

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

**AGENDA TITLE:** Process for Public Input  
**DEPARTMENT:** City Manager's Office  
**PRESENTED BY:** Steven C. Burkett, City Manager

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

During the Council's January 16 half-day retreat, a subcommittee of the Council was formed, which included Councilmembers Maggie Fimia, Paul Grace, and Bob Ransom. Together they developed a problem statement (See Attachment A), which is as follows:

Members of the community have raised concerns about the process for public input into City Council decision-making. To explore those concerns and determine if the current processes and procedures need to be amended, the Council will (1) sponsor two community forums as outlined below, and (2) dedicate an hour on a Council workshop agenda for public comment on this subject.

To discuss this further Council requested that this topic be included on the March 15 Workshop agenda.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

There is minimal financial impact with this proposal. The potential costs associated with this initiative include staff time, facility rental, tape recording services, and costs to advertise and promote the public forums.

**IMPLEMENTATION:**

In order to plan effectively, staff has tentatively reserved meeting space on dates that would allow input to be gathered prior to the Council retreat.

Monday, March 29 <i>(no Council meeting)</i>	6:30-9:30 PM	Shoreline Center – Mt. Rainer Room
Thursday, April 1	6:30-9:30 PM	Shoreline Center – Mt. Rainer Room
Saturday, April 3	9:00-11:30 AM	Shoreline Center – Mt. Rainer Room <i>or</i> Richmond Beach Congregational Church
Saturday, April 10	9:00-11:30 AM	Richmond Highland Recreational Center <i>or</i> Richmond Beach Congregational Church

It is anticipated that Councilmembers will be present to facilitate the discussion; however, staff will be made available to assist.

Likewise, staff will follow up with a press release, an announcement on the City's cable channel and web site, and advertisements in the *Shoreline Enterprise*. Letters and emails that are sent to Council will be collected and made part of the official record. A report will be generated and shared with the Council prior to the annual retreat on April 23, 2004.

Approved By:            City Manager  City Attorney 

**ATTACHMENT A**

Council Proposal

**ATTACHMENT B**

Memorandum from Steve Burkett, City Manager

**ATTACHMENT C**

Memorandum from Joyce Nichols, Director of Communications and Intergovernmental Relations

**ATTACHMENT D**

Memorandum from Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager

**PROBLEM / ISSUE STATEMENT**

Members of the community have raised concerns about the process for public input into City Council decision-making. To explore those concerns and determine if the current processes and procedures need to be amended, the Council will (1.) sponsor two community forums as outlined below, and (2.) dedicate an hour on a Council workshop agenda for public comment on this subject.

**Community forums:** one on east side, one on west side, at community police conference rooms. Advertised in routine manner as well as with newspaper ad, on public access channel, and notices to Shoreline community organizations. Council Rules of Procedures (#183) will be made available for reference if community members want to propose specific changes. (The Workshop agenda item will follow workshop notice procedures.)

**Forum structure:** moderated by three Council members chosen by the Council; allow up to five (5) minutes of public comment per speaker; length of forum will depend on number of speakers. Encourage speakers to submit written comments. Comments must focus on recommendations to change the current processes, not specific issues before the Council. While participants may refer to something that has not worked well for them in the past, they will be asked to focus on what changes they would recommend going forward. Speakers addressing the Workshop agenda item will also be allowed up to five (5) minutes to comment within the one-hour timeframe.

**Record keeping:** City staff will tape and transcribe comments from forums and workshop for Council review.

**Goal:** gather all comments (at forums, workshop and those received in other forms) for consideration (with the results of the survey) at the Council retreat on April 23-24.

### **Proposed Public Notice**

The City Council is sponsoring community forums to get input from residents about the public input process into decision-making. If you plan to participate in this process, you may want to address the following:

#### **What is working well with the public input process? What should the Council be doing differently?**

Do you have comments on the **current decision-making process**, outlined as follows:

- o Published Council agenda a week in advance of meetings
- o Agenda items may be added and voted on with 4 votes of Council members
- o Major topics discussed at bi-weekly workshops
- o Occasionally staff is given direction at workshops
- o Special meetings may be called by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor in his/her absence, or 4 Council members, with 24 hours public notice
- o Dinner meetings, held 90 minutes before Council meetings, include presentations and opportunities to meet with other public officials

Do you have specific suggestions about the **rules for public testimony** at workshops, regular meetings and Public Hearings? (Number of speakers, length of comment period, etc.)

Do you have adequate **access to Council members** at public meetings, by voice mail, e-mail, US mail or phone? If not, what changes would you suggest?


Do you have any comments about the **information you receive on specific issues** through the City's sources of information (Circuits, public access TV, newspaper articles, etc.) before the Council acts on those issues?

Do you have suggestions about individual and community input on the following:

- o Issues affecting a specific neighborhood or constituency
- o Annual decision-making on the budget, capital improvement projects or master plans
- o One-time actions such as zoning or ordinance changes



## Memorandum

**DATE:** March 5, 2004  
**TO:** City Council  
**FROM:** Steve Burkett   
**RE:** Process for Public Input

---

Attached please find two memorandums for you to review as part of your public input discussion scheduled for March 15. The first memorandum by Joyce Nichols, Director of Communications and Intergovernmental Relations, summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Citizen Involvement and Communications Project that the Council chartered following their 1997 retreat. As you can see, citizen participation and communicating with the public has been an ongoing concern of the Council.

The second memorandum by Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager, outlines 38 techniques that are used to seek public input for policies and projects. This list was taken from the table of contents in the *Citizen Participation Handbook for Public Officials and Other Professionals Serving the Public*, written by Hans Bleiker of the Institute of Participatory Management and Planning (IPMP). The City has used many of these techniques.

I look forward to the Council's discussion of their process. In the meantime, please call me if you have any questions.

Attachments



## Memorandum

**DATE:** February 25, 2004

**TO:** Shoreline City Council

**FROM:** Joyce Nichols, C/IR Director

**RE:** City communications background

**CC:** Steve Burkett, City Manager

City Manager Steve Burkett asked me to share a summary of the findings and recommendations of the Citizen Involvement and Communications Project and provide background information on the communications efforts at the City.

As early as the Council's retreat in January 1997, the issues of public involvement, citizen participation and communicating with the public have been a high priority. At its 1997 retreat the City Council established an objective to "create a two-way process for public information, input, and participation that enables Council to discern the pulse of the public in Council decision making".

Part of the rationale for this objective was the importance and value the Council placed on citizen participation and involvement in the decision-making processes. There was also an expressed desire to maintain the enthusiasm and commitment demonstrated by so many Shoreline residents during the move to incorporate. For those reasons, Council decided to ask Shoreline residents to participate in an assessment of the City's programs in place at that time and to recommend a future course of action. Some of the questions they sought to answer included:

- What opportunities do citizens currently have to be involved in the decisions of their City government?
- Who is currently participating in City government-related committees, meetings and groups? Who is not, and why not?
- What organizations and groups are currently involved—and how do they view their roles?
- How can a larger number of citizens become more effectively involved through outreach and communication programs?
- What communication programs can most effectively reach and encourage the broadest number of citizens to participate?

- How can the City ensure citizens through planning and coordination of meetings, programs and policy decisions that their views are fairly represented and considered as decisions are made?
- What can we learn by surveying other models for citizen involvement in successful local governments?
- What is the appropriate role for staff in supporting and communicating with stakeholder groups?

In early 1997, the City issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a consultant to assist the City in providing a comprehensive review of current public involvement programs and initiatives, coordinate the development of an integrated citizen involvement and communications program, and assist the City with implementation strategies. The City contracted with Elizabeth Magoon and Associates for this work.

In July 1997, Council appointed 17 members to the Citizen Involvement and Communications Project Committee. (A roster of committee members is included as Attachment A.) Committee members were selected to represent various stakeholder and constituent groups. Then-Mayor Connie King and Councilmember Ron Hansen were appointed as City Council representatives.

The scope of work for the project included the following four phases:

Phase 1—Reviewing and obtaining committee concurrence on the scope of work for the project.

Phase 2—Reviewing the City's current communication practices and gathering survey and interview data on citizens' opinions toward citizen involvement.

Phase 3—Developing the citizen involvement and communications program.

Phase 4—Developing the implementation plan.

The committee met three times between August and December 1997. On January 20, 1998 the committee submitted its report to City Council outlining its process, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Council discussed the report and directed staff to come back with an implementation plan. Key conclusions and recommendations included:

- Shoreline residents' expectations about their government and their new City are extraordinarily high;
- the majority of Shoreline residents believe City government is making good progress;
- the City is already communicating a good deal of information to its residents, but it should plan to disseminate even more, and through additional mechanisms—especially since the City, along with *Shoreline Week* (now *Shoreline Enterprise*)—was cited as the preferred source of information about City issues and activities.

**The project conclusions, drawn from the data from multiple sources indicated:**

- when disseminating information, the City should make meetings and materials available at the residents' convenience to the extent possible—many respondents cited lack of time, especially on weeknights, as the primary reason they are not involved in their local government or neighborhood group;
- some of those who are dissatisfied with the City's communication and public involvement efforts to date tended to express the frustration that the City Council "doesn't always listen" to its residents, or that the City sponsors activities to solicit citizen input but the input is not used in decision-making; and,

- the inability of residents to identify their neighborhood raises the question of whether the neighborhoods are defined in the best manner and whether they fit people's perceptions of "neighborhood".

Project recommendations were made by the committee at its December 1997 meeting. The short-term recommendations fell into two categories: 1) general and policy-oriented proposals to provide a foundation for other recommendations and to improve the already-effective approaches in use by the City and its residents; and 2) specific methods and/or tools to improve communication, education and citizen involvement.

**The following recommendations received the highest-priority ranking by the committee. They are divided into the four major project components determined by the committee—policy, communication and education, involvement and leadership.**

Policy recommendation receiving the highest priority ranking: The need for the City and neighborhood associations to engage in partnership-building and to work together.

Communication and Education projects receiving highest priority ranking:

- Purchase space and publish bi-weekly "corner" in the *Shoreline Week* for City news and information.
- Create an "owner's manual" or a "Guide to Citizen Participation in the City of Shoreline" and distribute to all residents. Print 5,000 additional for distribution at other venues.
- Create effective feedback mechanisms so that residents know about how other residents feel about City issues by polling subsets of residents to gather public opinion and report the results in the newspaper column.

Involvement projects receiving the highest priority ranking:

- Neighborhood associations to continue their efforts to become more viable and independent.
- City Council to fine-tune its processes for conducting work sessions and meetings and give greater evidence of methods chosen.
- Conduct periodic City Council "town meetings" to solicit input from citizens.

Leadership projects receiving highest priority ranking:

- Training and group-building assistance for City boards and commissions, neighborhood associations, Council of Neighborhoods, etc. Topics should include managing meetings, conflict resolution and creating partnerships.
- Collaborate with Shoreline Community College or a similar entity to have it offer training designed for neighborhood groups at a minimal cost.

On May 18, 1998, staff presented Council with an implementation plan for its review. Council consensus was to implement all of the recommendations with the exception of those concerning the Parks and Recreation advisory committee and the quarterly City newsletter (these two items were discussed at subsequent Council meetings and a decision was made to implement each).

**Recommendations from the committee implemented by the City to date include the following:**

Communication and Education Recommendations:

- Bi-weekly column in *Shoreline Week (Enterprise)*
- Create an "Owner's Manual"
- Create a City Web site



- Continue use of government access television where available and work to establish public/government/education access television in areas of Shoreline not currently served
- Publish a “State of the City” report annually
- Create a quarterly City newsletter (now 6 editions/year)
- Conduct a Citywide citizen interest and satisfaction survey every year or two
- Determine the need and develop translation services for City signs and documents

Involvement Recommendations:

- Provide training for neighborhood associations to continue their efforts to become more viable and independent
- Assist the City Council in fine-tuning its process for conducting work sessions/meetings in order to give greater evidence of listening to residents
- Conduct City Council “town hall” meetings as needed around critical policy topics
- Establish a Parks and Recreation advisory committee to work with the City’s PCRS department to develop policy and program recommendations to present to Council
- Reaffirm the criteria and process for selection and management of grant programs for neighborhoods (Neighborhood Mini-Grants), and communicate the policy well in advance of implementation

Leadership Recommendation:

- Provide training and group-building assistance for City boards, commissions, neighborhood associations, Council of Neighborhoods, etc.

One recommendation proposed for implementation in 1999—to create effective feedback mechanisms so that residents know about other residents opinions on City issues—was not implemented due to financial and staff resource limitations. This recommendation proposed using a “Nielson-type” survey mechanism to seek Shoreline residents’ opinions on City issues by surveying the same group of residents several times each year.

In summary, the expertise and insights provided by members of the committee were a valuable contribution to the development of improved citizen involvement and communications projects and programs in the City of Shoreline. The committee’s recommendations formed the basis for most of the formal communications the City offers today. The importance and value of citizen involvement and participation in the City’s decision-making process is not something we can, or should take for granted. It is one of the essential elements for the continued success of our representative form of government. Because this issue is so important, it has been the subject of discussion at each of the City Council retreats. We need to continue that discussion and seek ways to continuously improve our communications tools and methods. I hope the information included in this memo is helpful to you in your discussion of citizen involvement and participation.

