

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL

### SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Monday, November 5, 2001  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Jepsen, Deputy Mayor Hansen, Councilmembers Grossman, Gustafson, Lee, Montgomery and Ransom

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Jepsen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Jepsen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present with the exceptions of Councilmembers Grossman and Montgomery, who arrived later in the meeting.

(a) Proclamation of High School Boys Tennis Week

Mayor Jepsen proclaimed the week of November 4, 2001 as High School Boys Tennis Week in Shoreline in recognition of the Shorewood High School Boys Tennis Team winning the Western Conference South Division Tennis title. He presented the proclamation to the team and their coach, Corliss Liekkio.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Steve Burkett introduced Interim Public Works Director Art Maronek.

Mr. Burkett noted a request from the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Arts Council that City Council adopt a "One-Percent-for-the-Arts Ordinance." He also mentioned a survey form that staff prepared to gain Council input on the type and frequency of reports it receives.

Concluding, Mr. Burkett announced that the City again received the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award from the Government Finance Officers Association. He congratulated Finance Director Debra Tarry and her staff. He presented a certificate of recognition to Senior Budget Analyst Patti Rader.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom reported that the Jail Advisory Committee has still not met. He said King County continues to propose jail services cost increases that are substantially higher than those it presented to the committee in May. He questioned the amount of City input into the determination of jail services costs.

Mr. Burkett explained that the cities that contract with the County for jail services are negotiating jointly with the County. The cities believe that the County cannot legally terminate its contract, as it has proposed. He said the cities propose to accept the rates the County has proposed for 2002 provided that the County extends the current contract through 2002 and that negotiations continue. He noted that a subcommittee of city managers from the effected cities is, meanwhile, exploring other alternatives (e.g., some cities contract for jail services in eastern Washington). He explained that the jail services costs in the 2002 Proposed Budget reflect the rates the County has proposed. He said staff will update Council as the negotiations with the County continue.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Mr. Burkett said the current contract for jail services states that the County must present proposed rate changes to the Jail Advisory Committee. He mentioned the County's failure to meet this requirement as one of the reasons the County cannot now impose new rates.

Councilmember Grossman arrived at 6:51 p.m.

Councilmember Gustafson reported on the November 1 Puget Sound Salmon Forum.

Councilmember Grossman reported his participation in a group the Shoreline School District formed to address underutilized District properties in Shoreline and Lake Forest Park.

Mayor Jepsen discussed the BrightWater facilities siting process. He said King County Executive Ron Sims and Snohomish County Executive Bob Drewel have recommended that the process continue with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) including the Edmonds Unocal site and the Route 9 site. He said a majority of the Siting Advisory Committee voted October 25 to add the Point Wells and Gravel Quarry sites to the EIS. He explained that the opinions of both the majority and the minority will accompany the recommendation to the King County Council for its consideration in December.

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) Alan Balmforth, 1865 NE 171<sup>st</sup> Street, said he is circulating a petition which states that the base density calculation in the Development Code threatens low-density neighborhoods by lowering the R-6 standard of 7,200 square feet per dwelling unit to 5,445 square feet per dwelling unit.

(b) Dorothy Wilson, 1840 NE 171<sup>st</sup> Street, requested that Council pass an amendment to the Development Code to eliminate the loophole created by the base density calculation.

# DRAFT

(c) Bill Bettencourt, 1854 NE 171<sup>st</sup> Street, discussed Shoreline residents' input about the base density calculation at the November 1 Planning Commission meeting and the response of Commission Chair Marlin Gabbert.

(d) Bob Whitely, 1411 N 200<sup>th</sup> Street, noted comments at previous Council meetings on the reduction of accidents by the elimination of two-way left-turn lanes. He questioned why the City created a two-way left-turn lane on N 185<sup>th</sup> Street and why the City proposes to create one on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE if such lanes are so hazardous.

Mayor Jepsen said Council will address the base density calculation in R-6 zones during its November 13 meeting.

Continuing, Mayor Jepsen asserted that traffic volumes on Aurora Avenue N make the two-way left-turn lane there much more dangerous than the two-way left-turn lane on N 185<sup>th</sup> Street or the lane proposed on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He added that the State, which has jurisdiction over Aurora Avenue, will not allow the inclusion of a two-way left-turn lane in the Aurora Corridor Project.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asserted the merit of Mr. Whitely's comments. He noted that vehicles on Aurora Avenue travel faster than those on N 185<sup>th</sup> Street or 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, but he commented that the City should consider the safety of two-way left-turn lanes elsewhere in Shoreline. Councilmember Ransom said he has expressed concern about the proposed rechannelization of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Deputy Mayor Hansen said the rechannelization of N 185<sup>th</sup> and N 155<sup>th</sup> Streets has "worked out well."

## 6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

### (a) Departmental Presentations of the 2002 Proposed Budget

Mr. Burkett briefly noted highlights of the 2002 Proposed Budget, including the total of approximately \$48.6 million in all funds, the 24-percent reduction from the 2001 budget, the four-percent reduction in the operating budget and the General Fund budget total of approximately \$26.6 million. He noted that staff has changed the format of the budget to highlight expenditure comparisons, key objectives and accomplishments. He mentioned the refinement and revision of department mission statements and the pilot project to implement performance measures in some City departments. He went on to review the budget workshop schedule.

Councilmember Montgomery arrived at 7:22 p.m.

Mr. Burkett reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for the City Council and for the City Manager's Office.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the 16.4-percent increase in funds for services in the City Manager's Office budget for 2002 compared to funds projected to be spent for

# DRAFT

services in 2001. Mr. Burkett said staff budgeted almost \$140,000 for professional services in 2001, and staff now projects the expenditure of approximately \$90,000 for professional services by the end of the year. He explained that staff anticipated hiring consultants to do work in utilities review (e.g., wastewater utilities) and that staff has not undertaken that work. While staff reduced the budget from \$140,000 to \$107,000, this amount is still more than projected expenditures this year.

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Mr. Burkett explained that the method for selecting performance goals will vary with the measurement. He said departments will propose goals for review and approval by the City Manager's Office. He mentioned the opportunity to use comparisons to other cities participating in a City Management Association program.

Regarding the Customer Services Department, Councilmember Ransom advocated presentations that staff has provided to Council previously summarizing complaint issues. Mr. Burkett commented that new customer service software will enable staff to collect, analyze and provide much more information. Mr. Bauman mentioned information in the bimonthly staff report which summarizes, by neighborhood, the kinds of calls the City has received during the previous two months.

Councilmember Montgomery expressed her appreciation for the Customer Services Department "2002 Key Division Objectives," especially the first five.

Regarding the Office of the City Clerk, Councilmember Lee asked how other departments will use the proposed property records management system. Mr. Burkett said Development Services and Public Works staff will be the primary users as they review, approve and inspect work in the right-of-way. He explained that the City does not currently have good data about what it owns and where it is located in terms of the right-of-way.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, City Clerk Sharon Mattioli said the City issues approximately 400 pet licenses annually, the second most of cities contracting for animal control services with the County.

Councilmember Ransom asserted that the City could obtain more efficient animal control service with better customer service for less money by contracting with an entity other than the County (e.g., the City of Edmonds).

Commenting that microfilming is a "pretty old technology," Councilmember Grossman asked what else the City is doing to manage records. For example, he asked about making City records available via the City web site. Mr. Bauman explained that staff recommends microfilming because the State Archivist approves it as the one media that is dependable and capable of interfacing with other technologies. Ms. Tarry said staff has included an automated records management system in the Five-Year Technology Plan in 2003. She mentioned that staff from Community and Government Relations and

# DRAFT

Information Services will consider records access as part of their work on the City web site during the next two years.

Ms. Mattioli said staff intends to microfilm those records that the City must maintain that are accessed infrequently. She noted that those records requested on a regular basis (e.g., minutes, ordinances, resolutions, staff reports) are, or will soon be, on the City web site.

Community and Government Relations Manager Joyce Nichols briefly reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for Community and Government Relations.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Nichols explained the proposal to contract with a lobbyist for lobbying at the State level during the legislative session at a cost of \$20,000.

Upon discussion of the 2002 Proposed Budget for Health and Human Services, Mayor Jepsen reported that he met November 2 with the Fremont Public Association (FPA) regarding its request to backfill funding the County has proposed to eliminate for services at four King County Housing Authority senior buildings. He said the FPA has requested \$28,000 from the City. He noted that the FPA had not met with King County Councilmember Maggi Fimia. He said he advised the FPA that Council will not address its request until after the County adopts its budget. He highlighted this as an outstanding issue in the Health and Human Services budget.

Councilmember Ransom requested staff projections of the impact to the City of State and County cuts in funding for social services. Mr. Bauman commented that the County does not provide a high level of financial support for human services in Shoreline and that the potential impact of County funding cuts is, therefore, not great. Health and Human Services Manager Rob Beem commented that impacts will concentrate in mental health and substance abuse services.

Councilmember Lee referenced the statement in Mr. Burkett's transmittal letter that "local agencies could lose a minimum of \$58,000 if the County makes the reductions which have been discussed." Mr. Burkett and Mr. Bauman explained that this amount represents proposed County cuts in funding to the FPA, the Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Senior Center and child care. Mr. Burkett went on to discuss the likelihood of State cuts in funding to the City.

Mayor Jepsen noted that the 2001 Projected "Salary & Benefits" amount for Health and Human Services is substantially less than the amount in the 2001 Budget. He asked what happened to create such a large savings. Mr. Bauman agreed to research this issue and report back to Council.

Regarding the 2002 Proposed Budget for the City Attorney, Councilmember Ransom asked if the program to phone misdemeanor defendants to remind them of court dates has reduced prosecutor fees. City Attorney Ian Sievers said the program probably reduces the time prosecutors spend and helps to minimize City prosecution costs.

# DRAFT

Ms. Tarry briefly reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for Finance. She said the Technology Plan, which includes some costs that staff had originally anticipated spending in 2001, represents approximately \$900,000 of the proposed budget. She identified some of the major projects in the Technology Plan in 2002, including the implementation of a recreation management program and automated systems for payroll and Human Resources and plans for web site enhancements (e.g., e-commerce). (She distinguished these web site enhancements from the communications-related enhancements included in the 2002 Proposed Budget for Community and Government Relations.)

Ms. Tarry went on to review "2002 Key Service Level Changes" and "2002 Key Division Objectives" for the Finance Department.

Mayor Jepsen requested clarification of the relationships between the "Addition of Right-of-Way Infrastructure to Geographic Information System" in Finance and the "Right-of-Way Records Management" in the Office of the City Clerk and between the web site enhancements in Community and Government Relations and those in the Technology Plan in Finance. Mr. Burkett said staff prepared one issue paper each for the right-of-way project and for the web site enhancements and, for budget purposes, designated some of the one-time expenditures to the different departments that are going to be spending the money.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asked if the \$550,000 difference between the amounts in the 2001 Budget for Finance for supplies and services and the 2001 Projected expenditures represents savings or delayed expenditures. Ms. Tarry said Technology Plan expenditures delayed until 2002 represent the largest part of the difference.

Deputy Mayor Hansen asserted that the difference between the 2001 Budget and the 2002 Proposed Budget for the Finance Department represents a significant decrease. Ms. Tarry said staff has been very diligent about accomplishing project goals.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Mr. Burkett confirmed that the two budget analysts are "heading up the performance measurement process." He said their budget preparation and administration responsibilities necessitate the gradual implementation of performance measurements.

Councilmember Gustafson questioned the proposal of performance measurement targets below 100 percent for "Operations," "Budget & Financial Planning," "Purchasing" and "Information Services." Ms. Tarry said staff has set challenging initial goals that it can later revise.

Next, Ms. Tarry briefly reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for Citywide Services.

Mayor Jepsen questioned the proposed purchase of networked copiers. Deputy Mayor Hansen pointed out that staff intends to amortize the \$206,317 initial investment over six

# DRAFT

years. He said the City will thereby recover its investment in addition to the \$30,342 in annual cost savings.

Noting the rapid pace of technological change, Councilmember Ransom questioned whether the City will want to own copiers six to seven years. Ms. Tarry said staff will retire copiers at different times based on use and technological needs.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Tarry attributed the difference between the 2001 Budget and the 2001 projected expenditures for Citywide Services to unspent contingencies. She said staff annually budgets approximately \$250,000 for unexpected expenditures and approximately \$200,000 for amounts not covered by insurance. She explained that staff set aside additional funds in the 2001 Budget to address potential impacts of Initiative 722 (e.g., the potential rollback of property taxes). Ms. Tarry said staff included \$505,000 in contingencies in the Proposed 2002 Budget for emergency purposes and insurance. Mr. Burkett said he included \$70,000 in reorganization contingency funds.

Mayor Jepsen noted a discrepancy between the \$637,859 shown under "Contingencies" on page 177 of the 2002 Proposed Budget and the \$575,000 total of contingencies described on page 178. Ms. Tarry explained that staff budgeted the remaining funds in anticipation of an increase in the employer contribution rate for the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS).

Mayor Jepsen commented that Council has been very conservative by setting up a variety of funding reserves. He requested that staff identify the amount of reserves in the Operating Budget and in the Capital Improvement Program when it finalizes the 2002 Budget.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Ms. Tarry explained that each department equipment budget includes funds for replacing equipment. She said these amounts accumulate in a City equipment replacement fund.

Council went on to review the 2002 Proposed Budget for the Human Resources Department.

Shoreline Police Chief Denise Pentony briefly reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for Police Services.

Mr. Burkett said the city managers from the cities that contract with the County for police services have pointed out to the Sheriff's Department that contract costs are increasing by seven to eight percent but city revenues are not and that the disparity cannot continue. The increase in the 2002 Proposed Budget for Police Services is meant to continue the same level of staffing and service as currently provided under the City's contract with the King County Sheriff's Department.

# DRAFT

Mayor Jepsen asked how the City can manage "Special Support" costs. He noted discussion in the region about costs that should be paid from County revenues versus costs that contracting cities should pay. Chief Pentony discussed services included in "Special Support." She said the City could save \$30,000-\$35,000 by paying for canine service on an as-needed basis, but the Sheriff's Department cannot guarantee a response time helpful to patrol officers. She stated the need for a ten- to fifteen-minute response time for canine services.

Chief Pentony said the costs for 911 communications increased the most of all of the "Special Support" services costs. She explained that the percentage of 911 calls from Shoreline grew and that the City is therefore paying a higher percentage of the costs for the communications center.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Chief Pentony said the Shoreline Police Department includes 48 full-time employees. She said the department purchases the equivalent of 11.2 full-time centralized support personnel from the County for approximately \$1.2 million.

Noting community concerns about traffic safety, Mayor Jepsen raised the idea of additional traffic officers versus additional patrol officers. Mr. Burkett indicated that revenues from traffic citations do little to offset the costs of full-time police employees.

In response to Mayor Jepsen, Chief Pentony confirmed that the traffic unit transports prisoners from the King County Jail to the Shoreline District Court for hearings, arraignments and trials. She said staff is exploring the use of in-camera video arraignments and hearings to reduce the number of traffic unit trips to and from the jail.

Councilmember Grossman said the budget for the Police Department is increasing by \$584,000 or 9.2 percent. Noting that City revenues are not increasing at that rate, he questioned the reduction of the Police Department share of the General Fund by one tenth of one percent. He asked if General Fund revenues have increased more than 9.6 percent. Mr. Burkett agreed to research this issue and report back to Council.

Councilmember Grossman questioned whether Shoreline needs as many police officers as it has given its low crime rate. Chief Pentony referenced the citizen satisfaction survey and the study that consultants performed at the time the City and the County renegotiated the police services contract. She asserted that the Shoreline Police Department has the right amount and mixture of people. Councilmember Grossman commented that uniformly positive satisfaction reports lead him to believe the department has too many employees. He explained his desire to raise the issue in case the City needs to consider expenditure reductions.

Councilmember Grossman praised the police department performance statistics but wondered if it takes as many officers as we have to produce these results. Chief Pentony mentioned the Service Efforts and Accomplish-ments Report, which includes five-year trends and outcome measures. Mr. Burkett stated the importance of asking about



# DRAFT

productivity, considering that the police department represents 30 percent of the City operating budget. He asserted that the performance measures on page 125 of the proposed budget look very good. He said the "Cost of Police Services per Capita" is very low compared to other cities. He said the low rate of "Part 1 Crimes" is due, in part, to the below average "Number of Dispatched Calls per Officer." He acknowledged that a reduction in the number of officers would result in a more average number of 600 to 800 calls per officer, but he asserted the value of problem solving efforts that Shoreline Police can accomplish between dispatch calls. He stated that Shoreline "has a really good balance in terms of cost effectiveness."

Councilmember Grossman reiterated the potential of reductions in County funding for social services. He recommended that Council revisit the police department budget to reconsider the possibility of cost savings if it becomes necessary to identify funds to support Shoreline's social safety net. He concluded that "a lot of the people that require police intervention are people that if they'd had appropriate intervention from a social worker wouldn't need a police officer."

In response to Councilmember Gustafson, Chief Pentony advised that the School District funds half the cost of the School Resource Officer (SRO) program. She said the department continues to consider the SRO program more successful than the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program. She mentioned that educators and school administrators praise and support the SRO program. She noted the need for performance and outcome measures to validate the cost effectiveness of the program. She confirmed that the School District remains very supportive of the SRO program in spite of its budget difficulties.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Chief Pentony said the police department includes 45 uniformed officers, 44 of whom are commissioned. She explained that the Community Service Officer (CSO) is not commissioned. Councilmember Ransom commented that residents rarely see investigators in uniform. He noted that 21 uniformed King County Sheriff's officers patrolled Shoreline before the City incorporated. Chief Pentony said citizens see 35 uniformed, commissioned officers, plus the CSO, "on the street."

Councilmember Ransom asserted that the number of 911 calls provides a "good, long-term baseline" of police performance. He said other jurisdictions use this statistic. He noted that Shoreline officers carry cellular phones, and he advocated that the department also track the number of calls that officers receive directly from citizens. Chief Pentony said the department measures 911 calls and calls that officers initiate themselves (e.g., in response to cellular telephone calls). She estimated that 911 calls number 13,000 annually. She said officer-initiated calls increased from 15,000 in 1999 to 18,845 in 2000.

Councilmember Ransom noted the successful operation of the street crimes unit created after the City incorporated. He attributed the dramatic decrease in drug sales to Shoreline youth and the 40- to 50-percent decrease in burglaries to the street crimes unit. Chief

Pentony commented that King County Sheriff Dave Reichert recently redesigned the County drug enforcement unit to look more like the Shoreline street crimes unit.

Councilmember Lee said it is dangerous to assume, because police performance is good, the crime rate is down and public perception of safety is high, that the police department may have too many officers. She asserted that the assessment of public safety is "98 perception." She said the low crime rate in Shoreline is due, in part, to aggressive policing. She praised community policing and problem solving. She also stressed the value of "random patrolling" to "easing the minds of citizens." She advocated an effective balance.

Deputy Mayor Hansen agreed that Council should scrutinize all City departments, and he agreed with the value of funding human services to reduce subsequent problems. He went on to assert that Shoreline is "extremely low on officers per thousand." He commented that single incidents can sometimes require the attention of every available officer and that this leaves other parts of Shoreline "absolutely bare." He disagreed that there is any likelihood of Council being able to reduce the police force. He stated that, in terms of personnel, the police department is running as lean as possible.

Mayor Jepsen commented that the "Number of Officers per 1,000 Residents" can vary greatly between jurisdictions depending on the area being policed. He asked about the availability of national measures of numbers of officers by population density. He said measuring the number of officers only against population seems to provide an incomplete picture. Chief Pentony agreed to inquire about measures of numbers of officers by population density.

Councilmember Ransom suggested the use of a social worker or mental health counselor as another type of community service officer. He said these professionals are more appropriate than police officers in some situations, and the availability of such a community service officer in these situations would free police officers to return to patrol.

In response to Councilmember Lee, Mr. Burkett agreed to research and report back to Council on "Services" under "Objects by Department" on page 124.

Regarding the 2002 Proposed Budget for Judicial Services, Councilmember Ransom asked about the effectiveness of phone notifications of misdemeanor defendants of court dates. Mr. Sievers said the program has markedly reduced the "failure to appear (FTA)" rate. He noted that King County and the City of Seattle have implemented the practice.

Deputy Mayor Hansen mentioned discussion of the phone notification program at the Suburban Cities Association. He said other cities are adopting the program, and the City has received credit for initiating it.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Director Wendy Barry reviewed the 2002 Proposed Budget for PRCS.

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom noted the lack of performance measurements for PRCS. Mr. Burkett said PRCS is not one of the departments in which staff is piloting performance measurements in 2002.

Councilmember Ransom said King County spent \$1,000 per acre to maintain ball fields and a much smaller amount to maintain passive parks before Shoreline incorporated. He asked about the frequency and cost of mowing and maintenance now. Ms. Barry said staff mows non-athletic turf at two and a half inches every week March through November and athletic fields at two inches twice each week March through November. She explained that staff tries to match the amount of maintenance to the amounts of use. She said the City schedules each field for "a couple thousand practices and games" each year.

In response to Councilmember Ransom, Ms. Barry said the City has started to schedule athletic fields jointly with the School District. She mentioned that this has distributed usage and achieved economies of scale. She said this also allows the City and the District to "rest" fields.

Councilmember Ransom asked about the annual number of participants in recreation services. Ms. Barry agreed to research this question and report back to Council.

## MEETING EXTENSION

At 9:58 p.m., Deputy Mayor Hansen moved to extend the meeting until 10:20 p.m. Councilmember Ransom seconded the motion, which carried 5-2, with Councilmembers Grossman and Gustafson dissenting.

Mayor Jepsen questioned whether the \$58,300 budgeted to maintain improvements to the park system is sufficient. He noted his assumption that new fields include a contractor warranty period, and he asserted the need to maintain the fields to the appropriate level. Ms. Barry said City staff ascribes to all of the standards established for the Pacific Northwest for field maintenance.

Councilmember Ransom questioned the amount of contract maintenance performed by the North Rehabilitation Facility (NRF). Ms. Barry said the City contracts approximately 65 percent of park maintenance. She explained that NRF performs a great deal of park reclamation (e.g., removing blackberry vines). She said such efforts will be more dependent upon volunteers if NRF becomes less available, but the potential unavailability of NRF will not affect routine, normal, ongoing maintenance.

Councilmember Ransom noted past concerns about the adequacy of services for at-risk kids. Ms. Barry highlighted the following 2001 City recreation services: implementation of an after-school program; continuation of the teen program; expansion of the summer playground program to serve 750 youth per week (with approximately 55 percent of the children participating on scholarships).

# DRAFT

Councilmember Ransom asked about the availability of school gymnasiums to the public. Ms. Barry said the City provides recreation programs at various sites. She noted that the School District uses site-based management and scheduling. She said staff has focused recently on opening and operating the Spartan Gym.

Councilmember Gustafson asserted the importance of maintaining City parks to high standards. He supported a "master plan for our parks" that addresses how they will look in five to ten years and how the City will maintain them. He stressed the value of the City and School District scheduling athletic fields jointly. He asserted his belief that the City and the School District can save money by partnering to maintain facilities used by each.

Mayor Jepsen identified the following unresolved issues from Council consideration of the Proposed 2002 Budget:

- Councilmember Ransom's suggestion to consider animal control options;
- the discrepancy between the 2001 Budget and the 2001 Projected Health and Human Services "Salary & Benefits;"
- a summary of reserve balances in the Operating Budget and in the Capital Improvement Program;
- continued monitoring of County reductions in human services funding and Council consideration of human services needs;
- Councilmember Grossman's suggestion that Council consider reducing the number of police officers to fund human services;
- Councilmember Ransom's suggestion of a social worker or mental health counselor as another type of community service officer;
- Councilmember Lee's request for an explanation of "Services" under "Objects by Department" in the Proposed 2002 Budget for the Police Department; and
- Councilmember Ransom's request for information of the cost effectiveness of phone notifications of misdemeanor defendants of court dates.

Councilmember Grossman commented that he supports and appreciates the services and accomplishments of the Police Department. He explained that "in tight budget times, there shouldn't be any sacred cows." He noted that Police Services is the largest single item in the operating budget.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT: None

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:15 p.m., Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Sharon Mattioli, CMC  
City Clerk