

City of Seattle Legislative Information Service

Information updated as of November 8, 2005 9:16 PM

Resolution Number: 30666

A RESOLUTION stating that the Seattle City Council will not consider the appropriateness of designating the North Highline and West Hill areas as potential annexation areas until 2005 and will only consider designating these areas in 2005 if certain conditions are satisfied and certain information is provided.

Date introduced/referred: March 29, 2004

Date adopted: April 5, 2004

Status: Adopted

Vote: 7-0 (Excused: Godden and Steinbrueck)

Committee: Government Affairs and Labor

Sponsor: DRAGO

Index Terms: ANNEXATION, KING-COUNTY, INTERGOVERNMENTAL-RELATIONS, PLANNING, STATING-POLICY, REGIONAL-PLANNING, COMPREHENSIVE-PLAN, BUDGET, FINANCE

Text

A RESOLUTION stating that the Seattle City Council will not consider the appropriateness of designating the North Highline and West Hill areas as potential annexation areas until 2005 and will only consider designating these areas in 2005 if certain conditions are satisfied and certain information is provided.

WHEREAS, the Seattle City Council recognizes that the challenges of funding and providing services to the remaining urban unincorporated areas in King County is a regional problem that affects not only King County but all of the municipalities within King County; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle City Council is willing to participate in discussions on how to best address this regional problem, but it must be recognized that the City of Seattle is not solely responsible for resolving it; and

WHEREAS, the designation of potential annexation areas (PAA) in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan has significant implications and will create expectations that Seattle intends to annex these areas; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seattle is currently experiencing financial challenges and has had to make service reductions to balance its budget; and

WHEREAS, it is likely that Seattle will not have sufficient financial resources to provide services to any potential annexation areas without decreasing or otherwise negatively impacting service levels for existing Seattle citizens; and

WHEREAS, North Highline and West Hill residents are and will be studying their governance options, and the Seattle City Council believes that they should have an adequate period of time, i.e., at least until the end of 2004, to evaluate those options; and

WHEREAS, residents in North Highline and West Hill indicated in polls conducted in 1999 that they would prefer to be annexed by cities other

than Seattle; and

WHEREAS, as provided in the King County Planning Policies, the City of Seattle should consult with residential groups in the affected areas and collaborate with the cities adjacent to North Highline and West Hill and with King County to agree on potential annexation areas before any one city makes a PAA designation involving those areas; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seattle has not designated the unincorporated area abutting the 14th/16th Avenue South Bridge as a PAA because King County has not identified funding to replace the bridge; and

WHEREAS, an annexing jurisdiction is likely to be responsible for the maintenance and care of roadways within annexed areas unless other arrangements are made; and

WHEREAS, although the Seattle City Council may consider designating North Highline and West Hill as PAAs in its 2005 Comprehensive Plan update, considering designation does not mean the Seattle City Council will approve designation; and

WHEREAS, even if the Seattle City Council designates North Highline and/or West Hill as PAAs at some future time in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, it is understood that the Council may require additional information prior to making a final decision whether to annex these areas;

WHEREAS, the Seattle City Council believes that certain steps should be completed and certain conditions must be met prior to the Council considering designating North Highline and/or West Hill as PAAs and as a result wishes to defer consideration of designation until the 2005 Comprehensive Plan review; and NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE:

Section 1. The Seattle City Council will defer consideration of designating North Highline and West Hill as potential annexation areas in the 2004 Comprehensive Plan review and will not consider designating North Highline and West Hill as potential annexation areas in Seattle's 2005 Comprehensive Plan review unless and until the Council is satisfied that the following steps and conditions have been met:

A. King County executes an Interlocal Agreement that indemnifies Seattle against all liability associated with the existing 14th/16th Avenue South Bridge, including but not limited to the design and maintenance of the roadway, and all supporting structures associated with the bridge. King County must also agree to accept financial responsibility for replacing the bridge and commit to its replacement within a reasonable timeframe. The Seattle City Council will not consider annexing this area under any scenario in which Seattle would become responsible for the existing bridge. The City Council requests

that a member of Council Central Staff be included in any negotiations with King County concerning the bridge.

B. The Executive submits to Council detailed and comprehensive information on operation and capital costs for each potential annexation area, including but not limited to: assumptions about service levels and operation and maintenance costs, infrastructure upgrades, capital needs, FTE impacts, equipment costs, and any other costs associated with annexation of these areas, as well as supporting documentation. Specific costs associated with police protection (additional personnel, equipment, police stations); other criminal justice services, fire protection (additional personnel, equipment, hydrants, fire stations); public works (additional street lighting, maintenance, construction, storm drainage, garbage collection); transportation, including any potential changes in the allocation of metro transit service hours, parks and recreation (additional park acreage, recreational programs, new facilities); water (water main construction, maintenance, replacement of old lines); and sewers (new interceptor lines, additional treatment plant capacity, pump stations) should be addressed, along with other services provided by Seattle, such as libraries and human services. Cost estimates should also include the range of potential costs based on low-end vs. high-end service levels so that the City fully understands its potential financial liability. The supporting documentation must show how City departments determined the estimated costs.

C. The Executive provides a plan showing alternatives for how Seattle would pay for any increased costs that may result from any annexation without negatively impacting existing service levels to Seattle residents.

D. Demonstrable progress is made, as determined by the Seattle City Council, on a more equitable regional funding mechanism and cost sharing plan for human services.

E. Other jurisdictions abutting the North Highline and West Hill areas have indicated that they are not interested in also designating either of these areas or portions of these areas as a PAA.

F. Objective polling of North Highline and West Hill area residents indicates a majority of the population within these Unincorporated Areas prefers to be annexed by Seattle. Seattle residents should also be polled to determine support for annexation of these areas. Prior to conducting any such polls, the City Council must have an opportunity to review the proposed polling instruments. In addition to polling, the City Council expects to receive other input from residents of the unincorporated areas and expects Councilmembers to be informed of and included in regional discussions on this issue.

G. The City undertakes a review of existing statutes related to annexations and determines whether additions or changes to these statutes are needed to decrease the City's risks and costs associated

with annexing a potential annexation area. If the City determines that certain changes are desirable, it should include these in its State Legislative Agenda and request that the State Legislature consider such changes.

Adopted by the City Council the _____ day of _____, 2004, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this _____ day of _____, 2004.

President _____ of the City Council

Filed by me this _____ day of _____, 2004.

City Clerk

3/23/04