

### Council Questions Matrix Status Summary – as of 10/30/2024

New questions answered or revised since 10/22 are **bolded** below with links to the questions and responses.

Reference Number	Who Asked the Question	Question Posed	Status
<a href="#">CQ-1</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork was interested in understanding why the Housing and Human Services Manager was recommended as a permanent FTE vs. others.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-2</a>	CM Scully	Councilmember Scully wanted to know whether any recommended staff additions could be postponed.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-3</a>	CM Scully & Mayor Roberts	Councilmember Scully and Mayor Roberts wanted to know whether certain lower priority one-time costs could be delayed.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-4</a>	Mayor Roberts	Mayor Roberts asked about using FTEs vs. consultants for certain one-time projects.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-5</a>	CM Ramsdell	Councilmember Ramsdell wanted to know about the feasibility of adding funding for senior counseling.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-6</a>	CM Robertson	Councilmember Robertson wanted to know more about the need for printers in the City.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-7</a>	CM Robertson & Mayor Roberts	Councilmember Robertson and Mayor Roberts inquired about the Echo Lake Mural.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-8</a>	DM Mork & Mayor Roberts	Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts inquired into funding for Firlands Way	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-9</a>	<b>DM Mork &amp; Mayor Roberts</b>	<b>Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts inquired into the progress into the seismic evaluation at Ronald.</b>	<b>Revised Answer</b>

Reference Number	Who Asked the Question	Question Posed	Status
<a href="#">CQ-10</a>	DM Mork & Mayor Roberts	Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts inquired into Metro Flex and its possible expansion.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-11</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork inquired into the City's dump trucks and preparation for their replacement.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-12</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know about the value of the grants being brought into the City vs. the cost of the Grant Administrator.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-13</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know about the performance management position workplan and value.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-14</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know the cost of the City's human service portfolio now compared to after the proposed budget increases.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-15</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork wants to know how we measure effectiveness of human services programming.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-16</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know how we are efficiently allocating city funding to maximize alternative sources of human services funding.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-17</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork asks about how the City is preparing for the impacts of utility cost increases on low-income populations and assistance programs.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-18</a>	Mayor Roberts	Mayor Roberts inquired into the cost of adding police officers.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-19</a>	Mayor Roberts	<b>Mayor Roberts asked about the application of surface water rates to multifamily housing.</b>	<b>Answered</b>

Reference Number	Who Asked the Question	Question Posed	Status
<a href="#">CQ-20</a>	CM Scully	Councilmember Scully would like to know more about how Shoreline's FTEs compare with Redmond.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-21</a>	CM Pobee	Councilmember Pobee wants to know more about the impact and context of the police contract increases	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-22</a>	CM Pobee	Councilmember Pobee inquires into why the Grants Administrator was not make full-time.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-23</a>	CM Pobee	Councilmember Pobee would like to know about the current cost allocation related to the RCR.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-24</a>	DM Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork wanted to know the deadline for budget amendments.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-25</a>	Mayor Roberts	Mayor Roberts inquired into Storefront Repair Funds.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-26</a>	<b>CM Ademasu</b>	<b>CM Ademasu asks about the extent of the Housing Feasibility Study.</b>	<b>Revised Answer</b>
<a href="#">CQ-27</a>	CM Ademasu	CM Ademasu asks about the current and future utilization of urban forestry funds.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-28</a>	CM Ademasu	CM Ademasu would like to know more about the planned updates to the Commercial Energy Code.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-29</a>	CM Ademasu	CM Ademasu would like more information about the proposed consulting work related to the Tree Code.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-30</a>	Mayor Roberts	Mayor Roberts would like to know about plans for pedestrian infrastructure at Brugger's Bog.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-31</a>	<b>CM Scully</b>	<b>CM Scully asked about the increase to City Council's travel budget.</b>	<b>Answered</b>
<a href="#">CQ-32</a>	CM Ramsdell & CM Scully	CMs Ramsdell and Scully have asked about adding funding for a senior center mental health program.	Answered

Reference Number	Who Asked the Question	Question Posed	Status
<a href="#">CQ-33</a>	DM Mork	DM Mork would like to understand how grant funded programs are shown in the budget.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-34</a>	<b>Mayor Roberts</b>	<b>Mayor Roberts asked about budget for cleanup on trails &amp; pathways.</b>	<b>Revised Answer</b>
<a href="#">CQ-35</a>	CMs Scully, Ademasu & Deputy Mayor Mork	Councilmembers Scully, Ademasu and Deputy Mayor Mork asked about options for converting the Grants Administrator Position Limited-Term position to permanent.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-36</a>	Deputy Mayor Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork asked updating the valuation trees.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-37</a>	<b>Deputy Mayor Mork</b>	<b>Deputy Mayor Mork asked about how Burien's police force cost compares to Shoreline's.</b>	<b>Answered</b>
<a href="#">CQ-38</a>	CM Scully	CM Scully asks about how we can utilize recovery savings from the King County police contract.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-39</a>	CM Scully	CM Scully asked about budget for Police Special Support.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-40</a>	Mayor Roberts	Mayor Roberts asked about the change in "Planned Action" for cities and its impacts.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-41</a>	<b>CM Ademasu</b>	<b>CM Ademasu asks about the cost of expanding the Metro-Flex pilot to NE Shoreline.</b>	<b>Answered</b>
<a href="#">CQ-42</a>	<b>Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts</b>	<b>DMs Mork and Mayor Roberts asked several questions about SWM rate application to ADUs and non-single family homes.</b>	<b>Answered</b>
<a href="#">CQ-43</a>	Deputy Mayor Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork asks about Pipe Replacement & Repair expenditures.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-44</a>	Deputy Mayor Mork	Deputy Mayor Mork asks about why the Wastewater rate increase occurred	Answered

Reference Number	Who Asked the Question	Question Posed	Status
		despite achieving savings from being absorbed by the City.	
<a href="#">CQ-45</a>	CM Robertson	CM Robertson asks about the public art budget.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-46</a>	CM Ademasu	CM Ademasu asks about cobra lamps vs artistic heads.	Answered
<a href="#">CQ-47</a>	Deputy Mayor Mork	DM Mork asked about funding for Shoreline's 30th year celebration.	Pending

**Item/Issue:** CQ-1. Deputy Mayor Mork was interested in knowing why the HHS Manager was recommended as a permanent FTE vs. other positions.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork was interested in understanding why the Housing and Human Services Manager was proposed as a permanent FTE when other high priority positions, like the Grants Coordinator and Performance Management Analyst, were proposed to continue as limited-term employees.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** During the budget process, staff identified the costs needed to support current services as well as one-time and ongoing needs to support Council Goals and the plans adopted by Council. The Leadership Team then prioritized all the requests, and the City Manager recommended the highest priority needs that were sustainable within our 10-Year Financial Forecast. Staff identified a need to convert the current limited term Performance Management Analyst and Grant Administrator positions to permanent FTE positions, as well as the need for a permanent Human Services Manager as identified in the recently adopted Human Services Plan. While all three positions were ranked highly and would provide significant benefits to the City, the City Manager determined that the Human Services Plan was a higher priority for Council and included it in his proposed budget. Given the financial constraints shown in the 10-year forecast, we were not able to propose all three positions as ongoing FTEs at this time. Should Council determine that either of the other positions are a higher priority, the budget could be amended to either eliminate the Human Services Manager and convert one of the other two to permanent FTE or eliminate the Human Services Manager and retain both positions as limited term. Converting the Human Services Manager to limited term would not support the implementation of the Human Services Plan and is not recommended.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-2. Councilmember Scully wanted to know whether any recommended staff additions could be postponed.

**Question:** Councilmember Scully asked whether we could wait on any of the staff increases due to concerns about being at the max levy rate and decreased REET revenues.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** During the budget process, staff identified the costs needed to support current services as well as one-time and ongoing needs to support Council Goals and the plans adopted by Council. The Leadership Team then prioritized all the requests, and the City Manager recommended the highest priority needs that were sustainable within our 10-Year Financial Forecast. For this biennium there were a significant number of high priority FTE requests. The City Manager did not include all the requested positions and only proposed those that were determined to be the highest priority to achieve operational and Council Goals. It is important to note that many of these positions are funded by projects and enterprise funds and do not impact the General Fund. Additionally, the hiring of staff for new positions will be staggered and will likely not be completed until mid-2025. The following table provides options and impacts for each of the positions proposed that impact the General Fund should a Council Member want to propose an amendment to delay or eliminate the position.

Category	Position	FTE	LTE	General Fund Cost	Position Justification	Impact If Delayed or Unfunded
<b>Maintain What We Have</b>	<b>Park Bond Improvement Support-Facility Maintenance Worker II</b>	1		\$127.8K	With the completion of the Parks Bond Projects and anticipated expansion of undeveloped park sites funded by the Bond, there is a need to increase staffing levels for parks maintenance. The Parks, Fleet and Facilities Division is requesting budget to add one FTE and associated operating costs (utilities, supplies, chemicals) to maintain the new infrastructure in parks. This position will also require an Aquatic Facility certification to ensure that operations and maintenance of the spray parks, including the irrigation, plumbing, and mechanical systems, meet the safety standards for these park amenities.	Failure to fill this position would decrease other park and facility maintenance levels as current staff would need to refocus their time to ensure that new amenities are appropriately maintained.
	<b>Recreation Specialist</b>	1		\$87.5K	In 2020, the City piloted the expansion of two part-time Youth and Teen Development Recreation Specialist 1 positions to full-time in response to evolving community needs and school schedule changes. These positions were able to continue in 2023-2024 as ARPA (America Rescue Plan Act) Youth funds became available. These positions have proven instrumental in addressing the growing and complex needs of Shoreline's youth, including the rise in mental health concerns. The positions also contributed to the success of comprehensive youth programs like Hang Time, SAGE, and YOLO, which provide safe spaces, engagement, and specialized support at the Shoreline Teen Center and other locations. To ensure the continuity of these youth services, the City Manager is recommending these positions continue on a full-time basis.	Failure to continue this funding would decrease service levels for teens. Council could amend the budget to continue one-time funding while we evaluate other funding options and monitor the economy.



