

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

Monday, February 3, 2014
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers – Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor Winstead and Councilmembers McGlashan, Hall, McConnell, and Roberts

ABSENT: Deputy Mayor Eggen and Councilmember Salomon

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Winstead.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Winstead led the flag salute and the City Clerk called the roll.

Upon motion by Councilmember McGlashan, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and carried 5-0, Deputy Mayor Eggen and Councilmember Salomon were excused from the meeting for personal reasons.

3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor Winstead reported that she, Deputy Mayor Eggen, and Councilmember Roberts attended the Association of Washington Cities Convention last week in Olympia. Governor Inslee addressed them during lunch, and they had an opportunity to meet with local legislators.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline, referred to the January 2014 issue of *CURRENTS*, which stated both the City and Ronald Wastewater District (RWD) saw the benefits of unifying the wastewater utility operations within City-provided services when the Agreement was signed in 2002. She questioned why the City never provided information to citizens about the agreement until problems came up in 2012. She said former RWD Commissioner, Art Wadekamper, recently told her that prior to signing the Agreement he was assured citizens would have an opportunity to vote on the assumption. She expressed her belief that the only fair way to settle the issue is to allow a vote.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Councilmember Hall moved approval of the agenda with an amendment to move Study Item 8(b) (Human Resource Position Salary Range Discussion) before Study Item 8(a) (Point Wells/Snohomish County Draft Scoping Comments Discussion). Councilmember McGlashan seconded the motion, which carried 5-0.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and carried 5-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:

- a) Minutes of Business Meeting of December 2, 2013**
Minutes of Business Meeting of January 6, 2014

8. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Human Resources Position Salary Range Discussion

Ms. Tarry announced that the City's current Human Resources (HR) Director will be retiring May 2, 2014. She recalled that, during the 2014 budget process, Council adopted a proviso to have the City Manager provide a recommendation to Council on the classification of the position prior to starting the recruitment process. She advised that the current classification for the position is Salary Range 70, which is 10% below the City's Operational Department Directors. She also presented data comparing the City of Shoreline to other jurisdictions, noting that the City's pay scale for the position is about 4% above the median. She reviewed the City's compensation policy and described the process that was used to review the classification, particularly noting organizational needs and market conditions. She also briefly reviewed the current and future roles and responsibilities of the position.

Ms. Tarry concluded her report by recommending the Council keep the HR Director position as a director position with its current salary range. She explained that the current classification was approved as part of the 2014 budget. If the Council's consensus is to maintain the current classification, no further action would be needed. However, if Council determines another classification would be more appropriate, they will need to take action to amend the salary tables with the revised classification.

Questions were raised about the HR Director's role in evaluating candidates for City positions. Ms. Tarry explained that, typically, the HR Director reviews applications to ensure that candidates meet the minimum qualifications. The HR Director also assists with the interview process, but the Department Directors make the final decision on who to hire. It was asked how many recruits the City will have in any given year. Ms. Tarry answered that there have been an average of 15 to 20 over the past five years. She noted the numbers were lower than normal given the recession, but recruitment has increased over the last two years. She agreed to provide a table to Council to illustrate the numbers.

The Council requested additional information about the type of experience the City will be looking for with the new HR Director. Ms. Tarry said the classification requires a minimum of six years of

progressive experience in human resources. She said she would be looking for a candidate with a substantial amount of experience serving either in the capacity of an HR Director or a high level organization that has a variety of human resource related issues. When asked if the required level of experience corresponds with that required of other department heads, Ms. Tarry answered affirmatively.

It was asked if the position would be advertised at the lower end of Salary Range 70. Ms. Tarry said the normal practice is to advertise the full salary range, but the City's policy is to start someone at Step 1 unless there is demonstrated experience that would support a higher recommendation.

A question was asked about how the number of City employees compares to other jurisdictions in the area. Ms. Tarry answered that the City's employee-to-population ratio tends to be in the mid to lower third compared to other jurisdictions. She explained that regardless of the size of a city organization, the skill set required to perform the functions necessary in the human resource arena are similar.

Councilmember Hall pointed out that the current salary range for the HR Director (Salary Range 70) is 56% greater than the highest paid position (Salary Range 52) that is supervised by the HR Director. He further pointed out that the Finance, Planning, Central Services and Community Services Managers are at Salary Range 59, which is still 20% higher than Salary Range 52. He reviewed that when the City was formed, the HR Director served as a senior leader in the City to create job classifications, compensation schedules, etc. However, the position is now more of an administrative internal services function. While the HR Department is responsible for the recruitment process, the ultimate decision on who to hire rests with the department heads. He referred to the comparable data provided in the Staff Report and noted that no comparable city had an HR Director position with two or fewer employees, and many had dual titles. He suggested it would have been more accurate to compare the position to that of an HR Manager. He recommended the item be brought back as an action item to reclassify the position to a lower salary range. Councilmember Roberts concurred and suggested the City would likely find that comparable positions in the private sector are paid substantially less. He recommended that Salary Range 62 might be a more appropriate classification and would match that of the Economic Development Manager, who has a similar employment role in the City.

Mayor Winstead and Councilmembers McConnell and McGlashan indicated support for the City Manager's recommendation. They cautioned against comparing city salaries with those of the private sector, since service organizations have different responsibilities. The position requires a specialized person, and the City won't be able to attract the right person if they do not offer a comparable salary. They also cautioned against setting the HR Director's salary range based on the salary ranges of peers or subordinates. It was discussed that in addition to counseling with other departments regarding situations with employees, the HR Director assists throughout the recruitment and interview processes and can identify potential red flags that other directors might not be looking for. The future acquisition of utilities will also require the HR Director to work with union contracts. The HR Director also plays a major role in developing camaraderie and community amongst the existing employees.

It was discussed that while the HR Director position would be included in the 2014 salary survey, the Council did not anticipate any new information would be available for a salary comparison. It was suggested that the Council could reconsider the salary range and classification for the position as part of the 2015 budget discussions.

Because Deputy Mayor Eggen and Councilmember Salomon were absent, the Council discussed whether to take action on the item tonight or defer it to the next meeting. Concern was expressed that if the Council postpones its decision for too long, there would be a significant overlap between when the current HR Director retires and the new HR Director comes on board.

After continued discussion, the Council agreed to postpone action on the item until February 10.

(b) Point Wells/Snohomish County Draft Scoping Comments Discussion

Ms. Tarry provided introductory comments and Rachael Markle, Planning and Community Development Director, presented the Staff Report. She provided an overview of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process, noting that Snohomish County would be the lead agency for the Point Wells environmental review. She announced that a Determination of Significance (DS) was issued on February 2, which means that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be required. A scoping notice was also issued on February 2, announcing two scoping meetings on February 18 and setting a deadline of March 3 for written and oral comments.

Ms. Markle referred the Council to the draft Scoping Comment Letter (Attachment A) that was prepared by staff and specifically noted the following:

- Economics was not included on Snohomish County's list because it is no longer a category that is covered under SEPA. The City's concerns related to economics could be addressed under a different category such as utilities, public facilities, etc.
- Neighborhoods were not recognized on Snohomish County's list as an element of the EIS, either. Staff will contact Snohomish County to discuss the possibility of addressing neighborhood impacts as part of the land use category.
- Snohomish County is scoping environmental health, and staff suggests that the City's comments related to hazardous waste should be moved to that category. This change would fit more with the impacts the City is trying to identify, mainly remediation of soil and the affects of potential release into the air of heavy metals, etc.
- The City may wish to request mitigation funding from the developer to assist with third party review of technical reports about environmental health, air quality, public services and utilities to help ensure that the health and safety of the City's residents are adequately addressed.
- The City may wish to partner with the Town of Woodway, which has many of the same concerns, particularly regarding environmental health.
- Transportation is a significant concern, and the City will begin a Transportation Corridor Study (TCS) next week. The TCS will serve as the analysis for the transportation element of Snohomish County's EIS, and will include locally-derived mitigation.

Ms. Markle summarized that while no formal action is required by the Council at this time, staff is seeking feedback regarding the draft Scoping Comment Letter. Once the letter has been finalized, it will be shared with those who attended the pre-scoping workshops to provide a basis for them to work from when preparing their own scoping comments. The letter will also be shared with the Town of Woodway. It will be submitted to Snohomish County on or before the deadline of March 3.

Further clarification was requested about how impacts to neighborhoods would be addressed. Ms. Markle advised that although “neighborhoods” is not a specific category, the land use category includes items related to neighborhoods. The City’s comments regarding potential impacts to neighborhoods would remain in the letter, with a request that they be studied as part of the land use category or that a neighborhood category be added.

It was pointed out that the City Council received a comment letter from the president of *Save Richmond Beach* indicating that the draft Scoping Comment Letter provides a comprehensive list of the issues the organization wants to have considered as part of the project’s environmental review.

It was asked if the draft letter has been shared with officials from the Town of Woodway. Ms. Markle answered that the letter was shared with Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway as soon as it was issued as part of the Council’s Staff Report. In addition, she met with the Town of Woodway’s Planning Director to discuss common interests. She noted that the idea to ask for mitigation money to help with third party review came from the Town of Woodway’s Planning Director. She agreed that it is important that the two jurisdictions work together.

Councilmembers agreed that the Scoping Comment Letter should also include a request that Snohomish County consider how the Point Wells project would impact the two new light rail stations that are slated for 2023. Ms. Markle agreed that light rail stations could be included in the letter. It was noted that although the two projects are independent of each other, they will move forward concurrently and there are potential links.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:18 p.m., Mayor Winstead declared the meeting adjourned.

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk