

# 2001 01 27 Council Retreat

## LAKWOOD CITY COUNCIL RETREAT MINUTES

Saturday, January 27, 2001

Windermere Real Estate

Education Room

10009 59th Avenue SW

Lakewood, WA 98499

### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Harrison called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m.

### ROLL CALL

Councilmembers Present: 6 - Mayor Bill Harrison; Deputy Mayor Claudia Thomas; Councilmembers Larry Humphrey; JosÃ© Palmas; Doug Richardson and Sherri Thomas.

Councilmember Excused: 1 - Councilmember Ann Kirk Davis.

Councilmember Excused: 1 - Councilmember Ann Kirk Davis.

Staff Present: City Manager D. Scott Rohlf; Assistant City Manager Jeff Butzlaff; Police Chief Larry Saunders; Finance and Systems Director Galen Kidd; Community Development Director David Bugher; Public Works Director Bill Larkin; Human Resources & Services Director Debi Young; General Services Director/City Clerk Alice Bush and Redevelopment/Economic Development Administrator Candice Bock.

### ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

#### Review of Vision

A letter from Pastor Walt Kellcy was distributed to Councilmembers.

Deputy Mayor Thomas indicated that the Council needed to develop a clear vision and set five-year milestone goals. This matter will be discussed at a separate retreat to be held in March 2001.

#### YMCA Support

The YMCA is launching a campaign to collect \$200,000 for an expansion of the Lakewood facility. They would like the City Council to go on record as supporting the campaign.

#### City Council Retreat Minutes -2- January 27, 2001

Deputy Mayor Thomas indicated that she agreed with the Council supporting the expansion but wanted the YMCA to demonstrate that the facility would benefit all Lakewood families. A concern was expressed about the YMCA coming to the Council and asking for funding in the future. It was indicated that YMCA did not intend to request funds from the City.

Councilmember Humphrey expressed the need for good coordination with Pierce Transit to allow for easy access to the YMCA facility.

## **Economic Development Board (EDB)**

The Councilmembers discussed EDB support for the year 2002.

It appears there is a new focus on surrounding communities and not just Tacoma. Other cities are expecting Lakewood to step-up as the second largest city in the county.

Councilmember Palmas was concerned that there was a process in place for requesting funding/support and the process involved citizen committees, but this process had been bypassed with this request.

The Council referred the proposal to the Redevelopment Advisory Board for review.

The Mayor is on the board for Pierce County cities and towns, but agreed that if the EDB received funding from the City, Lakewood should be represented and it should have a voice in considering criteria for funding selection.

## **LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES AND UPDATE**

Councilmembers agreed that a good format had been established for meeting with legislators. The three Councilmembers involved felt this worked well.

City Manager Rohlfs informed Councilmembers that Senator Shirley Winsley requested that the City provide two top transportation priorities. City staff provided the State Route 512 and the Bridgeport Way SW interchange as the two priorities.

City Manager Rohlfs briefly summarized a priority list of issues.

Council agreed that it was important for Lakewood and neighboring cities to come together to support issues.

## **City Council Retreat Minutes -3- January 27, 2001**

### **FORT STEILACOOM PARK**

Currently, the transfer of the Ft. Steilacoom Park title to the City is not possible because of several issues. In 1999, the Council adopted an agreement to transfer the park, but the County did not agree to the terms. There are two outstanding issues still to be resolved, which are: the Ward building use and general deferred maintenance. The County and City are in agreement that the 1988 joint agreement does not apply to either entity and concur that the County is responsible for deferred maintenance.

The City and County are willing to explore joint operation and management of the Park and are putting together an interim agreement in this regard.

The question to come before the Council is if joint operations and maintenance are agreeable without a transfer of control. The City could still pursue the transfer of title in the future. There are 13 years left on the existing County lease.

Councilmember Thomas voiced concern that the County may be adding in overhead costs, but City Manager Rohlfs indicated that he believed this had been addressed and cost sharing was based on direct costs.

It was suggested that University Place might be willing to provide some capital funding for Fort Steilacoom Park as it is a regional park serving a wide population. City Manager Rohlfs shared some precedents for such joint support evident in other communities (SeaTac and Redmond). He indicated that neither Pierce County nor King County has defined what they envision as a regional park.

Councilmember Richardson expressed concern over which entity would have veto power in a joint management operation. The actual ownership was not of great concern to him, but he wondered if the County could stop progress by not funding the project.

City Manager Rohlfs reported that Mr. Lynn Horn is willing to do the Master Plan for Fort Steilacoom at no cost. The Master Plan could be organized to determine which projects belong to the City or the County or which ones will be handled jointly.

Specific concerns regarding Fort Steilacoom Park included:

• Scheduling is done by the County

• Should the golf course issue be resurfaced? Why does the County want this?

• Could the City be investing money in something it could lose in 13 years at the end of the current lease period? Is there a problem in investing money even without control of ownership because the park is in Lakewood and it is a regional park?

City Council Retreat Minutes -4- January 27, 2001

• The State wants restoration of the barns - not simple repair

• Does the liability for the barns rest with the County as the leaseholder?

• Citizens do not want development of Fort Steilacoom Park - they like it rustic and natural - do not want an urban park. Any master planning needs to be sensitive to these concerns.

• Long range planning may trigger an outcry from the public. The focus at this time needs to be directed solely to the playing fields.

• There is a big difference between improvements and maintenance

There is a big difference between improvements and maintenance. County would still like the City to provide \$73,000 for work in the park in FY 2000. The City maintains there was no agreement and therefore cannot legally pay.

A chart was listed on the white board to show prospective expenses over the next several years to address funding issues.

2000 \$73,000 (no agreement) \$300,000

2001 \$110,000 State Grants

2002 \$110,000

2003 \$ 80,000

2004 \$ 82,000

2005 \$ 84,000

Part of the money initially budgeted will make up for no contributions being made in the past. In 2001, the City has only budgeted \$78,000, so an additional \$32,000 will have to be funded to meet the above funding, if it is funded at that level.

To accept this package, the City would have to have a funding commitment from the County and agreement for joint management.

Councilmember Thomas felt the focus of the City's plan should be on maintenance and operation, not on recreation.

Mayor Harrison felt the Council should agree to move forward with the new plan.

There was consensus from the Council to move forward with a "Peace" plan.

Most of the \$300,000 for field improvements will not be spent this year. The City and County can take this opportunity to jointly apply for grants.

Mayor Harrison expressed caution regarding staffing needs associated with this project and asked that staff let the Council know if increased staffing was necessary to handle the project.

City Council Retreat Minutes -5- January 27, 2001

## UTILITY FRANCHISES UPDATE

All franchises are different. Even the electrical providers all have different provisions in their services and billing. Some agreements include an administrative fee; some do not. Some focus on underground service equipment; some use poles above ground. Community Development Block Grant funds are not allowed for lights because City lights cannot be placed on company owned poles. Some companies have the means to actively pursue "undergrounding"; but other companies do not have that means.

Councilmember Palmas spoke of a Street Light Safety Program in which poles could be identified by number and in which a set schedule of maintenance allowed for replacement of poles on a regular basis. He wanted the City charged only for operating lights - not those burned out - and he wanted a quick 48-hour turnaround repair time when a utility receives notice of a light out. Public Works Director Larkin is working on this type of program.

The City's contract with AT&T Cable is set at 10 years with two 5-year options. This allows the City the flexibility in adjusting to the many changes in this industry.

It is the Council's policy that they do not want to assume the Water District. There are terms in the franchise agreement with the Water District that remove any incentive the City might have to take it over.

It appears there are three major issues of concern in the franchise agreement with the Water District.

• Franchise Fee

• Joint Planning - City has GMA authority

• Joint Billing Services

The City cannot cut service to force payment of delinquent garbage bills. There are hundreds of delinquent garbage accounts

Most of the time, cutting service results in compliance, but that is not always possible. The Water District believes it cannot cut off service; the City is comfortable that this can be done. The City could be the billing agent and contract back to the Water District to do billing.

Service Contract Review.

Fire District: Approximately \$75,000 to \$80,000 in plan review fees go to the Fire District. In the year 2000, the City paid an additional \$25,000 in fees.

City Council Retreat Minutes -6- January 27, 2001

The Fire District proposes a long-term phase-in of what they consider full cost recovery, with an additional payment by the City of \$25,000 each year until the total payments (with revenues) of approximately \$250,000.

Staff is analyzing the cost of internalizing service for the City. This analysis may require the time of more than one employee. To begin, the City is attempting to do a full one-month tracking of the Fire Marshal duties.

Some discussion took place regarding the perception that the Fire District has obligations to do some work that it is trying to pass off to the City or adding services the City does not necessarily want or need. The Fire District is asking for a long-term contract. There is a legal requirement for a plan review process. There was some interest expressed in utilizing the services of the Fire Marshal in the Weed and Seed program.

Other comments brought forth included that the City's current payments to the Fire District total approximately \$120,000 per year. Councilmembers questioned if the City can combine service with Steilacoom, but it was noted that the City's service levels are different and their police and fire units are combined. The Fire District performs Code Enforcement currently, so there is no need for the City to perform this function.

Animal Control: Assistant City Manager Butzlaff reported that the current Humane Society contract will expire on February 1, 2001. The Society is offering a three-year contract, which the Society believes is essential to a quality program. He explained that the City is exploring the feasibility of providing animal licensing in-house and continuing

to have the Society provide animal field and shelter services. Again, as with the Fire Marshall contract, levels of service, perhaps above the City's means, are being packaged.

Discussion ensued on the importance of providing continuing animal control services and to develop viable options before any changes are made.

Discussion ensued on the importance of providing continuing animal control services and to develop viable options before any changes are made.

It was the consensus of the Council to try and extend the Human Society contract for a minimal amount of time in order to develop viable options for providing animal control services.

Discussion of Organizational Considerations.

Code Enforcement: Community Development Director Bugher reported that the Code Enforcement Division is proposed to be transferred from the Community Development Department to the Assistant City Manager Department beginning March 1, 2001. Community Development Director Bugher explained that the Assistant City Manager is responsible for the oversight of the police contract and has a relationship with the Weed and Seed Program, which Code Enforcement is heavily involved with. A budget amendment to transfer the function may be forthcoming.

City Council Retreat Minutes -7- January 27, 2001

Information Systems: City Manager Rohlfs reported that, with the recent changes in the Information Systems Division and the need to fill the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Specialist position to create mapping overlay requirements for Engineering, there are no changes being proposed at this time.

Public Information Officer (PIO): City Manager Rohlfs explained that there has been difficulty with filling the PIO position and the salary may need to be adjusted to fit the level of expertise required for that position.

Discussion ensued on issuing a Request for Proposal for contracting with a professional public relations firm this year and possibly filling that service with a public relations officer later.

Discussion ensued on issuing a Request for Proposal for contracting with a professional public relations firm this year and possibly filling that service with a public relations officer later.

City Manager Rohlfs indicated that a public relations firm could cost in the range of \$250,000 and that he would need the Council to provide a scope of work for the type of services required.

Theme Park Consultant Update.

City Manager Rohlfs reviewed the preliminary project time schedule for the Great Northwest Theme Park Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which may be scheduled for February 20, 2001. City Manager Rohlfs reviewed the amount of funds expended to date by the developer as follows:

\$320,000 - EIS (approximate)

800,000 - Expended by developer to date

\$1,120,000

\$5,000,000 - Cash and Certificates of Deposit (CD's)

City Manager Rohlfs then reviewed the estimated revenue and investment assumptions and debt servicing for the theme park. He explained that the public use of funds the State, Pierce County and the Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood could entertain in this venture will have approximate costs as follows:

State: \$10,000,000 Interchange and Bridgeport Way SW Improvements

6,000,000 Tax credits

2,000,000 Land

\$18,000,000

**County: \$2,000,000 Sewer infrastructure + Land**

**Tacoma: \$10,000,000 \* Stormwater/Electric and Other Transportation**

**\* LTGO or revenue bonds or enter into interlocal agreement with Lakewood and Lakewood issues bonds**

**City Council Retreat Minutes -8- January 27, 2001**

**Lakewood: \$20,000,000 Land, parking and improvements, natural gas and miscellaneous**

**City Manager Rohlfs explained that based on the scenario just described, the project would amount to \$128,000,000 as follows:**

**\$112,000,000 Theme Parks**

**6,000,000 Sales tax**

**10,000,000 Freeway improvements**

**\$128,000,000**

**of which \$50,000,000 is Public Funds (Lakewood, Tacoma, County, and State)**

**and \$78,000,000 is the Developer costs**

**Discussion ensued on obtaining the Governor's support for this project; how the Federal Way amusement park would impact the theme park; considering the recommendations of the Arthur Anderson report; and reviewing the terms of the theme park contract to ensure that the City's best interest is at heart.**

**New City Hall Opening Ceremony, Public Safety Committee Update and Landmarks and Heritage Agency Discussion**

**Mayor Harrison announced that due to the lateness of the hour, the City Hall opening, Public Safety Committee Update and Landmarks and Heritage Agency agenda topics would not be discussed at this time.**

**Mayor Harrison requested Councilmembers to provide General Services Director/City Clerk Bush with their input on the City Hall celebration before the City Events Committee begins to plan the event.**

**Utility Resolution and Energy Conservation**

**City Manager Rohlfs explained that the Tacoma Public Utilities is requesting to come before the Council to make a presentation on the energy crisis and conservation measure and to request that the Council consider adopting a conservation resolution.**

**Discussion ensued on what Lakewood's other two utility providers may think about the current energy situation.**

**Deputy Mayor Thomas indicated that she will work with all electric providers to consider drafting a resolution that would address the suggestions of all of Lakewood electrical providers.**

**City Council Retreat Minutes -9- January 27, 2001**

**Audits**

**Deputy Mayor Thomas reminded Councilmembers of the Management Letter on the City's audits requiring the submittal of payment receipts when requesting claims for reimbursement.**

**Discussion ensued on obtaining phone cards for Councilmembers and providing for a car allowance for the Mayor.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.**

---

**BILL HARRISON, MAYOR**

**ATTEST:**

---

**ALICE M. BUSH, CMC**

**CITY CLERK**

.....