct underground conduits for various utility services, including telecommunications. As part of this process, the company may be asked to pay for or construct some of these improvements as mitigation.

Councilmember Hansen moved to authorize the City Manager to execute a consultant agreement with KPFF Consulting Engineers. Councilmember Lee seconded the motion.

Responding to Councilmember Hansen, Mr.Gillespie said the design work will cost approximately $50,000. Mr. Deis noted that this amount is very low because much of the design work has already been done. He added that he will not have authority to exceed the budget for any of these contracts. If it appears that the figure will exceed the specific budget category for design, he will return to Council.

A vote was taken on the motion to authorize the City Manager to execute a consultant agreement with KPFF Consulting Engineers, including future amendments, for design and construction administration services of street improvements on 15th Avenue NE between NE 146th Street and NE 165th Street, which carried unanimously.

(c) Ordinance No. 190 establishing a moratorium on the filing of applications for business licenses and building permits for the expansion of existing or the addition of new food or drink establishments conducting social card games, punch boards, or pull tabs, and declaring an emergency

Mr. Deis explained that the gambling industry is changing very rapidly and many cities are talking about or adopting moratoriums. This means the area where mini-casinos can locate is shrinking, and Shoreline could become a focus of this activity. Since the Comprehensive Plan does not specifically speak to gambling, there are no policies in place about how to handle gambling. The moratorium is not designed to make a moral statement about gambling. Instead, the staff would like to give Council time to have a policy discussion about the gambling industry and then make a decision on what to do about these businesses. Mr. Deis added that the City is in the process of doing an economic development plan, and no decisions have been made about where gambling fits into that. He concluded that there are many options. The moratorium is for six months, but it can be rescinded if Council chooses. He concluded that Goldie's and the Hide-Away have mini-casino applications at the State, and the Drift-on-Inn has talked to staff about expanding its operations.

Councilmember Ransom clarified that the Drift-on-Inn has another application called "Hollywood Casino" which is on the application list before the Gambling Commission. The Hide-Away is number eight; and the others are 18 and 19 out of 83 on the list.

Mr. Deis said these businesses will be informed that the moratorium does not represent a final "no" to their plans but a time-out to develop policy.

Bruce Disend, City Attorney, reviewed the provisions of the moratorium, noting the Council is required to conduct a public hearing within 60 days.

Mr. Deis added that the Hollywood Casino application just came in and that staff has determined its completeness. He said staff called the State Gambling Commission this morning, and there was no record of the Hollywood Casino application. Councilmember Ransom responded that Hollywood Casino must have applied before September to be on the register because there are no additions after the closing date.

Councilmember Ransom moved to postpone the moratorium for one week. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom argued that the moratorium was not on the agenda and that Council only received the staff report tonight.

Councilmember Gustafson said he has heard more from his constituents on this topic than any other issue. He felt the Council should act tonight. Then the issue can be discussed and a public hearing scheduled.

Mayor Jepsen added that moratoriums are usually "walked on." They are used as a mechanism for Council to provide itself time to decide the best way to address an emerging issue. If a moratorium is publicized, there may be a flood of applications prior to its adoption.

Responding to Councilmember Ransom's comment that Council has not had enough time to digest the staff report before the vote, Councilmember Lee pointed out that this decision does not require information to be analyzed. Furthermore, it is not a final decision. Staff is simply being given the time to gather the data.

Mr. Deis committed to determining what business plans the effected parties may have made. He said staff will be sensitive to the impacts and will communicate these to the Council.

A vote was taken on the motion to postpone action for one week, which failed 1 - 6, with Councilmember Ransom affirming.

Councilmember King moved to approve Ordinance No. 190 establishing a moratorium on the filing of applications for business licenses and building permits for the expansion of existing or the addition of new food or drink establishments conducting social card games, punch boards, or pull tabs, and declaring an emergency. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilmember Ransom said the Gambling Commission was established by State law as the sole regulator of gambling. He pointed out that Ordinance No. 190 mentions business licenses, which the City does not require. This leaves only zoning (land use activity) and building permits as areas to be regulated. Mr. Disend agreed and said that the ordinance does not attempt to regulate gambling per se, which is the responsibility of the State Gambling Commission. However, matters of land use and the building codes are certainly the purview of the City, and the City is entitled by its police powers to enact a moratorium.

Continuing, Councilmember Ransom said the Hide-Away is an existing Class E card room. It wishes to be a Class F, or enhanced house-banked card room, commonly called a mini-casino. This involves an internal upgrade of an existing classification as a card room. He wondered how the City could apply its zoning regulations to an existing establishment. He also questioned how the City could say that a business cannot change what it is doing if it is already a gaming establishment and wants to change its gaming operation in compliance with the State Gambling Commission's rules and regulations.

Mr. Disend said the moratorium provides that if the facility must be expanded, the City will not grant a permit during the period of the moratorium. He said there is no case law on this set of facts. If the City's action is contested, staff will return to the City Council to discuss the potential litigation in executive session.

Councilmember Ransom referred to grandfathering provisions, noting the three establishments he named have filed applications with the Gambling Commission according to established procedure. Mr. Disend responded by emphasizing the difference between the State granting a license to conduct a certain business and the City's ability to regulate how the business operates in terms of the land use activities within the City of Shoreline.

Councilmember Ransom said Goldie's was granted an E-5 gaming operation as of the first of February. It is now a card room, but the application for a mini-casino is not yet approved because not all of the necessary changes to the physical plant have been completed. However, Goldie's has worked with the permit department and has been moving forward with its plans. He asked whether Goldie's has any grandfathered rights, given the amount of money already spent complying with the existing rules.

Mr. Disend said in any moratorium there are individuals or organizations "caught in the middle." One of the factors Council must weigh in its decision is the impact on these organizations should the moratorium be enacted. He pointed out that although the moratorium is proposed for the maximum six-month period, there is no obligation to keep it in effect for that length of time. Staff will gather information as quickly as possible, and after the public hearing, the matter could possibly be resolved in a matter of weeks.

Mayor Jepsen said this moratorium recognizes recent events such as King County Executive Ron Sims' suggestion of a similar moratorium in unincorporated King County and the fact that many cities in South King County have raised their gambling taxes to the full amount. He pointed out that as others say "no" to gambling, Shoreline will become

increasingly more friendly to gambling institutions than surrounding cities. Staff needs time to research and provide Council with the data to have an informed discussion on this issue.

Councilmember Hansen reiterated that although the City has no right to regulate a gambling establishment, the State Gambling Commission has no right to say where gambling establishments can go.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt Ordinance No. 190, which passed 6 – 1, with Councilmember Ransom dissenting, and Ordinance No. 190 was passed establishing a moratorium on the filing of applications for business licenses and building permits for the expansion of existing or the addition of new food or drink establishments conducting social card games, punch boards, or pull tabs, and declaring an emergency.

Councilmember Ransom expressed the concern that this is the time that gambling establishments are picking their locations and making investments. Establishing a six-month moratorium sends a very negative signal to investors, who will go to more favorable sites, such as Everett. He feared this could result in a loss of revenue of as much as $4 million per year, funding that could be used for capital projects or a City Hall.

Noting that Councilmember Ransom raises good questions about impacts on revenues, Councilmember Hansen said the other side of the question is whether this is the kind of revenue Shoreline wants to raise. He asserted that Shoreline probably does not want to become too dependent on this revenue source.

Mr. Deis said staff will make clear to any interested parties that the moratorium is not a "no" to gambling but Council will be discussing various options during this period. He also said staff will inform Council immediately if it discovers investors turning away from Shoreline because of the moratorium. He added that the revenues generated by gambling have caused a great deal of interest in Olympia and that a bill has been introduced to restrict cities' ability to use these funds.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 9:00 p.m., Mayor Jepsen announced that the Council would recess into executive session for thirty minutes to discuss one item of potential litigation. At 9:30 p.m., Councilmember Hansen announced that the executive session would be extended for thirty minutes. At 9:52 p.m., the executive session concluded and the regular session reconvened.

DRAFT

11. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

_____

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Council Meeting Date: February 16, 1999 **Agenda Item: 7(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of February 10th, 1999
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 $770,989.32 specified in the following detail:

Payroll and benefits for January 10, 1999 through January 23, 1999 in the amount of $228,119.90 paid with ADP checks 2453-2496, vouchers 40001-40092, benefit checks 70196-70197, 70199-70205 and City of Shoreline checks 2867-2868 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on January 27, 1999:

Expenses in the amount of $40,309.09 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10111-10133 and

Expenses in the amount of $48,971.34 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10110, 10134-10149 and

Expenses in the amount of $20,061.75 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10152-10162 and

Expenses in the amount of $40,685.77 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10163-10171 and

Expenses in the amount of $3,712.18 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10172-10179 and

Expenses in the amount of $2,880.02 paid on Expense Register dated 1-27-99 with the following claims checks: 10180 and

the following claims examined by C. Robert Morseburg paid on February 10, 1999:

Expenses in the amount of $165,580.59 paid on Expense Register dated 2-3-99 with the following claims checks: 10181-10210 and

Expenses in the amount of $39,965.57 paid on Expense Register dated 2-3-99 with the following claims checks: 10211-10231 and

Expenses in the amount of $8,157.78 paid on Expense Register dated 1-29-99 with the following claims checks: 10232-10234 and

Expenses in the amount of $3,667.47 paid on Expense Register dated 2-1-99 with the following claims checks: 10235 and

Expenses in the amount of $32,159.57 paid on Expense Register dated 2-5-99 with the following claims checks: 10236-10266 and

Expenses in the amount of $7,172.66 paid on Expense Register dated 2-5-99 with the following claims checks: 10267-10284 and

Expenses in the amount of $565.00 paid on Expense Register dated 2-5-99 with the following claims checks: 10285-10294 and

Expenses in the amount of $48,248.41 paid on Expense Register dated 2-5-99 with the following claims checks: 10295-10311 and

Expenses in the amount of $5,558.59 paid on Expense Register dated 2-5-99 with the following claims checks: 10312-10313 and

Expenses in the amount of $775.25 paid on Expense Register dated 2-8-99 with the following claims checks: 10314-10364 and

Expenses in the amount of $50,009.60 paid on Expense Register dated 2-10-99 with the following claims checks: 10365-10380 and

Expenses in the amount of $24,388.78 paid on Expense Register dated 2-10-99 with the following claims checks: 10381-10385.

Approved By: City Manager _____ City Attorney ____

Council Meeting Date: February 22, 1999 **Agenda Item: 7(c)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	(Consent) Approving Amendments To City Manager Employment Contract
DEPARTMENTS:	City Council
PRESENTED BY:	Scott Jepsen, Mayor LB (for)

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

As your Council knows, we recently completed the second performance review of the City Manager. After completing the review, we discussed the City Manager's employment contract and possible changes in compensation and leave accruals. As a result of this discussion, I am proposing that we amend sections 4 and 8 in the City Manager's employment agreement. The specific language changes are attached for your review.

Section 4 is amended to show the new base salary ($100,545) which reflects an adjustment of 2.5 percent over his 1998 compensation. This new salary is effective January 1, 1999.

As you know, Section 4 was amended last year to provide for an incentive payment that is tied to past performance and can be used by the City Manager for personal/career development, additional retirement or for compensation. In consideration of his recent review, this figure will be $6,000 for the 1998 year.

Section 8 has been amended to provide for an increase in his vacation accrual rate from 15 days to 20 days per year.

With these changes, the City Manager's employment agreement will continue to maintain him close to the statistical median of the total compensation levels for his peers in the Puget Sound region.

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the proposed amendments to sections 4 and 8 of the City Manager's employment agreement.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

AMENDMENT TO CITY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

Section 4. Salary

Employer agrees to pay City Manager for his services rendered pursuant hereto as City Manager an annual base salary of ~~$98,093~~ $100,545, payable in installments at the same time as other employees of the City of Shoreline are paid. Adjustments to this amount shall be made at the discretion of the City Council as a result of the annual performance evaluation described in Section 13.

Section 8. Vacation and Sick Leave

A. Employee shall be credited vacation in an amount equal to 10 days accrual upon his date of employment. Such vacation accrual shall be immediately available for use at the discretion of Employee. In addition, Employee shall accrue vacation at a rate equal to ~~15~~ 20 days (~~1.25~~ 1.67 days per month) in each calendar year.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the City of Shoreline has caused this Amendment to the Agreement to be signed and executed in its behalf by its Mayor and duly attested by its City Clerk, and the City Manager has signed and executed this agreement, dated this _____ day of _____, 1999.

_____	_____
Scott Jepsen Mayor	Robert E. Deis City Manager
ATTEST:	**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**
_____	_____
Sharon Mattioli City Clerk	Bruce L. Disend City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: February 22, 1999 **Agenda Item: 8(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	**Budget Amendment (Ordinance No. 191) to Implement Year One of the Public Works Development Plan and Enhancement to the 1999 Street Overlay Program**
DEPARTMENT:	**Public Works**
PRESENTED BY:	**Douglas W. Mattoon, Director**

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

At the Council workshop on January 4, 1999, Public Works staff presented their proposal to satisfy Goal No. 8 on your 1998 workplan "Develop a Public Works Department and define its operation and structure." Their analysis included (1) street and surface water maintenance tasks currently provided by King County and associated costs to the City, (2) staffing needs to implement the recently adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP), (3) professional engineering staffing needs to support Planning and Development Services and other City functions, and (4) the multi-year implementation plan.

