

FIFE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Fife City Hall
Council Chambers

Date: February 21, 2006
Time: 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Pro Tem Edwards called the special meeting/study session of the Fife City Council to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following Councilmembers present: Godwin, Johnson, Edwards, Kelley, Cerqui, and Roscoe.

Absent: Councilmember de Booy (excused).

Staff present: Worthington, Reinbold, Jacoby, Campbell, Blount, Kennedy, Reuter, Blackburn, Richards, and Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Kelley led the pledge of allegiance.

Traffic Impact Fees

Public Works Director Blount introduced **Michael Birdsall with David Evans and Associates, Inc.** Mr. Bristol reported he is assisting with Fife's traffic forecasting model and developing a traffic impact fee schedule. A traffic impact fee schedule simplifies administering the appropriate fees for each development proposal. The 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA) allows cities and counties to impose traffic impact fees by adopting an ordinance and fee schedule outlining in advance how much a developer must pay as well as providing standards for calculating fair and proportionate impact fees. Impact fees are authorized only to recover the unfunded costs of capacity improvements due to growth. Impact fees may not be used for projects to address existing deficiencies. All calculations are based on the City's adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan that lays out qualifying capacity improvements for growth. Over the next 20 years, it is assumed Fife could secure approximately \$2 million annually through grant opportunities to help fund capacity improvements. However, it is only one-third of what is needed to fund projects to maintain the City's level of service (LOS) standards. The shortfall of over \$70 million has to be applied evenly and proportionately to all classes of development over the next 20 years. The Fife traffic model indicates the pro-rata share of unfunded cost per vehicle-mile of travel growth is \$5,500. Individualization of the fee schedule is necessary to individually account for each development by type of land use, location, and vehicle mix of traffic generated. The analysis suggests six fee areas for the City based on trip length. Development types include:

- Single-family dwelling
- Multi-family dwelling
- Retail
- Office / Services
- Industrial, Cars
- Industrial, Trucks

Mr. Bristol outlined the formula used to determine impact fees. Director Blount distributed an *Impact Fee Comparison Table* of examples of traffic impact fees collected by other jurisdictions in the Puget Sound region. Mr. Bristol reviewed the *Product = Individualized Impact Fee Schedule by Development Type and by Small Areas within Fife* as reflected on page 4 of the report. The table provides a lowest, typical, and highest fee range based

on development types.

Staff and Councilmembers reviewed the *Impact Fee Comparison Table*.

Mayor Pro Tem Edwards inquired whether the proposed impact fees are based on the shortfall of \$73 million. Mr. Birdsall replied the total cost for improvements as listed in Fife's Comprehensive Transportation Plan is \$113 million. The plan assumes \$40 million from public funding sources. Mayor Pro Tem Edwards noted the proposed impact fees are based on the City's capacity needs and are not random numbers.

Councilmember Godwin asked when cities were authorized to collect traffic impact fees. City Attorney Jacoby replied cities have multiple statutory grounds for obtaining impact fees such as through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). SEPA allows local governments to condition approval of projects based on adverse environmental impacts. Fife has used SEPA to collect mitigation fees to address transportation. In 1990, the Legislature amended the GMA and added the ability for counties and cities to collect impact fees. Fife currently collects impact fees for schools and parks. Councilmember Godwin asked how developments currently vested would be affected should the Council approve an impact fee ordinance. City Attorney Jacoby explained that impact fees under the GMA are not similar to land use ordinances that pertain to the vesting of a project. If the Council adopted impact fees, building permits issued after the effective date of ordinance, would be subject to an appropriate traffic impact fee even though the SEPA process is complete. Director Blount added the developer would receive a credit against the traffic impact fee from any SEPA mitigation fee that has already been paid. City Attorney Jacoby confirmed the City cannot charge duplicitous fees.

Director Blount reported a key milestone occurred in December 2002 when the Council adopted the current Comprehensive Transportation Plan. "Grandfathered" SEPA's were adopted based on a previous transportation plan that included modest capacity improvements.

Discussion followed about improvements required as part of the Radiance project and what it would pay in the form of a traffic impact fee under the proposed formula, the City's ability to collect monies through other mitigation tools, and frontage improvements required along 54th.

Mayor Pro Tem Edwards expressed concerns about industrial businesses with truck traffic. Truck impacts are different because they don't usually operate during typical peak hours. However, there is "wear and tear" on the transportation system and trucks take up more space than a car. Mr. Bristol replied the unit size for *Industrial – trucks* is based on two passenger car equivalents (PCE) as provided for in the Institute of Transportation (ITE) Engineers Trip Generation Manual for truck terminal facilities.

Mayor Pro Tem Edwards asked if a warehouse owner could lower traffic impacts by scheduling truck trips during non-peak hours. Mr. Bristol replied the analysis is based on the average experience of comparable locations. The ITE Manual considers unique circumstances related to industrial truck traffic. The analysis prepared for the City uses the peak hour numbers that apply for truck operations per the ITE Manual. He cited an example of a development in Issaquah that was able to avoid paying a traffic impact fee.

City Attorney Jacoby explained the statute outlines how cities are to calculate traffic impact fees:

- The city shall consider unusual circumstances in specific cases to ensure that the impact fees are imposed fairly.
- The method for calculating the fees shall permit consideration of studies and data submitted by the development to adjust the amount of the fee.

However, the City is not obligated to make any adjustment to the impact fee based on unique circumstances. Further discussion of truck warehouse activities and whether impact fees can be used for maintenance and repair of the transportation network followed. Mr. Bristol emphasized that by law, traffic impact fees can only be used for construction of new capacity to accommodate new growth. The fees cannot be used to address preexisting conditions or maintenance costs.

Councilmember Roscoe asked whether errors have occurred where a development generates more traffic than anticipated. Mr. Birdsall indicated it has occurred. However, for practical reasons once the parties agree to a traffic impact fee the amount is final. SEPA would allow the City to explore a variety of unique issues.

Councilmember Johnson asked whether currently, there are any single-family developments that would fall under the proposed traffic impact fee schedule. City Manager Worthington replied the Saddle Creek development would be affected. Director Blount added staff can calculate the traffic impact fee for the Saddle Creek and Radiance developments and follow up with the Council at its next meeting.

Councilmember Cerqui inquired as to where the burden of proof lies. City Attorney Jacoby replied if a developer challenged the amount of the traffic impact fee, the developer would have to prove the City didn't calculate the fee as outlined in state statute. Director Blount added that the Board of Adjustment would consider the matter. The City does rely on the applicant's professionals to provide the correct traffic analysis information. The City could put out counters and/or do actual traffic counts to confirm the traffic data. In general, trips suggested in the ITE Manual based on land use types are accurate and consistent.

City Manager Worthington said impact fees are a good tool and is the right approach for Fife. Only since adoption of the new transportation plan has the City had the quantitative data required to implement traffic impact fees.

The Council discussed the possibility of forwarding a proposed ordinance to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation.

Councilmember Johnson requested staff provide the Council with a comparison between traffic impact fees and SEPA fees using recent City development projects.

**Voice
Telecommunications
Systems**

Assistant City Manager Reinbold distributed a *City of Fife Telephone System Vendor Demonstration Summary* dated February 21, 2006. In late 2005, the TMC Group assessed the needs and requirements of the City's telephone system. The present system is outdated and unable to accommodate expansion. The City received 11 proposals from eight vendors. Three vendors and system proposals were selected for further review. An evaluation committee attended vendor/product demonstrations. The committee considered Cerium and Avaya as the best combination of vendor and manufacturer and values the "one-system" solution. Avaya also has an active users group to address problems.

J.R. Simmons, TCM Group, described the evaluation process for reviewing the telephone system RFP responses. It was fairly easy to narrow the field to three finalists. Of the three finalists (Nexus, B& C Telephone, and Cerium) it was clear that one system stood out as the most appropriate for the City because the investment is long term and Cerium is at the beginning of its product life cycle. The system is supported by a leading manufacturer that provides local service assistance. The recommendation is to bring the voice telecommunications system forward to the Council's February 28, 2006 meeting for action.

Councilmember Godwin expressed concerns about how an electronic key system found its way through the RFP process and pointed out that from the proposals there could have been a better fit. He asked about the system's warranty period. Mr. Simmons replied the system is warranted for one year. Councilmember Godwin asked if the annual maintenance cost of \$10,000 a year begins with year two and if it includes switch upgrades. Mr. Simmons said the annual maintenance contract begins in year two. The contract includes software upgrades but no new releases to add features to the system.

Mr. Simmons clarified that his recommendation to the management team was against consideration of the electronic key system as a finalist. However, the system was so inexpensive it was prudent to evaluate it further. The system was determined to be inadequate and unresponsive to the RFP process.

In reply to an inquiry from Councilmember Johnson, Mr. Simmons replied the Cerium equipment and system is IP compatible.

Discussion ensued about the Qwest system for \$110,948, and that the Avaya system can accommodate each of the department's unique needs.

Councilmember Cerqui asked whether security is a factor to consider. Mr. Simmons replied Avaya implements one of the most secure approaches to system security by encrypting the IP communications between systems. Avaya also conducts periodic security audits, which is included in the maintenance package.

Councilmember Johnson inquired about Avaya's response guarantee. Mr. Simmons replied that once a service call is received, Cerium remotely accesses the system. The system uses self-diagnostics to report the problem many times before the user reports it. If an Avaya support person is needed on site for a major problem, the contract stipulates a one-hour response time. Avaya is required to respond to minor problems within four business hours.

City Manager Worthington reported the voice telecommunications system is scheduled for Council action on February 28, 2006.

Councilmember Godwin asked whether "PRI" automation will be supplied at each end. Mr. Simmons replied yes. The system is designed to run itself from either end circuit.

Mr. Simmons reported the City is not satisfied with the current local telephone carrier. The current carrier for local dial tone is under-performing. The carrier was recently purchased by another company. However, service has not improved. Selection of another carrier is anticipated and should result in lower carrier service costs and improved service. As part of the system implementation, the vendor, TMC, and each City department will meet to define how the system should be set up for each department. Documentation is also required as part of the implementation component.

**Parks Development
Project Updates**

Director Reuter reviewed the three park/facility improvement projects: Wedge Park Phase II, Fife Swim Center renovation, and Dacca Park/54th Avenue improvements.

The City is working with Cascade Design Collaborative to complete the second phase of Wedge Park. Additional amenities include a small parking lot and a small restroom structure. The current budget of \$230,000 includes \$200,000 from the 2006 budget and a carryover of \$30,000 from 2005.

Director Reuter presented a preliminary design of the improvements. The intent is to allow residents to park off Valley Avenue and access the park from the backside of a secured parking area. A restroom is proposed adjacent to the play area. The City's consultant believes the parking lot and permanent restroom can be accomplished within the budget allocation. The difference between a portable restroom and a permanent, prefab restroom structure is

approximately \$50,000. If the Council approves moving forward with a permanent restroom structure, staff will provide examples of structure types for a final selection at a future meeting. A two-unit restroom (a toilet for each sex) is proposed. A unisex restroom is another option for the Council's consideration.

Councilmembers Johnson, Godwin and Mayor Pro Tem Edwards said they prefer a permanent restroom. Mayor Pro Tem Edwards expressed concerns about the placement of the structure and security issues. Acting Police Chief Blackburn replied the Police Department could easily access the restroom facility at the proposed location. However, it is difficult to assess visibility to the building based on the proposed site plan. Mayor Pro Tem Edwards commented the restroom entrance faces away from the street. Interim Director Reuter said the concerns can be considered during the placement of the restroom facility.

Discussion ensued about vandalism associated with restroom facilities and connecting to City water and sewer.

Mayor Kelly said if the decision is to install a portable restroom, he recommends installing concrete walls around the structure.

Councilmember Godwin referred to a park built in Lakewood that closes at dusk and locks electronically. Interim Director Reuter said staff could investigate the cost of electronic door locks for the Council's consideration.

Discussion followed about the parking lot design and costs to include a trail connection.

Councilmember Cerqui said he is interested in the cost difference between providing a temporary versus a permanent restroom facility.

In reply to an inquiry from Councilmember Johnson, Interim Director Reuter replied the cost for the trail connection is approximately \$15,000–\$20,000 more. Councilmember Johnson said it is more cost effective to retain the trail connection at this point. Director Blount commented the bridge is not yet constructed. Interim Director Reuter said staff can ask the consultant to develop a cost estimate for Phase II of the park based on alternative scenarios.

Councilmember Roscoe expressed opposition to a permanent restroom facility that is locked from time to time due to vandalism. She said she prefers permanent structures in high use areas such as Dacca Park and a trail connection at Wedge Park in lieu of a permanent bathroom. Interim Director Reuter said staff could ask the consultant to provide the pad and infrastructure for adding a permanent restroom later. Councilmember Roscoe suggested adding a sink as well.

Discussion ensued about maintenance associated with drinking fountains and

providing a spigot. Director Blount reported the irrigation system is not constructed to potable water standards. Further discussion followed about the availability and/or location of City water and sewer lines.

Councilmember Johnson reported the park area in Phase III is covered in canary grass and blackberries and the trail that connects to the neighborhood park at Wapato Point is closed. City Manager Worthington replied staff will investigate the trail closure matter.

Interim Director Reuter summarized that the Council has indicated an interest in reviewing hard costs related to the trail extension, installing a portable versus permanent restroom structure, and the cost associated with a unisex bathroom with one toilet.

Director Reuter provided an update on the Fife Swim Center project. Five hundred thousand dollars is allocated to accomplish the pool renovations. The scope of work approved by the Council includes reconfiguration of both locker rooms. The ORB Organization has determined the approved budget will not fund completion of the items listed in Option D. Cost estimates for the work are projected at approximately \$400 a square foot. While the figure appears high, staff obtained information from other design consultants who confirmed the \$400 a square foot estimate is reasonable. The projected cost to complete all of the improvements (locker rooms, restrooms, and lobby area) is \$950,000. Staff requests further direction on how to proceed with the Fife Swim Center project.

City Manager Worthington said an \$850,000 target budget is appropriate and corresponds to the travel funding anticipated for the swim center. Staff presented the project to the Council last November and conveyed it would bring the proposal back with further details.

Discussion followed about the renovation of the lobby area and the \$300,000 estimated cost. Interim Director Reuter explained the cost may be less but the renovation includes the area that houses the HVAC equipment. City Manager Worthington added the Council could opt to make cosmetic changes only to the lobby area.

Councilmember Roscoe expressed support for the pool remodel. She asked whether the pool liner was repaired following the earthquake, how long the infrastructure under the pool will last, and the costs to replace the infrastructure. City Manager Worthington replied an evaluation of the structural integrity was completed approximately five years ago. There is ongoing maintenance costs associated with pump and valve replacement and/or repair. Interim Director Reuter added the department's approach to maintenance of the pool is a proactive one.

Councilmember Cerqui said he supports the swim center project but is concerned about the increase costs associated with the improvements. He

inquired about the source of funds if the project exceeds \$850,000. Councilmember Cerqui said he is interested in firm numbers before moving forward with renovations to the locker rooms and lobby area. Interim Director Reuter replied that soliciting RFPs is the next step once the cost estimates are confirmed.

Director Reuter reported that improvements to complete Dacca Park consist of the addition of a parking lot on the west side of 54th Avenue and enhancements to the open space areas.

Interim Director Reuter presented an overhead illumination and landscaping site plans. Staff is ready to move forward with the last phase of the project. The focal point of the Commons area is a “landmark” tree to be placed near the center of the open space.

Council and staff discussed the pros and cons for capping and/or decommissioning the old irrigation well, construction of a trail, and the budget for the project.

WSDOT Right-of-way Study

Director Blount reported the potential annual revenue if Fife billed Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for storm drainage for right-of-way located inside the City limits is approximately \$6,000 annually. However, the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) requires Fife to also pay for City right-of-way storm drainage. Those payments would total approximately \$23,000. The City may be required to pay a portion of the total cost to Drainage District 23. Additionally, the drainage district may claim a portion of the WSDOT payment.

Director Blount distributed a *Surface Water Management Utilities Street Charge* comparison document.

Councilmember Cerqui suggested the Council address the issue at a future study session. Director Blount added staff will provide an update on capital projects and timing at a future study session.

Valley Avenue Sidewalks – 54th

Director Blount reported the proposed scope of services concerns Valley Avenue East roadway improvements from 54th Avenue East to Dale Lane and a traffic signal at the intersection of 23rd Street East and 54th Avenue East. If the Council is comfortable with the scope of work for the design and engineering phases of the contract, staff will draft a budget estimate and present the information at the Council’s next meeting for further review and action.

A brief discussion about the 58th Avenue crossing ensued.

Director Blount explained \$100,000 was earmarked for the first construction on Valley Avenue. It appears there might be a way to invest funds towards a reconfigured intersection that includes installation of a mast arm for a signal

at the corner and hanging overhead warning signs. City Manager Worthington added the process provides an opportunity for staff and Council to review a reconfigured intersection and the costs associated with such a proposal. Director Blount clarified there are no controls with the mast arm to control traffic. The overhead warning signs serve to warn motorists of a crosswalk.

Councilmember Cerqui asked whether the reconfiguration design accounts for the future roadway alignment. Director Blount replied that it does.

Council and staff discussed the warning system behind the Sea Tac Mall that flashes and displays the speed of motorists, foundation needs for mast arms, and simply installing posts with warning signs.

Councilmember Godwin inquired whether the design and construction of the crosswalk is anticipated for completion this year. Director Blount replied the work should be completed this year.

Council and staff discussed the cost difference between the signals at 23rd Street and Freeman Road and Valley Avenue.

Councilmember Cerqui asked staff to elaborate on the 58th alignment design element of the study. Director Blount said the design of 58th and Valley is part of the overall engineering design of Valley.

Councilmember Roscoe inquired whether redesign of the intersection involves “that” house. Director Blount answered in the affirmative. In addition, it makes sense to install the wiring for a future signal under the sidewalk, which could drive construction costs for the sidewalk component higher. Staff will present cost estimates to the Council as the project moves towards construction next year.

Councilmember Cerqui inquired whether the design work includes Wilton. Director Blount replied sidewalks are in place on the north side of Wilton. There will be a continuous pedestrian way from Sheffield Place to Dacca Park with a crosswalk at 62nd and Valley.

Consensus

The Council agreed to schedule the Valley Avenue Sidewalks – 54th as a regular session agenda item for its next meeting.

“After Storm” Report

City Manager Worthington reported he asked staff to present an “after the storm” report to the Council.

Acting Police Chief Blackburn distributed a memorandum and reported Public Works staff was called out early to provide assistance. The Police Department maintained its regular level of staffing to respond to callouts. Power was the biggest issue and two traffic signal controllers (one in Fife and one in Milton) were damaged by a power surge. Staff is working to compile

cost assessments to determine whether the damages meet the threshold for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) assistance. He estimates damage in the \$20,000 range for both equipment and labor. Estimates are due by February 22, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. Pierce County is taking the lead with FEMA reporting. It is doubtful that damages will meet the minimum threshold.

City Manager Worthington commented that Fife residents might need help with clean up of debris with a more significant event rather than just having curbside pickup. He asked staff to develop a preliminary cost estimate. Staff estimates curbside pickup could cost between \$4,000 and \$6,000. It is a matter for future Council consideration.

Council and staff discussed damage from fallen trees, the lack of traffic flagging because City staff addressed other storm-related matters, and responsibility for repairing the fence on the backside of the ballpark.

Director Reuter reported staff is evaluating a number of potential hazard Cottonwood trees that should be removed. Several Councilmembers agreed that hazard trees should be removed.

ADJOURNMENT

Councilmember Roscoe moved, seconded by Mayor Kelley, to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. Motion carried.

Mike Kelley, Mayor

Marlyn Campbell, Clerk-Treasurer

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services