

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

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

Monday, August 21, 2006
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Ransom, Deputy Mayor Fimia, and Councilmembers Gustafson, Hansen, Ryu, and Way

ABSENT: Councilmember McGlashan

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. 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 except for Councilmember McGlashan.

**Councilmember Gustafson moved to excuse Councilmember McGlashan.
Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.**

(a) Award Presentation for Kelly Stephens, Shoreline Olympian

Mayor Ransom, Councilmember Ryu, and Rick Stephens, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, presented the award to Kelly Stephens, who was recognized as the Grand Marshall of the Celebrate Shoreline Parade and bronze medal-winning member of the 2006 U.S. Women's Olympic Hockey Team.

Ms. Stephens thanked the Council and the Chamber of Commerce for their support. She thanked Rick and Diana Stephens, at whose ice rink she learned to skate. She said she is moving back to Shoreline to work with the kids in the City, noting that she loves to mentor children and is excited about her future in the City.

Mr. Rick Stephens congratulated Kelly for being one of the world's greatest hockey players. He added that Kelly is a great role model for youth.

(b) Proclamation recognizing the Shoreline Water
District's 75th Anniversary

Mayor Ransom read the proclamation and applauded the Shoreline Water District for its quality customer service and their superior water service to Shoreline residents. He

recognized Ron Ricker and the rest of the Commissioners and staff that were present from the District.

Mr. Ricker thanked the Council for the proclamation and introduced Charlotte Haines, Denny Clause, and Stu Turner. He said he would provide additional copies of the "History of the Shoreline Water District" for the City Council and staff.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided updates and reports on the following items:

- The 11th annual Celebrate Shoreline
- The North City ribbon-cutting ceremony on August 17
- The annual "National Night Out Against Crime"
- The Renewable Energy Fair, which featured displays on solar and other renewable energy sources
- The renovation of two baseball fields and construction of covered dugouts by the Parks Department
- The open house on the Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Master Plan held on July 29
- In addition to plumbing and mechanical permits, the City now issues electrical permits, effective August 1.
- The near-completion of Shoreline Fields A & B. Play is scheduled to begin October 1.
- The ongoing work on priority sidewalk routes

Councilmember Way inquired if the block watches are posted on the City website. She also asked about the extent of fire damage at Richmond Beach Saltwater Park. She felt it might be a good idea to post the permit information on the City website. Mr. Olander responded that he would follow up regarding block watches. He said there was little damage to Richmond Beach Saltwater Park, but the City will reseed the slopes for long-term stabilization.

Councilmember Hansen asked when work would start at Twin Ponds Park. Mr. Olander said the design phase would begin in the next few months; completion is expected in late spring or early summer 2007.

Councilmember Hansen inquired why landscaping for the North City project ends at N. 170th Avenue on 15th Avenue NE. Mr. Olander said he would look into this issue and report back.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Ryu noted that the SeaShore Transportation Forum met on August 16.

Councilmember Way said she attended the “Frog Frolic”, a King Conservation District (KCD) event held at Shadow Lake Bog in Renton. She said the 92-acre bog was acquired by the City of Renton and King County.

Mayor Ransom reported that City of Seattle Mayor Nickels and King County Executive Ron Sims sent representatives to the SeaShore Transportation Forum. He said he met with several Sound Transit officials in regard to funding for Shoreline, and more information will be available at a later date.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Mike Bolton, Shoreline, urged the Council to review and discuss the code as it pertains to vehicles parked in yards. He noted although his personal issues with the City have been resolved, he would like to see specific revisions in the code.

(b) Michael Jacobs, Shoreline, President of Innis Arden Club (IAC), recalled that at the July 24 City Council meeting, Deputy Mayor Fimia claimed that the Innis Arden Club was using the Hazardous Tree Ordinance to cut down “alleged” hazardous trees. He said this is not true and the community has spent over \$250,000 on certified arborists, geologists, surveyors and hydrologists to help with managing the reserves in a responsible and environmentally sound manner. He said hazardous trees were only removed upon the advice of ISA-certified arborists and after the proper forms were submitted to City staff. He said that in May 2004, the City served a notice and order claiming that the IAC removed trees illegally. He said the IAC demonstrated at that time that the trees that were removed were, in fact, hazardous. He noted that the IAC spent over \$30,000 in legal fees then filed a claim against the City, which hasn’t been pursued. He felt Deputy Mayor Fimia should apologize because there is no basis for her allegations.

Councilmember Way asked the City Manager to respond to Mr. Bolton concerning his municipal code suggestions. Mr. Olander responded that the staff can propose Code amendments or the Council can request to put an item on a future agenda for discussion and review.

Councilmember Way and Deputy Mayor Fimia requested that a review of the code be added to a future City Council meeting agenda.

Responding to Mr. Jacob’s comments, Councilmember Ryu said she thought view protection was a big concern for the IAC. She said she is glad that the official position of the IAC is not the protection of views.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) – Update of Vision 2020

Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, noted that a staff memorandum was distributed on Vision 2020 to each Councilmember.

Ben Bekenta, PSRC Principal Planner, presented an overview and discussed the current schedule of the project – the Update of Vision 2020. He noted that the PSRC is a member organization responsible for long-range growth management, transportation, and economic planning, administering Federal transportation funds, and the preparation of regional data and forecasts. Vision 2020 provides the transportation overall long-range policy direction for Destination 2030 which is the adopted long-range regional transportation plan. Vision 2020 is the document that has multi-county planning policies and articulates a long-range vision for the region so all local governments and counties can work together. A highlight of Vision 2020 is the description of a system of designated major regional growth centers. These areas, he explained, would support the building of major transportation system. He noted that by 2040 there will be an additional 1,600,000 million people in the region, with an additional 1,100,000 million jobs. The PSRC has outlined that future growth in the region needs to be efficient and be sensitive to the natural environment.

Continuing, Mr. Bekenta noted that the Growth Management Policy Board reviewed adopted policies to remove redundancies, developed ten issue papers, and developed four regional growth alternatives for formal evaluation in the draft environmental impact statement. The board, he noted, attempted to be ambitious, but realistic. He said they attempt to respect the visions of the local entities. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), he stated, proposes four growth alternatives around the region which include: 1) extending currently adopted growth targets for each of the four counties, 2) extend adopted growth targets in metropolitan cities, 3) extend adopted growth targets in larger cities, and 4) extend adopted growth targets in smaller cities. He pointed out that the GMA policy board is beginning to apply evaluation criteria to the four alternatives described above, to include qualitative analyses such as quality of life. He also noted that they are in the process of collecting public comment and will bring the results back to the board in January or February. This will lead to working on a final draft to move towards adopting a final document in March 2008.

Mr. Olander noted that there was no financial impact shown on each of the scenarios presented. He said revenues do not necessarily follow the growth patterns and that is an important element that needs to be included in the analysis.

Mr. Bekenta agreed and said that analysis would have to be done at the local level. This is a key issue that is being discussed, however, it will not be a part of the SEPA EIS statement.

Mayor Ransom noted that the PSRC projected that the City will only have 2,500 more jobs becoming available, with most of the job growth occurring in South King County. He said Shoreline is not even close to having 25,000 – 30,000 jobs. He expressed concern that the projections distributed by the PSRC will encourage growth in the south to the exclusion of the north.

Mr. Bekenta said the jobs/housing balance is under active discussion at the PSRC and they are developing an alternative built-in to encourage more job growth in North King County and Snohomish County.

Councilmember Gustafson inquired if the PSRC studied other cities for examples of good growth management, and what the “formula” is for a City that has prospered in the past.

Mr. Bekenta responded that the PSRC has done that research as part of its “ten issue papers” and it has influenced policy direction to implement here.

Councilmember Gustafson added that the long-range plan needs to be addressed and it needs to be visionary as long as it does the best for this area.

Councilmember Way encouraged the public to review the information on the PSRC website and make comments. She inquired if the maps show how the growth would impact the agricultural lands.

Mr. Bekenta replied that they did a direct analysis of potential pressure from higher levels of rural development in the proximity to agricultural lands and natural resource lands.

Councilmember Way stated there has been an urban sprawl and ongoing build-out despite the charge to protect rural areas.

Mr. Bekenta referred her to the land use section of the EIS because it outlines potential impacts on natural resource lands and agricultural lands.

Mr. Tovar added that a major assumption is that the urban growth boundaries will not change; however, they may have different kinds of rural or agricultural areas in the future.

Councilmember Way felt that the average person is confused because there is still urban development going on in rural areas. She also pointed out that transportation and commerce is connected with these areas.

Mr. Olander asked Mr. Bekenta what the City’s best avenue would be to influence the process.

Mr. Bekenta said Shoreline can submit an official letter to the Growth Management Policy Board. He encouraged the City to submit comments.