The report to Council on January 4 presented the three-year Public Works Department implementation plan. This plan will transition street and surface water maintenance services from King County to a mixed method of service delivery comprised of City staff, private vendors, other public agencies and King County. The plan outlines the maintenance tasks to be performed and their preferred provider, staff levels necessary to complete the plan, and equipment necessary to accomplish the tasks.

Based upon your Council's support of the initiatives outlined in this report, staff is returning to your Council at this time with a detailed 1999 budget adjustment in the amount of $502,778 to implement year one of the plan. This includes an additional $205,000 for 1999 street overlays as presented to your Council at the February 1, 1999, workshop meeting. This budget figure is $301,390 less than the initial cost estimates presented to your Council for Public Works Development and the 1999 overlay program. Staff's recommendation for construction of a Public Works maintenance yard at Hamlin Park has been changed to include only the development of cost estimates and investigation of alternative locations for a Public Works maintenance area. Staff will return to your Council at a later date with a recommendation for location and cost estimate for constructing a maintenance yard. This should be developed to coincide with the evaluation of City Hall alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council adopt Ordinance No. 191 in the amount of $502,778 to implement year one of the Public Works implementation plan.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Public Works/CIP Implementation - Year One (1999)
Based on the Public Works implementation plan presented to, and conceptually approved by, your Council on January 4, 1999, the City will perform the following during year one (1999):

Task Responsibilities: By the end of year one of plan implementation, Shoreline Public Works will contract with a provider other than King County for tree maintenance, roadside spraying, and vegetation control. The City of Shoreline will assume traffic sign maintenance responsibilities (sign washing, repair, and replacement) though we will continue to contract with King County to maintain the traffic sign inventory (tracking of sign type and location in a database) as we don't yet have these tracking and inventory capabilities.

Per our agreement with King County, staff will also notify King County of our predicted changes to their year 2000 workplan. In the year 2000, the City will perform hand ditching and we will develop and manage contracts with other providers to perform thermoplastics installation, painting, vactoring, and some road patching, brush and debris removal, and hazardous materials response.

Staff Resources: The Operations Division staff resources to be acquired in year one of the transition plan include: Street Supervisor (May), Contracts Analyst/Management Analyst (May), Administration Assistant II (May), Maintenance Worker I (October), and Maintenance Worker II (October). The month named in parenthesis denotes the target month for employee hire. See Attachment A for a visual chart of Public Works staff resource changes.

To implement the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), staff recommended hiring an additional position in March of 1999. This position will be designated a Capital Project Manager instead of a Project Engineer as recommended in January. Due to the regional economy and demand for qualified engineers, we have had difficulty in recruiting engineers at this lower salary level that meet our expectations for knowledge and experience. The pay range for the Capital Project Manager is $51,492 vs. $56,856 for a Project Engineer. Funding for the CIP Capital Project Manager is already in the adopted 1999 CIP for each project; we simply need to move funds between expenditure categories to support this additional FTE authority in order to fill this position.

Equipment: In year one of the implementation plan, Public Works will purchase three ¾-ton pickup trucks (one of these for engineering), 3 radios, computers and desks for office staff, and field equipment for maintenance staff and the Street Supervisor. See Attachment B for a visual chart of Public Works equipment resources to be acquired in 1999.

Maintenance Yard: As discussed in the implementation plan, Public Works will require additional vehicle and supply storage space. In the January 4, 1999, report to your Council, staff included estimated costs to develop Hamlin Park as a possible maintenance yard site. However, based on input from the City Manager's office, Public Works staff recommends that we develop cost estimates and investigate alternative

locations for a Public Works maintenance area during 1999. The cost of this study is estimated to be $15,000 and will be completed by fall 1999. As part of this study, we will investigate other options for a maintenance yard including the possibility of co-locations with other public agencies. This evaluation should obviously coincide with any plans for a future City Hall. Staff will return to your Council for site approval and budget authority to construct a maintenance yard at a later date.

As previously mentioned, the City is purchasing the three trucks in 1999. These vehicles will be stored at the City Hall annex until a maintenance yard is developed. However, based on the Public Works implementation plan, several larger pieces of equipment (backhoe, loader, utility trailer, etc.) will be purchased throughout 2000 that will require storage elsewhere. The space required for staff will not be affected by this delay of maintenance yard construction.

1999 Budget Amendment

The following table itemizes staff and equipment costs for year one of the Public Works implementation plan. To determine the percentage of the staff positions and equipment to charge to the Street and Surface Water funds, King County maintenance bills from November 1997 through November 1998 were analyzed to determine the proportion of street (77%) and surface water (23%) charges. The table below has the charges broken down by Fund. The total 1999 budget amendment to implement year one of the Public Works plan is $502,778.

Table 1: 1999 Public Works Budget Amendment Costs

Item	**Street**	**Surface Water**	**1999 Total Cost**
Staff	$103,918	$31,040	$134,958
Vehicles (includes operation costs)	$ 81,173	$24,247	$105,420
Office equipment	$ 28,028	$ 8,372	$ 36,400
Field equipment	$ 4,620	$ 1,380	$ 6,000
Maintenance yard consultant	$ 11,550	$ 3,450	$15,000
Overlay Program: 1999 increase	$205,000	0	$205,000
TOTAL	**$434,289**	**$ 68,489**	**$502,778**

In 1999, the City of Shoreline will receive $500,000 from Seattle City Light as a result of utility negotiations. These funds were not anticipated during the 1999 budget process, therefore, the attached budget ordinance (Attachment C: Ordinance No. 191) will authorize the City Manager to place these funds in the General Fund. Ordinance No. 191 also transfers $434,289 of the Seattle City Light payments to the Street Fund (resulting in a $65,711 increase in the General Fund Balance). The remaining Public Works expenditure of $68,489 will be direct expensed from the existing Surface Water Fund balance, which reflects Surface Water's share of the Public Works Plan activities.

The table below (Table 2) demonstrates the difference between the estimated costs for year one of the Public Works implementation plan presented to Council on January 5, 1999, compared with this actual budget amendment.

