

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
PW	10/24	9. There was a lot of discussion of the 147th/148th Non-Motorized Bridge, as well as the Trail Along the Rail, concerning how much of the projects, will be completed with the proposed level of funding (\$500,000 & \$275,000 respectively), whether the projects should simply ensure the light rail station could have connectivity, and whether the projects should stop just short of the environmental phase and serve to inform the City's conversations with Sound Transit. (MULTIPLE COUNCIL MEMBERS)	Please See Response at Bottom of Matrix.
PRCS	10/24	8. Asked if the City is considering a project to create a Hillwood Park Master Plan given the School Board's vote to place a bond to rebuild Einstein Middle School on the ballot. (ROBERTS)	Yes. The PRCS Director has had preliminary conversations with the School District Deputy Superintendent about the advantages of doing a master plan for Hillwood Park simultaneous with the design of the rebuilt middle school. We will continue to pursue this collaboration.
PW	10/24	7. Asked if the Ridgecrest Park Master Plan can be paid for as part of the Sound Transit mitigation. (SCULLY)	Sound Transit is likely not willing to directly fund the Ridgecrest Master plan as a standalone item. It is a park master plan for the benefit of the City and does not have a strong "nexus" to the impacts to the park from the Sound Transit project. However, as the City is starting discussions with ST on compensation for their use of park (the track way affects a small portion of the west side of the park), the City could direct some of those "mitigation" funds to the master planning effort.
PW	10/24	6. Asked for more information about the need for \$70,000 in professional services for the Surface Water Utility. Why do these services need to be done in 2017? (SCULLY)	In 2016 a one-time appropriation of \$70,000 was provided to fund professional services to help the City address the backlog of unassigned drainage work. The 2016 funds were used to acquire an on-call professional services contract with Otak. This contract is being used to help address the backlog of unassigned drainage work that staff does

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
			not have capacity to address in-house. Of the 60 unassigned work orders, Otak has designed drainage improvements at N 179 th St and 1 st Ave NE, is conducting drainage/capacity investigations at N 149 th /Westminster Way N and in the Upper Hamlin Creek/Ditch near 1829 NE 171 st St., provided assistance in a stream classification review and is assisting in prioritizing and bid package development of projects in of the back log. . The \$70,000 requested for 2017 will continue funding the On-call professional services contract with Otak and keep addressing the backlog of unassigned drainage work orders that staff does not have capacity to perform. When staff brought forward the 2016 request, staff provided information to the City Council that the backlog would require an additional request for 2017.
PW	10/24	5. Asked for more information about the benefits about obtaining the APWA accreditation. (SCULLY)	<p>The American Public Works Association (APWA) has developed a program to enhance the effectiveness of agencies and their competencies in the public works field. This program is designed to provide guidance and technical resources to agency managers as they seek to evaluate and upgrade the performance of their agencies. The foundation of this program is the Public Works Management Practices Manual (Manual). The Manual provides more than 500 procedures necessary to perform as a public works agency and provides a framework for an objective evaluation of their work practices with a focus on improving how an agency conducts its work. Public works accreditation is recognition that the agency subscribes to the concept of continuous improvement and has conducted an in-depth self-assessment of the agency's policies, procedures and practices.</p> <p>The City initiated an effort to become an APWA accredited agency in July 2014. Since then Public Works and other Departments have been conducting the self-assessment and documenting procedures. This work is nearing completion. The next step, and what is included in the 2017 proposed budget, is the "on-site" evaluation conducted by public works professionals from other agencies which determines compliance with the procedures in the Manual and includes a review of written records, policies and procedures, interviews with staff, managers and elected officials supplemented by field observations. This evaluation and subsequent accreditation provide the "quality control" of our self-assessment and assure that the city has embraced and is following the best management practices for public work agencies.</p>

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
			Additional information on the program is available at: http://www2.apwa.net/documents/accreditation/07AccreQA.pdf
PW	10/24	4. Asked for Public Works to provide an analysis of the costs to maintain the BigBelly solar compactors versus returning to regular trash cans. Thought it was originally grant funded. Is the City taking on ongoing grant funded costs? (SALOMON)	The BigBelly cans were a one-time purchase using various grant funding contributions in 2009, 2011, and 2013; the city owns a total of 68 BigBelly garbage and recycling units. The City authorized the purchases to help meet its targets for the Climate Action Plan. The grant funds provided for the purchase of the BigBelly cans, and did not include operation and maintenance costs. The City has expended funds for the ongoing costs associated with maintenance such as battery replacement, minor repairs, etc., and after five years of use we are encountering technology upgrades and wear and tear which has created a need for a maintenance program. Since the budget proposal was developed, BigBelly has modified how they provide maintenance services. Staff is collecting this information and will be able to provide details next week on the cost and benefits of utilizing BigBelly cans compared to traditional cans.
PRCS	10/17	3. What was the timeline for the Senior Center losing its funding source that the City supplemented in 2016 with one-time funds (and requesting again in 2017)? (HALL)	<p>As part of the 2016 budget process the Senior Center asked for an additional one-time \$26,000 allocation. The Center said that this was necessary for two primary reasons: 1) A portion of a \$400,000 reduction in funding to Sound Generations (the Shoreline Senior Center parent organization) was passed along to them in 2016 which was resulting in a \$16,000 shortfall; 2) They had previously supported their agency with \$10,000 net revenue from catering and this revenue stream was ending. The one-time allocation of \$26,000 from the city has saved the Senior Center this year from any really significant reductions, although they will end the year with about a \$16,000 shortfall.</p> <p>The 2017 Proposed budget includes a base budget recommendation of \$95,708 for Senior Center operations plus a second year one-time allocation of \$26,000 for a total of \$121,708. Staff reached out to the Senior Center Executive Director as part of the 2016 budget process to see if they had filled the gap of the \$26,000 and was told that this revenue had not been replaced with another funding source.</p> <p>On October 18 we received the following e-mail from Bob Lohmeyer (Senior Center Exec. Dir.). Staff is trying to determine if the Senior Center is now inquiring if the City could provide another \$14,000 beyond what is already included in the proposed budget or if they are asking</p>

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
			<p>for another \$40,000 above what is already included in the proposed budget:</p> <p><i>Hi Eric,</i></p> <p><i>I wanted to give you an update of the Senior Center budget issues moving into 2017. I recently turned in budget projections for 2017 and am looking at close \$71,287 deficit next year. This is on a \$528,000 budget. So this represents about a 13.5% reduction on an already very thin budget. \$38,000 is directly attributable to United Way cuts.</i></p> <p><i>I have identified approximately \$27,878 in wage and maintenance services cuts, leaving the admin staffing very thin...all will be part time now and we will depend on overlapping hours to keep the center open. Any vacation or sick time may require additional hours to staff the center with at least one admin for the day. This will leave a large deficit of \$43,408 for a program such as ours.</i></p> <p><i>I will be looking at additional "efficiencies" to put in place to save more and some new fundraising ideas to raise more. Can you give me any idea as to whether the city will be able to increase support for the center? We need \$40,000 to have a realistic chance of getting to break even in 2017, however, if the city could maintain the \$26,000 this would give us a fighting chance to come up with some creative solutions to this over the next year. Otherwise, we could maintain our present full time schedule only through 2017 and in 2018 we would need to consider reductions in hours of operation.</i></p> <p>Staff is following up to get clarification on this issue.</p> <p>On 10/24/2016, Staff received information from the City of Lake Forest Park that it is providing funding to the Senior Center in the amounts of \$12,650 in 2016 and \$17,000 each year in 2017 and 2018.</p>
PW/ PRCS	10/17	2. What was the calculation for the rent charged to SWM for use of park space? (ROBERTS)	The City pays surface water management (SWM) fees for developed parks like other property owners in the city. The fees are established dependent on how the park has been developed, specifically the amount of impervious area. The SWM fee for Parks is \$20,552 in 2017.

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
			<p>Some SWM facilities are located in parks. These are separate from storm drainage and surface water systems that serve the just the park. SWM facilities in parks tend to fall into categories including those that are an engineered conveyance through a park (e.g. a pipe), an engineered facility (e.g. a bioswale, dry pond, etc.), or a location where SWM uses a natural body of water in a park which may or may not have surface water flow control devices. There are also instances where parks drainage flows into the SWM facility and when a park utilizes SWM facilities as an amenity to park.</p> <p>An examination of the park area that the SWM facilities utilize was conducted with a goal to establish a rental charge for those facilities. A tabulation of SWM facilities in parks was developed and a calculation of the area associated with each facility was developed.</p> <p>The use of park property by SWM is a very unique situation that is not covered by any fees in the City's fee structure which are intended for very short term uses for small portions of park land that may impact the general public enjoyment of the park. Additionally, other leases of property such as Cell Tower Leases don't provide a comparable market rate because there is not the same level of mutual benefit derived from those agreements such as we find with the storm drainage facilities. Because there wasn't a clear approach for determining the fair market value rental rate for this type of use of a small portion of a park for the non-exclusive use by SWM, setting the rate at a level that offsets the SWM fees paid by parks was thought to be appropriate as a mutual and offsetting benefit for the General Fund and SWM.</p> <p>The total area for SWM facilities on Park property is 548,700 sf. at a rent rate of \$0.037 per sq foot yields a 2017 rent payment to Parks of \$20,552.</p> <p>The rental rate will be adjusted annually to accommodate changes in SWM fees charged to park properties.</p> <p>This also clarifies that SWM will resume the role of "regulator" for NPDES permit compliance for park properties rather than performing the permit work. This aligns SWM activities in parks with those on other private and government properties.</p>

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

<u>Dept</u>	<u>Date of Request</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Response or Scheduled Follow Up</u>
ASD	10/17	1. Do we have a schedule for replacement of the AV equipment? Can it be done in 2016 when Council is on break? (ROBERTS)	The work was initially quoted by our existing A/V vendor at \$60,000. In view of that estimate and current purchasing policies, staff will need to initiate a full RFP process. It is highly unlikely that staff would be able to construct formal RFP scope, complete City review, receive bids, award the contract, order equipment and complete the work in 2016. Staff does not anticipate the actual installation of equipment to take more than 2 days, and therefore do not foresee any issues with interruption of Council activities in early 2017.

#9 Above

The CIP as proposed will fund the 147th/148th Non-motorized Bridge and the Trail Along the Rail projects to 30% Design and complete the environmental clearances (NEPA/SEPA). The benefit of taking these projects through the environmental clearance process is they are then officially recognized by Sound Transit's federal project sponsor (USDOT), it validates the projects' designs, and provides design guidelines for Sound Transit to either not preclude the future construction of these projects or partner on their implementation. This level of effort provides a strong city position in working with Sound Transit and other partners on project accommodation, funding and constructing the project. The City Manager included the funding for 30% Design work for both projects in the Proposed 2017 Budget in response to Council's CIP discussion on September 19 and as a result of the additional policies regarding station connections and partnerships for funding projects that Council added to the 145th Subarea Plan at the end of September.

At this time and with the information available, Sound Transit is not seriously making efforts to accommodate or include these projects in the Lynnwood Link Extension (LLE).

As you know, both of these projects are currently going through a feasibility analysis which will provide high level information on a preferred alignment for each project which the City can present to Sound Transit for further discussion. The preliminary results of the 147th/148th Non-motorized Bridge study are expected on October 27th and the preliminary results for the Trail Along the Rail feasibility study are expected by November 11th. The council has a discussion of the 147th/148th Non-motorized Bridge scheduled for the December 12th council meeting. Time permitting; a discussion of the Trail Along the Rail could also occur at that meeting.

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

The level of design and timing of this work is important as the Lynnwood Link Extension project is at approximately 30% design for their stations and is progressing towards a 60% design by Spring 2017, and a baseline design by mid-Summer 2017. Sound Transit will baseline the project in order to establish the scope, schedule and budget for the project through final design and construction. The proposed CIP would provide a level of design and environmental information on these projects by the end of 2017 that would:

- reduce the gap in the level of design between the City led projects and the Sound Transit project,
- promote the synchronization and coordination of design efforts, and
- increases the accuracy of project costs and feasibility for partnership negotiations.

It would be ideal to have the environmental clearances for the both projects by the time the Sound Transit project is expected to baseline in the summer of 2017. However if additional analysis is required by a regulatory agency the environmental clearance may not be achieved until the end of 2017. The additional analysis would be included in the CIP proposals.

Understanding the Council has expressed concerns regarding the cost to complete 30% design and environmental clearance for each project, the City could consider the following two alternatives to reduce the scope and anticipated costs:

147th/148th Street Non-motorized Bridge

- 5% design (preliminary engineering and special studies) and not start the environmental clearance process. In this alternative, the budget would be approximately \$150k. This effort would include development of Type, Size, and Location of bridge, contextual study of how neighborhood streets could be retrofitted to accommodate motorized and non-motorized access to the bridge, geotech study, survey/mapping, subsurface utilities, and environmental scoping. This effort would not include public outreach. The results of this effort would increase the project's readiness to advance to conceptual engineering, increase accuracy of the cost estimate, and reduce risks by reducing the number of unknowns.
- 10-15% design (conceptual engineering) to initiate the NEPA/SEPA environmental analysis. In this alternative, the budget would be approximately \$350k. This effort would include the preliminary engineering and special studies listed above, plus advance the design enough to initiate the environmental clearance process with the objective of receiving environmental clearance by the summer of 2017. The disadvantage is that it would not close the gap at this level of design as much as taking the design to the 30% milestone would achieve. There may also be additional design environmental analysis required by the environmental regulatory agency(s) that could require additional funds in the future.

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.

2017 Budget Questions Matrix for November 7, 2016

Trail Along the Rail

- 5% design (preliminary engineering and special studies) and not start the environmental clearance. In this alternative the budget would be approximately \$125k. This effort would advance the design of the entire alignment enough to frame the environmental clearance process. For budget efficiency, this effort would not include any supplemental survey. This effort would focus on at-grade solutions for trail crossings (i.e. no elevated structures) and provide a high-level assessment of ROW impacts, potential easements, stormwater and drainage design, traffic management, and environmental impacts. The results of this effort would increase the project's readiness to advance to conceptual engineering, increase accuracy of the cost estimate, and reduce risks by reducing the number of unknowns.
- 10-15% design (conceptual engineering) for the alignment. With this alternative, the budget would be approximately \$200k. This effort would initiate the SEPA/NEPA environmental analysis with a desired outcome of achieving environmental clearance of the project by summer 2017 in coordination with the baselining of the Sound Transit project, thus reducing project risk and increasing partnership negotiations. As stated above for the non-motorized bridge, a primary disadvantage of this alternative is that it would not close the gap the level of design as much as taking the design to the 30% milestone would achieve. There may also be additional design and environmental analysis required by the environmental regulatory agency(s) that could require additional funds.

Each alternative presented progresses the project to a different level of design and a closing off the gap between the City project's and Sound Transit's. As the design progresses (5%, 15% or 30%) the level of risk is reduced and the accuracy of the cost and the strength of the City's negotiation position is increased.

Without any additional design information, Sound Transit is more likely to lock into a baseline design for the LLE stations and guideway that may preclude some elements of the 147th/148th Non-motorized Bridge and/or the Trail along the Rail and therefore require design alternatives that may compromise their optimal alignment. If Council's direction is still to pursue these projects, and put the City in the best position to seek funding partnerships for these projects, then staff would recommend that funding as proposed to move towards 30% design remain in the 2017 budget. Of course, this assumes that the higher level feasibility analysis that will be available November/December supports moving forward. If Council is more comfortable with a lower level of design work, which may require future analysis, then staff would recommend the minimal level of funding to be to take both projects to the 10% to 15% design level.

***Questions listed as "Open Item" are scheduled for follow-up and will be addressed by staff in a future Budget Question Tracking Matrix.

**Please note: There have been no new questions or responses since the October 31, 2016 update.