DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Tuesday, September 3, 2002 — Shoreline Conference Center
6:30 p.m. — Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Grossman, Councilmembers Chang, Hansen, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, and Ransom, who arrived shortly thereafter.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS: None

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Montgomery announced that the Association of Washington Cities is sponsoring the "Walk Across Washington" from September 23rd to October 11th,. She said the City of Shoreline is scheduled to participate in this event on October 4th.

Mayor Jepsen recognized those individuals and businesses that contributed to the success of "Celebrate Shoreline": Joe Peterson, Bruce Titcomb, Colleen Reddy, Father Otto, Gretchen Atkinson, Charolotte Haines, Patty Hale, Dick Nicholson, Vicki Stiles, Tom Ramus, Central Market, Shoreline Bank, Shoreline Enterprise, Sky Nursery, Wells Fargo Bank, Chuck Olson Chevrolet Kia, John L. Scott Realty, Safeway, True-Green Land Care, Bank of America, Complete Travel, Highland Pharmacy and Leena's Café.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: none

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

(a) Draft Work Plan on Council Goal #7

Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager, reviewed the two timing options for accomplishing Council Goal #7, establishing a Citizen's Bond Advisory Committee. Option A proposes a bond election in the spring of 2004, and Option B would reach the same goal in 2005. He said staff recommends Option B due to the large number of projects currently under consideration. He did not anticipate a potential conflict with future school levies, noting that the Shoreline School District's next operational levy is scheduled for 2006.

Steve Burkett, City Manager, said flat revenues have made financial planning somewhat uncertain. He added that the economic slowdown is projected to end in 2004-2005 and noted that bond issues are an important part of the overall financial strategy.

Mayor Jepsen asked for public comment.

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, expressed concern about the financing options for the second and third phases of the Aurora Corridor Project. He said a lack of funding will likely force Shoreline residents to pay for the project via bonds.

Mr. Burkett said that a bond issue to fund the Aurora project is highly unlikely, noting that staff has focused on state and federal money as potential funding sources. He said staff is not likely to recommend a change in current policy, but a citizen's committee could recommend a bond issue.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that the potential bond package is too comprehensive and includes too many items. He said the City must first establish credibility with the public before it submits a bond, much like the Fire District has done. He feared a large, comprehensive package would likely end in failure and felt that the public would feel more comfortable with a more limited, manageable package.

Mr. Burkett said Councilmember Ransom may have misinterpreted earlier comments relating to the scope of a bond issue, noting that current projects are underway and funded. He added that staff is simply recommending a lengthier process to allow for public input on future projects.

Mr. Olander said that Council will have many opportunities to direct the approach it wishes to take. He noted that Council can direct the Citizen's Advisory Committee and will make the ultimate decision on what is proposed to the public.

Councilmember Ransom expressed support for Councilmember Gustafson's suggestion at an earlier meeting to establish a larger, 15-member Citizen's Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Gustafson was concerned about timing issues and said he favored establishing the Citizen's Advisory Committee now rather than waiting. He said the School District utilized a facilitator and put together an effective committee in 1990 that came up with a successful bond issue. He said the Citizen's Advisory Committee should decide issues of timing and determine what the community would support. He said the

committee should act as an exploratory body and receive input from a variety of sources, including City Council, business and community groups.

Councilmember Montgomery asked for clarification as to which of the two options Councilmember Gustafson was proposing. Councilmember Gustafson said he favors Option A, but would abide by a Citizen's Advisory Committee recommendation regarding the timing of the vote.

Councilmember Chang expressed support for a 15-member CAC and proposed that Council recommend seven members and other City departments recommend the remaining eight members. He said the Customer Response Team should be represented because it is most aware of the public's critical needs.

Deputy Mayor Grossman also favored the idea of a larger group, noting that the school district utilized large groups successfully. He expressed concern about the timing of a Citizen's Advisory Committee and questioned the City's ability to staff such a program appropriately. He added that the City should focus on the projects it is already engaged in.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed the City should focus on quality rather than quantity but reiterated his desire to form the Committee now. He noted that the Committee may decide the timing is not right anyway.

Mr. Burkett said the City could be flexible on the number of people on the Committee, noting that he has seen committees ranging from 20 to 100 people. He was most concerned about making sure the committee has good information about the priorities, options, and estimated costs of proposed projects.

Mayor Jepsen felt that Council Goal #7 was meant to focus on parks facilities. He suggested that since the Parks Master Plan will become available in April 2003, the committee should be established in March 2003 when it can analyze the PMP and determine the City's needs.

Councilmember Gustafson said the CAC could provide direction for the PMP, which in turn could give the focus to the consideration of the projects.

Mr. Olander expressed his preference that Council get started sooner rather than later if it decides to choose Option A, since the CAC will need up to six months preparatory time.

Councilmember Ransom agreed and noted it will take several months to educate committee members about the issues.

Mayor Jepsen noted that three Councilmembers favor Option A, one favors Option B, and two were undecided.

Councilmember Hansen expressed support for Option A, noting the exploratory nature of the committee and the fact that some lead time will be necessary. He said current projects will be completed before the City undertakes new projects, so he favors taking action now, even though he feels the timing represented by Option B will be the eventual result.

Mayor Jepsen summarized Council comments in saying there is sufficient interest in moving forward with an exploratory committee of about 15 members with a somewhat narrower focus than originally proposed.

Councilmember Gustafson stressed the need for an adequate number of people on the committee to ensure it represents the entire community.

Councilmember Hansen agreed, but added that the committee members' responsibility is to gather public opinion as well as provide their own opinions.

Mr. Burkett said staff will return to Council for a discussion of how to narrow the scope and determine priorities.

(b) School Traffic Safety Plan

Mr. Burkett introduced the School Traffic Safety Plan, noting that traffic safety concerns have been a topic of discussion for several months in the City of Shoreline. He noted that staff will be applying for three demonstration in-pavement light systems at 155th Street and Wallingford, 175th Street and Wallingford, and 170th Street and 15th Avenue NE.

Police Captain Clem Rusk provided the staff report on this year's "Back to School" emphasis by the Shoreline Police Department. He said pedestrian safety involves both enforcement and education, and he explained what the Police Department is doing in both of these areas, including the sting operations involving pedestrians in crosswalks. Mayor Jepsen then called for public comment.

(a) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, agreed with the traffic safety program, noting that crosswalk sting operations are overdue and desperately needed in Shoreline.

(b) Laura Staulk, Edmonds, representing the Tia Foundation, conveyed David Townsend's appreciation for the City's efforts to improve traffic safety. She noted that street signage on Meridian Avenue and 185th Street is obscured by overgrown trees and asked for Council's help to address this problem.

(c) Michael Rasch, Shoreline, expressed concern that there are only three traffic safety officers in the City of Shoreline. He felt the police department would not be able to implement an effective traffic safety program without more resources. He expressed concern about speed enforcement, noting that cars routinely speed in the area of Springdale Court and 14th Avenue/15th Avenue. He added that local schools should be

educated about traffic safety guidelines, noting that King's School track team was using the wrong side of the street in Richmond Beach.

(d) Bill Townsend, Shoreline, thanked the City for its efforts in addressing the traffic safety problem in Shoreline. He expressed hope that the program will be a permanent, ongoing endeavor.

Mayor Jepsen commented on the sign blockage issue and encouraged citizens to report unsafe situations to the Customer Response Team by calling 546-1700.

Mr. Burkett said the City has worked on improving traffic safety in many Shoreline neighborhoods, noting every community has to deal with limited budgets and resources.

Captain Rusk said officers are strongly encouraged to work the school zones, and grant funds have provided additional radar units for police use. As opposed to the three officers previously mentioned, he said there are typically seven to eight officers working the school zones in morning and afternoon.

Mr. Burkett noted that Council has provided some additional funding in the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program for overtime police officers. He added that the City does not rely solely upon citizens for information, but the Customer Response Team routinely looks for potential problems throughout the City.

Mayor Jepsen asked about the timeline for in-pavement lighting grants. Mr. Burkett said it should be a matter of only two or three months if grants are approved.

Councilmember Chang said adult supervision of crosswalks is a possible answer to the traffic safety question. He inquired whether schools use volunteers to supervise crosswalk activity, noting that senior citizens perform that role in many communities. Captain Rusk responded that the school district uses students and adults as crossing guards, but he was not sure whether they were paid or volunteer positions.

Deputy Mayor Grossman said traffic safety is a matter of community outreach, because accidents often happen in unpredictable locations. He said the whole community must get involved and be aware of traffic safety issues.

Councilmember Chang proposed that the City assume a leadership role by bringing the police, school district, and neighborhoods together to address these issues as a team.

Captain Rusk said the police department would be more than happy to work with anyone in order to make the streets safer.

Paul Haines, Director of Public Works, said the City has categorized all the crosswalks in Shoreline and contacted the school district to discuss the highest priorities. He added that the City will be investing added protection through the Pedestrian Safety Program.

Councilmember Hansen mentioned that Innis Arden hired an off duty officer to patrol traffic there and inquired whether Shoreline assigned officers to periodically check traffic on through streets.