Table 2: Comparison of Costs between January 4 and February 1 Council Presentations and Actual Budget Amendment

	Cost Presented on January 4 and February 1, 1999	Actual Budget Amendment Cost
Staff Costs	$102,856	$134,958
Start-up Equipment Costs (vehicles, computers, etc)	$146,190	$147,820
Hamlin Park Shop Construction	$365,122	$15,000
Overlay	$190,000	$205,000
Total	**$804,168**	**$502,778**

Table 2 shows that the actual budget amendment for 1999 for year one of Public Works implementation is $301,390 lower than presented to your Council on January 4 and February 1, 1999. Staff costs are higher in the actual budget amendment which is partly due to moving the start date for several positions to May. We believe this earlier start date is critical to properly train and prepare staff for future transition of King County services. Also, we estimate that salaries for Street Supervisor and Maintenance Workers will be higher than our first estimate due to the knowledge and skills required for these positions and the ever-changing labor market. Start-up vehicle costs are very close to our original estimate. The cost difference between the January 4 estimate and the budget amendment is mostly due to the 1999 Hamlin Park Shop Construction being reduced to preliminary design and cost estimates ($15,000) rather than actual construction. Given that your Council is interested in studying a City Hall site and the fact that at least one special district is interested in joint siting possibilities, we felt that some alternatives to permanent construction be evaluated.

As mentioned, this 1999 budget amendment for $502,778 will implement year one of the Public Works implementation plan and increase funding for the 1999 overlay program. Funds to implement years two and three of the Public Works plan will be addressed during the annual budget process. It was estimated that one-time start-up costs will continue in 2000 for equipment and staff in the amount of approximately $286,027 which does not include funding for maintenance yard construction that may result from this year's investigation. As planned, there are no start-up costs identified for year three. As a result, the annual budget in year three and beyond should go down by roughly $286,027 unless the Council agrees to increase service levels.

King County Notification

Staff will notify King County by April 1, 1999, that the City of Shoreline intends to modify their street maintenance contract for the year 2000 by removing tree maintenance,

roadside spraying, vegetation control, and sign maintenance. Our Operations Manager will work closely with County staff to ensure a smooth transition of tasks from the County to other providers and City staff. As previously mentioned, staff will also work closely with King County to incorporate the increased funds into the Shoreline overlay program and discuss our plans for future years' implementation plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Council adopt Ordinance No. 191 in the amount of $502,778 to implement year one of the Public Works implementation plan.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A:	Implementation Plan Staff Resources
Attachment B:	Implementation Plan Equipment
Attachment C:	Ordinance No. 191

Attachment A: Public Works 3-Year Staffing Implementation Plan

Division	1998	1999	2000	2001
Facilities				
	Facilities Coord. Maint. Worker II	Facilities Coord. Maint. Worker II	Facilities Coord. Maint. Worker II	Facilities Coord. Maint. Worker II
Subtotal	*2*	*2*	*2*	*2*
Engineering				
	City Engineer *CIP Project Mgr.* (2) Project Engineer	City Engineer **(2) CIP Project Mgr.** (2) Project Engineer	City Engineer (2) CIP Project Mgr. (2) Project Engineer	City Engineer (2) CIP Project Mgr. (2) Project Engineer
Subtotal	*4*	*5*	*5*	*5*
Administration				
	Public Works Director Management Analyst Admin. Assistant II	Public Works Director Management Analyst Admin. Assistant III	Public Works Director Management Analyst Admin. Assistant III	Public Works Director Management Analyst Admin. Assistant III
Subtotal	*3*	*3*	*3*	*3*
Operations				
	Operations Manager	Operations Manager ***Admin. Assistant II*** ***Contracts/Management Analyst***	Operations Manager Admin. Assistant II Contract Analyst	Operations Manager Admin. Assistant II Contract Analyst
Emergency Operations Customer Response Team	Contract CRT Supervisor (3) CRT Rep. Admin. Assistant II	Contract CRT Supervisor (3) CRT Rep. Admin. Assistant II	***Admin. Assistant I*** to be determined CRT Supervisor (3) CRT Rep. Admin. Assistant II	Admin. Assistant I to be determined CRT Supervisor (3) CRT Rep. Admin. Assistant II
Surface Water Management Streets Operations	SW Coord.	SW Coord. ***Street Supervisor*** ***Maint. Worker II (signs)*** ***Maint.Worker I***	SW Coord. Street Supervisor Maint. Worker II (signs) ***(3) Maint.Worker I*** ***Maint. Worker III*** ***(2) Maint. Worker II***	SW Coord. Street Supervisor Maint. Worker II (signs) (3) Maint.Worker I Maint. Worker III (2) Maint. Worker II
Subtotal	*7*	*12*	*18*	*18*
Total	**16**	**22**	**28**	**28**

Attachment B: Public Works 3-Year Equipment Implementation Plan

Division	1998	1999	2000	2001
Facilities				
	3/4-ton Van	3/4-ton Van	3/4-ton Van	3/4-ton Van
Engineering				
		3/4-ton Pickup	3/4-ton Pickup	3/4-ton Pickup
Administration				
	Sedan	Sedan	Sedan	Sedan
Operations				
	(2) 1/2-ton Pickup 4x4 Utility 1.5-Ton FB Dump Snow Plow Sanding Box	(2) 1/2-ton Pickup 4x4 Utility 1.5-Ton FB Dump Snow Plow Sanding Box ***(2) 3/4-ton Pickup*** ***(3) 800 mHz radios***	(2) 1/2-ton Pickup 4x4 Utility 1.5-Ton FB Dump ***(3) Snow Plows*** ***(3) Sanding Boxes*** **(3) 3/4-ton Pickup** **Crew cab-Pickup** ***Backhoe w/loader*** ***Mower attachment*** **Utility Trailer** ***(2) 5-yd Dump***	(2) 1/2-ton Pickup 4x4 Utility 1.5-Ton FB Dump (3) Snow Plows (3) Sanding Boxes (3) 3/4-ton Pickup Crew cab-Pickup Backhoe w/loader Mower attachment Utility Trailer (2) 5-yd Dump

Attachment C: Ordinance 191

ORDINANCE 191

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 184, AS AMENDED, BY INCREASING THE REVENUE TO THE GENERAL FUND AND APPROPRIATION FROM THE STREET FUND, AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS PROGRAMS, AND THE HIRING OF ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, the 1999 Budget was adopted in Ordinance No. 184; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has included the development of the Public Works Department as an annual Council Goal; and

WHEREAS, the City has developed and presented to the City Council a three-year implementation plan for development of the Public Works Department by transitioning to a public works delivery system that includes hiring City staff, contracting with public agencies or private contractors, and remaining with King County where it is to the City's advantage to do so; and

WHEREAS, the City has established road overlays as a critical need for preservation of the City's transportation infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, the City is now prepared to begin the implementation of the three-year implementation plan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shoreline is required by RCW 35A.33.075 to include all revenues and expenditures for each fund in the annual budget;

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

Section 1. Amending Section 2 of Ordinance No. 184. The City hereby amends Section 2. of Ordinance No. 184, as amended, the 1999 Annual Budget, by increasing the General Fund to $22,499,191, appropriation from the Street Fund to $4,041,611 and by increasing the Total Funds appropriation to $54,397,175 as follows:

General Fund	~~$21,999,191~~	$ 22,499,191
Development Services Fund	2,846,447	
Street Fund	~~3,556,832~~	3,991,121
Arterial Street Fund	594,860	
Surface Water Management Fund	5,178,777	
General Capital Fund	7,248,574	
Roads Capital Fund	8,167,461	
Surface Water Capital	1,092,850	
General Reserve Fund	1,583,084	
Asset Depreciation Fund	721,835	

Equipment Rental Fund		147,983	
Unemployment Fund		44,042	
Advance Travel Fund		5,460	
Agency Fund		225,000	
	Total Funds	~~$53,412,395~~	$ 54,346,684

Section 2. Additional Resources for the General Fund. The City Manager is hereby authorized to increase the resources for the General Fund by $500,000, reflecting the addition of revenue transfers to the City from Seattle City Light.

Section 3. General Fund Transfer to the Street Fund. The City Manager is hereby authorized to transfer $434,289 from the General Fund to the Street Fund for development of the Public Works Operations Programs.

Section 4. Additional Resources for the Street Fund. The City Manager is hereby authorized to increase the resources for the Street Fund by $434,289, reflecting an addition of $434,289 from the General Fund.

Section 5. Funds for Development of Public Works Operations Programs. The City Manager is hereby authorized to expend an additional sum of $434,289 in the Public Works Department for development of Operations Programs, including funds for road overlays, the hiring of staff as outlined in Section 6, for professional services, and for machinery and equipment.

Section 6. Authorization to Hire Additional City Employees. The City Manager is hereby authorized to hire five new employees in the Department of Public Works as outlined below.

1. Street Supervisor
2. Contract Analyst
3. Maintenance Worker II
4. Maintenance Worker I
5. Administrative Assistant II

Section 7. Funds for Surface Water Portion of Public Works Operations Programs. The City Manager is hereby authorized to expend $68,489 from the Surface Water Management Fund fund balance to pay for the surface water portion of the development of Public Works Operations Programs.

Section 8. Funds for Capital Project Manager. The City Manager is hereby authorized to expend $78,654 from the General Capital Fund fund balance to hire a Capital Project Manager and for equipment to coordinate and complete work on the City's Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.

Section 9. Severability. Should any section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, or should any portion of this ordinance be preempted by

state or federal law or regulation, such decision or preemption shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances.

Section 10. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City and shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY ____, 1999.

_____
Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

_____
Sharon Mattioli
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Bruce L. Disend
City Attorney

Date of Publication: _____, 1999
Effective Date: _____, 1999

Council Meeting Date: February 22, 1999 **Agenda Item: 8(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: City Council Support for King County Transportation Coalition List of Projects to be Funded under Referendum 49
DEPARTMENT: Community/Government Relations
PRESENTED BY: Joyce A. Nichols, C/GR Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

The purpose of this staff report is to seek your Council's support for a list of transportation projects, including Shoreline's Aurora Avenue project, that are included in a proposal for funding available from Referendum 49 (see Attachment "A").

Referendum 49 was referred to the voters by the Washington State Legislature and was approved by voters in November, 1998. Referendum 49's passage allows the state to sell $1.9 billion in bonds for five years' worth of highway improvements and other transportation projects. The bonds would be repaid over 25 years. Referendum 49 also dedicates more of our auto license tab fees to pay for needed transportation projects. A total of about $2.4 billion will be available to pay for transportation projects throughout our state over the next six years.

At the time Referendum 49 was referred to the voters, there had been no agreement among the key players—the Governor, the State Senate, the State House of Representatives, the State Department of Transportation—on a list of projects to be funded if the referendum was approved by voters. Specific details on the process and timing of the decision-making are not yet available from the House and Senate Transportation Committees. When they are available, we will share them with you.

Following voter approval of Referendum 49, a coalition of groups facilitated by the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce and Chambers of Commerce from across King County began meeting to pursue funding for transportation projects in King County. This effort was stimulated by a challenge from King County Councilmembers Rob McKenna, Dwight Pelz and Chris Vance to a group of local Chamber leaders to get serious about pursuing transportation funding from Olympia. These Councilmembers noted that King County seldom gets its needs completely met because King County is seldom as organized and unified as some other counties.

The Chamber's group accepted the challenge and over the past three months sponsored stakeholder meetings in which Shoreline staff participated to develop a list of projects the King County region could support. This group included as many as 85 people representing cities—elected officials and staff—including Seattle, Bellevue, Redmond, Auburn, Federal Way, Renton, Woodinville, Covington, Maple Valley and Shoreline; King County; Washington Department of Transportation; Puget Sound

Regional Council; Port of Seattle; King County Labor Council; and Chambers of Commerce from across the county.

The coalition agreed to work as a team to press the Legislature to deliver transportation funding to King County that is directly proportional to our County's economic impact. One of the key messages from the coalition to Olympia is that our lack of progress on transportation issues is a serious threat to every family and every business in King County. Attachment "B" includes key messages and answers to frequently asked questions from the King County Transportation Coalition.

The coalition was guided in its efforts to develop a single list of projects for King County by the following principles:

- Completing existing, but incomplete, "regional linkage" projects—sometimes referred to as the corridor approach.
- Improving freight mobility.
- Relieving traffic congestion.
- Achieving substantial project completion within a six-year timeframe.

The King County Transportation Coalition developed a single list of transportation projects and programs agreed to by the participants. The coalition list includes: completion of the HOV system within King County; major capacity improvements to our so-called "killer highways"—SR 18 and SR 522; completion of major interchanges on I-5, I-90, I-405 and numerous state highways; and, several intermodal projects designed to better serve transit riders, pedestrians and bicyclists. The grand total of all projects on the list is $1.48 billion. Projects on the list are not listed in priority order.

Of particular note, the Aurora Avenue project—from 145th to 205th through Shoreline—is also included on the list for $10 million in state funding (funds available from Referendum 49 are state funds only). The City's Capital Improvement Program lists the total cost of the Aurora Avenue project at (an estimated) $26 million. The $16 million balance would come from a combination of federal grants, other state sources (e.g., Transportation Improvement Board) and local funds. While these are preliminary estimates that include potential grant resources, they were developed with conservative assumptions.

