

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, October 20, 2008 - 6:30 p.m.
Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Scott, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember Hansen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember McGlashan, and Councilmember Way.

ABSENT: Mayor Ryu

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Deputy Mayor Scott, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Scott led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exception of Mayor Ryu and Councilmember Hansen. Councilmember Hansen arrived shortly thereafter.

Councilmember Eggen moved to excuse Mayor Ryu. Councilmember Way seconded the motion, which carried 5-0 and Mayor Ryu was excused.

Deputy Mayor Scott announced that the Council would recess the meeting at approximately 6:50 p.m. to attend a short meeting down the hall.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND FUTURE AGENDAS

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events. He discussed the beginning of the Richmond Beach Saltwater Park project and the amenities that are being added to include sidewalks, parking, and a new gathering space. He noted that the Ronald Bog Arboretum and Rotary kiosk were dedicated on October 13 by Mayor Ryu and the Rotary Club. He then outlined the next set of Visioning meetings, which all begin at 7:00 p.m. Continuing, Mr. Olander stated that there is a meeting of the King County Council Budget Review and Adoption Committee. The Committee will review the 2009 King County Executive Proposed Budget and take public comments. He concluded his report with a reminder about upcoming meetings.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen stated that he typed up a report on the Public Issues Committee (PIC) meeting from last week. He said they made some recommendations and released some prospective ideas regarding lobbying. These ideas were sent to the Council today and he asked for direct comments to be given to him or Mayor Ryu.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one wishing to provide public comment.

6. STUDY ITEMS

(a) 2009 Proposed Budget - Department Presentations

Debbie Tarry, Finance Director, noted that the City Manager presented the 2009 Proposed Budget to the City Council on October 13, 2008. She noted that this staff report includes the review of department's 2009 budget requests and that the proposed 2009 budget has been made available to the public and is available at the City Hall, the Shoreline Police Station, Neighborhood Police Centers, and at Shoreline and Richmond Beach libraries. In addition, she said the November issue of "*Currents*" is a special 2009 Budget issue that is being sent to all City residents. The departmental presentations will focus on any significant changes between the department's 2008 budget and the 2009 proposed budget which will serve to expedite the budget review process and make the best use of the Council meeting time, she highlighted. She noted the department review schedule and said future budget workshops are planned for October 27 and November 3. Public hearings on the budget will be held on October 27th and November 17th. The hearing on November 17th will have special emphasis on revenue sources and the 2009 property tax levy with the budget scheduled for adoption on November 24. She highlighted that this budget includes a cost of living allowance (COLA) of 5.22% and that health benefits will only increase 3%.

Mr. Olander communicated that the 2009 budget is balanced.

RECESS

At 6:47 p.m., Deputy Mayor Scott called for a ten minute recess. The Council meeting reconvened at 7:08 p.m.

Debbie Tarry continued the budget presentation, starting with the City Council budget which she said had no major changes. She continued and reviewed the City Manager, City Clerk, and Community Services Division budgets.

Councilmember Way noted that on page 136, the average number of CRT service requests increased in 2008. She said she is glad residents are reporting their issues and she is glad to see five neighborhood mini-grants funded. She felt that the City needs to address the King County cuts and said she is looking at possibilities to get more help to the Human Services Department and would like to get some details from Rob Beem, Community Services Director.

Deputy Mayor Scott inquired if Shoreline will be affected by the King County cuts and suggested that Mr. Beem could provide a report to the Council.

Ms. Tarry discussed the City Attorney and Finance budgets.

Councilmember Way asked if the City ended up paying for the impacts from the flood that occurred in December of 2007. Ms. Tarry replied that the City has received some reimbursement from applied FEMA funds and sent in a request to the Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA) for insurance coverage. She predicted that the City will recapture all the costs incurred from the flood.

Councilmember Way inquired about page 156, the interfund payment for service contingency and depreciation. Ms. Tarry replied that this amount was related to the operational and insurance contingency, including the City Hall move, vehicle contingency, and salary survey. She continued and discussed the Human Resources budget and the Police Department budget.

Councilmember Eggen asked if the King County cuts will lead to a reduction in investigative services. Mr. Olander replied that it possibly would and the City could pick up an additional officer in the fraud unit to offset that loss.