Captain Rusk said several streets in Innis Arden are patrolled as a part of the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program.

Mr. Burkett noted that there are hundreds of miles of streets in Shoreline, and therefore hundreds of potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. He used Aurora Avenue and 15th Avenue NE to illustrate that the City tries to allocate resources to the areas with the highest risk.

Mayor Jepsen asked for a follow up report next quarter.

(c) Central Shoreline Subarea Plan

Tim Stewart, Planning and Development Services Director, described the three options available to the City in adopting the draft Central Shoreline Subarea Plan. He made the following points in his presentation:

- It may be premature to adopt a set of development regulations as part of the Central Subarea Plan because the draft development regulations are more restrictive than current code. There is concern that adopting regulations now might serve as a disincentive to the desired type of redevelopment.
- Nothing in the proposed plan would be prohibited by current development regulations.
- In the process of adopting environmental documentation for the plan, SEPA will require an environmental assessment.
- There is a great deal of public uncertainty as to what will happen to properties as a result of major capital improvements such as Aurora Corridor and Interurban Trail. Staff wants to reduce that uncertainty so people can get on with their lives and make future plans.
- After extensive public input, staff arrived at three basic options: 1) delay the plan; 2) adopt a planned-action environmental assessment; or 3) follow a non-project environmental review.
- Holding off on the plan allows the environmental assessment to be combined with the Aurora Corridor Project and Interurban Trail Project. The disadvantage is that the CIP calls for Aurora in 2004-06, long after adoption of the Central Subarea Plan.
- The Central Subarea Plan involves very specific analysis of various land uses much like North City, but lacks the same level of certainty about how the project will develop.
- The plan will involve an EIS and help identify uncertainties such as the Seattle City Light right-of-way.
- There is $75,000 in the current 2002 budget programmed for the Central Subarea Plan.

- Staff intends to move forward with consultant selection this fall.
- Staff will consider the following three alternatives in its analysis of the Central Subarea Plan: 1) no-build, 2) worst-case, most intrusive expansion; and 3) a middle ground, preferred alternative.
- Staff recommends not including the development regulations and moving forward with a limited-scope, non-project environmental review process for the Central Shoreline Plan.

Mayor Jepsen asked whether a limited-scope environmental document would provide the City with information on right-of-way issues associated with Aurora Avenue and the Interurban Trail. Mr. Stewart responded that the environmental document would include phasing and a 25-year vision, but it could become outdated due to time limits and legal issues.

City Attorney Ian Sievers said there are no specific guidelines, but the information should be valid as long as conditions surrounding the non-project EIS remain constant.

Mr. Stewart said current Shoreline Development Code 20.50.230 requires 10-foot front yard setbacks unless there is room for street improvements in the right-of-way. If the City can establish right-of-way needs in the corridor, then private property owners effectively gain ten feet.

Mayor Jepsen said the terms "environmental assessment" and "environmental impact statement" were being used interchangeably and asked staff exactly what it was recommending. Mr. Stewart replied that various options exist, but staff was recommending a non-project EIS.

Mayor Jepsen asked whether consultant/design work is far enough along to clarify the Central Subarea Plan on alignment issues relating to the Aurora and Interurban projects.

Mr. Stewart was confident the City could find the ultimate right-of-way within the worst-case scenario, although establishing a preferred alternative might be difficult. He said the worst-case must be defined and that a final decision will come about at the end of the process.

Councilmember Chang asked whether any developers have expressed an interest in the Central area.

Mr. Stewart responded that the City had not received any formal development permits or proposals for the Central area yet, but there have been extensive discussions with a number of private property owners on how it might be developed. He noted that the biggest concern to property owners and the business community is uncertainty. He said another concern is that development regulations might actually preclude further development.

Councilmember Chang asked for an explanation of the term "non-project" and said such an environmental review would be conducted by agencies to the exclusion of businesses and property owners.

Mr. Stewart said that "non-project" is a term SEPA uses to describe a type of process. He noted that property owners and stakeholders are encouraged to participate in the EIS process to help identify potential impacts. He said the North City environmental review was so extensive that it will relieve private developers from going through the SEPA process. He added that such a review is not appropriate for the Central Subarea due to its relatively large size and lack of homogeneous features.

Councilmember Chang expressed concern about potential costs to Shoreline citizens. Since many businesses will be moved or completely demolished, he asked if the City was working with potential developers to assist impacted businesses to relocate within the City limits.

Mr. Stewart said that would be the ideal situation, since there will be significant adverse environmental impacts. He added that the purpose of the process is to quantify those impacts and seek ways to mitigate them.

Mr. Burkett said two different developers have expressed some interest in the Aurora Corridor, and that the City has spoken with property owners in the wedge.

Councilmember Chang urged staff to do their utmost to look after the best interests of businesses and neighbors.

Councilmember Ransom expressed concern that the Central Subarea was originally the 165th Street to 185th Street section and now it appears to go to 205th Street. He asked staff to clarify this issue.

Mr. Burkett noted that the Aurora Corridor Project includes three phases, and that the 165th Street to 205th Street section would be done in two phases.

Mr. Stewart said the Central Subarea Plan was established in March 2001 and encompasses all the property on Aurora between North 192nd and just south of 175th Street. He said the study area was clearly defined early on and included all areas not designated as low-density residential in the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Ransom asked staff to clarify what was meant by the "six new overlay zones," questioning whether it was referring to six break-out areas from 173rd to 192nd Street.

Mr. Stewart referred to page 35 of the Draft Plan and said that comment illustrates the complexity of the study area. He noted that the overlay zones were proposed for specific development schemes within different study areas.

Councilmember Ransom was uncertain whether changing the bus routing in the area from 173rd to 183rd from Aurora Avenue to Midvale Avenue is still being pursued. He added that this idea is strongly supported by the business community. Mr. Burkett replied it was not being pursued because Metro objected to the proposed rerouting off Aurora due to potential delays. He said Council consensus was not to pursue it as one of strategies in Central Subarea Plan. Mr. Stewart added the plan still has potential for transit-oriented development.

Councilmember Ransom disagreed with the view that there was Council consensus not to pursue bus rerouting.

Mr. Burkett said this decision occurred in the April meeting in which Council opposed the idea of diverting buses. He said Council also conveyed clear direction and expressed concerns about the proposed development standards acting as a disincentive.

Mayor Jepsen said opposition to bus rerouting stemmed from intersection issues which staff explored. He said Council reluctantly decided to keep the buses on Aurora Avenue due to Metro comments and intersection problems.

Mr. Burkett noted Council's decision does not necessarily preclude that issue from being discussed in the future.

Councilmember Ransom said the City was not able to meet the turnaround timelines that Top Foods needed for its development, but businesses on Midvale and Aurora both like the idea of the Midvale Avenue bus route. He asked if the City is still considering a shift to the east, noting that businesses on Aurora's east side are taking a major loss in square footage, but using Midvale Avenue would relieve those losses.

Mr. Stewart reiterated that Metro strongly objects to rerouting the buses. He emphasized that the plan allows opportunities for transit-oriented development anywhere in the corridor.

Councilmember Ransom did not consider Metro's objection a serious barrier, noting that bus rerouting would not delay the bus schedule much.

Mr. Stewart said the Central Subarea Plan is the vehicle to study these issues. He added that Council can resolve these issues and relieve public anxiety by analyzing the impacts and making a decision.

Deputy Mayor Grossman asked whether the staff recommendation would provide greater certainty about the consequences of the Central Subarea Plan. Mr. Stewart said it would.

Councilmember Hansen emphasized the importance of considering the worst-case scenario in analyzing the Central Subarea Plan. He said the problem with rerouting the buses now is that development is already underway. He said the idea was not feasible,

noting that Metro is not going to make two 90-degree turns from Aurora Avenue onto 175th Street and then again onto Midvale Avenue.

Councilmember Chang asked about business community input into the plan.

Mr. Stewart said business owners have their own individual perspectives, but if the City can mitigate impacts for business owners and satisfy both City and property owners' needs, it will eliminate the fear of uncertainty.

Mayor Jepsen mentioned the idea of tunneling under the road at 175th and 185th Streets, noting that now would be the opportunity to address high impact scenarios.

Mr. Stewart said that particular scenario was not included in the preliminary draft plan but it could reemerge in the scoping process. He added that tunneling would take a more elaborate environmental assessment requiring much more time and money.

Mayor Jepsen opposed spending more money but wondered if this could be considered in a very general way.

Mr. Olander said it could be included in Phase 2 of the Aurora EIS if Council and the business community wants it.

Councilmember Hansen supported consideration of an undercrossing at 185th Street and at 205th Street due to the topography at those two intersections.

Mr. Stewart noted that the Central Subarea Plan only goes to 192nd Street.

Councilmember Ransom noted that many citizens want the City to consider options for 185th Street. He said it could be included in the EIS and Council could decide whether to proceed at the appropriate time.

Mr. Burkett identified two opportunities for including the option: 1) during the scope of limited environmental review; or 2) during the Phase 2 scoping process.

Mayor Jepsen noted Council consensus to move forward with the staff recommendation to use a limited scope non-project environmental review process for the Central Subarea Plan, without including the development standards. He noted there are mixed feelings on the Council as to the scope of the review process.

(d) Sister Cities Policy

Eric Swanson, Senior Management Analyst, provided the staff report and noted some concerns expressed by the Sister Cities Association (SCA) about some of the proposed policies. He gave a brief background on the origin and evolution of Sister City relationships. In 1996, the Shoreline City Council adopted a resolution to encourage the formation of a non-profit SCA that would support relationships on behalf of the City. He

said the SCA would act as an umbrella organization to formally select and manage sister city relationships. He stressed the importance of defining the role and responsibility of the SCA through established policy and by-laws.

Continuing, Mr. Swansen said the Shoreline SCA recently incorporated. He added that the City could only provide in-kind contributions, and that the SCA's duties include fund raising and arranging exchanges. He said Shoreline SCA would like to review the policy again because it was not considered by all members of the Association.

He then introduced former Councilmember Cheryl Lee and Vicki Stiles, co-chairs of the Shoreline Sister City Association.

Mayor Jepsen called for public comment.

(a) Cheryl Lee, Shoreline, said the SCA would like more time to consider the policy. She said there are many areas that still need work and that she does not support the policy as written. She emphasized the need for integrating the policies with the SCA and carefully outlining the duties and responsibilities of both the City and SCA. She anticipated that the final policy will provide a great benefit to the community.

(b) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, suggested that the City divert the 1% for Arts funding to the Sister Cities Association. He said the money could put some meaning behind the term "sister city" and be better used for small-scale disaster relief. He said art funding is a decadent excess and that disaster relief is a worthy cause.

Mayor Jepsen asked whether staff looked at the Federal Way model in addition to the Bellevue model. Mr. Swansen said the City borrowed heavily from the Federal Way by-laws even though Federal Way does not have a formal policy.

Mayor Jepsen noted that Council will wait to make a decision until the SCA Board meets on September 26th.

Councilmember Ransom said Federal Way Councilmember Park informed him that Federal Way has a $15,000 sister cities budget, although it does not have a formal policy. He pointed out that some of the statistics in the staff report may be outdated, noting that the City is now 13 square miles after annexation. He also asked staff to check the current census for the Korean population, since he felt that 1,500 Koreans is an undercount. He felt there is definite interest in having a Korean sister city.

Councilmember Gustafson asked whether Shoreline intended to be proactive in requesting sister city status. He emphasized the fact that the sister city process is a two-way street and said Shoreline could benefit from such relationship. He felt the policy should state that Shoreline may initiate sister city relationships instead of waiting for others to approach Shoreline. Mayor Jepsen agreed.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Doug Hamilton, Shoreline, expressed support on behalf of the Tia Foundation for in-pavement street lighting on 15th Avenue NE. He suggested that the speed limit be decreased on 15th Avenue NE between 175th and 165th Streets. He also asked if there was a schedule for installing signage at crosswalks.

(b) Anthony Poland, Shoreline, said Shoreline merchants found that displaced businesses will not be affected by an overpass at 185th Street, but one at 175th Street will be a problem for all parties concerned. He said there will be better traffic flow toward I-5 if an overpass is constructed, although Council will need to remove the unused bike lane on 185th Street. He expressed support for a 15-member Citizen Advisory Committee, but suggested that it be comprised of 13 Neighborhood Council representatives and two appointments by City Council.

(c) Alissa Brooks, Shoreline, asked for clarification on the process and timeline for getting pedestrian signage installed. She recommended that the City adopt a standard for pedestrian arrow signs throughout the City. She said good signage will help educate the motoring public. She thanked the Tia Foundation for its efforts to improve pedestrian safety and said the City was making progress.

(d) Laura Staulk, Edmonds, expressed the Tia Foundation's interest in working with the City, schools and the police department to set up a crossing safety program. She encouraged everyone to think about children and traffic safety issues. She noted Edmonds-Woodway High School's effective use of in-pavement street lighting and said Shoreline needs to adopt similar measures.

Mayor Jepsen noted the City's efforts to remind the public about traffic safety. He said the City made many reminders when school started which focused on schools zones and crosswalks. He said it will take a collective effort in order to make a positive impact. He added the City will wait to change the speed limit on 15th Avenue NE until it determines the lane configuration.

Paul Haines, Director of Public Works, said the City's application for in-pavement street lighting is in draft form and will be submitted as soon as it is completed. He said if the City competes well and the grant is approved, installation could happen by late October. He noted that three Shoreline locations will be tested by funding agencies. He said the City has adopted standard signage to identify school crosswalks and is working with schools to have them all identified.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:34 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk