Council Meeting Date: May 17 , 1999 **Agenda Item: 6(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Status Report on City of Shoreline Y2K Project
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Joe Meneghini, Finance Director

EXECUTIVE/COUNCIL SUMMARY

The City of Shoreline, like all public and private agencies, is faced with the Year 2000 computing issue. This issue affects computer equipment that performs date calculations using a two-digit data structure to describe the year. These systems can fail or cause errors by incorrectly interpreting the year as 1900 instead of 2000.

Considering that computerization has become a part of our modern lifestyle, the potential for this issue to negatively impact our City Government and our community is significant if you do not proactively mitigate impacts of the Y2K bug. We are bringing this issue before your Council to brief you on what we are doing to minimize the potential negative impact.

As part of this briefing we want to share the process we are using to evaluate, fix and test equipment and software. We also want to outline our strategy for developing a contingency plan for our community.

The City is a provider of essential services to the community. These services are provided either directly by the City, or on behalf of the City by third party contractors. Our primary concern revolves around a single question – Are we going to be able to provide services on or after January 1, 2000? For City functions we divided the list of potential concerns into three categories: internal systems, for systems we own and operate; external systems, for systems we are responsible for providing and rely on third party contractors for the service; and community services, for services (such as utilities) that are franchised by the City or affect the immediate life, health and safety of our community.

The methodology used to review our readiness for Y2K was to follow a systematic and comprehensive process consisting of the following steps: awareness, inventory, assessment, solution design, testing, implementation, and monitoring.

This process was used to evaluate all internal, external, and community systems. Using the process, each product is inventoried and are then assessed for Y2K issues based upon manufacturer's written assessment. If the product is not Y2K ready, a fix is developed. Fixes can include upgrades from manufacturers, replacing the equipment or planning for the product to remain non-compliant but not affect service delivery. All products, both Y2K ready and Y2K fixed, are tested to verify readiness. A monitoring period follows the tests to ensure service delivery is not interrupted should problems arise.

The Findings:

Since the City is relatively new, a majority of internal systems were already Y2K ready when the City purchased or created them. For example, the Customer Response Team (CRT) and Development Services (DSG) data bases are already Y2K compliant. Nevertheless, we found a number of products that are not ready and are in the process of being fixed. The majority of these concerns involve the Microsoft Windows 95 operating system and the Microsoft Office '97 software which are standard on all of our PC's (176 including computer lab, teen center, police station, etc.). Other areas include the UNIX operating system that manages City's Geographic Information System (GIS), a number of PC's (160), and the remote access to the City's PC network. All products identified are being fixed and are on a schedule for Y2K testing to occur in June.

External systems are in line with planned Y2K compliance schedules. Many of these systems were originally developed prior to Y2K becoming a major issue, requiring more attention than newer equipment. The King County Sheriff's Office, using a process similar to ours is addressing most of these systems. Solutions are currently being developed to enable testing this Summer. City staff continues to work with the Sheriff's Office and other providers to ensure readiness. The City's traffic signals operated by King County, a key external system, are compliant.

All the City's major community service providers have Y2K assessment programs in place and are either Y2K compliant or are making good progress on Y2K readiness goals. Staff continues to work with community service providers (such as cable TV, garbage, water, wastewater, power, etc.) each of who are progressing along their planned Y2K readiness timelines.

The problems identified with the City's products are fairly simple to fix. Many of the products involve using free upgrades from manufacturers. Staff time will also be required to install the upgrades before testing. In few cases, product upgrades need to be purchased to obtain compliance. The total cost, not including staff time, is expected to total $4,000. These funds are already allocated under the existing Information Services budget.

Community Contingency Planning:

Like most other jurisdictions, the City intends to prepare for the continuity of services by using our existing emergency operations plan. As part of this planning, we intend to work with other local providers (water, wastewater, fire, King County) to coordinate the timely response to any problems that might arise. Because of the increased awareness of the Y2K issue over the past two years, the initial predictions of widespread disruption seem overstated. The scale is probably something similar to a winter storm, where sporadic events create inconveniences that might require a City response, but the overall scope of disruptions is minor.

RECOMMENDATION

For City Council information, no Council action is required.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney N/A

BACKGROUND ANALYSIS:

This issue affects computer equipment that performs date calculations using a two-digit data structure to describe the year. These systems can fail or cause errors by incorrectly interpreting the year as 1900 instead of 2000.

City Implications:

The City provides a variety of functions (police, public works, planning, parks and recreation, finance, etc) to the public, that are dependent on computing. These various functions are provided either directly by the City (building permits) or by external providers (Evergreen Landscape, King County Police). Also, the City like other businesses and residents is a buyer of a number of services (water, sewer, electrical, phones, facilities, banking, etc.) it needs in order to function.

With respect to our City departmental computer operations, the various City departments use Windows 95, Microsoft Office 97 (word, excel, access), GroupWise for e-mail (also scheduling, etc.) and a number of applications designed/built by the Information Systems division, such as a Building Permit System, Customer Response tracking, Parks registration, and Small Contract Roster (used for managing small construction projects/professional services contracts). Further, all these applications work through a computer network system, which consists of a variety of network devices (routers, switches, hubs, wires, etc.) that must function in order for the software application to work.

The City also contracts for the following services: Police and Dispatch (911), Street Services (sweeping, traffic signal maintenance, etc.), some Parks maintenance and Payroll (ADP). Within these services, key areas that are computer dependent are (police communication/dispatching, police information system (IRIS), traffic signals). Further, as noted above, the City is a buyer of many services in order for it to be able to do its business (phones, banking, utilities, payroll, building space, etc.).

These service providers are also heavily dependent on computers to deliver their services or on devices that have embedded chips, which control certain functions (equipment, valves, thermostats).

The Y2K Project Methodology (Best Practice):

Each product is inventoried, noting serial, model and version numbers. The products are then assessed for Y2K issues based upon manufacturer's research. A written record is collected of this manufacturer's assessment. If the product is not Y2K ready, a fix is developed. Fixes can include upgrades from manufacturers, replacing the equipment or planning for the product to remain non-compliant but not affect service delivery. All products, both Y2K ready and Y2K fixed, are tested to verify readiness. A monitoring period follows the tests to ensure service delivery is not interrupted should problems arise.

The Y2K issue is taken seriously by the City. A Y2K project team was established to deal with the issue. This team has been systematically going through the project phases identified above. The Y2K team has completed the inventory, assessment and solution design stages and has also undertaken a number of corrective actions to bring products into compliancy.

As noted above, the project approach consists first of doing an inventory of all our products, services, devices that may or may not be computer dependent. Following this inventory an assessment was undertaken to determine which products in the inventory are not Y2K compliant.

The solution design phase is then used to determine best solutions to items that were non-compliant. That is, should the item be replaced, or fixed, or modify operations so as to become compliant and not adversely affect City services.

All products, regardless of Y2K readiness, are subsequently tested to ensure readiness. This will ensure that any fixes solve the problem, and that manufacturers' claims of readiness are verified.

A monitoring period follows the testing phase to ensure products remain ready. There are numerous examples where subsequent product upgrades make systems not Y2K ready. This monitoring period will continue well into the new year.

The Findings:

Our efforts to identify and address Y2K issues are working well. Since most of the City's inventory was recently acquired when Y2K issues were well known, we are not experiencing some of the major costs facing our older, more established peers in local government.

Problems identified with internal systems (those systems that we own and operate) are mostly software related. A list of known problems we are in the process of resolving follow:

- Microsoft Windows '95 operating system is used by virtually all personal computers (176) in the City:

  The problem is the date format affecting such functions as find files. The solution is a free patch from Microsoft that the IS staff loads onto the PC to correct. This task has been completed.

- Microsoft Office '97 integrated office application (word processing, spreadsheet) is used by virtually all personal computers (176) in the City:

  The problem is date format and to correct it is necessary to convert all Access databases and Excel spreadsheets into a 4-digit date format manually.

- Network-based WinFrame remote access system is used by staff to connect to the City's network from other locations:

  The problem with the current version of WinFrame (V1.7) is that our servers and the WinFrame software will not be able to link and activate the remote connection. The solution is to upgrade to V1.8 and NT4 at a cost of $2,700. This cost is included in this years' Finance Department budget appropriation.

- Sun Solaris UNIX operating system, which runs the City's Geographic Information System (GIS):

The problem resides in the inability of UNIX (V2.5) to execute some utility functions which are date driven. The upgrade to Solaris V2.7 (a free upgrade covered under our maintenance agreement) resolved this problem.

- Most of the City's personal computers (160). Only the most recent acquisitions pass all tests and need no modification (16):

  The problem again centered on the time-clock function in the PC's. The solution, which has already been administered, was a simple patch (cost $800) which allows PC's clock function to operate into the year 2000 (Y2K compliant).

Problems identified with external systems (those systems supporting services that we are responsible for providing --- but are contracted to outside providers) are more common than with our internal systems. Providers, in general, are addressing the problem using a similar methodology. We are in constant contact with all providers ensuring due diligence. Many systems are already compliant. Other systems on schedule for compliance testing in the near future are noted below:

- Managing Patrol Performance (MPP) Police scheduling and patrol software, used to schedule community policing staff. The problem involves the date function/schedule. This has been fixed by the vendor and tested but needs certification of Y2K readiness.

Solutions to these problems are in-progress. Staff continues to work with providers to ensure readiness.

Community Systems are services either regulated by the City under franchise agreements (e.g. utilities) or vital to health, safety and welfare of our community (e.g. electricity, water). Here again, providers are addressing the problem to ensure services are not disrupted by the year 2000.

Seattle City Light's most critical application systems (power system controls/distribution) are compliant. City Light is in the process of fixing financial applications (billing) and are scheduled for completion by June, 1999. Puget Sound Energy has upgraded a number of their systems so that they are Y2K compliant. They are now in the testing stage. Cable TV provider Chambers is compliant while TCI is scheduled to complete their Y2K readiness the 3rd quarter of 1999.

Shoreline Water District has replaced their computer network, billing, accounting system, and meter reading hardware and software. All their new systems are Y2K compliant. The Shoreline Wastewater District has reviewed all their systems and equipment and are Y2K compliant. The City's solid waste providers: Eastside Disposal and Waste Management are Year 2000 compliant.

The Seattle Public Utility (sewer and water) systems are substantially compliant and are scheduled to be fully compliant by June 1999 (currently upgrading wastewater pump station network/replacing sensors, etc.).

The other key service provider (non-franchise) is the telecommunication industry. According to the industry, they have undertaken extensive testing which has verified that voice and data call processing will continue without significant disruptions before, during and after the roll over into the year 2000.

Staff intends to work with providers to establish communication procedures and lines of communication should disruptions occur. This part of the community preparedness planning is outlined later in this report.

The problems identified with regards to City products are fairly simple to fix. Many of the products involve using free upgrades from manufacturers. Staff time will also be required to install the upgrades before testing. In few cases, product upgrades need to be purchased to obtain compliance. The total cost, not including staff time, is expected to total $4,000. These funds are already allocated under the existing Information Services budget.

Community Contingency Planning

Because there are many Y2K related issues that are outside the City's ownership and control, it is critical that the City plan for the continuity of services. Doing so will minimize disruptions to services and ensure problems are promptly noted for attention.

Like many other jurisdictions, the City intends to prepare for the continuity of services by using our existing emergency operations plan. Part of this planning will include working with other local service providers, such as power, cable, water, wastewater, fire, and King County to coordinate a timely response procedure for any problems that arise.

Because of the increased awareness of this issue in the past few years, the scale of any disruption is probably similar to the threat posed by a winter storm.

Next Steps:

Testing of all systems will take place once fixes are installed, to ensure that the manufacturer's claims and fixes actually prove to be correct. Should systems fail tests, the problem will be reviewed, fixed (or replaced) and tested again. After testing is complete, products will continue to be monitored to ensure compliance. Since relatively minor upgrades have been known to result in making a system non-compliant, monitoring is a very important element. Monitoring will continue well into the New Year to ensure compliance.

Staff will return to your Council with an update on this issue once we have completed testing and outside providers have completed all theirs as well. At that time, we will recommend what sort of emergency response plan will be implemented for the early days of year 2000. Additionally, the City's newsletter to residents (Currents) will likewise be covering this subject in an upcoming issue.

RECOMMENDATION

For City Council information, no Council action is required.

Attachment

A: City Y2K Master List

Year 2000 Inventory & Assessment & Solution Design Detailed Report

CITY OF SHORELINE

Updated: 5/7/99
Mina Farhad

Inventory		*Assessment*	*Solution*	
Item Type/Version	**Supplier**	**Y2K ready? Y/N**	**If no, action plans? (Convert, Replace, Upgrade, Discard)**	**Notes**
Software PC Based				
Adobe Acrobat 3.01	Adobe	Y		
InocuLAN Cheyenne Anti-Virus V4.0	Cheyenne	Y		
Visio 5.0	Visio	Y		
Great Plains	Great Plains	Y		
Dynamics C/S + Client	Great Plains	Y		
GroupWise 5.5 Client	Novell	Y		
Microsoft Office 97, SR-1	Microsoft	Y		
Microsoft Project v4.0	Microsoft	Y		
Netscape Navigator Version 4.5	Novell	Y		
RealPlayer	RealAudio	Y		

Attachment A

Server based software				
Novell 4.11 Server	Novell	Y		
Border Manager	Novell	Y		
GroupWise 5.5	Novell	Y		
NetConnect	NetConnect	Y		
Cyber Patrol v.4.00B	Learning Center	Y		
NT 3.51	Microsoft	Y		
NT 4.0	Microsoft	Y		
Compaq Insight Manager v3.50	Compaq	N	Will upgrade to version 4.0 or 4.5 (Free)	
Backup EXEC V7.O for NT & 6.11 for Novell	SEAGATE Software	Y		
WinFrame Citrix for NT3.51 v 1.7	Citrix	N	Will be upgrading to MetaFrame 1.8 & NT 4	Requires SP 5b patch
FrontPage 97	Microsoft	N	Free upgrade to 98	
ARCServe 6.1 Enterprise	ESRI	Y		
ACP Smart UPS software V.4.2.3 for Novell	American Power Conversion	Y		
Microsoft Win 95 All versions	Microsoft	Y		
ArcView GIS v. 3.0a	ESRI	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1000	American Power Conversion	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1400	American Power Conversion	Y		
Corel Draw v 7.0	Corel	Y		
IN-House Databases				
Request_CRT	Oracle	Y		
Permitts_DSG	Oracle	Y		
Parks	Oracle	Y		
Bid Trak_Small Works Rosters	Oracle	Y		
Cash REC	Oracle	Y		

Programs specific to an individual user:				
Print Shop Deluxe v2.0.3	Broderbund Software Inc.	Y		
Coreflow 2.00.D5	Corel Corp.	Y		
Report Smith	ADP	Y		
ArcExplorer	ESRI	Y		
ArcInfo 7.04	ESRI	Y		
ArcView ArcPress V 2.0	ESRI	Y		
ArcView GIS v. 3.1	ESRI	Y		
WinZip	WinZip	Y		
Unix – parbase batch file	Fred	Y		
Ultra I Sparc Workstation	Sun	Y		
HP755CM	Hewlett Packard	Y		
HP650C	Hewlett Packard	Y		
WS – FTP Pro	Ipswitch	Y		
Solaris2.5	SUN	Y		
GIS Data	City of Seattle	Y		
Crystal Reports 6.5	Seagate	Y		
Oracle 8	Oracle	Y		
Clarion 5	Clarion	Y		
Data Junction 6.5	Data Junction	Y		
Metroscan	Metroscan	Y		
Avery Direct Print Custom Dividers	Avery	Y		
Jet Admin v. 3.0	HP	N	Download of software upgrade will make it compliant (Free)	
Microsoft IntelliPoint 2.0	Microsoft	Y		
QuickTime 3.0	Apple	Y		
Visio Technical	Visio	Y		
ArcServe 6	ESRI	Y		
Air Source Pro For Networks	SilverLake comm.	Y		
HP DeskJet Utility	Hewlett Packard	Y		
Shoreline Municipal Code/Folio	Code Publishing	Y		
Iomega Tools for Win 95	Iomega	Y		
Financial Accounting Software	BI-Tech	Y		

FRx for Windows	FRx	Y		
Ngc's21.exe (Cost Allocation Program)	David Griffith Associates	N	Can upgrade to new software version or work around minor print issues program not date sensitive	
Taxtools	Microflex	Y		
HP ScanJet Scanner	Hewlett Packard	Y		
Adobe Illustrator 7.0	Adobe	Y		
Adobe PhotoShop 4.0	Adobe	Y		
Quicken Basic 98	Quicken	Y		
PageMaker 6.5	Adobe	Y		
Mustek scanner 600111 hardware and software v3.2	Mustek	Y		
Textbridge Classic v1.07 software	Xerox	Y		
Iphoto Plus 4-software	Ulead systems	Y		
MS Expedia Streets 98-software	Microsoft	N	Microsoft is testing	Minor Program/Not critical.
RecWare	Sierra Digital	Y		
R-Base	Microrim King Co.	Y		
PC/Server/Network based Hardware				
Compaq Proliant 6000	Compaq	Y		
Compaq 15/30 GB DLT tape	Compaq	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1000	American Power Conversion	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1400	American Power Conversion	Y		
Sun Microsystems Enterprise 250	Sun	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1400	American Power Conversion	Y		
Gateway 2000 66-200 Pentium Pro WinFrame	Gateway	Y		
DIGI ports / 8em		Y		
US Robotics 56k modems	US Robotics	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1000	American Power Conversion	Y		
PCN Pentium IBM compatible PC City Hall	PCN	Y		
Supra Fax Modem 28.8	Diamond	Y		
Exabyte EXB-8700 Tape backup	Exabyte	Y		

APC Smart UPS 1000	American Power Conversion	Y		
Gateway 2000 P5-166 Net Connect	Gateway	Y		
Gateway 2000 P5-166 Border Manger	Gateway	Y		
Compaq Proliant 1600 GroupWise	Compaq	Y		
APC Smart UPS 700	American Power Conversion	Y		
HP Sure Store DAT 24 tape backup	Hewlett Packard	Y		
PCN Pentium IBM compatible PC NT server	PCN	Y		
Bay Stack 151 10BT Hub	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay Stack 150 10BT Hub	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay Stack 350F 10/100 Auto sense switch	Bay Networks	Y		
TP/12 hub (3C16170)	3COM	Y		
FT 100s CSU/DSU	Motorola UDS	Y		
D-SERV DSU/CSU	ADC Kentrox:	Y		
DATA SMART Intelligent DSU/CSU	ADC Kentrox:	Y		
2500 SERIES 2501 SN 250370906	Cisco	Y		
4000 SERIES c4500 SN 45531264	Cisco	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1000	APC	Y		
Bay stack 150 10bt hub SN 9018300569	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay stack 151 10bt hub SN 9117800855	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay stack 350f-HD 10/100 SWITCH	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay stack 150 10BT Hub	Bay Networks	Y		
Bay stack 151 10BT Hub	Bay Networks	Y		
Super Stack II Hub 3C16441	3COM	Y		

Cisco Router 2500 series 2524 SN 25641871	Cisco	Y		
TP/12 HUB 3C16170 SN 0300/7HDV086239	3COM	Y		
Exabyte tape backup EXB 8700 SN 15006266	Exabyte	Y		
APC Smart UPS 1000 SN WS9640545791	American Power Conversion	Y		
Cisco Router 2500 series 2524 SN 250019782	Cisco	Y		
Super Stack II Entry Hub 3C16441 7XXU001F618	3COM	Y		
Super Stack II Entry Hub 3C16441 7XXU01F4AD	3COM	Y		
DLINK DE-812 TP+	D-Link	Y		
Cisco 2500 Router	Cisco	Y		
TP/12HUB 3C16170 SN 0300/7HDV098957	3COM	Y		
TP/12 HUB 3C16170 SN 0300/7HDV093313	3COM	Y		
2500 Cisco series Router	Cisco	Y		
Telephone system				
Telephone Service	GTE	Y		
Telephone Service	US West	Y		
Paging Service	MetroCall	Y		
Cellular Service	AirTouch	Y		
Cellular Service	AT & T	Y		
Long Distance	Shared Comm	Y		
800 MHz Radio	EPSCA	Y		
Frame Relay	GTE	Y		
Pagers	Motorola	Y		
Cellular Phones	Motorola	Y		
Cellular Phones	Nokia	Y		
Frame Relay	US West	Y		

Utilities				
Wastewater	Shoreline	Y		
Wastewater	City of Seattle	Y	Mission critical systems completed.	Scheduled for completion on 6/99.
Water	City of Seattle	Y	Mission critical systems completed.	Scheduled for completion on 6/99.
Water	Shoreline	Y		
Electricity	City of Seattle	Y	Mission critical systems are compliant. Finance system is scheduled for completion in June 1999	
Cable TV	TCI	N	Will be compliant	3rd quarter of 1999
Cable TV	Chambers Cable	Y		
Solid Waste	Eastside Disposal	Y		
Solid Waste	Waste-Management	Y		
Gas	Puget Sound Energy	Y	Mission critical energy system is compliant. Testing under way.	Scheduled for Complete readiness on 6/99. (Gas & Electric)
External Interfaces				
Fire Dept/District	Shoreline	Y		
ADP	Payroll	Y		
KC Assessor		Y		
KC office of Finance Management		N	Working on an action plan and if not compliant they'll have a contingency plan.	
State Dept. of Revenue		N	Working on an action plan, if not compliant they'll have contingency plans.	89% of systems compliant.
ICMA		Y		
PEBSCO		Y		
State Investment Pool		Y		
Sea-First Bank		Y	Mission critical Software Y2K compliant.	
Web Hosting Service	Adhost	Y		
Internet Service	VERIO	Y		

Systems listed by Departments				
PARKS				
Cash Register	Royal 8160NX	**Y**		
Irrigation Controllers		**Y**		
Field Light Controllers		**Y**		
Credit Card Machine	Seafirst Bank	**Y**		
POLICE				
PC/Server based hardware/software/applications/programs/…				
"Sea-King" criminal data information terminal-hardware & software 9 Sea-king, AFIS, ITS, SKID)	King County ITS 296-0606	**Y**		
MPP Managing Patrol Performance 6.10-software	K.C.-Jim Hilmar 205-7922 & Police Management Advisors	**N**	The system is partially compliant and the remainder will be made compliant	Passed tests, waiting for certification
I.R.I.S. police database-software	K.C. Computer Resource Unit 205-7894	**Y**		
Laptops-hardware	Compaq/King County C.R.U.	**Y**		
"Sea-King" on desktops · Attachmate Extra 6.4 personal client-software	Attachmate	**Y**		

Other systems using embedded chips				
911 emergency phone system	King County Comm. center 296-7500 Ken Rhodes	Y		
800 MHz portable radios and vehicle radios	King County Radio Shop 296-5051	Y		
Vehicles -- regular and patrol cars	Greg Thomas, KC Prop. Mng. 296-4078	Y		
800 MHz -- repeaters	King County Radio Shop 296-5051	Y		
Pagers (numerical & alpha-numeric)	At & T	Y		
B.A.C. verifier	WA State Patrol	Y		

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PC/Server based hardware/software/applications/programs/...

Thomas Bros. CD	Thomas Guide	Y		
Enercalc Fast Frame	Enercalc Enercalc	Y Y		
ICBO ES Reports on CD Rom	International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO)	Y		
1997 UBC on CD Rom	ICBO	Y		
Simpson Strong-Tie Hanger & Hardware	Simpson Strong-Tie Co.	Y		
AOL Greetings viewer	AOL	Y		
IntelliCAD	Visio	Y		

Kodak Picture Disk Software	Kodak	Y		
EMME 2	Transport Modeling	Y		
Other systems using embedded chips (e.g. elevators, environmental control systems, etc.)				
Digital Camera	Sony	Y		
Lanier Recorder	Lanier Serial Number 206496,	Y		
Lanier Transcriber	Lanier	Y		
Truck	Ford	Y		
Truck	Ford	Y		
Truck	Ford	Y		
Taurus	Ford	Y		

PUBLIC WORKS

PC/Server based hardware/software/applications/programs

Waterworks: updated on 6/11/98	Waterworks (Ballard, WA)	Y		
elevator controls	Sound Elevator	Y		
fire alarm controls	Sentrol Inc. 1.800.648.7424	Y		
fire alarm controls		Y		
fire alarm system	Sound Electronics	Y		
security controls	Protection 1: ADEMCO	Y		
security controls	protection 1: DSC Console	Y		
security controls	protection 1	Y		
security controls	Protection 1: ADEMCO	Y		
timer controls	BRK electronics	Y		
timer controls	Tork	Y		
fuel tank monitor	Emco Wheaton: 919.467.5878	Y		

hot water control		NA		Mechanical - no compliance necessary
boiler	Gordon Piatt Energy Group 316.221.4770	NA		Not dependent on embedded chips
thermostats-HVAC		Y		
motor-HVAC	thermo	NA		No embedded chips
microwaves	Kenmore	Y		
vehicles	Ford, Chevy	Y		
traffic lights	King County	Y		
traffic lights	State DOT	Y		
(3) Stormwater pump stations	Seattle Pub. Utilities/Shoreline Water Dist.	Y		
Wastewater	Shoreline Wastewater	Y		
Street lights	Seattle City Light/KC	Y		
Electricity	Seattle City Light/KC	Y		
CHEM TROL	Santa Barbara Control System	Y		
sprinkler controllers	Superior Controls	NA		No embedded chips
County Contract for street maintenance	King County	Y		

****

Council Meeting Date: May 17, 1999 **Agenda Item: 6(b)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Implementing new process for allocating General Fund Human Services and Community Development Block Grant Funds.
DEPARTMENT:	Health and Human Services
PRESENTED BY:	Rob Beem, Health and Human Services Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

This report updates the Council on the process staff proposes to use in developing recommendations for the allocation of the City's Human Services and Community Development Block Grant funds in the year 2000.

In order to make timely funding allocation decisions and to comply with King County CDBG contract timelines for next year, we need to begin the competitive process for allocating local and federal funds for human services. Agencies will be preparing applications over the next two months. Before we issue specific instructions to the agencies, staff is seeking Council concurrence with the process staff has developed. Council last discussed this during the 1999 Budget discussions. At that time, Council expressed an interest in combining the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and General Fund Human Services Funds allocations in one process. In addition, Mayor Jepsen has asked staff to consider moving from our current one year funding cycle to a two-year cycle.

In designing this year's process, staff considered two questions:
1) Should we implement a two-year cycle and if so, this year or next?
2) Should we combine all previously budgeted General Fund human services funds and the CDBG funds into the competitive allocations process?

We have developed a process that is intended to provide more predictability for agencies and the City, to focus our funding more tightly on addressing the Desired Outcomes outlined in the *Draft Proposed Health and Human Services Strategy for Shoreline* and to be less time consuming for agencies and the City. The process will combine all funds the City uses for direct support of human services agencies. This will include the additional $50,000 Council incorporated in the 1999 Budget, the allocation to Center for Human Services ($40,000), the Shoreline Senior Center ($67,739) as well as our CDBG Public Services dollars ($51,388). This would create a total of $209,135, available for the City's support of human services program operations. There will be an additional $146,616 available for capital projects.

Based on the experience of other communities that have already implemented a two-year cycle and positive response from agencies, Shoreline should be moving to a two-year funding cycle. We recommend this move beginning for the years 2001/2002. Implementing this change then will keep Shoreline in sync with our other partner communities. It will also give us time to more fully develop specific program strategies to implement the Human Services Desired Outcomes. A one-year allocation for 2000 would give staff the opportunity to work directly with agencies to understand their services and objectives and to suggest how they could better support Shoreline's Desired Outcomes. By taking the year 2000 to implement these Outcomes, the City would be able to expect applications for the two-year cycle that better match these objectives.

RECOMMENDATION

No formal action is required. Staff seeks Council consensus on the recommendation to combine all Human Services and CDBG funds into one allocation process, to continue our one year funding cycle for the coming year, 2000, and move to implement a two-year cycle for 2001 and 2002 funding.

Approved By: City Manager LB City Attorney MA

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Council last addressed allocation of human services February 8, 1999 when it made final decisions on the allocation of the new $50,000 in General Fund support for Human Services. This was the last of three separate processes used to allocate funds in the 1999 Budget. These processes include:

- Council action to directly fund the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center and the Center for Human Services as a part of the budget process,
- a competitive process for Community Development Block Grant funds, and
- a competitive process for general Fund Human Services Funds.

Having these three processes last year was necessary because the total amount of funds available was not known at the beginning of the year. It did however, introduce a level of unpredictability to the process which left some in the community uncertain on how best to work with the City for funding support. While your Council has not yet considered a budget for the year 2000, we are assuming at this point that roughly the same amount of General Funds would be available as we enter the year 2000 human services allocation cycle. Accordingly, your Council asked the staff to examine how these separate processes could be streamlined or merged into one process. In addition, Mayor Jepsen asked that we investigate moving to a two-year funding cycle.

Staff has crafted this year's allocation process so that it:

1. **Is more predictable** in terms of both funds available and process: Our intent is to give agencies and the community clear direction up front as to the amount of funds ultimately available for the year 2000. By giving this clear direction we will encourage agencies to make more realistic funding requests and to allow agencies to have a more realistic assessment of the extent of the City's funding capability.
2. **Focuses more sharply on achieving our Desired Outcomes**. When last year's allocations process began, your Council had yet to receive and review *the Proposed Health and Human Services Strategy*. At your September 28, 1998, meeting, there was a consensus that these were an appropriate set of outcomes to seek to achieve with the City's human services activities. Though the specific strategies and roles the City will use to achieve these Outcomes have yet to be identified, funding is clearly one of the roles we now play.
3. **Implements a Two-year Funding Cycle.** Moving to a two-year funding cycle will decrease the amount of time agencies, staff and your Council spend on the allocation process. The cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way now use this process.

Staff considered two key operational issues in developing this new process: When to move to a two-year cycle and what funds to include in the competitive process.

When to implement a Two-Year Funding Cycle

In considering a two-year cycle we consulted with Bellevue and Redmond, both of which have used this two-year cycle for the past two rounds of allocations. They have had very positive experience using the two-year cycle. They will begin their next cycle for the funding years 2001/2002. They strongly encouraged Shoreline to adopt the two-year cycle. Kirkland is scheduled to move to a two-year cycle in sync with Bellevue and Redmond for 2001/2002. All three communities strongly encouraged Shoreline to stay in sync with the other communities.

Shoreline participates with other cities in the North/East part of King County to coordinate our funding allocation processes. The group—North/East Funders—consists of Shoreline,

Woodinville, Bothell, Issaquah, Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond, Mercer Island and King County. Lake Forest Park, which has a much smaller pot of funds to distribute, does not use this type of competitive process. Kenmore has not yet determined how to address human services funding. Neither City participates as a member of the North/East Funders. The North/East Funders have worked to support one another and to make the application process as easy as possible for agencies. Agencies have benefited from using one standard application and contracting form and from having the cities coordinate their due dates in order to spread out the agencies' peak workloads. Members of this group share the administrative load of preparing applications and providing technical assistance to agencies. As a part of the North/Eastside funding group, the cities get together and discuss the applications that each jurisdiction receives in order to develop staff recommendations that will later be used by the Citizen Advisory Committee and City Council. This allows Shoreline to benefit from the years of combined expertise these other cities possess. As a result of our participation in this group, Shoreline is able to produce a much higher level of service than would be possible were we to go it alone.

We also consulted with several agencies that we fund. They too had a positive response to this potential change. They like the potential reduction of workload and the increased predictability of two-year funding. Time freed up from preparing annual applications could be used to provide more services and to seek support from other funders. Obviously, since the City's budget is on a one-year cycle, we could not obligate funding for the second year. We would instead provide the agencies with a contract that would give the City an escape clause in the event funding for the second year was reduced as a result of unanticipated budget changes.

With the recent arrival of the Health and Human Services Manager, staff and Council will begin the work of refining the strategies used to achieve the Desired Outcomes. This work will not be complete in time to fully inform this year's application process. Committing to a two-year cycle of funding now would delay the time the City could use its Human Services Funding to implement these strategies until 2002.

By implementing the two-year cycle in 2001/2002 the City will maintain maximum flexibility to use its Human Services funding to achieve our Desired Outcomes and continue to take full advantage of the partnership with other cities and to offer agencies a better-coordinated application process.

Combining CDBG and local Human Services Funds

In setting the amount of funds to be included in single allocation process, cities have typically pulled together their CDBG and General Fund support provided to outside agencies. For Shoreline, this would result in combining our CDBG and Human Services funds as well as the funds made available to the Center for Human Services and to the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center into our competitive process. Doing this is consistent with the approach used by all other cities in the North and Eastside area. In the area of youth services, all North/ Eastside cities allocate their support to non-city programs through their competitive process. Support to senior centers and services varies depending on whether or not the city operates its own senior center and whether or not the city has a competitive process. Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland, and Issaquah each operate their own senior center. Woodinville has no senior center. Bothell and Lake Forest Park, like Shoreline, do not themselves operate senior centers. Lake Forest Park does not have a competitive process to allocate human services funds. Bothell is the most similar to Shoreline; it does not operate its senior center and it does have a competitive process. Bothell allocates its support to the senior center through its competitive process.

Combining these funding streams into one process allows the City to be more consistent and effective in its management of the allocation, contracting and monitoring processes. By asking

all agencies to prepare a common application, the City is in a better position to use its funding to implement strategies we may develop to implement the desired outcomes. Finally, combining all the funding streams into a common process allows the City to make its allocation decisions with an understanding of community needs and capacity.

The Community Development Block Grant is the second part of Shoreline's annual allocation for Human Services. For the year 2000, our grant is expected to be $317,113. This amount is dependent on the passage of the Federal Budget and may vary somewhat. The CDBG is divided into categories for public services, capital projects, home repair and planning/administration. Historically Shoreline has included its public services and capital projects funding in the competitive process. Based on historic patterns, the amounts available for competitive allocation in the coming year are $51,388 for public services and $146,616 for capital projects. Staff will come to Council on May 24 for a specific action to confirm this distribution.

Combining these totals, Shoreline's available human services funding for the year 2000 would be allocated through the competitive process is as follows:

General Fund Supported Human Services	$ 157,739
CDBG Public Services	$ 51,388
Total Direct Services	**$ 209,739**
CDBG Capital Projects	**$ 146,616**

SUMMARY

Shoreline is in the process of streamlining its Human Services funds allocation process. This year the City will allocate all of its year 2000 local and CDBG Human Services funds through one competitive application process. The following year, Shoreline will implement a two-year allocation cycle in concert with other cities in North/East King County. These modifications to Shoreline's allocation process will result in a more predictable and less time consuming process for the City and agencies.

RECOMMENDATION

No formal action is required. Staff seeks Council consensus on the recommendation to combine all Human Services and CDBG funds into one allocation process, to continue our one-year funding cycle for the coming year—2000—and move to implement a two-year cycle for 2001 and 2002 funding.

Council Meeting Date: May 17, 1999 **Agenda Item: 6(c)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Objectives For Negotiations With The Town Of Woodway And Snohomish County Regarding Interlocal Agreements Related To Land Use Coordination
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY:	Kristoff T. Bauer, Assistant to the City Manager

EXECUTIVE / COUNCIL SUMMARY

Your Council's sixth item on your 1999 workplan is the continued development of intergovernmental relations with specific mention to complete and interlocal agreement with the Town of Woodway and Snohomish County. As discussed with Council at your April 5, 1999 workshop, an interlocal with Snohomish County is seen as crucial to the protection of the City's interests regarding potential development of the Point Wells area. Similarly, the Woodway Highlands project in the Town of Woodway has demonstrated the potential value of closer land use coordination with that town. Prior to initiating formal negotiations with these governments, staff is presenting, herein, the recommended objectives and initial steps for these discussions for Council's consideration.

Objectives with Woodway

1) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms to ensure cooperative land use decision making where cross border impacts are likely
2) Seek to avoid burdensome or overly duplicative procedural requirements
3) Seek to establish mutual obligations to enforce reasonable mitigation of cross border impacts
4) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms for cooperative and efficient development of transportation infrastructure utilized by the citizens of both cities
5) Seek to establish mechanisms that will provide for the development of a watershed based surface water management system

Detail and discussion of these objectives may be found in the Background/Analysis section of this report. An outline of an interlocal agreement based upon these objectives is attached (See Attachment A). In deference to Woodway's stated preference, with Council concurrence, staff would develop a complete interlocal based upon this outline and the objectives above for review and comment by Woodway.

Objectives for the interlocal with Snohomish County are similar to those for Woodway, but they also include issues related to annexation as established by the Snohomish County Planning Policy relating to cross border annexations (See Attachment B).

Objectives with Snohomish County

1) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms to ensure cooperative land use decision making where cross border impacts are likely
2) Seek to avoid burdensome or overly duplicative procedural requirements
3) Seek to establish mutual obligations to enforce reasonable mitigation of cross border impacts
4) Seek to establish a mechanism for the development and implementation of common land use policies related to Point Wells
5) Seek to establish a road map for the annexation of Point Wells by Shoreline should that course become available and beneficial to the City

With Council concurrence, staff will begin working with County staff to develop the interlocal outline attached (See Attachment C) into a draft agreement for Council consideration.

Snohomish County has a general planning policy that states that the County should oppose any petition for annexation across county boundaries unless the County and the annexing city have executed an annexation agreement. Snohomish County is considering adoption a revised version of this policy as a Countywide Planning Policy that may make future cross border annexation attempts more difficult. Specifically, the proposed Countywide Planning Policy (See Attachment B) would give Woodway a role in establishing the scope of the interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and Shoreline and would provide the Snohomish County Tomorrow Committee ("SCT") a role in determining whether the policy has been complied with in any particular case.

The SCT is a committee comprised of elected officials from Snohomish County and cities in Snohomish County (including Woodway) that is advisory to the County Council. It is recommended that Shoreline participate to the extent possible in the County's policy adoption process. There will be a meeting of the SCT on May 26th to discuss recommending this new Countywide Planning Policy related to cross border annexations. The attendance of the Mayor or his designee could be key in protecting the City's interests in this matter.

Staff also recommends the continued utilization of Reid Shockey, Shockey/Brent, and Steve DiJulio, Foster Pepper & Shefelman, (both critical in past explorations of land use issues related to Point Wells and the Town of Woodway) for the development of these interlocal agreements.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for discussion purposes only. Staff seeks Council comment regarding recommended objectives and next steps for the negotiations of interlocal agreements with Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway. No action is requested.

Approved By: City Manager JB City Attorney N/A

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The City Council 1999 Work Plan has as its sixth item:

"Continue to strengthen intergovernmental relations.

- Pursue interlocal agreements with Woodway, School District and surrounding cities as appropriate.
- Strengthen communications and collaboration with the School District and other public agencies."

Your Council has met in a joint session with the School Board earlier this year and established a committee to meet regularly. The City is working with the District to develop a work plan to address common issues and staffs from both organizations are hammering out the final details of a Joint Use Agreement for consideration by the Council and the School Board.

In 1998, the Town of Woodway began the consideration of the Woodway Highlands development project. New traffic from this development is expected to impact Shoreline streets. Despite this fact, the Town of Woodway has not cooperated with Shoreline's efforts to ensure that alternate transportation routes and mitigation for these impacts are provided. The City has had some success in addressing mitigation issues by working directly with the developer and will continue to take steps necessary to protect the City's interests. An interlocal agreement establishing the scope and means of cooperation between the cities on land use issues would assist in preventing this from reoccurring.

The City's comprehensive plan identified Point Wells as a potential annexation area. The only access to this property is through Shoreline. The current use and any future use of this property will impact the City of Shoreline. King County has identified Point Wells as a potential site for a regional wastewater treatment facility. Snohomish County is currently the permitting authority for this area. As discussed with Council at your April 5, 1999 workshop, an interlocal agreement with Snohomish County is the only way Shoreline may be able to gain a direct role in a permitting process related to such a regional facility should the Point Wells site be selected.

It is also recommended that Shoreline negotiate an agreement with Snohomish County that contains the elements included in the current GPP related to cross border annexations (See Attachment B).

Further, Snohomish County has also begun a process of amending its planning policy related to cross border annexations. This process has the potential to create new barriers to the satisfaction of the objectives below in two key ways. First, this process would adopt a version of the current General Planning Policy ("GPP") as a Countywide Planning Policy (See Attachment B). GPP's are guidelines interpreted and applied by County staff. The interpretation and application of Countywide Planning Policies, in contrast, is influenced by recommendations from the Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee ("SCT") (a committee composed of elected officials from Snohomish County cities including Woodway that makes recommendations to the Snohomish County Council).

Second, The revised policy requires that any pre-annexation interlocal agreement between a King County City and Snohomish County address all issues raised by an adjacent Snohomish County city impacted by the proposed annexation (i.e. Woodway).

King County cities, such as Shoreline, would not have the same standing to identify issues that must be addressed in the annexation agreement prior to annexation.

There will be a meeting of the SCT on May 26th to discuss recommending this new Countywide Planning Policy related to cross border annexations. The attendance of the Mayor or his designee could be key in protecting the City's interests in this matter.

OBJECTIVES

Staff is proposing to move forward with the initiation of discussions with both the Town of Woodway and Snohomish County. Objectives for the discussions with the Town of Woodway focus on impacts or interests that cross the jurisdictional boundary between the two cities (e.g. development impacts, transportation, and water). These objectives will be a subset of those for the discussion with Snohomish County, which will also include objectives related to annexation.

Objectives with Woodway

1) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms to ensure cooperative land use decision making where cross border impacts are likely

   - Fulfilling this objective would begin with the identification of the scope of development that is likely to result in cross border impacts. Closer relationships between the planning functions of the two cities and mechanisms to provide both cities standing in the development decisions within this scope would follow.

2) Seek to avoid burdensome or overly duplicative procedural requirements

   - This objective focuses on the means for achieving the first objective indicating that mutual participation in land use decision making processes is preferred to separate duplicative processes. It would be preferred, for example, for one city to be involved and assist the other in making a common SEPA determination rather then providing for the generation of separate SEPA determinations that would then need to be consolidated.

3) Seek to establish mutual obligations to enforce reasonable mitigation of cross border impacts

   - Where a development project has cross border impacts and the non-permitting city desires mitigation for those impacts, the permitting city should enforce the mitigation requirements of the other. The Woodway Highlands project demonstrates the risks born by each city should this objective not be satisfied. It will be important, however, to include terms that will ensure that provisions related to this objective can not be used to unreasonably stifle appropriate development.

4) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms for cooperative and efficient development of transportation infrastructure utilized by the citizens of both cities

   - Whether the cities have any common interests in the development of trail, road, or regional transportation facilities is currently unknown. The focus of this objective is to take advantage of common interests in these areas that may exist or that may develop over time.

5) Seek to establish mechanisms that will provide for the development of a watershed based surface water management system

   - Water doesn't respect jurisdictional boundaries, and upstream intervention may be the most efficient and environmentally sound means of resolving downstream problems. While there are no outstanding watershed issues between the cities at this time, the ability to have a cooperative dialogue aimed at managing entire watershed surface water system could assist both cities in weathering upcoming environmental challenges including compliance with developing state and federal regulations.

An outline of an interlocal agreement built from these objectives is attached (See Attachment A).

Objectives with Snohomish County

The first three objectives for this agreement mirror those of the proposed Woodway agreement with the only difference likely to be that this agreement is likely to be less mutual, that is it is expected to focus on Shoreline's interest in development at Point Wells. The counter balance to this interest is likely to be Snohomish County's interest in ensuring that development consistent with its planning policies can occur at Point Wells.

1) Seek to establish relationships and mechanisms to ensure cooperative land use decision making where cross border impacts are likely
2) Seek to avoid burdensome or overly duplicative procedural requirements
3) Seek to establish mutual obligations to enforce reasonable mitigation of cross border impacts
4) Seek to establish a mechanism for the development and implementation of common land use policies related to Point Wells

   - Snohomish County has identified Point Wells as an urban growth area, which indicates that a city is expected to annex the area eventually. A mechanism for the development of land use policies at Point Wells consistent with the interests of Shoreline, Snohomish County, and other stakeholders (e.g. Woodway) is seen as a customary first step in the annexation process. Implementation of this common vision would then prepare the area (i.e. provide for consistent road standards, etc.) for eventual incorporation into the annexing city.

5) Seek to establish a road map for the annexation of Point Wells by Shoreline should that course become available and beneficial to the City

   - Snohomish County planning policies establish a laundry list of issues (See Attachment B) aimed at clarifying the timing and responsibilities of both parties to an annexation that must be resolved prior to an annexation gaining the support of the County. Resolving these issues in advance reduces the risk of unexpected impacts from an annexation and would allow Shoreline to complete a more certain analysis of the costs and benefits of completing the annexation.

An outline of an interlocal agreement based upon these objectives is attached (See Attachment C)

NEXT STEPS

The City contacted Woodway in early February 1999 to ascertain the point of contact for this discussion. Woodway stated in response that they would prefer to review and respond to a completed interlocal proposed by Shoreline. In deference to that preference, the next step would be to develop the text of a complete interlocal agreement between the two cities based upon the objectives above and the outline attached. That draft would then be provided to Woodway for review and comment.

Snohomish County has expressed a willingness to work with Shoreline in an effort to develop this kind of interlocal agreement. With Council's concurrence, staff would begin meeting with County staff in an effort to collaboratively develop language to complete the outline attached. At the same time, the County has begun a process to consider the adoption of a revised policy regarding cross border annexations. How this policy is crafted and who has a role in interpreting it may have long lasting repercussions on Shoreline's interests regarding Point Wells. There will be a key meeting of elected officials from Snohomish County cities on this issue on May 26th. Staff recommends that the Mayor or his designee be prepared to meet with key participants in this process and attend the meeting to represent Shoreline's interests in this issue.

Staff recommends the utilization of a team including staff from the City Manager's Office and Planning & Development Services assisted by Reid Shockey, Shockey/Brent, and Steve DiJulio, Foster Pepper, for the development of these interlocal agreements. Mr. Shockey assisted the City in analyzing the current zoning and annexation process of Point Wells as part of the team that developed the report on the wastewater treatment facility. Mr. DiJulio also assisted in the creation of that report and has been advising the City throughout the unfolding of the Woodway Highlands issue.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for discussion purposes only. Staff seeks Council comment regarding recommended objectives and next steps for the negotiations of interlocal agreements with Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway. No action is requested.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Draft Outline of Interlocal Agreement With The Town Of Woodway

Attachment B - Current and Proposed Snohomish County Planning Policy Related to Cross Border Annexations

Attachment C - Draft Outline of Interlocal Agreement With Snohomish County

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT

Interlocal Agreement Between The City Of Shoreline And The Town Of Woodway Related To Cross Border Coordination Of Municipal Activities

1. Land Use

a) **Notification (scope, nature, timing)**

b) **Participation in review process**

c) **Lead Agency Determination**

d) **Reciprocal impact mitigation (process for establishing project mitigation, enforcement)**

e) **Planning (scope of involvement)**

2. Transportation

a) **Planning (scope of involvement)**

b) **Capital Improvement Plan Coordination (notice, joint project development)**

c) **Management responsibility for 205th**

3. Surface Water Management

a) **Planning (scope of involvement)**

b) **Capital Improvement Plan Coordination (notice, joint project development)**

c) **Transfer Of Impact Fees (when, how)**

Alternative Snohomish County Cross Border Annexation Policies

Current Policy (not of general application):

> The county shall not support any proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district situated predominantly outside of Snohomish County unless and until an annexation agreement has been signed by the county and said district or city. Such agreement shall address and substantially resolve issues of land use, applicable development regulations, permit processing, public services delivery, facilities financing, transportation planning, concurrency management, and any other similar jurisdictional issues identified by the county. Such agreement should be approved prior to city acceptance of an annexation petition.

Proposed Countywide Planning Policy (would be generally applied):

> An interlocal agreement shall be in place for proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district situated predominately outside of Snohomish County. This agreement shall address and substantially resolve issues of land use, applicable development regulations, permit processing, public service delivery, facilities financing, transportation, concurrency management, mitigation payments, public infrastructure maintenance/improvement short falls and any other similar jurisdictional issues identified by the County and the city or district proposing the annexation and adjacent city impacted by the proposed annexation. Such agreement shall be approved prior to the city or district submitting a Notice of Intention to Annex to the County Boundary Review Board.

ATTACHMENT C

DRAFT

Interlocal Agreement Between Snohomish County And The City Of Shoreline Relating Land Use Coordination And Annexation Within The City's Urban Growth Area

1. Pre-Annexation Coordination

a) **Pre-Zoning (zone consistent with City Comp. Plan)**

b) **Snohomish County Comprehensive Planning (City participation/coordination, Point Wells sub-area plan)**

c) **Development Standards (adoption, process, enforcement of City standards, limitations to meet County objectives)**

d) **Public Infrastructure Maintenance/Improvement Short Falls**

2. Land Use

a) **Notification (scope, nature, timing)**

b) **Participation in review process**

c) **Lead Agency Determination**

d) **Reciprocal impact mitigation (process for establishing project mitigation, enforcement)**

3. Annexation Policies

a) **County Land Use Objectives (City required to cooperate with)**

b) **Transfer of Permitting (code, timing, fee)**

c) **Transfer of Records**

d) **Roads / Facilities Financing (road ownership, acquisition of ROW, fees and/or tax revenue)**

e) **Transfer of Mitigation (authority to enforce, division of fees)**

f) **Parks (may not be needed)**

g) **Coordination With Other Jurisdictions (cross reference Woodway interlocal, an interlocal with the Edmond Port District may also be necessary)**

h) **Delivery Of Public Services (which agencies will provide services)**

4. Post Annexation Land Use Planning

a) **Comprehensive Plan Concurrency Management (scope, notice, planning coordination)**

b) **Transportation Planning (scope of involvement)**