Dan Pingrey, Police Chief, commented that it doesn't make sense for Shoreline fraud cases to be handled by Kenmore officers. He noted that the fraud unit handles identity theft, fraud, and forgery cases. He said his goal is to enhance Shoreline services and increase the number of cases handled.

Councilmember Way asked if there are credit card and cash machine fraud present in the City. She related a story in which one of her family members was defrauded. Chief Pingrey replied that it has happened both in the City of Shoreline and he has seen it in the King County region too.

Councilmember Hansen departed at 7:51 p.m.

Councilmember McGlashan asked if the City could contract this fraud investigator directly with Lake Forest Park. He commented that if the officer is our employee he could contract to work their fraud investigation. He asked if that would help the budget. Mr. Olander concurred that the City would save money by having our own fraud investigation officer.

Ms. Tarry continued and discussed the criminal justice budget.

Councilmember Eggen asked if \$5,000 was required to have a public defender at all the jail facilities. Mr. Olander replied that public defenders are required for the first appearance hearings. Ms. Tarry continued outlining the criminal justice budget.

Councilmember Way asked for clarification on the property crimes threshold change. She asked if there would be an impact on the prosecution of those cases. Mr. Olander replied that she was correct and that the responsibility for the cost is shifting from county to city.

Ms. Tarry continued her presentation with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services budget.

Councilmember Eggen asked about the experimental enrichment program for special needs youth and if it is budgeted in 2009. Ms. Tarry replied that it is and it is at the same level of funding.

Councilmember Way inquired about the revenue from facilities use and how well the City was doing. Referring to page 21, Ms. Tarry replied that the revenue is separated by program. She noted that the facility rentals are for the fields, gym, and picnic shelters. Councilmember Way commented that South Woods and Kruckeberg Botanical Gardens should be added to this program so they can be rented.

Councilmember Eggen discussed the salary survey and asked if there was a comparison done between public and private salaries. Ms. Tarry replied that under the City's compensation policy salaries are reviewed every 2-3 years. She noted that the salaries are compared to cities with no private sector entities included. She said that three years ago the City staff recommended reviewing 1/3 of the classifications every year and the current policy is for salaries to be at the median of the comparables.

Mr. Olander added that there is no cost impact to doing a 1/3 salary study every year.

Ms. Tarry said she will conclude the budget presentation with the Planning and Development Services (PADS) and Public Works (PW) departments next week.

Deputy Mayor Scott called for public comment.

a) Mary Weaver, Shoreline, requested to know the approximate date when the new City Hall will be completed so she can review the property management services contract for estimated services. She noted that there was a vote to increase their services by \$210,000 and an additional \$30,000 in the budget for transportation for this firm. She asked why it is needed. She urged a consideration of a per diem and mileage on their own vehicles. She also stated that it looks like the funds used for vehicles will be coming out of the Street Fund. She asked what additional items have been cut to take the place of street maintenance. She urged the Council to revisit the building moratorium and drop it. She concluded that grants may be drying up soon.

Councilmember Hansen returned 8:05 p.m.

b) Bill Meyer, Shoreline, said his impression is that this is a business-as-usual budget. He said he read the 2008 budget on the City website, and the original budget was adopted for \$94 million and now the projected actuals are \$103 million. Now, he said the City is talking about adding another 1% to the budget. He said things are getting worse and King County has layoffs and across-the-board cuts. He asked the Council to "keep their pencils sharpened."

Ms. Tarry stated that Ms. Weaver was referring to the Council increase in the contract for services related to City Hall. That increase is a separate contract from the reclassification recommended in the 2009 budget. The City staff, she said, is recommending that the construction inspection supervisor will need a vehicle since this person works with all the capital projects.

Mr. Olander added that the City isn't adding positions and this is actually add to efficiencies and save about \$90,000 in the General Fund.

Ms. Tarry noted that carryovers account for the difference between the 2008 budget and current budget, most of which are related to the capital budget. Mr. Olander clarified that a vast majority of the budget amendments are grants and carryovers.

Councilmember Hansen commented that the \$94 million figure and the \$103 million figure have to be broken down between capital and operating budgets in order to understand them correctly. He explained that the operating budget shouldn't change much, but the capital budget can because of project timing.

Mr. Olander said the City recognizes the difficult budget and economic times and is fortunate to have Ms. Tarry. He noted that the City staff and Council are constantly reviewing the revenues, estimating conservatively, and have a fewer employees per capita than comparable cities.

Ms. Tarry submitted that given the economy and because there are lots of rapid changes late in the year the City will continue to monitor projections and update the Council on revenues and expenditures.

Mr. Olander added that's why the City staff isn't recommending spending the savings from jail or health care costs.

Councilmember Eggen inquired if the 1% increase in the 2009 budget over the 2008 budget is relative to the \$94 million figure or the \$103 million figure. Ms. Tarry said it is relative to the \$103 million figure, but that's the original budget plus carryovers. She clarified that less may actually be spent in 2008. This figure reflects the current 2008 budget as amended by Council.

Councilmember Way asked if Mr. Angle's contract will show up on the 2008 budget. Mr. Olander replied that it would and it is already included so no budget increase is needed.

Councilmember Eggen questioned if the long range financial planning committee has made any comments yet. Ms. Tarry answered that they haven't but they've been doing a higher level budget analysis. Mr. Olander said their interim conclusion is that the majority of the community wants to maintain the current levels of service.

Councilmember Way said she would welcome comments from the long range financial planning committee if they want to come to a Council meeting and give their observations.

Mr. Olander communicated that the committee is talking about long-range issues, maintaining the level of service, and finding efficiencies.

Councilmember Hansen stated that the long range financial planning committee makes recommendations to the Council and he would be interested to know what their recommendations are. He felt that the Council has far more responsibility and sets policy.

Mr. Olander noted that even though no programs are being added, this budget focuses on the Council goals.

Councilmember McConnell commended the City staff on the 1% budget increase and said there are a lot of challenges trying to increase and maintain services. She commented that the City staff does an excellent job watching the money very carefully.

Mr. Olander pointed out that a lot of the reason for the 1% is that the one-time expenses are not repeating in 2009.

RECESS

At 8:24 p.m., Deputy Mayor Scott called for a five minute break. Deputy Mayor Scott reconvened the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

(b) SEPA Nominal Lead Agency Agreement for a Regional Jail Facility

Scott MacColl, Intergovernmental Program Manager, and Eric Bratton, Management Analyst, provided the staff report. Mr. MacColl explained that Shoreline's contract to house misdemeanants in the King County Jail ends on December 31, 2012, as the County no longer has space for misdemeanor prisoners. Shoreline, he explained, must replace the functions that King County currently provides for their misdemeanor jail population, which specifically includes 1) a booking facility; 2) medical, drug treatment and psychiatric services; and 3) long-term jail bed space. He said Shoreline is partnering with other North and East King County cities to develop a facility to meet these needs for the long term and the first step in that partnership is an agreement to assess potential sites for a regional municipal jail.

Mr. Bratton noted that King County was the regional service provider of jail services for King County municipalities until 2002, then the county notified cities it would not accept city prisoners after 2012. While it makes financial and operational sense for jail services to be coordinated and managed by a regional agency, such as a county, King County has explicitly expressed its desire to discontinue providing this service, with the exception of felony and unincorporated King County misdemeanor inmates.

Currently, he explained that Shoreline's jail model for meeting the misdemeanor population, which municipalities are responsible for, is a complex system of multiple jails and contracts. He said the City has two main jail contracts, one with Yakima County and the other with King County which are due to expire in 2010 and 2012, respectively. Rather than plan for dozens of small, inefficient jails, or relying solely on contracting, cities have determined that a more effective model is to partner together for a long-term solution - building and operating a regional jail by 2013. He highlighted that the roles and obligations of each City were established during

an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study process on potential sites and provides the first step in implementing a long-term solution.

Mr. MacColl communicated that the options for housing misdemeanor populations are limited and it is better to partner with other jurisdictions. He noted that the total cost of \$3.3 million would be spread out over all the cities and that Shoreline has money for the siting study.

Mr. Bratton outlined the SEPA Nominal Lead Agency Agreement and noted that Shoreline contracts for all its jail services and is working to extend the contract to 2014 by using the Yakima contract. He noted that the City had a contract with Issaquah and was trying to use Issaquah as a primary booking facility instead of King County, but Issaquah restricts special needs misdemeanants. He noted that the feasibility study is going on and the Northeast cities are looking at building a facility.

