

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 19, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Moss
Vice Chair Esselman
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Scully
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Planning & Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning & Community Development
Mark Relph, Public Works Director
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Others Present

Mayor McGlashan

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moss called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Moss, Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Montero, Scully, and Wagner.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Markle did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the March 1, 2011 Dinner Meeting and March 15, 2011 Regular meeting were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

STUDY SESSION ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – CAPITAL FACILITIES/UTILITIES

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger explained that the Capital Facilities Element includes the types of facilities a jurisdiction considers necessary for development (structures, streets or utility system improvements, or other long-lasting major assets, including land). Capital facilities are provided for public purposes and may include streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and police and fire protection facilities. The Utilities Element consists of the general or proposed location and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines. (No criteria or requirement is provided in the Growth Management Act (GMA), the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) or the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for consistency evaluation of the general utilities.)

Ms. Redinger reported that the goals, policies and analysis sections of the Capital Facilities Element have been forwarded to the City's water and sewer providers. The goals, policies and analysis sections of the Utilities Element have been forwarded to the utility providers. Staff will work with the providers to update the maps and ensure that the City's long-range plans are in sync with those of the providers.

Chair Moss clarified that when group editing a document, the City Attorney has advised it is a violation of the Open Meetings Act for Commissioners to send comments to each another. The correct approach is for Commissioners to forward their comments and/or corrections to staff no later than the close of business on the Tuesday prior to a Planning Commission meeting. Comments and/or corrections can also be brought forward at a Commission meeting.

The Commission reviewed the proposed Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements as follows:

Capital Facilities Element

- Commissioner Maul noted that the term “stormwater” is used in Paragraph 5 of the Introduction, but the remainder of the document uses the term “surface water.” Mr. Relph said that “stormwater” is the official name of the utility, so this term should be used consistently throughout the document.
- Commissioner Maul suggested that the 4th sentence in Paragraph 5 of the Introduction should be clarified to read, “Only city-owned or managed facilities are considered for capital facilities expenditures.” Commissioner Scully said his interpretation of the language is not that city-owned and operated facilities are considered capital expenditures, but that they have capital expenditure costs the City must pay. The Commission agreed that staff should clarify the language.
- Vice Chair Esselman referred to Paragraph 4 of the Introduction, which provides a list of the facilities and services the City must provide. She asked why “schools” were included on the list.

Ms. Redinger said the City works with the Shoreline School District to coordinate population growth and comprehensive planning targets.

- Commissioner Maul noted that in the 5th sentence of Paragraph 5 of the Introduction, the word “projected” should be changed to “projecting.” The Commission agreed.
- Commissioner Scully referred to the new Goal CF II, which is to acquire the Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline. He asked if the City Council has identified this as a specific goal, or if it something that is being considered. Mr. Relph answered that acquiring the system is a stated goal of the City Council. He explained that a public steering committee has been formed to help the City assess the financial feasibility of the acquisition.
- Chair Moss asked if both dates are necessary in the 3rd bullet of Paragraph 5 of the Introduction. Ms. Markle said staff would obtain final clarification from each provider regarding the names and dates of their approved plans.
- Ms. Redinger explained that the original Goal CF II can be deleted as a goal because it is already a requirement of GMA.
- Commissioner Wagner commented that new Goals CF III and CF IV appear to be duplicative of Goal CF I. She suggested that, with the exception of promoting citywide utility services that are “environmentally sensitive and energy efficient,” the remainder of these two goals could be deleted. Ms. Redinger suggested that perhaps Goals CF III and CF IV could be rephrased to become a more effective utility goal. Commissioner Wagner pointed out that the City already strives to provide reliable utilities, so the two goals could just be deleted.
- Chair Moss reminded the Commission that the City of Shoreline has set boundaries, and Point Wells is located within another county and outside of the City’s boundaries. She cautioned against inadvertently approving language in the Capital Facilities Element that could be interpreted to mean the City no longer plans to annex Point Wells at some point in the future. She recommended that Policy CF4 should retain the term “within the Shoreline planning area.”
- Commissioner Montero suggested that Policies CF22 and CF20 could be merged to read, “Utilize prudent financing options that best facilitate implementation of the CIP by considering all available funding and financing mechanisms . . .”
- Commissioner Maul pointed out that in Policy CF 21, the term “surface water” should be changed to “stormwater.” Ms. Redinger agreed to word search the entire document and make the appropriate adjustments.
- Chair Moss noted the word “consistency” needs to be spelled correctly in Policy CF31.
- Ms. Redinger advised that there will likely be additional staff corrections to the Service Standards (Policies CF33 and CF 34).
- Chair Moss asked staff for further direction about whether the language in Policy CF33, which identifies the number of officers per 1,000 residents, is appropriate for inclusion in the Capital Facilities Element. Ms. Redinger said she has left messages, but due to staff transition in the Police Department, she has not received a response. She said she would continue to solicit this input.
- Chair Moss questioned whether it is necessary to have separate subheadings for surface water, waste water and drinking water. Ms. Redinger said a lot of the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies were based on adopted master plans. The Parks and Transportation Master Plans were formatted similarly to the Comprehensive Plan, in that they contained stated goals and policies. However, the Stormwater Master Plan was written to be more programmatic. She suggested that the separate

subheadings remain in the document as a placeholder because the Surface Water Manager may develop more stormwater policies to incorporate direction from the Stormwater Master Plan.

- Chair Moss noted that staff is recommending that Policies CF18, CF19 and CF21 be combined. She asked staff to double check to make sure these policies were replaced by a new Policy CF18.

Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis

- Chair Moss asked if the analysis would be inserted into the Comprehensive Plan, or if it intended to be used as background information. Ms. Markle said the one reason the current Comprehensive Plan is so thick is because each analysis section was included. Staff is recommending that the Comprehensive Plan only contain goals and policies, and the supporting analysis would be an accessory document. This will allow the Comprehensive Plan to be a less intimidating and easier-to-understand document.
- Commissioner Montero asked who actually owns the Shoreline District Court building and acreage. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this question and report back.
- Chair Moss noted that the existing language under “Planned Fire Facilities” would be deleted. For consistency, she suggested that language should be added similar to the comment made under the Planned Police Facilities Section to make it clear there are currently no plans for additional facilities. Ms. Redinger explained that the emergency manager pointed out that the Hazard Mitigation Plan calls for constructing a police facility that is seismically upgraded, and this should be included as a recommendation in the plan. She agreed to learn more from the Fire Department about their long-range capital facilities plan.
- Chair Moss inquired if Sunset Elementary should remain in Table CF-1 because it is still a school district asset even though it is currently closed. Vice Chair Esselman said this facility is part of the school district’s land bank, and they have no plans to sell the property. As population grows, this site will be the first one to open again. Chair Moss summarized that the facility could be a capital cost for the school district over the term of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Chair Moss suggested that a note should be made in the Planned School District Facilities Section that Shorecrest High School would be updated and a new Shorewood High School would be constructed. She noted that these two projects will not have been completed by the time the Comprehensive Plan is approved. Ms. Redinger agreed that would be useful information.
- Commissioner Montero referred to the Water Service Section and asked if The Highlands is considered to be a separate water district. Mr. Relph answered that Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) owns and operates the utility within The Highlands. Vice Chair Esselman asked if the City of Shoreline receives water from both the Cedar and Tolt Rivers. Mr. Relph answered that the majority of the City’s water service comes from the Tolt system, but at times the Cedar could, and probably does, serve the lower end.
- Chair Moss asked if the City has a timeline for acquiring the water facility from the SPU. Mr. Relph answered that the City is scheduled to take ownership of the utility on January 1, 2020. Chair Moss suggested that because the acquisition would occur prior to the next Comprehensive Plan update, the acquisition should be included in the document.
- Commissioner Scully asked if the analysis on the unsewered areas that is provided in the Wastewater Section would translate into a policy to get the unsewered lots onto the City’s sewer system. Mr. Szafran agreed to research and report back on whether some parcels in the City are still on septic. If

there are still unsewered areas, he suggested the City should create a clear policy for getting them connected to the City's sewer system.

- Chair Moss said the Treatment Facilities Section currently states that the majority of the flows go the Westpoint Treatment Plant. She suggested that this section also identify that some flow would go to the new Brightwater Treatment Plant. This project, once completed, will have a significant impact to the City. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this issue and report back.
- Chair Moss asked if the number of additional households identified in the General Growth Projections Section is consistent with those identified in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 and the King County Planning Policies. Mr. Szafran noted that the numbers would be updated.
- Although the City contracts for police service, Chair Moss said her understanding is that the City owns the police headquarters building. The building should be included in the Level of Service Section, particularly if renovations and/or changes are needed to address seismic issues.
- Chair Moss agreed that language included in the Transportation Element does not need to be restated in Table CF-2 unless required by State Law. Ms. Redinger said City staff is still working to complete the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), and one of the final items is the GMA requirement to show how every recommended transportation improvement would be funded. Mr. Relph added that the funding piece, including a discussion about impact fees, is a required element of the TMP. Ms. Redinger stated that once the TMP has been completed, the table would be updated to be consistent.
- Commissioner Maul noted that the 4th sentence in Paragraph 1 of the Inadequate Infrastructure Section should be changed by also deleting "not."
- Ms. Redinger recalled that over the past few years, there have been back and forth discussions about whether the City should mandate such things as green building, affordable housing and public amenities, or if they should incentivize them. As the Comprehensive Plan Update moves forward, staff is requesting feedback and consistent direction from the Commission regarding this issue. Chair Moss asked staff to flag this issue for additional review when the next draft is presented for review. Ms. Redinger agreed that when an updated draft is presented to the Commission, staff would identify the outstanding "big picture" questions and policies. Commissioner Wagner suggested it would be helpful to have input from the Economic Development Director, particularly about activity that has resulted from the new Mixed Use Zoning and whether the incentive program has been effective. The Commission agreed to discuss this issue with the Economic Development Director at their May 3rd meeting when he would be present to discuss the Economic Development Element.
- Commissioner Montero asked why the Frequent Flooding Section was removed. Mr. Relph said this language would likely be replaced with updated language. He advised that over the past 16 years, the City has addressed the majority of the flooding issues. The focus in the future will be on maintenance, including repair and replacement of existing infrastructure. Mr. Relph agreed to confirm the Surface Water Manager's recommendation to delete this language. Commissioner Wagner emphasized the need to be sensitive to the large number of public comments that have been received related to frequent flooding issues. Ms. Redinger recalled that most of the public comments were related to groundwater issues, which are different than stormwater issues, but that the City admittedly has an incomplete understanding of their interrelation. Potentially, Commissioners could include policy language recommending a hydrology study. Commissioner Wagner suggested that

policy language should be added to address flooding issues whether they are related to stormwater or groundwater.

- Chair Moss suggested that the 2nd sentence in the Environmental Impact from Utility Improvements Section should be deleted. The 3rd sentence could be changed to acknowledge that the Brightwater Treatment Plant and the solid waste transfer station expansion projects have been completed or are near completion.
- Commissioner Scully commented that the language provided in Paragraph 2 in the Maintaining and/or Improving Services Section appears to place the onus on the community to tell the City what is important. He suggested that the language be changed to say that “the City would solicit community input.”
- Chair Moss referred to staff’s comment about whether or not Paragraph 2 in the Siting and Mitigating Environmental Impacts Section should be retained or deleted. She recalled a previous discussion regarding potential siting of a jail in Shoreline. Even though that particular issue was resolved, Paragraph 2 might be helpful if a similar issue were to come up in the future.
- Chair Moss asked if the property tax numbers would be updated in the next draft document. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively.
- Chair Moss noted that there is no reference to Proposition 1 in the Property Tax Section. Ms. Redinger agreed this would be important information to include in the document.
- Chair Moss said the current language provided in the Transportation Benefit District Section is generic and should be updated to acknowledge that the City now has an established Transportation Benefit District.
- Commissioner Maul asked why all the numbers contained in the draft document are in 2004 dollars. Chair Moss answered that the numbers would be updated to reflect current dollars.
- Given that the Commission’s mandate is to reduce the heft of the document, Chair Moss suggested it would be prudent to delete those funding sources that do not currently and are not likely to apply to the City.
- Commissioner Maul asked about the tables that are referenced in Paragraph 2 of the Twenty-Year Capital Facilities Plan Section. Ms. Redinger said these large tables were inadvertently left out of the current version. She said the entire section would be thoroughly reviewed by the Finance Department before it is presented again to the Commission, and the tables would be included.

Utilities Element Goals and Policies

- Commissioner Wagner suggested that Goal U I is too vague. If there is a reason to include it in the document, it should be clarified.
- Commissioner Montero commented that cell service on the west side of Shoreline is weak. He suggested that the need to improve this service should be acknowledged in the Wireless Communication Facilities Section (Policies U19 through U22).
- Commissioner Wagner suggested that Policy U22 is redundant because the City would not pass a development code that does not protect the public’s health, safety and general welfare. Ms. Redinger agreed.
- Chair Moss suggested that Policy U17 should be changed to read, “Encourage and work with telecommunication providers to develop fiber optic cable networks and technologies that increase interconnectivity between different networks.”

- Commissioner Scully observed that household hazardous waste seems to be an issue in the City. The transfer station does not currently accept these products, and neither does curbside collection. He questioned if it would be appropriate to add a specific policy to the Solid Waste Section to address this issue. Mr. Relph noted that King County has specific policies for household hazardous waste, and that is why it is not accepted at the transfer station. He agreed to research the issue further and provide recommendations to the Commission.
- Commissioner Wagner asked if the intent of U23 is to improve and expand natural gas throughout the City. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively and suggested that “coordinate” may be a better word than “cooperate.” Chair Moss shared an example of a natural gas expansion that occurred in her neighborhood. The City did a great job of coordinating with the utility provider to address the neighborhood’s issues and concerns.

Utilities Element Supporting Analysis

- Chair Moss pointed out that the comment related to the GMA requirement should be deleted from Paragraph 2 of the Background and Context Section.
- Chair Moss referred to staff’s recommendation that the description provided in Paragraph 2 of the Existing Natural Gas Service and Facility Section should be replaced with a map. She recommended that staff investigate and incorporate changes that have occurred. Ms. Redinger said she received notification that Puget Sound Energy is reviewing the document and would provide comments and changes soon.
- Commissioner Montero pointed out that in the Non-City Managed Capital Facilities Plan Section, “Comcast” should be changed to “Xfinity.” Chair Moss asked staff to double check this name and update the entire document accordingly.
- Chair Moss said that in the Non-City Managed Capital Facilities Plan Section the correct reference is “King County Metro” rather than “Metro/King County.”

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that Rob Bennett from the Portland Sustainability Institute would present the next speaker series event on April 25th. Mr. Bennett would also provide a presentation to staff between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m., and several people will go to dinner with him. She asked that Commissioners contact staff if they are interested in attending the dinner. She also announced that the Commission would review the draft Housing and Economic Development Elements of the Comprehensive Plan on May 3rd.

Public Comment

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Markle thanked Commissioner Moss for attending the open house on the draft framework policies for light rail station area planning. They are trying to get the word out that changes will be coming within a quarter to a half mile radius of stations at 145th and Interstate 5 and 185th and Interstate 5 on the east side. She reported that there was a good turnout at the open house, which sets the stage of land use

changes that will come in policy form this year and on the actual land use map in 2013. This is a big change in the City, and it is important that as many people as possible know what is going on.

Chair Moss said she anticipates the Comprehensive Plan would include at least a rudimentary framework for light rail station area planning. Ms. Markle said the TMP has already taken into account the possibility of stations at 185th and 145th by adding new trips in anticipation of the stations being developed within the next 20 years. While updates to fully integrate light rail into the TMP would not take place in 2012, the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan would be updated this year to provide policies related to light rail.

OLD BUSINESS

Planning Commission Annual Report to City Council

The Commission reviewed the final draft of their Annual Report to the City Council and made appropriate changes. In addition to some grammatical corrections, the Commission agreed to add a new “parking lot” subheading called “parking,” which would include not only general parking issues, but also specific parking requirements for accessory dwelling units and home-occupied businesses. They also agreed to add a new subheading called “incentives,” which would address the concept of citywide implementation of the incentives program identified in the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan. Commissioner Wagner agreed to update the document and present it to the Commission for final approval on May 5th. They also agreed that the letterhead should include the names of the former and current Commissioners.

NEW BUSINESS

Utilities Acquisition Presentation

Ms. Markle announced that the City has entered into a tentative agreement with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to acquire the water system’s basic infrastructure (pipes and pumps) by 2020 at a cost of about \$25 million. She reviewed a current map and provided a brief history of the City’s water system. She emphasized that the City is only looking to acquire the distribution system, and not the entire water supply system. Water would continue to be supplied through SPU water sources. She explained that providing local representation and utility service has been a long-term community goal since the City was incorporated. Framework Goal 2 in Vision 2029 calls for providing high-quality public services, utilities and infrastructure that accommodate anticipated levels of growth, protect public health and safety and enhance the quality of life. Framework Goal 14 calls for designating specific areas for high-density development, especially along major transportation corridors, and utilities are a key factor in accomplishing this goal. Acquisition of the SPU water system in Shoreline was a formal City Council Goal in 2009, as well. She reviewed that the acquisition would allow the City to:

- **Establish a more aggressive reinvestment strategy.** A reinvestment strategy for maintenance and capital improvements, line replacement and fire protection becomes a priority when a utility is owned locally.

- **Coordinate growth planning.** The City wants to be able to work directly with all utility providers to ensure that utilities are included in land use planning.
- **Allow for timely and strategic installation of utilities.** Coordination is necessary so that utility plans match the City's growth plan.
- **Diversify the City's tax base.**
- **Provide rate payers with direct representation.** At this time, Shoreline rate payers have no direct control over SPU's rate structure, capital improvements, or service standards. Acquisition would allow citizens of Shoreline to have more control over their tax bills.
- **Allow for construction coordination.** The City wants to better manage construction activities within the public rights-of-way. The goal is to maximize efficiencies through better planning for capacity, financing and construction timing.
- **Provide customer service and operational efficiencies.** Preventative maintenance equals longer service life, and the City would have a real investment in its own system. Local representation would result in a more reasonable and stable rate structure. Because the City is much smaller, they would have flexibility in delivering operation and maintenance.
- **Provides an opportunity for the City to share resources.** Some of the same equipment needed to operate a water utility is also needed to operate a stormwater utility. In addition, administration for the program is already in place.
- **Offer one-stop permitting.** The acquisition would allow developers to obtain the required Water Availability Certificate from the City of Shoreline rather than having to make a special trip to SPU.

Ms. Markle advised that the City Council's objective for acquisition is "to acquire the system at a price that, when added to other costs to operate and maintain the system, would fall within a rate structure equal to or less than what SPU would forecast over a reasonable period of time." She explained that the City is currently in the due diligence phase of the acquisition, and the information gathered during this process would be used to negotiate a final agreement with SPU.

Ms. Markle advised that Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioner Montero are participating on a 28-member steering committee that will continue to meet through June, and they will provide the City Council with a recommendation. An agreement with SPU would be negotiated from now until July, and it is anticipated that the Shoreline and Seattle City Councils would take action in July. If approved by the both city councils, the agreement would be placed on the ballot for citizen approval in the fall.

Mr. Relph emphasized that the acquisition would be funded by the rate payers within the SPU system, and properties served by the Shoreline Water District would not be affected. The cost for the purchase price and necessary improvements would be part of a revenue bond, which would also be paid by the rate payers within the SPU system. Next week, staff will present comparison information between the Shoreline Water District and SPU to the steering committee. It is anticipated the City would be able to pay the debt service and reinvest heavily back into the system because SPU currently charges Shoreline customers a 14% surcharge because they live outside the City of Seattle and the 13% utility tax goes directly to the City of Seattle's general fund. He shared his experience working with various types of utilities in both Shoreline and Grand Junction, Colorado. He said that while there are definite challenges, he does not see any fatal flaws. He encouraged the Commissioners to visit the City's website for additional information about the acquisition.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None of the Commissioners provided reports or announcements during this portion of the meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran announced that a public hearing for the FEMA Flood Plain Ordinance is scheduled for May 3rd. In addition, Ms. Redinger would present the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff would also demonstrate the Environmental Indicators Website.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
April 19, 2012

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT:

STUDY SESSION ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – CAPITAL
FACILITIES/UTILITIES: 2:08

Staff Presentation: 2:15

Public Comment: 1:26:35

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 1:26:42

OLD BUSINESS:

Planning Commission Annual Report to City Council: 1:30:35

NEW BUSINESS:

Utilities Acquisition Presentation: 1:43:00

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 2:01:01

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING 2:01:10

ADJOURNMENT