The coalition is seeking letters of support for the project list and assistance with its efforts to inform our King County legislative delegation about the serious problems we face in the transportation arena and importance of delivering funding for these projects.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends your Council provide consensus agreement for the Mayor to sign a letter of support to the King County Transportation Coalition and direct staff to contact our 32nd District Legislators to urge their support for projects on the coalition's list.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

Attachments

Attachment "A" – King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

Attachment "B" – King County Transportation Coalition Key Messages

Attachment A

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
I-5		Eastlake noise wall/noise mitigation	Noise reduction	$ 4,300,000
	Congestion Relief	Complete HOV - Tukwila to Pierce Co. line	Completion of HOV lanes	$ 170,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Link	South Lake Union Corridor Study and Construction	Design and build grade separation, signal and street channelization improvements and evaluate further improvements to improving traffic flow.	$ 20,000,000
			I-5 corridor subtotal:	$ 194,300,000
I-90	Congestion Relief	Reconfigure HOV access ramps to/from I-405	Construct new direct ramps to connect inside HOV lanes	$ 118,000,000
	Regional Link, Congestion Relief	Sunset interchange	Construct new interchange. Local/private partnership to construct new corridor connection north and south of interchange	$ 26,000,000
	Congestion Relief	SR 900 interchange	Congestion relief and transit operations, access to Issaquah Park & Ride and related improvements to Tibbetts Creek Culvert and Greenway.	$ 17,400,000
			I-90 corridor subtotal:	$ 161,400,000

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
I-405	Congestion Relief	Bellevue downtown access ramps	Construct new transit/carpool interchange at NE 6th St, widen NE 8th and NE 4th St bridges across I-405. Provide related intersection capacity improvements, new pedestrian facilities	$ 10,000,000
	Regional Link, Congestion Relief	Major Investment Study	Study and EIS	$ 10,000,000
	Regional Link, Congestion Relief	N.E. 44th interchange	Interchange improvements, signals, HOV direct access ramps, overpass	$ 15,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	Finish I-405/SR 167 interchange	Improve safety and operation of interchange	$ 5,000,000
			I-405 corridor subtotal:	$ 40,000,000
SR 18	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Widen to four lanes - SE 200th to SR 516	Widen major truck corridor to 4 lanes and interchange improvements	$ 117,500,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Truck climbing lane, SR 167 to Weyerhaeuser Way	Widen major truck corridor to accommodate truck lane up steep grade	$ 10,000,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Widen to four lanes - 180th Street to Issaquah/Hobart Road	Widen major truck corridor to 4 lanes and interchange improvements	$ 25,000,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Complete SR 18/SR 167 interchange	initial EIS and pre-design	$ 5,000,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Study & design interchange w/ I-5 & SR 161	Design study for new interchange	$ 2,000,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	"C" St./SW 3rd St. interchange w/ grade separation	Realign SR 18 WB ramps to intersect C St SW in the vicinity of 3rd St SW, FAST I	$ 10,000,000
			SR 18 corridor subtotal:	$ 169,500,000

36

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
SR 99	Congestion Relief, Regional Link, Freight Mobility	Aurora Avenue North Project-Shoreline 145th to 205th	Roadway, transit and access improvements/sidewalks on Highway 99 North between Seattle and Snohomish County line & implement results of study currently underway	$ 10,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Regional Link, Freight Mobility	HOV/Roadway improvements - S 356th to S 116th Street	Construct transit lanes and sidewalk/access control improvements, signal coordination	$ 50,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Regional Link, Freight Mobility	Seismic Study of the Alaskan Way Viaduct	Conduct a study to ascertain condition of Alaskan Way Viaduct	$ 500,000
			SR 99 corridor subtotal:	$ 60,500,000
SR 167	Congestion Relief	Add HOV lanes between 15th SW and 15th NW	Extension of HOV lanes	$ 31,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Regional Link	Interchange at SW 27th with arterial connection to SR 181	New HOV interchange on SR 167 @ SW 27th St, arterial HOV lanes, rail grade separation, access to Longacres commuter rail station on SW 27th/ Strander Blvd.	$ 18,000,000
			SR 167 corridor subtotal:	$ 49,000,000
SR 202 Corridor	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Link	SR 202 Widen to 5 lanes from E. Lake Sammamish Pkwy to Sahalee Way	Widen congested road to 5 lanes, serving commuter/freight corridor	$ 38,000,000
			SR 202 subtotal:	$ 38,000,000

37

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
SR 509	Freight Mobility, Regional Link, Congestion Relief	Extend SR 509 from S 188th to I-5	Extend SR-509 with a six lane limited access highway from the existing end of SR-509 at S 188th to an I-5 connection near S 210th Street. Phase I includes design, right of way acquisition and construction of I-5 southbound improvements	$ 140,000,000
			SR 509 corridor subtotal:	$ 140,000,000
SR 516	Congestion Relief, Regional Link	SR 516	Widen SR 516 from Wax Road to SR 169, Design Signal and Street channelization improvements between SE 168th Street and SE Witte Road, Construct Pedestrian facilities between SE Wax Road and SE Witte Road, HAC access management improvement between SE 168th Street and SE Wax Road	$ 2,000,000
			SR 516 subtotal	$ 2,000,000
SR 520	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	Complete interchange in Bel-Red. area	Reconstruct interchange to add ramps to/from east	$ 32,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Link	Complete interchange at SR 202 and complete HOV lanes	Complete interchange	$ 50,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Link	EIS for results of Trans-Lake Washington Study Committee	Conduct EIS on solutions proposed by Trans-Lake Washington Study Committee	10,000,000
			SR 520 corridor subtotal:	$ 92,000,000

38

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
SR 522	Regional link, Congestion Relief	Multi-modal improvements - I-5 to Bothell	Design, right of way, acquisition and construction of multi-modal improvements, including transit lanes signal pre-empts, new signal equipment including pedestrian controlled signs and widening.	$ 30,000,000
	Regional link	Access to UW Bothell campus	Frontage access road from SR-522 into campus	$ 10,000,000
	Regional link, Congestion Relief	SR 202/SR 522 interchange improvements	Construct new freeway ramps and improve access to Woodinville	$ 6,600,000
			SR 522 corridor subtotal:	$ 46,600,000
Freight Mobility	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	S. 277th grade separation and interchange w/ SR 167	Separate train & vehicle traffic, widen to 4 lanes. Enhance traffic flow and rail safety. Sound Transit benefit, FAST I	$ 21,300,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	"M" St. grade separation	Freight mobility railroad grade separation, Tier II FAST corridor project	$ 6,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	S. 180th grade separation	Grade separate S 180th St from UP and BNSF rail, increasing capacity and safety, FAST I	$ 6,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	Willis St. grade separations (2)	Freight mobility railroad grade separation, Tier II FAST corridor project	$ 10,000,000
	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility	S. 212th grade separation	Freight mobility railroad grade separation, Tier II FAST corridor project	$ 13,000,000
	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	SR 519 - connect I-90/I-5 to waterfront/stadiums/SR 99	Construct railroad grade separation and freeway ramp over BNSF mainline tracks, FAST I	$ 75,000,000

