

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION**

Monday, July 2, 2007 - 6:30 PM  
Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

**PRESENT:** Mayor Ransom, Councilmember Gustafson, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McGlashan, Councilmember Ryu, and Councilmember Way.

**ABSENT:** None.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

At 6:32 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Ransom, who presided.

**2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Ransom led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Deputy Mayor Fimia and Councilmember Hansen. It was noted that Deputy Mayor Fimia would be absent and that Councilmember Hansen would arrive soon.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Ryu, seconded by Councilmember Gustafson and carried 5-0, Deputy Mayor Fimia was excused.**

**3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS**

Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager, provided the City Manager's report. She outlined that Dayton Avenue N. would be closed to traffic July 23 and will reopen on August 31. Aurora Avenue lane closures are expected July 2-3. Crews are installing storm drainage lines as part of the Interurban Trail Project. Ms. Modrzejewski reminded the Council and audience that fireworks are illegal within the City, and additional patrol officers will be enforcing the ban – violators are subject to a misdemeanor. She concluded by noting that City of Shoreline offices will be closed on Wednesday, July 4, in observance of Independence Day.

Responding to Councilmember Ryu, Ms. Modrzejewski clarified that calls to 911 to report fireworks violations is permissible.

Mayor Ransom announced that there would be a public reading of the Declaration of Independence at the Federal Building in downtown Seattle on July 4th from noon to 4 p.m.

#### 4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Gustafson reported on the activities of the Joint Recommendation Committee for the Community Development Block Grant, which outlined the housing finance program for 2007. He provided a brief summary of the applications and recommendation, noting that it funded about \$7.5 million, and this is part of the Veterans & Human Services levy. Councilmember Way asked that the recommendation be provided to the Comprehensive Housing Strategy Citizen Advisory Committee. Councilmember Gustafson also reported on the Water Resource Inventory Area 8 meeting, where WRIA-8 came up with a recommendation for conservation projects. He passed this information among the Council. He also attended the Suburban Cities Association Public Issues Committee, where the discussion focused on RTID and regionalism.

Councilmember Ryu reported on the meeting with King County Councilmember Bob Ferguson regarding the apportionment of new bus service throughout the County. She commented that if the apportionment is allocated based on population, Shoreline will see very little increase in bus service. Therefore, the idea of joining the eastside subarea is very intriguing, because Shoreline would likely receive a better proportion. She also noted that she has been reappointed to the Advisory Council on Democratic Peaceful Unification of Korea, where she will be serving another term of two years.

Mayor Ransom noted that Councilmember Ferguson will be discussing the bus service apportionment at the July 23 dinner meeting. He expressed mixed feelings about joining the eastside forum due to the concern that perhaps Shoreline might still not get its fair share of new bus service. Regarding the SCA Public Issues Committee presentation, he said an Elway poll shows that 62% of Seattle, and 66% of east King County, would approve the Sound Transit investment district at this time. He said this is interesting because prior polls, although different because they were general random polls, did not return such high numbers. He pointed out that only 1% of Sound Transit will be covered by fares, whereas Seattle transit has a 25% coverage rate. He said another study has shown that a system where officials are directly elected to the transit authority is more accountable than the present system. He noted that other transit examples have yielded surprising results. For example, higher densities are created within one mile of the transit system, and the higher densities have created more competition and higher cost-of-living and housing costs. It was previously thought that building transit would have the opposite effect.

#### 5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, thanked the Mayor for reading the public notice on the July 4th document reading. She noted that she has not yet received a response regarding her CIP questions, and that they are not frivolous or irrelevant. She said the inflation

projections in the CIP is alarming, and the City has an obligation to inform citizens about per capita and household costs, annual business costs, revenue sources, levy lid lifts, and other tax and fee rates.

Ms. Modrzejewski said the City has drafted a response and will provide it to Ms. Paulsen tomorrow.

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, responded that in terms of the projected revenue in the CIP and the per household tax burden, most of the revenue in the CIP comes from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET), which is paid by those who sell their homes. There is no levy lid lift as part of the proposed CIP, and the property tax is limited to a 1% overall increase.

Councilmember Ryu asked Ms. Tarry to contrast a levy lid lift with a local improvement district, or LID. Ms. Tarry explained that an LID is a statute that allows a neighborhood to assess itself a fee if they want to make local capital improvements, such as sidewalks. She said LIDs may be needed in the 2011-2013 timeframe for capital improvements.

## 6. STUDY ITEMS

### (a) 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Discussion

Ms. Modrzejewski said that tonight's discussion is a continuation of last week's CIP presentation.

Mayor Ransom called for public comment.

(a) Pamela Meeth, Shoreline, urged the Council to proceed cautiously with the CIP given the deteriorating economic conditions. She expressed concern about the references made to a utility rate study, since all the taxes and fees are combining to the point that people are being priced out of their homes. She said the City cannot fund everything, and there are so many agencies that are seeking increased rates, taxes, and fees.

Mayor Ransom pointed out that the City only receives 10% of the property tax collection; even the fire district gets a larger portion than the City.

Ms. Tarry clarified that the City assesses all property owners a surface water utility fee, and for a typical single family residence this amounts to about \$120 annually.

Councilmember Way asked what types of things are covered by surface water utility revenues. Ms. Tarry said the utility helps provide for storm water collection and distribution. The capital side is represented in the surface water utility portion of the CIP. The rate review of the utility fee itself occurs every 3-5 years, and the utility rate is only fee we have control over.

Councilmember Hansen added that the surface water utility fee is a carryover from King County and is assessed on a per parcel basis. It was noted that all cities have a surface water utility, and each city can choose whether to assess a fee, but almost every city does.

Councilmember Ryu pointed out that even though we have 1% cap on the property tax increase, individual taxpayers see somewhere between a 15-20% increase from year to year. She said realistically, the 1% increase is not spread out evenly.

Ms. Tarry confirmed that part of the issue is when special levies are passed, such as the Parks bond, the new assessment shows up on the property tax bill. She noted that an article in Currents explains the property tax assessment in detail. She said the property taxes went up mostly due to the bond, but there are also school district and fire district levies. She said the City can provide more information on this to people in an effort to make it understandable.

Councilmember Hansen noted that the 1% doesn't apply to the voter-approved portion, which is by far the largest portion of the property tax amount.

Councilmember Way said it would be helpful to see what the cumulative impact of current and projected fees might look like.

**Councilmember Hansen moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Gustafson seconded the motion.**

There was a brief discussion about whether the public hearing should be closed, or whether written comments should be accepted until Friday. Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, and McGlashan favored closing the public hearing with the understanding that the record is open, and people can continue to comment until a final vote is taken. Councilmembers Ryu and Way favored leaving the hearing open, which sends the message to the public that the Council is still open to hearing public input on this issue.

**A vote was taken on the motion, which carried 4-2, with Councilmembers Ryu and Way dissenting, and the public hearing was closed.**

Ms. Tarry responded to various Council questions on the proposed CIP. She highlighted the annual road surface maintenance program, sidewalks, and the traffic signal rehabilitation program, adding that the staff recommendation is not to change the funding scheme. She said the recommendation is to "front-load" the money early on in the CIP for road surface maintenance so the City can maintain its road rating of 80-81; in later years it is funded at a lower level. She pointed out that a Citizen Advisory Committee on the City's long-term finances could provide much-needed input into the stated priorities.

Councilmember Hansen concurred with the recommendation, especially the road overlay. He said there is no real need to change projections, but we should try to ensure we find the funding in years 2011-2013. He said the road overlay program is very important and the job is to continue balancing priorities.

Councilmember Way noted that she has been working on a lot of issues related to surface water impacts, and she has gathered information from websites on simple surface water technologies, such as pervious pavement. She provided the information to Public Works Director Mark Relph and requested that staff explore ways to use this information in order to positively impact the CIP.

Staff agreed to consider the information, and Mr. Olander noted that the City's Sustainability Team is a good opportunity to see how we can apply those additional tools.

Councilmember Gustafson thanked the staff for their work on the CIP and said he is inclined to support the recommendations. He agreed that advisory committee to review long-term finances is a good idea. He asked why 3rd Avenue NW & Richmond Beach Road is no longer a high priority. He also asked for an explanation of the Speed & Reliability Partnership. He asked if there was a preferred alternative identified in Shoreline Community College's master plan as it relates to N 160th Street & Greenwood Avenue N. Staff responded that no preferred plan has been identified. He asked staff to establish trails and pathways as a higher priority and to work with Seattle and Lake Forest Park on the I-5 pedestrian bridge within the context of connections to the Burke-Gilman Trail. He said this last item should be established as a priority but not necessarily within the CIP.

Councilmember Ryu agreed with the recommendation to increase road resurfacing projects in 2009-2010, which should end up saving expenses in the future. She said the proposed CIP as a whole is focused on essential services, and she appreciates the public comments received. She expressed concern about LIDs, since they will only succeed in neighborhoods that have higher discretionary income; they could further divide people along economic lines and create a struggle between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

Councilmember McGlashan thanked the staff for the CIP, which he found easy to understand and contains nothing frivolous. He asked about the 2007 sidewalk project proposed for Dayton Avenue N., and staff confirmed that there is an additional sidewalk section separate from the retaining wall work. Referring to the Richmond Beach Road Subarea Study on page 114, Councilmember McGlashan wished to ensure that the staff is following this item as it relates to Point Wells, because it might have to be moved into the CIP rather quickly. Mr. Relph stated that any development in Richmond Beach will require a traffic analysis, so staff will become aware of any future proposals as they happen. Responding to Councilmember McGlashan regarding page 127, Ms. Tarry clarified that TIB grants are very competitive and staff will continue to pursue them.

Councilmember Hansen noted that the National League of Cities (NLC) conventions are an excellent place for Councilmembers to get information on emerging technologies such as pervious pavement, solar traffic lights, and dry water irrigation.

Councilmember Way clarified that she has attended various presentations and workshops on low-impact design. She also agreed with Councilmember Ryu's concern about the

potential for LIDs to create economic divisions. She supporting spreading out the costs and paying for sidewalks in an equitable manner.

Mr. Relph and Ms. Tarry noted that there are a number of options and combinations of CDBG and LID funding that could be considered for sidewalk construction.

Responding to Councilmember Gustafson's prior questions, Mr. Relph pointed out that the 3rd Avenue project was heavily reliant on grant funding, but staff could pursue it if Council desires. Also, staff has forwarded a summary of the Speed & Reliability Partnership to Mr. Olander, but much more discussion is needed. He said he will work with SCC on the N 160th Street & Greenwood Avenue N issue.

Councilmember McGlashan expressed concern about the curves and traffic speeds at the intersection of Ashworth Avenue N and 152nd Street. He asked for an update of that project, which is currently on the unfunded list, and if there were any possibilities for grant funding or Sea-street applications.

Jesus Sanchez, Public Works Operations Manager, outlined the extensive work with the community on the traffic problems associated with this intersection. He said there are heavy surface water flows there, which could be accommodated with a meandering street approach, but it would be too fast for an open stream. He said although a number of traffic calming measures have been considered the critical issue is to move pedestrians through that intersection safely. He noted that 90% of the pedestrians are walking on the west side of the street.

Councilmember Way noted that a meandering street would address the speeding and volume problems, adding that it might be a good opportunity to achieve partial infiltration through pervious pavement. She asked staff to consider all the possibilities and "pull out all the tools."

Mr. Sanchez said he is not sure this is the right spot for such a project, but staff is looking at every opportunity to create Sea-Street-type projects. He said if we can get pedestrians off the grade at that location, it will create a safe pathway.

Councilmember Ryu said that if curbing is added, the street shouldn't necessarily be widened there because traffic should be routed to Aurora Avenue, not into neighborhoods. She noted that the King County Council is asking cities about their transit planning subarea boundaries and route-specific service areas, so she is glad to hear the Speed & Reliability Partnership is coming along well. She said if there is any "fat" in the CIP, then she would like to increase service hours of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor that we taxed ourselves through the Transit Now vote.

Mayor Ransom expressed concern about the lack of sidewalks on arterial streets, noting that there are 26 miles of streets, out of 41 miles, with no sidewalks throughout the City. He asked about the possibility of acquiring grant funding for sidewalks as part of the CIP.

