

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP DINNER MEETING

Monday, March 22, 2010
6:00 p.m.

Conference Room 301 - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue N.

PRESENT: Mayor Keith McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Will Hall, and Councilmembers Chris Eggen, Doris McConnell, Chris Roberts, Terry Scott, and Shari Tracey

ABSENT: none

STAFF: Bob Olander, City Manager; Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager; Eric Bratton, Management Analyst; Patti Rader, Finance Manager; Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director; Mark Relph, Public Works Director; Rachael Markle, Assistant Planning & Development Services Director; Ted Stensland, Shoreline Police; Scott Passey, City Clerk

GUESTS: EMC Research: Andrew Thibault, Principal; and Dominick Martin, Research Analyst

Mayor McGlashan called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

Andrew Thibault, EMC Research, reported on the results of the recent telephone survey which polled Shoreline residents about the issues facing them. The survey covered current City services, resources, and questions about a possible ballot measure to raise the property tax levy rate to fund City services. He explained that 500 telephone interviews were conducted, which lasted on average 15 minutes each, and the overall margin of error was plus or minus 4.4 points at the 95% confidence interval. His report included the following points:

- Residents are very optimistic about the overall direction of the City (67% right direction), but most (65%) do not think the economic is going to improve over the net year.
- Most residents (65%) agree that they trust the City to spend their tax dollars responsibly. About one quarter (27%) do not trust the City to spend their tax dollars responsibly.
- A strong majority (59%) disagree that there is room to cut back public safety funding while maintaining adequate police protection and safe neighborhoods. One third (32%) agree.

- About half (48%) disagree that there is room to cut back on maintenance and operations funding for parks and still have safe and well-maintained parks. Just over one third (37%) agree.
- “Safety” is a key theme in residents’ top priorities for City spending.
 - “Preserving neighborhood police patrols” is residents’ top priority.
 - Safe playgrounds and safe parks and trails are also top priorities.
- A strong majority of residents found all of the information about why the ballot measure is needed and how the funds might be used to be important.
 - The most important information focused on preserving parks for the future, having a dedicated revenue source for public safety, and on the City’s efforts to reduce costs and assure efficiency.
- Support for both options is higher in the 2010 General than the 2010 Primary.
- Support for Option B (total levy mil rate of \$1.30) is 6-8 points higher than support for Option A (total levy mil rate of \$1.40).
- Support for both options increases when respondents are told the average cost of the levy.
- The King County sales tax measure reduces support for Option A by 2-3 points and for Option B by 1-2 points.
- A public safety-only measure (no parks funding) would likely reduce overall support for the levy.

During the presentation, Councilmembers asked questions and commented about the survey results and the likelihood of success of the various levy options, including levy amounts and timeframes. The Council, staff, and consultants discussed various approaches to the messaging and the need to emphasize that a levy increase would be earmarked for operations, not capital expenditures. There was also discussion about the need to train Councilmembers on the difference between neutrality and advocacy in order to ensure the City complies with State statutes related to campaigns and ballot measures.

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Scott Passey, City Clerk