

1

appendices

APPENDIX A

Complete Sustainability Recommendations List
with Notes

APPENDIX B

Existing Program Evaluation Summary Matrix

APPENDIX C

Capacity Assessment Matrix

APPENDIX D

LID and Green Building Code Assessment

APPENDIX E

Sustainable Decision Making

APPENDIX F

Potential Indicators

APPENDIX G

Implementation Resources

APPENDIX A

Complete Sustainability Recommendations List
with Notes

APPENDIX A — Complete Sustainability Recommendations List with Notes

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
City Operations & Outreach		
1	Integrate sustainability into City and Departmental missions, functions and decision making at all levels using clear and transparent tools.	Sustainability is not just another program, it is now central to the very mission of the City. Establish and reinforce sustainability as a consistent and unifying factor in policy development and program analysis across all departments. Evaluate the impact of potential decisions and actions on sustainability in a structured and transparent manner (e.g. Sustainable Decision Making Tool).
2	Create baselines for all Sustainability Strategy focus areas and implement indicator tracking system to track progress over time.	Establish and maintain sustainability indicators tracking system with indicators identified in the Shoreline Sustainability Strategy, Appendix F.
3	Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals.	Represents a “quick win”. Use the move to the planned new City Hall as a key opportunity for internal change. Employee of the quarter and other new programs could be used to reward sustainability. Currently, there are no formal standards or clear employee and department expectations related to sustainability. Performance should be measured, and a “carrots rather than sticks” approach should be used to build and maintain support.
4	Establish a permanent GREEN team or interdepartmental committee(s) to focus on sustainability program management and sustainability techniques.	Current working structure of leadership team and technical working group could be formalized and enhanced. Establishing a “Sustainability Coordinator” is not recommended at this time due to budget constraints. It is very important to have clear leadership and emphasis at the highest levels of the City.

Notes:

- 1) The number (#) assigned to each recommendation is for reference purposes only and is not intended to indicate priority or sequence. The number used here is the same number used in the Capacity Assessment Matrix, in Appendix C in the strategy.
- 2) An * in the # column indicates that this is a continuation or expansion of an existing City of Shoreline program, policy or project. These recommendations are presented in the context of the existing programs in Appendix B.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
City Operations & Outreach – continued		
5	Pursue funding to establish a key City staff position or contracted consultant related to sustainability.	For example, the need for a Volunteer Coordinator position was mentioned several times by different people in staff interviews. Volunteers require organization and guidance to leverage this resource effectively. Other ideas included a mid or senior level Sustainability Coordinator Position to oversee the overall effort. Current budget needs and projections do not appear to support an additional general funded position.
6	Develop a comprehensive environmental purchasing policy (EPP) for all City purchasing decisions.	EPP represents a “quick win”. Use the move to the planned new City Hall as a key opportunity for internal change. Existing programs from King County, Seattle and elsewhere can be modified and adopted. Guidelines for specific areas should be separate and updatable.
7 *	Create a green business certification and promotion program.	Chamber of Commerce has received grant funding to start this program. The City should collaborate on this effort with the Chamber. The City’s existing sustainable business program, part of the Economic Development Program, is not a certification program and does not currently appear to be a high priority. More emphasis, structure and focus would be helpful here. Consider stronger efforts to attract and promote environmentally friendly businesses.
8 *	Provide expanded “how to” sustainability info to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, City website and informational brochures).	Use the move to the planned new City Hall and website update as key opportunities to promote community outreach. City currently uses website effectively and regularly mails out information. Additional sustainability outreach can be achieved thorough the City’s informational mailers. Time and resources for additional outreach are always an issue to consider.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
Energy & Carbon Reduction		
9	Develop a baseline for energy consumption and carbon data using ICLEI “5 Milestones Toolkit.”	Using ICLEI’s process (provided in a toolkit to cities who “sign on” to ICLEI, the City creates a baseline for their carbon emissions. The City (generally with the use of volunteers) collects energy and waste data, and calculates greenhouse gas emissions for a base year (e.g., 2000) and for a forecast year (e.g., 2015). The inventory and the forecast capture emissions from all municipal operations (e.g., city owned and/or operated buildings, streetlights, transit systems, wastewater treatment facilities) and from all community-related activities (e.g., residential and commercial buildings, motor vehicles, waste streams, industry). The inventory and forecast provide a benchmark against which the city can measure progress.
10	For all new construction of City facilities (including the City Hall), meet requirements specified in LEED Core Performance Guide, referenced in the prescriptive path for LEED Energy and Atmosphere Credit 1.	The purpose of the LEED EA Credit 1 is to achieve increasing levels of energy performance over a prescribed baseline. Credit requirements can be met through whole building energy simulation or one of two applicable prescriptive compliance paths. City buildings that get state funding must comply with the state requirement to achieve LEED Silver. Regardless of whether state funding is used, the City should consider implementation of this recommendation and related recommendations. For Recommendation #10, #11 and #24, the City should consider the definitions, thresholds and exemptions defined in the recent Washington State High Performance Public Buildings Law (ESSB 5509). For example, the LEED requirements apply to “major facility projects,” which for new construction is defined as buildings larger than five thousand gross square feet of occupied or conditioned space as defined in the Washington state energy code.
11	For all new construction of City facilities (including the City Hall), require the use of Commissioning as outlined by the ASHRAE Commissioning Process Guideline 0-2005.	Commissioning is a process that ensures buildings operate as intended, thus ensuring energy efficiencies are actually achieved.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Energy & Carbon Reduction – continued</i>		
12	Upgrade existing City facilities to meet Energy Star building performance standard for similar building types.	Shoreline can also become an ENERGY STAR partner. As part of the City’s partnership commitment, they agree to: measure, track, and benchmark energy performance; develop and implement a plan to improve energy efficiency; and educate staff and the public about the partnership and achievements with ENERGY STAR, or similar, efficiency improvements (Energy Star provides tools to develop the plan, and benchmark buildings against similar types, including local government facilities).
13	Include requirements to meet Energy Star for building equipment and appliances in purchasing guidelines.	Energy Star provides lists of equipment and appliances that meet their standards. Their website shows a range, including equipment that goes well beyond their minimal standards.
14	Engage in Seattle City Light’s (SCL) green power program (Green Up). Increase green power purchase to 100% during annual budget planning.	Greater coordination with power utilities could be pursued. In addition, zoning and permitting incentives could specifically target energy efficient construction. Local non-profit groups, such as Shoreline Solar Project could be approached as partners.
15 *	Require all new fleet vehicles be alternatively fueled, or rated by EPA for 45 mpg or higher for fossil fuel vehicles.	This requirement would only apply to vehicle types where these options are generally available and cost effective. For exempt vehicles, require the most efficient options available. Fleet decisions must consider the use and initial cost of the vehicles as well as maintenance costs.
16	Conduct a campaign for city staff to reward “smart” trip planning to reduce unnecessary trips and the total miles traveled for work related trips.	The campaign could reward staff for “smart” trip planning, including using the most efficient vehicle for the job, combining trips and planning the trip route to reduce miles traveled and gas used.
17	Promote use of SCL and Puget Sound Energy (PSE) incentives, or other encouragement for conservation and alternative energy as part of an outreach campaign.	Utilities promote these incentives through bill stuffers. The city could include information in its public outreach campaign (see General recommendations).