Category	Position	FTE	LTE	General Fund Cost	Position Justification	Impact If Delayed or Unfunded
	<b>Park Bond Improvement Support - Ground MW I</b>	.75 (0.50 GF)		\$57.8K	This position is required to meet the additional labor needs created due to Parks Bond improvements. These improvements will result in new landscape features, additional turf areas, and tree maintenance needs in designated parks throughout the city. This position will also support some additional street maintenance needs such as implementation of the Integrated Pest Management policy. This position is budgeted at .75 FTE with .25 FTE funded by Streets/SWM and .5 by the General Fund.	Failure to fill this position would decrease the current ROW and Parks level of service as newly refurbished parks are coming onboard and will require maintenance to upkeep quality and safety.
<b>Build a Stable Foundation</b>	<b>Finance Operations - Staff Accountant</b>	1		\$127.8K	In recent years, there has been increased demand on staff and increased workload due to new GASB (Government Accounting Standards Board) standards, increased financial transaction volume, and additional essential training required for staff across City departments due to the high number of new staff. This additional FTE will ensure adequate resources are allocated to maintain the City's financial records, support the annual audit process, and ensure the City's ability to maintain its excellent bond rating. To support the onboarding of this new staff member, a separate one-time budget request for consulting support for 2025 financial statements has also been recommended.	There is significant risk to the City of continued Audit findings related to our Financial Statements, Federal Single Audits, and Accountability Audit if this request is not approved. Continued staff turnover will exacerbate current training shortages. This position could potentially be filled with a limited term position temporarily. However, classification as a limited term position may impact our ability to attract a highly qualified candidate.
	<b>Information Technology- Systems Analyst</b>	1		\$158.4K	In 2022, the City conducted an IT Workload and Staffing Analysis. That analysis recommended the addition of between 3-5 positions to meet the City's then current IT Workload. The Council added 1.0 FTE in IT staffing plus extra help funding in the 2023-2024 budget. The City is still in need of an ongoing IT System Analyst to support applications and	Currently the IT Manager spends a significant portion of their time fulfilling the role of Systems Analyst for the City's Financial and Human Resources system. Our most important Enterprise application, the Finance/HR system, lacks a dedicated IT systems analyst. This

Category	Position	FTE	LTE	General Fund Cost	Position Justification	Impact If Delayed or Unfunded
					databases. The City currently has 37 software applications. The increased complexity in our IT environment has not been matched with additional support and is increasing the City's risk of data loss and down-time for major applications. Currently, the City has only 1 full-time employee in the Systems Analyst role and 3 position executing that role on a part-time basis for a total of 2.5 FTE overall. With over 15 enterprise applications (which many departments use) and over 40 overall applications (including department-specific applications) this ratio of Systems Analyst to Applications is far below the best practice standards.	<p>impacts the team's ability to proactively plan for the future, execute planned projects and implement further security of our network infrastructure.</p> <p>Temporarily shifting this position to a limited-term position while we evaluate the longer-term economy could work, but is likely to impact the quality of candidates; the position is one of the hardest to fill in IT.</p>
<b>Build a Stable Foundation</b>	<b>Housing &amp; Human Services Manager</b>	1		\$198k	This position is critical to implementation of the Human Services Plan adopted by Council. Delay in adding or filling this position will delay the implementation of the plan.	If this position is not filled we will not be able to implement the major enhancements identified in the Human Service Plan. Staff do not believe this position would be appropriate for a limited-term position.
	<b>PW MW II (Traffic Services)</b>	0.30		\$15.2K	This position addresses the program needs to meet increased NPDES permit requirements for street sweeping within the Surface Water/Roads work unit and the needs of the Traffic Services work unit to comply with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) criteria for the pavement marking and other ancillary traffic service programs. The position is to receive 70% of its funding from the Surface Water Utility (street sweeping) and 30% from the General Fund for the Traffic Services program elements. It is partially offset by a reduction in other budget line items.	If council were to eliminate or delay this position it would delay the implementation of the SWM Master Plan. This position is not recommended to be considered for part-time or limited-term funding.

Category	Position	FTE	LTE	General Fund Cost	Position Justification	Impact If Delayed or Unfunded
Prepare for the Future	LT GIS Analyst		1	\$150.3K	The new ESRI ArcGIS program is more complex and has added many more capabilities for the City. Supporting the use of ArcGIS will require GIS Analyst effort and time. The Public Works Department has increased their GIS demand as they mature and improve their asset management of critical City infrastructure. Finally, the major plans produced by the City to support programs have become more complex as the City added more tracking components for criteria such as equity, tree canopy, and asset management. This limited-term position will enable the team to build processes and procedures that better support the work and determine the ongoing support needs to more efficiently use and maximize the use of ArcGIS for these tracking and mapping needs.	The City's GIS platform is critical to supporting day-to-day operations. There is currently a backlog of GIS work and remaining work to optimize the upgraded system. Delay of this position will extend the backlog and impact the delivery of public works and parks projects and services.
Prepare for the Future	LT Aquatics Facility Planning		1	\$171.4K	The City intends to continue the Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Art (PROSA) Plan Strategic Action Initiative #4 by pursuing opportunities to provide access to aquatic and recreation facilities for residents. The City Council has indicated a desire to present voters with an aquatics facility option on the November 2026 general election ballot. This funding would support public engagement, planning, conceptual design, cost estimating, ballot measure development, and preparation for design development and permitting to begin in 2027 should the measure be successful. This request includes a limited-term Senior Management Analyst position to manage the planning aspects of this project.	Council has indicated a desire to place a measure on the 2026 General Election. Delaying this position would hinder our ability to meet that goal.
	LT Senior Planner		1	\$171K	The City's planning team is primarily resourced to accommodate current planning work in the form of	If eliminated from the proposed budget, staff would only be able to update either

Category	Position	FTE	LTE	General Fund Cost	Position Justification	Impact If Delayed or Unfunded
					development review of permit applications. However, there remains a growing need to focus on long-range planning in the form of plan updates and amendments to the Development Code in order to be responsive to the community and Council goals and adapt to changing regulatory changes from the state. This new position would add a limited-term third planner to support the updates to the City Tree Code, Development Code, and Sub-Area Planning.	the Tree Code or the Development Code in this biennium.
Address Council Priorities	LT AAI-Security		1	\$105K	Staff are recommending security enhancements to City facilities. An alternative to physical enhancements at City Hall is being considered by utilizing a 1.0 limited term FTE Administrative Assistant I to provide guest management support/building access control at City Hall.	If this position is not approved, then staff would need to pursue other alternatives to address security concerns at a similar one-time cost.
	LT Environmental Sustainability Coordinator		1	\$148k	The Environmental Sustainability program is requesting a limited-term FTE to take on the management of the Recology contract and subsequent work items associated with contract management, lead other environmental programs focused on solid waste and healthy ecosystems to support the implementation of the Climate Action Plan (CAP), and to lead internal City efforts around sustainability. This will allow existing environmental program staff to have sufficient capacity to take on new and innovative environmental projects and implement the CAP more efficiently.	If eliminated from the proposed budget, work on implementing the updated Climate Action Plan would be delayed.

<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-3. Councilmembers Scully and Roberts wanted to know whether certain lower priority one-time costs could be delayed.</b>
<b>Question:</b>	There was some concern expressed about the total amount of the one-time costs proposed in the budget. Councilmembers Scully and Roberts both questioned whether we could delay some of the lower priority projects, such as Tree Code, Subarea Planning, Development Code Modernization. What are the benefits and costs of doing that? Why is it best to keep them in the budget?
<b>Department:</b>	Planning and Community Development
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>The projects identified in the PCD budget were developed to be responsive to ongoing feedback from the community and stakeholders. Staff would propose them in the following priority: Tree Code, Subarea Planning, and Development Code Modernization.</p> <p>Of the three projects called out here, the Tree Code is perhaps the one with the most public interest and about which staff have shared in public meetings that an update would begin in 2025. The existing tree code has been amended several times over the years without a holistic update and has become difficult for applicants to understand and staff to administer. The proposed budget would fund a consultant with expertise in urban forestry or a related field to assist in developing a new tree code. Delaying this update would require continued use of the existing tree code.</p> <p>The proposal to undertake subarea planning is in direct response to community feedback during the Comprehensive Plan update. Residents overwhelmingly want to be located near vibrant neighborhood centers that offer dining, shopping, recreation, etc. Staff have also heard a desire to differentiate neighborhood centers. Subarea planning is an opportunity to focus on creating centers with the goal of bringing together the community to develop a cohesive plan that could enable more options for residents and improve quality of life while advancing other citywide goals such as around transportation and mobility.</p> <p>The estimated cost for subarea planning assumes two plans to be undertaken during the biennium and that each plan would include environmental analysis with the technical assistance of a consultant. Should this project not be funded, there would be reduced capacity to prepare subarea plans and to conduct some of the required technical analysis that may be necessary for environmental review. As a result, important neighborhood centers would continue to function in the status quo without the modernized, community-supported subarea plans, as the existing zoning and development standards would still control.</p> <p>Additionally, portions of the Development Code overall have become difficult to administer and need updating as it has been more than two decades since the code was originally adopted. There is also opportunity to evaluate and streamline the competing incentives throughout the code and its structure and usability by residents, business owners, and developers. If the Development Code modernization project is not funded, staff could still undertake updates to the code but in smaller segments and over a longer period time.</p>

<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-4. Mayor Roberts asked about using FTEs vs. consultants for certain one-time projects.</b>
<b>Question:</b>	Council Member Roberts asked whether it would make more sense to add FTEs to perform the work identified in the one-time projects such as Tree Code update, Subarea Planning, Development Code Modernization instead of using consultants that are more costly? How do the costs compare?
<b>Department:</b>	Planning and Community Development
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>The recommended approach of utilizing consultants to assist on these projects is based on the level of expertise that may be needed for each. For the Tree Code update, staff will be seeking a consultant with expertise in urban forestry or related field. Subarea plans can often include technical analysis related to demographics, economic analysis, and environmental analysis that specialized firms are more efficient and effective in completing. Attempting to compile an internal team of specialists in each of these areas would not be cost effective.</p> <p>A related component of delivering these projects within the two-year biennium is the Limited Term Senior Planner. This position would provide additional capacity to manage these planning projects and code updates, including the procurement and selection of consultants, leading community engagement, and coordinating with internal departments/divisions and external agencies and stakeholders.</p>

**Item/Issue:** CQ-5. Councilmember Ramsdell wanted to know about the feasibility of adding funding for senior counseling.

**Question:** Councilmember Ramsdell noted that he had spoken with the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior center about a Senior Counseling Program. Their director noted that they have asked for additional funding to support a senior counseling mental health program. His understanding is that the City Managers proposed budget doesn't include that. He would like to see it be added. (\$52k, first year, \$65K next year)

**Department:** Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services

**Final Answer:** There is a \$180,000 yearly allocation for the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center that is a component of the proposed Human Services Plan and integrated into the proposed 2025-2026 Budget. This allocation represents an increase from their current contract of \$95,708 in 2024. The additional funds are provided in part to maintain the social worker position that was added with one-time City funds provided by the ARPA Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) during the pandemic. It also provides additional general operating funds to be used at their discretion (their funding from the City has been flat at \$95,708 per year for over 15 years). The social worker program began in December of 2021 as a response to the growth and complexity of needs within the senior population during the Covid-19 pandemic and which continue today. Approximately \$65,000 of the additional funds will be used to cover the costs of the social worker. This would leave approximately \$20,000 of the added funds that could be used to support a new mental health program or other Senior Center priorities. Additional funds beyond this would need to be added via Council amendment.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-6. Councilmember Robertson wanted to know more about the need for printers in the City.

**Question:** The Councilmember wanted to know what kind of costs are involved in the printer/copier leases. and whether we can we take a hard look at how many printers we need with the goal of becoming a more digital operation. Why are these leases needed?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** In 2022 staff in IT performed an analysis of copiers / printers and identified potential reductions in our copier fleet. Because this was shortly after the COVID-19 pandemic and staff were still adjusting to a hybrid work environment, we were not able to implement all the analysis' recommendations. We have done further analysis since that time and believe that we can better engage users and evaluate the usage data to support a further reduction in our copy fleet.

We currently have 5 copiers / printers that are off-lease, and we are paying month-to-month. In 2025, 2 more copier / printers will come off lease. Our goal, beginning later in 2024 and continuing into 2025 will be to collaborate with key staff and leadership to complete a copier evaluation with the goal of significantly reducing our reliance on copiers and printers, reducing the fleet, and reducing the City's costs and environmental footprint. The one-time budget ask in the proposed 2025-2026 Biennial Budget supports the month-to-month copier costs in 2025 while we complete the evaluation and downsize our copier fleet. Recognizing that some of the under-utilized copiers are in outlying locations in the City (rather than City Hall, where several are available), we will need to identify lower cost alternatives to meet their needs and develop training and processes to ensure they are equipped to self-support in these areas.



**Item/Issue:** CQ-7. Councilmember Robertson and Mayor Roberts inquired about the Echo Lake Mural.

**Question:** Questions include: Is there a public process for the mural's development? Is this a new mural or are we enhancing what is there? Should we anticipate that this will be an ongoing cost to replace or update the mural on a regular basis?

**Department:** Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services

**Final Answer:** This is a one-time request to increase the expenditure authority of the Municipal Art Fund (MAF) to include budget for the replacement of this mural. This request does **not** have an impact on the General Fund as it is fully MAF supported.

Murals are part of our temporary art collection and by their nature require cleaning/maintenance during their lifecycle and then replacement at the end of life. The life cycle of a typical mural, when well maintained, is 5-7 years. This mural was installed 10 years ago and has received little to no maintenance over the ensuing years and greatly exceeded its life expectancy. Staff have received two public comments in the past months regarding the state of the mural's decline.

Due to the age of the mural and its lack of maintenance over the years, this mural has growing issues with water pockets, effervescence, and paint flaking. The mural now needs to be removed, the cement wall cleaned, and a new mural installed. Staff are in the final stages of developing a complete repair and replacement schedule for the City's entire permanent, portable, and temporary art collections which will inform MAF budget development in the future. Because the process for replacing the Echo Lake Mural has not been started, a replacement mural has not yet been selected.

The Public Art Program has established a robust public engagement process for public art selection, which includes having community members on artist selection panels, and neighborhood and community meetings with an artist once they are selected regarding the piece. There is then a PRCS/Tree Board final review for approval of the replacement/new art.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-8. Deputy Mayor Mork and Roberts inquired into funding for Firlands Way.

**Question:** Funding for Firlands Way was included in the current budget. What is the status of the project and where is the funding in this budget and at what amount?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** Funding for a study to define a concept plan/cross-section of Firlands Way was added as a mid-bi budget amendment for the 23-24 Biennial Budget. The scope of work for that study was for the limits between N 185<sup>th</sup> and N 188<sup>th</sup>. As part of the TIP, based on Council discussion, Firlands Way Study was added as an emerging issue with the identification of an additional \$40,000 in funding to extend the limits of the study to N 195<sup>th</sup>. The proposed 25-26 Biennial Budget does not include the additional funding. At this point, if Council would like to expand the limits of the study, an amendment to the proposed budget will be needed. At the time of the mid-bi budget amendment, staff identified that this work would not begin until 2025 and ideally would be timed in conjunction with a potential subarea plan of this area. This project is currently on the workplan for Transportation Services in 2025.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-9. Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts inquired into the progress into the seismic evaluation at Ronald.

**Question:** There was a seismic evaluation done at Ronald Wastewater during the transition related to the safety of the door frames. Has the work identified in that study been completed? If not, is the funding to complete it included in the proposed biennial budget? How long would it take to free the equipment from the building in the event that they were trapped?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** The biggest challenge in the seismic integrity of the building is the actual type of structure – pre-engineered metal building (PEMB). In general, these types of building are susceptible to seismic events. As stated in the consultant's report:

*“PEMBS are typically highly refined designs that are intended to optimize economy of construction costs but are designed to minimum code requirements for a Life Safety seismic performance level. As a result, PEMBs are extremely difficult to seismically retrofit to a higher seismic performance level”.*

The consultant evaluated 4 options to address seismic integrity – 2 were structural modifications to the PEMB, 1 was a “do nothing” option, and the 4<sup>th</sup> option was door replacement. The door replacement option does not address the other structural concerns, however.

On the door option, the consultant performing the seismic study evaluated three door options that potentially would allow for operation after an earthquake. The three door options were:

- 1) Four-fold doors - highest ability to accommodate building seismic movement,
- 2) High-Speed/Standard Roll-Up doors (next highest seismic performance) and
- 3) Sectional doors – lowest seismic performance.

Door Option 1 was estimated to cost between \$50 to \$60k, Door Option 2 was estimated to cost \$30-\$40k, and Door Option 3 was estimated at \$10-\$15k. The consultant concluded in their report that based on their conversations with an architect and door manufactures that ***none of these options would be able to accommodate large building shifts caused by a significant seismic event.***

The consultant further opined that none of the three options were deemed viable because of the cost of construction relative to the value of the pre-engineered metal buildings. They therefore concluded that the Do Nothing (aka “Brute Force Method”) option was the recommended option in the report. Staff concurred and did not take further action.

With regard to the question of how long would it take to free the equipment from the building in the event that they were trapped, the amount of time to remove a vehicle from the building after a seismic event is difficult to predict given the variables involved. A large seismic event where the PEMB collapses, trapping vehicles inside, would require the longest amount of time to remove the vehicles. This scenario would require specialized equipment (cranes, shoring, cutting torches and other specialized excavation equipment) and resources that the City does not have and would need to look to others to provide. The timeframe for this scenario is estimated in days, not hours. For a light to moderate seismic event, where the PEMB is still intact, but the doors are jammed shut, would require the least amount of time to free the vehicles. Staff believes that in this type of

scenario that we could either a) drive the vehicles directly through the doors, or b) pull the doors down with existing City equipment (backhoe). The timeframe for this scenario is believed to be hours upon mobilizing staff.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-10. Deputy Mayor Mork and Mayor Roberts inquired into Metro Flex and its possible expansion.

**Question:** How is Metro Flex funded and what areas does it cover? Could/should we consider funding an expansion in the Ballinger Neighborhood?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** Metro Flex is a new program that has been implemented in several areas throughout the County. The Northshore service area includes a small segment of Shoreline located North of Ballinger Way. Hours for the program vary by the area. For the Northshore area hours are Weekdays 7 a.m. to 7p.m. More details on the program can be found at: [Metro Flex - King County, Washington](#)

During Metro's restructuring, staff worked closely with KC Metro to expand the service area to fully include Shoreline or expand the current service area. For a variety of reasons, KC Metro was unwilling/unable to expand the services. KC Metro still considers MetroFlex a pilot and is still evaluating the cost effectiveness of the program. As a result, they are not interested in expanding hours or service areas at this time until they see the results of these new implementations and the costs associated with the service. Initial feedback has been that the service is very costly on a per trip basis. If usage increases, then the cost per trip will go down. Staff will continue to work with KC Metro and advocate for expanded services, but do not see a viable path to "buy in" for services at this time.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-11. Deputy Mayor Mork inquired into the City's dump trucks and preparation for their replacement.

**Question:** The Deputy Mayor asked about how many dump trucks the city has and how old are they. How much replacement reserves have we accumulated for them? Could we use the replacement reserves from the current dump trucks to fund the one-time cost of the new one requested? And could the new dump truck be electric?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The City fleet contains 9 dump trucks. Their ages range from 4-18 years old. The reserve balances collected for all dump trucks will be at about \$1.14M by the end of the current biennium. The City would have sufficient funds in the reserve fund to allocate to the acquisition cost of \$213,699 for an additional dump truck, however, this would necessarily involve using currently allocated funds dedicated to the replacement of current trucks. This use would thus cause a future reserve shortfall for scheduled replacements and require an additional budget infusion later to make the replacement fund whole. The current reserves for each dump truck vehicle can be found in the table below. Additionally, while the City is making significant effort to purchase electric vehicles as we replace or add vehicles, not all vehicles are suited to electrification with current technology. That is the case for this vehicle. Because the vehicle will be plow ready and used to help in storm response it will need to be operated for extended periods of time during a snow event. Existing EV technology will not allow for extended use. Staff will continue to monitor the market whenever we are purchasing a vehicle to evaluate the potential for purchasing an EV, plug in Hybrid, or regular Hybrid.

**Current City of Shoreline Dump Truck Inventory and Information**

Vehicle Number	Model Year	Description	Main Fund Source	Fund Ownership	Dept	Forecasted Replacement Year	Fleet Estimated Salvage Value	AK Updated Equipment Replacement Reserves as of 12/31/2024	Build Price/Acquisition Cost	Comments
510	2020	Grounds Maintenance F-450 Dump Truck	001	503	Grounds	2033	\$0.00	\$23,020.00		Replacement year suspect, may need earlier replacement
503	2019	X1C F150 SC 4x2 Pickup	001	503	Grounds	2031	\$0.00	\$34,193.00		Load capacity minimal, need to upsize chassis at replacement, will require additional funding
183	2017	Freightliner Dump truck M106	101	503	PW	2028	\$25,000.00	\$146,172.00		Likely underfunded
172	2015	Ford W5h F550 4x4 w/Crew Cab	101	503	PW Streets	2026	\$20,000.00	\$184,641.00	\$ 214,000.00	Replacing in 2026
WW122	2014	Ford F-350 Dump Truck	405	415	WW	2027	\$9,000.00	\$17,443.00		Good shape, low mileage, 2WD only, significantly underfunded for future replacement, budget request expected (Spring 2025)
166	2012	Navistar International 7000 SFA	101	503	PW	2023	\$3,000.00	\$319,382.00		Extending life, expect replacement in 27-28 budget cycle, will need to collect replacement escalation cost
158	2010	Ford F550 Super Crew 4x4	401	415	PW Streets	2024	\$4,000.00	\$209,923.00	\$209,923.00	Cab & Chassis on order expected delivery in October
159	2010	F550 Super Cab 4x4	101	503	PW	2024	\$4,000.00	\$225,043.00	\$225,043.00	Cab & Chassis on order expected delivery in October
153	2008	Isuzu Truck	001	503	Parks Ops	2025	\$2,500.00	\$86,487.00	\$88,987.00	Replacing in 2025, likely underfunded, searching for a viable EV option
145	2006	Ford Super Duty F450	001	503	Parks Ops	2023	\$2,000.00	\$108,179.00	\$ 129,000.00	Replacing in 2025, extended life to the 25-26 budget cycle
								<b>\$1,354,483.00</b>	<b>\$866,953.00</b>	

Replacing in 25-26 biennial  
 Replacing in current budget cycle

**Item/Issue:** CQ-12. Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know the value of the grants being brought into the city is vs. the cost of the Grant Administrator.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Laura Mork would like to know the value of grants successfully brought into the city? What is the value of pending grants? On an annual basis, approximately how many times their salary has been brought in by this position? Finally, does this person perform any grant administration tasks?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Year to date in 2024, the City has submitted 28 grant requests totaling \$36,233,069. These requests have come in the form of grant applications and public assistance, legislative, and federal earmark requests.

The limited-term Grant Administrator has collaborated with City staff across multiple departments, including Transportation, Surface Water, IT, Parks, Fleet and Facilities, and Emergency Management staff to support the submission of 14 grant requests totaling \$11,894,302. To date, the City has secured \$638,513, with an estimated \$5,165,250 anticipated to be received, and \$30,429,306 in pending requests.

In Year 1 of the position, the Grant Administrator helped secure \$1,414,803 in grant funds. With a salary of \$85,715 that accounts for a May 8, 2023 start date, this means the Administrator helped obtain grant funding 16.5x the cost of first year salary costs.

The Grant Administrator engages in various grant administrative tasks including reporting, reimbursement requests, and completing and filing staff reports.



<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-13. Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know about the performance management position workplan and value</b>
<b>Question:</b>	Deputy Mayor Laura Mork would like to know what this position is working on. Are there any tasks that they are performing that Shoreline would have had to hire an outside consultant? Would eliminating the position take time away from another staff person? Does the data justify making this position permanent at this time?
<b>Department:</b>	City Manager's Office
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>The following projects are those that a consultant would have been hired to lead/complete, that another staff person would have had to lead, or that would not have been done if the performance management analyst position did not exist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitting Process Improvement Team's Implementation Project Manager</li> <li>• Organization's Vision, Mission, Values Refresh Project</li> <li>• PCD and PW Departmental Vision and Mission Refresh Projects</li> <li>• Improving Performance via Purposeful Questions Workshop Series</li> <li>• See Click Fix Continuous Improvement Project</li> <li>• City Strategic Plan Development</li> </ul> <p>Alternatives to this approach would have been to (1) not do this work at all or to do it with existing management staff or (2) do the work at a much slower pace, likely taking multiple years to accomplish. In 2025, we expect that this position will take on several projects that staff initially asked for consultant support to complete. This includes at least \$100,000 worth of consultant work that will transition to this position instead. The program is currently establishing performance measures to track how much cost savings there are due to the performance improvement program being started, along with other measures adopted to assist the City Manager in determining its value over time.</p> <p>Without this position, the performance management program's work would have likely been led by the City Manager's Office Program Manager. That position is already currently leading the Parking Enforcement Program implementation and the Code Enforcement continuous improvement project in addition to their ongoing programmatic and supervisory responsibilities, which includes oversight and management of the City's criminal justice program, emergency management program, and animal control program, among others.</p>

**Item/Issue:** CQ-14. Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know the cost of the City's human service portfolio now versus after the proposed budget increases.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know what the currently projected costs of all human services-related programming is for 2023-2024, including the salaries, contracts, and any donations. In the 2025-2026 biennium, what is the projected value for this area? What is the percentage increase?

**Department:** Recreation, Cultural and Community Services

**Final Answer:** The 2023-2024 biennial budget for human services was a combination of funding from the general fund and COVID-19 Response Funding. The general fund support was adopted through the biennial budget process with additional Council approved one-time expenditures throughout the biennium noted below. There were no donations received in 2023-2024 to support human services programming. It is anticipated that for the 2025-2026 biennium, external contributions will remain the same, as donations for this line of service is extremely uncommon.

The originally adopted budget for 2023-2024 for Human Services program included the following expenditures:

	2023	2024
0.4 FTE Community Services Manager	\$72,677	\$78,712
HS Contracted Programs - Community Fund	\$409,784	\$409,784
HS Contracted Programs - Homelessness Services	\$125,817	\$125,817
HS Contracted Programs - Core Services	\$253,812	\$253,812
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$862,090</b>	<b>\$868,125</b>
<b>23-24 Biennial Total</b>	<b>\$1,730,215</b>	

For 2023-2024, the original budget for personnel and contracts totaled \$1,730,215. Additionally, through budget actions, the Council added the following one-time supplemental programs with COVID-19 Response Funds and City General Funds:

	2023	2024
1.4 FTE Community Support Specialists	\$193,171	\$209,339
COVID Response Programs	\$511,339	\$474,000
Shoreline/LFP Senior Center – Social Worker – GF	\$30,000	\$52,000
Utility and Rent Assistance - GF		\$50,000
Holiday Baskets – GF		\$50,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$734,510</b>	<b>\$885,339</b>
<b>23-24 Biennial Total</b>	<b>\$1,619,849</b>	

Totaling both the City's general fund support and COVID-19 Response Funds, the City provided the following human services funding for 2023-2024:

	2023	2024
<b>General Fund and COVID-19 Funding Total</b>	<b>\$1,596,600</b>	<b>\$1,753,464</b>
<b>23-24 Biennial Total</b>	<b>\$3,350,064</b>	

The proposed 2025-2026 Human Services Budget for personnel and contracts is as follows:

	2025	2026
1.0 FTE Housing & Human Services Program Manager	\$189,546	\$195,106
0.25 FTE Community Services Manager	\$53,200	\$54,753
HS Contracted Programs - Community Fund	\$516,098	\$516,098
HS Contracted Programs - Homelessness Services	\$183,463	\$183,463
HS Contracted Programs - Core Services	\$338,104	\$338,104
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,280,411</b>	<b>\$1,287,524</b>
<b>25-26 Biennial Total</b>	<b>\$2,567,935</b>	

The 2025-2026 proposed Human Services biennial budget is framed by the Council adopted Human Services Plan and reflects the loss of COVID-19 funding, an additional HS Manager position, and a reduction in the HS support needed from the Community Services Manager. Human Services funding is based on 1% of the general fund and has therefore increased for the upcoming biennium. Additionally, the City Manager is recommending an additional \$125,000 ongoing per year to support the needs reflected in the HS Strategic Plan. The proposed 2025-2026 budget for Human Services personnel and contracts is \$2,567,935, which is a 48% increase over the original 2023-2024 budget of \$1,730,215. However, if we take into account the additional Council one-time funding and COVID-19 Response Funds allocated during that same period, the proposed budget represents a reduction from 2023-2024 for Human Services by 30% of the \$3,350,064 approved for Human Services Personnel for 2023-2024 from the General Fund, COVID-19 Response Funds and one-time Council approved General Funds.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-15. Deputy Mayor Mork wants to know how we measure effectiveness of human services programming.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork asked about what measurements we have in place to determine the effectiveness of Human Services programs. Are there similar metrics used for all programs? For example, the Councilmember used the example that recalls that there are 3 different entities associated with immigrant assistance that receive funding. Does the city measure the effectiveness of all three? Do we have data that would allow a comparison between organizations doing similar work in all areas? When we do, do we utilize that information to determine how we allocate funding?

**Department:** Recreation, Cultural and Community Services

**Final Answer:** For our Human Services programs, the City contracts with community-based organizations to provide services. Our contracts include a scope of work which states the agreed-upon performance measures and outcomes required for reimbursement. These measures and outcomes may be similar, but not identical. For performance measures, there are generally a minimum of two per program:

1. An unduplicated count of Shoreline residents served, and
2. A measure of the specific service provided, such as hours of counseling or number of meals served. Program reports are provided at least quarterly.

In terms of program effectiveness, programs provide information on their program outcomes achieved. Proposed program outcomes are provided as part of their application process and required in their contract and reported on yearly. Theoretically, it would be possible to make comparisons across programs doing similar work. However, Shoreline is a small community with usually only one agency funded to provide a particular service. For example, we provide funding to only one food bank; one after-school tutoring program; one family support program; and one Senior Center.

Since each program is different, there is more of an advantage of using the performance outcomes to measure our success in meeting our identified Human Service priorities (Behavioral Health, Housing /Homelessness, Basic Needs); rather than comparing two programs against each other. Additionally, the information is used when evaluating programs during the application process.

Also, due to the limited amount of human services funding available, we have intentionally avoided duplication of efforts amongst multiple agencies. Human services programs which have similar services, such as behavioral health, have unique populations or areas of expertise that does not make comparison especially helpful. For example, of the similar mental health programs, one is focused on serving victims of sexual assault, one is focused on serving recent immigrant and BIPOC populations, and one serves a broader range of community members. Each of these agencies also vary in size, history in the community, and capacity.

In the human services funding competitive process every two years, all agencies report how many Shoreline residents were served in the last year and how many achieved performance measures for the services they are proposing. That information is used in the rating and selection process.

<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-16. Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know how we are efficiently allocating city funding to maximize alternative sources of human services funding.</b>
<b>Question:</b>	Deputy Mayor Mork knows that human services funding is also provided by the County, State, non-profits, and others. Should we be focusing city resources on local needs other than human services that do not have such revenue streams available? How is staff assessing these tradeoffs when developing the budget?
<b>Department:</b>	Recreation, Cultural and Community Services
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>The City has provided funding for human services agencies since shortly after its incorporation to support human service delivery to Shoreline residents. Even with City support, there remains wide gaps in service need, as is shown in the 2024 Council adopted Human Services Strategic Plan. Human Service agencies continue to rely on a variety of funding sources, all vital to maintaining service delivery. Having multiple sources of funding is important to a sustainable funding framework for agencies, as sole source funding creates vulnerable over-reliance. While the City is not the sole funder for services, it is no less critical to continued service delivery to Shoreline residents.</p> <p>Community-based organizations exist and thrive where they are provided funds. Local investment amplifies regional initiatives, similar to climate action efforts. One must be a funder in the sector to leverage and direct human services. In addition, North King County is not viewed as having the most critical human services need in King County, which makes it more challenging to receive any County dollars which may be available. The <a href="#">North Urban Human Services Alliance (NUHSA)</a> was formed as a response to this funding challenge for our sub-region.</p> <p>Staff would anticipate significant impact on services for Shoreline residents if Council were to discontinue providing funding for human services programs and solely rely on County and State funding for local agencies for Shoreline residents. While the systemic issues that cause poverty, homelessness, mental illness, and drug addiction in the Shoreline community are not solely on the City's to solve, the City provides an important piece of the overall funding puzzle that creates a safety net for the community.</p>

**Item/Issue:** CQ-17. Deputy Mayor Mork asks about how the City is preparing for the impacts of utility cost increases on low-income populations and assistance programs.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know if the low-income wastewater program is adequately budgeted to cover increased needs as wastewater costs go up. She also has inquired into whether a low-income solid waste program is currently in existence and, if not, if we would consider investing in as a part of our human service investments. Finally, she asks whether there is staff at the city that is monitoring the impacts of regionwide utility costs on low-income people and are we considering these impacts when we budget for utility fee increases?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The budget assumes implementation of the expansion of the low-income discount program for Wastewater to all low-income households in 2025-2026. It assumes a 50% discount of wastewater utility rates as well as or rebate for qualified residents and assumes that we won't have 100% participation rates based on experiences from other organizations.

The City currently provides a Utility Tax exemption for qualified low-income residents for solid waste. We are planning to streamline the process of application for this program and will be discussing that with Council this fall as we present proposed code-changes to support both programs. Additionally, we will be evaluating the possibility of encouraging our Solid Waste provider to offer their own low-income discount during future contract discussions.

Regarding a SWM low-income discount, that is limited to the Property Tax relief program for seniors and disabled homeowners. Expanding this was not a focus of the most recent rate study, and doing so would likely require bringing administration of SWM fees in-house. Any change in the process would require an update to the rate study.

City utility fee increases are always proposed and approved within the context of a rate study to align with the Utility's Master Plan. As part of the discussion, Council considers the needs of the Utility and the potential impact to our residents, particularly our low-income residents. Staff have generally provided cost comparisons from other local jurisdictions. We have not generally identified all the potential cost increases that residents will face as background for the discussions.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-18. Mayor Roberts inquired into the cost of adding police officers.

**Question:** Mayor Roberts would like to know the cost of adding an additional police officer to the police contract with King County.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The cost to add an officer for 2025 is projected to be \$272,322. Staff are not recommending additional officers in the proposed budget for several reasons. First, and most importantly, there are still 10 vacancies that are not expected to be filled for some time. Adding another police officer would tie-up budget capacity but would not result in increased staffing. Second, crime trends have not returned to pre-pandemic levels, so while we would always like them to be lower, there is no clear need for additional budgeted staff at this time. Finally, with the creation of Regional Crisis Response (RCR) Agency, the City has added 4 FTE staff that work alongside our Police Department to support public safety in a way that honors and respects our residents, while not reducing workload for officers it has certainly enhanced the service to the community.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-19. Mayor Roberts asked about the application of surface water rates to multifamily housing.

**Question:** Mayor Roberts asked how surface water rates would apply to units that fall under “middle housing” such as those properties with 2-6 units, if the new regulations pass.

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** Various types of middle housing such as ADUs, townhomes, duplex’s, etc., are allowed today and managed under our current structure of billing as a Single Family Residential (SFR) flat fee, or as a non-SFR hard-rate based on hard surface coverage. The non-hard surface coverage will be modified for the 27 billing cycle to align with the new Equivalent Service Unit (ESU)-based billing approach for non-SFR properties as discussed as part of the updated Surface Water Master Plan.

Here are a few examples of how these types of developments are currently assessed SWM fees:

1. Current "middle-housing" types which often are SWM fee billed for SFR "flat fees" and tend to be smaller in scale, including:
  - SFR properties with Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
  - Duplexes which superficially resemble and have a similar "footprint as" SFR homes
  - Townhomes (individuals - if each townhome is sub-platted with an individual SFR parcel)
2. Current "middle housing" types which often are SWM fee billed as non-SFR (by hard-surface coverage) and tend to be larger in scale, including:
  - Any properties with present use listed as Apartment or Condominium
  - Triplexes, 4-plexes, and any ">4-plex" units (typically resemble apartments and condos more than SFRs)
  - Townhomes (groups - for townhomes that are collectively operated more like condos); essentially if it operates like a condo or apartment structure, the non-SFR structure is used

In general, if the dwelling unit looks/operates like an SFR, the flat rate is used. Staff intends to continue with this approach under the new code requirements and, as mentioned previously, in the update for the non-SFR rates to an ESU model in 2027. As development occurs, if staff find this current approach isn't working, or is problematic, we can look to make additional adjustments in the future, possibly at the same time as the ESU implementation. This is also something that can be reviewed and re-assessed with the next Surface Water Master Plan and rate study.



**Item/Issue:** CQ-20. CM Scully would like to know more about how Shoreline's FTEs compare with Redmond

**Question:** Councilmember Scully notes that there is a stark difference between Redmond and the rest of the cities on the chart showing staffing levels per resident. What is this difference from? Did Redmond include fire/safety staff?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Our Methodology

Staff believes that what was presented in the PowerPoint presentation when presenting the proposed Biennial Budget to Council on October 14<sup>th</sup> regarding the City of Redmond's FTE count per capita was in fact an accurate comparison to Shoreline. When calculating FTEs per capita, budget staff exclude FTEs in courts, police, fire, utilities, and any notably unique areas of public services that are not shared with Shoreline (ex. airport staff). In Redmond's FTE calculation, we exclude the fire, police, and utilities FTEs presented in their "Staffing Authorizations" list shown in their budget summary section of their [2023-2024 Adopted Budget](#). These numbers can be seen below.

		Excludable FTE								
City (2024)	Total	Court	Police	Fire	Other	Utilities	Subtotal	Comparable Total	Population	FTE Per 1,000
Redmond	723.36	-	130.92	137.00	-	68.79	336.71	386.65 (total - subtotal)	80,040	4.83

**Item/Issue:** CQ-21. CM Pobee wants to know more about the impact and context of the police contract increases.

**Question:** Councilmember Pobee found the police contract cost increase to appear high. He wonders if the contract negotiation could be reopened. How does this contract increase compare with the increases in the rest of the budget?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The ability for Shoreline to reopen our contract independently is limited to changes in levels of services. However, the King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) contract has two oversight committees that regularly discuss the administration of the contract. An executive committee made up of City Managers from contracting cities provides oversight on operational and cost issues. The administrative committee, known as the Oyster Team, provide a more detailed oversight on the cost issues of the contract, reviewing cost increases closely and raising concerns as appropriate. The Draft Exhibit B (our contract's annual cost documentation) represents an increase of 7.9% from our 2024 Final Contract. This increase is driven by several factors including Insurance, Motor Pool Costs, New Radios and some training and hiring bonuses to address the vacancy rate. While this cost increase is larger than past cost increases, when we compare the line item with increases for similar items at the City, the increase appears reasonably comparable. For example, KCSO has a 17% increase in Motorpool costs that include higher fuel, higher replacement costs, and higher maintenance costs. The City's increase in fuel and maintenance costs are 21%. The KCSO had several significant increases in insurance, including a 32% increase in L&I coverage and a general overhead increase of 8%, which included liability insurance increases. The medical benefit costs for deputies increased by 18% for deputies and 22% for administrative staff in the last year alone. The City's property and liability insurance increase was a similar rate at 18%. Finally, the cost for Radios increased almost 80%. This is the result of a countywide levy that mandated and funded the replacement of all 800mhz radios. The increase in the cost of radios is the result of higher maintenance and replacement costs that are not covered by the levy. Given all of these cost drivers and our own increases in comparable cost categories, the cost increase in the police contract appears reasonable.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-22. CM Pobee inquired into why the Grants Administrator was not made full-time.

**Question:** Councilmember Pobee would like to know why the Grants Administrator position was kept limited-term in the proposed Biennial Budget, especially given that it is self-funded.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** FTE conversions, including the decision related to the grants administrator position, occurred after careful consideration of the City's staffing needs and its budget constraints and risks over the next biennium. See answer given in [CQ-1](#) for more detail. Additionally, while the grant funding that this position has helped secure for the City is greater in value than the cost of the salary and benefits of this position, the grant funding that has been secured cannot be used to fund this position. This position is funded by general tax revenue out of the City's General Fund.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-23. CM Pobee would like to know about the current cost allocation related to the RCR Agency.

**Question:** Councilmember Pobee remembers we had an initial investment of around \$1.1 million in the Regional Care Response (RCR) Agency. What will the continuing cost be? Will we be paying more in the future?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** For the 2023-2024 biennium, the start-up and operating costs for RCR totaled \$6,245,451. This amount included building an operating reserve and rate stabilization reserve. The City's share of this amount would have been \$1,486,585 based on Shoreline's proportion of the RCR's served population. However, Kirkland accepted a larger share of start-up and initial operating costs because they were already operating the unit for their jurisdiction, with the expectation that participating cities would assume their per-capita-based share of the operating budget beginning in 2025-2026.

The RCR's 2025-2026 budget includes the addition of 2 FTE's with a few other modest operational cost increases in the 1-2% range. The FTE addition will be partially offset by the use of the Rate Stabilization Reserve. Our full 2025-2026 Biennial Budget allocation is projected to be \$1,106,677.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-24. Deputy Mayor Mork wanted to know the deadline for budget amendments.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork wanted to know what the deadline is for making amendments to the biennial budget.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Staff request that all budget amendments be submitted to the City Manager no later than November 12, 2024. Each amendment should include an offsetting reduction or funding source. Councilmembers are encouraged to submit questions requesting information and cost estimates for potential amendments by November 4<sup>th</sup> to provide adequate time for staff to gather data. Once amendments are submitted, staff will develop slides for each amendment that will be used to facilitate discussion and Council action on November 18<sup>th</sup>. Staff will strive to share those slides in advance with Councilmembers on Friday, November 15<sup>th</sup>. Budget amendments received prior to the November 4<sup>th</sup> Council meeting may be ready to review with Council at the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-25. Mayor Roberts inquired into Storefront Repair Funds.

**Question:** Mayor Roberts notes that Burien, Seattle, and King County all have had something known as a storefront repair fund. How well did those programs work and would it be appropriate to allocate resources to develop a similar program in Shoreline?

**Department:** City Manager's Office

**Final Answer:** In 2022, Seattle, Burien, and King County established a Storefront Repair Grant to alleviate the cost of property damage incurred by small businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic. Eligibility for the grant varied by jurisdiction, but some common requirements were that it had to be an operating small business that is not a chain or franchise, the property damage occurred after March 1st, 2020, and the owner needed proof of the damage and repair costs. The grant amount ranged from \$1,000 in Burien to \$5,000 in unincorporated King County. All three of these programs were funded by the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and grant applications were open until ARPA funds were expended.

These grants were welcomed by the small business community, which had seen a significant increase in break-ins and property damage since 2020. Many small business owners were reluctant to file insurance claims because their insurance companies raised prices after paying out a claim. They tended to pay for the repairs out of pocket, and these grants provided financial assistance during a period when all costs of operating a business were rising.

If Shoreline were to allocate resources to develop a similar program, the program would have to contend with Washington State Constitution Article 8, Section 7, which prohibits any local government entity from bestowing a gift or lending money, property, or the entity's credit to a private party. The programs mentioned above were funded via a federal grant and were not subject to Article 8.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-26. CM Ademasu asks about the extent of the Housing Feasibility Study.

**Question:** Councilmember Ademasu asks about the scope of the Affordable Housing Feasibility Study: will it include a review of all housing types and strategies? (MFTE, Middle Housing, ADUs, etc.). **Would it include a review of incentives for middle housing and/or ADUs to help other governmental agencies across King County address the affordable housing crisis, such as tax exemptions programs?**

**Department:** Recreation, Cultural and Community Services

**Final Answer:** The Affordable Housing Feasibility Study will focus on gathering data on various types of affordable housing (Land Trusts, ADU's, MFTE, partnerships with housing providing agencies, etc.) and the feasibility within Shoreline of the implementation of those strategies. It will not be a plan with a prescribed course of action, but rather an overview of the landscape of affordable housing and what could be feasible in Shoreline. While Shoreline adopted a [Housing Action Plan](#) in 2021, this feasibility study would focus primarily on ways to increase affordable housing, including what is possible and practical for cities of our size and within our region. For example, in strategies related to middle housing, several requirements have already been prescribed by State law. This study will review what additional actions the City could take within middle housing to increase affordable housing options. Other possible subjects for the study would include: the funding and use of a housing trust fund, how to encourage/require affordable units to have three (3) or more bedrooms, and options to reduce displacement, etc.

**Additionally, while we have not fully finalized the scope of the Affordable Housing Feasibility Study, we do plan to include reviewing ADUs and middle housing and their role in increasing affordable housing. However, these housing options do not generally represent affordable housing options in the 0-70%/80% range, although they will increase the overall housing units within Shoreline, which may have the effect of lowering the overall cost of housing and increasing housing options as housing supply rises.**

**Item/Issue:** CQ-27. CM Ademasu asks about the current and future utilization of urban forestry funds.

**Question:** Councilmember Ademasu requests an explanation for how Parks Operations Urban Forestry money is utilized in the current biennium. Are those activities being done under a different name in the 2025-2026 Biennium? This relates to pages 157 and 159 in the budget book.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The Parks Operations- Urban Forestry Program expenditures reflected in the 2023-2024 Budget is comprised of the \$1,000,000 USDA Urban Forestry Grant that the City received in 2024. This grant will be used over three years to enhance the urban forest in disadvantaged areas of the City. The full amount of the 3-year grant was appropriated in 2024 and the unspent balance will be carried over into 2025-2026 and likely into 2027. The work that is supported by the grant includes completing and enhancing the City's Public Tree Inventory, expanding tree pruning in the right-of-way, updating our 20-Year Forest Management Plan to include street trees in addition to parks and open space trees, purchasing additional trees including small container-grown native trees for planting in parks, and larger ball and burlap trees for planting in the right-of-way, growing the City's public tree giveaway program, called "Communi-trees," through both material support and increased staff time spent on outreach, and increasing education and volunteer-led restoration work in the City's federally identified disadvantaged areas. An additional position, a Limited-Term Urban Forestry Program Specialist, will also be supported by this funding for three years.

This one-time grant funding is in addition to the following ongoing funding:

- \$75,000 per year for urban forestry work provided in the Parks Operations Division;
- \$300,000 per year for the Parks Ecological Restoration Program, which is included in the General Capital CIP; and
- \$140,000 in one-time funding for additional tree pruning and tree planting included in the General Fund.



**Item/Issue:** CQ-28. CM Ademasu would like to know more about the planned updates to the Commercial Energy Code.

**Question:** Councilmember Ademasu asks: Updates are planned for the Commercial Energy Code, which will now include residential properties. What is the direction and key items that will be reviewed? Will it take into account indoor air quality in small homes/apartments and prevent sick building syndrome? (The question relates to information on page 190 in the budget book.)

**Department:** Planning & Community Development

**Final Answer:** The Commercial Energy Code is scheduled for Council action on October 28<sup>th</sup>. As proposed, the City would adopt the 2021 Seattle Energy Code. The code will apply primarily to commercial and multifamily buildings. This code builds on the current Commercial Energy Code the City has in place and will align more closely with the 2021 Washington State Energy Code. The [October 14<sup>th</sup> staff report](#) on the Commercial Energy Code highlights in more detail the key changes. Under the code, “balanced ventilation” is required, meaning fresh air is balanced in with exhaust air on a continual basis.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-29. CM Ademasu would like more information about the proposed consulting work related to the Tree Code.

**Question:** Councilmember Ademasu inquired into whether we use staff expertise to draft the update to the Tree Code. If we utilize a consultant to draft the update to Tree Code, what are the key elements that staff are asking the consultant to revise?

**Department:** Planning & Community Development

**Final Answer:** Planning staff will be managing the update to the tree code. It's anticipated that consultant services will be utilized to support the community and stakeholder engagement process and provide technical expertise in developing the regulations (e.g. expertise in arboreal or urban forestry). Using these services is standard practice, and consultant work would be reviewed and managed by staff. However, the precise code language is written by planning staff rather than consultants because there is a deeper level of familiarity with how changes will impact the existing code and how the code will be interpreted and implemented after it is adopted.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-30. Mayor Roberts would like to know about plans for pedestrian infrastructure at Brugger's Bog.

**Question:** The Mayor asked what the plan is for the sidewalk/pedestrian path at Brugger's Bog Park on 25th? Is the plan to only build the sidewalk from the maintenance facility to the north edge of the park? If that is the case, he would like to know how much it would cost to continue the sidewalk from the north edge of the park to 200th Street (and include curb extensions at the intersection of 200th and 25th).

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** New sidewalks will be added along 25th Avenue NE as part of required frontage improvements to Brugger's Bog Park. This sidewalk will eventually connect to future sidewalks to the south when the maintenance facility improvements take place. Currently, there are no plans to continue the sidewalk further north past the park boundary.

If the sidewalk were to continue north approximately 318' to the intersection with 200th Street, the estimated cost would approach \$500k. This rough estimate includes costs for re-paving, stormwater requirements, sidewalks, landscape strips, and amenity zones. While this is a high priority street in the Pedestrian Prioritization Plan, and this project could be funded using remaining funds from the Sidewalk Expansion funding, staff would recommend that Council review all the high priority projects to ensure we are allocating any remaining funds across the numerous high priority projects appropriately. Additionally, this project could be a candidate for grant funding such as Safe Routes to School or other grant funding, as it would be filling a small gap in a larger network. The final option would be to amend our contract with Forma Construction to increase the scope of the Brugger's Bog project. This option would provide economies of scope and may still provide the opportunity to seek grant funding because the work would likely not be ready to proceed until 2027. Additionally, because the general fund has already committed funds to the parks bond projects, we do not believe that this would require additional funding being committed at this time. If Council would like to add this project to the CIP, staff recommend an amendment to the CIP to include this project in or after 2027 with funding identified as "future funding" to provide time to evaluate the viability of the three options. The work could potentially be performed sooner depending on the best option. Based on this approach, Council could simply direct staff to explore these options and update the CIP as appropriate to accomplish this project with a future budget amendment. Alternatively, a potential amendment could be:

*"I move to amend Roads Cap in the 2025-2030 CIP to include expanding the frontage improvements on 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to reach 200<sup>th</sup> Street at a value of \$500,000 in 2027 with funding identified as "Future Funding".*

**Item/Issue:** CQ-31. CM Scully asked about the increase to City Council's travel budget.

**Question:** Councilmember Scully asked about what made up the 14.9% cost increase in the City Council travel budget? Was it per trip? To where?

**Department:** City Manager's Office

**Final Answer:** The Council travel budget estimates that all Councilmembers will travel annually to the AWC Annual Conference, AWC City Action Days, NLC Congressional City Conference, and the NLC City Summit. Additionally, staff added budget for one lobby trip to D.C. for the Mayor. There is a small amount budgeted for miscellaneous travel. This year's base budget adjustment is a "catch up year," as recent adjustments for inflation weren't sufficient for rising travel costs. The per person trip cost for the NLC Congressional Conference increased 28% (\$846) from 2017 to 2024 and increased 49% (\$846) for the NLC City Summit during the same period. In 2024, 23 trips were taken by Councilmembers, compared to 24 trips in 2023. As a comparison to historic pre-covid travel, 13 trips were taken in 2018 and 21 trips in 2017. While Council's travel budget has routinely been adjusted for inflation, we now have had enough post-covid travel cost data to more accurately anticipate future travel costs.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-32. CMs Ramsdell and Scully have asked about adding funding for a senior center mental health program.

**Question:** The Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Senior Center Mental Health Program has requested additional one-time funding of \$65k for the 1st year/\$80k for the 2nd year as a pilot project while they seek other funding to support this program. What impact would that have on the City's General Fund balance if we were to fund this? Can the City Manager provide a recommendation for funding this program? Additionally, how does the ongoing increase in the proposed budget compare to the prior budget for the senior center including the one-time funding. What is the net ongoing increase?

**Department:** Recreation, Cultural and Community Services

**Final Answer:** Staff is projecting that there is \$19.9M of unassigned, undesignated ending fund balance available after we adjust the project ending fund balance for required reserves and set-asides already in place. From this amount, the proposed budget includes an additional use of fund balance of \$8.7M, leaving \$11.3M unassigned and undesignated. Staff has been targeting maintaining this amount at no less than \$10M for this budget process.

Maintaining a healthy fund balance beyond the mandated reserves is recommended for several reasons. These include providing flexibility to respond to unforeseen needs whether it is related to the economy, grant matches, or other capital or operational needs, as well as providing assurance of our financial situation to investors and bond rating agencies. This would mean that Council could allocate up to a \$1.3 million in one-time amendments to the proposed budget and still meet this target. This amount is higher than what was originally projected with our preliminary proposed budget in September and could support this amendment.