Mr. Relph said there are some federal grants and other options that staff can explore, but it is challenging. Ms. Tarry concurred, adding that staff will continue to seek grant opportunities. She said the City's grant specialist understands these are priorities.

Councilmember Ryu speculated that it is probably harder for the City to acquire such funding due to its vigilance on pedestrian safety, education, and engineering. Mr. Relph agreed, noting that most grant programs are really focused on accident rates.

Councilmember Way inquired about the scope and status of the traffic light proposed for 15th Avenue NE and NE 150th Street.

Tricia Junke, Capital Projects Manager, said the City is close to advertising the project for bid. She said the project is limited to the intersection only. Councilmember Way pointed out that there is no sidewalk on the northeast side of the street near Fircrest, and there have been concerns about the planted median. She suggested that the shrubs in the median be trimmed back so pedestrians can be seen and encouraged to cross at the light.

Councilmember Way then asked about the status of the Kruckeberg Garden acquisition.

Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, explained that staff is getting closer to a negotiated agreement, with the hope of finalizing it in September. The next meeting will take place July 11. He noted that the bond issue had \$950,000 identified for the acquisition, but possibly \$300,000 to \$500,000 could be left over for capital improvements after the acquisition is complete.

Councilmember Ryu pointed out that the proposed CIP allocates \$1.25 million for Kruckeberg over the 2007-2008 timeframe. Ms. Tarry said staff has known all along that the costs would be more than what was initially in the bond, so it's proposed to increase the funding using interest from the bond proceeds.

## RECESS

At 8:18 p.m., Mayor Ransom called for a five minute break. At 8:22 p.m., the meeting reconvened.

### (b) King County Flood Control Zone District

Mark Relph, Public Works Director, provided an overview of King County's effort to create the Flood Control Zone District. He explained that in April of this year, the County Council formally approved the legislation to form a countywide flood control district with the intent to begin collecting revenue January 1, 2008. In order to meet this deadline, the Assessor must have the assessment amount in early August. He said the County Council formed an Advisory Committee to recommend a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), what form of assessment, and the amount of the levy. He said the County Council has the ability to assess a levy via councilmanic up to 50 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value. The Advisory Committee has been studying levy options (some with special assessments,

service charges, etc.) that range from 5 cents to 12 cents.

Continuing, Mr. Relph pointed out that the central issue is how to assess county properties; one flat levy applied against all assessed valuation, or a tiered approach. Since the vast majority of the CIP is in the lower end of the river basins where much of the flood problems persist, upstream cities like Shoreline will likely see little physical improvements with a single, flat levy. Therefore, the issue quickly focuses on the degree to which this is considered a regional issue. Unfortunately, the timeline has prevented interested parties from understanding all of the capital projects included in the plan. On July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007 the Advisory Committee for the King County Flood Control Zone District will conduct a formal vote and thereby make a recommendation to the County Council on a district CIP and levy amount. Shoreline Councilmember Ron Hansen has been appointed as a member of the Advisory Committee and is representing the Suburban Cities Association. Council discussion and direction is requested for our representative to the Advisory Committee. Mr. Relph concluded by outlining the following options: 1) Request additional time; 2) Flat levy, then allowing a public vote on what is needed; and 3) 10-cent flat levy. The figure of \$300 million in capital projects has been discussed, however, staff recommends a sunset provision regardless of which funding option is selected.

Responding to Mayor Ransom, staff confirmed that the \$300 million amount would be achieved in 10 years with a 10-cent levy. A 14-cent levy would achieve approximately \$400 million in 10 years.

Councilmember Way asked which cities are considered "downstream" cities, and what insufficient levies or flood projects are out there that this is designed to address. She asked for an explanation of how the current and proposed flood control zones fit together and what forces are pushing this issue.

Councilmember Hansen said that all the other flood zones are abolished with the countywide flood zone district as of January 2007. He said the forces that are pushing this issue are Hurricane Katrina, the Army Corps. Engineers, and FEMA. He said that a "downstream city" is any city that has a river flowing through it, however, until the subregion issue is resolved, the definition of "downstream" probably won't be finalized until 2008. He said the primary flooding problems have been occurring on the Green River in the Kent-Auburn-Renton valley, as well as the Cedar River, Snoqualmie River, and Skykomish. He said although these river basins seem to be far removed from Shoreline, their problems affect Shoreline because much of Shoreline's water comes from the Tolt River. He said this is not a new issue, as he has been aware of the \$180 million to \$300 million figure for a couple years. In the past, cities have tried to approach the problem on their own, but it is clear they need regional assistance.

Councilmember Way said she is still a bit confused by the term "downstream," but whatever the definition, the concept of the subregion makes some sense and Shoreline should benefit. The next issue is which funding option would be most beneficial, however, the County's sense of urgency on this issue seems a bit odd.



Mr. Relph pointed out that cities have invested lots of money in the flooding problem, but suddenly they found out the levies built over time weren't built to appropriate standards.

Councilmember Hansen added that Bellevue and Seattle are not considered downstream for this purpose.

Councilmember Ryu expressed interest in examining some type of tiered approach. She pointed out that if the funding is not there, it could potentially leave areas uninsurable or will little insurance coverage. She felt that something should be done, but the dilemma is whether to assess a levy of \$40/year or \$60/year per household. She emphasized the need for equity and agreed that a sunset provision is definitely needed. She concluded that whatever option is chosen, it needs to be justified and reexamined regularly.

Councilmember Hansen said that since King County will be administering the program and it make the decision, the 10-cent levy seems to be a foregone conclusion. He said the advisory committee is, in many respects, "political window-dressing." He said the theory is that with a 10-cent levy, they could start interlinking the projects to where they'd make a difference. He said he doesn't see them delaying the projects due to pressure from Hurricane Katrina.

Councilmember Way said it seems Seattle is saying "let's slow down and take a look" because they're considered an upstream city, but they have flooding problems too. She wondered if it is reasonable to wait if that is the direction Bellevue and Seattle are going.

Mr. Relph said he will be meeting with Seattle, Bellevue, and Federal Way tomorrow to discuss the present timeline and will report back.

Councilmember McGlashan said if other cities feel they need to wait, then he agrees. He expressed concern with the apparent lack of public process and sense of urgency.

Councilmember Gustafson agreed with asking for a sunset clause and concurred with Councilmember Hansen and Mr. Relph's position.

Mr. Relph said he is more than happy to report back to Council, but is not sure how much opportunity there is to ask for more time.

Mayor Ransom also agreed with the sunset clause, but said they seem to be pushing so fast there isn't adequate time to fully assess the program or priorities. He would encourage a time extension if possible.

Councilmember Ryu said despite the fact that King County can overrule us, Shoreline should request more time for public process. She said at the least we can get it on record that our residents would like a more equitable approach.

Councilmember Hansen said he will be presenting his opinion on the advisory committee to the SCA choice on July 11, after which the advisory committee recommendation should

come. The urgency is that they need the data by August if they want to begin the assessments in 2008; otherwise they have to wait another year. He said while the tiered rate sounds good, there are some problems with it because the numbers don't necessarily work out. He said a 10-cent levy would yield about \$650,000 per year from Shoreline.

Councilmember Way said it seems they're addressing downstream issues but asking upstream cities why they're sending this water so fast. She said Shoreline needs money to address our responsibility and asked if the flat rate would provide funds to Shoreline.

Mr. Relph wasn't sure, although King County submitted a tiered scheme that didn't have much effect on the overall rate. He said a tiered system may be so cumbersome and expensive that it's impractical, but unfortunately there isn't enough time to evaluate it.

Councilmember Way said she favors a "wait and learn" approach; otherwise, she wants to make sure there is equity and that Shoreline sees a direct benefit.

Councilmember Hansen said there are yet more variables that make it even more interesting - some projects may be covered by WRIA or KCD, and there's a suggestion that more coordination with them is needed. The initial response is that there is no significant interplay between the Flood Control Zone District and those entities. He concluded the discussion by saying the general feeling is that a 10-cent levy is needed.

## 7. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:22 p.m., Mayor Ransom declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk