

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Amending the Comprehensive Plan by Adopting Ordinance No. 357, Authorizing the City's 2005 – 2010 Capital Improvement Plan and Proposed Amendments to the Capital Facilities Table CF-1: Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan
DEPARTMENT:	Finance
PRESENTED BY:	Debbie Tarry, Finance Director

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On June 14, 2004, staff presented the proposed 2005 – 2010 CIP to the City Council. The following schedule is being followed to facilitate the adoption of the 2005 – 2010 CIP.

June 14, 2004	Presentation of the Proposed 2005 – 2010 CIP
June 17, 2004	Planning Commission Public Hearing on Proposed 2005-2010 CIP
June 21, 2004	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2005 – 2010 CIP
June 28, 2004	Public Hearing on the Proposed 2005 – 2010 CIP
July 6, 2004	Council Discussion on the Proposed 2005 – 2010 CIP
July 12, 2004	Council Adoption of 2005 – 2010 CIP

Tonight, the Council will consider amending the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the proposed 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan and update the Capital Facilities Table CF-1: Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan by adopting Ordinance No. 357 (Attachment A). The updated table now reflects historical revenue and expenditures for the years 1997 through 2003 and projected revenues and expenditures for the years 2004 through 2010 (Exhibit A). Projected costs beyond 2010 have not been included in the table because the City has not yet completed that level of analysis. With the completion of the Transportation Master Plan, Surface Water Master Plan and the update of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan in 2004, the City will have accurate data and cost projections to better support the development and adoption of the CIP in future years. Table CF-1 will also be updated in 2005 to reflect this analysis.

Table CF-1 is being updated now to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and the CIP are consistent to ensure compliance with the Growth Management Act. The Planning Commission has reviewed the Proposed CIP and amended Table CF-1 for consistency and recommends adoption of the amendments. A copy of the Planning Commission minutes reflecting their recommendation is included in this packet as Attachment B.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Proposed 2005-2010 CIP is balanced, as required by the Growth Management Act. The Proposed 2005-2010 CIP totals \$130.5 million. The following table is a summary of the six-year plan by fund:

Capital Fund	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
General Capital	\$15,234,593	\$8,599,436	\$429,058	\$307,840	\$201,353	\$203,170	\$24,975,451
Roads Capital	\$23,962,961	\$8,980,331	\$7,488,069	\$18,447,195	\$18,895,726	\$18,959,685	\$96,733,967
SWM Capital	\$2,434,000	\$2,452,000	\$2,016,000	\$594,000	\$615,000	\$637,000	\$8,748,000
CIP By Year	\$41,631,554	\$20,031,767	\$9,933,128	\$19,349,035	\$19,712,079	\$19,799,855	\$130,457,418

Attachment C is a summary of the proposed 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan by project.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Council adopt the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, including the 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan, by approving Ordinance No. 357.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Ordinance No. 357, Amending the Comprehensive Plan

Exhibit A -Table CF-1: Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan

Attachment B – Planning Commission Minute Excerpt from the Planning Commission Meeting of June 17, 2004.

Attachment C - Proposed 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan Summary

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

ORDINANCE NO. 357

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE,
WASHINGTON, AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO
ADD THE 2005 - 2010 SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT
PLAN AND UPDATE THE CAPITAL FACILITIES TABLE CF-1:
TWENTY YEAR CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN**

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 331 on July 21, 2003 which adopted the 2004 – 2009 Capital Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council conducted a public hearing on the proposed 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Plan on June 28, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) requires the adoption of the Capital Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, staff has proposed and recommended amendments to Table CF-1 Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission developed a recommendation on the amendments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the amendments adopted by this ordinance are consistent with and implement the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan and comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A);

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

Section 1. Adopting the 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan. The City hereby adopts the six-year Capital Improvement Plan for the years 2005 – 2010 filed with the City Clerk under Clerk's Receiving No. 2904.

Section 2 Amendment. The Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Table CF-1: Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan is amended as set forth in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3. Effective Date and Publication. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City. This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force July 20, 2004.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON July 12, 2004.

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: July 15, 2004
Effective Date: July 20, 2004

EXHIBIT A

TWENTY YEAR CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

TABLE CF-1: GENERAL CAPITAL FACILITIES:

Municipal and Police Facilities

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Facilities

All figures are expressed millions of dollars - Excludes Non-Project Specific Engineering & Overhead

Capital Facilities plan 1997-2010	1997-2003	2004	2005-2017	Total
<u>MUNICIPAL and POLICE FACILITIES</u>				
Project Costs, By Type				
Municipal Office Improvements/Facilities	1.99	0.71	0.10	2.80
New Municipal Building	3.58	0.24	19.18	23.00
Total Municipal/Police Project Costs	5.57	0.95	19.28	25.80
<u>PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE</u>				
Project Costs, By Type				
Parks	5.77	1.21	3.03	10.01
Recreation Facilities	3.07	0.18	0.33	3.58
Open Space	-	0.10	1.60	1.70
Total Parks, Recreation & Open Space Project Costs	8.84	1.49	4.96	15.29
Total General Facilities Project Costs	14.41	2.44	24.24	41.09
Project Revenues, By Source				
Real Estate Excise Tax	5.05	0.65	2.59	8.29
General Fund (Property Tax) Transfers	5.02	1.68	4.03	10.73
Grants	2.90	0.05	2.93	5.88
Interest Earnings	-	0.06	0.31	0.37
Cash Reserves	-	-	3.79	3.79
Bonds/Municipal Debt	-	-	10.60	10.60
Misc/Other	1.44	-	-	1.44
Total Project Revenues	14.41	2.44	24.24	41.10

NOTE: Project expenditures are listed by the category which best describes the primary purpose of the project. In some cases, projects listed in one category may include secondary components from other categories. For example, a park project may provid

TABLE CF-1: TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES:

All figures are expressed millions of dollars - Excludes Non-Project Specific Engineering & Overhead

Capital Facilities plan 1997-2010	1997-2003	2004	2005-2017	Total
<u>TRANSPORTATION</u>				
Project Costs, By Type				
Concurrency Improvements	-	-	-	-
Safety/Operations	6.98	7.77	81.71	96.46
Pedestrian/Bike	3.43	4.30	6.94	14.68
System Preservation	4.00	1.26	5.44	10.70
Total Project Costs	14.42	13.32	94.09	121.84
 Project Revenues, By Source				
Real Estate Excise Tax	5.05	0.69	4.41	10.14
General Fund (Property Tax) Transfers	2.41	1.42	7.43	11.26
Grants	5.25	7.70	71.56	84.51
Interest Earnings	0.12	0.31	1.57	2.01
Cash Reserves	-	2.86	6.75	9.62
Bonds/Municipal Debt	-	-	-	-
Misc/Other	1.59	0.35	2.37	4.31
Total Project Revenues	14.42	13.32	94.09	121.84

NOTE: Project expenditures are listed by the category which best describes the primary purpose of the project. In some cases, projects listed in one category may include secondary components from other categories. For example, a park project may provide

TABLE CF-1: SURFACE WATER UTILITY FACILITIES:

All figures are expressed millions of dollars - Excludes Non-Project Specific Engineering & Overhead

Capital Facilities plan 1997-2010	1997-2003	2004	2005-2017	Total
<u>STORMWATER</u>				
Project Costs, By Type				
Conveyance & Treatment	2.82	1.88	6.57	11.26
Stream Rehabilitation/Habitat Enhancement	0.01	0.23	0.46	0.71
Total Project Costs	2.83	2.11	7.03	11.97
Project Revenues, By Source				
Surface Water Management Fund Transfer	1.69	0.40	3.96	6.05
Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest Earnings	-	-	0.38	0.38
Cash Reserves	-	-	-	-
Bonds/Municipal Debt/Loans	0.82	1.67	2.69	5.18
Misc/Other	0.32	0.04	-	0.36
Total Project Revenues	2.82	2.11	7.03	11.98

NOTE: Project expenditures are listed by the category which best describes the primary purpose of the project. In some cases, projects listed in one category may include secondary components from other categories. For example, a park project may provide

TABLE CF-1: NON-CITY CAPITAL FACILITIES

For capital facility plans from service providers other than the City of Shoreline, the reader is referred to the Comprehensive and/or Capital Facility Plans of the following responsible agencies:

GENERAL FACILITIES

Historical Museum, Shoreline Center
Shoreline School District

Libraries
King County Library District
Postal Buildings
U.W. Postal Service

Public Housing
King County Housing Authority

Human Services
Washington Department of Health
Washington D.S.H.S.

Public Safety
Fire Dept No. 4
King County Corrections
King County District Court
Washington State Patrol

Public Schools
Shoreline School District

Community College
Shoreline Community College

Transportation
Metro/King County
Sound Transit
WSDOT

Land Reserves
Washington DNR

UTILITIES

Water
Seattle Public Utilities Water Division
Shoreline Water District

Wastewater
Highland Sewer District
Ronald Wastewater District

Solid Waste
King County Solid Waste Division
Rabanco
Waste Management Northwest

Electricity
Seattle City Light

Natural Gas
Puget Sound Energy

Telecommunications
Air Touch West
AT&T
Chambers Cable
Electric Lightwave
GTE
Metricom
TCI Cablevision of WA
US West Communications

STAFF REPORTS

a. Type L – Legislative Public Hearing on the 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Plan

Chair Harris reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing.

Jeff Ding, Planner, advised that the purpose of the hearing is to introduce the City of Shoreline's 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to the public and the Planning Commission. He explained that the Planning Commission's role in the hearing and discussion is fairly narrow. Their responsibility is to review the proposed Capital Improvement Program for consistency with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and to review the proposed amendments to the 20-year Capital Facilities Plan for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria. He advised that there are three Comprehensive Plan amendment decision criteria as follows:

- ❖ The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the City's Comprehensive Plan; or
- ❖ The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a sub-area plan or corrects information; or
- ❖ The amendment benefits the community as a whole and does not adversely affect community facilities, health, safety or welfare.

Mr. Ding said that as staff has reviewed the CIP, they have concluded that with the adoption of the CIP and the amendment to Table CF-1 (Attachment B-1), the Capital Facilities Plan meets both the first and second criteria in that it is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with Countywide Planning Policies or the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Capital Facilities Plan and the Capital Improvement Plan also address changing circumstances and corrects information that is now in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Ding explained that the future review of the CIP would be made easier once the Comprehensive Plan Update is completed to include adoption of the new Transportation and Stormwater Master Plans, and the update of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, referred to the schedule that would be followed for the adoption of the CIP. She said the CIP was presented to the City Council on June 14th, and they are aware that the Commission would be holding a public hearing. She advised that the City Council would continue to review the CIP throughout June and early July, with scheduled adoption on July 12th. They will be holding a public hearing on June 28th.

Ms. Tarry said the CIP is to be used as a long-term policy document to help the City identify future capital investment priorities, and as a financial planning tool for future

capital investments. She advised that one of the challenges is that the City is currently in the process of developing master plans that will contain 20 years worth of projects with priorities. To date, they have been following the priorities set by City Council goals and the Comprehensive Plan policies. The master plans will help clarify the future needs of the City and what order they should be considered. She said the CIP could also be used as a management tool when forecasting future capital demands on current revenues. The CIP also provides cost estimates and schedules based on known and assumed details and policies. She emphasized that the CIP is a document that is flexible and subject to change. It is reviewed on an annual basis, and if priorities or circumstances have changed, it can be amended.

Ms. Tarry explained that most of the projects identified in the CIP have not been fully scoped for work. Therefore, the project costs are estimates and are subject to change. The CIP is not a precise document in relation to schedule. It contains an estimate for planning purposes, but as projects are fully scoped, the schedules may need to be revised.

Ms. Tarry advised that the amendments to the Capital Facilities Plan are reflected in Table CF-1. This table was updated to include the actual capital expenditures for 1997 through 2003 and the estimated expenditures that will occur in 2004. The remaining period of time reflects the proposed 2005-2010 CIP. She explained that when the Master Plans are completed, this table would reflect the 20-year project plan costs. The master plans are anticipated to be adopted by the City Council at the end of 2004.

Ms. Tarry explained that there are 30 projects identified in the proposed CIP, and they are very similar to the projects that were in the 2004-2009 document. The total projected expenditure for the projects is \$130.5 million. The funding and project categories fall into three funding areas. General Capital includes such things as general facilities and parks and open space. Roads Capital includes projects related to pedestrian safety, road system preservation, and transportation safety. The largest project in this category would be the Aurora Ave improvements, and other projects include the Interurban Trail and North City. The Surface Water Capital includes any projects related to the surface water drainage system and some stream rehabilitation and habitat enhancement.

Ms. Tarry referred to a pie chart illustrating how the CIP is proposed to be funded. She noted that a large portion would come from grants, and this is heavily related to the Aurora Ave and Interurban Trail Projects. They have also allocated a portion of the general fund for capital projects. Some of the smaller resources include real estate excise tax and surface water fees. She said the largest portion of the CIP is related to transportation safety, and the largest project in that category is the Aurora Project. About 15 percent of the CIP has been allocated for facilities, and the major project in that category is the proposed new City Hall.

Jill Marilley, City Engineer, reviewed that City Hall is a large project that is still in the real estate phase and would be funded by the general capital fund. The Richmond Beach Master Plan will be started as soon as the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan is adopted later in the year. This project will be coupled with the Saltwater Park pedestrian

bridge replacement project. While this bridge is safe, they are anticipating ahead to the future when the bridge will need to be replaced and tie this in with any improvements that are made at Richmond Beach Park as a whole.

Ms. Marilley advised that construction of the Spartan Gym should get started later this year. Regarding the repair and replacement at neighborhood parks, she said this is a regular project that appears in the CIP to address the upkeep of work. The CIP includes not only new capital projects, but also maintaining the regular capital projects. The Cromwell Park master plan will begin once the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan has been adopted. The Hamlin Park Open Space Acquisition was included in the CIP so that the City could be prepared for the hopeful future of Seattle Public Utilities surplussing the property. The City would definitely be the first in line for that particular property to enhance Hamlin Park.

Ms. Marilley said the roads capital fund includes significant projects such as the Interurban Trail. Two sections have been completed to date. The next section will be built towards the end of 2004. The Interurban Trail pedestrian project would include two bridges to bring pedestrian and bicycle traffic over 155th Ave and over Aurora Ave to transition the City Light Project on the west side of Aurora. The curb ramp, gutter and sidewalk program is a replacement program, and not necessarily seeking to build new sidewalks. The traffic small works projects add flexibility to be able to respond to priorities that come up throughout the year. The annual road surface maintenance program was approved by the City Council for annual work.

The Richmond Beach overcross would go over the Burlington Northern tracks and would serve Apple Tree Lane. This has been on the CIP for a while, but they have just recently been able to reach an agreement with Burlington Northern. The next step is to take the project plans out to the community. The Aurora Ave project is the largest project in this fund, and design on Phase I from 145th Ave to 165th Ave is continuing. Staff is expecting to go to bid early next year. The project should be well underway by this time next year. The North City Business District 15th Ave NE improvement project is being advertised right now for construction bids, which will open on July 1st. At this time, staff is tentatively planning a groundbreaking ceremony in August. The neighborhood traffic safety program will continue throughout the next six years, but the scope was broadened to allow more flexibility to the program. The goal is to review the program so that they can be more quickly responsive to the neighborhood concerns. This program is a partnership program between the City and the neighborhoods to come up with a collective agreement about what should be done.

Ms. Marilley said the Surface Water Capital Fund includes surface water small projects, which are ongoing projects to address local spot problems. During the last few years, the City has been able to do several phases of the Ronald Bog drainage improvement project. They found that the improvements that have been completed to date have reduced flooding. Because of some minor improvements and extensive maintenance throughout the area, Ronald Bog didn't overtop or flood the area south of the bog when the significant storm occurred. They also reduced the impact in the area at 10th NE and NE 175th. The surface water master plan will address what more they can do in the Ronald

Bog area to best utilize the funds without doing more than is really necessary. The first phase of the 3rd Ave NW drainage improvement project will go to bid this fall, and construction will be started and completed in early 2005. This project is being coupled with work that Metro is doing in the area of Boeing Creek Park. They are doing some detention work and rebuilding a pump station. The City has been able to partner with them to do improvements to the park and create surface water improvements to the retention pond in the area. Finally, she said the stream rehabilitation/habitat enhancement program continues.

Ms. Marilley said that from time-to-time, the staff provides quarterly status updates to the City Council regarding the progress of the CIP. She summarized that the staff's recommendation is that the Commission recommend adoption of the CIP and the amendment to Table CF-1 to the City Council based on consistency with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Sands asked how the proposed 2005-2010 CIP compares dollar wise to the 2004-2009 CIP. He noted that the total amount for the proposed plan is \$135 million. He questioned if there is really enough money in the City's funds to pay for all of the projects identified in the updated plan. Ms. Tarry responded that the 2004-2009 CIP was about \$131 million. The 2005-2010 CIP differs because there will be some projects that will be completed in 2004 and then fall off, such as two section of the Interurban Trail. There is one new project in the new CIP, which is the Saltwater Park Pedestrian Bridge. A large portion of this is scheduled to be funded with grants. She explained that the Council's policy regarding the amount of general funding available is a known amount. But they don't know yet if they will actually receive a grant for a particular project. If they believe a project is eligible to receive a grant, they show a large portion of the project as grant funded. In order for a project to be eligible for grant funding, it must be included in the adopted CIP.

If grants are not obtained, a project will either not occur, the City will have to find another funding source, or another project will have to be given up in order to provide funding. Staff believes the revenue sources identified in the CIP are accurate.

Commissioner Hall referred to the figure identified in Table CF-1 for pedestrian and bicycle programs. He questioned if this includes everything listed in the CIP under pedestrian, non-motorized projects, including the new curb ramp, gutters and sidewalk programs and the traffic small works program. Ms. Tarry answered affirmatively. Commissioner Hall inquired if the new curb ramp, gutter and sidewalk program and the traffic small works program are both limited to strictly to non-motorized projects. Or would it be possible for the traffic small works project to fund a road improvement. He referred to the total dollar amount listed in Table CF-1 under pedestrian and bicycle programs, and said it is not clear that this total dollar amount is restricted to pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Ms. Tarry said pedestrian and bicycle improvements could include some roadwork to improve their safety. Commissioner Hall expressed his concern that the way the traffic small works project is described, funding could be used for things other than pedestrian and bicycle improvements, which would mean that the amendment to the CIP could effectively shift funding away from pedestrian and bicycle

improvements and towards motorized traffic improvements. Ms. Tarry said the intent is that projects funded by this account should remain pedestrian and bicycle oriented.

Commissioner Hall referred to Page 27 of the staff report. The language on this page states that the curb ramp, gutter and sidewalk program was created by combining the former curb ramp and sidewalk repair programs, but the funding level would remain the same. However, it appears that in 2004 the Curb Ramp Program was funded at \$78,000 and the Sidewalk Program was funded at \$160,000 for a total of \$238,000 (Page 82 of the CIP). Yet the 2005 budget for the combined program is \$104,000. Ms. Tarry explained that if a project or the funding is not completed in the previous year, they do a re-appropriation or carry over. What is reflected in the 2004 budget is what was originally adopted in the 2004 CIP, plus monies that were not fully expended at the end of 2003. Commissioner Hall summarized that he was comparing the 2005 CIP with the budget rather than the previous CIP, which was a mistake.

Commissioner Doering referred to Page 82 of the CIP under “Safety/Operations Projects,” and noted that it identifies \$40,000 for the North 185th and Aurora Intersection Preliminary Study. However, it states that construction for this project would not begin until about 2007 and it would be completed in 2009. She said she doesn’t understand why the City would spend \$40,000 in 2004 yet do nothing else on the project until 2007. She noted that there is an interim project that needs to be attended to on 185th and Aurora Ave because Fred Meyer is remodeling. Mr. Stewart replied that representatives from Fred Meyer have attended a pre-application meeting discussing a potential upgrade, but the City has not received a building permit application. Commissioner Doering noted that the Subway business has already redeveloped and the piano store also did some improvements. The gateway project is going to occur in this area, too. She suggested that the southwest corner of 185th is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and new businesses are being constructed, yet nothing is scheduled to be done until 2009. She said she understands it would probably be more fiscally prudent to do the whole thing at once, but she is concerned about pedestrian safety. Right now, there is no separation between the pedestrians and the vehicles.

Ms. Marilley said the intention of the \$40,000 that is budgeted for the 185th and Aurora Intersection in 2004 is to sort out what they can do at the intersection in advance of the major improvements. In addition, staff will continue to pursue grant funding to rebuild Aurora Ave, but right now there is no money to do any major improvements at 185th. If any development comes through that triggers the correct requirements, they could assist the City in their goals for that intersection. She said staff is also taking into consideration the Brightwater mitigation that will bring funds in for improvements of this type. Ms. Marilley said the City also has a grant to do pedestrian improvements, and they are looking to do a pedestrian signal in the area of approximately 180th Street to improve the situation in advance of the Aurora Project.

Commissioner Doering suggested that the 185th Street and Aurora Ave Intersection be added to the section outlining changes to existing projects. She said she doesn’t just want

a study to be done to identify what is wrong. She would like to go beyond the study and make some improvements to change the existing situation.

Ms. Markle reminded the Commission that the intent of the Commission's review is to compare whether or not the CIP meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Adding projects to the CIP is not within the scope of what the Commission is being asked to do. Despite that, the staff can be very clear that if there are funds available to do this work in advance, it should be actively pursued. The staff is painfully aware of this situation.

Commissioner Doering referred to the next to the last bullet on Page 3 of the CIP, which states, "Develop a proactive code enforcement program." She noted that the current code enforcement program is to react if a citizen calls with a complaint. She inquired how a proactive code enforcement program would be created. Mr. Stewart said this goal is an outcome of the City Council retreat of a few months ago when it was added as a work item goal. Staff is putting together a report that will go before the City Council in August to clarify what types of proactive projects they would like them to focus on. Once this direction has been provided, the staff will be in a position to further develop a program. Some of the things that are being looked at would be illegal parking on public rights-of-way, illegal parking on private property, nuisance properties, etc. He said the first step is to identify the problems they want the new program to address and how aggressive they want to be. The citizen survey that was recently conducted identified a number of problems and issues related to code enforcement.

Commissioner Kuboi referred to the comment on Page 89 of the CIP related to the annual road and surface maintenance program and how it is being under funded by \$200,000 per year. He questioned what the logical end to this situation would be. He understands that the City can't continue to under fund something over a six-year period without expecting serious repercussions. Ms. Tarry said this is an issue that must be addressed by the City Council sometime this year. The challenge is that one of the major funding sources for the transportation budget has been sealed with the passage of Initiative 776. Ms. Marilley pointed out that regardless of the customer survey, the City's roads are in better shape than they were when the City incorporated. While there is time to figure out the issue, the City Council must continue to address this as a funding policy.

Commissioner Kuboi asked how the Central Shoreline Master Plan and the Transfer Station Master Plan would factor into the CIP. Mr. Stewart explained that the Central Shoreline Master Plan was developed but never adopted. It is currently in draft form and is used as a guidance document. It is not a mandate and there are no regulations or implementing capital improvement projects associated with it. If a master plan is adopted for a geographic area, there is and should be an associated capital improvement schedule or needs list that goes along with that. While these master plans are not yet part of the CIP, they would be included once a master plan is adopted by the City Council. He pointed out that many of the projects in the CIP support the re-development of the Central Shoreline Sub Area, such as the Interurban Trail.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that if any Commissioner wants to comment on the actual document, they should express their views at the City Council Meeting. She expressed her concern that the CIP allocates two-thirds of the budget going towards transportation safety/operations, 4 percent for parks, and 5 percent for pedestrian non-motorized. She suggested that this is out of balance. She said she walks from Richland Highlands to the Shoreline Center, which means she has to cross Aurora Ave. She expressed her concern about the dangers of crossing Aurora Ave. People need to be able to safely cross Aurora Ave, and improvements should be placed at the top of the CIP list of priorities. She suggested that any project that involves people walking or bicycling should be given the top priority. She said she is also disappointed to see how small the parks funding is compared to transportation funding.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that it is important to reinforce the City's policy regarding their 1% for the Arts Contribution. Perhaps this item should be included on the pie chart that illustrates where the funding would be spent.

Commissioner McClelland said it would be informative to know how the City's CIP distribution compares with other similar cities in the area. She noted that there is no line item in the CIP for acquisition of land, yet they will need more parkland and open space in the future. She suggested that perhaps they need more elaborate policies to justify capital expenditures.

Ms. Tarry said staff has not compared the City of Shoreline's CIP with other similar cities, but most have a similar level of funding sources for capital projects. She said it is important to understand that there are certain funding sources that can only be used for specific types of projects. In some ways, this puts a limitation on the distribution of the types of projects within the CIP, itself. Unfortunately, the general projects fund, which includes parks, etc., has the lowest funding level at this point. She also noted that if the Aurora Project were separated out of the Road Fund, the numbers would be substantially lower. Commissioner McClelland said that because the Aurora Ave Project skews the pie chart and the appearance of priorities, perhaps this should be clarified.

Commissioner Piro reminded the Commission that the goal of the Aurora Project is to make the street, which is strictly vehicular now, into something that is more multi-modal with improved transit, pedestrian access, etc. He said the Commission group that worked on the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan tried to redirect what seemed to be a lot of road and vehicle emphasis to more of a emphasis on mobility and accessibility of people and goods.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if the Central Shoreline Sub Area Plan would ever be adopted by the City Council. Mr. Stewart said it has not been adopted yet, but the Commission could request that this plan be moved forward. He recalled that concerns were raised at the last review that have not been resolved yet. Commissioner Piro suggested that staff provide an update on the status of the Central Shoreline Sub Area Plan and outline the contentious issues that are still outstanding.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

COMMISSIONER HALL MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF THE 2005-2010 CIP AND THE AMENDMENTS TO TABLE CF-1 BASED ON CONSISTENCY WITH THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Piro said he has no problem with combining the two programs, but the title “Traffic Small Works Program” is troubling to him. He suggested that another term be used that does not include the word “traffic.” Staff indicated that they would address this concern.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attachment C

**City of Shoreline 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY**

EXPENDITURES	Proposed 2005	Proposed 2006	Proposed 2007	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Total 2005-2010
Fund							
<i>Project</i>							
General Capital							
<i>Facilities Projects</i>							
City Hall	\$14,121,000	\$5,060,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,181,000
City Gateways Plan and Implementation of Gateways	\$103,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$103,000
<i>Parks Projects</i>							
Richmond Beach Master Plan	\$113,000	\$93,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$206,000
Parks Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$93,000	\$0	\$0	\$93,000
Spartan Gym Upgrades	\$325,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,000
Neighborhood Parks Repair and Replacement	\$58,000	\$67,000	\$70,000	\$102,000	\$110,000	\$115,000	\$522,000
Ronald Bog Park Master Plan	\$27,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,000
Twin Ponds Park Master Plan	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	\$23,000	\$0	\$0	\$61,000
Saltwater Park Pedestrian Bridge Replacement	\$136,000	\$1,522,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,658,000
Cromwell Park	\$97,000	\$185,000	\$185,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$467,000
<i>Recreation Facilities Projects</i>							
<i>Open Space Projects</i>							
Hamlin Park Open Space Acquisition	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000
Parks and Open Space Acquisition	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
<i>Non-Project Specific</i>							
General Capital Engineering	\$72,436	\$72,436	\$76,058	\$76,058	\$79,861	\$79,861	\$456,711
General Fund Cost Allocation Charge	\$82,157	\$100,000	\$60,000	\$13,782	\$11,492	\$8,309	\$275,740
General Capital Fund Total	\$15,234,593	\$8,599,436	\$429,058	\$307,840	\$201,353	\$203,170	\$24,975,451
Roads Capital Fund							
<i>Pedestrian / Non-Motorized Projects</i>							
Interurban Trail Pedestrian Crossing	\$3,005,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,005,000
Interurban Trail - North Central Segment	\$2,030,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,030,000
Curb Ramp, Gutter & Sidewalk Program	\$104,000	\$109,000	\$114,000	\$120,000	\$126,000	\$132,000	\$705,000
Traffic Small Works	\$178,000	\$187,000	\$195,000	\$204,000	\$214,000	\$223,000	\$1,201,000
<i>System Preservation Projects</i>							
Annual Road Surface Maintenance Program	\$518,000	\$543,000	\$571,000	\$599,000	\$629,000	\$660,000	\$3,520,000
Richmond Beach Overcrossing 167AOX	\$1,924,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,924,000
<i>Safety / Operations Projects</i>							
Transportation Improvements CIP Project Formulation	\$78,000	\$81,000	\$85,000	\$90,000	\$92,000	\$94,000	\$520,000
Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program	\$161,000	\$167,000	\$174,000	\$180,000	\$186,000	\$193,000	\$1,061,000
Aurora Avenue North 145th - 165th	\$10,221,000	\$6,252,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,473,000
Aurora Avenue North 165th-205th	\$1,200,000	\$1,300,000	\$6,000,000	\$16,897,000	\$17,283,000	\$17,283,000	\$59,963,000
NCBD/15th Avenue Improvements	\$3,810,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,810,000
Dayton Avenue North @ North 175th Street Retaining Wall	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000
<i>Non-Project Specific</i>							
Roads Capital Engineering	\$147,399	\$154,769	\$162,507	\$170,633	\$179,164	\$188,123	\$1,002,595
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	\$186,562	\$186,562	\$186,562	\$186,562	\$186,562	\$186,562	\$1,119,372
Roads Capital Fund Total	\$23,962,961	\$8,980,331	\$7,488,069	\$18,447,195	\$18,895,726	\$18,959,685	\$96,733,967

**City of Shoreline 2005 - 2010 Capital Improvement Plan
PROGRAM SUMMARY**

EXPENDITURES	Proposed 2005	Proposed 2006	Proposed 2007	Proposed 2008	Proposed 2009	Proposed 2010	Total 2005-2010
Fund							
Project							
<u>Surface Water Capital</u>							
<i>Conveyance and Treatment Projects</i>							
SWM CIP Project Formulation	\$42,000	\$44,000	\$46,000	\$49,000	\$51,000	\$52,000	\$284,000
Surface Water Small Projects	\$155,000	\$161,000	\$168,000	\$177,000	\$184,000	\$192,000	\$1,037,000
Ronald Bog Drainage Improvements	\$400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,444,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,244,000
3rd Avenue NW Drainage Improvements	\$1,500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000
<i>Stream Rehabilitation / Habitat Enhancement</i>							
Stream Rehab / Habitat Enhancement Program	\$51,000	\$53,000	\$56,000	\$58,000	\$61,000	\$65,000	\$344,000
Advanced Stormwater Right-of-Way Acquisition	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$120,000
<i>Non-Project Specific</i>							
Surface Water Capital Engineering	\$152,000	\$160,000	\$168,000	\$176,000	\$185,000	\$194,000	\$1,035,000
General Fund Cost Allocation Overhead Charge	\$114,000	\$114,000	\$114,000	\$114,000	\$114,000	\$114,000	\$684,000
Surface Water Capital Fund Total	\$2,434,000	\$2,452,000	\$2,016,000	\$594,000	\$615,000	\$637,000	\$8,748,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$41,631,554	\$20,031,767	\$9,933,128	\$19,349,035	\$19,712,079	\$19,799,855	\$130,457,418
RESOURCES							
General Fund Contribution	\$5,253,817	\$1,264,302	\$1,236,491	\$1,236,491	\$1,236,491	\$1,236,491	\$11,464,083
Real Estate Excise Tax - 1st Quarter Percent	\$698,700	\$362,674	\$369,927	\$377,326	\$384,873	\$392,570	\$2,586,070
Real Estate Excise Tax - 2nd Quarter Percent	\$698,700	\$712,674	\$726,927	\$741,466	\$756,295	\$771,421	\$4,407,484
Fuel Tax	\$382,906	\$390,564	\$398,375	\$398,375	\$398,375	\$398,375	\$2,366,970
Surface Water Fees	\$713,973	\$715,209	\$716,515	\$722,808	\$726,922	\$731,187	\$4,326,614
Investment Interest Income	\$354,308	\$439,421	\$420,959	\$424,171	\$336,088	\$287,377	\$2,262,323
Municipal Financing	\$10,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,600,000
Public Works Trust Fund Loan	\$0	\$2,296,530	\$394,110	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,690,640
Grants	\$17,024,505	\$9,714,679	\$5,734,075	\$13,686,726	\$14,898,813	\$12,683,762	\$73,742,560
Seattle City Light - Undergrounding Reimbursement	\$644,120	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$644,120
Private Contributions	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
Use of Accumulated Fund Balance	\$5,160,525	\$4,135,714	\$0	\$1,761,672	\$974,223	\$3,298,672	\$15,330,806
Contribution to Accumulated Fund Balance for Future Projects	\$0	\$0	(\$64,252)	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$64,252)
TOTAL RESOURCES	\$41,631,554	\$20,031,767	\$9,933,128	\$19,349,035	\$19,712,079	\$19,799,855	\$130,457,418