

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
PRCS/ ASD	11/11	<p>16. [T]he fees in SMC 3.01.016(A) Park Impact Fees should be per dwelling unit, not per square foot</p> <p>Am I correct that this is just to correct an administrative error and is not a substantive change in fees? (SALOMON)</p>	<p>The Park Impact Fee is charged on a "per dwelling unit" basis. The 2018 Proposed Budget Book released on October 9, 2017 had the fee as "per square feet". The November 13, 2017 "Public Hearing on 2018 Proposed Budget and 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan" staff report (available here: http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/council/staffreports/2017/staffreport111317-8a.pdf) corrected it to the "per dwelling unit" basis (see page 8a-22 of the staff report).</p> <p>The corrected Park Impact Fee will also be included with the adoption of Ordinance No. 806, 2018 Budget, 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Program scheduled for November 20, 2017.</p>
PRCS	11/9	<p>15. Is there a proposal in the fee table to change the PRCS fee structure for concessionaires (people offering commercial services in parks)? (ROBERTS)</p>	<p>Yes. As we have reassessed how we manage concession permits PRCS is proposing a change in the fee structure for 2018 as presented in Section C of the proposed PRCS Fee Schedule. In 2018 an applicant will apply for specific days/hours rather than have free reign in the park. A base concession permit fee of \$50.00 will apply and then an additional \$3.00 per hour fee for each hour of park use will be added. This will allow for better management of permits and increased accountability for permittees which should lead to limited concessionaire impact on other park users. This change is being applied to all concession permits. Under the current system concessionaires pay a one-time fee for a single, specific day and hours or they can obtain and 3-month permit (\$150.00) or an annual permit (\$450.00). This blanket permit fee structure makes it difficult for PRSC to enforce and track concessionaire use of the parks. Under the proposed structure they will be paying for specific days and times so we expect them to be more accountable.</p>
CMO	11/6	<p>14. Mayor Roberts asked staff to prepare an amendment to include a membership with the US Conference of Mayors. Deputy Mayor Winstead asked staff to prepare a cost/benefit analysis of the membership. (WINSTEAD)</p>	<p>The draft response for Mayor Roberts/Deputy Mayor Winstead's inquiry about the US Conference of Mayors is below. Please let me know if you have any questions/edits/thoughts.</p> <p>The primary role of the US Conference of Mayors is to promote the development of effective national urban/suburban policy; strengthen federal-city relationships; ensure that federal policy meets urban needs; provide mayors with leadership and management tools; and create a forum in which mayors can share ideas and information.</p> <p>Member cities are able to participate in the organization's policy-shaping process and are eligible for grant and award programs. Throughout the year, the Conference awards over \$2</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<p>million to member cities on projects such as city livability, childhood obesity prevention, prescription drug abuse awareness, financial literacy, and much more. Members also receive discounts for meeting registration and other preferred benefits.</p> <p>Annual membership costs are based on city populations; Shoreline’s annual membership would remain the same as last year’s at \$5,269, though as a new member, Shoreline would be offered a 50% discount on first-year dues, resulting in a payment of \$2,634 for 2018. There would be additional costs for attending conferences. For example, staff travel costs for conferences similar in size and scope, including flights, hotel, etc., have typically cost around \$2,500 per trip per person, though costs will vary based on time of year, location, duration, etc. The Conference holds its Winter Meeting each January in Washington, D.C. and an Annual Meeting each June in a different U.S. city. Additional meetings and events are held as directed by the Conference leadership. Meeting registration costs for members for the Washington D.C. meeting in January is \$650 before December 15th, \$850 after. Non-Members pay \$1,800 if registering before December 15th, \$2,000 after. It is likely that becoming a member of the Conference and sending one person to each national meeting may cost the City around \$9,500—\$11,500 per year.</p> <p>Member cities from Washington State include Auburn, Everett, Pullman, Redmond, Renton, Seattle, Spokane, Tacoma, Tukwila, and Vancouver. All of these cities are strong mayor forms of government, except Tacoma and Vancouver which are Council-Manager forms of government. Although Tacoma is a Council-Manager form of government, the Mayor is separately elected by voters. Mayor Strickland of Tacoma is a USCM Trustee and Vice Chair of the Jobs, Education, and Workforce Standing Committee.</p>
ASD	11/2	13. If City Hall is LEED Gold then how can we be blindsided by an added \$29k in electricity costs? (SALOMON)	<p>While the LEED certification does help to ensure that the City Hall building operates in an environmentally friendly manner, it does not eliminate the impact of increased demand for energy. It is important to remember that City Hall is an all electric building. The demand for electricity comes from heating, cooling, lighting, and powering various equipment. The 2017 electrical utility funding in the Facilities Budget totals \$83,403 predominately for City Hall. Expenditures to date total \$83,240. The 2017 Electrical year end projection was estimated at \$112,824. The year-end projection provided for an increase in electrical usage at City Hall (compared to the previous time periods) as shown below. Increases are due to a combination</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up																								
			<p>of factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the HVAC over certain weekend cold/hot periods to prevent sudden surges in demand on Monday mornings and provide comfortable temperatures. • Colder than normal winter months and warmer than normal summer months (La Nina). • Increased activities/meetings scheduled at City Hall outside of regular working hours. • Construction related work beginning and continuing throughout the year requiring additional heating and cooling and equipment - and less efficient HVAC operation during remodel of the 3rd floor. <table border="1" data-bbox="932 623 2060 922"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="932 623 1073 699">Period</th> <th data-bbox="1073 623 1213 699">12/13/2016 - 1/17-2017</th> <th data-bbox="1213 623 1346 699">2/15/17 - 3/17/2017</th> <th data-bbox="1346 623 1486 699">3/17/2017 - 2/15/2017</th> <th data-bbox="1486 623 1627 699">3/17/2017 - 4/14/2017</th> <th data-bbox="1627 623 1768 699">4/14/2017 - 5/15/2017</th> <th data-bbox="1768 623 1908 699">5/15/2017 - 6/14/2017</th> <th data-bbox="1908 623 2060 699">6/14/2017 - 7/14/2017</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="932 699 1073 781">kWh Consumption</td> <td data-bbox="1073 699 1213 781">150,922</td> <td data-bbox="1213 699 1346 781">108,300</td> <td data-bbox="1346 699 1486 781">106,619</td> <td data-bbox="1486 699 1627 781">82,500</td> <td data-bbox="1627 699 1768 781">70,219</td> <td data-bbox="1768 699 1908 781">57,019</td> <td data-bbox="1908 699 2060 781">54,719</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="932 781 1073 922">KWh Consumption (Same Period Last Year)</td> <td data-bbox="1073 781 1213 922">108,714</td> <td data-bbox="1213 781 1346 922">87,300</td> <td data-bbox="1346 781 1486 922">83,721</td> <td data-bbox="1486 781 1627 922">64,900</td> <td data-bbox="1627 781 1768 922">52,818</td> <td data-bbox="1768 781 1908 922">57,521</td> <td data-bbox="1908 781 2060 922">45,618</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Facilities continues to use strategies to reduce electrical consumption. One good example includes to move to LED lighting. In 2017 all lobby lighting and 4th floor was converted to LED. The 2nd Floor will be converted in 2018. The 1st and 3rd floors will be converted as part of the Police Station at City Hall Project.</p>	Period	12/13/2016 - 1/17-2017	2/15/17 - 3/17/2017	3/17/2017 - 2/15/2017	3/17/2017 - 4/14/2017	4/14/2017 - 5/15/2017	5/15/2017 - 6/14/2017	6/14/2017 - 7/14/2017	kWh Consumption	150,922	108,300	106,619	82,500	70,219	57,019	54,719	KWh Consumption (Same Period Last Year)	108,714	87,300	83,721	64,900	52,818	57,521	45,618
Period	12/13/2016 - 1/17-2017	2/15/17 - 3/17/2017	3/17/2017 - 2/15/2017	3/17/2017 - 4/14/2017	4/14/2017 - 5/15/2017	5/15/2017 - 6/14/2017	6/14/2017 - 7/14/2017																				
kWh Consumption	150,922	108,300	106,619	82,500	70,219	57,019	54,719																				
KWh Consumption (Same Period Last Year)	108,714	87,300	83,721	64,900	52,818	57,521	45,618																				
PCD	10/25	12. I'm having trouble seeing how this is value added for us. We have staff that are concerned about making sure we do development right and we have to comply w npdes. What value would the requested \$80k salmon safe certification expenditure bring?	<p>Action Step #5 from the 2017-2018 Council goals directs the City to: Implement the 2016-2019 Priority Environmental Strategies, including adoption of incentives for environmentally sustainable buildings, exploration of district energy, update of the City's "forevergreen" website, and continued focus on effective storm-water management practices including restoration of salmon habitat. The 2018 Proposed Budget for the City Manager's Office includes \$30,000 of ongoing funding to support these efforts. In addition, in 2018, staff proposed Shoreline attain Salmon Safe Certification at the cost of a total of \$80,000; therefore, an additional \$50,000 in one-time funding is included in the 2018 Proposed Budget.</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<p>In addition to fulfilling a Council goal, the list below describes a variety of ways in which Salmon-Safe certification would create value for the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Salmon-Safe isn't only a certificate; it's ongoing expert guidance and a high value environmental assessment toolkit. Even beyond providing third party certification of a site's water quality and habitat impacts, Salmon-Safe delivers a toolkit of peer-reviewed assessment tools and environmental management guidelines. Salmon-Safe works through a multi-disciplinary, PhD-level science team who conduct on-the-ground assessments of operations and provide site-specific guidance for enhancing programs, facilities, and practices over time. The science team stays with the project throughout the 5-year certification cycle, providing design guidance on construction projects, input regarding land management challenges, and other expert consulting at no additional charge. * Salmon-Safe certification opens funding opportunities. By linking projects that the city wants to take on to Salmon-Safe certification, those projects can be prioritized by funders for support. This has been the case for Portland Parks in successfully funding projects that the city had prioritized but had previously been difficult to fund. Likewise, Oregon's Sandy River Watershed Council reported on Nov. 2, 2017, that a stream restoration and dam removal project that was identified through Salmon-Safe assessment of Mount Hood Community College has received an initial \$75K grant from a national foundation with other funders now interested in supporting the effort. * Salmon-Safe certification can open significant funding opportunities through prioritizing City projects for funders. This was the case for Portland Parks in being able to fund projects through foundations that had long been identified for retrofit or restoration, but that under Salmon-Safe were linked to certification and therefore more competitive for a wider range of funding support. * Salmon-Safe provides expert third party environmental certification at a citywide level, at a cost comparable to taking a single City building through other leading certification programs. US Green Building Council (USGBC) and other leading green building certification programs recognize that Salmon-Safe is the expert with respect to watershed impacts and offer LEED innovation credits for Salmon-Safe projects; Built-Green has a similar approach. Potentially, citywide certification could benefit private and other public-sector projects seeking green

***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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<p>building certification in Shoreline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Salmon-Safe provides the City with public education opportunities linked to conservation of local waterways and provides important talking points for the City with respect to management practices related to pesticide use and other sensitive natural resource topics. These Best Management Practices are often more robust than existing stormwater or NPDES requirements. * Salmon-Safe certification can deliver cost reduction benefits for the City by transitioning to low input landscape practices and managing stormwater on site rather than more highly engineered approaches. * Salmon-Safe can provide important messaging and context for the City across its natural resource efforts, serving as a focal point for employees and residents in working to reduce downstream impacts of everyday decisions that impact the watershed. * Salmon-Safe offers a comprehensive and peer-reviewed management standard that can be incorporated into the City's leasing and development contracts, providing a highly efficient and cost effective platform to ensure that best practices are followed by Shoreline's many contractors. * Salmon-Safe provides the ongoing services of the multi-disciplinary science team throughout the 5-year certification cycle, providing design guidance on construction projects, input regarding land management challenges, and other expert consulting at no additional charge. <p>In Salmon-Safe's 15+ years of working with City of Portland, the City Council has voted multiple times on committing first to Salmon-Safe assessment, then certification for Portland Parks, and then transitioning citywide operations to Salmon-Safe standards. In every case, Salmon-Safe has received unanimous support from Mayors and Commissioners. Portland Commissioner Nick Fish, responsible for the City's water, environmental services, and stormwater systems, could provide further perspective on the ongoing value that Salmon-Safe certification delivers. Contact info here<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/fish/47686>.</p> <p>Attached, please find the PDX flyer for Salmon-Safe. This link to the Vancouver airport video also discusses benefits of Salmon-Safe certification: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2yZGcXZ-lqs</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<p>Please find an email from the City of Portland regarding their experience with Salmon Safe.</p> <p>Shoreline is becoming a regional (and therefore national) leader in sustainability and climate initiatives; one of the best ways to demonstration leadership is adopting a standard that you want other landowners to use.</p>
ASD	10/24	11. Can we obligate future drug seizure funds to pay back the general fund for the police station until the general fund is made whole? What are the seizure funds usually spent on?	<p>The equitable share of State and Federal Drug Seizure monies the City has received are from cases where a Shoreline officer was participating with interagency teams. That program has ended so we don't anticipate any significant new funds coming from this source and we have already accounted for the City's equitable share already in the pipeline. RCW 64.50.505(10) governs the use of State Drug Seizure money and states, "Forfeited property and net proceeds not required to be paid to the state treasurer shall be retained by the seizing law enforcement agency exclusively for the expansion and improvement of controlled substances related law enforcement activity. Money retained under this section may not be used to supplant preexisting funding sources." In the past we have utilized these monies for training and equipment purchases that are neither funded by the City's General Fund or the King County Sheriff's Office. We are using a small amount of Federal Drug Seizure monies in 2017 to obtain two electric motorcycles for police use on park trails and the Interurban Trail.</p> <p>The City's funding plan for the construction of the new Police Station at City Hall includes the use of State Drug Seizure, Federal Drug Seizure, and Treasury Seizure monies that is reasonably anticipated to be received by the City prior to completion of the project. The Shoreline Police Department's Special Emphasis Team (SET) is a plain clothes unit that is made up of one sergeant and four detectives. The unit primarily focuses their efforts on narcotics investigations and criminal activity in high crime areas that have a nexus to narcotics. To support the operation of the SET unit the new Police Station at City Hall will have a sergeant's office and work space for the SET detectives. Additionally the facility will have a secured evidence processing garage where seized vehicles can be securely stored while a search warrant is obtained. The bid and contract cost of the police portion of the project is calculated at approximately \$3.7 million. The estimated cost of the improvements to the law enforcement facility to support the SET operation and investigations is \$631,000, calculated as follows:</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SET Storage Garage: 805 sq. ft. @ \$191,000 • Police Station Cost : \$3.7 M divided by 42 staff total equals \$88,000 per police staff • 5 SET staff multiplied by \$88,000 equals \$440,000 • \$440,000 plus \$191,000 equals \$631,000 <p>The City of Shoreline intends to include up to \$631,000 of State Drug Seizure money as part of its funding plan for the Police Station at City Hall project.</p> <p>Again, RCW 64.50.505(10) is clear that money retained under that section may not be used to supplant preexisting funding sources.</p>
ASD	10/16	10. Councilmember McGlashan noted that the chart on slide 48 of the 10/16 presentation does not match the chart on p. 142 of the budget book. (MCGLASHAN)	There are some bugs that staff is working out with the shift to Office 365. On occasion PowerPoint will not properly update some charts imported from Excel. Nonetheless, the pie chart in question is accurate in the Proposed Budget Book and has been properly updated for the version of the presentation that will be posted on the City's website.
ASD	10/15	9. What is the future of the radar program if we're not spending money on it this year? (SALOMON)	When the City was awarded the grant funding in late 2015, we amended the City budget to include the entire 3-year funding amount. We then proceeded to carryover the funds into the 2016 and 2017 budgets; and will do the same for the 2018 budget in early 2018. As for the continuation of the program past the grant funded 3 years; Shoreline Police will evaluate the opportunity to continue the program in subsequent years.
Police	10/15	8. Why do we need a canine unit? (SALOMON)	<p>Shoreline Police Department serves a population of 55,060 residents but does not have a K9 Unit. The City has not added a new police position since 2007. Since 2013, we have seen police response times for Priority X calls increase by 1.26 minutes and calls for service have increased by 21.0%. Data from prior to 2013 will show bigger increases. Currently, when a K9 is needed for tracking a suspect, building searches, narcotics detection, etc., it calls for a King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) K9. There is usually a significant delay in the response from a KCSO K9 unit as they are typically responding from the Precinct-4 area (Burien) or Precinct-3 area (Maple Valley). Shoreline also uses K9 units from Edmonds PD and Lynwood PD when appropriate and available. The longer the response time, the more difficult it is to hold containment and make an arrest.</p> <p>A Shoreline K9 unit would add an FTE to the staffing of Shoreline PD, drive a marked Shoreline police vehicle and wear a Shoreline uniform. The officer would likely work a late dayshift, early</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
			<p>swing-shift hours when activity is high and a timely response is beneficial. When not performing K9 duties the officer would handle typical calls for service adding capacity to patrol staffing levels. The addition of the K9 unit would increase the number of uniformed officers from 49 to 50 and bring us closer to our goal of one officer per 1,000 residents with a ratio of 1:1,101 (one per 1,101 residents).</p> <p>The K9 would be cross trained for tracking and narcotics detection. Ideally we will want to select a dog that is social and can be used to enhance public relations at certain events. The K9 unit would assist other cities under mutual aid; however, we would set parameters to keep the unit close and available to serve Shoreline.</p>
ASD	10/15	7. Why the increase in city attorney salary? Step increase? (SALOMON)	The increase in salaries for the City Attorney's Office is attributable to the 2.7% cost of living adjustment (COLA) and steps increases for two employees.
ASD	10/15	6. RE: CELLULAR BOOSTERS - \$24,475 one-time: This seems overpriced, please explain/justify the cost (not the service necessarily, but the height cost). (SALOMON)	<p>The cellular booster devices that have been identified have a cost of approximately \$450 per unit. We will need one in each of our 37 vehicles due to the fixed nature of the installation and mounting. Additionally, Fleet Services has received an estimate of approximately \$200 per install for the cellular boosters from the Mountlake Terrace Vehicle Shop.</p> <p>The intent of the implementation of this technology is to provide effective and reliable cellular service to our maintenance staff. Consumer-quality hardware is not built for this purpose. Cellular boosters appropriate for use in maintenance vehicles run from \$350 to over \$1,000. While less expensive units are available for consumer use, they are generally not effective. Use of these devices would result in less effective coverage and frequent failures. Furthermore, while a consumer-grade device would be inexpensive to replace, the installation costs would continue to be incurred if the models of the replacement devices change making it more expensive in the long run.</p> <p>Given that the City does not have direct experience in this technology, staff reached out to the City of Mountlake Terrace Vehicle Shop (MLTVS), our contract vehicle maintenance service provider. MLTVs installed cellular boosters in Mountlake Terrace maintenance vehicles recently. After wide testing, they identified the most effective cellular booster for installation on their maintenance vehicles. The City staff used the cost of this device as a basis for the budget request.</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
CMO/ CS & ASD	10/9	5. Mayor Roberts asked about the workload/demand of our current Customer Response Team staff, what the threshold would be in order to add a CRT Representative, and what the cost would be to add a CRT Representative. (ROBERTS)	<p>The City's Customer Response Team (CRT) is composed of one supervisor, two representatives, and one administrative assistant. The supervisor and representatives each have primary responsibility for one third of the City. CRT's primary responsibilities include addressing infrastructure issues in the City, engaging in code enforcement, and supporting emergency operations, among other tasks. CRT staff also rotate the responsibility of managing the City's 24/7 on-call emergency response telephone line on a tri-weekly basis.</p> <p>Given existing tasks, workload and priorities, CRT is very busy and it can be a challenge to stay on top of the existing set of issues that CRT faces on a daily basis. With that said, the current level of staff resources within CRT provides for an adequate level of service, based on the currently focused priorities of reactive versus proactive enforcement efforts. Increasing the regulatory responsibilities that CRT manages or elevating certain issues as priorities without decreasing the priority level of other issues would likely mean that the timeliness of service delivery would suffer without the addition of resources.</p> <p>Data trends, such as number of service requests, over the last few years have not shown a significant increase in calls, although 2017 activity seems to be indicating an increase in service requests. One of the challenges facing CRT has been that staff have undergone some significant changes with the retirement of the previous CRT Supervisor and replacement of a CRT Representative as a result of an internal promotion. CRT staff have also been engaged in a significant effort to help implement Track-It, the City's new Permitting and Customer Service software, which is something staff is still working through. In evaluating CRT's workload in the context of these two major contributing items, staff feels that as time progresses, there could be more staff resources available to conduct the core functions of the work group, including proactive work – it is difficult to fully know until the dust settles. Staff will also continue to monitor the number of service requests that CRT receives as the data that has been reported has not indicated that multi-year increases in service requests are likely. This is something that staff will continue to monitor and work to understand more fully.</p> <p>It should be noted that staff believes that the complexity of code enforcement cases has also increased, with some commanding a lot of time and focus to gain compliance. This is often driven by the condition of the properties and structures that are encountered and by the</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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up						
			<p>complexity of the issues presented by tenants and homeowners. Homelessness and non-sanctioned encampment issues have also become increasingly frequent calls for service and the required response often takes significant time and resource.</p> <p>While staff feel that the current service level is adequate for the community, a higher level of service or more service responsibilities will not be able to be achieved without additional resources. The cost of adding an additional CRT Representative is as follows:</p> <p>Ongoing costs Per year:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>Salaries & Benefits</td> <td>\$100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicle Maint/Repl</td> <td><u>\$7,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$107,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>One-Time costs- Vehicle: \$46,000</p>	Salaries & Benefits	\$100,000	Vehicle Maint/Repl	<u>\$7,000</u>		\$107,000
Salaries & Benefits	\$100,000								
Vehicle Maint/Repl	<u>\$7,000</u>								
	\$107,000								
ASD	10/9	4. Mayor Roberts asked staff to prepare a memo regarding the imposition, use and impact of a lodging tax. (ROBERTS)	<p>Since the previous question and memo were drafted, staff received clarification from the Department of Revenue (DOR) regarding the potential to impose a "basic" and "special" lodging tax in Shoreline. King County currently imposes the 2% basic tax (the portion carved out of the state's 6.5% portion of the sales tax). The previously attached memo noted that if Shoreline were to impose this tax there would be a credit for the amount of the City's tax against the County's lodging tax so that two taxes are not levied on the same taxable event. Clarification from DOR revealed that King County has an agreement with cities whereby the County, not the cities, will receive the tax.</p> <p>With regard to the "special" tax, King County put in place a limit to where cities would be able to levy only 1% of the "special" tax. Since King County levies the Convention and Trade Center Tax on all hotels with more than 60 rooms, thereby pushing the total sales tax rate to the 12% cap (also discussed in the memo), the City would not be able to levy the 1% "special" tax on hotels with more than 60 rooms. Bottom line is Shoreline would only be able to levy the 1% "special" tax on hotels with less than 60 rooms.</p>						
ASD	10/9	3. Councilmember Scully asked staff to	In 2017, a single-family residence with a median value of \$386,000 would pay \$537 to the City						

***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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
		calculate and present the amount of the regular property tax levy that a typical homeowner will pay to the City in 2018. (SCULLY)	<p>for the regular property tax levy at a rate of \$1.39 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (AV). In 2018, the rate is estimated to drop to \$1.30689 per \$1,000 AV. That same home valued at \$386,000 in 2018 would pay \$504, which is \$32, or 6.0%, less than that paid in 2017.</p> <p>The amount a homeowner pays is based on a complex calculation set by RCW with factors including growth in the City's total AV, including the amount of new construction coming on the rolls, and the growth in the City's levy. Here are the factors that are working in this example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City's total AV is expected to grow 10.3%, with AV of existing construction increasing 9.8% and new construction adding 0.5%. • The levy is expected to grow 3.7%, with the June-to-June percentage change in the CPI-U adding 2.99% and new construction and re-levy for prior year refunds adding 0.75%. <p>Here are three examples that illustrate these factors at work when the AV of the home, depending on that determined by the King County Assessor's Office, grows the same as, less than, or more than the City's total AV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing 10.3% (the same as the City's total AV) to \$425,758, the homeowner would pay \$20, or 3.7%, more, which is the same growth as the City's levy. • Growing 5.0% (less than the City's total AV) to \$405,300, the homeowner would pay \$7, or 1.3%, less, which is less than the growth of the City's levy. • Growing 15.0% (more than the City's total AV) \$443,900, the homeowner would pay \$44, or 8.1%, more, which is more than the growth of the City's levy.
ASD	10/9	2. Councilmember Hall asked staff to provide information on the impact of the state education funding decision (McCleary). (HALL)	Staff spoke with the King County Assessor's Office (KCAO) and while the 2018 levy rates have not yet been established, KCAO staff expects the local school district rates to not be adversely impacted in a manner that would generate less direct property tax revenue for the school district due to the increase in the state school rate until 2019. The basic estimate provided by KCAO staff for a Shoreline property with a median value of \$386,000 will be an additional \$650 - \$700 in property tax paid in 2018. In 2019 the amount of property tax paid will depend on how much the local school district levy rate is decreased due to the increase in the state school levy rate.
PW	9/18	1. During the September 18 discussion of the 2018 Preliminary Budget, Councilmember	This year is somewhat unique in that WSDOT changed the Construction Cost Index, therefore the numbers do not align with previous year's numbers. SMC 12.40.130, specifically requires

***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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

2018 Budget Questions Matrix for November 13, 2017

Dept	Date of Request	Items	Response or Scheduled Follow Up
		Salomon stated that he does not believe the Transportation Impact Fee should remain flat when the change in the index indicates the fee should be decreased. (SALOMON)	use of a 3-year average, which creates the very small reduction of the TIF fees. While the change in the CCI was -0.4%, the reality is that the growth projects which are the basis for the TIF will continue to increase over time. With the change in the WSDOT CCI methodology and the addition of a Parks Impact Fee, staff will be reviewing the methodology for adjusting the TIF fees for the 2019 budget. Therefore, for 2018 staff recommends holding the TIF fee flat.

***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: Items in BOLD have been answered or updated since the last Budget Question Tracking Matrix on 11/6/2017.

From: [Miranda Redinger](#)
To: [Debbie Tarry](#); [Sara Lane](#); [Rick Kirkwood](#); [Grant Raupp](#); [Carolyn Wurdeman](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Salmon Safe experiences in Portland
Date: Monday, November 13, 2017 1:28:42 PM

Here is what Portland has to say about their experience with Salmon Safe, please include in tonight's green folder and the matrix. Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Miranda

From: Lovell, Kaitlin [mailto:Kaitlin.Lovell@portlandoregon.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 1:03 PM
To: Miranda Redinger <mredinger@shorelinewa.gov>
Cc: Roth, Emily <Emily.Roth@portlandoregon.gov>; Lofgren, Todd <Todd.Lofgren@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Salmon Safe experiences in Portland

Greetings Miranda,

Thank you for reaching out to Portland to inquire about our experiences with the Salmon Safe Certification. Commissioner Fish asked me to respond to your inquiry. I was the bureau lead for the Salmon Safe evaluation of the Bureau of Environmental Services, and my team is responsible for salmon recovery within the city. I have to admit that I was personally skeptical of the certification at first because we had many progressive policies and programs in place already, and we have a strong science team at the city. I was and continue to be pleasantly surprised by the value and benefits of the results and the staying power the certification has had for the city. Here are a few key take aways from our experience that may be relevant to your discussions tonight and next week.

- For the policies and programs that we already had in place, having an independent third party scientific review team has added validation. It is no longer just city staff and city leaders doing a self-assessment, but now we have the stamp of approval of a reputable third party. This has come up in multiple conversations with regulators with respect to stormwater and salmon recovery.
- Salmon Safe helped us identify areas where we can improve across all city bureaus. For example, Portland Parks has an Integrated Pest Management program that was the result of its Salmon Safe Certification back in 2004 (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/66607>). Other bureaus followed the IPM program informally. As a result of the Salmon Safe Certification all bureaus now formally follow the Parks IPM and have bureau specific addendums; it is formally institutionalized throughout the city. Similar cross-sector benefits include habitat and stormwater opportunities on different city owned lands. It helps that the bureau leads continue to coordinate across the different bureaus to ensure success.
- The conditions associated with the certification ensure that the Salmon Safe certification doesn't just sit on a shelf but rather starts to change the culture, programs and policies of the bureaus over time. Portland Parks is a great example since they have been certified since 2004. Salmon Safe is incorporated into the way Parks does business

and has carried forward as new staff have come onboard. In the short time that BES and other bureaus have been certified I have seen it move beyond the initial evaluation. For example, when the Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) recently evaluated whether, when, and where to use road salt it first asked what approach would be acceptable under its Salmon Safe Certification since road salt was not evaluated during the initial review and certification. Salmon Safe served on a “blue ribbon” committee to evaluate the issue and stormwater and water quality became key elements of consideration which required PBOT to work very collaboratively with my bureau, BES, on the issue. Instead of the message focusing on safety vs. fish, it became a highlight that PBOT is trying to address public safety while minimizing its environmental impact.

- Finally, the initial cost may seem high, however I have seen how it has led to cost savings and leveraging during implementation. As we have worked to implement some of the conditions we have evaluated different solutions based on the multiple purposes they could serve. We have not quantified this yet so I couldn't give you an exact dollar amount of how much savings but I can give you examples. The best example is our condition requiring a third party evaluation of our restoration projects. Initially, we determined the least cost solution would be to write up the results of the projects and have it published in a peer-reviewed journal. However, when we looked at the needs for extensive habitat assessments for our stormwater system planning, and for our response to changing federal floodplain rules, we realized that a more robust approach would serve all of those purposes better. We would have likely had three independent, disconnected, and potentially expensive consultant contracts to address these different needs. Instead we have one approach that will serve all needs across multiple bureaus.

If you would like to learn more about Portland Park's long term experience with Salmon Safe, Emily Roth (503-823-9225 or Emily.roth@portlandoregon.gov) is the Parks' Salmon Safe liaison. Please don't hesitate to followup with any additional questions or concerns about how Salmon Safe may benefit Shoreline.

Best,
Kaitlin

Kaitlin Lovell
Science Integration Division Manager
Bureau of Environmental Services
City of Portland
1120 SW 5th Ave., Suite 1000
Portland, Oregon 97204

W: 503-823-7032

www.portlandoregon.gov/bes/fish