Regarding the ongoing increase that is included in the proposed budget, the City Manager included an ongoing increase in allocation to the Senior Center of \$84,202. This ongoing increase is intended to continue the one-time funding that was being provided to cover the social worker at \$50,000 per year. Therefore, the net increase is approximately \$34,000. Given that the annual amount provided to the Shoreline/LFP Senior Center has not escalated for inflation for many years, this amount would address normal inflationary increases over recent history. The City Manager recommends that if a budget amendment to provide the Shoreline/LFP Senior Center funding to provide Mental Health Support Services to seniors is moved, that it be limited to "income qualified Shoreline seniors" funded by a one-time general fund contribution. Based on this approach, a potential amendment could be:

*"I move to amend the 2025-2026 Biennial Budget by increasing General Fund appropriations to provide \$145,000 in one-time funding to the Shoreline/LFP Senior Center to provide mental health supportive services for income qualified Shoreline seniors supported by use of General Fund fund balance."*

**Item/Issue:** CQ-33. DM Mork would like to understand how grant funded programs are shown in the budget.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork would like to understand how grant-funded programs are presented in the budget book.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** It is difficult to isolate grant funding in the operating budget. Operating projects funded by grants are only included in the proposed budget if the grant has been awarded. Generally, when a grant is awarded for an operating project, staff will incorporate that funding into the budget through a budget amendment that reflects both the grant revenues, and the expenses supported by the grant.

Capital projects that have secured grant funding will have that clearly identified. Capital projects that do not have secured funding may include lines for potential grant funding where we anticipate that there are grant opportunities available to support that specific project.

While it is challenging to isolate the total grant funding included in the City's budget, staff closely track grant applications and awards for both general and capital projects. Additionally, the City reports annual grant revenues, which are included in [CQ-12](#).

**Item/Issue:** CQ-34. Mayor Roberts asked about budget for cleanup on trails & pathways.

**Question:** Mayor Roberts asked if the proposed budget provides for additional focused clean up (garbage service) on City's trails and pathways, specifically for drug use on Interurban Trail. Examples could be budget for sharps containers or a dedicated FTE/contract for garbage services. If not, how much would it cost to have increased emphasis on this?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The following matrix compares the cost of a pilot program to remove trash along the Interurban Trail using a Limited-Term Employee, Extra-Help and Contracted Services. It assumes daily garbage pick-up for the full length of the interurban trail. If Council is interested in pursuing a pilot program like this, staff would recommend amending the budget to allow for a Limited-Term employee while staff conduct a more thorough evaluation of the contracted versus limited-term options before implementing the program.

Option	Cost	Pros	Cons
1.0 Limited Term Employee - LTE	\$234,000 (Biennium)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provides the greatest economy of scope/scale by adding capacity to existing crew.</li><li>Ability to provide daily trash removal along the full length of the Inter-Urban Trail and on an as needed response to other trouble spots.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Highest cost</li><li>Additional staff management demands.</li></ul>
2 – 15–20-hour Extra Help	\$170,000 (Biennium)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Lowest cost option</li><li>Provides Daily response to Interurban trail garbage.</li><li>May provide some capacity for other as-needed response.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>We have experienced challenges finding and managing limited-term maintenance staff.</li><li>Park Operations Extra Help staff are required to drive a city vehicle, which represents higher liability issues and difficulty in finding insurable driving records.</li></ul>
Contracted Daily Garbage Pick-up	\$200,000 (Biennium)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Contracted Service, less personnel liability for city staff.</li><li>Can require SOW with staff who have Hazardous Waste removal training/certification.</li><li>Could be used by other City staff, recreation division and Police Dept. if needed.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provides lowest level of service.</li><li>Issue with Union – contracting out work that is also performed by represented employees.</li></ul>

**Item/Issue:** CQ-35. Councilmembers Scully, Ademasu and Deputy Mayor Mork asked about options for converting the limited-term Grant Administrator position to a permanent position.

**Question:** The Councilmembers would like options for converting the limited-term grant administrator position to an ongoing FTE for this biennium.

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Ongoing General Fund funding is required to convert the Limited-Term Grant Administrator position to an ongoing FTE. Staff are concerned about the impacts to the 10-Year Financial Sustainability Model when an additional FTE is added. If Council would like to convert that position to an FTE an option to minimize the financial impacts on the 10YFSM would be to convert one of the positions currently proposed as an FTE to a limited-term position. In evaluating all the proposed FTE's (discussed in detail in question [CQ-1](#)) staff believe that the Staff Accountant position is most suited to being converted to a limited term position. While there are risks to the City's financial credibility associated with not filling this position, it is possible that we could attract an entry level accountant in a limited term capacity to fill this role. Alternatively, if we were unsuccessful in recruiting a limited-term position, we could rely on contracted consultants or temporary staff to support this function. While these options are not the most effective, they are preferable to impacts related to converting other proposed positions. There is a one-time impact estimated at \$50,000 for the biennium because the current proposed budget only includes 16 months of budgeted expenses. There is ongoing impact estimated at \$27,000 per year due to the Grant Administrator position being in a higher classification. Following is the proposed Amendment Language for this change should a Councilmember choose to move it:

*"I move to amend the 2025-2026 Biennial Budget to change the Grant Administrator position in the Administrative Services Department currently proposed as Limited Term to an ongoing FTE, and the Staff Accountant position also in the Administrative Services Department currently proposed as an FTE to a Limited Term position and update the salary table accordingly and increase the General Fund appropriations of \$77k with 50k of one-time use of General Fund fund balance and 27k supported by ongoing General Fund revenue to support this change."*



**Item/Issue:** CQ-36. Deputy Mayor Mork asked about updating the valuation of publicly owned trees.

**Question:** The Deputy Mayor asked whether the update to the Tree Inventory funded by the Urban Forestry Grant includes a new valuation of trees. If not, is there a plan for how we will value publicly owned trees in Shoreline going forward?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The Urban Forestry Grant funded tree inventory will include a dollar amount per tree of the functional ecosystem benefits of each individual tree calculated using the [US Forest Service's i-Tree software](#). This is not an appraisal of the value of the tree, rather the value of the environmental benefits. A full appraised value of each individual tree involves in-depth measurements and calculations using the industry standard trunk formula technique and is not feasible per tree in a City-Wide inventory of over 40,000 trees. Previous valuations done for illegal ROW removals cost about \$1,850 per tree. Staff are researching the cost to perform this type of valuation for a larger quantity of trees.

Given the likely cost of these valuations, staff would recommend that valuations be performed as needed to support specific decision making. Additionally, staff will explore options and cost/benefit for valuing trees as an asset as part of continuous improvement in asset management.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-37. Deputy Mayor Mork asked how Burien's police force cost compares to Shoreline's.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork would like to know how the cost of the City of Burien's police force compares to Shoreline, including accounting for the number of sworn officers.

**Department:** City Manager's Office

**Final Answer:** In 2024, Burien has 0.87 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, which has a \$302 per capita cost. This compares with Shoreline's 0.81 sworn officers per 1,000 residents and has a \$242 per capita cost. A complete comparison for all contracted police force cities is below for 2023:

City	Cost per Capita	Commissioned officers per 1000 residents
Burien	\$303.42	0.85
Carnation	\$242.05	0.91
Covington	\$269.33	0.90
Kenmore	\$175.04	0.61
Maple Valley	\$212.75	0.72
Newcastle	\$240.12	0.85
Sammamish	\$140.57	0.51
SeaTac	\$509.05	1.58
Shoreline	\$252.40	0.82
Woodinville	\$327.74	1.14

**Item/Issue:** CQ-38. CM Scully asks about how we can utilize recovery savings from the King County police contract.

**Question:** Councilmember Scully asked whether we can use cost recovery savings (reconciliation credit) from the King County Police contract to pay for limited-term, non-commissioned officers to help with back-office tasks to free up our limited commissioned officers while we address our vacancy rate. Or are there other creative strategies for temporary support that could be provided with these savings to deliver services?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Chief Collins and the King County Sheriff's Office will work together to evaluate the options to use limited term non-commissioned staff to backfill some of our vacancies. While this evaluation will not be completed before budget adoption, a budget amendment would not be needed to fund a limited term plan because we would use savings from the current Police budget to fund the limited-term staffing.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-39. CM Scully asked about budget for Police Special Support.

**Question:** Councilmember Scully asked about what services are comprised within the \$5.2 million budget within the King County police contract for "Police Special Services."

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** Police Special Support is comprised of a number of additional services, including jail transport, K9 team support and services, communications/dispatch services, Hostage Negotiation Team, major crimes investigation, SWAT (TAC-30) Team, and the Fire Investigation Unit.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-40. Mayor Roberts asked about the change in "Planned Action" for cities and its impacts.

**Question:** Mayor Roberts asked about how the state law changes related to "planned actions" in municipalities impact the decision to plan for a "planned action" for an entire city versus small sub-areas like 185th or 145th. What would the difference to city be, such as in staff costs?

**Department:** Planning & Community Development

**Final Answer:** Under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), a planned action ordinance is a way to have an environmental review of a specific geographic area before permits are filed. It is an up-front environmental review as a way to help streamline the development process later.

RCW 43.21C.440(4) allows for a SEPA planned action ordinance to encompass the entire boundary of a city. A planned action needs to be designated by ordinance and in conjunction with or to implement a comprehensive plan, subarea plan, etc. A planned action would need to specify the type of development or redevelopment (e.g. office buildings up to a certain size) that are eligible (RCW 43.21C.440(1)).

Staff have not researched whether any jurisdictions in the state have adopted a citywide planned action. Identification of project-level impacts and mitigation measures at a citywide-scale could prove difficult and resource intensive.

Given the stage of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update and that the draft Environmental Impact Statement has already been published, a citywide planned action could not be included with this update.

However, as noted in the PCD 2025-26 key goals on p. 190 of the 2025-26 Biennial Budget, an update of the 145th and 185th Light Rail Station SEPA planned actions is anticipated to increase the thresholds in those two areas. This update was identified and funds were appropriated as part of the 2023-24 Biennial Budget and work has just been getting underway in recent months.

If neighborhood subarea planning is advanced in other parts of the City, planned actions could be evaluated to be included as part of that work as a way to encourage development and streamline process within those areas.

Furthermore, adopting the maximum development thresholds allowed by the SEPA rules in WAC 19-11-800 could also be a way to minimize additional process for new development and could be analyzed to be included in a future Development Code amendment.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-41. CM Ademasu asks about the cost of expanding the Metro-Flex pilot to NE Shoreline.

**Question:** Councilmember Ademasu notes that there is no bus service in east Shoreline (east of 15th Ave. NE), and that this creates equity issues, as there are more BIPOC and seniors in North City, east Briarcrest, and east Ballinger. The Councilmember asks about whether staff could inquire with Metro into if the Lake Forest Park program could be extended to cover this area. How much would it cost?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** Shoreline staff reached out to Metro staff to discuss this possibility. Metro responded with below:

First, the new Northshore Metro Flex pilot is in Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, and a sliver of Shoreline, and also includes parts of Mountlake Terrace and Brier. The current zone was part of a robust public engagement process and is focused on serving the highest Equity Priority Areas within the current zone, testing connections to Link light rail and other community destinations in areas with less or no access to transit service. Metro continues to learn from these pilots in the design and operation of new Metro Flex areas. The Northshore pilot is for a two-year period after which it will receive a full evaluation. Initial feedback is positive, but it is too early to assess performance.

At this point, Metro is not considering expansion of this Metro Flex zone. As you may know, Shoreline City staff asked Metro to look at this area in 2023. Metro staff replied with information about why Metro was not considering a flexible service in this area. As part of that Lynnwood Link Connections engagement, Metro launched a new frequent route in this area based on community feedback, input from Shoreline staff, and Metro's decision-making criteria. The design and size of Metro Flex zones, including Northshore zone, needs to strike a balance. Expanding zones by too much can affect service quality by creating longer trips that reduce the efficiency of the service, extend wait times for riders, increase cost per ride and make it more difficult to meet customer demand.

As the Northshore zone continues to operate, and we track ridership trends on the new bus routes serving the City of Shoreline and neighboring communities, we will continue to evaluate service performance and adjust service based on our Service Guidelines.

<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-42. CMs Mork and Mayor Roberts asked several questions about SWM rate application to ADUs and non-single family homes.</b>
<b>Question:</b>	Is Shoreline looking at building residential tiered rates for differences between small houses and big ADUs? Similarly, Do we have a definition of what a single family household is for SWM rates? Is this coordinated with the new development code work? How will ADUs be categorized? Have we considered renaming SFH rates to “neighborhood residential” if they are applied to lots that are not single-families?
<b>Department:</b>	Public Works
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>We've broken the answer down into the multiple questions to simplify the ability to review the answers</p> <p><i>Is Shoreline looking at building residential tiered rates for differences between small houses and big ADUs?</i></p> <p>As discussed in the April 22, 2024, Council meeting, the 2025-2030 SWM fee structure will continue to have a single rate class for "single family residential" (SFR) properties, which make up the large majority of properties in the City. A tiered structure for single family residential properties will be explored further in the next rate study, expected to begin in 2028 and apply to rates for 2031 and beyond. Starting a tiered rate structure for single family properties prior to then would need to occur outside of the City's typical SW master planning and rate study timeline.</p> <p>While a future tiered structure for SFRs may help to differentiate SWM Fees for properties with relatively large differences in hard surfaces, for many properties adding an ADU would likely not lead to a change in a hypothetical tiered billing system - such as the 3- or 4-tiered model examined recently in the SW rate study. Typically, ADU's are relatively small and do not create major stormwater impacts - relative to the range of hard surface conditions typically found on "SFR" properties.</p> <p><i>Similarly, Do we have a definition of what a single family household is for SWM rates?</i></p> <p>We typically use the King County Assessor's listed "present use" for the parcel, although our data set is routinely audited to ensure that rare anomalies are corrected (such as obvious commercial properties with high hardscape listed as "SFR" are billed as commercial, and vice versa). We do not currently have a definition within the SMC for Single Family Residential or other property types as per SWM fee billing.</p> <p><i>Is this coordinated with the new development code work?</i></p> <p>SWU staff have been discussing the middle housing changes with PCD staff. SWU staff have also been conferring with consultants on the SWM Fee rate structure. These discussions have not yielded any near-term driving need to overhaul the SWM fee billing structure due to an expected increase in middle housing types in coming years. The current SWM fee billing structure already accounts for and applies to various middle housing types.</p> <p><i>How will ADUs be categorized?</i></p> <p>ADU's constructed on a parcel that the King County Assessor lists as Single Family present use are billed for SWM fees as a Single Family Residential. See response to Mayor Roberts's similar question from October 14, 2024, for more information on how SWM fees are applied to different middle housing types.</p>

Have we considered renaming SFH rates to "neighborhood residential" if they are applied to lots that are not single-families?

*Discussions around SWM billing to date have not yielded any near-term driving need to rename Single Family Residential billing category to anything else, such as "neighborhood residential", but such a change could be considered - in particular for 2027 rates when the City changes from our current SWM billing model to the new Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) model. The ESU model will be applied to non-SFR properties only, while SFR properties will all be billed at 1.0 ESU regardless of hard surface coverage amount. Staff will consider potentially renaming the current "Single Family Residential" category to accompany this transition. Similarly, staff are anticipating an update to the Wastewater Rate Study and would evaluate needed changes in titles for Wastewater rates with that study. It is important to note that the current Wastewater rate table that Single Family residential rates applies to single family through a four-plex.*



**Item/Issue:** CQ-43. Deputy Mayor Mork asks about Pipe Replacement & Repair expenditures.

**Question:** Deputy Mayor Mork asks: What is the “2023-2024 current” vs the “2023-2024 estimated” costs difference in Pipe Replacement & Repair for Wastewater?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** The 2023-2024 Current Budget represents the approved budget as part of the approved 2023-2028 CIP and the 2023-2024 Estimated has been updated to reflect more current projections for expenditures at the end of the year.

There are multiple factors that have impacted the reduction in expenditures between budgeted and estimated amounts. The 2023-2028 CIP was the City’s first CIP after the assumption of the wastewater utility and was based on the Comprehensive Sewer Plan adopted by the Ronald Wastewater District (RWD) in 2021 and utilized in the 2022 rate study. During the formulation of the CIP, staff had incomplete knowledge of the projects or the status of their phase of delivery. As we’ve progressed since development of the first wastewater CIP, staff have gained a better understanding of the system and capital needs and have re-prioritized the CIP while remaining within the resources and needs determined by the 2022 rate study.

There have also been resource limitations as we have moved from a singular District Engineer model of RWD to City oversight of the program. Due to limited design support resources within the Public Works staff, consultants are still being utilized for design. City staff prioritize and scope the work, select, and manage the consultants while overseeing design work. Much of the pipeline construction work that was budgeted for the 2023-2024 biennium had not yet been designed, and so project expenditures have been either re-prioritized or deferred to the 2025-2026 biennium.

<b>Item/Issue:</b>	<b>CQ-44. Deputy Mayor Mork asks about why the Wastewater rate increase occurred despite achieving savings from being absorbed by the City.</b>
<b>Question:</b>	The Deputy Mayor asks: When Shoreline absorbed Ronald Wastewater, the City determined that this would achieve savings in the long run for ratepayers. And yet the rate increase for WW between 2022 and 2030 looks like it's around 147%. Are the ratepayers saving money from the acquisition? Are cost increases in operating or capital?
<b>Department:</b>	Public Works
<b>Final Answer:</b>	<p>The City fully assumed the Ronald Wastewater District (RWD) in the spring of 2021, as RWD was finalizing the update of their Wastewater Master Plan. Given the timing, we were unable to perform a major rate study to incorporate the impacts of the Master Plan update into the 2022 rates that were adopted in the fall of 2021. Therefore, rate increases for 2022 were consistent with historical rate increases imposed by RWD. The major drivers for the rate increases in 2023 were due to several factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporating projects included in the Wastewater Master Plan into the rate study. As noted above, the updated Master Plan was adopted by the Ronald Wastewater Board prior to the City's assumption of RWD. The number and cost of projects included in the Master Plan significantly increased from the prior Master Plan and represents work that is needed to address aging infrastructure and extend the life of the wastewater utility. This was by far the most significant driver in the rate increases anticipated for the next six years.</li> <li>2. In 2022, the City performed a comprehensive rate study and evaluated several financial policies. Policies adopted impacted the rates that are charged, in some cases increasing rates and, in some cases, reducing rates as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizing a balance of debt and pay-as-you go funding for capital projects to spread the impact of the cost of extending the life of the sewer system over time. This <u>decreased</u> the impact on rates.</li> <li>• Resuming the imposition of fees to cover credit card processing costs and late fees that were temporarily suspended during the response to COVID. This change <u>decreased</u> the impact on rates.</li> <li>• Extending the current low-income senior home-owners discount to low-income customers of all ages. This change <u>increased</u> the impact on rates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Finally, the impacts of inflation are also experienced in the operation of the wastewater utility. Employee salaries, benefits, supplies and materials necessary to operate the utility have all increased for the wastewater utility in the same way they do for all staff. Additionally, we made some adjustments to move some previously contracted work in-house where we think that we will experience net savings in the future. However, overall, the impacts of inflation increased the rates.</li> </ol> <p>The end result is that regardless of whether RWD or the City owned and operated the wastewater utility, costs would and did increase during this timeframe in order to implement a more robust capital program, adjusting financial policies and adjusting operating expenses due to a period of high inflation.</p>

**Item/Issue:** CQ-45. CM Robertson asks about the public art budget.

**Question:** Councilmember Robertson asked if there was a place in the budget book where she could see all of the funds that are expected to go into the Public Art Fund?

**Department:** Administrative Services

**Final Answer:** The public art expenditure budget can be found on page 157 and the revenue budget can be found on page 159 of the proposed budget book. You can also find a summary of the Municipal Art Fund (MAF) on page 233. The budgeted revenues for the MAF are primarily comprised of 1% public art contributions from capital construction projects, which is based on 1% of budgeted construction expenditures. It is important to note that revenues are transferred at the end of the year based on the actual (not the budgeted) capital project expenditures for eligible capital projects with eligible capital project revenues. Historically, public art contributions have been much less than budgeted due to actual construction expenditures being less than budgeted within a single year, typically due to project timelines being extended or projects being changed. For example, 2023 1% public art contributions actually only about 30% of the budgeted revenue. In order to ensure that we don't overspend in this fund, use of the 1% public art contribution revenues is only budgeted after the revenues are received, and thus expenditures are budgeted based on the actual ending fund balance. At the beginning of 2024, the MAF had a fund balance of approximately \$205K. The MAF is used to support public art and projects that are consistent with the MAF Policy, along with staff time. MAF expenditures and revenues are also projected out over several years to ensure stability and sustainability of the MAF. And as noted above actual budgets are adjusted as necessary to address any shortfall.

**Item/Issue:** CQ-46. CM Ademasu asks about cobra lamps vs artistic heads.

**Question:** With the Aurora Lighting, we replaced artistic heads with the cobra lamps - what makes them not wildlife friendly at night?

**Department:** Public Works

**Final Answer:** Replacement streetlights for Aurora Avenue N will function the same as the old lights from the perspective of dark sky principles and color temperature. The new lights, like the old lights, point down and are shielded along the top to prevent light trespass into the sky. They come with glare guards, which additionally limit the impact of glare to wildlife and can be more dynamically adjusted for sensitive environments compared to existing lights. They will be the same color temperature as the existing lights. See the below picture for a photo comparison of the new light standard to the old.

Old lights



New Lights



**Item/Issue:** CQ-47. DM Mork asked about funding for Shoreline's 30th year celebration.

**Question:** The Deputy Mayor would like to consider funding the Shoreline Historical Society to celebrate their 50th and Shoreline's 30th year of incorporation and the history of Firlands way. Do we have plans and funding for such a celebration already in the budget?

**Department:** Recreation, Cultural and Community Services

**Final Answer:** *Pending*