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Energy & Carbon Reduction - continued</i>		
18	Work with SCL and PSE to prepare a report showing Shoreline Community’s overall energy use as of baseline year; update figures provided by SCL/PSE.	The City should work with Seattle City Light and Puget Sound Energy to gain their support for the City’s Sustainability Strategy by assisting with collection of baseline data. The City of Kirkland has successfully engaged Puget Sound Energy in components of their sustainability efforts. Data in such a report would need to be normalized and explain other factors that impact utility rates such as house size and annual temperature variations.
19	Collect information about greenhouse gas emissions and energy use through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process.	The SEPA Checklist already requires a project applicant to estimate the air emissions that will result from the project. The Washington State Department of Ecology is currently working to clarify the SEPA Checklist to include greenhouse gas emissions. The City of Seattle and King County recently starting requiring project applicants to include greenhouse gas emissions in the air emissions estimate. See worksheet: http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/forms/SEPA-GHG-EmissionsWorksheet-Bulletin26.pdf . An effort to collect this information should be rolled out first. This will set the stage for eventual regulation and requiring mitigation of impacts through the SEPA process. Particular attention needs to be paid to how threshold levels would be structured and set.
20	Employ PLACE³S (PLAnning for Community Energy, Economic and Environmental Sustainability) or similar software, for future land use planning efforts (e.g. the next major Comprehensive Plan update).	PLACE ³ S is an innovative planning method that fully integrates focused public participation, community development and design, and computer-assisted quantification tools (GIS) to help communities produce plans that retain dollars in the local economy, save energy, attract jobs and development, reduce pollution and traffic congestion and conserve open space. It creates an information base to function as a common yardstick, empowering a community to compare components of each plan (apples-to-apples), make informed trade-offs, and arrive at a consensus. The consensus-based plan would be broadly supported, economically and environmentally realistic, make investment sense, and encourage Smart Growth benefits to be tracked and reported annually.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure</i>		
21 *	Prioritize and promote Green Building and Low Impact Development (LID) proficiencies for select staff (e.g. Planning and Development Services, Environmental Services and Capital Projects Engineers).	Emphasize training where it will do the most good. Planners, Building Plan Reviewers, Engineers, Grant Coordinator, Surface Water and Environmental Services personnel appear to be the highest priorities. Some of these personnel have already received training. By being “literate” in green building, city staff can be available to provide information at the permitting counter to those interested in green building and LID, and help when developers have innovative projects.
22 *	Establish a Residential Green Building Program, including worksheets on specific innovations for permitting clients.	Provide information to homeowners and builders on residential green building practices, resources, and opportunities. Concurrently establish a green building permitting process and expertise in the Planning Department. Funding was just obtained to start outreach in 2008. City of Seattle has produced informational sheets on innovative systems; these can be used as a model for Shoreline worksheets.
23 *	Revise zoning and engineering standards to provide guidance and incentives for Low Impact Development (LID) and Green Building.	Many opportunities exist in this area and they will be detailed in consultant recommendations. These range from LID engineering details and specific standards to provide guidance, modifying how impervious surface coverage is calculated, and creating development flexibility and incentives for green building projects. The City’s stormwater engineering standards are currently under review. Over forty jurisdictions in the country have enacted policies to incentivize green building standards. Most do this with the carrot: expedited permitting, tax credits, grants, technical assistance, density bonuses, FAR allowances tied to meeting a standard are examples. Both Issaquah and Kirkland for example allow a verified five star Built Green project to receive expedited permitting.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure - continued</i>		
24 *	Adopt a Green Building Policy for the City’s capital projects. Construct new buildings and additions to LEED Silver Standard (with Washington State exemption limits). Specify a commitment to LID principles as outlined in Low Impact Development: Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound.	City staff have indicated that this is something that they intend to examine, but do not expect to take action in the short term. This item should be considered for short term, high priority status. Current plans for new City Hall/Civic Center are consistent with this recommendation. Phase II plan for Aurora Corridor is generally in line with the intent of this recommendation. Additional specifics regarding LID should be in new adopted policy.
25 *	Prioritize and structure the development of the Green Streets program.	A demonstration project is needed, but emphasis should also be on planning, site selection criteria, and implementation strategies using an “opportunistic” approach that addresses site conditions, neighbor interest and budgets. Priority should be placed on funding and specific goals for this program. The Transportation and Storm Water Master Plans should be revised to include additional guidance for where and how this initiative should be pursued.
26	Modify the stormwater utility fee to promote low impact development, calibrate for true system impact/cost and encourage natural drainage improvements.	This would require a fee study and is potentially a medium-term time frame action. Current fee is collected with property taxes. It is a flat fee for residential users and for commercial is based on the amount of impervious surface on the property without any consideration of LIDs that might reduce the effective impervious. Fee structure for commercial properties only provides incentives for proper maintenance of required private stormwater facilities such as detention tanks.
27 *	Expand and reorient the existing priority sidewalk improvement program to focus on linking destinations and network connectivity.	Aurora corridor program will represent a major achievement. Existing focus on sidewalks near schools will result in benefits, but there is a recognized need to both broaden and reorient the program as budget constraints allow. The Transportation Master Plan should be revised to provide clear guidance on the development of an overall pedestrian system for utilitarian walking. A bond issue or other funding mechanism could be explored as a funding mechanism for this future work.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure - continued</i>		
28 *	Improve identification, mapping, designation, surfacing and signage of existing trails. Develop a plan for future trail expansion.	City has recently convened a trail user and planning group to identify and prioritize improvements. Specific priorities and locations should result from this effort. City should also focus on linking destinations with trails and treating them as part of the transportation system – focus not just on trails pleasure walking, but for utilitarian walking as well. The Parks and Transportation Master Plan scheduled updates should provide clear guidance on the development of an overall pedestrian system, including trails.
29 *	Develop bicycle and pedestrian plans in the Transportation Master Plan that identify a cohesive network which connects major destinations.	Improvements include Interurban Trail “feeders”, complete gaps on 155th and 185th, and connections in the Fircrest, North City and Richmond Beach areas. The Transportation Master Plan should be revised to provide clear guidance on the development of an overall pedestrian system for utilitarian, as well as recreational, walking.
30 *	Update the Transportation Master Plan and provide a stronger link to the Land Use Element in the Comprehensive Plan.	Provide a vision for the future of all major streets consistent with the land use plan to guide future investment and capital improvement decisions, including transit routes, street classifications and Right-of-Way improvement standards and needs.
31 *	Develop a plan with near-term and long-term priorities for transit system improvements prior to or as part of the Transportation Master Plan process to guide advocacy, intergovernmental coordination and advance planning.	Clear consensus between the City staff and Council on specific priorities and a strong commitment to pursuing these transit improvements through all available means will increase the likelihood that progress is made in this area. Adoption of resolutions outlining such priorities, such as recently adopted Resolutions 272 and 273, is a good first step.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure - continued</i>		
32 *	Advocate for a revised Sound Transit Phase II Plan (ST2) which includes improvements that serve the City of Shoreline.	Under the current version of the ST2 proposal, Shoreline residents will receive no direct benefits for their additional financial contributions. Current Sound Transit service to Shoreline is very limited. In Resolution No. 272, the Shoreline City Council expresses support for changes to the current ST2 proposal, including continuation of the light rail system to North 205 th , light rail stops at North 145 th and North 185 th , Bus Rapid Transit stops at those locations if light rail is not feasible, and \$40 million financial contribution toward the completion of the Business Access Transit (BAT) lanes in the Aurora Corridor.
33 *	Advocate for a single, integrated and continuous bus rapid transit system on Aurora Ave. (SR 99) between Everett and Seattle.	Coordination between Community Transit, Metro and Sound Transit is needed along Aurora Ave (State Route 99). Current transit agency plans will result in two different systems and no regional coordination. The lack of integration results in service gaps, significant delay and inconvenience that decreases rider-ship. The Shoreline City Council recently adopted Resolution 273 which states these concerns and directs staff to contact adjacent communities along the corridor, transit agencies, neighboring city council and planning commissions and State legislators to engage them on this matter.
34	Consider advocating for a Metro “feeder” route to improve east-west transit and support Aurora backbone.	Residents and staff have noted that east-west transportation in the City is poor. City should try and capitalize on Aurora corridor investment and service levels. Where the demand exists or is likely with future densities, additional east-west service should be a priority for the City and its lobbying efforts.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure - continued</i>		
35 *	Consider providing a program based on the State's commute trip reduction (CTR) program for medium-sized sites not currently required to participate in the State CTR program.	This is another potential idea that was mentioned by a City staff member that should be investigated. More incentives for non-SOV commuters can be targeted for employers large and medium size employers not currently required to participate in the CTR program. Current program only requires participation of six employers in the City. Funding options for a program expansion would need to be researched as it is significant issue for this program. Current support and administration of this program for the City is provided through an inter-local agreement with Metro, however voluntary expansion of the program might not get additional funding/support. Options for expansion of the CTR program should be explored the next time the CTR plan is updated.
36 *	Future updates to Comprehensive Plan and/or Housing Strategy should include a focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and transit supportive neighborhoods to create density nodes that support transit use. Continue to focus new development near existing and proposed transit corridors and improvements.	Existing park and ride at 192 nd and Aurora has been considered as a key potential location in the past for a TOD. This location is more convenient for riders making connections on Aurora than the current Aurora Village location. Sustainability factors (e.g. managing growth in locations near existing and future transportation investment, such as light rail stations, where density will help support transit use) should be given strong consideration in public conversations and Subarea plan development. The Housing Strategy emphasizes the need for housing choice, affordability and use of design to attain neighborhood compatibility. These concepts should also be considered in proposals to create density nodes.
<i>Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction</i>		
37 *	Expand existing efforts to reduce, reuse, and recycle in City offices, parks, and other facilities.	Build on existing plan to implement plastic bottle recycling in Twin Ponds Park. Extend program to additional parks and City facilities and the recycling of additional materials as feasibility issues are worked out and as funding is available. Current recycling program at City Hall should be emphasized and improved.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction - continued</i>		
38 *	Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse (e.g. duplex copiers, durable goods); reduce consumption of raw materials (e.g. recycled content and recyclable materials) and present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials).	This is perhaps the most mature element of most EPP guidelines (Seattle, King County EPA).
39	Provide convenient opportunities (prominent and labeled bins) for sorting, collecting, and composting solid waste streams in the community.	This recommendation has strong potential for engagement of volunteers. Efforts should be focused on obtaining partnerships with businesses and schools. Focus should be on waste generated outside the home and items that are difficult to dispose of because they are not allowed in residential curbside collection.
40 *	Implement construction and business waste reduction outreach and incentives through the permitting process and municipal waste contract.	Both King County and City of Seattle have had tremendous success using education and technical assistance to help reduce construction and business waste. Expedited permitting is a popular incentive with builders. The reduction of construction waste should be an important focus, e.g. free and early demo permit issuance for projects that recycle construction waste as well as outreach materials to promote building “deconstruction” and related recycling and reuse of materials. Rate structure could encourage construction waste recycling. Currently there is no drop-off for commercial hazardous waste near Shoreline. At a minimum, information and outreach materials are needed on this issue.

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction - continued		
41 *	For high use operations including irrigation and park restrooms replace fixtures and equipment with the highest efficiency, cost-effective water conservation options available.	Examples include more efficient irrigation equipment, automatic low flow fixtures in park restrooms, grey water reuse systems, etc. Retrofit if funding is available, develop a phased plan for replacement or at a minimum require when existing equipment reaches end of serviceable lifespan. A supporting recommendation is to include expanded use of naturalized drought tolerant plantings in low use park areas. Fixture and equipment selection must take into consideration product performance, maintenance and replacement constraints and costs.
42 *	For retrofits and new construction of City indoor facilities, specify/replace fixtures with high efficiency, low flow alternatives.	Examples include automatic low flow fixtures in bathrooms, two-stage flush toilets, etc. Require for new facilities. For existing facilities, retrofit if funding is available, develop a phased plan for replacement or at a minimum require when existing equipment reaches end of serviceable lifespan. Fixture and equipment selection must take into consideration product performance, maintenance and replacement constraints and costs.
43	Investigate the use of non-potable sources or non-potable uses, such as grey water reuse for toilet flushing.	There are a range of opportunities to save potable water use for indoor water consumption, from conserving water consumption overall, to replacing potable water used for non-drinking purposes, such as toilet flushing with grey water. Rainwater catchment for outdoor use/irrigation is less effective in our climate, because the rain comes mostly in the seasons when it is not needed. However, a new Built Green residential project near Shoreline Community College includes rainwater catchment for irrigation and it can be used to supplement irrigation needs in some applications.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction - continued</i>		
44	Work with utilities to expand existing and develop new incentives to reduce potable and irrigation water consumption.	For example, not all utility districts in Shoreline bill based on consumption, so there is no financial incentive to conserve and not all utility districts actively promote conservation. Shoreline Water District used to give out rain barrels at cost and such programs should be reinstated. Overall, more strategic direction and expansion of water and wastewater conservation programs is needed. City should meet with utilities and see what is planned and where they can partner.
45 *	Implement residential waste incentives and requirements through the municipal waste contract and permit process. Expand community outreach and information efforts to reduce waste and recycle.	The recent CleanScapes contract is a major achievement in the City's efforts to reduce waste and improve recycling efforts. By linking the familiar three R's with the Sustainability Strategy in community outreach efforts it will both revitalize interest in three R's and bridge to other less familiar concepts. Specific requirements should be established for waste and recycling facilities in new residential construction.
<i>Ecosystem Management</i>		
46 *	Identify underutilized park lands and other City property and use for habitat improvements, infiltration, water treatment and other compatible purposes.	This is another great idea that was mentioned by City staff during the interviews. Transform some underutilized grass areas into plant and wildlife habitat. Reduction in maintenance costs would partially offset cost of habitat improvements. Improvements at Cromwell Park provide an example. Areas at Hamlin Park, Ronald Bog and elsewhere could also be considered.
47	Consider the development of a Natural Resources and Habitat Action Plan.	A focused and strategic planning effort is needed to establish or synthesize key goals, specific objectives, priority locations, targets, partners and funding mechanisms. An action Plan will organize this effort and improve the City's ability to obtain grant funding.