Deputy Mayor Fimia noted her heavy involvement in the 1995-96 Growth Management Updates. She said she would like to be able to sit down with PSRC staff and look at the assumptions and the data. There is a big disconnect, she said, between theory and the implementation by the cities. She noted there were huge growth projections in 1995 for what this area would look like in 10 years. She asked how close the projections were to

actual growth. Mr. Bekenta responded that this region has tracked very closely to the forecasts.

Deputy Mayor Fimia also inquired where the growth was projected to go and where it has actually gone. She asked if there was a quantitative analysis done on the population projections for the different scenarios, and how they are implemented to allow cities to up-zone in areas that growth should occur. She said this is a difficult process to execute. Generally, she said people support growth management as a concept. However, when development is proposed in their neighborhood, they come to the City and say they don't want it mostly because of traffic. Thus, they are telling the legislators that existing growth is not being handled, so more growth is not acceptable. Although transit use has increased, the projections for single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) use continue to outpace transit. She added that fixed rail will not solve the issue either. Therefore, she would like to see the projections include commuter data. She inquired about the proportion of riders projected to join carpools, and what is being done to facilitate that. She also asked what cities have achieved success in reducing congestion through fixed rail. She noted that Atlanta got money for a light rail system because they have an urban sprawl, but they still have a congestion problem. She concluded that she would set up a time to visit PSRC and look at their projections.

Mayor Ransom inquired when and who would decide which of the four alternatives would be chosen.

Mr. Bekenta said the policy board is meeting through the months of September and October to make a preliminary decision based on sensitivity tests; it will then go out for public review in January and February. Once the public review is completed it will go before the entire assembly of the PSRC next March. The executive board would then devise a preferred alternative that would go out in April so a supplemental draft EIS could go out to the public.

Councilmember Gustafson asked Mayor Ransom if the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) had this topic on their agenda. Mayor Ransom said there has been some discussion, but not enough to make a decision.

Councilmember Hansen, speaking as President of the Suburban Cities Association (SCA), responded that they are writing issue papers and making strides in influencing the PSRC in some of their opinions. He commented that communication between the PSRC and the SCA is good.

There was no one wishing to provide public comment on this item.

(b) 2006 Second Quarter Financial Report

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, provided the revenue and expenditure reports for the City's operating and capital funds through the second quarter of 2006. Her presentation included the following points:

- Actual General Fund revenue collections of \$12,207,736 through the second quarter of 2006 totaled \$150,893, or 1.3% above revised projections of \$12,056,791. The General Fund is projected to collect \$675,487 less in revenue than originally budgeted.
- 2006 projected revenue is \$28,722,678 down from the current revenue budget of \$29,398,165. The revenue decrease is primarily due to the \$876,700 reduction in gambling tax revenue and a \$35,012 reduction in state shared revenue. Offsetting those decreases are projected revenue increases in collections from the criminal justice sales tax of \$49,313, the Seattle City Light (SCL) contract payment of \$150,000, newly awarded grants totaling \$33,438, and a minor increase in miscellaneous revenue of \$3,474.
- Reductions in gambling tax revenues impact both general fund operation revenues and roads capital revenues. Operational revenues are expected to decrease by \$426,700 and capital revenues by \$450,000.
- Departmental expenditures during the first half of 2006 were \$13,110,485, under projected expenditures of \$13,281,900 by \$184,443 or 1.4%. The Customer Response Team, Parks, Recreational & Cultural Services (PRCS), and Planning & Development Services have all experienced staff vacancies resulting in savings. PRCS has also experienced some savings in contracted services and utility costs through the second quarter. Some other departments have under-spent projections due to delays in billing from contractors including King County when compared with prior years.
- Street Fund revenue through the first half of 2006 was \$1,228,399, under revised projections of \$1,236,202 by only \$7,803, a 0.6% variance. Projected revenues for 2006 have been increased by \$43,987 to include a grant from the Washington Traffic Safety Council (WTSC) for \$22,500, unanticipated insurance recoveries, \$17,476, and increased investment earnings of \$4,000.
- Street Fund expenditures of \$1,042,268 are below projections of \$1,069,949 by \$27,681 or 2.6%.
- Earlier this year, the City Council approved the creation of the Surface Water Utility Fund to merge all surface water related activities. Revenues in the Surface Water Utility Fund of \$1,610,772 are ahead of projections of \$1,538,573 by \$72,199 or 2.3%. Storm drainage fees are slightly ahead of projections by \$6,504 or 0.5%. Investment earnings are ahead of projections by \$65,695.
- Expenditures of \$980,218 are under projections of \$1,188,528 by \$208,310 or 17.5%. The majority of the under-expenditure is in the intergovernmental professional services category due to the timing of billings from King County and other contracted services. Some capital projects are also under projections as of the end of the second quarter.
- General Fund revenues are on target and real estate excise tax collections are ahead of projections by \$68,239 or 12.7%. Investment earnings also exceeded projections by \$8,671 or 14.6%. Projected 2006 revenue from real estate excise taxes has been increased by \$362,326 over the adopted budget. 2006 projected

revenues have been adjusted to reflect the delay of financing for the Civic Center project until 2007 and to include proceeds from the parks bond issue that will be received later this year. Through the first half of 2006, \$517,134 has been spent, which is under projections of \$755,389 by \$238,255. Overall, 2006 projected expenditures have been increased to include new projects funded by the bond issue.

- In the Roads Capital Fund, year-to-date revenues of \$6,185,735 are above projected revenue of \$6,169,461 by \$16,274 or 0.26%. Overall projected revenues for 2006 have been lowered from a budget of \$34,488,918 to \$28,504,404 to reflect the recently adopted CIP. The revenue changes are a result of the reduced transfer of general fund monies as a result of reduced gambling tax proceeds and adjustments to grants as a result of timing.
- Projected 2006 expenditures have been lowered from the original budget of \$34,488,918 to \$27,967,937. This change reflects the projections included in the 2007 – 2012 CIP. Expenditures through June totaling \$8,777,070 are under projections of \$10,030,637.

Ms. Tarry concluded her presentation by stating that revenues are tracking slightly ahead of projections, while expenditures are slightly behind. The areas of concern her department is monitoring include the gambling tax, sales tax, and jail expenditures.

Responding to Deputy Mayor Fimia, Ms. Tarry said that the sales tax revenues have a two month lag time from when the actual sales occurred. Therefore, we received funds in January 2006 from sales that took place in November 2005.

Councilmember Way inquired whether or not the current concrete strike is impacting the budget. Ms. Tarry responded that the impact, if any, is not showing in the first six months. However, she felt challenges may come later in the year and be reflected in the capital projects.

Mr. Olander added that it has not had much effect on our sales tax in terms of private construction projects.

Councilmember Hansen asked if there was an increase in the surface water utility rate projections due to changes in the market. Ms. Tarry replied that there has been since the City used 4.5 percent as a base for 2006, and at times it has gone above that. She added that the City utilizes a “ladder” system so there are some investments that are giving us a smaller return, but over time it evens out.

There was no one wishing to provide public comment.

Mayor Ransom asked Ms. Tarry to discuss the potential problems with the jail expenditures, the Yakima jail, and the new jail staffing. Ms. Tarry responded that there has been no difference in the trend that has been discussed previously. She added that Shoreline is using more jail days and the City will be about \$400,000 over the 2006 budget for jail expenditures.

Mr. Olander said there are long range issues with overcrowding and medical care, and the City is trying to work with Yakima to resolve them. Currently, there is no immediate need to terminate the contract with Yakima. He said they are also looking at other options with King County if needed in the future.

Deputy Mayor Fimia inquired what the status was on the King County facility. Mr. Olander said the South King County facility still has some wings closed due to operational expenses. He said the preference is to use Yakima, but overnight prisoners are held in King County.

Deputy Mayor Fimia noted this should be addressed in the context of increasing expenditures and limited revenues. Mr. Olander agreed and said in the long run Yakima is not the best choice. He said the City needs to find misdemeanor facilities in King County, but we are in this dilemma because the King County Executive limited our bed days for misdemeanor prisoners. He said the options include looking at other facilities, building our own joint misdemeanor facility, prevention, alternative incarceration, day reporting, work release, and rehabilitation facilities.

Deputy Mayor Fimia noted that there was a countywide levy to build the facility in South King County, and we are paying for that facility with the promise that cities would be able to use it. She asked if there have been any discussions at the Suburban Cities Association about holding King County accountable for the use of that facility.

Mr. Olander said there has not been any discussion about it and the facility is about 40 – 50 percent more expensive to house our prisoners there.

Councilmember Way asked how many prisoners needed to be incarcerated. Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst, responded that the average number of prisoners between the Yakima and King County facilities was 30 to 32 prisoners per day. That average, he added, is up from 24 in the last six to nine months.

Councilmember Hansen noted that many of the cities are not using their allotment, and the contract states if they don't use the allotment, the City can utilize their days. He added that not only did King County threaten to terminate the City's contract, it also increased the price. Yakima County saved the City millions of dollars, however, now it is not as good as expected, but it is still a better deal than utilizing King County.

Councilmember Way inquired about the Seattle City Light (SCL) contract payment of \$150,000. Ms. Tarry responded that it was from SCL generating more revenue from their electricity charges to their customers. SCL pays the City 6 percent of the power portion of the electric fee that they charge to Shoreline consumers. Basically, Shoreline consumers are using more power. She clarified that the split between power and distribution is getting closer to 50 – 50.

Councilmember Hansen pointed out that in the franchise negotiations the City allows for up to an 8 percent differential charge between what SCL charges residents in the City and for what they would charge those outside of City limits. He said he heard that they would be moving up to the full 8 percent rate and asked if there was a significant decrease proposed. Ms. Tarry responded that the rate in the City of Seattle is coming down, however, everyone else's will increase and the rate will be raised to 8 percent.

RECESS

At 8:30 p.m. Councilmember Ryu moved to recess the meeting for 10 minutes. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 4-0-2, with Councilmembers Gustafson and Hansen remaining silent. At 8:43 p.m. the meeting reconvened.

(c) Building and Inspections Team Report

Joe Tovar, Planning and Development Services Director, explained that the City personnel responsible for enforcing building and safety codes are the "silent defenders" also known as the Building Inspection team. They bring a high level of technical expertise in a wide array of building systems through plan review and field inspection activities for construction permits. He added that they also assist the regulatory efforts of other agencies to ensure site improvements meet minimum standards. He introduced the City's Building Official, Ray Allshouse.

Mr. Allshouse explained that his staff is responsible for technical plan review and construction inspection of all new construction, additions, and alteration projects within the City that require building permits. He added that his staff represents over 160 years of construction related experience. His team is small and highly-talented with a low turnover rate which has led to high familiarity with ongoing City issues. The 2006 budget for the Building and Inspections Team is \$625,714 with anticipated revenues of \$611,985. The intention, he said, is for user fees to cover direct costs of service delivery. He highlighted that it is important that fees closely align with actual costs of service. To achieve published performance measures, he pointed out that his team must work closely with other City entities as an integral part of the overall development review team. He said his team scores high on customer service but there is always room for improvement. He noted that the Washington Survey and Ratings Bureau gave Shoreline a "2" under their building code effectiveness rating schedule, thus placing the team in the top 10 percent of municipalities in the State of Washington. No Washington municipality has ever received a rating of "1," but that is a future goal of the team. He said the City directly contributes efforts to standing and ad hoc code development committees of various organizations and attendance at periodic national code amendment voting forums of the International Code Council. Earthquake, fire, and safety issues are of the highest priority at these forums. This coincides with Council Goal #9 concerning the increasing of emergency preparedness training in Shoreline. He displayed a map containing structures along National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) Type-D soils. These structures are in a liquefaction zone and face imminent destruction during a

seismic event. He added that in 2004 the City expanded local regulatory coverage to include plumbing permits and just recently added electrical permitting.

Councilmember Way said she would like to get a copy of the map pertaining to the structures that are in a liquefaction zone in Shoreline. She also wanted to know if the map could be incorporated into a document that would inform residents how to fix the problems. Mr. Olander said he has directed various departments to incorporate the information into their hazardous mitigation workplans. The next step is to produce an information packet to inform residents what resources are available to retrofit their homes and what mitigation measures can be done. He added that one of the work tasks this year is to provide the affected homeowners with information directly.

Councilmember Way asked where the study originated. Mr. Allshouse responded that it was done by the University of Washington. The survey charts the various soil types and it is useful for surface water personnel because different soils have different percolation rates.

Councilmember Way inquired how a person would know if their remodel needs a permit. Mr. Allshouse said the simple answer is that if the electrical wires need to be touched, you need a permit. The Washington State Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) Inspector resides in Shoreline and is very helpful to homeowners.

Councilmember Way asked if the City staff has any expertise concerning solar water heaters and other energy conservation gadgets. Mr. Allshouse noted there is a wealth of information regarding these topics. He said they can research these creative ideas with the applicant and point them in the right direction. Councilmember Way asked if the City provides any information to residents about these alternative systems. Mr. Allshouse said they do not; however, they can research it and look to have information available in the future. Mr. Tovar said this is a good topic for them to follow up with the Council.

Councilmember Ryu commented favorably on the report. She said the liquefaction zone information should be a part of the economic development program and the business registration program. She said hopefully some of them are already aware of the need for retrofitting and she is amazed at the amount of resources the City has on this.

Mr. Olander noted that the City is working with the businesses on non-structural retrofits, such as securing file cabinets. He pointed out that the City needs to begin working with businesses and the fire department to secure hazardous chemicals. He estimated that there are at least several years of implementation to do, but the City is incorporating this in the Hazard Mitigation Plan and will bring it back for Council review.

Councilmember Hansen noted that statistics have shown there are a number of children being killed by falling TV sets. He said homeowners should secure such items in their homes. He said if a person has alternative energy sources in their house they need to make sure no electricity gets back into their lines. When you have an alternative energy system and the power is off in the house, the power will go back down the line and a

person can be electrocuted if he is working on the power lines. Major electrical contractors have information on this. He added that the Arts Council is having an issue with the Department of Labor and Industries relative to the "Showmobile" and its generation system. Mr. Olander responded that Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director, has responded to the problem. He stated he would follow-up with the Council on the results.

Deputy Mayor Fimia appreciated the enthusiasm and the goal of getting a "1" rating. She inquired if the team was hiring an additional employee. Mr. Tovar responded that the additional hire was a Development Review Engineer for this team.

Deputy Mayor Fimia wondered if the City could do demonstration projects, such as garden roofs, waterless toilets, and water reuse demonstrations. She asked about the possibility of including such things in the municipal code.

Mr. Allshouse said the code is set up to allow for "alternative means and methods" and it is his responsibility to evaluate proposals that homeowners make. There is also an appeal process if the homeowner is denied and wants to have the hearing examiner review the proposal. However, he said he is open-minded and aggressive in trying to ensure these new technologies operate properly after third-party testing.

Deputy Mayor Fimia proposed that the City advertise the fact that Shoreline welcomes these types of projects for review. She added that this would help put Shoreline on the map in terms of environmental conservation. She said gray water and the waterless toilet concepts are great. Concerning liquefaction zones, she pointed out that even if a homeowner doesn't reside in one of the zones, they still needed to be prepared for emergencies.

Mr. Allshouse replied that the suspect areas on the map are highlighted as "more susceptible," so all of Shoreline needs to prepare, not just homeowners in the susceptible zones.

(d) City Council 2007 – 2008 Goals and Work Plan

Mr. Olander discussed the adoption of the Council Goals and how they came to be. He said the staff report represents how the City staff will accomplish the goals. He pointed out that the goals are very ambitious based on the City's limited staff resources and budget. There are no funds for additional staff or consultants in 2007 or 2008, and the Council needs to prioritize the list. He encouraged the Council to maintain high-level review and not get involved with the timeframe of these goals.

Councilmember Way inquired if City staff had a timeframe in mind for the completion and the funding of the goals. Mr. Olander noted that the staff needs direction from Council in order to incorporate these items into the budget. He hoped the Council could provide direction over the next couple of weeks to incorporate any financial impacts into

the budget that is being developed. He added that the staff distributes the goals and the summary work plan to the community.

There was Council consensus to review the ten Council Goals one at a time, beginning with Goal #1.

Council Goal #1: Complete the projects approved in the 2006 Parks Bond

Councilmember Ryu noted that the timeline on Goal #1 needs to be sensitive to neighborhoods. For instance, she said the parks construction projects need to be delayed until 2007 or spaced out geographically based on the traffic and light pollution issues they would cause in the neighborhoods. Mr. Olander responded that the staff has spaced the projects and the goals out based on the City resources.

Councilmember Ryu also inquired about the location of the off-leash dog park. Mr. Olander replied that the location hasn't been decided, but there was an idea that two smaller off-leash parks would be more appropriate instead of one large park. The locations are difficult to find, he added. He said the process will take time and the staff will work with the neighbors and the ShoreDog organization.

Councilmember Way asked if any of the projects on the list would fit the criteria for having a master plan done, and how long they generally take to complete. Mr. Olander responded that there are separable projects that a master plan wouldn't necessarily cover. He added that depending on how much public involvement the Council would want to take and the details of the specific project, the process could take from nine months to one year.

Councilmember Gustafson appreciated the time and energy the City staff. He stated that the goals were ambitious and asked the Council to leave the details and the timeline development to the staff. He pointed out that the budget is constrained. He said the detailed work is done and applauded the time and effort of the City staff.