I am attaching a copy of the Final Report of the Citizen Involvement and Communication Project (Attachment B) for your information. If you have any questions about the committee, its conclusions, recommendations or implementation steps, please do not hesitate to contact me at 546-0779.



## CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

NAME	AREA OF INTEREST
Lina Ahn *	Business
Vicki Carnahan	Human Services
John Chang	Business
William Clements	Parks & Recreation
Bob Deis	Shoreline City Manager
Carolyn Edmonds	Shoreline Planning Commissioner
Florestien Flynn	Community Policing
James Guest	Community Policing
Patty Hale	Parks & Recreation
Ron Hansen	Shoreline Councilmember
Joanne Hargrave	Neighborhoods
Connie King	Shoreline Mayor
Dan Kuhn	Shoreline Planning Commissioner
Grace Marshall	Neighborhoods
Linda Minarcin	Specific area not listed
Neil Neroutsos *	Neighborhoods
Diane Yates	Human Services

\* Alternates

8/5/97

**THE CITY OF SHORELINE  
CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT  
& COMMUNICATION PROJECT**

**Final Report**

**December 1997**

ELIZABETH  
MAGOON  
& ASSOCIATES



Management  
& Organization  
Consulting

Post Office Box 1691  
Olympia, Washington 98507  
(360) 456-7022

## The Project

The City of Shoreline Citizen Involvement and Communication Project was undertaken in 1997 to review the City's current public involvement programs and initiatives, collect data about City communication and participation patterns, coordinate the development of an integrated program for optimal communication and involvement, and assist the City with implementation of the strategy.

To accomplish these goals, a Steering Committee composed of members from an array of community interests was appointed. These individuals were involved in all phases of the study. Information and perceptions about Shoreline's communication and involvement issues were obtained through interviews with these individuals. Many other people were also interviewed:

- > Members of the City Council, and as many Council candidates as were available for conversations
- > The City Manager and his deputy, and the heads of several City departments
- > A cross-section of the representatives to the Council of Neighborhoods
- > 301 Shoreline residents selected through as random a process as is technologically possible. These people completed a telephone survey conducted by a professional research firm
- > 27 citizen representatives whose names were provided by Steering Committee representatives
- > Representatives of eight "benchmark" Cities and public organizations known to be doing innovative work in the areas of citizen communication and public involvement

From the information collected through these interviews, the consultants drew a number of conclusions, and then formulated a set of recommendations for improvements to the City's communication and public involvement efforts. These draft recommendations were reviewed by the Council of Neighborhoods and several members of the interested public who attended the Council meeting, and these people's input was incorporated into a revised draft. This document was then presented to the project Steering Committee, which prioritized the recommendations.

## The Data

The data collection process was designed to 1) compose a picture of the current scenario in Shoreline, and 2) to gather information and ideas from Cities that are recognized as innovators, to investigate approaches and tactics that might be adaptable to Shoreline's needs. Because of the high costs of constructing surveys with tight validity, the data collection interviews were structured to gain a wider spectrum of participation and opinion, with less effort toward statistical validity.

Shoreline residents in general expressed a medium degree of satisfaction with the way in which the City is presently handling communication and citizen involvement opportunities. 107 of the 301 people contacted for **the randomized telephone survey** described themselves as participants in City activities (which were defined to include the neighborhood associations.) Among the participants, the average score on a 1- to-5 ranking of the City's performance was 3.6. Among the 197 non-participants, the average was 3.4.

Zoning and development, and city planning, were most commonly cited as topics of highest interest and concern among both participants and non-participants.

Those who said they do not participate in City government most commonly cited a lack of time as the reason.

Sixty of the 107 self-described participants reported being aware of the schedule and activities of their neighborhood associations. Thirty-two of the 60 said they participate in their neighborhood associations.

The 301 residents were asked to identify the neighborhoods in which they live. A striking number -- 146 of the 301 -- could not do so. These people either listed another geographic descriptor or simply said they did not know. Because of this factor, it is not possible to determine whether the 301 completed telephone surveys are proportionally representative of the City's neighborhoods.

The **27 additional citizen representatives** interviewed were "nominated" by Steering Committee members because they were known to have strong feelings about City communication and involvement issues. Among this group, the average ranking on the 1-to-5 scale for how well the City is currently doing in this area was 2.85.

Eight of the 27 described themselves as non-participants in City activities. The most commonly cited reason for non-involvement was a sense of futility in having an impact. The other two most frequent answers were a lack of time, and a feeling that City and neighborhood association meetings, etc., did not make good use of their time.

Among the representatives of **the benchmarking cities**, a common theme was the importance of "growing" strong and independent neighborhood associations, tempered with the understanding that it is impossible in the 1990s to have very high percentages of residents participating in any City or neighborhood activities on an ongoing basis; people are simply too busy.

The benchmarking interviews also made clear that there is no one best way for a City to support neighborhoods; several viable models were described. It was also clear, however, that the Cities with enviable public involvement programs maximize communication with their constituents, and use an array of overlapping communication methods to ensure "saturation."

## Conclusions

The data from the multiple sources indicated:

- > Shoreline residents' expectations about their government and their new city are extraordinarily high. Some of the sense of unmet expectations expressed by some interviewees may be attributed to the process of adjusting the idealism that accompanied incorporation to the realities of what can be achieved in a small city in two short years. Enhanced communication from the City -- about processes and realities -- could help to speed this adjustment.
- > The majority of Shoreline residents believe City government is making good progress.
- > The City is already communicating a good deal of information to its residents, but it should plan to disseminate even more, and through additional mechanisms -- especially since the City, along with the Shoreline Week, was typically cited as the preferred source of information about City issues and activities.
- > Those who are dissatisfied with the City's communication and public involvement efforts to date tend to express their frustrations along two themes:
  - > The City Council "doesn't listen" to its residents.
  - > People see little evidence that City representatives receive citizen communication and use it in decision-making. Beginning with the Transition Papers (which were often cited as a sore point), citizens have participated in a variety of activities designed to solicit their input. But many doubt that the input is actually used in decision-making.
- > There is a resulting lack of trust, and even some conspiratorial suspicions, among some residents' perceptions of the City Council and City management.
- > The City needs to use multiple methods for disseminating information to residents; meetings and materials must be at the residents' own convenience to the extent possible. They also need to be designed with maximum respect for citizens' limited time; many survey respondents cited lack of time -- especially lack of time on weekday evenings -- as the primary reason for not being involved in their local government and/or neighborhood group.
- > The inability of residents to identify their neighborhood raises the question of whether the neighborhoods are defined in the best manner and whether they fit people's perceptions of "neighborhood." It also suggests that some neighborhood associations have not yet successfully made themselves known to their residents, and that many residents' perspectives and concerns are city-wide rather than neighborhood-focused.

## Recommendations

The recommendations were clustered according to a continuum of needs that represents a logical progression for enhancing citizen participation in municipal government:

### Communication.....Education.....Involvement.....Leadership

The recommendations fell into two categories:

- > General and policy-oriented proposals to provide a foundation for other recommendations and to improve the already-effective approaches in use by the City and its residents.
- > Specific methods and/or tools to improve communication, education, and citizen involvement.

The recommendations were also categorized as short- and long-term, with only the short-term list prioritized by the Steering Committee. Its priority choices:

**In the policy arena**, the Committee selected as the top priority the need for the City and neighborhood associations to engage in partnership-building, and to work together:

- > To clarify the roles that each should play; the expectations they have of one another; and the boundaries that are important to a successful relationship
- > To develop methods for collaborating and for solving conflicts.

The consultants' other policy-oriented recommendation was that the neighborhood associations be recognized as one of a number of methods by which residents can become involved in their City, and that other mechanisms also be used as appropriate.

**Specific recommendations for methods and tools**, and the priorities assigned by the Steering Committee:

#### High-priority Communication and Education projects:

1. Maximize the use of the *Shoreline Week*, including the purchase of a bi-weekly "corner" for City news and information. Fiscal impact: \$9,000 - \$11,000, depending on the size of the purchased space and the production values (i.e., one color of ink versus two) used in creating it. The cost assumes the content is written by a staff member.
2. Create an "owner's manual," or a "Guide to Citizen Participation in the City of Shoreline," and distribute it to all residents. Fiscal impact: \$13,200 - \$18,000, depending on production values and method of distribution.
3. Create effective mechanisms for providing feedback to residents about how their

fellow residents feel about City issues, so that everyone can have greater understanding about how decisions are made. Methods might include polling subsets of residents to gather public opinion and then reporting the results in the newspaper column and other logical places; ensuring that the outcomes of public hearings are similarly reported, etc. Fiscal impact: depends on the methods used. A monthly survey of a small sample of residents would cost about \$6,240 annually including analysis of the information.

**The Steering Committee gave medium-priority rankings to the following:**

4. Continue use of public access television, and incorporate the use of government access TV as well.
5. Develop and maintain a City Web site.
6. Publish a "state of the City" document or annual report at the end of each year, beginning in 1998.

*Five additional recommendations in the Communication and Education category received decidedly mixed priority votes from the Committee, and should be reviewed and perhaps revised before any action is taken on them.*

**Three Involvement recommendations received the highest priority ranking:**

1. The neighborhood associations need to continue their efforts to become more viable and independent. Fiscal impact: \$3,000 in training funds for the first year.
2. The City Council should fine-tune its processes for conducting work sessions and meetings so that they give greater evidence of listening to residents, and the residents can see how their input affects decisions. Fiscal impact: Depends on methods used, but not substantial.
3. Conduct periodic City Council "town meetings" to solicit input from citizens about their interests. Or conduct public meetings on specific topics scheduled to come before the Council. Fiscal impact: About \$1,900 per meeting.

**The following Involvement recommendations received medium-priority rankings from the Committee:**

4. The Council should establish three types of citizen committees and roles to routinize timely input from residents: standing committees, Council ad hoc committees, and intergovernmental committees.



5. Create a simple method for collecting information about residents' interests in volunteering to help with City issues and needs.
6. Build staff and neighborhood association skills in meeting facilitation.

**Two recommendations in the Leadership category received high-priority scores:**

1. Plan and engage City boards and commissions in training and group-building assistance. Offer the training to the Council of Neighborhoods, and to the neighborhood associations as appropriate.
2. Develop a collaboration with an entity such as Shoreline Community College to have low-cost training designed and offered to neighborhood groups.

**Three others received a mixture of high- and low-priority rankings:**

3. Plan and conduct a retreat for the Council, City staff and citizen committee members soon after the new Council takes office.
4. Create or obtain rights to use a manual for committees, to facilitate current and potential members' understanding of roles, relationships, and responsibilities.
5. Establish a mentoring program for citizens who want to become more knowledgeable and involved in city issues and government. Encourage minorities to become involved.

**The consultants also made five long-term recommendations for the City.** These were not prioritized by the Committee because of the likelihood that needs will change and priorities will shift before it becomes to implement them:

1. Reaffirm and publish the vision defined by the City's comprehensive plan. In reviewing the vision, create strategies for the City for the next five years.
2. Reaffirm the criteria and process for selection and management of grant programs to neighborhoods, and communicate the policy well in advance of implementation.
3. Plan to strengthen the role of the neighborhood City halls, and investigate the possibility of adding one or more in other parts of the city.
4. Plan to review the mission and vision of the City's committee structure and the Council of Neighborhoods, and also the methods by which the City communicates with residents, encourages their involvement, and supports the building of leadership.

Such a review should occur about every two years in order to assure the continued relevance and viability of these groups and processes.

5. Create a Staff Liaison Team for the City, so that neighborhood associations and other key groups have an ongoing relationship with senior City staff without those individuals being overwhelmed by additional meetings and requirements.

## A SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

### The Purpose

This project was designed to review the City of Shoreline's current public involvement programs and initiatives, collect data about City communication and participation patterns, coordinate the development of an integrated program for optimal communication and involvement, and assist the City with implementation of the strategy.

### The Key Tasks

- Phase 1. Obtain concurrence about the scope of work
- Phase 2. Research and review current practices of the City of Shoreline and citizens' perceptions of them
- Phase 3. Develop a program to enhance communication and citizen involvement
- Phase 4. Develop an implementation plan

### Products

- Phase 1. A statement of the project's goals and objectives and a schedule for the steering committee's work
- Phase 2. A report on the data, which was presented to the City Council and the steering committee (October 20 and 21). The final report will incorporate these groups' feedback
- Phase 3. A report on the work to date and proposals for improvements to citizen participation and communication and participation activities, with budgetary impact of each
- Phase 4. An implementation plan and budget, with supporting materials; a final presentation to the City Council

### Key Accomplishments

- > Created a steering committee incorporating members from a variety of community interests, and involved them in all phases of the project.
- > Conducted approximately 50 key person interviews by phone and in person to explore perceptions, ideas and needs.
- > Conducted a randomized telephone survey of about 300 residents of the city to gather data about current patterns, perceived needs, and satisfaction.
- > Conducted process benchmarking surveys with eight Cities and/or organizations engaged in community development. These entities were identified by colleagues as ones that do innovative work in communication and public participation.