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
Freight Mobility Continued	Freight Mobility, Congestion Relief	Spokane St. viaduct - widen structure, complete seismic work, install median	Widen existing viaduct to improve safety, FAST I	$ 25,000,000
	Freight Mobility	Ballard Bridge - replace electrical and mechanical systems and rehabilitation structure	Bridge rehabilitation	$ 6,500,000
	Freight Mobility	Fremont Bridge - replace approaches, replace electrical and mechanical systems and gratings	Bridge rehabilitation	$ 25,000,000
	Freight Mobility	14th Ave. S./16th Ave. S. Bridge - rehabilitation/rebuild	Bridge rehabilitation	$ 30,000,000
	Freight Mobility	E. Marginal Way ramps	Construct northbound & southbound overpass on E Marginal Way to improve access to port terminals	$ 7,000,000
	Freight Mobility	Lander St. underpass	Construct grade separation	$ 15,000,000
			freight corridor subtotal:	$ 239,800,000
Multi-modal	Congestion Relief	Federal Way Park & Ride	New Park & Ride lot in high demand area	$ 7,200,000
	Congestion Relief	University Way Multi-modal Project	Establish University Way as a major transfer point, by adding bus bulbs, wider sidewalks, signal improvements and a link to a future light rail station	$ 3,000,000
	Congestion Relief	Marion St. to ferry terminal pedestrian overpass	Bridge and pedestrian improvements for ferry terminal and transit passengers	$ 1,500,000
	Congestion Relief	Galer St./SR 99 pedestrian overpass	Pedestrian bridge over Aurora Ave	$ 1,400,000
	Congestion Relief	Cross-over Study at Greenlake Park & Ride, southbound transit lane on Express lanes	Funding for initial study	$ 3,000,000
	Congestion Relief	King Street Station	Renovate station and improve facilities for transit, inter-city rail and taxi service	$ 8,000,000
			Transit subtotal:	$ 24,100,000

King County Transportation Coalition Priorities for State Funding 1999-2005

January 22, 1999

Corridor	Criteria	Project	Project Description	State Request
Unallocated Local Area projects	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Links	Seattle and North King County	Resources to allocate based on local jurisdiction needs	$ 75,000,000
Note: Local Jurisdictions have projects	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Links	Eastside	Resources to allocate based on local jurisdiction needs	$ 75,000,000
which far exceed their $75 million allocation, but all have agreed to limit their requests to $75 million per area	Congestion Relief, Freight Mobility, Regional Links	Local Projects, South County	Resources to allocate based on local jurisdiction needs	$ 75,000,000
			Unallocated local projects subtotal:	$ 225,000,000
			Grand Total:	$ 1,482,200,000

In addition to the projects above, the King County Transportation Coalition supports continuing investments in statewide programs including: inter-city passenger rail, public transit modernization, congestion management/trip reduction, passenger only ferries and freight mobility.

King County
TRANSPORTATION COALITION

King County must keep moving...
...to keep Washington's economy growing

- In 1997, a federally-funded national study ranked the Seattle metropolitan area, along with San Francisco and Los Angeles, in a three-way tie for the worst *rush-hour* traffic congestion in the nation.

- The same study pointed out that traffic congestion *throughout the day* is also a serious problem, ranking us as the sixth-most-congested region in the country.

- It is important to solve King County's major transportation problems *now*. Within the next decade or two, other urban regions, such as Spokane and Vancouver, will become as congested as our area. It will be more difficult to "catch up" than to "keep up."

- Freight mobility within King County is now a *statewide* concern.

- The Port of Seattle accounts for almost half of the $74 billion in imports and exports moving through our state. One in every four state jobs now depends on international trade. The percentage of manufactured goods sold to foreign markets puts our state among the top five states in the USA.

- Our state's "one-day" competitive shipping advantage in world trade is now being eroded as traffic congestion delays trains and trucks carrying international cargo. We have that natural advantage because the Port of Seattle is located geographically closer to our Pacific Rim trading partners than any other major US seaport. Without new transportation investments, we lose it.

- The 37,000 farms and ranches in our state will benefit directly from freight mobility projects within King County. For example, Washington farmers and ranchers produce more than $3 billion in agricultural commodities annually, over 80 percent of which comes from East of the Cascades. A train from central or eastern Washington can cross the Cascades in less time than it takes that same train to travel the last 20 miles to the Port of Seattle.

- Over 3,700 interstate trucking companies haul freight within our state and many depend upon the massive freight distribution hub in the Kent Valley — the 3rd largest truck-freight distribution hub in the entire nation. Proposed freight mobility projects will improve access to this hub, as well as to our Puget Sound seaports.

- King County serves as our state's gateway for destination visitors and accounts for over half of the state's $9.1 billion travel and tourism industry. It also benefits tourism throughout all parts of the state. For example, in 1972, Washington had just 6 wineries; today there are over 60 vintners. . Washington is now recognized as one of the prime wine producers in the world, with many award-winning wines. Destination visitors now come to tour the Columbia and Yakima valleys much as they would California's wine producing regions. Over half of these destination visitors will fly into, or drive through, King County to reach Washington wine growing regions. Whether destination visitors go see wine country, the Olympic Mountains or other attractions, odds are they will pass through King County to get there.

- King County is a powerful "economic engine" for Washington State. State taxes collected in King County are re-distributed in Olympia to help many smaller counties and communities. Here's why. King County provides jobs for over 1 million workers, many of whom live in one of four adjoining counties. These workers comprise about one-third of our state's civilian labor force. King County also generates 42 percent of our state's total taxable retail sales and accounts for 38 percent of the state's total property tax assessed valuation. By way of comparison, King County comprises only 29 percent of the state's total population.

- New transportation investments are needed now in King County if it is to remain an "economic engine" and the freight mobility hub for the entire state.

- The Growth Management Act requires that transportation systems be put in place to keep up with growth. King County has grown dramatically, while our transportation systems and the funding for those systems have not.

FAQ

1. Who is supporting the King County transportation project list?

More than 85 civic leaders representing chambers of commerce, organized labor, cities and King County met over a six week period to develop a list of transportation priorities for our region. This is the first time in several decades that transportation stakeholders have met to assess and set priorities for state funding of transportation projects throughout King County. The list is designed to assist the Governor, the legislature and the Washington State Department of Transportation as they plan for new statewide transportation investments. To continue this effort, those involved have agreed to continue to work together as the King County Transportation Coalition.

2. How were the proposed projects selected to be on the list?

Projects were selected using four guiding principles: (1) completing an existing, but incomplete, "regional linkage" (sometimes referred to as the "corridor approach"); (2) improving freight mobility (includes the FAST Corridor projects); (3) relieving traffic congestion; and (4) achieving completion within a six-year timeframe.

3. How will we pay for the proposed projects on the list?

Last fall, Washington voters approved Referendum 49. This measure will dedicate more of our auto license tab fees to pay for needed transportation projects. About $2.4 billion in new monies will be available to pay for transportation solutions throughout our state over the next six years. Additionally, existing gas tax revenues are available to fund projects. Those two sources provide the funding for those projects on the King County project list.

4. Will the proposed projects solve all of our congestion and freight mobility problems?

The proponents of Referendum 49 pointed out that $2.4 billion will not solve all of our state's transportation problems and that it was only a "first step." The Governor and the legislature have created a Blue Ribbon panel to assess our state's long-term transportation needs and how to best pay for them. The proposed King County list is also a "first step" to meet our regional mobility needs. "Next steps" will include identifying additional solutions and how to best pay for them.

5. Will the commuting public see any difference in congestion levels?

The King County project list includes those projects anticipated in current transportation plans and which can be substantially completed within the six years envisioned by Referendum 49. Included is the completion of the HOV system within King County, major capacity improvements to our two so-called "killer highways" (SR-18 and SR -522), completion of major interchanges on I-5, I-90, I-405 and numerous state highways, and many intermodal projects designed to better serve transit riders, bicyclists and pedestrians. In certain corridors, commuters will enjoy a demonstrable improvement in their daily commute and have more mode choices for commuting to work. In addition, the project list includes major freight mobility improvements to keep freight from being stuck in traffic.

Council Meeting Date: February 22, 1999 **Agenda Item: 8(c)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Klub Kellogg $10,000 Application for Phase II Health and Human Services General Fund Allocations
DEPARTMENT:	Health and Human Services
PRESENTED BY:	Larry Bauman, Assistant City Manager LB Rachael Markle, Grant Specialist RM

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

On February 8, 1999, staff presented to your Council the recommendations of the Citizen Advisory Committee, which allocates $50,000 in General Fund grants for 1999 in various health and human services. Because Council had questions concerning one of the applicants—YMCA's Klub Kellogg—your Council approved only $40,000 in allocations and withheld a decision on the remaining $10,000 until additional information could be brought back by staff concerning the Klub Kellogg program.

The principal question asked by Council involved the relationship between the YMCA's Klub Kellogg application for $10,000 to the City for a General Fund allocation and the recent award of a $10,000 Special Programs Grant to the YMCA from King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia. YMCA's King County grant request for Klub Kellogg was in fact for only $3,000 of the $10,000 King County request. The YMCA also applied separately to Councilmember Fimia for $7,000 to help fund another teen program, transportation services for the Late Night Teen Program at the former Aldercrest school site in unincorporated King County (Shoreline Potential Annexation Area A-2). Since both of these grant requests were approved by Councilmember Fimia, the result was a total grant of $10,000.

The Klub Kellogg King County grant for $3,000 will fund costs for personnel ($2,600), transportation ($100), insurance/overhead ($200) and field trips ($100). The total budget for the program is $33,100, of which more than half--$15,600--is for two paid staff positions (there is also a third, unpaid, position provided through the federal AmeriCorps program). Overall, the budget would include $10,000 from the City of Shoreline, $10,000 from the City of Lake Forest Park, $3,000 from King County and $10,100 from other sources. The other sources amount includes $3,300 from the YMCA for 10 percent of its teen program director's time, $3,000 of in-kind donations from the Shoreline School District for rent and utilities and $2,000 in scholarship funds from various sources (for further detail, see Attachment A, the Klub Kellogg 1999 Proposed Budget).

As stated in the YMCA's application to the City, the primary aim of the program is to provide an after school recreation and tutoring program from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. each school day at Kellogg Middle School. The target group is all students who would be going home to situations where no parent is there after school. The program also provides homework support, community service projects, and arts and crafts. The Shoreline School District provides classroom space.

The Klub Kellogg program intends to serve a total of 80 students over the course of the 1999 school year. Particularly in this one aspect, the YMCA's application to the City for this program is considerably improved over the proposal made to your Council in the fall of 1998, which suggested it would serve only 30 students.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt the Citizen Advisory Committee's recommendation to allocate 1999 Human Services General Funds to the YMCA Klub Kellogg program in the amount of $10,000 and authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements to implement this project.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

ATTACHMENTS

A: YMCA Klub Kellogg 1999 Proposed Budget

Attachment A

Shoreline YMCA

Klub Kellogg
1999 Proposed Budget

2/12/99

Program Revenue

Revenue Source	1999 Total Budget
City of Shoreline	$10,000
City of Lake Forest Park	$10,000
King County	$3,000
Kellogg Middle School - In Kind Support	$3,000
Shoreline YMCA	$3,000
Program Fees	$4,100
Total Revenue	$33,100

Program Expense

Expense Category	City of SL Funds	City of LFP Funds	King Co. Funds	Other Funds	1998 Total Budget
Personnel Costs	$6,500	$6,500	$2,600		$15,600
Program Director (10%)				$3,300	$3,300
Office/Operating Supplies					$0
Telephone					$0
Travel/Training					$0
Facility: Rent & Utilities				$3,000	$3,000
Contractual Fees					$0
Transportation	$200	$200	$100		$500
Food	$1,200	$1,200			$2,400
Program Supplies	$1,200	$1,200			$2,400
Insurance / Overhead	$900	$900	$200	$1,300	$3,300
Scholarships				$2,000	$2,000
Equipment				$500	$500
Field Trips			$100		$100
Total Expense	$10,000	$10,000	$3,000	$10,100	$33,100

Program Personnel Expenses

Position Title	% FTE	1999 Annual Salary	City of SL Funds	City of LFP Funds	King Co. Funds
Program Coordinator	50%	$9,720	$4,045	$4,045	$1,630
Program Assistant	38%	$3,500	$1,455	$1,455	$590
Subtotal		$13,220	$5,510	$5,510	$2,200
Benefits & Taxes (18%)		$2,380	$990	$990	$400
Total Personnel Costs		$15,600	$6,500	$6,500	$2,600