CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, October 22, 2012 7:00 p.m. Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall 17500 Midvale Avenue North

- PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Eggen, Councilmember Hall, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Winstead, Councilmember Salomon, and Councilmember Roberts
- 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. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Julie Underwood, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

No Council reports were given.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

a) Afia Menke, Shoreline, stated that the City needs to find ways to fund city-wide non-environmental grassroots organizations that aren't necessarily affiliated with a particular neighborhood.

b) Jack Maleck, Shoreline, representing the Council of Neighborhoods, expressed support for the existing mini-grant program but felt the requirements and application process could be modified to include smaller neighborhoods and possibly other groups.

c) Arthur Peach, Shoreline, expressed support for the mini-grant program as-is, adding that his neighborhood can accomplish so much with so little.

October 22, 2012 Council Business Meeting

d) Greg Logan, Shoreline, expressed concern about the recently adopted tree ordinance and the impacts it is having on his property with regard to hazardous trees, noise, and safety.

Ms. Underwood commented that she will follow up with Mr. Logan.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Roberts pulled item 7(a) Minutes of Special Meeting of September 24, 2012, from the agenda. Upon motion by Councilmember McConnell, seconded by Councilmember Winstead and carried 7-0, the amended agenda was approved.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and carried 7-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

(a) Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of October 1, 2012

(b) Approval of Expenses and Payroll as of October 12, 2012 in the amount of \$1,213,167.73 as specified in the following detail:

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	*Pay	vroll and Benefits:					
$\underbrace{(\text{EF}) (\text{PR}) (\text{AP})}_{9/16/12 \cdot 9/29/12} 10/5/2012 47213 \cdot 47407 12082 \cdot 12110 51635 \cdot 51641 \frac{$408,711.62}{$408,711.62} \\ * \text{Accounts Payable Claims:} \\ \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Expense} \\ \text{Register} \\ \text{Dated} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{Check Number} \\ (\text{Begin}) \\ \text{Number} \\ \text{Paid} \\ \hline \\ 10/1/2012 51484 51485 \$100,123.78 \\ 10/4/2012 51486 51486 \$1,822.03 \\ 10/4/2012 51486 51486 \$1,822.03 \\ 10/4/2012 51487 51495 \$72,739.51 \\ 10/4/2012 51516 51512 \$32,077.74 \\ 10/4/2012 51516 51522 \$5,050.38 \\ 10/4/2012 51518 51518 (\$3,492.00) \\ 10/4/2012 51518 51518 (\$3,492.00) \\ 10/4/2012 51523 51523 \$3,3492.00 \\ 10/4/2012 51524 51538 \$2239,680.70 \\ 10/4/2012 51533 51577 \$91,659.54 \\ 10/10/2012 51578 51589 \$19,821.58 \\ 10/10/2012 51590 51601 \$2,755.06 \\ 10/10/2012 51602 51622 \$20,674.19 \\ \end{array}$		-	Payment	EFT	•		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Period	Date				Paid
*Accounts Payable Claims: *Accounts Payable Claims: $ \frac{Expense}{Dated} Check Number (End) Check Amount Paid (End) $ 10/1/2012 51484 51485 \$100,123.78 10/4/2012 51486 51486 \$1,822.03 10/4/2012 51486 51486 \$1,822.03 10/4/2012 515487 51495 \$772,739.51 10/4/2012 51516 51522 \$5,050.38 10/4/2012 51516 51522 \$5,050.38 10/4/2012 51518 51518 ($\$3,492.00$) 10/4/2012 51518 51518 ($\$3,492.00$) 10/4/2012 51523 51523 \$3,492.00 10/4/2012 51524 51538 \$239,680.70 10/4/2012 51553 51577 \$91,659.54 10/10/2012 51578 51589 \$19,821.58 10/10/2012 51578 51589 \$19,821.58 10/10/2012 51590 51601 \$2,755.06 10/10/2012 51602 51622 \$20,674.19				(EF)	(PR)	(AP)	
*Accounts Payable Claims: Expense Register Dated Check Number (Begin) Check Number (End) Amount Paid 10/1/2012 51484 51485 \$100,123.78 10/4/2012 51486 51486 \$1,822.03 10/4/2012 51487 51495 \$72,739.51 10/4/2012 51486 51515 \$32,077.74 10/4/2012 51516 51522 \$5,050.38 10/4/2012 51518 \$1518 (\$3,492.00) 10/4/2012 51523 \$1523 \$3,492.00 10/4/2012 51539 51552 \$215,045.66 10/10/2012 51578 51589 \$19,821.58 10/10/2012 51590 51601 \$2,755.06 10/10/2012 51602 51622 \$20,674.19	-	9/16/12-9/29/12	10/5/2012	47213-47407	12082-12110	51635-51641	\$408,711.62
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							\$408,711.62
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	*Ace	counts Payable Clai	ims:				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Expense	Check Number	Check	Amount
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				Register	(Begin)	Number	Paid
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				Dated		(End)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/1/2012	51484	51485	\$100,123.78
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/4/2012	51486	51486	\$1,822.03
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/4/2012	51487	51495	\$72,739.51
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/4/2012	51496	51515	\$32,077.74
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/4/2012	51516	51522	\$5,050.38
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				10/4/2012	51518	51518	(\$3,492.00)
10/4/20125153951552\$215,045.6610/10/20125155351577\$91,659.5410/10/20125157851589\$19,821.5810/10/20125159051601\$2,755.0610/10/20125160251622\$20,674.19				10/4/2012	51523	51523	\$3,492.00
10/10/20125155351577\$91,659.5410/10/20125157851589\$19,821.5810/10/20125159051601\$2,755.0610/10/20125160251622\$20,674.19				10/4/2012	51524	51538	\$239,680.70
10/10/20125157851589\$19,821.5810/10/20125159051601\$2,755.0610/10/20125160251622\$20,674.19				10/4/2012	51539	51552	\$215,045.66
10/10/20125159051601\$2,755.0610/10/20125160251622\$20,674.19				10/10/2012	51553	51577	\$91,659.54
10/10/2012 51602 51622 \$20,674.19				10/10/2012	51578	51589	\$19,821.58
10/10/2012 51602 51622 \$20,674.19				10/10/2012	51590	51601	\$2,755.06
				10/10/2012	51602	51622	-
				10/10/2012	51623	51634	\$2,087.93
10/12/2012 51642 51642 \$918.01				10/12/2012	51642	51642	,

DRAFT

\$804,456.11

(c) Authorize the City Manager to Execute the 2013 Janitorial Services Contract with Allbright Floor Care for City Facilities in the Amount of \$197,457.12

(d) Approval of PAWS Contract

(e) Adoption of Ordinance No. 648 Assigning Open Record Hearings for Street Vacations to the Hearing Examiner

8. STUDY ITEMS

(a) 2013 Department Budget Presentations

Bob Hartwig, Administrative Services Director, outlined the proposed revenues and expenditures for the 2013 City budget as well as the budget review and public hearing schedules. He outlined the format of the budget book and began by discussing personnel cost changes. He noted that there is a 2.7% increase in compensation (salary and benefits). He displayed the FTE comparison and changes in staffing from 2008-2013,

Debbie Tarry, Assistant City Manager, outlined the proposed budgets of the City Council and City Manager's Office, which totals \$1.5 million (Communications, Intergovernmental Relations, Economic Development) and the Community Services Division (Human Services, Customer Response Team, Emergency Management, Neighborhoods, Code Enforcement, and Animal Control) which totals \$1.49 million.

She noted that the Neighborhoods budget contains the \$20,000 for neighborhood mini-grants and the amount used by each neighborhood has varied over the years. She discussed the request from Shoreline/Woodway/Edmonds/Lake Forest Park (SWEL) Timebank. Deputy Mayor Eggen suggested the City look at eastside cities to see how they fund the SWEL Timebank. Councilmember Salomon noted that there is some Council of Neighborhoods concern about considering applications from other groups. He said he didn't give a statement for or against funding other groups but he is interested in increasing competition amongst applicants. Councilmember Roberts wanted to know how the business mini-grant program would work so the Council is clear and consistent among programs. Responding to Councilmember Winstead, Ms. Tarry said that City staff will come back to the Council in late November regarding the criteria for the business mini-grant program.

Councilmember Hall inquired why the budget for code enforcement shows a reduction in FTE from 2.48 to 2.15. Mr. Hartwig replied that it is based on the reallocation of existing staff. He stated that last year there was a 60-40 split and for this budget it's a 52-48 split. He clarified that these positions are in the same program and there is no change in level of service.

Ms. Tarry outlined the City Attorney Division (legal services, prosecuting attorney, including domestic violence) budget which totaled \$585,000. She highlighted the Human Resources budget which totaled \$426,000. She also discussed the Criminal Justice (jail, court, public

defender) budget which totals \$2.1 million. She stated that there haven't been any decisions about increases for arraignment for the public defender.

Councilmember Hall said he agrees with taking a conservative approach and only supporting the basic services the voters approved. Deputy Mayor Eggen stated he generally agrees but is concerned about Shoreline operating in a fair manner and responding to the needs of defendants. Councilmember Winstead noted that the City doesn't have the funds to increase the budget for the public defender arraignments. Councilmember Roberts wondered if there would be savings in court costs by funding counsel at arraignments because defendants wouldn't need to go back to court. Ian Sievers, City Attorney, replied that the review hasn't been completed so it is yet to be determined. Councilmember Salomon felt the Council should wait towards the end of the budget process before adding anything new.

Continuing, Ms. Tarry noted that the largest portion of the criminal justice budget is related to jail. She noted that there is a lower than usual jail usage projected for 2013. Responding to Councilmember Salomon, Ms. Tarry said the hope is that video hearings are decreasing jail days, thus lowering costs.

Shawn Ledford, Police Chief, outlined the proposed police budget and provided a detailed breakdown of expenditures. He noted that the total budget is \$10.7 million and it represents a 1.4% increase in salaries/benefits. He stated that there are 52 FTEs. He gave a 2011 cost comparison and noted the cost of officers and cost per capita. He broke down the contract, non-contract costs, and efficiencies in the department.

Councilmember Roberts inquired if the budget includes keeping the storefronts and Chief Ledford responded that it is still in the discussion phase. Chief Ledford said there could be efficiencies by consolidating the storefronts at City and then adding a mobile storefront to increase visibility in neighborhoods. Councilmember Salomon confirmed that officers aren't at storefronts full time, and part of the reason they are there is to supervise the volunteers and answer questions. He stated that he wants to keep the same amount of service and possibly expand to areas that they can improve. Councilmember Salomon inquired if there is a need for police officer to supervise, to which Chief Ledford replied that there should be a person who has knowledge of crime statistics, crime prevention, and the community. Councilmember Winstead encouraged the City staff to reach out to the neighborhood associations on this idea.

Ms. Underwood responded that the effectiveness of consolidating the storefronts will be evaluated by Chief Ledford as well as by a focus group of all stakeholders. She briefly discussed the possibility of a mobile storefront unit.

Councilmember McConnell noted the possibility of cost savings by consolidating the storefronts at City Hall, thereby discontinuing lease agreements. She commented that the storefronts are primarily staffed by volunteers, so the cost is in the renting of office space. She felt that all options should be evaluated to determine the best approach for neighborhood policing.

Deputy Mayor Eggen stated that having a mobile storefront is interesting, but Ridgecrest neighbors are concerned about moving their storefront to City Hall. He added that some savings could be realized by finding a cheaper location to rent.

Councilmember Salomon stated that a key issue raised is the potential cost savings achieved by not leasing the two locations anymore. He pointed out that budget decisions should be driven by data, not based on feelings. He said he is more concerned that people are actually safe.

Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS), provided an outline of the proposed PRCS budget, totaling almost \$5 million. He noted that PRCS is experiencing a stable revenue trend, although recreation facility rentals are down about \$10,000. He discussed crime prevention through environmental planning of the parks which will be done in 2013. He noted this will lead to revisions in the parks, which will increase the safety of its users.

Councilmember Roberts inquired about the impact of the PRCS Department's assumption of responsibility for right-of-way tree regulations. Mr. Deal replied that the PRCS Board is still evaluating it and will present a more detailed report to the Council after their retreat. He noted that the PRCS board meeting in December will focus on trees. He confirmed with Mr. Deal that the \$10,000 dollars funding was still in the Public Works budget.

Councilmember Hall discussed the City's demographics playing a role in parks/facilities usage. He explained that this is a vision issue as opposed to a budget issue. Mr. Deal also noted that there has been a downward trend nationwide in adult recreation participation.

Rachael Markle, Planning and Community Development (PCD) Director, outlined the PCD budget totaling \$2.6 million. She discussed the programs throughout the department, revenue trends, permits, land use, and plan check fees. She noted that there has been a \$250,000 increase for light rail planning.

Deputy Mayor Eggen and Councilmember Salomon commented on the plans examination position. Ms. Markle replied that there wouldn't be any physical revision to the department; the employee would be examining plans and be paid for it instead of using an outside contract. Deputy Mayor Eggen questioned the \$250,000 increase for light rail planning and Ms. Markle noted that it would be contracted out with \$100,000 being utilized for the environmental impact statement, enhanced public outreach, studies, market analysis, and design work.

Councilmember Salomon verified that there was a competitive bidding process for the light rail planning consultants. He also verified with Ms. Markle that there would be 5,000 hours spent on comprehensive plan amendments. She further explained that there is one (1) FTE devoted to the comprehensive plan and the rest relates to other employees' time such as public meetings, Planning Commission meetings, proofing the plan, and so forth. However, she said the 5,000 hours is only an estimate and could be refined by the long-range planners.

Mr. Hartwig outlined the proposed budget for Administrative Services Division and Citywide budget totaling \$6.2 million with 24.2 FTEs. He noted that the FTEs are increased based on the transfer of four (4) employees from fleet and facilities. He outlined the citywide budget changes

and discussed the decreases and increases from the previous year's budget. He reviewed the potential unemployment claims and reserve policy contingencies.

Councilmember Hall inquired about the reserve policy for operational contingency. Patti Rader, Budget Manager, explained that the City's revenue stabilization fund is the fund that uses the calculation based on the economically sensitive revenues. The operational contingency, she pointed out is two percent of the City's budgeted revenues.

Mr. Hartwig confirmed for Deputy Mayor Eggen that all of the vehicles in the City's fleet are included in the vehicle replacement costs in the citywide fund. Responding to Councilmember Salomon, Mr. Hartwig said that the unemployment claims are paid with a transfer from the General Fund; then the claims are paid out when the City is billed by the State.

Councilmember Roberts asked for responses from the City staff relating to: 1) understanding what kind of reductions in state revenue might occur; 2) finding a way to encourage more permits for minor maintenance; and 3) ways to increase revenue from annual pet licenses.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Scott Passey, City Clerk