Council Meeting Date: March 17, 2003 **Agenda Item: 7**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Executive Session - City Hall Siting
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY:	Eric C. Swansen, Senior Management Analyst

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Finding a suitable site for City Hall is the immediate problem we are trying to solve. This problem is the first of many that need to be addressed that lead to the completion of a new City Hall.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Although there is a financial impact to this discussion, it is impossible to gauge this impact at this time, due to numerous outstanding issues that directly affect costs. These issues include siting, market conditions, delivery method and project complexity.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required at this time. Staff is seeking Council's consensus support for pursuing three specific sites based on information presented in executive session. With Council consensus staff will begin discussions with property owners of suitable high-ranking sites for possible acquisition. Staff will also pursue site-based cost estimates.

Approved By: City Manager RSC City Attorney N/A

This page intentionally left blank.

INTRODUCTION

The immediate problem we are solving is selecting suitable sites for City Hall. As Council is aware, this immediate problem is critical to solving problems related to suitable space for City offices and the economics of owning space versus leasing.

Under RCW 42.30.110 (1)(b), the City Council can meet in executive session to consider the selection of a site or acquisition of real estate by lease or purchase when public knowledge regarding such consideration would cause a likelihood of increased price. Executive session portions of City Council meetings are not open to the general public.

This executive session item is part one of a two-part report. This report is intended to share basic information about the status for site selection as a public document. This item will not present any information that infers interest in any particular site, as this market knowledge may result in the perception of increased value for a seller. A second part to this report will provide more detailed confidential information to Council regarding specific sites and rankings.

BACKGROUND

Staff shared with Council a project workplan for the City Hall Project last year. That workplan included finding suitable sites for a future City Hall and selecting the best site for the project.

On October 21, 2002 Council reviewed criteria to be applied to potential sites. Staff outlined a process that would provide an opportunity for interested property owners to express interest in selling sites for a potential City Hall. In addition, staff has received a number of site suggestions from staff that are also being considered.

In December the City advertised official notices in the Seattle Times, the Shoreline Enterprise and the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce regarding how interested property owners can provide information to express interest in selling property for this project. Staff received no interest from property owners or brokers representing specific properties. Staff also used an updated site list that was developed in 2000. This list consisted of thirteen properties.

This list of thirteen was further narrowed down to six sites, based on a examination of the site availability and time needed to produce a developable site. In many cases these sites were dependent upon future development or aggregation of multiple parcels to become developable.

In January, staff ranked the six sites using the criteria previously developed. The criteria used a two-part criteria – the first being a basic fit criteria – the second a more detailed criteria for those sites that met the basic fit criteria.

This item is a refinement of the information staff shared with Council on February 3, 2003.

DISCUSSION

Council has requested more information regarding the relative schedule, cost and benefit for four of the six sites staff recommended for further consideration. Council also requested that more information about one site, reviewed but not recommended, also be added to this comparison.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required at this time. Staff is seeking Council's consensus support for pursuing three specific sites based on information presented in executive session. With Council consensus staff will begin discussions with property owners of suitable high-ranking sites for possible acquisition. Staff will also pursue site-based cost estimates.