Councilmember Way noted that the average Shoreline daily population is 41 inmates per day. She questioned if that is correct because the numbers also reflect that 20% of those inmates are in for 20 days or more. Mr. Olander replied that the consortium went into all the records in detail and this is a best projection.

Mr. Bratton commented that the agreement sets out the rules and obligations of all the parties involved. Seattle, he explained, would be the nominal lead agency and each city will designate a representative.

Councilmember Way discussed page 19 and asked how the committee designates representatives and if it was a committee designed by the Suburban Cities Association. Mr. Bratton replied that the designated representatives are elected or appointed officials and each of the five cities will appoint someone to serve in that capacity. He added that the committee will meet based on how the committee is set up.

Mr. MacColl added that no city can "go it alone" and the representatives on the committee will need to consult with their own city councils and report back to the committee. He said there are a number of check-in points with the city councils so they can obtain direction on voting issues. He noted that the committee would make a decision on the scoping environmental impact statement with direction from the city councils.

Mr. Bratton commented that the agreement states that the committee will attempt to reach consensus, and that means that three cities have to agree, and one of them has to be Seattle.

Mr. MacColl commented that the current contracting model doesn't hold up and King County served as the launching point because they were unable to control service costs. He said Shoreline doesn't have a voice in operational issues because it is a contracted city.

Deputy Mayor Scott asked if it is more cost effective to go with a larger, joint facility. Mr. MacColl replied that partnering on a regional jail is the way to go.

Councilmember Eggen clarified that this new facility would accommodate all of Shoreline's capacity.

Councilmember Way questioned if the savings will come from not having to send misdemeanants to other facilities.

Mr. MacColl commented that the Issaquah and Yakima contracts don't require a minimum, so they would essentially be a "wash." He said they can obtain more accurate figures, but it's really a matter of the daily bed rate. He noted that this Council will be voting on the SEPA Nominal Lead Agency Agreement and outlined the options. He clarified that final action for this is scheduled for the next meeting.

Deputy Mayor Scott called for public comment.

a) Bill Meyer, Shoreline, asked if the regional facility must be built in King County, noting that King County is expensive.

Mr. MacColl replied that the facility will be built in King County because it needs to be close to a booking facility. Mr. Olander added that the transfer to and from the courts takes a lot of officer time when the facility is far way.

Councilmember McGlashan asked what the other 17 cities need to do to be included. Mr. MacColl explained that they would have to contract with us and pay a higher rate than the owner cities.

Councilmember Eggen questioned if the cities outside of the five principal cities are guaranteed a certain amount of bed space. Mr. MacColl replied that even with a guarantee, they can only fill 10% of the beds in the facility.

Deputy Mayor Scott noted that the inmate population could increase with the general population increase. Mr. Olander responded that this is a long-term plan that anticipates population growth.

Mr. MacColl confirmed for Councilmember Eggen that people charged with felonies will still be booked into the King County facility.

Councilmember McGlashan inquired if 600 beds will be enough. Mr. MacColl replied that 640 beds is a 20-year projection, and eventually the Consortium wants to find a site to expand on and utilize single cells. He said it would double the capacity if two inmates could be put into single cells.

Councilmember Way asked who would own the facility. Mr. MacColl replied that the five cities including Shoreline are only signing on to be included in the SEPA process, and over time the remaining cities could sign on.

Councilmember Way said she seems to recall some issue with the King County facility in Kent and some of the beds weren't being utilized. She asked if there are projections that by 2012 there won't be any space for Shoreline.

Councilmember McConnell stated if the five cities are utilizing 90% of the total beds she can't see why other cities would not eventually follow suit.

Councilmember Hansen stated that if 17 cities were involved in negotiating for a new jail, it would be an unwieldy process. He speculated that all of the cities will probably join at some point.

Councilmember Eggen pointed out that King County is very eager to offload its unincorporated urban areas, one of which is the Finn Hill area east of Kenmore. He wondered if things would change if they joined, since they make up a large proportion of the King County population. Mr. MacColl replied that they weren't included in the 640 figure; however, there is room for expansion.

Councilmember Hansen commented that there is a lot of pressure on those areas to incorporate, especially due to the King County budget issues.

Mr. Olander commented that the City should update the Richard Green study.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:25 p.m., Deputy Mayor Scott declared the meeting adjourned. .

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.