

**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, November 15, 2010  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue North

**PRESENT:** Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Hall, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Roberts, Councilmember Scott, and Councilmember Winstead

**ABSENT:** None

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

At 7:00 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Mayor McGlashan, who presided.

**2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

Mayor McGlashan led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

**3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT & FUTURE AGENDAS**

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

**4. COUNCIL REPORTS**

Councilmember Winstead reported on the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) Public Issues Committee.

Mayor McGlashan thanked Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Director Dick Deal and Recreation Superintendent Lynn Cheeney and their staff for the Veteran's Day event held at City Hall.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Upon motion by Councilmember Eggen, seconded by Councilmember Winstead and unanimously carried, the agenda was approved.**

**6. ACTION ITEMS: PUBLIC HEARING**

- (a) Public hearing to receive citizens' comments on the 2011 Proposed Budget

Mayor McGlashan opened the public hearing.

Debbie Tarry provided a brief staff report, detailing the changes proposed by staff to reduce certain operating budget items.

a) Bob Lohmeyer, Seattle, thanked the City for its support of the Senior Center over the years and urged the Council to support the City Manager recommended 2011 budget.

b) Loretta Gardner, Shoreline, commented on the services at the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center and urged the Council to support the recommended budget.

c) Arthur Peach, Shoreline, stated that the City is not upholding City values by reducing the 30% "safety net fund" and suggested creating an appendix chapter in the budget that shows the distribution of levy lid lift and car tab tax revenues.

d) John Chang, Shoreline, on behalf of the Shoreline Sister City Association (SCA), spoke about the importance of the sister city program and urged the Council to fund the program in 2011.

e) Robert Ransom, Shoreline, thanked the Council and the public for Proposition No. 1 and noted the many services this funding will cover, including cultural services, police, traffic patrol, and parks.

f) Boni Biery, Shoreline, asked the Council to seriously consider the value of the tree canopy in the City, adding that the City experiences financial losses when the tree canopy is diminished.

g) Carolyn Walker, Shoreline, commented on the projected City salaries and benefits, which reflect a 27% salary increase and an 18% increase in benefits by 2016. She asked that they both be reconsidered.

Mr. Olander responded to public comments and clarified policies related to the Revenue Stabilization Fund, Sister Cities Program, and salaries and benefits.

Councilmember Eggen stated that the Economic Development Manager gave a presentation in which he stated that the City should work closely with the City's Korean community. With that, he felt it is worthwhile to continue funding the Sister Cities Program. He also responded to Ms. Walker, stating that the City has a policy regarding staff compensation which is reviewed in the annual budget process.

Councilmember Roberts stated that the budget reflects the City's values. For the most part he said the budget reflects what Shoreline voters said through Proposition No. 1. However, he expressed concern that the budget is not sustainable in the long-term as it relies more and more

on property taxes. He said the revenue system should be reformed so we move away from 1% revenue limitations and move toward more sales tax revenue. He also felt the City should have some funds to promote general businesses in Shoreline. He concluded that this budget doesn't change the way the City does business.

Deputy Mayor Hall agreed that Proposition No. 1 doesn't provide long-term financial sustainability. He discussed the importance of tax reform, economic development, finding efficiencies, simplifying the zoning code to encourage investment, maintaining existing infrastructure, and promoting business by enhancing outside organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce.

Councilmember Scott agreed with much of what's been said and communicated that the citizens have shown great faith in this Council. He encouraged celebrating efficiency and said the City will continue to be efficient while struggling with long-term challenges. He communicated that the City should take pride with the passage of Proposition No. 1 and the Council will continue to do what needs to be done, demonstrating how tax dollars are being spent. He pointed out that the recent jail contract saves over \$700,000 and he is encouraged that the citizens understood the efforts of the City when they went to the polls.

Councilmember Winstead agreed with the previous comments. She noted that the staff accepted and executed the recommendations of Long-Term Financial Planning Citizens Advisory Committee. The efficiencies, educating the public, and the transparency with City spending were important to the process and led to the passage of Proposition No. 1. She noted that State mandates constrict the City and thanked the staff and citizens for their questions and support.