Mr. Olander said he would get back to the Council regarding Councilmember Ryu's question about tennis court lighting.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said she was amazed that the City staff pulled the work plan together in such a short amount of time. She said it generally looks good and is consistent with Council direction. Overall, she said some of the work plan included good citizen involvement but there is still need for more. She said some items need ad-hoc advisory committees, town hall meetings, and the work plans need to state that full community involvement will occur. Mr. Olander concurred.

Council Goal #2: Implement the Economic Development Strategic Plan

Deputy Mayor Fimia asked about the facilitation for wedge properties that is printed on page 42 of the packet. She wondered if there is potential development along the

Interurban Trail. Mr. Olander said there has been an ongoing project at 175th and Aurora Avenue N. to look at how they can be relocated to their best advantage. He said the City has been working with the business owners at that location to craft something mutually acceptable. It is important to provide as much certainty as possible to these businesses.

Deputy Mayor Fimia recommended keeping the Economic Development Task Force because it assists in bringing the business community together, which is something she would like to see as a project step. Tom Boydell, Economic Development Manager, stated the group met in May, but they were not sure what the Council's future intent was for the Task Force.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested that the group should have a quarterly gathering where information is shared. Mr. Boydell replied that the task force structure would lend itself to that.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said the members should be identified and invited to the table to bring the business community together.

Councilmember Way noticed that there was a plan to develop the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Plan. She wondered if it could be combined into a joint Ridgecrest/Briarcrest neighborhood plan. Mr. Boydell said the original idea was to begin a "sustainable neighborhoods initiative." The focus is to learn from the mistakes of the past and look at the needs of the future. The idea is to pioneer ways of planning that are more organic and focus on local neighborhood resources and leadership. He noted that the discussions with the Planning Department and others led to the proposal that Ridgecrest be the place to start because of the manageable number of variables and historical character of the area. He said the feedback from the City was to "start in Ridgecrest."

Mr. Olander commented that this ties into creating neighborhood centers. These "centers" would include a theater, bingo parlors, and other things that interest the community. He added that they are also looking at redeveloping other areas, such as the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and NE 145th Street, and the area where the Ballinger Special Study is taking place.

Councilmember Way inquired if this goal could be combined with one or more of the other goals. She added that perhaps Goal #6, concerning renewable energy, could be combined with Goal #2 in partnership with Shoreline Solar and Shoreline Community College. She felt it would be nice to see this item as a sub-bullet under the Economic Development Plan. Mr. Olander replied that it could possibly fit under Goal #6.

Councilmember Ryu commented that she did not see the business registration program incorporated into this goal. She would like clarification that existing businesses will have an input into the business promotion programs. She added that the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce has a Convention and Visitors Bureau that might align itself with this program since the City has a limited budget. The pilot project with Community Capital

Development (CCD) was not impressive, she said, based on the money the City spent. She would rather have a small business assistance plan that is local because she hasn't seen the return on taxpayer's money.

Mr. Olander said it would be brought to the Council in October. He said information generated from that can help inform other research efforts, but it isn't a goal. He added that the returns on the CCD project will take time and patience. The organization is working on the applications and helping small businesses transition into securing a commercial loan, he said. He emphasized that noticeable results wouldn't be visible for a couple years because it is a long-term investment.

Mr. Boydell replied that the contract with CCD is a three-year contract, and the City is only two months into the term. The Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS) contract is a year-to-year contract which is dependent upon the annual budget. ECOSS is utilized to address environmental sustainability issues with businesses.

Deputy Mayor Fimia suggested the possibility of utilizing type-based instead of use-based zoning in the Ridgecrest neighborhood plan. She added that this is a new concept that the Planning Director, Mr. Tovar, is interested in. She said it would take some Council action, but thought this would be a good time to look at it. Mr. Boydell replied that they haven't figured out any zoning issues just yet, but the suggestion is a good one.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:02 p.m., Councilmember Ryu moved to extend the meeting until 10:30 p.m. Deputy Mayor Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 4-2, with Councilmembers Hansen and Gustafson dissenting.

Mr. Olander pointed out that there have been many individual suggestions made to the goals. He thought staff could transcribe the suggestions for incorporation in the future.

Councilmember Hansen said he voted against this package of ten goals along with two other Councilmembers. He said the plan was too aggressive and staff is saying the same thing. He felt the goals represent an overly-aggressive plan and it calls for City staff to do more than expected. He noted that the City staff is saying that the plan is too ambitious, but the Council is still adding more to do. He said he is confident in the plan that the City staff comes up with.

Councilmember Ryu supported the suggestion that public involvement is needed on Goal #1. She added that advisory committees make sense also.

Mayor Ransom said although there is a small business assistance program in Shoreline, the emphasis should be on the retention and expansion of small businesses. He wondered if that emphasis will be lost. He added that the Buxton Company did a study to attract new businesses, but it is not mentioned. The Ridgecrest community, he noted, was not one of his initial considerations. He expressed concern that City staff and the Council

will be “spread too thin” to accomplish these Council goals. He suggested concentrating on retention and attracting businesses utilizing the Buxton report. He cautioned against overextending City resources.

Mr. Boydell said they are concentrating on small business retention and expansion. He pointed out that the City is working with the Buxton Company on developing an economic development portal that they will host on their website to attract new businesses. This portal will be augmented with the updated demographic analysis that they completed for the City. He will take that information and discuss it with other cities and match it with businesses. The CCD and ECOSS are focused on the retention and expansion of existing businesses as well as support for start-up ventures. These businesses will also be trained on how to use the Buxton website so they can incorporate the information into their business.

Mr. Olander stated that the goals and tasks are 5 percent of the total picture. He said there is more going on than what the Council sees in the staff report.

Councilmember Gustafson suggested the Councilmembers submit revisions to the City staff and have the staff summarize them for discussion and adoption at a future meeting.

Deputy Mayor Fimia said she is not opposed to that idea and suggested the Council take the next 15 minutes to wrap up. She suggested Mr. Olander bring the suggestions back and reflect which are easily adoptable and which require Council action. She highlighted that the economic development area is the hardest because there is not a lot consistency between the Task Force and what is included in the plan.

Rather than continue proceeding goal by goal, there was Council consensus to have each Councilmember reveal what additions or issues they had with each goal.

Regarding Council Goal #4, Deputy Mayor Fimia said she would like to know what the Council has to do to move up the preliminary design and final design timeframe of the Aurora Project. Concerning Goal #5, she wanted to have a town hall meeting after the open house. She suggested inventorying environmental programs from other cities in Goal #6. She wanted the Council to consider type-based zoning and having a citizen transit or transportation advisory committee included with Goal #7. Under Goal #8, she suggested adding the party leadership and the Governor in discussions on the Fircrest property. She suggested having a public outreach campaign and wondered about implementing an enterprise fund to augment the emergency preparedness training and education in Goal #9. In Goal #10, concerning neighborhood safety and improvement programs, she proposed to add not only schools, but the YMCA, churches, parks, and so forth. She felt it would be good to develop a database of youth involvement organizations throughout Shoreline. Noting that only larger neighborhood organizations can apply for mini-grants, she suggested that the process be revised to allow smaller organizations to apply.

Mayor Ransom stated that the final design for the Aurora Improvements from 165th to 205th, as in Goal #4, should include businesses. He also suggested that solar wind and biodiesel fuels be included in Goal #6 as they pertain to environmentally sustainable communities. He stated the Council and the City staff should be careful of using the term "town center" in Goal #7 because it has upset some neighbors.

Councilmember Way submitted that in Goal #6, the renewable energy piece can be accomplished through partnerships between businesses, schools, and other agencies such as Shoreline Solar. She felt staff has done a great job and that this is a magnificent plan. She noted that she would correspond with the City staff on funding ideas.

Mr. Olander said he would be bringing back different funding and budget options in the future. He stated he would create a list of Council suggestions and send the list out to the Council. Once that is completed, he will bring funding options to the Council in the next few weeks.

Regarding Goal #4, Councilmember Ryu suggested that City staff check with the businesses on Aurora Avenue and the community concerning the design. She questioned whether, under the proposed design, emergency vehicles could adequately circulate on Aurora Avenue and asked that the fire department provide input on this. Regarding Goal #8, she felt that knowledge of any prior work done, including any and all past and future public input at Fircrest, would be important in order to accomplish this goal. She also emphasized that signage notifying the public of upcoming meetings is very important when it comes to accomplishing these goals. She stated she wants to see multi-jurisdictional coordination with the emergency preparedness training and education reflected in Goal #9. She believed the definition of neighborhoods needs to be more inclusive in Goal #10.

Mr. Olander noted that many of these suggestions deal with the ongoing details on how the City accomplishes these goals. He said for each one of the goals there will be a detailed citizen communication plan. Therefore, he explained staff doesn't necessarily add that to each bullet. He noted it is best to concentrate on the major elements.

Councilmember Ryu responded that the "how" is quite important because if citizens know there will be public involvement, their minds will be eased.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:32 p.m., Mayor Ransom declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.