## The Steering Committee

Over the course of four meetings, it has:

- > Become acquainted and established norms and guidelines for the conduct of its meetings
- > Established a purpose for its work
- > Identified issues and problems it hopes will be addressed as this process continues
- > Identified a vision for what would be in place when this project is completed:
  - > A method for two-way flow of information with citizens
  - > A prioritization of the elements of the public involvement/communications plan
  - > Concrete, measurable components
  - > A budget, defined by the City Council, for at least some components and a timeline for others
  - > Milestones/criteria for measuring progress on the components
  - > Broad public buy-in, with positive feedback and measurement through periodic satisfaction surveys
  - > Increased trust
  - > Baseline data about the current situation
- > Defined "citizen participation":

Citizen participation ranges from passive receipt of information about city issues and events to active involvement in one or more of those issues and activities. It assumes that the opportunities for involvement are known, that diversity is respected, and that citizen input is sought before and during decision-making and is incorporated into the decisions. For the purposes of this project, the emphasis is on involvement in policy making; however, it is understood that the vehicles for involvement also include neighborhood planning and enhancement, and service delivery.
- > Defined measures or indicators of a successful communication and citizen involvement program:
  - > There is sufficient information, available by a variety of means, for citizens to be able to educate themselves and to determine how to become involved if they choose.
  - > There are more and better-defined entry points for involvement, along with greater clarity about what the citizen is getting involved in, if he or she chooses to do so.
  - > There is increased trust in the process of government and in the leadership, as evidenced by data from a yearly satisfaction survey.
  - > Minority residents and ethnic groups have begun to participate in larger numbers.

- > Reviewed drafts of the report twice, suggesting changes and posing questions for clarification.
- > Prioritized the recommendations to define those which will most directly address the criteria defined above.

=====

Note: This report uses the journalistic style for capitalization of the word "city": when the word is capitalized, the term is intended to refer to a city's government. The lower-case version of the word denotes the incorporated area.

## SUMMARY OF THE DATA

### The Data Collection Process

The consultants were asked to collect information on the City's present communication and public participation practices, as well as suggestions about how it might be improved, from an array of sources. The data collection scenario was designed with the goal of maximizing input from the people of Shoreline -- City representatives and both involved and uninvolved residents -- within the financial and time constraints posed by the project. It was agreed that, because of the way in which the data would be used, scope and richness of information were more important than tight (and expensive) statistical validity.

Toward this end, we designed a data collection system that would capture input from a wide variety of people. The information would not be directly comparable across groups, because they were not all asked the same questions. We interviewed the following:

- > Members of the City Council
- > The City Manager and his deputy, and the heads of several City departments
- > As many of the City Council candidates as could be scheduled
- > Members of the Steering Committee
- > A cross-section of the representatives to the Council of Neighborhoods
- > Representatives of "benchmark" cities; i.e., those which are known to be using innovative and effective strategies in their public involvement programs.
- > The editor of the *Shoreline Week*, and
- > 27 citizen representatives whose names were provided by Steering Committee members.

In addition, we contracted with Market Trends, a large and reputable research firm in Bellevue, to complete a telephone survey of about 300 Shoreline residents selected by as random a procedure as is possible in the current telecommunications environment. The proliferation of numbers and prefixes which do not fit within the boundaries of a single city make it virtually impossible to obtain a perfectly random sample. City directories do not represent an improvement as a source because they are incomplete and outdated by the time they are printed.

Market Trends completed telephone interviews, at varying times of the day and week, with 301 individuals who said they live within the of Shoreline.

It should be noted that all of the data was collected through self-reporting; i.e., respondents' answers were recorded without the accuracy being checked, whether the question was about the neighborhood in which they live or the ways in which they participate in Shoreline activities. We assume that there are some errors and distortions inherent in this method.

## A SUMMARY OF THE DATA FROM THE 301 RESPONDENTS TO THE RANDOMIZED TELEPHONE SURVEY

The respondents identified themselves as being residents of the following neighborhoods:

Briarcrest = 2  
Echo Lake = 7  
Highland Terrace = 7  
Hillwood = 1  
Innis Arden = 3  
Meridian Park = 5  
North City = 30  
Parkwood = 6  
Richmond Beach = 25  
Richmond Highlands = 36  
Ridgecrest = 29  
Westminster Triangle = 5  
The Highlands = 2

57 listed "other" and 89 said they did not know. With the help of City staff, we have been able to locate the addresses of 48 of these 146 to determine in which neighborhoods they reside. The neighborhoods of the remaining 98 could not be identified in any cost-effective way. Thus we cannot determine for certain whether the neighborhoods were represented in the survey in numbers roughly proportional to the number of residents in each. Nor is it vital to do so, because this survey was not intended to compare one neighborhood with another, but rather to take a snapshot of how neighborhoods fit into the ways in which residents are involved with their city. In addition, with a total sample of 301, the number of respondents from any one neighborhood -- even if the numbers were strictly proportional to population size -- would not be adequate to make any useful comparisons among them. The sample size is, however, more than adequate to provide validity in analyzing the city as a whole.

City staff believe there are explanations for the apparent skew of neighborhoods named, and that it is at least in part due to the fact, demonstrated by the people who answered with a response that fit the "other" category, that some residents do not identify with the City-designated neighborhood in which they live. This is particularly likely in some of the newer neighborhoods, where residents have traditionally thought of themselves as "belonging" to a particular area.

With the actual neighborhoods of the additional 48 people identified, the totals are:

Briarcrest = 7  
Echo Lake = 17  
Highland Terrace = 12

Hillwood = 4  
Innis Arden = 3  
Meridian Park = 3  
North City = 33  
Parkwood = 13  
Richmond Beach = 25  
Richmond Highlands = 39  
Ridgecrest = 38  
Westminster Triangle = 5  
The Highlands = 2

These numbers clearly are not proportional to the number of residents of each of the neighborhoods. We can only speculate whether the unidentified 98 respondents would significantly shift the proportionality.

The sample of 301 was large enough to provide statistically valid information about the city as a whole. There was no acceptable way to "even up" the representation of each neighborhood in the sample, and we did not believe it necessary to attempt to do so -- particularly since comparing one neighborhood to another was not one of the objectives of data collection. Therefore, no additional interviews were undertaken in this portion of the research.

The most striking result of this portion of the data analysis is the fact that nearly half the sample cannot/do not identify themselves as being a part of one of the City-designated neighborhoods.

#### **The results of the survey:**

Individuals who answered the phone calls made through the random survey were asked if they were at least 18 years old and were residents of Shoreline. The interview proceeded if they responded "yes" to both questions. (If they reported being younger than 18, they were asked if someone else in the household fit the age criterion and was available to answer questions.) The respondents were not asked whether they were citizens, or whether they vote.

All 301 were asked if they:

Are involved in a City government committee or commission?

1 often  
6 occasionally  
295 never



Attend council meetings?

4 often  
36 occasionally  
264 never

Attend hearings or planning meetings?

5 often  
58 occasionally  
241 never

Participate in a neighborhood association?

19 often  
37 occasionally  
246 never

**107 of the 301 said they participate in City government activities in some way. (Voting was specifically excluded from the list of participatory categories.)**

The 107 who said they participate were asked to assign a 1-5 rating (where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent) for how well the City is doing at providing citizens with opportunities to participate; there were 101 valid responses:

5's = 20 %  
4's = 36 %  
3's = 30 %  
2's = 8 %  
1's = 6 %  
Average = 3.6

The 107 participants were asked how they learn about opportunities to participate in City government. Multiple responses were permitted:

*Shoreline Week* = 84, or 79 %  
City-produced flyers and newsletters = 73, or 69 %  
Neighborhood association newsletters and flyers = 43, or 41 %  
Word of mouth = 38, or 36 %  
Phone trees = 7, or 7 %  
Other (Specifics were recorded.) = 26, or 25 %

They were also asked how they would prefer to learn about city issues. Multiple responses were allowed:

Mailings from the City = 83, or 78 %  
More information in *Shoreline Week* = 74, or 70 %  
Information from the neighborhood associations = 59, or 56 %  
Public meetings and/or hearings = 53, or 50 %  
A Web site = 30, or 28 %

Other = 24 (Specifics were recorded.)

The 107 indicated the following issues are most important to them. Six reported they did not know, or refused to answer. Among the remaining 101:

Zoning and development = 44, or 44 %  
Public safety = 29, or 29 %  
City planning = 17, or 17 %  
Parks and recreation = 6, or 6 %  
City budget and spending = 6, or 6 %  
Other = 69, or 69 % (Specifics were recorded.)

60 of the 107 participants said they are aware of the schedule and activities of their neighborhood association; 45 said they are not; 2 did not answer.

Of the 60 who said they are aware, 32 said they participate in their neighborhood/homeowners associations and 28 said they do not.

The 28 who said they are aware of their neighborhood association's schedule and activities but do not participate were asked "why not?" The open-ended answers can be categorized as:

Not enough time = 15, or 54 %  
Other = 9, or 33 % (Specifics were recorded.)  
No response = 4, or 14 %

The responses to the three questions above were not broken out by neighborhood, because the numbers are too small for use in drawing any conclusions.

(It should be noted that the percentages of each answer may not add up to 100%, as in the list above, because the numbers have been rounded. The computer analysis of the data actually produced numbers carried out to two decimal places.)

### **Non-participants' questions and responses:**

The 197 non-participants were asked whether they feel they have enough information to be able to participate should they choose to do so.

Yes = 81, or 41 %  
No = 109, or 59 %

They were also asked an open-ended question about why they do not participate. Their answers can be categorized as follows. (Some provided responses that fit multiple categories):

Not enough time = 39 %  
Not enough interest = 13 %  
Logistical difficulties (handicap, no transportation, etc.) = 15 %

Not enough information = 9%  
Disagreements with the political process and/or leaders = 6%  
Not a citizen = 2%  
Other = 16% (Specifics were recorded.)

The non-participants were asked if they are concerned about/interested in any particular city issues:

Yes = 74, or 38%  
No = 118, or 62%

The 74 "yeses" identified the following issues:

Zoning and development = 30, or 41%  
Public safety = 13, or 18%  
City planning = 9, or 12%  
City budget and spending = 5, or 7%  
Other = 43, or 58% (Specifics were recorded.)

The non-participants were asked if there were any city issues about which they would like more information, even though they may not choose to become active in them:

Yes = 45, or 23%  
No = 137, or 77%

Zoning and development, and city planning, represented 50 percent of the topics identified by those who said "yes."

The non-participants' answers to how they would like to be kept informed about city issues closely matched the participants' answers:

Mailings from the City = 77%  
More information in the *Shoreline Week* = 65%  
Information from your neighborhood association = 47%  
Public meetings and/or hearings = 37%  
A Web site = 33%  
Other = 16%

Non-participants rated how the City is doing at providing opportunities for citizens to participate in government on the same 1-to-5 scale:

5s = 18%  
4s = 31%  
3s = 34%  
2s = 10%  
1s = 7%  
Average = 3.4

**Questions asked of all interviewees:**

95 of the 301 (31%) have home access to the Internet. An additional 45 (15%) reported using the computers at the library or other public places to access the Internet. Of the 107 self-declared participants in City government, 52 (nearly 49%) reported having Internet Access.

222 of the 301 (73%) reported owning their own homes.

The range of time the respondents reported having lived in Shoreline is less than one year (9%) to more than 40 years (9%). The average was 16 years.

**Ethnicity:**

- Caucasian = 89%
- Asian = 6%
- Hispanic = 5%
- African-American = 1%
- Other = 2%

**Gender:**

- Female = 61%
- Male = 39%

**Age:**

- 18-24 = 7%
- 25-34 = 15%
- 35-44 = 22%
- 45-54 = 19%
- 55-64 = 14%
- 65 and older = 23%
- Average = 48.4 years

**Comments on the context of the survey:**

To place this data into appropriate context, it is important to overlay it on the events that were taking place in the community at the time the interviews were conducted (October 7 through 13). For instance, the relatively high number of people who mentioned adult clubs as an issue of concern can be at least partially explained by the action before the City Council that same week. Two other key events were the first planning summit held as part of the City's comprehensive planning process, and the announcement by Shoreline police that a convicted sexual predator was moving into the community. These factors could certainly have had an influence on the topics of most importance as identified by the survey respondents.

## A SUMMARY OF THE DATA FROM THE SAMPLE OF 27 CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVES

(These individuals' names were supplied by members of the Steering Committee, in response to the consultants' request that they identify residents whom they knew to have to have strong opinions about citizen participation issues, whether or not they were involved in City government.)

This purposive sample more closely matched the relative population of the neighborhoods than did the random sample. The 27 identified themselves as being residents of the following neighborhoods:

Briarcrest = 2  
Echo Lake = 3  
Highland Terrace = 1  
Hillwood = 2  
Innis Arden = 3  
Meridian Park = 3  
North City = 1  
Parkwood = 2  
Richmond Beach = 3  
Richmond Highlands = 3  
Ridgecrest = 2  
Westminster Triangle = 2  
The Highlands = 0

Their rating of how the City is doing at providing opportunities for citizens to participate in government on the 1-to-5 (poor-to-excellent) scale:

5s = 0  
4s = 6, or 22%  
3s = 14, or 52%  
2s = 5, or 19%  
1s = 2, or 7%  
Average = 2.85

8 of the 27 (30%) described themselves as "non-participants." Their reasons for non-involvement included:

lack of time - 38%  
a sense of futility in having an impact - 75%  
a feeling that City and neighborhood association-sponsored meetings, etc., did not make good use of their time - 38%

(Multiple responses were permitted.)

The 27 identified the following issues as being most important to them:

Zoning and development = 16, or 59%

Public safety = 7, or 26%

City planning = 19, or 70%

City budget and spending = 4, or 15%

Other = 9, or 33% (Specifics were recorded; parks and recreation issues were the most commonly mentioned.)

### Notes on the data from the telephone surveys

Respondents expressed decidedly mixed reactions to all the input and involvement methods the City has used:

- > Some people believe that the group or activity with which they have been associated is listening and responsive to citizens' needs; others feel strongly the City people and processes are non-responsive.
- > Some believe the neighborhood associations are the best hope for greater cohesiveness among residents and for increased involvement in City decision-making. But others expressed the view that the associations are only interested in the business of the neighborhood they represent, and not of the needs of the city as a whole. A few also said the associations are composed of cliques, uninterested in including others.
- > Some believe the staff managing the comprehensive planning process is trying to enlist information, but the input that the citizens provide is not reflected in the options being developed.
- > Some also believe the City Council talks about gathering input but does not provide adequate opportunity, and it is not apparent that the input is connected to the decision made.
- > Some expressed irritation that when they call the telephone number which they understand will enable them to leave a message with a Council member, a City staff person often intercepts it and it is not clear that the message ever reaches the Council person.

## A SUMMARY OF THE DATA FROM THE BENCHMARKING INTERVIEWS

"Benchmarking" is a '90s term which has become popular in management circles as part of the active effort to improve quality in the work of every organization, public and private. A working definition for the term would be:

The identification of other cities which are known for achieving the highest standards of excellence in their products, services, and processes, then making the improvements in your organization necessary to reach and ultimately exceed those standards.

As it is done in the corporate world, benchmarking is an expensive process, often involving visits by several members of the interviewing organization to the benchmarking companies to observe as well as question how they do their work. In an effort to balance the cost of the work on this project against the potential gain, our process was conducted somewhat less formally. In preparation for our benchmarking data gathering, the following steps were taken:

- > Solicited suggestions for cities from Shoreline City staff and our professional contacts around the West.
- > Determined which cities to contact. Criteria for inclusion were:
  - > At least some medium-sized cities, where we might expect that staffing levels for communication and citizen involvement might be similar to what Shoreline could expect to invest over the coming years.
  - > Some cities that are nationally known for their innovation in this arena, even though they might be allocating more staff than Shoreline could expect to allocate in the coming years.
  - > Some organizations that are known for their innovation and success, even though they are not a municipal government.
  - > The Arizona cities were suggested by City staff, as were cities in other states. Because one of the consultants commutes to Arizona regularly, those cities could be interviewed without the added travel cost which would be incurred to talk with cities in other states in the East, Midwest, or Southwest.

This data is based on interviews with the *following* cities and organizations. Four of the respondents were managers, the other four program staff or supervisors.

The organizations participating in the study include:

- > The Cities of Kirkland, Bellevue, Tacoma, and Eugene, OR, and Scottsdale, AZ.
- > The Eugene Water and Electric Board
- > The Forum, a non-profit community development organization serving the Valley of

- the Sun, AZ
- > Mesa United Way, AZ, which operates a program called "Building A Healthier Mesa," whose mission is to "build strong and stable families and neighbors through supporting the development of the skills and leadership of neighborhood residents."
- > The City of Renton, whose materials we reviewed, but did not interview staff.

## **A Continuum of Needs**

As we have analyzed which initiatives should be included in a communication and public involvement strategy, we have placed the needs on a continuum:

Communication.....Education.....Involvement.....Leadership

We have organized the information we received from other cities according to this group of strategies.

### **Communication and Education**

- > Two respondents have a city-wide newsletter which is disseminated every four months or quarterly. One other respondent identified a "neighborhood newsletter," which may have a more limited focus or distribution than a "city-wide" newsletter.
- > Five of our respondents indicated they produce and distribute some type of neighborhood association handbook. The subjects covered in the booklets range from development of neighborhood associations to a "how-to" on undertaking neighborhood improvement projects.
- > At least four of the cities have a guidebook for citizens about City government and how to become involved.
- > Three have a Web site or are building one.
- > At least three use public-access cable television.
- > Two reported use of some type of regular newspaper column.
- > Several also indicated use of special interest or special purpose mailings, or utility stuffers.
- > Most use some type of regular interest and satisfaction survey to solicit residents' perspectives about how the City is doing. Some are clearly designed for use on a yearly basis. Others are placed on a reception desk for citizens to pick up whenever they have contact with the City; these are designed so that they could also be mailed.



- > One City gave us a copy of a slick magazine advertising the city. It is apparently published by the Chamber of Commerce, with contributions and cooperation from the City.
- > One produces a "boards and committees manual" which helps volunteers in those roles to understand the role and responsibilities they are taking on, their interface with other city groups and individuals, how their work will be handled, and other issues of concern.
- > One City indicated it has two mini-city halls for information dissemination, education, and involvement.
- > Several Cities collaborate with a community college to offer classes at low cost to residents, on issues related to City government and community development. Those appear to be taught typically by volunteers or City staff, and the cost per class seems to average about \$5. Topics may be as varied as how to influence City government, lead public meetings, deal with conflict, and build a cohesive neighborhood organization.
- > Three reported presentations or support for periodic neighborhood conferences to increase skill and understanding about the city, its needs, and ways for neighborhoods to be effective partners in creating a healthy city.
- > At least one City distributes a yearly questionnaire in which respondents are asked to record preferences about decisions facing the City -- to set priorities for the City's budget, for example.

### **Involvement**

In addition to the descriptions above, several of which have involvement components, the following options are being employed by some Cities:

- > All the cities and community organizations identified described the involvement of neighborhood associations.
  - > Two also described some type of a council of neighborhoods.
  - > Most respondents indicated a policy of active support for residents in the development of healthy neighborhood associations.
  - > Two respondents indicated a less proactive policy: "When they call us, we will assist them."
  - > One City with a history of active neighborhood associations is designing a new

strategy for community involvement which downplays the role of neighborhood associations. Their rationale is that they don't want citizens to have to go through a neighborhood association to talk with the City Council.

- > Several cities specifically reported the involvement of two types of committees composed of citizens: standing committees which report to the Council, and ad hoc committees which are organized for a specific purpose and disband when that purpose is fulfilled.
- > Several Cities also use open houses, town meetings, and other types of meeting processes to engage residents in dialogue about the issues facing the city.
- > Two Cities specifically indicated they encourage and support events such as block parties and other gatherings.
- > One City supports a Quality of Life Assessment to provide neighborhoods with data about their community.

### **Leadership**

We consider several of the strategies identified above to contribute to the building of leadership for neighborhoods, cities and communities:

- > Training offerings
- > A leadership "college"
- > Participation, and service as chair, on various committees

### **Other data obtained from the surveys:**

#### **Size of City:**

Range: 43,000 - several million. Average: about 400,000.

#### **Typical Size of City Neighborhood Staff:**

Range: 0 - 5, with an average of 3.2. Four Cities have only one staff person assigned full time. One City has no one assigned full time.

#### **Staff Roles:**

Typical positions/roles for people who support neighborhoods include:

- > Issues liaison - puts individuals and neighborhood groups in touch with City staff people who can address their questions or needs.
- > Neighborhood support person or neighborhood developer - helps associations get started
- > Technical assistance support - these are often staff - including the directors - of

departments. Typically each is the liaison for an association. They meet together regularly with a senior manager from City government to exchange information and support one another. Personnel are normally chosen because of their people skills and knowledge of City policies and processes.

- > Team coordinator - may be the City manager, his or her deputy, or a manager in the planning department. Coordinates or facilitates the efforts of from 3 to a dozen or more employees with varying responsibility for neighborhood support.
- > Mediator - helps reconcile differences and create consensus within neighborhood associations and across association boundaries.
- > Neighborhood planner - assists neighborhoods in developing strategic plans consistent with other city-wide plans such as the Comprehensive Plan.

### **City Approach to Neighborhood Development:**

The approach or philosophy about neighborhood development ranges from one City which takes a reactive/responsive approach when groups approach them, to a number of Cities which are actively attempting to define and support the development of associations.

### **Number of Neighborhoods:**

The range is from 8 to 280+ self-defined groups -- this largest number in a city with only three staff members assigned to neighborhood work. Those which actively seek to develop neighborhoods tend to have fewer compared to the population size. Those which support groups as they self-define tend to have more groups in proportion to the size of the community.

In several of the cities where we conducted interviews, the interviewee represented an organization other than the municipal government: the Eugene Water and Electric Board; the Forum, a private non-profit organization in Phoenix; and United Way in Mesa. Their purposes tended to vary somewhat, but to be generally the same as those of the City organizations.

### **Number of Residents Who Participate in Associations:**

- > The range estimated by respondents is from 15 to 50%.
- > One respondent excluded people living in multi-family dwellings before estimating the percentage.
- > The Forum respondent said "hundreds of thousands," which is probably accurate for its work and irrelevant for a city.
- > One respondent, a long-time community developer, proposed the following goal for involvement: 6-8 leaders and 20-25 regular participants per association. If 10% of the residents of a neighborhood are relatively actively involved, he considers that to be a well-organized association.

The data here may be colored by our lack of a respondent-established definition for "belong," the word used in the questionnaire.

**Primary Interests in the Past Year or Two:**

- > Organizing, learning how to work together for common goals
- > Projects

The community developer defined five levels or stages he considers desirable:

- > Organizing
- > Creating a plan for an initial project
- > Getting officers and a structure established
- > Creating an action plan for a year
- > Creating a strategic plan for the neighborhood

**Other City Support Issues:**

Most Cities provide some level of financial support for neighborhood associations:

- > Some, like Shoreline, provide "in-kind" support, such as printing and mailing newsletters, etc.
- > About half of the respondents indicated their organizations have some grant money available to neighborhood associations. Most expect it to be used for neighborhood projects. At least one permits the funds to be used for association support, for such things as communication.
- > One of the four has allocated very large grants for capital improvement projects defined by neighborhoods. This appears to be one-time-only money.
- > One respondent felt very strongly that awarding funds to neighborhood associations for implementing their plans typically creates more problems than it solves. He subscribes to the philosophy that neighborhood associations are by nature grassroots organizations, and should be encouraged to use the resources within their neighborhood to accomplish their goals. It should be noted that his general definition of neighborhood would include not only residential areas and schools -- and sometimes community colleges -- but also businesses and service organizations.
- > Every respondent indicated that, when funds are available, they need to be granted to an organization which is appropriately registered with the Internal Revenue Service. The underlying theme behind most of the comments about grant funds was that those organizations receiving such funds are expected/required to be sufficiently organized to plan for and use them for the purposes for which they are granted, and in a manner consistent with the City's fiduciary responsibility.

City purposes in encouraging the development of neighborhood associations were perhaps defined most clearly by one assistant City manager: to give the City a way to talk to residents; to facilitate the develop of consensus about the direction of City policy and practices; and to give citizens an additional way to be involved.

Most indicated that actively or philosophically, their organization supports the continued development of neighborhood associations. One City indicated it is intent on changing its strategy for dealing with citizens so that it will not use a neighborhood structure; City staff want to change from a "push" to a "pull" strategy for involvement.

Some of the respondents employ strategies which suggest the following underlying philosophy:

The goal of neighborhood development is to encourage the establishment of effective but separate neighborhood groups. The ideal neighborhood association would be strong, independent, and able to be a partner to City government - and to other community organizations such as a merchants' association or a Chamber of Commerce. Actions which encourage neighborhood associations to be dependent on the City, or active competitors to its elected and appointed officials, are ultimately not in the best interests of either.

Some Cities, including some we talked with, put relatively little effort into neighborhood development. The City's role in these cases is understood to be one of issue liaison. Development and support activities are carried out by other organizations, such as United Way, thus creating a distance between the associations and the City.

Some community colleges also are taking on part of the development-and-support role.

#### **Councils:**

Most of the Cities interviewed have some type of council of neighborhoods. Most have one or two major purposes: to enable associations to talk easily to one another, and to address issues of city-wide significance.

In Kirkland, the group pre-dated the establishment of most neighborhoods.

#### **Other Groups:**

Most cities also have some number of issue-oriented groups, either ad hoc or permanent, which provide another vehicle for citizen involvement.

#### **Criteria for Success:**

Themes in these responses include:

- > People feel good about the outcome of a project.
- > They talk about how nice it is to work with the City; there is a lack of complaints.
- > People believe they were heard, and that they were given time to be involved

before decisions were made.

(These data for measuring success are typically obtained by informal means.)

Some of the respondents have established a regular citizen satisfaction measurement process. Others indicate they need to get such a process in place.

**Involvement in the Political Process:**

We obtained specific responses from about half the interviewees about the degree to which neighborhood association members become involved in campaigns for issues or offices. Themes implicit in their responses, and those of other survey participants as well, suggest the following:

- > If a neighborhood association is registered with the Internal Revenue Service, its ability to engage in political activity as an organization is constrained. Such associations would be likely to hold candidate forums, but need to avoid endorsing a candidate or a position on an issue.
- > An association's members can and should be expected to actively support candidates and issues and, as their experience with government grows, to become interested in running for office themselves -- just as planning commission members in many cities go on to run for the City council. Care needs to be taken by neighborhood associations to create the type of organizational structure that allows the associations to legally take stands on issues and candidates if it is their intent to do so. Absent this structure, neighborhood association leaders need to be aware of the fact that their involvement in political activities, however well-intentioned, may have the appearance of partisan politics.

In addition to the data on benchmarking cities, we have accumulated a sizable file of materials used by the organizations which we interviewed. These can be used as guides in designing materials for the City of Shoreline.

## CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn from the data from the randomized telephone survey, the survey of key citizens and City staff, and the benchmarking interviews:

- > Shoreline residents' expectations about their government and their new city are extraordinarily high. We assume that is due in part to the considerable involvement of citizens in the recent creation of this city. We suspect that some of the negative feedback received through the interviews is attributable to people's attempts to adjust their notions about the ideal Shoreline (stemming, often, from the period prior to and during incorporation) to the realities of what can be accomplished in a city of this size with a limited budget, a small City staff, and a part-time City Council. Enhanced communication from the City may help to speed this adjustment.
- > The majority of people who contributed to the surveys believe City government is making good progress. Further, there is a high investment in having a city that functions well and maximizes the quality of life for its residents; the frequency with which survey respondents emphasized the importance of planning and development issues illustrates this point.
- > The data collected from City departments clearly shows that Shoreline is already disseminating a good deal of information to its citizens. Nonetheless, the City should plan to communicate more: the survey data indicate that the City itself, along with the *Shoreline Week*, is the preferred source of information about municipal issues. Further, a significant number of the nearly 400 people interviewed asked for more information about city issues and opportunities to participate in decision-making. Some respondents (9%) listed a lack of information as a primary reason for not becoming involved in city-wide as well as neighborhood activities.
- > Despite the fact that survey results showed a moderately high level of satisfaction with City government, there is a segment of opinion in the community which says the City Council and City staff are not meeting the wants and needs of citizens. We suspect their frustration is stronger than might be the case in some cities, because of the aforementioned expectations about what this City should be and do.

We heard two themes or elements tied to those views:

- > The City Council "doesn't listen" to citizens.
- > The Transition Papers, which represented a great amount of citizens' work as well as their visions about how the City should address the various issues of government, are believed to be relegated to a shelf, unaddressed, while decisions contrary to the Transition Paper guidelines are being made.

One facet of this issue is the lack of consensus about the effectiveness of any of the methods for ensuring that City representatives receive communications and use them in decision-making. Respondents cited the issue groups, the comprehensive plan group processes, and the neighborhood association network, as mechanisms that are achieving the purpose of allowing citizens to have input into government -- but that the input being offered is not used.

- > The combination of these issues has resulted in a lack of trust between some residents, particularly those who were activists in creating the city, and the City Council and management. Conspiratorial views about what City government is planning -- and why -- seem to find ready ears. City officials' actions can then be seen as confirmation of these fears, even when they are actually unrelated. An example: there has been a belief reported by a number of people during this citizen involvement study that the project's real purpose is to abolish the neighborhood associations and the Council of Neighborhoods. This belief may still linger among some citizens, despite the project emphasis on building healthier neighborhood associations and creating stronger partnerships between associations and City government.
- > The benchmark cities identified as using "best practices" regarding communication and citizen involvement employ an array of different methods to inform citizens about issues and solicit their participation in decision-making. The information gathered through the telephone interviews in Shoreline clearly supports the need for Shoreline to similarly use multiple methods of disseminating information if it is to meet residents' needs. These materials must be available for use at the residents' own convenience.
- > Further, many respondents cited lack of time -- and especially lack of time on weekday evenings -- as the main reason for not becoming involved in city decision-making activities. These factors indicate a need for involvement opportunities that make the best possible use of citizens' scarce time, and are offered at varying times of the day and week.
- > The inability of people to identify their neighborhood raises the question of whether the neighborhoods are defined in the best manner and whether they fit residents' perceptions of "neighborhood." It can also be taken as an indicator that citizens' concerns are not necessarily defined by or limited to neighborhoods. Further, it suggests that some neighborhood associations have not yet successfully made themselves known and enlisted the involvement of many of the residents of the neighborhood. These conclusions are also supported by the open-ended responses to survey questions about the issues of most interest: the top-ranked ones typically reflected a concern about city-wide topics rather than items limited to the interviewee's own neighborhood.



The wealth of data affords the opportunity to draw other conclusions as well; the ones above appear to be the most visible and compelling -- and, therefore, the ones that the recommendations which follow are designed to address.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

As we formulated recommendations to address the data and the conclusions drawn from its analysis, we returned to the previously cited continuum of needs:

Communication.....Education.....Involvement.....Leadership.

We believe that, to manage a city in which citizens are satisfied with their government and their ability to influence government policy and actions, City officials and community leaders must invest in strategies which will provide opportunities for each of the above to occur. However, we also expect that other groups -- neighborhood groups, public schools, and Chambers of Commerce, among them -- will also be engaged in addressing some or all of those elements.

Collaborative leadership is essential to accomplish any change in today's world. Our society has become so complex that in most settings change can only be effected by those who are able to enlist the participation and support of three groups: those who will be affected by the change: those who will need to carry it out: and, often, those whose best interest may not be served by the change. Collaborative leadership includes several elements:

- > The systematic establishment of communication methods which enable every citizen and government official to learn what is occurring, easily and in a manner which encourages him or her to become and remain informed.
- > A focus on education: a systematic effort to ensure that government is transparent; citizens are heard; their views are incorporated appropriately into decision-making; and the rationale for decisions is explained so that citizens whose views do not match the decision learn how the choices were made.
- > A commitment to inclusiveness, to enlisting the involvement of those who disagree as well as those who agree. When citizens feel that either their elected and appointed government, or their neighborhood association leadership, is made up of a small group of people who prefer to talk only to one another, most will not work very hard to break through that barrier -- until election time, or until they are sufficiently disenchanted to bring the courts into the process. It is important to state that our data does not indicate this is a major issue today in Shoreline; in every city, however, stories are told about citizen groups which felt uninvolved and acted very quickly to legally overturn a decision with which they disagreed.

The last step in the continuum above is leadership: acquisition of skills and information, and the opportunity to use them in the furtherance of neighborhood, city-wide or national goals. Building leadership -- especially collaborative leadership -- is a challenging task for a City

government: It strengthens the ability of citizen groups to act as a force in influencing decisions, and it often leads individuals to set their sites on elected office, so that they become competitors with those who have facilitated the development of their skills and ambition.

Most people who have been involved for a period of time in public or government affairs would probably agree that we begin our involvement in a rather egocentric position: we want what we think is right. When we recognize the needs of others, either our neighbors or residents of other parts of the city, we tend to believe or hear those which generally match ours. So, for example, we may go to a City Council meeting requesting a street closure to protect a neighborhood from high traffic volume, but pay little heed to other viewpoints about such a closure -- as if they don't matter.

It is only when we are drawn into processes, or provided with believable information about the various impacts such an act would have, that most adults begin to see and be concerned about "the bigger picture." If City leaders want to build trust, continue the quest for the involvement of more citizens, and "grow" new leaders for the future, the processes that are established or sustained as a result of this project must both communicate and educate. They need to create as many kinds of opportunity as can be afforded for involvement with others, both within the neighborhood and in the city as a whole. And today's leaders in both the City and civic organizations must commit themselves to helping others prepare to carry out leadership roles skillfully and collaboratively.

One other concept widely discussed in the benchmarking interviews, as well as elsewhere, was "partnership": between City government -- Council and staff -- and its citizens, individually and in their neighborhood associations; between business and neighborhoods; and between a City and other public entities within its boundaries and serving its citizens, such as community colleges, public schools, special units of government, etc. The strong message is that no single part of a community can succeed without the participation and assistance of a variety of other individuals and groups.

Trust is an issue central to building partnerships. It represents both a short- and a long-term challenge to the City and its residents. There are a number of factors which must be addressed if there is to be enough trust in a group or community to facilitate the building of working partnerships:

- > Trust is easily broken and takes time and effort to rebuild.
- > Communication is essential.
  - > Skilled communicators recognize that individuals must have much more information about others and about the interests we share than we will ever use, in order to be assured that information that would be important to us is not being withheld.
  - > It is important for most of us to be able to control how much information we

pay attention to, when we receive it, the degree to which we can validate the information via a second source, etc. Without that sense of control, we sometimes begin to believe that we are being spoonfed what others want us to know.

- > When we question the honesty, openness, or completeness of others' statements, or their motives in making them, it becomes easier for us to accept rumors as true, without questioning their veracity or checking them out.
  
- > Education about City affairs and processes is essential to building trust:
  - > As residents become more educated, they are more able to seek out information they need, evaluate what they hear, and draw informed conclusions about people and issues.
  - > Involvement facilitates continued education. Without the trust that encourages us to become involved, our education will be incomplete.

We believe that the neighborhood associations and the Council of Neighborhoods have a very important role to play in both the leadership of the City and in building and participating in partnerships with other groups. To carry out those roles, however, both the associations and the Council of Neighborhoods need to continue the efforts they have been and are making to build their internal skills and effectiveness. Cities involved in the benchmarking interviews estimate that one can expect that 5-20 percent of the residents of a neighborhood will be active. While the City of Shoreline is implementing a clearly defined goal to involve a larger percentage of residents in some manner, the neighborhood partners must also be developing strategies to communicate, educate and involve more of their residents than they do today.

The benchmarking data indicates two typical purposes for neighborhood associations: to facilitate residents' taking responsibility for creating the kind of neighborhood they want to live in, and to provide a vehicle for dialogue between City officials and residents.

The recommendations that follow reflect these philosophical beliefs as well as the data and the work of the Steering Committee. *The Committee reviewed and prioritized the consultants' recommendations in December. Committee actions and comments are shown in italics.*

### **SHORT-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS**

Our recommendations fall into two categories:

- > General and policy-oriented proposals to provide a foundation for other recommendations and to improve the already-effective approaches being taken by the City and its citizens
  
- > Specific methods or tools to improve communication, education and citizen involvement.

## **Policies**

The City has made a sizable investment in the development of neighborhood associations; it is clear from the data that substantially more work needs to be done if these groups are to be viable vehicles for communication and involvement. Two recommendations -- to the City and to the associations themselves -- stem from this conclusion; *the Steering Committee cited #1 as the top priority:*

1. The City and the associations need to engage in partnership-building. Presently there are clearly a variety of role and relationship issues of concern to all the partners. Those conflicts or confusions are not helpful to the interests of the neighborhoods, City government, or the citizens at large, and need to be addressed in a collaborative manner at the earliest possible time.

The City and the associations need to work together:

- > To clarify what role each should and can play in the business of the city (a list of possible roles will be compiled from the benchmarking data); what expectations each has of the other and what boundaries are important to the success of the partnership; and
- > To develop and employ methods for collaborating and solving conflicts that will reduce the level of stress and increase the effectiveness of their efforts.

We believe that the partnership process needs to involve a kind of community evaluation of the "state of the City" in which the Transition Papers, prepared as part of the incorporation process, are dusted off and reviewed --- perhaps at a town hall-type meeting. An assessment of the papers should determine which of those recommendations have been accomplished; which have not but remain important to citizens; and which have become less important or viable as other changes have occurred.

2. Because as citizens we bring different interests to our communities, the associations should be recognized as but one of a number of methods by which residents can become involved in the business of the city; the police volunteer program and the group of citizen committees are two additional mechanisms currently in place. City officials should be flexible in using these as needs arise.

## **Communication and Education:**

**Plan to diversify the communication tools the City uses to convey information about city affairs to residents, and to enlist their involvement.** That diversity will enable citizens to find and use information in whatever manner is most convenient and appropriate for them.

*In its final review of this document, the Steering Committee identified the following three recommendations as high-priority:*

1. Maximize the use of *Shoreline Week*.
  - > Include City Council agendas and outcomes of deliberations and votes.
  - > When current issues do not consume the available space, include information which spotlights issues and activities in more depth.

The data indicates that a large percentage of Shoreline residents prefer to get information about City issues and activities either through direct mail from the City or in the *Shoreline Week*. Use of a regular column of purchased space in the newspaper, with design and placement which make it easily recognizable, would permit the City to control the content and to include a variety of information about current and upcoming issues and events, as well as periodic short surveys, requests for volunteers, etc.

Fiscal Impact: A one-time cost to create a template would be about \$1,000. Writing time could require approximately 8 hours each for 26 columns per year. If the cost of a (staff) writer is \$20/hour, the total writing cost would be \$4,160. Purchase of 10 -- 25 column inches in the paper would be \$145 - \$250 per issue for black ink only. There would be an additional charge of about \$85 for black plus two colors of ink (enabling use of the City's logo colors.)

An additional \$14.56 per issue used would guarantee "premium placement"; e.g., the City columns would always be in the same position on page 3. With 26 columns per year, the total annual cost for the newspaper space would range from \$3,785.60 to \$6,504.16, depending on the choices for number of ink colors and premium placement. Adding the \$4,160 for writing, and a one-time design fee of about \$1,000, brings the annual cost of this communication element to \$9,000 - \$11,000.

2. Create an "owner's manual," perhaps called a "Guide to Citizen Participation in the City of Shoreline." Plan to update it regularly.

This handbook would provide a wide range of information, from City Council schedules and procedures to information about the neighborhood associations. We recommend that the citizen's guide be delivered to every household in Shoreline, by one of two methods: bulk mail delivery, or as an insert in the *Shoreline Week*.

Fiscal Impact: The writing, design and printing of 30,000 copies of such a document would cost from \$10,000 - \$14,500, depending on production values. Bulk mail delivery would cost \$3,200 - \$3,500 for 25,000 copies. An insert in the *Shoreline Week* would cost \$1,065. The annual cost of this communication element is \$13,200 - \$18,000.

The print quantity cited exceeds the number of households in Shoreline. We recommend printing a significantly larger number of the guides in order to ensure that an adequate supply is available at convenient places: the libraries, City facilities, human service agencies, senior centers and offices such as the Chamber of Commerce. If the recommendation to create a welcome packet for newcomers is accepted, this would be a high-priority item for inclusion in those packets. And neighborhood associations may be willing to deliver copies to newcomers.

Fiscal Impact: Printing an additional 5,000 copies of the owner's manual, which should more than suffice for distribution through welcome packets, would cost \$1,500 - \$4,000.

In support of this recommendation and any others which include dissemination of materials to residents, we also believe the City should:

- > Begin efforts to centralize the maintenance and use of mailing lists, to enhance the accuracy and inclusiveness of mailings from the City and to reduce their cost.

When individual departments maintain and use their own, separate mailing lists, residents get mailings about some issues and from some departments, but not from others. Their efforts to have their names added to lists for City mailings may also be frustrating.

Fiscal Impact: The primary cost would be the purchase of software, if needed and unless it is donated, and the staffing costs associated with entering lists and names into a new database.

- > Standardize the City logo, and use it on every publication, including video. We understand that this recommendation is already being implemented.

Fiscal Impact: If standardized logo use is phased in as new materials are printed/created, there will be only minimal staff costs associated with creating the standards and managing the transition.

3. Create mechanisms for sampling public opinion about City issues, and for providing feedback to residents about how their fellow residents feel about those topics, so that everyone can gain a greater understanding of how decisions are made:
  - > Gather citizen responses to proposals through a polling method.
    - > Use a subset of the database surveyed as part of this project as a type of "Nielsen Survey" group, whose members are willing to be contacted over the course of a year to gather perspective about emerging issues.
    - > If a useful and cost-effective program can be identified, use a proactive method of calling citizens at random or in purposive samples to gather

- timely input regarding key decisions.
- > When public hearings are held, report their results at all the usual places, including the newspaper column and the Web site as they become available.
  - > Explain the rationale for policy decisions using the above methods.

Fiscal Impact: Assuming that a monthly survey of a small sample of residents were to be planned, the costs might include design time - 8 hours at approximately \$20/hour: \$160. Identifying the sample of residents: \$500 (a one-time charge, assuming the same people are contacted repeatedly.) Mailing of 200 copies/month: \$40. Tabulation, analysis, and preparation of a two-page report: 16 hours X \$20/hour: \$320. The total cost per month: \$520; for 12 months: \$6,240.

A similar process could be used every other month or every quarter. It may be more cost-effective, and valid for residents, to contract to have the survey done. It may also be possible to use a telephone process similar to the "Tele-Circ" system used by libraries.

*The following recommendations received a medium-priority ranking from the Steering Committee:*

4. Continue the use of public access television, and incorporate the use of government access TV as well. Franchises for the two cable companies which serve Shoreline are currently being negotiated. These issues are being incorporated in those negotiations.

Fiscal Impact: Unknown at this time.

5. Develop and maintain a City Web site.

Shoreline, like every other governmental entity, sooner or later will have to create an Internet presence. We would recommend doing it sooner, with attention to strategies that ensure that citizens who do not have access to -- or a willingness to use -- the Internet are not penalized.

The City would have a number of allies in this effort. The Shoreline Library already provides terminals, and lessons in how to use them. Shoreline Public Schools may also be willing to cooperate in encouraging use of the City Web site. Adding terminals at the police neighborhood centers will help maximize the usefulness of those facilities.

The Web site should become an additional location where Council agendas, meeting minutes, and other information of interest to citizens can be placed.



to update the pages weekly and to follow up on requests; without these, a Web site is relatively useless.

Fiscal Impact: Creation of a 20-page interactive Web site, with strategies to encourage citizen involvement and repeat use, would total \$9,000 - \$10,000. This fee would include the design of the site, graphics, technical development of the system for easy updating, and production of the first version. Hiring one staff member to be the Web site administrator would cost \$40,000-50,000 per year, including benefits and administrative overhead. However, this would not necessarily require a full-time position; Web site administration could be combined with other community relations or information services assignments.

6. Publish a "state of the City" document or annual report at the end of 1998 and each year thereafter; highlight the accomplishments and compare them to the planning documents such as the Transition Papers; indicate key reasons for any lack of achievement; and project the accomplishments for the coming year.

Fiscal Impact: Costs for writing, producing and disseminating this type of document are likely to be comparable to other materials defined above. The Web site or newsletter may become the vehicle by which this type of document is published and disseminated; if so, we would anticipate that additional costs would be associated with staff time to write and compile the information. Assuming the scope of the project is similar to producing and distributing an issue of the newsletter, the total cost would be about \$12,000.

*The following projects received very mixed responses from the Steering Committee: both supportive votes and lowest-priority rankings. These need further discussion before any action is taken:*

7. Create a quarterly City newsletter.

An eight-page newsletter would provide the City a significant opportunity to ensure that all residents have the same access to basic information about events and developments in their municipal government. Ideally, the content would also include one or more feature articles to help maintain and convey Shoreline's focus on people and quality of life.

Fiscal Impact: An eight-page tabloid newsletter, produced in black ink with one highlight color, would total about \$5,000 per issue for photography and printing. The most efficient way to manage periodicals such as this is to have a designer create a "look" and a template that can be used to lay out future issues with less time and expense. Design fees for a project such as this are about \$3,500.

We recommend that a newsletter be distributed in the same manner as is chosen for the citizen's guide. If the choice is bulk mail, it would cost about \$3,500 to mail 25,000 copies of each issue. As with the guide, extra copies should be printed and made available at the previously identified pick-up places. Total first-year costs, including 40 hours (per issue) of a (non-staff) writer's time at \$65 per hour, would be \$47,900.

8. Determine the need for translation of signs and documents about the City into Korean, Spanish, and other languages as appropriate.

The project data makes clear that this is a city with significant diversity in its population. While most residents may be able to read and converse in English well enough to do business with the City, there are undoubtedly groups who cannot. Further conversation with and/or data gathering from those whose first language is not English is needed to determine their needs.

Fiscal Impact: Will depend on methods chosen for data gathering, and on identified needs.

9. Plan to conduct a city-wide interest and satisfaction survey every year or two. Some questions from our citizen survey might be used, since the current data would provide a baseline for measuring change.

Fiscal Impact: Once again, costs will be dependent on methods to be used to carry out this recommendation:

- > A follow-up survey, using some of the questions from our 1997 survey as well as some new ones, could be purchased for \$10,000 or less.
- > A questionnaire could also be printed in the newsletter, without added cost for dissemination. If that method were chosen, however, costs for tabulation and analysis need to be included, whether the work is done by City staff or by a contractor. Use of a drop box to allow residents to return the survey would enable the City to avoid the expense of return envelopes. It should be remembered, however, that randomized telephone surveys produce results very different from questionnaires that rely on interested citizens to complete and return them.

10. Create a welcome packet for newcomers to the city.

Include the "owner's manual," and other current and pertinent information which new residents will find helpful or necessary. If there is an organization, such as the Welcome Wagon, which distributes packets to new residents, try to have this information included. If no such organization exists, neighborhood associations may

be an appropriate group to identify new residents and convey the packet to them.

**Fiscal Impact:** Cannot be determined at this time. If it is necessary to acquire a database by which new residents can be identified, the software and database maintenance will have associated costs.

Distribution at previously identified pickup points and through the neighborhood associations may be both efficient and effective. Organizations such as the school district, the Chamber of Commerce, and day care centers may also be willing to partner with the City on this project.

11. Build a kiosk, bulletin board or other type of device in each neighborhood which does not already have one. Use them, and encourage residents to use them, to post information and seek information about issues of concern to residents of the neighborhood.

**Fiscal Impact:** Costs for this type of communication device will vary from none, if space in a public building or business is contributed and volunteers maintain it, to the cost of building a structure. Since the needs and opportunities in each neighborhood are different, it is not practical to estimate costs here. It is worth noting, however, that this is the kind of project for which a neighborhood might apply for a mini-grant from the City.

### **Involvement:**

**Plan to create a variety of methods and processes by which more citizens can become involved.** The individuals who responded to our survey made a number of suggestions for improvements.

*The Committee identified the following three as having the highest priority:*

1. The neighborhood associations need to continue their efforts to become more viable and independent. Because a sizable proportion of those who responded to our surveys could not identify the neighborhood in which they live, one must assume that at least some of the associations presently represent only a small portion of the people within their geographic boundaries. If the associations are to play the role their leaders have said they desire, more of their constituents must be aware of the associations and have some involvement in them.

Increasing the percentage of involvement is a challenging goal for neighborhood associations. Several guidelines are suggested:

- > Be sure you are communicating about the association with all residents.

- > Periodically review the purpose of your association. Does it still reflect what residents want?
- > Ask your residents what the association can do this year that would make your neighborhood a better place to live.
- > Commit to doing what they suggest.
- > Plan for a variety of types of events and activities during the year. Each will be interesting to some residents and not to others.
- > Focus on continuing to develop collaborative leadership skills within the association, to maximize the ease with which additional residents can become involved.

Fiscal Impact: The costs will be dependent on the activities undertaken by the associations, and on the City staff support or other out-of-pocket expenses associated with their completion.

Committing \$3,000 in training funds for 1998 should provide needed flexibility for scheduling and choosing topics.

2. The City Council should fine-tune its process for conducting meetings and work sessions so that they give greater evidence of listening, and citizens can see how their input affects the decisions.

As with issues defined earlier in this section, methods for accomplishing this need to be systematic, involving the consistent use of communication strategies so that the City Council, staff, and residents all become accustomed to disseminating and acquiring information in these ways:

- > Use of a comment card, focused on residents' views about the effectiveness of *the process*, would provide ongoing data, examples of what residents believe constitute success and what causes problems, and a chance to "rant and/or rave" at the moment an issue is pertinent. The cards should be readily available at Council meetings, workshops and other places where the Council interacts with residents,
- > As with the consultants' comment tracking sheet, some vehicle needs to be created which records comments from the cards, and indicates what the Council/staff is to do about them. Registering input in this way -- and ensuring appropriate follow-through -- is key to closing the gap in the communication loop that many people perceive exists in Shoreline.
- > Another relatively simple method would be for Council members and staff to train themselves to ask residents who are submitting comments: "What do you want from us, or want us to do?" Or, "What is your purpose in talking to us

about this subject?" If this mechanism is used, it needs to be clear to everyone that:

- > The question is being asked to help Council respond more quickly and effectively to citizens.
- > Asking the question cannot be construed to mean that the Council will always be able or willing to do what is being requested, but that the resident's answer will help them to respond more accurately and quickly.

Fiscal Impact: The cost of implementing this recommendation does not have to be substantial. Use of a comment sheet, and/or inclusion of a "rant and rave" form on the Web site, in the newspaper column, and other locations, could be accomplished within costs already defined for those strategies. The format and instructions for use of these devices should be clear about whether the residents submitting them should routinely expect an acknowledgement or other response.

3. Conduct periodic "town meetings" to solicit input from citizens about their interests. Or plan to conduct periodic informal public meetings on topics which will come before the Council several months into the future.

Fiscal Impact: Costs for conducting such a meeting are likely to be similar to those associated with committees. Additional effort to advertise the meeting to residents may be part of the newsletter/newspaper column/Web site group of communication tools.

*The following recommendations received a medium-priority ranking from the Committee:*

4. The Council should establish three types of citizen committees and roles:
  - > Standing Committees, which are citizen advisory groups charged with working with City departments to develop policy and program recommendations to present to the City Council. Each might include one or more subcommittees as needed.

The Shoreline Planning Commission has been established; a Parks and Recreation Committee should be created.

- > Council Ad-Hoc Committees, which are charged with studying and making recommendations on a specific issue. These committees are created for a specific purpose, and are disbanded when the task is complete. The Citizen Involvement Committee is a current example of this type of committee.
- > Intergovernmental Committees, formed as a result of intergovernmental agreements signed between the City and another entity, such as the King County Library System.

Fiscal Impact: Actual costs associated with existing committee activities can be extracted from existing City records. The types of expenses involved are likely to include:

- > Meeting space rental: About \$200/meeting
- > Refreshments: \$100/meeting
- > Staffing: \$500/meeting if minutes are required  
\$1,000/meeting for notices  
and  
materials preparation
- > Taping \$125/meeting
- Total per meeting: \$1,925

5. Develop a simple method for collecting information about citizens' interests in volunteering to help with City issues and needs. Then, as committees are being created or vacancies filled, those making the recommendations will have a list of interested candidates to consider. Expanding current efforts to involve volunteers would be an effective way to address this issue.

Fiscal Impact: Once again, this is a recommendation which can be carried out as part of the newsletter or newspaper column. A small cost would be associated with staff time needed to maintain this file and update it periodically.

6. Plan to build staff and neighborhood association skills in facilitation, so that the meetings described throughout this report can be facilitated with City personnel unless there is a clear reason to involve an outside facilitator.

Typically, the facilitator's role -- and training -- is focused on assisting him or her to learn to manage the process of meetings, ensuring that desired outcomes are achieved; that all participants are able to participate and feel safe in doing so; and that issues which arise are addressed in an effective and "win-win" manner. One rule: the trained facilitator does not facilitate groups in which he or she has an interest in the topics being discussed. Therefore, in most public organizations, including other cities, staff are being trained to facilitate meetings in order to eliminate the necessity for hiring outside facilitators. They work with groups other than those in which they are members or participants. For example, a staff member in the planning department might be asked to facilitate a meeting for the police department, but would normally not facilitate a meeting involving planning personnel and/or issues.

It is our understanding that there are already some trained facilitators among City staff, but that more might be desirable:

- > To help address the growing numbers of meetings for which leaders want a facilitator.
- > To help avoid burning out those who are currently available.

- > To ensure that, as employees come and go, there continues to be a pool of personnel available.

Facilitation skills are also appropriate for leaders of any number of community organizations which are important to this report: the various committees, neighborhood associations and Council of Neighborhoods. Training in facilitation skills could be conducted for interested members of all these organizations.

Fiscal Impact: Facilitation training can require from 1-5 days, depending on what participants need to accomplish during the training; how large the group is; what previous training in this or related topics participants have had, etc. The cost could be part of the training costs identified elsewhere in this document. Generally, professional training costs from \$400/day upward, depending on the topic and the trainer's experience.

#### Leadership:

**Involvement is easier for citizens when the leaders of the organizations and events are skilled, understand collaborative leadership, and are willing to help others gain the skills, education and experience to be good participants and/or good leaders.**

*This category received less attention during the prioritizing activity than the previous two. The following two received the most "high priority" votes from Steering Committee members:*

1. Plan and engage City boards and commissions in training and group-building assistance. Offer the training to the Council of Neighborhoods, and as appropriate to the neighborhood associations. Topics should include managing meetings, managing conflict in a constructive and collaborative manner, creating partnerships to accomplish citizens' goals, influencing the public process, etc.

Fiscal Impact: This is the type of activity which can be carried out with little or no cost, utilizing volunteers; it can also be very expensive, depending on the trainers used. \$3,000 should provide sufficient funding to carry out what can reasonably be completed during 1998.

2. Develop a collaboration with an entity such as the Shoreline Community College to have it offer training designed for neighborhood groups, at a minimal cost.

Fiscal Impact: This task should involve the Council of Neighborhoods and the City's neighborhood staff. Actual costs will be dependent on the agreement created among the partners.

*The following received both "high-priority" and "low priority" votes from the Steering Committee:*

3. When a new Council takes office, plan and conduct some type of retreat or meeting involving the Council, City staff, and committee members. The goal should be to increase the skill and practice of all those groups concerned with the City's business in creating norms, clarifying roles and expectations, developing methods for working together, maximizing input from citizens, etc.

Fiscal Impact: Costs will depend on the number of participants, availability of meeting space, etc.

4. Create or obtain rights to use a manual for committees, to facilitate current and potential members' understanding of roles, relationships, and responsibilities.

Fiscal Impact: Manuals are available to purchase through a number of Cities around the country, as well as through publishers. It is likely that a useful version can be found at a reasonable cost.

5. Establish a mentoring program for citizens who want to become more knowledgeable and involved in city issues and government. Encourage minorities to become involved.

If adopted, this recommendation represents a project which should appropriately involve the City staff, representatives of neighborhood associations, and the Council of Neighborhoods.

Tasks which may need to be carried out in order to implement an effective mentoring program include:

- > Creating a vision, mission, goals and objectives for the program.
- > Defining roles to be taken on by City personnel and by community representatives.
- > Acquiring training materials which can be presented periodically to help potential new mentors understand their role; to serve as a bridge between cultures; to hone their mentoring skills; and to increase their knowledge of how the City operates and how to help a minority resident to more effectively deal with municipal government.
- > It may be desirable to develop, with the assistance of members of the minority community, a brief "training" or education program that can be presented to minority community residents who might be interested in working with a mentor, to help portray what they can expect and how the program might benefit them.



Fiscal Impact: The key costs associated with this recommendation are likely to be those for a consultant to assist City and neighborhood representatives in:

- > Development of a mentoring program
- > Development of training for mentors and potential proteges from the minority community.
- > Delivery of the first training session.
- > Training City staff and/or volunteers so that subsequent sessions can be offered without the need for a consultant or trainer.

Depending on the actual work requested, these tasks should be accomplishable for approximately \$5,000.

### **LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS**

*(These were not prioritized by the Steering Committee.)*

We expect that some recommendations will need to be considered for achievement in the long term, because:

- > **Achieving them easily and successfully depends on accomplishing other tasks and activities which have been defined as "short term."**
- > **They are likely to be expensive, and accomplishing them will require budgetary planning.**
- > **They would compete for staff time and public visibility with tasks which need to be done more quickly.**

Fiscal impacts have not been identified for these strategies. The methods for carrying them out may be different in two years than they would be if the City were to implement them now, and the costs for consulting time, mailing, and other expenses which might be a part of the implementation will be different than they are today.

1. Reaffirm and publish the vision defined by the City's comprehensive plan. In reviewing that vision, create strategies for the City for the next five years.
2. Reaffirm the criteria and process for selection and management of grant programs to neighborhoods, and communicate the policy well in advance of implementation.
3. Plan to strengthen the role of the neighborhood City halls, and investigate the

possibility of adding one or more in other parts of the city.

4. Plan to review (and modify as needed) the vision and mission of the City's committee structure and the Council of Neighborhoods, and also the methods by which the City communicates with residents, encourages their involvement, and supports the building of leadership. Such a review should occur about every two years, in order to ensure the continued relevance and viability of these groups and processes.

Nothing in our lives remains static; many wise people assert that the most constant factor we as Americans deal with is change. This means that everything planned by a City or an organization must be evaluated within a year or two of its implementation to determine whether it continues to be relevant. As one participant said in the recent meeting of the Council of Neighborhoods, this process and the recommendations which are adopted are among the things which need to be reviewed in about two years. Among the questions that should be asked:

- > How well have the measurement criteria identified by the Citizen Involvement and Communication Committee been addressed?
- > How many of the recommendations adopted by the Council have been implemented?
- > Which of those adopted have not been carried out, and why?
- > What has changed about the city, citizens' needs and expectations, etc.?
- > How should the strategies being used by the City and the neighborhood associations change as a result of new information about citizens' needs?

5. Create a Staff Liaison Team for the City.

One of the issues which several of the benchmark cities have begun to address in a thoughtful manner is the question of which staff are expected to act as liaisons to community groups, such as the neighborhood associations. It is easy for key staff, such as the police management team, to find themselves attending meetings every night of the week. That ensures, over a period of time, that their daytime work will suffer. On the other hand, it is important for many of those groups to have a regular contact with someone from the City staff: someone they can count on to gather information for them, and to help them understand how the City does business and how citizens can be involved in a specific issue.

Several of the other cities have developed what might be called a liaison team, composed of staff members from various departments. Each of the staff members -- whatever his or her rank -- is assigned to one or more groups as their regular liaison. The liaison is charged with providing information to the community group, and bringing information from it back to the City. Liaison team members meet periodically to share information and deal with common problems. Typically, the team reports to the City Manager or Assistant City Manager, in order to facilitate the

objective of giving the City a means to talk with citizens about issues of concern to each.

We believe that each group in Shoreline, and its liaison, should create an agreement about what the group expects of its liaison; other City employees should not attend the group's meetings unless asked to do so for a specific purpose.

### **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The consultants have enjoyed this project for the City of Shoreline, particularly because of the energy and commitment displayed by virtually all of the individuals with whom we had contact: City Council and staff, our Steering Committee, and Shoreline residents representing many neighborhoods and interests. We were impressed by the degree to which all of these people are determined to make Shoreline the best possible city in which to live, and we hope that the findings and recommendations in this report will help channel that determination.

A City can be likened to a human, in that it must "grow up" through many stages -- each with its own challenges. Shoreline has accomplished much in two years; its leaders deserve credit for tackling the problems of communication and public involvement at such an early "age," rather than struggling with ineffective systems for years. The payoff for this proactive stance, hopefully, will be that the City will continue to mature with a maximum number of informed and involved citizens -- and a minimum of growing pains.



## Memorandum

**DATE:** March 4, 2004  
**TO:** City Council  
**FROM:** Julie Modrzjewski, Assistant City Manager *Julie*  
**RE:** Citizen Participation Techniques

---

City Manager Steve Burkett asked me to forward a copy to you of a list of citizen participation techniques that are used to seek public input for policies and projects. This list was taken from the table of contents in the *Citizen Participation Handbook for Public Officials and Other Professionals Serving the Public*, written by Hans Bleiker of the Institute of Participatory Management and Planning (IPMP). Many of our staff have been trained by IPMP and have used some of the techniques listed.

With 38 techniques available, there are many ways for local governments to seek public input. If you would like additional information on these techniques, please do not hesitate to contact me. This may be helpful as the Council discusses ways to increase public participation and gather input.

In addition, for your information, I have attached a copy of the Shoreline Board of Directors March 1, 2004 regular meeting agenda. Section seven titled, "Comments from the community" provides another approach for seeking public input.

Attachment

*Citizen Participation Handbook for Public Officials and Other Professionals Working in the Public Sector*

A: The five Responsibility Objectives .....	IV - A - 81
#1: Establish the Legitimacy of your Agency and your Project .....	IV - A - 2
#2: Maintain the Legitimacy of your Agency and your Project .....	IV - A - 6
#3: Establish the Legitimacy of your Problem-Solving and Decision-Making Process .....	IV - A - 7
#4: Maintain the Legitimacy of your Processes .....	IV - A - 8
#5: Establish and Maintain the Legitimacy of Major Assumptions and Earlier Decisions .....	IV - A - 10
B: The five Responsiveness Objectives .....	IV - B - 1
#6: Get to Know all the Potentially Affected Interests .....	IV - B - 1
#7: Get to See the Project through their Eyes .....	IV - B - 1
#8: Identify and Understand Problems .....	IV - B - 1
#9: Generate Alternative Solutions .....	IV - B - 1
#10: Articulate and Clarify the Key Issues .....	IV - B - 1
C: The Effectiveness Objectives .....	IV - C - 1
#11: Protect and Enhance your Credibility .....	IV - C - 2
#12: Have all of the Information that you need to Communicate to the various Interests Received and Understood by them .....	IV - C - 3
#13: Receive and Understand all the Information that the various Interests Need to Communicate to You .....	IV - C - 4
The De-Polarizing Objectives .....	IV - C - 5
#14: Finding Common Ground among Polarized Interests ...	IV - C - 6
Some Game Theory Basics .....	IV - C - 6
There is a bit of a Chicken-and-Egg Problem .....	IV - C - 8
Back to CP Objective #14 .....	IV - C - 8
#15: Depolarizing Interests Who are Polarized for Some Other Reason .....	IV - C - 10
Shape Your CP Program around Your CP Needs .....	IV - D - 1

**→ CHAPTER V: Citizen Participation Techniques ..... V - 1**

The Table of CP Techniques and CP Objectives shows each Technique's Strengths and Weaknesses .....	V - 1
Additional PROs and CONs that each Technique has .....	V - 2

Here's how the table displays these PROs and CONs .....	V - 3
#1: Holding or Attending Meetings and Hearings (CP Technique #1) .....	V- 1 - 1
Some Basic Principles that Apply to all the different Types of Meetings .....	V- 1 - 2
#1A: Working Meetings .....	V- 1A - 1
#1B: "Open" Meetings .....	V- 1B - 1
#1C: Forums .....	V- 1C - 1
#1D: Public Mass Meetings .....	V- 1D - 1
#1E: Public Hearings .....	V- 1E - 1
#1F: Open Houses .....	V- 1F - 1
#1G: Town Meetings .....	V- 1G - 1
#1H: Samoan Circles .....	V- 1H - 1
#2: Advisory Committees (CP Technique #2) .....	V- 2 - 1
#2A: Committees that give Popularity-Type Advice .....	V- 2A - 1
#2B: Committees that give Content-Type Advice .....	V- 2B - 1
#2C: Blue-Ribbon Panels .....	V- 2C - 1
#2D: Watch-Dog Advisory Committees .....	V- 2D - 1
#2E: Constituency-Building Advisory Committees .....	V- 2E - 1
#2F: Depolarizing Advisory Committees .....	V- 2F - 1
#2G: Mediating Advisory Committees .....	V- 2G - 1
#2H: Gophers .....	V- 2H - 1
#2I: Foxes .....	V- 2I - 1
#2J: Beavers .....	V- 2J - 1
#3: Nominal Group Workshops .....	V- 3 - 1
#4: Using the Mass Media to Communicate .....	V- 4 - 1
#5: Project Newsletters .....	V- 5 - 1
#6: Napoleon's Idiot .....	V- 6 - 1
#7: Informing the Public about Your Decision-Making Process .....	V- 7 - 1
#8: Mapping Socio-Political and Environmental Data .....	V- 8 - 1
#9: Presenting the Public the Full Range of Feasible Alternatives .....	V- 9 - 1
#9A: Presenting the Public the Full Range of Options .....	V- 9A - 1
#9B: Fish-Bowl Planning .....	V- 9B - 1
#10: Illustrating the Final Form of a Proposed Alternative in Laymen's Terms .....	V- 10 - 1
#11: Dealing with the Public in the Agency Offices .....	V- 11 - 1

*Citizen Participation Handbook for Public Officials and Other Professionals Working in the Public Sector*

#12:	Installing an Ombudsman .....	V- 12 - 1
#13:	Encouraging Internal Communication .....	V- 13 - 1
#14:	Gaming and Role-Playing .....	V- 14 - 1
#15:	Operating a Field Office .....	V- 15 - 1
	#15A: Creating a Store-Front Office or “Drop-In” Center .....	V- 15 - 2
	#15B: Temporary Field Office .....	V- 15 - 2
	#15C: Mobile Office .....	V- 15 - 3
#16:	Making the Most of Existing Mechanisms .....	V- 16A - 1
	#16A: Clubs, Civic Groups, and Other Existing Organizations .....	V- 16A - 1
	#16B: Newsletters, Other Publications and the Media .....	V- 16ABC - 1
	#16C: Existing Institutions, School Systems, etc. ....	V- 16ABC - 2
	#16D: Making the Most of Other Problem-Solving Efforts .....	V- 16ABC - 2
#17:	Open a Channel of Communication with Each PAI .....	V- 17 - 1
#18:	Monitoring the Mass Media and Other Non-Reactive Learning .....	V- 18 - 1
#19:	Collecting Data; Carrying out Surveys .....	V- 19 - 1
#20:	Examining Past Actions of a PAI .....	V- 20 - 1
#21:	Experiencing Empathy .....	V- 21 - 1
#22A:	Being a Participant Observer .....	V- 22A - 1
	#22B: Focus Groups .....	V- 22B - 1
#23:	Employing Local Citizens on the Project .....	V- 23 - 1
#24:	Monitoring New Developments in Systems that may Affect your Project .....	V- 24 - 1
#25:	Conducting a Background Study .....	V- 25 - 1
#26:	Hiring an Advocate for One or Several Affected Interests .....	V- 26 - 1
#27:	Looking for Analogies .....	V- 27 - 1
#28:	Cataloguing of Solution Concepts .....	V- 28 - 1
#29:	Conducting Charrette or Other Creativity Enhancing Techniques .....	V- 29 - 1
	#29A: Charrette .....	V- 29 - 1
	#29B: Brainstorming Sessions .....	V- 29 - 3

#30:	Mediating a Conflict Between Different Interests .....	V- 30 - 1
#31:	Being a “Good Samaritan” by Helping Solve Problems Outside your Scope of Responsibility .....	V- 31 - 1
#32:	Monitoring the Actual Impacts of a Project .....	V- 32 - 1
#33:	“Delphi” Techniques .....	V- 33 - 1
	#33A: Creating a “Delphi” Crystal Ball .....	V- 33 - 1
	#33B: Doing a “Delphi” Public Survey .....	V- 33 - 3
	333C: “Delphi” Intelligence Gathering .....	V- 33 - 3
#34:	Lost Letter .....	V- 34.35.36 - 1
#35:	Telephone Hot-Line 800-Number .....	V- 34.35.36 - 2
#36:	Poster Campaign .....	V- 34.35.36 - 2
#37:	Responsiveness Summary / Listening Log .....	V- 37 - 1
#38:	Using the Computer, ... the Internet, ... Television and Radio ... as Technology-Enabled Responsiveness Tools ....	V- 38 - 1
	#38A: Telephones, FAX Machines, and E-Mail as a CP Technique .....	V- 38A - 1
	#38B: Bulletin Boards .....	V- 38B - 1
	#38C: Using your own Web Site .....	V- 38C - 1
	#38D: Using the PAIs’ Web Sites .....	V- 38D - 1

**CHAPTER VI: the Management of your CP Program ..... VI - 1 - 1**

Step 1: Assess Your CP Needs .....	VI - 2
1. Who Should Do the CP Needs Assessments and Why? .....	VI - 4
2. Some Notes About the “CP Needs Assessment Worksheets” .....	VI - 4
3. Using CP Worksheets A1 – A15 .....	VI - 5
Step 2: Examine Your CP Resources .....	VI - 8
Using CP Worksheet B .....	VI - 9
Step 3: Review Your CP Resources in Light of Your CP Needs .....	VI - 10
Step 4: Create Your CP Program .....	VI - 11
Step 5: Identify and Program Your CP Tasks .....	VI - 14



SHORELINE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
March 1, 2004 Regular Meeting  
VISITORS' AGENDA

Welcome to the meeting of the Shoreline Board of Directors. Your Visitors' Agenda parallels our official agenda. It has been prepared in narrative form so that you may have a better understanding of the topics under consideration.

All meetings are held in the board room of the Administrative Offices located at the Shoreline Center, 18560 1st Ave. N.E., unless otherwise noted. Committee of the Whole meetings are scheduled when needed. All board meetings are open to the public except when we go into an executive session to discuss personnel and legal matters, property acquisitions or sales, or matters of national defense. A schedule of future board meetings can be found on the last page of this agenda.

We would appreciate you signing the roster so that we may keep a record of attendance. Again--welcome, we hope you enjoy your visit.

**NOTE:** Anyone who wishes to audiotape or videotape the proceedings must make their request to the school board president prior to the meeting. Any activity of this type must be unobtrusive and cannot interfere with the conduct of the meeting in any way. If any person in attendance requests that they not be taped, it is desired that their request be honored.

\* \* \* \* \*

1. **Executive session** re legal and personnel matters
2. The meeting shall be opened by the **salute to the flag**.
3. **Roll call**
4. **Welcome and introduction** of visitors and community members.
5. **Approval of minutes**
6. **Adoption of Consent Agenda**  
The board has previewed these routine business items prior to the meeting. These items are limited to board discussion. Audience comments on these routine items will be received during the community input section.

It will be the recommendation of the superintendent that the board approve the consent agenda as presented.

- 6a. **Adoption of Policy #7270, Fund Raising and review of accompanying procedures**  
Policy #7270, District Fundraising, is a new policy. This policy was presented for first reading at the February 2 regular board meeting and is now being presented for adoption. The procedures are administrative and do not require board action. As stated previously, historically, school districts have used various fundraising strategies to supplement state, federal, and local funding, often to offer or enhance educational programs. Fundraising has taken various forms from bake sales to book sales to facilities rentals.

These fundraising activities are not Associated Student Body (ASB) activities even though students ultimately benefit from the funds raised and the proceeds go into the general fund, not into ASB accounts.

It will be the recommendation of the superintendent that the board adopt Policy #7270, District Fundraising, for inclusion in the Shoreline School District Policy Manual, effective March 1, 2004 as presented.

6b. Approval of financial statements of the district as of January 2004

The January 2004 financial statements of the district will be presented for approval.

6c. Approval of extended field trips

It will be the recommendation of the superintendent that the board approve the attached extended field trip forms as presented.

6d. Personnel

Personnel action presented for board consideration on recommendation of the superintendent is usually supported by a list or other attachment showing names, locations, effective dates, and other pertinent details.

6e. Approval of payroll and vouchers

A list of vouchers to be paid in the current period will be presented for board approval.

7. Comments from the community

Community members are invited to make comments on any topic (2 minutes per person, generally 20 minutes total). (If you have a question on a school-related item, you may be directed to the appropriate administrator who can be of assistance.) It should be understood the board cannot take action on any issue presented by members of the audience. In order to address the board, please raise your hand, and wait to be recognized by the board president and then stand and state your name for the record. The board asks that there be no comments regarding personnel matters. Personnel matters should be made confidentially to the board members and/or the superintendent by phone, in writing, or in person.

The board may approve up to a five-minute presentation during the Comments from the Community portion of the meeting if the information is relevant to the education of students or the operation of the Shoreline School District. A request, along with all written material, must be submitted to the board secretary one week prior to the meeting. If approved, the citizen(s) making the request will be informed by the board secretary.

You may also provide written input. To see that your letter is included as board correspondence, please send it to either Mrs. Patti Giboney, Board President, or Dr. James M. Welsh, Secretary of the Board/Superintendent, 18560 1st Ave. NE, Seattle, 98155. It must be received no later than Monday noon preceding the regularly scheduled board meeting. You will then receive a written response to your inquiry.

8. **Communications** which have been directed to the board will be reviewed.

9. **Presentations and recommendations of the superintendent to the board**

After a presentation, the board president shall inquire if any board member has any questions for the presenter. Following board discussion, the board president, at his/her discretion (due to time constraints, etc.), may acknowledge comments from audience members regarding the presentation. Questions or comments on issues not being presented will be considered out of order. The board will listen to the information and opinions offered by a member of the audience, but is under no obligation to take action or respond to questions.

9. **Presentations and recommendations of the superintendent to the board**

9a. Adoption of Resolution 2004-1, Support Person of the Year

**You are invited to attend a reception to honor the "Support Person of the Year." The reception will be held at 7:00 p.m. in the lobby of the Shoreline Center.**

The Shoreline School District honors classified staff members annually in part by naming a "Support Person of the Year" and designating March 8-12 as Support Staff Appreciation Week. In order to recognize the dedication and professionalism of our classified staff members, it would be appropriate to declare the week of March 8-12 as Shoreline Support Staff Appreciation Week.

It will be the recommendation of the superintendent that the board adopt Resolution No. 2004-1, 2004 Support Person of the Year, and declare the week of March 8-12, 2004 as Shoreline Support Staff Appreciation Week.

9b. First reading: District Instructional Materials Committee Recommendations

Ms. Linda Johnson, Associate Superintendent, will review the recommendations of the District Instructional Materials Committee (DIMC). These materials are being presented for first reading and will be presented for adoption at the March 15, 2004 regular board meeting. The materials will be available for review in the instruction department during the interim period.

9c. Approval of design and authorization to bid Spartan Gym Phase II

In August 2000, the Shoreline School District and City of Shoreline entered into a Joint Use Agreement for facilities with a vision to maximize public use of public facilities while maintaining them as sustainable assets. In September 2001, the School District and City of Shoreline executed the Spartan Gym Addendum to the Joint Use Agreement. This Addendum outlines roles and responsibilities regarding the joint operation and reinvestment in the Spartan Gym. Specifically, the City commits to pay the District up to \$650,000 for additional improvements to the building for multi-purpose rooms and related support facilities. The City is contracting with the School District to provide design, project management, and construction of this project.

It will be the recommendation of the superintendent that the board approve the design and authorize the bidding of the Spartan Gym Phase II Final Design with the understanding that with the bidding process completed, there needs to be a 10-15% contingency amount to cover any unforeseen items in the remodel process, and that the board will only authorize spending up to \$650,000.

10. **School Board Requested Discussion or Action**

10a. Report from the School Board

10b. New business

Board members will discuss any new business.

11. **Information for the board**

12. **Adjournment:** 9:30 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE BOARD MEETINGS**

All meetings will be held at the Shoreline Center unless otherwise identified.

\* \* \* \* \*

**NOTE** - At the beginning of each regularly scheduled board meeting beginning at 7:00 p.m., a 30 minute executive session has been scheduled.

The public session of the board meeting will not be convened until 7:30 p.m.

If an executive session is not needed, the meeting will be opened at 7:30 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

**2003-04 BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE**

- March 1 - regular board meeting, ~~7:00 p.m.~~ 6:30 p.m.  
**The starting time of the March 1 regular board meeting has been changed to 6:30 in order to conduct an executive session for personnel and legal matters. A reception to honor the "Support Person of the Year" will be held at 7:00 p.m. in the lobby of the Shoreline Center; you are invited to attend.**
- March 8 - Committee of the Whole meeting, 4:30 p.m.
- March 15 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- April 5 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- April 19 - Committee of the Whole meeting, 4:30 p.m.
- April 26 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- May 10 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- May 17 - Committee of the Whole meeting, 4:30 p.m.
- May 24 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- June 7 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.
- June 14 - Committee of the Whole meeting, 4:30 p.m.
- June 21 - regular board meeting, 7:00 p.m.