Councilmember McConnell noted that wages and benefits are the largest part of the City expenditures, so it would be great to hear from citizens if they feel the staff is overpaid. She felt that having wages and benefits in the middle of the range based on comparable cities is good because Shoreline is regarded as one of the nation's best cities.

Mr. Olander noted that the goal of having competitive wages and benefits is to attract and retain quality employees. Additionally, having 25% fewer employees than comparable cities mean further savings and efficiencies. However, operations and efficiencies can always be improved, he said. He noted that the Aurora Corridor is Shoreline's major economic stimulus and it will help the City in the future. He highlighted past projects like the North City Business District, transit development, and other opportunities the City will look at in the future.

Mayor McGlashan closed the public hearing.

## 7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### (a) Apprenticeship Utilization Program

Eric Bratton, Management Analyst, provided a brief staff report regarding the proposal to include apprenticeship utilization requirements in the City's public works contracts. There was a proposed substitute ordinance by Deputy Mayor Hall and Councilmember Winstead, he said. He

noted that apprenticeship utilization requirements are waived under certain conditions and the amended ordinance changes the threshold from \$500,000 to \$1 million.

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment.

a) Lee Newgent, Seattle, stated that a majority of the costs for this program are paid by the individual apprentices/members, and apprenticeships and journeyman are two classifications which create a competitive workforce.

b) Bruce Kelley, Mountlake Terrace, stated that he understands the value in apprenticeship utilization and would be happy to help clarify any misunderstood issues.

Deputy Mayor Hall expressed strong support for this goal, although it has the potential to make the bid process more difficult for some firms in the future. He noted that his proposal maintains a 15% requirement based on the total number of project hours. He said the burden of ensuring that minorities and women are recruited should fall on the agencies partnering with the City.

Councilmember Eggen commented that the initial proposal was to have some goals for minority and women's representation and he was told that it's not legal. However, he thought he heard something different from Mr. Newgent. Mr. Newgent responded that his organization has \$15 billion in work under project labor agreements in the Puget Sound area and they have maintained a 15% apprenticeship utilization requirement. Of that amount, he explained that 20% shall be minority compliance hours and 20% of that shall be female hours. He noted that the minority compliance has gone well, but the female hours have never been reached. The agreements have never been challenged in court and are legal, he noted. He also stated that Sound Transit, Brightwater, and the Port of Seattle all have the same standard language for their agreements.

Mr. Olander inquired if this is limited to project labor agreements, to which Mr. Newgent responded in the affirmative. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, confirmed for Mr. Olander that the City doesn't work with project labor agreements. Mr. Sievers said apprenticeship utilization implies that the City uses the information as a basis for approving contracts; however, the City cannot legally use a quota in making a selection on the contractor itself.

Mr. Olander asked Mr. Newgent how successful the apprenticeship program has been in recruiting minorities and women. Mr. Newgent replied that the minority ratio went from 12% to 30% and the highest for females was 10%. He said they are always in compliance for minority males and they meet a "good faith effort" rating when it comes to female recruitment.

Councilmember Eggen stated that it might be legal for the work Mr. Newgent is talking about but not with the City's Public Works contracts. Mr. Sievers confirmed Councilmember Eggen's statement and said the City has affirmative action goals for the city workforce and it can promote that goal to increase the percentage of minority hires, but when the City awards a contract, it is strictly controlled by bidding laws and cannot be based on race or sex.

Councilmember Roberts supported the idea of apprenticeship utilization and believed the City of Seattle has these goals in their ordinances. Mr. Sievers commented on the difference between

stating it as a goal and formally adopting it as part of the purchasing policies. Mr. Olander stated that numeric goals that cannot be enforced could cause problems if included in contracts themselves, but they could be added to the purchasing policies.

Noting that "good faith" requirement language is fairly broad, Councilmember Roberts wondered how such language has been interpreted in other cities if they cannot meet the requirement. Mr. Bratton replied that if apprentices cannot be found in a given area, the City would have to demonstrate they have tried to meet the requirement.

Councilmember Roberts said he would support the ordinance as it is written and said it is a Shoreline value to support building trades. He noted that the City should encourage people to enter the workforce through a variety of ways.

Councilmember Winstead noted that while the apprenticeship utilization program is a way to help the workforce, she would hate to see companies put in a bad situation if they cannot meet the requirements. She expressed support for the measure. Mayor McGlashan stated that he is currently undecided at this point.

#### RECESS

**At 8:30 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a five minute break. The meeting reconvened at 8:38 p.m.**

#### **(b) Animal Control Update and PAWS Contract Discussion**

John Norris, Management Analyst, provided the staff report on the proposed PAWS two-year contract extension. He noted that the most relevant issue concerning the contract is the rate. The City staff recommends a rate increase of \$15.00 per animal to \$160.00. There would be two officers providing service within the City, he stated. He added that the cost is a big concern, specifically the estimated net cost for 2010 and 2011. He then reviewed the next steps. Mr. Olander highlighted that the PAWS contract is working well and is much more convenient for residents.

Deputy Mayor Hall expressed concerns for long-term planning and felt the City could provide more effective and accountable animal control services in-house. Additionally, he felt that the sheltering charges are high.

Councilmember Eggen concurred and inquired how the amount not to exceed \$80,000 would work. Mr. Norris responded that there is a contract clause that states when there is \$7,000 left to bill, PAWS would then notify the City and the City could decide whether to amend the contract. Councilmember Eggen discussed an email from Debbie Kellogg regarding a serious dog bite injury at Hamlin Park and confirmed with Mr. Norris that the King County Animal Control (KCAC) Enhanced Services Officer did an investigation because this occurred on a weekend.

Councilmember Winstead called for a point of order, noting that the discussion about this specific incident was not germane to the topic. After brief discussion, there was consensus to continue discussion of Councilmember Eggen's issue.

Councilmember Scott felt that timeliness of response is one specific issue concerning this incident that is related to the contract. Mr. Norris stated that KCAC responded to this incident in a timely manner and the investigation is ongoing. Dick Deal, PRCS Director, pointed out that the response to the incident was timely; however, KCAC was not as timely in reporting back to City staff. Mr. Olander summarized that the timeliness of the response was reasonable and the investigation has been initiated, but staff was not involved in the feedback aspect.

Councilmember Winstead stated that she is glad the City is using PAWS sheltering service because she was skeptical going with the King County model. However, it will need to be reevaluated as the City moves towards the end of the contract.

Councilmember Roberts agreed that the City needs to be focused on getting the best value for its dollar and possibly moving to have in-house animal control services. He supported PAWS and confirmed with Mr. Norris that the contract extension is in the proposed budget. At Councilmember Roberts' request, Mr. Norris said he would contact PAWS regarding the percentage of lost animals that have been reclaimed by their original owners and report back to Council.

Councilmember Winstead added that animal licensing is an important piece of this contract and urged all citizens to license their pets.

Councilmember Eggen stated that it makes sense that stray animals are brought in are paid for under the contract. He verified that the City would pay for dogs that have puppies that are brought to PAWS for adoption.

Mr. Deal further explained to Mayor McGlashan about Animal Control Officer Meyer's off-leash enforcement service. He noted that once Mr. Meyers completes his necessary documentation he will be utilized in Shoreline. Mr. Norris then outlined leash law enforcement and the differentiation between ticketing and warnings. Mayor McGlashan stated that Mr. Meyers has been with the City for two years and the number of warnings for non-licensed pets needs to be reduced and reverted into tickets.

Councilmember Winstead verified that Mr. Meyers will be under a separate contract with the City, outside of the two KCAC Animal Control Officers that are in this animal control service contract.

## **8. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**At 9:13 p.m. Mayor McGlashan announced that the Council would recess into an Executive Session for a period of 30 minutes to discuss litigation as prescribed in RCW 42.30.110(I)(i).**

**At 9:40 p.m. Mayor McGlashan announced that the Executive Session would be extended for 30 minutes. At 10:10 p.m. the Executive Session concluded and the Special Meeting reconvened.**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**At 10:11 p.m. Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.**

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk

**This page intentionally left blank.**