

Lisa Clausen

From: Public Council Inbox
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2011 10:45 AM
To: 'Chestine Edgar'
Subject: RE: annexation

Thank you for your message to the City Council. It will be provided to the appropriate staff and included in the Correspondence for the Record for an upcoming Council meeting.

L. Clausen
City Manager's Office

From: Chestine Edgar [mailto:c_edgar2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2011 10:12 AM
To: Monica Lusk; Gordon Shaw; Rose Clark; Joan McGilton; Jack Block Jr.; Lucy Krakowiak; Brian Bennett; Public Council Inbox
Subject: Fw: annexation

Hello Monica,

Please include this letter and attachment to the City Council packet for this next Monday

C. Edgar

CFTR: 09/26/11

To Berk and Associates,
September 13, 2011

To Berk and Associates;

I am a citizen of the City of Burien and your agency has created two reports for the City of Burien-2007 and 2011-regarding annexation. Your 2007 report has not been made available for the citizens to review in conjunction with the 2011 report. As a result, citizens are only able to draw assumptions from the references to it in the 2011 report that refer back to or quote the 2007 report. It would be helpful for citizens to be able to review your 2007 report before any decisions are made on the annexation of Area Y.

In reviewing page A-2 of your 8/1/2011 Berk Report Discussion Draft, it appears that in 2007 Berk projected that both Area X and Area Y-if both were annexed to Burien-would create an ongoing \$2.5 million dollar deficit for the City. While the sales tax credit will off set this deficit for 10 years, it appears that when the sales tax credits run out, Burien will again have this \$2.5 million dollar annual deficit to contend with for Area X and Area Y. Is this a correct assumption? Of course this dollars amount does not include any projections related to inherit infrastructure debt that Burien might inherit as a result of annexation.

We-as citizens -have still not seen any budget information on the actual costs for running Area X. However, I am assuming that you were given no further information from the City that stated that the assumptions in your 2007 Report were completely wrong.

If I have missed the answer for this information in some part of your report, could you refer to the correct page number?

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,
C.Edgar

To the Burien City Council
September 14, 2011

To the Burien City Council:

At the September 12, 2011 City Council meeting some members of the audience requested factual citation for the items that I spoke about in my citizen testimony. Listed below are the sources that my information came from;

1. The letter that I referred to as having come from the Unincorporated Highline Area requesting that Seattle run an annexation vote for Area Y. The letter dated March 11, 2011, was sent to Richard Conlin and the Seattle City Council requesting that Seattle put the annexation ballot before the 20,000 residents of White Center/N. Highline by Nov. 2011. This letter claimed to speak on behalf of the White Center CDA, its community driven board of directors, staff and 1400+ volunteers. This does not appear to just represent a tiny hand full of people that advanced this request as was suggested at the City Council meeting of 9-12-11.

2. The document that I read from describing the demographics and physical condition of the area know as Area Y came from *Park Lake Homes Site II, Environmental Assessment*, King County Housing Authority, 1-2 February 2009.

3. The Berk 2007 Study that I mentioned has not been made available to the public. I am requesting that that study be made available to Burien citizens as it is relevant to this issue of annexation and is a public document. However, I quoted that the City would still be in the deficit by millions of dollars after the sales tax credits run out and Burien has to finance the running of both Area X and Area Y / the North Highline areas. Both areas do not generate enough revenues to cover the operating cost of the areas. This information was gotten from page A-2 of the 2011 Berk Report dated 8/1/2011. The table on page ES-2 shows that the housing units in Area Y bring in approximately half the amount of revenue that the same number of housing units in Burien brings in. Also, notice that the citizens in Area Y generate approximately half of the taxable retail sales that the same number of citizens in Burien generates. This means that this area generates less revenue than Burien but needs the same or greater services and creates a deficit for the City.

4. The Term Area Y and Area X have been used in city, county and state legal documents to distinguish which areas of North Highline are being discussed. If the citizens in this area are offended by the areas having been or being identified by these names, then they should take that issue up with the cities, county and state which created the names and ask that the areas be legally renamed. It is inappropriate to verbally attack or act verbally indignant when other citizen speakers use these names-Area X, Area Y-when presenting on the topic of these areas. See terms used in the Berk 2011 Report referring to the name designations for both areas.

Lastly, see the attached letter asking for clarification on their 2007 Berk Report and how that report relates to the 2011 Berk Report for the long term financial projections for Burien-should Burien consider annexation of Area Y. It is important to note that the Berk 2011 Report failed to include the debt Burien would inherit from the degraded infrastructure in Area Y. This would contribute to an additional financial shortfall for the City of Burien.

Sincerely,
C. Edgar