APPENDIX A — Preliminary Draft Recommendations

#	RECOMMENDATIONS	NOTES
<i>Ecosystem Management - continued</i>		
48 *	Continue and expand restoration and enhancement priority locations and targets for publicly funded or assisted wetland and stream enhancement projects.	The City has some established priorities and targets for habit improvement in the current Surface Water Master Plan. Specific City goals should be updated and expanded for enhancement of wetlands and streams in future updates of the Surface Water and Parks Master Plans and in other logical project or planning processes. Focus can be on City owned property at first, but outreach efforts should seek partners and opportunities on private property as well.
49 *	Implement the Cascade Land Conservancy's (CLC) Green Cities Program by prioritizing forest health data collection and improvement projects and strengthening partnerships to increase the acreage analyzed and enhanced.	City staff has identified this as a medium timeframe priority, however it should be considered for earlier implementation to strengthen the Green Cities Partnership. Existing work with Seattle Urban Nature Project includes Hamlin, Shoreview, Boeing and South Woods parks as a priority and findings will be reported to City Council in early 2008. Current program budget is \$50K and program should be continued and enhanced if possible. Next steps will include looking at additional parks and acting on implementation recommendations. City should look at grants and volunteers through CLC and Ivy OUT to leverage greater implementation support if possible.
50 *	Promote and expand environmental mini-grant program, with focus on critical area and urban forest enhancement.	Existing City environmental grant program should be expanded to leverage greater community support of restoration and enhancement efforts.

Notes:

- 1) The number (#) assigned to each recommendation is for reference purposes only and is not intended to indicate priority or sequence. The number used here is the same number used in the Capacity Assessment Matrix, in Appendix C in the strategy.
- 2) An * in the # column indicates that this is a continuation or expansion of an existing City of Shoreline program, policy or project. These recommendations are presented in the context of the existing programs in Appendix B.

APPENDIX B

Existing Program Evaluation Summary Matrix

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

Existing Program Evaluation/Recommendation Summary Matrix

Notes: Existing Programs inventory was generated prior to finalization of the Focus Areas so this table is not organized into the Strategy's Focus Areas as the recommendations and Appendices A and C. RECOMMENDATION CATEGORIES: Ensure Continuation, Modify Overall Approach and Expand Current Efforts.

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Climate Protection and Transportation Management</p> <p>Business Access/Transit Lanes on Aurora (PW) – The Aurora Corridor Project includes lanes dedicated to transit, making transit more efficient, competitive and attractive to users.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Aurora Corridor Project is an excellent foundation on which to build a comprehensive transit program. Next steps should include setting clear priorities for improving transit service and connectivity, considering the specifics outlined in the recommendations.</p>	<p>#31: Update Transportation Master Plan with transit priorities to guide increased advocacy. #32: Advocate for a revised Sound Transit Phase II Plan that serves Shoreline directly. #33: Advocate for a single, integrated and continuous bus rapid transit system on Aurora Ave. (SR 99) between Everett and Seattle. #34: Consider advocating for a metro “feeder” route to improve east-west transit and support Aurora backbone.</p>
<p>Promoting Alternatives to Driving (PW/PADS) – The City of Shoreline promotes non-motorized transportation through installation of dedicated bicycle and pedestrian pathways such as the Interurban Trail, installation of bicycle lanes on City streets, promotion of the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program for City employees and citizens, installation of pedestrian walkways near local schools, and construction and maintenance of urban trails as part of the City's 2006 Parks Bond.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: This comprehensive approach to Alternatives to Driving should be a major focal point of community outreach efforts and a revised website, providing that the City demonstrates its commitments to improving transit and non-motorized transportation in its capital investments and regional coordination, so that residents have real alternatives.</p>	<p>#27: Expand and re-orient the existing sidewalk improvement program to focus on linking destinations and connectivity. #28: Improve identification, mapping, designation, surfacing and signage of existing trails. Develop a plan for future trail expansion. #31: Update Transportation Master Plan with transit priorities to guide increased advocacy. #32: Advocate for a revised Sound Transit Phase II Plan that serves Shoreline directly. #33: Advocate for a single, integrated and continuous bus rapid transit system on Aurora Ave. (SR 99) between Everett and Seattle. #35: Consider providing a program based on the existing commute trip reduction program to include medium-size employers. #36: Future update to Comp Plan and/or Housing strategy should include a focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and transit-supportive neighborhoods to create transit nodes.</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
Climate Protection and Transportation Management - continued		
<p>Climate Protection Campaign (PW) – In 2007 and 2008, the City of Shoreline will collect baseline data from local practices that contribute to global warming. In fall/winter 2008, a pilot education program will be proposed.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: This City Inventory Item can really be divided into separate categories – energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, both City and public arenas. Need to include language from US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement and other commitments, and continue to develop more specific initiatives. Good starts are Recommendations at right.</p>	<p>#1: Integrate sustainability into all City functions and decision making using clear and transparent tools. #2: Create baselines for all environmental focus areas. #9: Develop a baseline for energy consumption and carbon data using ICLEI “5 Milestones Toolkit” #10: For all new construction of City facilities (including the City Hall), meet requirements specified in LEED Core Performance Guide, referenced in the prescriptive path for LEED Energy & Atmosphere Credit 1. #11: For all new construction of City facilities (including the City Hall), require the use of Commissioning as outlined by the ASHRAE Commissioning Process Guideline 0-2005. #12: Upgrade existing City facilities to meet Energy Star building performance standard for similar building types. #13: Include requirements to meet Energy Star for building equipment and appliances in purchasing guidelines. #14: Engage in Seattle City Light’s (SCL) green power program (Green Up). As part of annual budget planning, increase proportion of green power purchase to 100%. #16: Conduct a campaign for City staff to reward “smart” trip planning to reduce unnecessary trips/miles travelled. #17: Promote use of SCL/PSE and other incentives for conservation and alternative energy as part of public outreach program. #18: Work with SCL/PSE to prepare a report showing Shoreline Community’s overall energy use as of baseline year; update figures provided by SCL/PSE. #20: Employ energy software such as PLACE’S or similar for land use planning.</p>
<p>Fleet Vehicles (PW-operations) – The City of Shoreline has begun incorporating hybrid fuel cell vehicles into its vehicle fleet. Staff is also investigating the possibility of purchasing electric vehicles.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: Targets should be more ambitious – current target is 2% of fleet per year, which just follows the replacement schedule. Also, continue to reevaluate and increase targets as technology changes dictate.</p>	<p>#15: Require all new fleet vehicles be alternatively fueled, or rated by EPA for 45 mpg or higher for fossil fuel vehicles (only applies to vehicle types where these options exist).</p>
<p>Regional Roads Maintenance Forum (PW) – As an active member of this program, the City of Shoreline implements and tracks Best Management Practices in its municipal maintenance activities such as regular inspection of vehicles for leaks and street sweeping to prevent solid and hazardous waste from entering waterways.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): This is an existing program that should be continued, and expanded in time to include maintenance specific to Green Streets.</p>	<p>#25: Prioritize and structure the development of the Green Streets program.</p>
Community Building and Outreach		
<p>Earth Day Celebration (PCS/PW) – In partnership with local businesses and Shoreline Community College, the City of Shoreline offers a variety of Earth Day programs including habitat restoration projects at local parks, the Natural Yard Care for Earth Day & Everyday</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Sustainability calls to action will occur more often. For example, have one Shoreline volunteer work day each quarter and engage greater volunteer participation.</p>	<p>#8: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures).</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
Community Building and Outreach - continued		
<p>Neighborhood Environmental Stewardship Team (PW) – The Neighborhood Environmental Stewardship Team (NEST) program actively involves community residents in learning about and selecting environmental changes that promote health and sustainability in their neighborhood and homes.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: This program can be expanded and developed using internet resources. Creation of “how to” sheets with technical guidance and available resources might help grow the program. This initiative can be greatly helped through either a sustainability coordinator or volunteer coordinator position.</p>	<p>#5: Pursue grants to establish a key City staff position related to sustainability (e.g., Volunteer Coordinator). #8: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures).</p>
<p>Environmental Mini Grant Program (PW/C&IR) – This new program supports local non-profits, youth and community groups that want to implement environmental projects to benefit the Shoreline community.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Program is doing well and should be ramped up. Make sure funding source is reliable. Volunteer Coordinator position and a specific focus on critical area and urban forest enhancement would help expand, leverage and focus resources.</p>	<p>#5: Pursue grants to establish a key City staff position related to sustainability (e.g., Volunteer Coordinator). #50: Promote and expand environmental mini-grant program, with focus on critical area and urban forest enhancement.</p>
<p>Adopt-a-Road and Adopt-a-Trail Programs (PW/C&IR/PRCS) – The City of Shoreline Adopt-a-Road Program helps clean up litter and debris on City streets. Since the program began, over 100 volunteers have removed over 5,000 lbs of litter. An Adopt-a-Trail program was started in 2007 to care for the new Inter-urban Trail system.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): As part of overall community building and outreach initiative, both Adopt-a programs can be continued and perhaps further developed. Adopt-a-Trail program might even be used to develop linkages -- volunteer labor and a focus on maintenance and signage in addition to litter.</p>	<p>#5: Pursue grants to establish a key City staff position related to sustainability (e.g., Volunteer Coordinator). #28: Improve identification, mapping, designation surface and signage of existing trails. Develop a plan for future trail expansion.</p>
Habitat Conservation and Restoration		
<p>Urban Forest Assessment Planning (PRCS) – The City of Shoreline is contracting with Seattle Urban Nature Project to perform an urban forest assessment for Hamlin, Shoreview, Boeing Creek and South Woods parks. These assessments will help the City determine the health of major forested park sites in Shoreline and prioritize areas that need the most attention from Park maintenance staff and Ivy OUT volunteers.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: While this has been tagged as a low-priority inventory item for consultant analysis, it is the gateway to other items and recommendations. Forest enhancement provides public amenities, habitat, and opportunities for stormwater infiltration that reduce burdens on infrastructure. Adopt an integrated approach to UFA Planning.</p>	<p>#46: Identify underutilized park lands and use for habitat improvements, infiltration, water treatment and other compatible purposes. #47: Consider development of a Natural Resources Action Plan. #49: Implement the Cascade Land Conservancy’s (CLC) Green Cities Program by prioritizing forest health data collection and improvement projects and pursue partnerships to increase the acreage analyzed and enhanced. #50: Promote and expand environmental mini-grant program, with focus on critical area and urban forest enhancement.</p>
<p>Open Space Acquisition (PRCS) – The City of Shoreline is always seeking opportunities to ensure the protection of natural habitat. The 2006 Park Bond recently approved by Shoreline voters includes funding for the acquisition of 25 acres of open space.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: Create specific targets for acquisition, conservation and/or restoration of open space and habitat (different things!).</p>	<p>#46: Identify underutilized park lands and use for habitat improvements, infiltration, water treatment and other compatible purposes. #47: Consider the development of a Natural Resources Action Plan.</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Habitat Conservation and Restoration - continued</p>		
<p>Critical Areas Ordinance (PADS) – The City of Shoreline updated its Critical Areas Ordinance in March 2006 to comply with State guidelines as well as provide greater protection for local streams, wetlands, steep slopes and fish and wildlife habitat areas.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As is): CAO was recently revised and no immediate modification of regulations are recommended. However, additional efforts are needed in the larger arena of critical area stewardship. Create specific targets for acquisition, conservation and/or restoration of wetland and stream enhancement projects</p>	<p>#48: Establish restoration and enhancement targets for publicly funded or assisted wetland and stream enhancement projects.</p>
<p>WRIA 8 Participation (PW) – Since 2001, the City of Shoreline has participated in the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 8 regional process to develop and implement a plan for the recovery of endangered Chinook salmon.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As is): Existing participation in WRIA process has been useful in identifying regional priorities and some local priorities. Additional work needed to set clear targets for local watershed enhancement efforts and demonstrate greater progress.</p>	<p>#48: Establish restoration and enhancement targets for publicly funded or assisted wetland and stream enhancement projects.</p>
<p>Ivy Out Volunteer Program (PRCS/C&IP) – The City of Shoreline initiated Ivy O.U.T. (Off Urban Trees) events in parks in 2005 and in 2006 formalized a monthly schedule of rotating work parties in City parks.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: This is an good example of using community resources. This overlaps with recommendations to develop volunteer resources and community education. The Ivy O.U.T. format can be broadened to include other initiatives and used as a template for other initiatives.</p>	<p>#49: Implement the Cascade Land Conservancy’s (CLC) Green Cities program by prioritizing forest health data collection and improvement projects and pursue partnerships to increase the acreage analyzed and enhanced.</p>
<p>Habitat Restoration Projects (PADS/PW/PRCS) – The City of Shoreline has partnered with the community to improve stream systems and fish & wildlife habitats through vegetation restoration in the City.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: Opportunities to increase public involvement through greater education (via Web resources). Additional work needed to truly prioritize, ramp up commitment and set specific targets. More structure and hard targets needed. Natural Resources Action Plan is recommended.</p>	<p>#48: Establish restoration and enhancement targets for publicly funded or assisted wetland and stream enhancement projects. #50: Promote and expand environmental mini-grant program, with focus on critical area. #47: Consider the development of a Natural Resources Action Plan.</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Land Use and Development</p>		
<p>Green Building Program implementation</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: See Recommendations.</p>	<p>#10: For major new City facilities meet LEED Core Performance Requirements for Energy and Atmosphere Credit #1. #11: For new construction of major City facilities (including City Hall), require the use of Commissioning as outlined by the ASHRAE Commissioning Process Guideline 0-2005. #12: Upgrade existing City facilities to meet Energy Star building performance standard for similar building types. #13: Include requirements to meet Energy Star for building equipment and appliances in purchasing guidelines. #21: Prioritize and promote Green Building and LID training for select staff (e.g., PADS, Grants & Engineers). #22: Establish a Residential Green Building program, including outreach and worksheets. #23: Revise zoning and engineering standards to provide guidance and incentives for LID and Green Building. #24 Adopt a Green Building Policy for City Capital Projects - LEED Silver and LID principles as outlined in Puget Sound Manual. #26: Modify the stormwater utility fee to promote LID, calibrate for true system impact/cost and encourage natural drainage improvements.</p>
<p>Civic Center/City Hall (PW/PADS) – The new Civic Center/City Hall is to be built to a minimum LEED Silver standard. It will serve as a model for sustainable practices throughout the community by implementing standards of construction to the extent possible that support re-use of materials, energy conservation, water efficiency, landscaping and indoor environmental quality. To parallel the construction of the new Civic Center/City Hall, a Green Building brochure will offer examples and resources for residents to incorporate sustainable building practices into their home remodeling projects.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): This is the flagship for the City, and in all ways should be used to advance and model sustainable design strategies.</p>	
<p>Green Street Demonstration (PW) – Green Street Demonstration Projects will focus on developing opportunities that will provide a “living demonstration” to serve as an educational experience, support sound environmental practices and improve water quality in the City of Shoreline.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: Need to develop a plan with specific priorities and siting criteria. Focus should continue to be on “opportunistic approach” however and not a “one size fits all”. Demo project important, but need to jumpstart the planning piece and identify capital improvement plans and integrate with Transportation Master Plan and Surface Water Master Plan.</p>	<p>#25: Prioritize and structure the development of the Green Streets program - focus on surface water enhancements, connectivity and linking destinations.</p>
<p>Sustainable Business Extension Service (CMO) – economic development program - SBES promotes resource conservation programs and environmentally sound business practices to Shoreline’s local businesses. This free confidential service provides improved access to government programs, rebates and technical assistance in the ever-changing world of environmental and safety regulations.</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: Collaborate with Shoreline Chamber of Commerce and identify local business champions to sponsor and/or assume leadership roles in implementing the program. The Chamber of Commerce is using a King County grant to develop a Sustainable Business Program similar to Kirkland’s, with the intent of partnering with the City to implement and administer. Emphasis should be on supporting, enabling and coordinating with the Chamber of Commerce efforts.</p>	<p>#7: Work with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce to create a green business certification and promotion program.</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Land Use and Development - continued</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: This is a major area of opportunity, as reflected in Recommendations. Specific targets should be adopted, and as mentioned above, City Hall is a great way to kick off all new initiatives, including public outreach and possibly new requirements for developers.</p>	<p>#14: Engage in Seattle City Light green power program (Green Up). As part of annual budget planning, increase proportion of green power purchase to 100%. #37: Expand existing efforts to reduce, reuse, and recycle in City offices, parks, and other facilities. #38: Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse; reduce consumption of raw materials; and, present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials). #3: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals. #4: Establish a permanent green team or interdepartmental committee to focus on sustainability program management and sustainability techniques. #6: Develop a comprehensive environmental purchasing policy for all City purchasing decisions.</p>
<p>City Buildings Operations Practices and Policies – This is not necessarily sustainable now, but future decisions should be made to reduce the carbon/ecological footprints of our buildings, purchasing decisions, and standard operations.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Increase awareness of this program and make an explicit offer to expand it to other communities if they are interested.</p>	<p>#7: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures). #38: Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse; reduce consumption of raw materials; and, present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials). #2: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals.</p>
<p>Toxics Reduction</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Increase awareness of this program and make an explicit offer to expand it to other communities if they are interested.</p>	<p>#7: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures). #38: Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse; reduce consumption of raw materials; and, present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials). #2: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals.</p>
<p>No Spray Zones in Richmond Beach (PW) – Based on community interest, the City of Shoreline initiated a pilot “No Spray Zone” in the Richmond Beach neighborhood in 2004. The City agreed not to spray pesticides in the right-of-way for four years, and local residents agreed to maintain the six-inch area adjacent to the road pavement.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): Program is working well. Possible future efforts might include the creations of specific lists of banned products and preferred providers of environmentally sustainable products. Make lists publicly available.</p>	<p>#7: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures). #38: Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse; reduce consumption of raw materials; and, present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials). #2: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals.</p>
<p>Pesticide-Free Parks (PCS) – The City of Shoreline is proud to say that it makes every effort to not use pesticides or herbicides in the maintenance of City parks. Chemical pesticide or herbicide use is prohibited for use near City-owned critical areas such as streams and wetlands.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): Program is working well. Possible future efforts might include the creations of specific lists of banned products and preferred providers of environmentally sustainable products. Make lists publicly available.</p>	<p>#7: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures). #38: Include in purchase guidelines preference/requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse; reduce consumption of raw materials; and, present reduced risk to human and ecological health (non-toxic materials). #2: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals.</p>

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

INVENTORY ITEM	ANALYSIS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Waste Reduction and Management</p>	<p>Modify Overall Approach: This is a major area of opportunity, as reflected in Recommendations. Waste management should be a comprehensive approach to environmental sustainability, from household decisions (e.g., sorting and recycling) to City operations (e.g., proper disposal and diversion at transfer stations). Recycling must be made a priority in the City - recycling in City operations is the biggest need. Construction Waste Management is also essential to reducing overall waste volumes and is integrated with green building initiatives; residential recycling is another way of providing focus and generating momentum within the community for the Sustainability Strategy.</p>	<p>#37: Expand existing efforts for staff to reduce, reuse, and recycle in City offices, parks, and other facilities. #39: Provide convenient opportunities (prominent and labeled bins) for sorting, collecting, and composting solid waste streams in the community. #40: Implement commercial, residential, and construction waste information outreach and incentives through the permit process and municipal waste contract. #3: Create standard office procedures, training and department expectations that support sustainability goals; then measure, reward and promote individual and departmental achievement of these goals. #7: Work with the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce to create a green business certification and promotion program.</p>
<p>Solid & Hazardous Waste Management Program (PW) – The City of Shoreline coordinates hazardous waste and recycling collection programs for residents and businesses including: • Two Clean Sweep Recycling Events are offered annually to provide an easy and affordable way for residents to dispose of and recycle bulky household items. • To help recycle Christmas trees, the City of Shoreline offers an annual chipping event in conjunction with various community groups that collect trees from residents.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Compost is a major opportunity for reducing waste and building a community focus on sustainability. An integrated program of collection, processing, and distribution (especially in concert with a pea-patch/community garden program) is one way of building an IDENTITY for the Shoreline Sustainability Strategy. Residents will rally around an objective of reducing waste and composting; the community may even be able to accept and process (for revenue) other municipalities' compost; and, distribution of compost and development of community garden network is a benefit to the City.</p>	
<p>Municipal Compost Facility (PW/PCS) – Located on the grounds of Shorecrest High School, the compost facility allows the City of Shoreline to reuse green waste collected from the right-of-way.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Important to coordinate current ECOSS work with the new Chamber of Commerce work on development of a Sustainable Business Program</p>	
<p>Business Solid Waste Reduction, Recycling & Resource Conservation Program (PW) – In 2007, the City of Shoreline began conducting outreach, site assessment and assistance to businesses to reduce solid waste and encourage recycling.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): No significant change to program is recommended.</p>	
<p>Free Wood Chips at Hamlin Park (PCS) – Wood chips are offered free to the public at the Hamlin Park Maintenance Facility, 16006 15th Avenue NE, from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., seven days a week.</p>		

APPENDIX B — Existing Program Summary Matrix

<p>Battery Recycling (PW) – The Household Battery Collection program provides bins year-round for collection of household batteries at each of the libraries in Shoreline, as well as at City Hall, the City Hall Annex and the Shoreline Police Station.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): No significant change to program is recommended.</p>	
<p>Water Resources Management</p>	<p>ANALYSIS</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>
<p>Clean & Green Car Wash Kits (PW) – The City of Shoreline loans easy-to-use car wash kits to community groups for fundraising events that allows them to wash cars in an environmentally sustainable way by keeping soap and other pollutants out of our streams.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Additional outreach needed. Current kits are well used, but many car washes do not use them. More kits may be needed.</p>	<p>#8: Provide expanded “how to” sustainability information to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, events, website and City Hall brochures).</p>
<p>City of Shoreline Stormwater Standards update (PW) – The City of Shoreline is updating its stormwater standards. Improvements in these standards will result in cleaner water being discharged to our streams and the Puget Sound.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): Need specific targets here</p>	<p>#26: Modify the stormwater utility fee to promote LID, calibrate for true system impact/cost and encourage natural drainage improvements. #41: For high-use operations including irrigation and park restrooms, replace fixtures and equipment with the highest efficiency cost-effective water conservation options available.</p>
<p>Aurora Corridor Project Stormwater Solutions (PW) – The first mile of the Aurora Corridor Project includes stormwater quality improvements such as filters, swirl separators and oil-water separators. The next two miles of the Aurora project will include exploration of natural water treatment systems as well as methods used in the first mile.</p>	<p>Expand Current Efforts: Demonstration project should be closely monitored, lessons learned used to influence future projects (need targets) and to shape policy/codes.</p>	<p>#42: For retrofits and new construction of City indoor facilities, specify/replace fixtures with high-efficiency, low-flow alternatives. Investigate the use of non-potable sources, such as greater reuse and rainwater catchment. #44: Work with utilities to expand existing incentives and develop new incentives to reduce potable and irrigation water consumption.</p>
<p>Storm Drain Medallions & Stenciling (PW) – The City of Shoreline provides free training and loans stencil kits to community groups who want to stencil the message “Dump No Waste, Leads to Stream” at catch basins on residential streets. Staff place medallions with the same message at catch basins on arterial roads.</p>	<p>Ensure Continuation (As Is): Program has been successful and is noticed in the community. Volunteers have been effectively engaged.</p>	

APPENDIX C
Capacity Assessment Matrix

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CAPACITY ASSESSMENT LEGEND

Costs categories identified in this chapter and in the Capacity Assessment Matrix in Appendix C refer to the percentage above the current or conventional or in addition to what is currently budgeted annually for that item, project or program. These include both first and lifecycle costs where (and only where) a recommendation refers to a new item, project or program, where no comparison of current or conventional costs is possible, cost categories were determined based on the dollar cost maximums listed below.

Where potential cost savings have been identified, these items are underlined in the Capacity Assessment Matrix. Where HIGH costs are identified, these are bolded.

COST CATEGORIES - COSTS BEYOND CONVENTIONAL OR CURRENT

NEGLIGIBLE	up to 2% over existing practices or under \$5,000 if new
LOW	up to 10% or under \$20,000
MEDIUM	up to 30% or under \$75,000
HIGH	over 30% or over \$75,000

PRIORITY CATEGORIES

1	High Priority
2	Medium Priority
3	Lower Priority

TIME-FRAME CATEGORIES

Short	1-3 years
Medium	3-6 years
Long	7-10 years

DEPARTMENT ABBREVIATIONS

C	Clerks
CMO	City Manager's Office
CS	Community Services
ED	Economic Development
F	Finance
IT	Information Technology
HR	Human Resources
PDS	Planning and Development Services
PRCS	Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services
PW	Public Works
PW-E	Public Works - Engineering
PW-ES	Public Works - Environmental Services
PW-F/O	Public Works - Facilities/Operations
PW-S/A	Public Works - Streets/Aurora
PW-SW	Public Works - Surface Water

Note: Italics indicates cost savings.

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
FOCUS AREA 1: City Operations, Practices & Outreach						
1	Integrate sustainability into City and Departmental missions, functions and decision making at all levels using clear and transparent tools.	NEGLIGIBLE	Not directly	Will provide continuity & leadership	No. But adjustment of staff responsibilities and workloads necessary.	NEGLIGIBLE
2	Create baselines for all Sustainability Strategy focus areas and implement system to track progress over time.	Yes. Additional MODERATE staff time commitment	Not directly. LOW indirect savings possible from overall program.	Performance measures for City and community will help assess progress.	No. Can accomplish with existing staff w/ some training. See above.	Yes, LOW
3	Create standard office procedures, training & expectations; measure, reward & promote individual and departmental achievements.	NEGLIGIBLE	<i>LOW. Procedures & training should help reduce resource use and related cost.</i>	City operations savings and leadership that can be used to educate/guide community motivation	No. Existing staff can accomplish.	No
4	Green Team	NEGLIGIBLE	Not directly	Will provide continuity & leadership	Not required, but would help. At a minimum, adjustment of staff responsibility and workloads necessary.	NEGLIGIBLE
5	Pursue funding to establish a key City staff position or contracted consultant.	NEGLIGIBLE If done in house	Not directly. Depends on implementation outcome. Indirect savings expected to be LOW to MEDIUM.	Leadership and expertise continuity/tracking of effort	Existing finance staff aided by Environmental Services can pursue funding	Depends on funding obtained

1 <http://www.kingcounty.gov/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
No	City-wide, CMO	No	City of Seattle Green Team is an excellent model	No	1	S
No	City -wide, Green Team Structure. Leadership & Management	Yes. Community participation.	Many federal, State, and local resources are available	Yes. Energy baseline required by Mayor’s Climate Agreement, other baselines recommended.	1 Baseline data collection will likely take 1-2 years	S-M
No	City-wide, CMO	No	Many internal “sustainable practices” programs as models ¹	No	1 - Quick win.	S-M
No	City-wide, CMO	No	City of Seattle Green Team is an excellent model	No, however sustainability management structure is vital	1	S
No	CMO, F, PW-ES	No	Yes, necessary given budget forecast	No, but could support Cascade Agenda requirement to appoint a staff representative to program	1	M

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 1: City Operations, Practices & Outreach *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
6	Develop an environmental purchasing policy for all City purchasing decisions.	Initial development should require only LOW to MEDIUM additional staff investment	<i>Yes. LOW energy & resource efficiency reduces operations costs savings; durable products reduce maintenance costs & replacement schedules</i>	Promotes sustainable, non-toxic and efficient products and businesses	No. City should be able to accomplish with existing staff and resources in this Strategy	NEGLIGIBLE
7	Create a green business certification and promotion program.	NEGLIGIBLE	No direct savings expected. Potential for business promotion and expansion though, which could impact tax base positively	Makes Strategy visible to the community; operations savings for businesses, promotes green businesses.	No. Chamber of Commerce is creating a program. City and Chamber should coordinate	NEGLIGIBLE
8	Provide expanded “how to” sustainability info to the community through varied approaches (e.g. mailers, event, website and city hall brochures)	NEGLIGIBLE	No direct savings expected. Indirect savings to larger community possible.	Benefits all residents and business owners through greater efficiencies; City benefits via reduced burden on infrastructure and services	No. Existing staff appears adequate	Yes. But negligible and can be absorbed into current budget.

FOCUS AREA 2: Energy & Carbon Reduction

9	Develop a baseline for energy consumption and carbon data using ICLEI “5 Milestones Toolkit”	Yes, NEGLIGIBLE to LOW depending on which ICLEI services/products the City chooses to use	<i>Yes. Predicted to be LOW. 5 Milestones Toolkit helps reduce energy consumption, saving money</i>	Enables community- and City-wide planning specific to energy use standardized comparisons to other jurisdictions using program	Yes. Can be accomplished with existing staff but training will be required.	Yes. LOW direct costs of establishing a baseline. Indirect costs expected.
---	--	---	---	--	---	--

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
No. However, actual items often have LOW increased initial costs.	F and support from all departments	No	King County and City of Seattle EPP are excellent models	No	1	S
No	Limited. Some coordination will likely rest with GREEN TEAM.	Shoreline Chamber of Commerce	Department of Ecology, ECOSS	No	1 City and Chamber should meet. Chamber is moving forward	S-M
No	GREEN TEAM, PW-ES, PW, PDS, CS	No	Model materials on other municipalities; partner with other municipalities or utilities to pursue non-profit partnerships.	Yes: Res. #242: Help educate the public, schools, other jurisdictions, professional associations, business and industry and about reducing global warming pollution ^{1A}	1	S-M
No	Yes, creation of baseline and regular updates PW-SW, PW-ES	Not for creation of the baseline, but community is involved in data collection and target setting	Yes, the City should pursue volunteer assistance and partnerships with Seattle City Light and PSE in establishing baselines.	Yes: Res. #242: Inventory global warming emissions in City operations and in the community, set reduction targets and create an action plan	1	S-M

1A Reference: City of Shoreline Resolution 242 Authorizing support for the US Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement. <http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 2: Energy & Carbon *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
10	For all new major City facilities (City Hall), meet requirements for LEED Energy & Atmosphere Credit # 1. ²	Yes, NEGLIGIBLE. Strategies sometimes incur a first-cost premium.	Yes, energy savings generally to fall within MEDIUM range	Standards save money in operations	Yes. LEED Consultant for new buildings	No. MEDIUM savings expected.
11	For all new major City facilities (City Hall), require Commissioning ³	Yes. Expected to be LOW. Activities add development costs.	Yes. Savings expected to be MEDIUM. The process can lead to greater efficiencies and quality of construction	Commissioning IDs inefficiency and potential conflicts. Can ensure proper bldg function	Yes. LEED Consultant for new buildings	No. MEDIUM positive budget savings impacts are expected
12	Upgrade existing City facilities to meet Energy Star (ES) building performance standard for similar building types.	Yes, expected to result in increased costs in the MEDIUM to LOW range	Yes. Expected to result in MEDIUM or HIGH savings over building life. Substantial savings possible from ES performance strategies	The City will save money in operations and maintenance by upgrading existing facilities to use less energy	Yes. Fleets and Facilities will manage this process but consultant likely necessary.	No, operating budget savings expected to be MEDIUM
13	Include requirements to meet Energy Star (ES) for building equipment in purchasing guidelines.	Yes. LOW TO NEGLIGIBLE. ES often costs more. Increasingly, quality models meet standard.	Yes -- energy savings expected and will vary from LOW to MEDIUM depending on the specific equipment.	City will save money in operations and maintenance costs	No	No. LOW to MEDIUM savings expected.
14	Engage in Seattle City Light's (SCL) green power program (Green Up). Increase green power purchase to 100% through annual budget planning.	NEGLIGIBLE. Costs relate to ongoing operating budget impacts.	No. Green power can be expected to cost more. NEGLIGIBLE	Green power is consistent with commitment to reducing carbon emissions and aligning operations w/ Kyoto Protocol	No	Yes. Annual budget will increase due to cost of green power, expected to be LOW

² The purpose of the LEED EA Credit 1 is to achieve increasing levels of energy performance over a prescribed baseline. Credit requirements can be met through whole building energy simulation or one of two applicable prescriptive compliance paths.

³ "Commissioning" defined and outlined by the ASHRAE Commissioning Process Guidelines 0-2005.

⁴ <http://www.northwestenergystar.com/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes, first costs may increase, though expected to be NEGLIGIBLE	Yes -- requires City staff familiarity with Guide PW-F/O,PDS	No	Developers working with LEED; consultants	Yes: Res. #242: Practice and promote sustainable building practices using the US Green Building Council's LEED program or a similar system	1	M-L
Yes, LOW. 1st costs will increase when commissioning is added to scope.	Yes -- requires City staff familiarity w/procedures and benefits PW-F/O	No	Local commissioning authorities	Yes: Res. #242: Prioritize energy efficiency through building code, energy efficient lighting and employee conservation	1	M-L
Yes, see first cost premium, capital costs expected in the MEDIUM to LOW range	Yes PW-F/O	No	NW Energy Star (via WSU Energy Extension) is an invaluable resource	Yes: Res. #242: Prioritize energy efficiency through building code, retrofitting City facilities w/energy efficient lighting & urging employees to conserve energy	3	S-L
Yes, NEGLIGIBLE to LOW will vary depending on replacement schedules	Yes -- Purchasing F	No	NW Energy Star (via WSU Energy Extension) is an invaluable resource ⁴	Yes: Res. #242: Purchase only Energy Star equipment and appliances for City use	1 - Quick win	S
No. This is an operating cost.	Yes PDS, PW-F/O, F	Not yet -- future plans could include expansion to all City buildings	SCL	Yes: Res. #242: Increase alternative energy: invest in "green tags;" advocate renewable energy; recover landfill methane; support waste-to-energy technology	1 - Initial efforts 2 - 100% green power.	M

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 2: Energy & Carbon *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
15	Require all new fleet vehicles be alternatively fueled, or rated by EPA for 45 mpg or higher for fossil fuel vehicles. ⁵	Cost premium expected to be MEDIUM	<i>Yes. Fuel efficiency results in operations savings. MEDIUM expected when compared to existing costs</i>	Fuel-efficient vehicles save \$\$ and contribute to stated goals of reducing carbon emissions, a public symbol of commitment	No	<i>No. Should result in savings in MEDIUM (30%) range or greater.</i>
16	Conduct a campaign for city staff to reward “smart” trip planning to reduce unnecessary trips/ miles traveled	Expected to be NEGLIGIBLE	<i>LOW savings expected for modest trip consolidation. MEDIUM if more aggressive tools are used (e.g., GIS trip routing)</i>	Smart trip planning reduces dependence on vehicles, reducing carbon emissions	No	<i>No, LOW savings expected from reduced fuel use.</i>
17	Promote SCL, Puget Sound Energy (PSE), or other incentives for conservation and alternative energy as part of an outreach campaign.	NEGLIGIBLE to LOW if existing incentives are used.	Indirect benefits to larger Shoreline community. LOW savings expected, depending on effectiveness	Will reduce energy use & carbon emissions, resulting in savings and alignment with Kyoto Protocol	No	TBD. LOW to NEGLIGIBLE, depending on scope.
18	Work with SCL & PSE to report Community’s overall energy use as of baseline year. Update SCL/PSE figures.	Partnership requirements unclear. Potential costs in the LOW range	No direct or indirect cost savings. Will help determine baselines and monitor progress.	Helps determine baselines and monitor progress toward goals.	No. Should be able to do with existing utility assistance.	NEGLIGIBLE
19	Collect information about greenhouse gas emissions and energy use through State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process.	Negligible direct costs to City to get training and to review this information	No direct lifecycle cost savings. SEPA reporting, self-mitigation, & eventual mitigation may result in higher performance buildings and LOW lifecycle cost savings in community.	High performance buildings & energy efficient construction. Helps determine baselines and monitor progress toward goals.	No additional City Staff, however planners should get additional training to implement	Negligible

5 For exempt vehicles, require the most efficient options available.

6 <http://www.seattle.gov/light/>

7 <http://www.pse.com/Pages/default.aspx>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes. Fleets & Facilities will need more \$\$/ vehicle, unless replacement schedules are extended	Yes PW-F/O	No	Will open-bid requirement allow for partnerships with dealers of fuel-efficient vehicles?	Yes: Res. #242: Increase avg. fuel efficiency of municipal fleet; reduce # of vehicles; educate employees; convert diesel to bio-diesel	1	M-L
No	Yes HR, PW-S/A	No	Use ESRI GIS or similar software for trip routing. See UPS example in Implementation section. Must develop specific resources.	Yes. Helps reduce carbon emissions	1 - Quick win.	S-M
No	Yes CS, PW-ES	Yes. Shoreline partners, residents and businesses participation encouraged	SCL ⁶ and PSE ⁷	Yes: Res. #242: Increase alternative energy; invest in “green tags;” advocate renewable energy; recover landfill methane; support waste-to-energy technology	1	M
No	Yes CS, PW-SW, PW-ES	No	SCL ⁶ and PSE ⁷	Yes	1 Must establish a baseline for reporting	M
No	Yes - PDS	DOE likely to provide additional guidance	Department of Ecology (DOE). King County Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions worksheet ⁸	Yes: Res. #242: Inventory emissions in City and Community; Set targets; create Action Plan; Recent interpretations by DOE reinforce that now required by State Law	1 Immediate implementation recommended	S

8 <http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/forms/SEPA-GHG-EmissionsWorksheet-Bulletin26.pdf>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 2: Energy & Carbon *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
20	Employ PLACE ³ S software or similar for future land use planning efforts (e.g. next major Comp Plan update).	NEGLIGIBLE TO LOW, PLACE ³ S has free and fee versions, depending on desired functions	<i>Indirect LOW to MEDIUM savings depending on how aggressive findings are implemented</i>	PLACE ³ S fully integrates public participation & computer-assisted tools (GIS) to produce plans ⁹	Yes. Staff training will be needed, including GIS and Planners. PLACE ³ S requires data input and analysis by City staff	Yes, staffing and any fees associated with the tool but expected to be LOW.

FOCUS AREA 3: Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure

21	Prioritize and promote Green Building and Low Impact Development (LID) proficiencies for select staff.	NEGLIGIBLE. TO LOW. Many instructional materials for Green Building and LID have been developed and are available.	<i>Low savings can be expected in larger community as a result of reduction in stormwater conveyance and treatment, energy use, and use of non-sustainable building materials.</i>	Encourages and supports internal & external sustainable development, saving energy & waste & deducting toxics	Yes. Training but will require outside resources. Some staff required for organizing training and consultants for needed same training.	LOW
22	Establish a Residential Green Building Program, including worksheets on specific innovations for permitting clients.	LOW to MEDIUM. Would require some initial staff time to set up program and establish green permitting system	<i>Indirect NEGLIGIBLE to LOW savings expected in larger community.</i>	Encourages and supports internal & external sustainable development, saving energy & waste & deducting toxics.	No	NEGLIGIBLE
23	Revise zoning and engineering standards to provide guidance and incentives for Low Impact Development (LID) and Green Building.	Minimal staff time for quick fixes. LOW to MEDIUM cost for complete overhaul of standards.	<i>Indirect NEGLIGIBLE to LOW savings expected in larger community.</i>	Improved water surface water quality. Establish City as leader and example.	Yes. Consultant may be needed for code revisions	NEGLIGIBLE - once. Part of the Code, LOW to MEDIUM for initial effort.

⁹ These plans retain dollars in the local economy, save energy, attract jobs and development, reduce pollution and traffic congestion and conserve open space.

¹⁰ <http://cpr.ca.gov/report/cprprt/issrec/res/res22.htm>

¹¹ <http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/LID.htm>

¹² <http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/GreenBuilding/>

¹³ <http://www.ci.issaquah.wa.us/Page.asp?NavID=326>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
No	GIS and PDS	Yes, PLACE ³ S is a fully integrated tool, meaning community members are active participants	City partners and participants; PLACE ³ S and DOE support ¹⁰	Yes: Not this tool in particular, but overall objectives and results will result in greater energy efficiency and reduced carbon emissions	3 Energy analysis necessary during future Comp Plan update	M
No	Yes PDS, PW, F/IT, PRCS	No	Yes. Puget Sound Partnership LID handbook ¹¹ .	Yes: Res. #242: Practice and promote sustainable building practices using the US Green Building Council's LEED program or a similar system	1	S
No	Yes PW-ES, PDS	No	Existing programs such as Green Built, LEED. See Seattle ¹² , Issaquah ¹³ , and Seattle technical resources ¹⁴ .	Yes: Res. #242: Practice and promote sustainable building practices using the US Green Building Council's LEED program or a similar system.	1	S
No	Yes PDS, PW	No	Numerous federal, private, state and King County funding programs available ^{15,16} .	Yes: Res. #242: Practice and promote sustainable building practices using the US Green Building Council's LEED program or a similar system	1	S

14 http://www.seattle.gov/util/About_SPU/Drainage_&_Sewer_System/Natural_Drainage_Systems/Natural_Drainage_Overview/SPU01_002593.asp

15 <http://www.epa.gov/greenbuilding/tools/funding.htm>

16 www.dsireusa.com

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 3: Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
24	Adopt a Green Building Policy for Capital Projects. Construct new buildings and additions according to LEED Silver Standard and specify a commitment to LID principles.	NEGLIGIBLE TO LOW - generally this standard will result in a first-cost premium, e.g. to document action for LEED.	Yes, expected to result in LOW cost savings for City, potential MEDIUM when combined with other recommendations such as commissioning	Annual savings of 20% energy & water, 38% in waste water production and 22% reduction in construction waste projected. ¹⁷ LEED can be implemented in concert with LID.	No additional City Staff, however architect selected for building construction must have LEED training	<i>Yes, we expect operating budget savings to be LOW</i>
25	Prioritize and structure the development of the Green Streets program.	LOW to MEDIUM. Some staff time required for establishing program.	Not for program development. See Capital Costs.	Decreased demand on stormwater conveyance and treatment systems.	Not required. Some staff time required for establishing program and integrating into Transportation and Stormwater Master Plans.	LOW to MEDIUM
26	Modify the stormwater utility fee to promote low impact development, calibrate for true system impact/cost and encourage natural drainage improvements.	MEDIUM one-time costs, consultant likely needed for Fee Study.	<i>Yes. This item will generate increased revenue in the LOW range & decreased system impacts in the LOW to MEDIUM range.</i>	Encourages private improvement, more funds for improved pedestrian facilities, greater user safety, neighborhood beautification, traffic calming, extension of park system.	Yes, consultant Fee Study needed.	LOW, but only for one budget cycle. Will likely require hiring of a consultant.

17 Washington State Law Mandates Green Building, Renewable Energy Access, 2005-04-21. Retrieved 2007-02-10

18 <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CategoryID=19>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes, see first cost premium, capital costs expected in the LOW range	Yes	No	LEED trained building consultants, developers and/or architects. ¹⁸	Yes: Res. #242: Practice and promote sustainable building practices using the US Green Building Council's LEED program or a similar system	1 - need to adopt a policy, however, existing City Hall plans are consistent	S-M
Yes, funds would be needed to establish a demonstration project, however, <i>MEDIUM savings are expected from implementation.</i> Seattle estimates that their SEA-Street design saves >20% of traditional street drainage cost.	Yes PW-S/A, PW-SW	No	Existing programs such as SeaStreets ¹⁹ and programs in Portland ²⁰	No, but strongly supports Green Cities Partnership	1	S-M
<i>No. May preclude need for future stormwater infrastructure enhancements in long-term & will provide increased revenue in LOW range.</i>	Yes CMO, PW-SW	No	See other municipal programs, e.g. City of Portland	No	2	S-M

19 http://www.seattle.gov/util/About_SPU/Drainage_&_Sewer_System/Natural_Drainage_Systems/Street_Edge_Alternatives/index.asp

20 <http://www.portlandonline.com/BES/index.cfm?c=eeeeah>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 3: Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
27	Expand and reorient the existing sidewalk improvement program to focus on linking destinations and connectivity.	LOW to MEDIUM. Revise the Transportation Master Plan.	No, direct savings.	Would improve sidewalk continuity and overall walkability in targeted areas. Encourages walking and healthier lifestyles.	Depends if consultant retained to revise Transportation Master Plan. However, revision is planned.	NEGLIGIBLE.
28	Improve identification, mapping, designation, surfacing and signage of existing trails. Develop a plan for future trail expansion.	MEDIUM to HIGH costs associated with improvement plan.	No direct savings.	Would improve safety and comfort of user, and potentially increase trail usage. Encourages walking and healthier lifestyles.	Yes. Trail improvements likely contracted out. Staff time required to coordinate effort.	LOW
29	Strengthen the bike and pedestrian facility elements to strategize a network.	NEGLIGIBLE. Rolled into Transportation Plan Update.	Not directly. More bicycle and pedestrian trips means less car trips, precluding road widenings and other infrastructure investments.	Potentially better mode split and improved air quality. Non-motorized improvements encourage walking and healthier lifestyles.	Potential for outside assistance. Staff time required to do updating, but update planned.	NEGLIGIBLE
30	Update the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and provide a stronger link to the Land Use Element in the Comp Plan.	NEGLIGIBLE. Staff time req to do updating, but update already planned	No direct savings.	More consistency & coordination among plans would result in better implementation of planning goals	NEGLIGIBLE. Staff time required to do updating, but update planned.	NEGLIGIBLE

21 <http://www.bicyclealliance.org/saferoutes/minigrants.phprg/saferoutes/minigrants.php>

22 <http://www.wildliferecreation.org/wwrp-projects>

23 http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ta/operations/localplanning/pdf/GMA_Ammend.pdf

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes. Expansion of program would require capital funding. Costs in MEDIUM to HIGH range expected.	Yes PW and PDS	No	Grants available - WSDOT Safe Routes to Schools Program and Washington State Transportation Improvement Board. ²¹	Yes: Res. #242: Adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities	?	M
Yes, MEDIUM to HIGH . Signage, surfacing, future planning would require funding. Recommend incremental increases in the 30% range.	Yes PRCS, PW and PDS	No	Grants available - Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program and other sources. ²²	No, but supports Green Cities Partnership	1 - Initial efforts ongoing 2 - Trail improvements	M
N/A for planning. Facility construction would require funding. Recommend incremental increase in the 30% range.	Yes PW-E, PRCS	No	CTED Grants possible. ²³	Yes: Res. #242: Adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities	2	M-L
N/A for planning.	Yes PDS, PW-E	No	CTED Grants possible	Yes: Res. #242: Adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities	2	M

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 3: Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
31	Identify clear and specify near- and long-term priorities for transit improvements as part of the TMP process.	NEGLIGIBLE. Part of TMP update process	No direct savings.	Potentially improved transit service. Setting priorities is needed to coordinate actions, develop momentum and achieve results.	Yes. May require funding for increased lobbyist or new position.	NEGLIGIBLE
32	Advocate for a revised Sound Transit Phase II Plan (ST2) which includes improvements that serve the City of Shoreline.	LOW to MEDIUM depending on level of involvement.	No direct savings. Improved transit means better mode split. Will encourage smart growth investment & reduce carbon emissions.	Improved transit means better mode split. Improved transit services would result in less car use, improved air quality, etc.	Yes. May require funding for increased lobbyist or new position	LOW to MEDIUM
33	Advocate for a single, integrated and continuous bus rapid transit system on Aurora Ave. (SR 99) between Everett and Seattle.	NEGLIGIBLE	Improved transit creates better mode split.	Improved transit creates better mode split. Improved transit services would result in less car use, improved air quality, etc.	Yes. May require funding for increased lobbyist or new position	NEGLIGIBLE
34	Consider advocating for a Metro “feeder” route to improve east-west transit and support Aurora backbone.	NEGLIGIBLE	Improved transit means better mode split.	Improved transit = better mode split. Improved transit services would result in less car use, improved air quality, etc.	Yes. May require funding for increased lobbyist or new position	NEGLIGIBLE

24 <http://transit.metrokc.gov/>

25 <http://www.soundtransit.org/>

26 <http://commtrans.org/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
No direct costs. N/A for planning.	Yes. PDS, PW-E	No	CTED grants possible	Yes: Res. #242: Adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities	1	M
No direct costs. TBD - future transit investments may require local match.	Yes CMO, PW, PDS	Yes	Partner with: Metro ²⁴ Sound Transit ²⁵ Community Transit ²⁶	No, but strongly supports Res. #272 which states Council's position on the current ST2 proposal.	2	S-M
No direct costs.	Yes CMO, PW, PDS	Yes	Partner with: Metro ²⁴ Sound Transit ²⁵ Community Transit ²⁶	No, but strongly supports Res. #273 which states Council's position on the current transit agency plans for the Aurora corridor.	2	S-M
No direct costs. TBD - future transit investments may require local match.	Yes CMO, PDS, PW	Yes	Partner with: Metro ²⁴ Sound Transit ²⁵ Community Transit ²⁶	No	2	M-L

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 3: Sustainable Development & Green Infrastructure *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
35	Consider providing a program based on the State's commute trip reduction (CTR) program for medium-sized sites not currently required to participate in the State CTR program.	MEDIUM	Not directly. Potentially less car trips may preclude future road widenings and other infrastructure investments.	Yes. Reduced demand on roads would reduce need for road expansions, improve air quality	Yes. Creation of new program will require staff	LOW. Staff time for maintaining the program.
36	Future updates to Comprehensive Plan and/or Housing Strategy should include a focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and transit supportive neighborhoods to create density nodes that support transit use. Continue to focus new development near existing and proposed transit corridors and improvements.	NEGLIGIBLE, if done during future update	Not directly. Potentially less car trips may preclude future road widenings and other infrastructure investments.	Yes. Reduced demand on roads would reduce need for expansion, improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions.	No.	No

FOCUS AREA 4: Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction

37	Expand existing efforts to get City employees to reduce, reuse, and recycle in City offices, parks, and other facilities.	NEGLIGIBLE. Additional receptacles, staff training and coordination with CleanScapes ²⁷	<i>NEGLIGIBLE to LOW savings may be achieved by diverting additional solid waste</i>	Reduces waste directed to landfills and increases recycling; may include energy generation from waste	See short term priorities.	NEGLIGIBLE to LOW, depending on extend of program.
----	---	--	--	---	----------------------------	--

²⁷ <http://www.cleanscapes.com/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
LOW to MEDIUM. Depending on County or State funding or employer support	Yes PW-S/A	Yes	Possibly County, CTED, WSDOT grant funding for CTR expansion pilot.	Yes: Res. #242: Promote transportation options such as bicycle trails, commute trip reduction programs	3	M
N/A	Yes PDS, PW, Council	No	King County TOD program, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC)	Yes: GMA and Res. #242: Adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities	3	M
NEGLIGIBLE- additional receptacles and other capital assets may be needed	Yes. PW -ES, PW-F/O, PW-SW	CleanScapes	CleanScapes ²⁷	Yes: Res. #242: Prioritize energy efficiency through building code, energy efficient lighting and employee conservation	1	S

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 4: Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
38	Include in purchase guidelines preference/ requirement for products that promote reduction and reuse, reduce consumption of raw materials and present reduced risk to human and ecological health.	LOW. Green product may cost more than current. Recommend 10% premium cap on certain items.	NEGLIGIBLE. Reduced consumption will save money, however this may be offset by product premium	Established EPPs can save money; reduced consumption reduces waste; environmental considerations benefit all residents	Potential for consultant but with guidance and examples from this Strategy, existing staff should be able to develop and implement this.	LOW. Additional costs may be incurred, both for additional staffing hours and for regular purchases
39	Provide Shoreline residents with convenient opportunities (prominent and labeled bins) for sorting, collecting, and composting solid waste streams in the community at public places and events.	Yes. Can be LOW and incremental as budget allows.	<i>Indirect savings in the LOW range expected due to overall reduction in waste sent to sorting facility and to landfills</i>	Reduce generated solid waste. Programs allow communities to embrace sustainability. May act as “gateways” of participation	No. Should be accommodated within Fleets and Facilities/Parks Departments and existing CleanScapes contract.	Yes, if additional collection services are required. Recommend incremental improvements in the LOW range as budgets allow
40	Implement construction and business waste reduction outreach and incentives through the permitting process and municipal waste contract.	NEGLIGIBLE. Add to existing outreach efforts; partner with ECOSS and Chamber or Commerce	No direct savings expected. LOW savings for average business. Construction recycling savings NEGLIGIBLE and LOW increased costs possible.	Reduce burden on infrastructure, transfer stations & landfills; Reduce env’t damage; Savings for residents and businesses	Existing staff may need additional training. Research and development of incentives may require consultant resources	NEGLIGIBLE to LOW depending on whether consultant resources are used
41	Replace equipment in high-use outdoor operations with highest efficiency, cost-effective water conservation options available.	LOW. Fixtures to be replaced as needed.	<i>MEDIUM savings. Reduced water consumption results in reduced operations costs.</i>	Reduced operations costs, reduced burden on City and regional infrastructure, responsible management of water resources	No. Fleets and Facilities aware of options. Can add requirement to replacement & maintenance schedules	<i>MEDIUM savings. Potential impacts to maintenance staff. Potential savings in operations far offset</i>

28 <http://www.newdream.org/procure/start/develop.php>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Increased costs in the LOW range possible for major machines and appliances	F with support from purchasing personnel from all major departments, particularly Fleets and Facilities	No	King County may be willing to partner. KC and City of Seattle EPPs are excellent models ²⁸	No	1	S
NEGLIGIBLE. Additional bins required.	PW-ES PW-F/O, PRCS	Yes. Community participation	CleanScapes. Business partners such as Shoreline Community College and School District	Yes: Res. #242: Increase recycling rates in City operations and in the community	2 Explore additional opportunities after Clean-Scapes transition	S
No	PDS, PW-ES, PW-SW	CleanScapes, Chamber, ECOSS	ECOSS, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, CleanScapes	Yes: Res. #242: Increase recycling rates in City operations and in the community	2 Need contractors	S
LOW additional costs for efficient fixtures. Many not considered capital items. Irrigation system would be considered a capital item.	PRCS, PW-F/O	No	ECOSS and some utilities provide rebates, incentives	No	2	M-L

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 4: Resource Conservation & Waste Reduction *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
42	For retrofits and new construction of City indoor facilities, specify/replace fixtures with high efficiency, low flow alternatives.	LOW cost premium expected	<i>MEDIUM savings. Decreased operations costs. Durable alternatives must be selected to see this savings</i>	Reduced operations costs, reduced burden on City and regional infrastructure, and responsible management of water resources	No. Fleets and Facilities aware of options. Can add requirement to replacement & maintenance schedules	<i>MEDIUM savings Potential impacts to maintenance staff. Potential savings in operations far offset</i>
43	Investigate non-potable sources uses, such as grey water reuse and rainwater catchment for toilet flushing.	LOW to MEDIUM. Applicability determination will require consultant resources	TBD. Dependent on implementation	Reduced burden on City and regional infrastructure and decreased operations costs	Yes. Consultant research of feasibility	LOW, increased maintenance costs.
44	Work with utilities to expand existing incentives and develop new incentives to reduce potable and irrigation water consumption.	NEGLIGIBLE - coordination effort only if utilities offer incentives	TBD -- depends on implementation	Reduction of potable water use reduces burden on City and regional infrastructure and decreases operations costs	Yes. Research into applicability	Negligible
45	Implement residential waste incentives & requirements through municipal waste contract & permits. Expand community outreach.	UNDERWAY. Additional may be considered. Recommend only additional expenditures that are LOW	No direct. Indirect LOW savings in larger community as a result of reduction in solid waste generated and disposed	Reduce burden on infrastructure, transfer stations & landfills; Reduce env't damage; Savings for residents	Existing staff has demonstrated skills and competence in research and coordination w/ CleanScapes	Potentially LOW -- depending on scope of outreach. Expected to be LOW.

FOCUS AREA 5: Ecosystem Management

46	ID under-utilized City property and use for habitat improvements, water treatment and other compatible purposes.	LOW costs associates with identification. Cost may jump to MEDIUM depending on nature of any improvements.	Dependent on size of areas and how natural allowed to become. LOW direct cost savings for vegetation maintenance expected.	Potential habitat improvement. "On-site" stormwater treatment. Less maintenance costs.	Potential for consultant assistance.	NEGLIGIBLE. Cost of maintaining habitat may be offset by reduced maintenance costs
----	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------	--

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes. LOW additional costs for efficient fixtures	PW-F/O	No	ECOSS and some utilities provide rebates, incentives, and free fixtures	No	2	M
Yes. LOW to MEDIUM. Implementation of reuse and catchments systems will require capital	Yes. PRCS, PW-F/O	No	Consultant resources, DOE, Shoreline Water District	Yes: Res. #242: Evaluate opps to increase pump efficiency in systems; recover wastewater treatment methane	3	M-L
No	Yes CMO, PW-SW, PW-ES	Yes. Utilities	Shoreline Water District	No	2	M-L
No	Yes PW-SW, PW-ES	Yes. Community participation	CleanScapes and Identify champions in the community	Yes: Res. #242: Increase recycling rates in City operations and in the community	1	S
Yes, improvements may require MEDIUM costs, but may be partially offset by savings.	Yes PRCS, PW-SW	No	Local grants offered by EPA ²⁹	Yes: Res. #242: Maintain healthy urban forests; promote tree planting to increase shading and to absorb CO ² Supports Cascade Agenda Principle using land efficiently	2	M

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

FOCUS AREA 5: Ecosystem Management *continued*

#	POTENTIAL ACTION	FIRST COST PREMIUM	LIFECYCLE COST SAVINGS	BENEFITS	ADDITIONAL STAFF OR CONSULTANT REQUIRED	CITY OPERATING BUDGET COSTS
47	Consider the development of a Natural Resources and Habitat Master Plan.	MEDIUM	<i>No direct savings. HIGH indirect savings by acting sooner rather than later.</i>	Increase City's ability to obtain grant funding.	Yes. Potential for consultant services.	LOW
48	Continue and expand restoration & enhancement priority locations & targets for publicly funded or assisted wetlands & stream enhancement projects.	NEGLIGIBLE cost to ID targets could be rolled into Action plan efforts .	No savings expected. MEDIUM TO HIGH costs. Critical area improvement costs depends on size and number of locations targeted.	Healthier wetland and stream habitats.	Yes. Ramp up of likely to require 5 FTE.	NEGLIGIBLE for target identified
49	Implement Cascade Land Conservancy's (CLC) Green Cities Program by prioritizing forest health data collection & improvement projects & strengthening partnerships to increase the acreage analyzed & enhanced.	Recommend incremental increases at the LOW to MEDIUM level.	No savings costs. MEDIUM TO HIGH. Forest health improvement takes a concerted effort over many years to control invasive vegetation.	Enhanced urban forests in the community.	Yes. Consultant services needed	LOW to MEDIUM. Volunteer coordination could assist.
50	Promote & expand environmental mini-grant program, with focus on critical area & urban forest enhancement.	LOW to MEDIUM, depending on level of expansion.	No direct cost savings.	Increased community support & action to achieve goals.	Yes. Ramp up of likely to require 5 FTE.	Low - Existing program.

29 <http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/HOMEPAGE.NSF/webpage/Grants>

30 <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Small/2005.shtml>

31 <http://www.greenseattle.org/>

APPENDIX C — Capacity Assessment Matrix

CITY CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS	INTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	EXTERNAL RSPNSBLTY	IMPLMNTN RESOURCES	REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING AGREEMENT	PRIORITY	TIMEFRAME
Yes	Yes PRCS, PDS, PW-SW	Yes, indirectly for grant applications	Local grants offered by EPA ²⁹ .	No, but strongly supports Green Cities Partnership	1	L
LOW for ID efforts MED to HIGH for actual improvements	Yes PRCS, PW-SW, PDS	No	USFWS Small Grants and Marching Funds (2005 list ³⁰)	Yes: Res. #242: Maintain healthy urban forests; promote tree planting to increase shading and to absorb CO ₂ ; and strongly supports Green Cities Partnership	1	M-L
LOW	Yes PRCS	Yes - Partnerships with Seattle Urban Nature Project and Cascade Land Conservancy	Green Seattle ³¹ Potential partnership with CLC	Yes: Implements CLC's Green Cities Parntership and Res. #242: Maintain healthy urban forests; promote tree planting to increase shading and to absorb CO ₂	1	S-M
MEDIUM	Yes PRCS, PW-SW, PW-ES, PDS	No	Lake Forest Park ³² Weyerhaeuser ³³	No	2	S-M

32 <http://www.cityoffp.com/city/eqcomm/documents/eqcminigrant2007.pdf>

33 Potential partnership with Weyerhaeuser [partnered with schools with Arkansas (http://www.arcf.org/images/2006-07_Mini-Grant_form.pdf)]

