

2019-2020 Council Budget Question Matrix

Date of Request	Item	Question	Response
10/15/2018	10	Can you provide us some historical information (maybe past 5 to 10 years) on (1) how much extra help we used in the various programs each year and (2) each of the budget actions we have taken to shift from extra help to regular positions including how many positions and extra help hours were changed. (HALL)	Please see response below the matrix.
10/22/2018	11	Provide a comparison of professional services in the City Attorney's office. (SCULLY)	Please see response below the matrix.
10/29/2018	14	Should we consider expanding the parking studies beyond the light rail areas? Of particular interest is North City and the south east area of the city. What is the cost of adding those areas to the current project? (ROBERTS)	<p>The current scope of the subareas parking study is a combination of field conditions review and policy review and development. Policy review and development will include documentation of current practices and development of parking management strategies/recommendations for future conditions. Tools to be reviewed and considered include, but are not limited to, Residential Parking Zones (RPZ), time limited zones, metered zones, and time of day zones. The policy component of the study can be applied to other areas of the City as needed.</p> <p>Documentation of existing conditions would be the main way the study would expand if there is desire to include other areas of the City. Adding an additional area(s) would cost approximately \$1000/year for 5 blocks (estimated increase in study area for each neighborhood), however staff will better understand true costs once the project begins.</p>
9/17/2018	1	What is leading to the 11% increase in Liquor Excise Tax? (MCGLASHAN)	<p>Liquor revenues have two separate distributions. There is a state shared distribution from the liquor revolving account for licensing fees, commonly referred to as "liquor profits", and a distribution from the liquor excise tax account that represents a portion of the excise tax collected on liquor sales. The statewide total distribution from liquor profits is the same each year, while the total distribution for liquor excise taxes varies depending on liquor sales.</p> <p>Liquor revenue distributions have seen a lot of changes over the past several years. State legislation in 2012 created a permanent diversion of \$10 million per year (\$2.5 million per quarter) of city and county money from the liquor excise tax fund to the state general fund. The legislature also changed the share of liquor excise taxes remitted to cities and counties from 35% in the 2013-2015 state budget to 22.5% in 2015-2017 and back again to 35% in the current 2017-2019 biennium. These fluctuations have made long term forecasting of this state shared revenue a challenge.</p> <p>The Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council's (ERFC) June 2018 forecast projects a 14% increase in liquor excise tax collections after the aforementioned deductions in 2020 as compared to the 2017 level, thereby resulting in increased distributions to cities. Municipal Research and Services Center's (MRSC) forecast accounts for changes in population when deriving the per capita amount Shoreline uses for its forecast, which is anticipated to increase 8% during this period. Applying the per capita amount to Shoreline's population forecast results in the City's estimated receipts in 2020 being 11% more than the 2017 level as Councilmember McGlashan noted in his question.</p>
9/17/2018	2	What's new in the Green Cities Partnership program with Foreterra that we do not already do? (CHANG)	The Green Cities Partnership will complete Forest Assessments for Parks that don't have them such as Paramount Open Space, North City, Northcrest, etc. and update them for parks that were done more than a decade ago. The Forest Assessment will then be used to create a 20-year, prioritized plan for addressing the health of the urban forest. The 2014 Urban Forest Strategic Plan anticipated this would be needed. Finally the Green Cities Partnership will help establish a partnership/volunteer outreach and engagement plan. Currently, our forest restoration efforts are focused on forested areas selected by volunteers and we have no clear priority to our restoration efforts. This one-time funding will provide us with additional information about the health of Shoreline's forests and a long-term work plan for prioritizing our efforts.

***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.

2019-2020 Council Budget Question Matrix

9/17/2018	3 Why are we reducing our General Fund contribution to the Roads Capital Fund when we are showing adequate reserves? (ROBERTS)	During discussions about the imposition of the Vehicle License Fee for Sidewalk Maintenance and potential replacement of the General Fund Contribution to Roads Capital Fund, Council decided that the contribution from General Fund to Roads Capital would be reviewed during the budget process to determine whether to maintain or reduce the contribution for each budget. The proposed budget includes full funding for 2019 and partial funding for 2020 using fund balance. There is adequate fund balance to fully fund 2020 in the budget however there are competing priorities for that fund balance. The CIP currently has a number of underfunded and unfunded projects including several transportation improvement projects located along N. 145th Street, N. 175th Street, N. 160th Street, N. 185th Street, and Westminster Way N. & N. 155th Street, are not fully funded as well as several Facilities needs including the City Maintenance Facility. Recognizing the competing priorities for fund balance, staff proposed the reduced funding. Council can certainly recommend a change during budget deliberations.
9/17/2018	4 Would like to see an analysis of wage compression due to the minimum wage impact on extra help versus regular employees? Why are we increasing COLA from our historic 90% in 2020 and onward? (SALOMON)	Please see response below the matrix.
9/17/2018	5 What are the metrics being used to increase by an extra officer in 2020? (SCULLY/HALL)	<p>Over the last several years the Shoreline Police Department has had a steady increase in dispatched calls for service (DCFS). In 2010 there were 10,981 DCFS; DCFS have increased to 16,308 in 2017; a 49% increase in workload. A K9 officer was added in 2018, prior to that the last time an officer was added to Shoreline police staffing was 2007.</p> <p>In addition to DCFS, Shoreline officers initiate on-view contacts. Last year officers initiated 14,758 on-views, for a total of 31,066 police related contacts in 2017. Shoreline currently has 50 commissioned staff assigned to the City; 34 are assigned to patrol as a patrol sergeant or officer. They cover 10 hour shifts, 24/7, 365 days a year. The increase in workload (DCFS) has equated to a decrease in the average response time to an emergency call for service. In 2012 it was (3.39) minutes to a priority-x call, 2013 was (3.42) minutes and 2014 was (3.92) minutes. In 2017 the average response time to a priority-x call was 4.37 minutes.</p> <p>There are a number of factors when trying to determine the proper staffing ratio. Officer per thousand population is a simple formula that is often used. It's not a good indicator if a City has the proper police staffing; it seemed to work for Shoreline in 2012, 2013 and 2014, the response time to a priority-x call was less than 4 minutes. That number is getting closer to 5 minutes as the workload has increased. In 2016 it was (4.68) minutes in 2017 it was (4.37) minutes. At this point it makes sense to consider adding staffing as the population has increased that typically equals an increase in workload. There is a high expectation of police service in Shoreline; from crime prevention to perception of safety and the expectation of police addressing quality of life issues, homelessness, mental illness and other social services.</p> <p>A much more in depth analysis would be necessary to figure out the proper police staffing ratio for Shoreline. It would need to factor in report writing time, travel time for prisoner transports, available time necessary for on-view activity, workload, arrests, training, a 24/7 operation, minimum staffing, work schedules, relief factor and many other variables. The City of Sammamish is currently having BERK strategy/analysis/communication do a police services study for them.</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.

2019-2020 Council Budget Question Matrix

9/17/2018	6 Why is so much extra help hours needed in the landscaping proposal? Should any of these be FTEs? (SCULLY)	In April the Council authorized the City Manager to redirect funds that were budgeted for the Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County (EDC) so that the City could contribute \$2,500 towards the start-up of the GSP. This was part of an effort to raise \$50,000, of the \$500,000 start-up contribution from the public sector, from Sound City Association members. The 2019-2020 budget includes \$10,000 in anticipated membership fees for the organization (\$5,000/year). The organization has hired a new Executive Director, who started in August 2018, and is currently in the planning stages including plans to conduct a listening tour. Staff has requested a meeting with the Executive Director to get a better sense of their vision and plans for the commission. Although the 2019-20 budget includes budget to support membership for the Seattle-King Economic Development Commission the City is not obligated to continue with this membership. Staff recommends maintaining the budget but delaying payment for membership until we have further information about the direction and plan for GSP, with the intent to join only if the vision and direction benefits the City of Shoreline and furthers our economic development objectives. If Council desires to remove this from the budget an amendment can be made the night of the budget adoption to remove the \$10,000 from the 2019-2020 budget for the purpose of Greater Seattle Partners membership.
9/17/2018	7 Why is so much extra help hours needed in the Fleet & Facilities proposal? Should this be a FTE? (SCULLY)	The preliminary budget includes the addition of \$17,500 extra help in 2019, with \$10,500 continuing in 2020 and beyond. This additional support will provide approximately 500 hours of extra help in 2019 and 300 in 2020 and beyond. Extra help will enable Fleet and Facilities to return to desired service levels ensuring that staff are able to maintain the City's investment in its assets and meet professional safety guidelines for maintenance of vehicles and facilities. The impact of the Police at City Hall, Wastewater vehicles maintenance /administration and other major projects in 2018 have created a backlog of work that needs to be addressed in 2019. Providing a lower level of on-going extra help support will allow us to hire part-time support during the summer months when projects and vacations impact the ability to maintain service levels. The hours identified as necessary at this time are not of the level to warrant an ongoing part-time .50 FTE. However, the additional capacity will also ensure that Fleet and Facilities is able to better manage work using CityWorks which enables us to monitor workload and service levels to recognize when the ongoing need reaches a level that supports an ongoing FTE request.

***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.

2019-2020 Council Budget Question Matrix

9/17/2018	8 What's the reasoning of getting our own ariel photography for \$50,000 versus using other available sources? (SCULLY)	<p>There are strict technical standards that are applied to aerials for public sector use. Some of the technical standards are as follows: the sun angle, the time of year, the color balance, the resolution of the imagery, the amount of image overlap, the surface accuracy, and the altitude of the capture vehicle. City staff has investigated alternatives for acquiring aerial data, but have not found any outside sources which meet these criteria. Google, for instance, utilizes a number of different capture methods from planes, satellites, even drones for the primary vehicle and with each there will be changes to the image quality. Google does not make claims of accuracy or merchantability for their product. If their aerial is offset 5-10 feet from reality, the stakes are very low. The City relies on the accuracy of the imagery we use to make business decisions on a daily basis, making alternative data sources inappropriate for our use. We also must be able to reproduce that imagery and provide it to the public, something often limited or prohibited using other on-demand sources.</p> <p>Based on these requirements, the City needs to have oversight of the method and quality of aerial photography. Historically we have been participants in a larger regional aerial project which has greatly reduced the cost to each participant. However, over the last few years that coalition has broken down, first as it grew too large and cumbersome, and then as organizations changed their cycle time on imagery collection. We are hopeful that we will be able to work with adjacent organizations (e.g. Shoreline Fire District, Seattle City light, Seattle Public Utilities, Lake Forest Park, City of Seattle) with each additional participant reducing the overall cost, but there is no guarantee that these organizations will be able to participate over the next two years, or that we will agree on a project. If a coalition can be established, any savings would be returned to the general fund. Otherwise, given funding approval, the City will need to identify an appropriate firm to perform this work without partners.</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.

2019-2020 Council Budget Question Matrix

10/1/2018	9 As I mentioned to Debbie recently, it looks like [Greater Seattle Partners (GSP)] is continuing the kind of economic development (attracting large employers) that does not benefit our community, and in fact drives up demand for housing which hurts affordability, plus puts further strain on our transportation and environmental infrastructure. I do not support continued investment in this style of regional economic development. I would rather use our staff to focus on the local opportunities. Please let me know if staff planned any investment in the upcoming biennial budget, and if so, the appropriate method for me to pull that out. (HALL)	<p>On April 16, 2018, the City Council discussed the Regional Economic Development Initiative. Bob Drewel came to speak on behalf of the new alliance which is now called Greater Seattle Partners (GSP). Mr. Drewel shared that the Greater Seattle Partners is the first public-private partnership created to advance economic growth and competitiveness for the Puget Sound region. It will focus on attracting new investment, promoting international trade and growing existing industry clusters by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •aggressively marketing the Puget Sound region; •recruiting targeted business and trade focused on region's assets; •using sophisticated analytics and data to tell region's competitive story; and •engaging leadership and funding from both the public and the private sector. <p>In April the Council authorized the City Manager to redirect funds that were budgeted for the Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County (EDC) so that the City could contribute \$2,500 towards the start-up of the GSP. This was part of an effort to raise \$50,000, of the \$500,000 start-up contribution from the public sector, from Sound City Association members. The 2019-2020 budget includes \$10,000 in anticipated membership fees for the organization (\$5,000/year). The organization has hired a new Executive Director, who started in August 2018, and is currently in the planning stages including plans to conduct a listening tour. Staff has requested a meeting with the Executive Director to get a better sense of their vision and plans for the commission. Although the 2019-20 budget includes budget to support membership for the Seattle-King Economic Development Commission the City is not obligated to continue with this membership. Staff recommends maintaining the budget but delaying payment for membership until we have further information about the direction and plan for GSP, with the intent to join only if the vision and direction benefits the City of Shoreline and furthers our economic development objectives. If Council desires to remove this from the budget an amendment can be made the night of the budget adoption to remove the \$10,000 from the 2019-2020 budget for the purpose of Greater Seattle Partners membership.</p>
10/22/2018	12 For the one-time deep cleaning of permeable pavement, how many square feet will be cleaned for the \$10,200? (SALOMON)	The City of Shoreline's park system has 18,188 square feet of permeable surface. The current maintenance plan for this surfacing, as recommended by the Surface Water Utility Division, includes a one-time deep cleaning. Examples include the ADA pathway at City Hall and the path adjacent to South Woods Park.
10/22/2018	13 For the performance measures citing average weeks to first review/approve permits, how does our average compare to other jurisdictions' review time and targets? (ROBERTS)	Please see response below the matrix.

***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.

4. Would like to see an analysis of wage compression due to the minimum wage impact on extra help versus regular employees? Why are we increasing COLA from our historic 90% in 2020 and onward? (Salomon)

In 2015, the Council directed staff to conduct a compensation study and an outside consultant was engaged for the purpose. The study identified in broad terms, that the City's compensation plan should:

- Ensure that the City has the ability to attract and retain well-qualified employees
- Provide a defensible and rational basis for compensating employees
- Allow flexibility and adaptability for making City-wide compensation decisions based on changing market conditions
- Recognize the City's responsibility as a public agency in establishing a pay plan that is consistent with public practices
- Ensure that the City's compensation practices are competitive and consistent with those of comparable employers

The City's comparable labor market for the study, and going forward, were Bellevue, Bothell, Burien, Edmonds, Everett, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lynnwood, Marysville, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, and Seattle. The results of the 2015 Study showed that overall Shoreline's salary compensation was approximately 3.9% below the median. The Council directed that the Shoreline Salary Schedule be set at the median of the comparable cities effective January 1, 2016.

Historically the City's compensation practice has been to apply a cost of living adjustment (COLA), equal to 90% of the June-to-June Seattle/Tacoma CPI-U, to the City's Salary Schedule effective each year on January 1. This is approved through the City's budget process. The use of 90% of CPI was thought to be at the median of COLA adjustments approved by the City's labor market survey agencies; therefore, keeping Shoreline's salary compensation at the median of the comparable cities.

Since the Compensation Study two things have occurred that are the basis for the City Manager's recommendation to transition the COLA adjustment to 100% of the Seattle/Tacoma CPI-U by 2021.

1. In 2016 voters approved Initiative 1433 which increases the state minimum wage from \$9.47 to \$13.50 by 2020. Beginning January 1, 2021, the minimum wage will be adjusted for inflation annually at 100% of the CPI-W.
2. In January 2018, Shoreline's Salary Schedule, overall, was -2.62% below the median for a variety of reasons. Twelve of our 13 comparable cities provided increases in excess of CPI, 1 of the 13 was less than CPI.

Impact of Initiative 1433 Minimum Wage Increases

The 2020 Washington State Minimum Wage will be 42.6% higher than the 2016 minimum wage. From 2016 to 2020 the City's regular salary schedule will have increased by approximately 9.8% as a result of applying 90% of the CPI. Range 34 is the first range in the City's regular position salary schedule that has an active job classification. In 2016, the differential between the minimum wage (\$9.47/hr) and step 1 of range 34 (\$22.21) was 57%. In 2020, the differential is projected to be 44.6%. (Minimum wage - \$13.50/hr; Range 34 Step 1 - \$24.38/hr). Starting in 2021 minimum wage will increase by 100% of CPI. Using range 34, step 1 as an example, if the City increases its salary ranges by 90% of CPI each year thereafter the differential between minimum wage and the range 34, step 1, will decrease by approximately 0.2% annually. This may be a small change per year, but there will be compounding impacts over time.

Shoreline’s Position to Market Median

In January 2018, Shoreline’s Salary Schedule overall was -2.62% below the median of our comparable cities for a variety of reasons. Based on research by the Human Resources Director, she found that 12 of our 13 comparable cities provided increases in excess of CPI, 1 of the 13 was less than CPI. Contributing circumstances include any combination of the following:

- COLA based on different CPI measures (W vs. U, 100% vs. 90%, annual vs. June index, a blend of market comparables and CPI)
- Labor union settlements, some of which have “floors and ceilings” in lieu of CPI (such as no less than 2% and no more than 5%) or “across the board” market adjustments in addition to CPI, or covering more than one year in a ‘catch up’ provision following non-settlement,
- Compensation studies and job reclassifications.

The following table summarizes the findings:

Jurisdiction	No of Available Benchmark Positions	Total of Increases for last 2 years (2017 + 2018 increase)
Marysville	24	14.47%
Bothell	24	10.64%
Kenmore	12	9.40%
Burien	17	8.32%
Lynnwood	23	7.19%
Everett	29	6.44%
Renton	32	5.95%
Bellevue	33	5.05%
Seattle	27	4.85%
Edmonds	20	4.69%
Redmond	31	4.56%
Sammamish	27	4.41%
90% CPI-U (Shoreline)	<i>Western Region</i>	4.32%
Kirkland	35	2.97%

Each year the City reviews 1/3 of the benchmark classifications for market. If a classification is found to be more than 5% below or above the market median, then a change is recommended through the budget process. Given the three year rotation, classifications that may be within the 5% differential range, meaning no adjustment recommended, may be within market the year they are reviewed, but can fall out of market the following year but not be reviewed again for an additional two years.

Recommendation

Based on the analysis reflected above, the City Manager has recommended that the City’s compensation practice be modified to use 100% of CPI for establishing the annual COLA effective January 1, 2021. The Proposed 2019-2020 Budget recommends a 90% CPI COLA for 2019 and then a 95% CPI COLA for 2020 as a transition. The difference in cost between a 90% CPI COLA in 2020 and a 95% CPI COLA is approximately \$16,200 across all City funds (includes utility funds).

Question 10: Can you provide us some historical information (maybe past 5 to 10 years) on (1) how much extra help we used in the various programs each year and (2) each of the budget actions we have taken to shift from extra help to regular positions including how many positions and extra help hours were changed. (HALL)

The following table that presents the number of extra help hours by division as well as the head count related to those hours and an average annual hours per extra help worker and provides documentation for change in extra help staffing through budget narrative from 2014 through 2018 (year-to-date).

Extra Help Hours History by Department/Division

Program	Program Description	Data Point	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018YTD
1100001	City Manager's Office	Extra Help Hours	439	0	0	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	0	0	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	439	0	0	0	0	0
1200000	City Clerks Office	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	919	926	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	2	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	459	926	0
1500000	City Attorney	Extra Help Hours	207	0	0	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	0	0	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	207	0	0	0	0	0
1601014	Budget/Financial Plan	Extra Help Hours	0	8	0	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	1	0	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	8	0	0	0	0
1601015	Financial Operations	Extra Help Hours	228	0	332	522	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	0	1	2	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	228	0	332	261	0	0
1602013	IT Strategic Plan & Advrsy Svc	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	0	834	1,095
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	0	1	2
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	0	834	547
1602018	Information Technology - GIS	Extra Help Hours	0	2,031	1,776	1,878	1,593	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	2	3	4	2	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	1,016	592	470	796	0
1602145	IT-Operations	Extra Help Hours	0	0	943	1,049	1,458	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	1	3	2	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	943	350	729	0
1602282	Web Development	Extra Help Hours	163	150	160	227	182	143
		Extra Help Head Count	2	2	1	2	2	3
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	81	75	160	114	91	48
1612300	Facilities	Extra Help Hours	0	125	475	266	479	448
		Extra Help Head Count	0	1	1	1	3	2
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	125	475	266	160	224
1700024	Citywide-Non-departmental	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	0	284	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	0	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	0	284	0
1800026	Human Resource Services	Extra Help Hours	2	0	2	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	0	1	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	2	0	2	0	0	0
2005035	Police Special Support	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	732	568	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	1	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	732	568	0
2408037	Parks Administration	Extra Help Hours	356	300	368	407	152	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	1	1	1	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	356	300	368	407	152	0
2409038	Parks Operations	Extra Help Hours	5,179	3,045	1,579	1,971	1,959	1,124
		Extra Help Head Count	10	4	3	2	3	5
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	518	761	526	985	653	225
2410039	Parks Aquatics	Extra Help Hours	16,201	17,548	16,558	14,005	20,806	14,450
		Extra Help Head Count	53	52	51	60	70	59
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	306	337	325	233	297	245
2410040	Parks Facilities/Rentals	Extra Help Hours	1,518	1,274	3,609	1,658	1,338	890
		Extra Help Head Count	16	12	27	10	7	8
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	95	106	134	166	191	111
2410041	Parks General Programs	Extra Help Hours	20,889	22,175	20,073	20,964	21,693	18,797
		Extra Help Head Count	85	90	88	95	91	88
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	246	246	228	221	238	214
2410057	Parks Teen & Youth Devpmt Prog	Extra Help Hours	4,470	4,003	4,542	4,668	4,989	5,405
		Extra Help Head Count	19	17	13	14	16	20
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	235	235	349	333	312	270
2411042	Cultural Services	Extra Help Hours	288	336	518	481	204	145
		Extra Help Head Count	25	15	14	13	8	8
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	12	22	37	37	26	18
2411156	Public Art Projects	Extra Help Hours	337	300	368	407	152	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	1	1	1	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	337	300	368	407	152	0
2506046	Economic Development	Extra Help Hours	0	329	170	153	62	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	2	2	2	1	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	165	85	77	62	0
2506137	City Planning	Extra Help Hours	0	0	17	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	1	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	17	0	0	0
2506139	Building & Inspections	Extra Help Hours	13	22	42	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	2	2	1	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	6	11	42	0	0	0

Program	Program Description	Data Point	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
2708092	Environmental Services	Extra Help Hours	35	10	0	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	3	1	0	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	12	10	0	0	0	0
2709000	Surface Water Management	Extra Help Hours	3,389	2,063	2,267	2,217	2,066	936
		Extra Help Head Count	5	5	4	4	3	2
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	678	413	567	554	689	468
2709054	Street Operations	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	295	1,343	2,246
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	2	3	4
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	148	448	562
2709169	Surface Water (Roads)	Extra Help Hours	2,160	1,040	0	0	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	3	1	0	0	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	720	1,040	0	0	0	0
2713153	Right of Way Program	Extra Help Hours	918	53	14	22	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	2	1	1	1	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	459	53	14	22	0	0
2713241	Engineering	Extra Help Hours	0	0	0	0	2,048	343
		Extra Help Head Count	0	0	0	0	4	4
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	0	0	0	0	512	86
2726168	PW Traffic Services	Extra Help Hours	4	125	422	8	0	0
		Extra Help Head Count	1	1	1	1	0	0
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	4	125	422	8	0	0
Capital	Capital Projects	Extra Help Hours	578	863	565	697	172	80
		Extra Help Head Count	8	6	8	8	6	1
		Average Annual Hours / EH Employee	578	863	565	466	154	80
		Citywide Total Extra Help Hours	57,371	55,796	54,796	53,545	63,305	46,101

Extra Help Budget Changes in 2015-2018

- **Administrative Services:**
 - **Information Technology – GIS:**
 - **GIS Technicians:**
 - **2018 (ongoing):** Added 1.00 FTE GIS Technician. The City has been utilizing one-time funding for extra help for GIS support for the asset management system (Cityworks) until the staff capacity resulting from assumption of Ronald Wastewater District could be fully analyzed. Reduced extra-help by 2,080 hours.
 - **Information Technology – IT Operations:**
 - **Computer Support Specialist:**
 - **2018:** Added 0.50 FTE IT Systems Specialist. The Administrative Services Department has utilized one-time funding for extra-help since 2015 to address a work backlog and current workload demand. Reduced extra-help hours by 1,040 that had been used to support the IT Help Desk.
- **City Manager's Office:**
 - **City Clerk's Office:**
 - **Public Disclosure Specialist:**
 - **2016 (one-time):** Added 832 hours of extra-help for a Public Disclosure Specialist to work on processing public disclosure requests. The extra-help improved the City's response time on requests and freed more of the City Clerk's time to work on other essential duties that needed attention.
 - **2017 (one-time):** Continuation of the Public Disclosure Specialist extra-help position is needed to work on processing public records requests. The extra help has improved the City's response time on complex requests and is buying the City Clerk's time back to work on other essential duties. Another year of extra-help is required.
 - **2018 (ongoing):** In 2015, the City experienced a significant increase in public records requests, and the workload has remained constant. In 2016 and 2017, one-time extra help was utilized to help address the increased volume of public records requests. In 2018 this was added as a regular position.
- **Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services:**
 - **Parks Operations:**
 - **Parks Maintenance Workers:**
 - **2014 (ongoing):** Added 1.00 FTE Parks Maintenance Worker II and reduced 4,443 hours of extra help. This position was needed to provide year round work at a higher skill level than could be achieved through seasonal staffing. There was no net increase to the budget.
 - **2015 (ongoing):** A 0.80 FTE Parks Maintenance Worker I position was added to restore the number of funded park maintenance hours to 2013 levels. In 2012 the responsibility of maintaining public right-of-way trees was transferred from the Public Works Department to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department without the allocation of additional resources. In 2014 reductions were made in funding for extra-help workers in the Parks Operations Division to allocate the funds for a regular position. This change resulted in a net reduction of 2,363 maintenance worker hours. Based on feedback from users of the City's parks during the first part of 2015 and evaluation of the workload for existing maintenance workers the proposed 2015 budget restored funding to get maintenance worker hours back to the level provided in 2013.
 - **2017:** The 0.80 FTE Parks Maintenance Worker I position added in 2015 was increased to 1.00 FTE to provide labor hours needed to assume additional maintenance duties to maintain stormwater utility infrastructure within the park system as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.
 - **General Programs:**
 - **Spartan Recreation Center Staffing Model:**
 - **2016 (ongoing):** Added 1.00 FTE Administrative Assistant I and reduced front desk attendant extra-help hours by 1,483 for the adjusted staffing model at the Spartan Recreation Center. Adding this position allowed two staff to be onsite during all business hours, direct supervision of extra help staff, and qualified assistance with an ever-increasing workload. A reduction in extra-help expense and offsetting increase in revenue kept pace with increased cost of services and maintained the current level of cost recovery.

- **2018:** Increase of 0.10 FTE Administrative Assistant I to 0.60 FTE at the Spartan Recreation Center. The 2016 budget provided for the conversion of extra-help to a 1.00 FTE to provide at least one regular staff position at Spartan Gym during all operating hours. As schedules were finalized it was determined that there was still a four hour gap on Saturdays without regular staffing coverage. The increase in the number of hours for this position will address this.
 - **Camp Shoreline Expansion:**
 - **2016 (ongoing):** Added 1,000 hours of extra-help to expand Camp Shoreline, which is a summer camp offered by the City, by adding a five week outdoor camp during the month of August. The camp brings in revenue sufficient to cover the cost.
- **Teen & Youth Development Program:**
 - **Hang Time Expansion:**
 - **2016 (ongoing):** The Hang Time program for middle school students was expanded into Einstein Middle School. As a result, a 0.125 FTE increase for a Recreation Specialist II position and extra-help hours were added to support the program.
- **Public Art:**
 - **Aurora Ave Banner Project:**
 - **2016 (one-time):** Added 382.67 hours for the installation of banners along Aurora Ave.
 - **2017 (ongoing):** On February 13, 2017, the City Council held a study session on the proposed 2017-2022 Public Art Plan (staff report available here: <http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/council/staffreports/2017/staffreport021317-9a.pdf>). This discussion highlighted the contributions of the Public Art Coordinator in managing the public art program, which has evolved from coordinating art projects associated with specific capital projects to developing community-based temporary art such as “Piano Time” and “Artscape” (Temporary sculptures at City Hall and the Park at Town Center). This extra help position was created in 2007. The total number of extra help hours ranged between 600 – 815 during the years of 2013 through 2016 for an average of 711 hours.

At its March 6, 2017 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 404 approving the Public Art Plan for 2017-2022 (staff report available here: <http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/council/staffreports/2017/staffreport030617-7c.pdf>). This discussion noted that implementation of the Public Art Plan calls for transitioning the extra help position to a 0.50 FTE position and it was brought back as part of the April 2017 Budget Amendment discussion. The cost of the Public Art Coordinator continues to be split evenly between the General Fund and Municipal Art Fund.

Question #11: Provide a comparison of professional services in the City Attorney's office. (SCULLY)

The totals in the 2019-20 Proposed Budget Book on the “Expenditure by Type” table for “Other Services & Charges” for the City Attorney’s Office on page 162 are mainly attributable to the professional services for outside legal counsel and prosecuting attorney services. Please see the below table for budgeted ongoing and one-time changes from 2016-2020 (proposed). The amount for ongoing outside legal counsel was increased in 2017 by \$20,000 and has remained the same through 2020 due to the number of litigation matters, including condemnation actions, that are new and ongoing and will not likely be resolved prior to 2020.

There was an additional one-time transfer of \$25,000 in both 2016 and 2017 to cover Sound Transit and RWD negotiations and litigation, and an additional transfer in 2017 to cover additional costs related to BSRE and Grease Monkey condemnation and related negotiations over soil clean-up. In 2018 that amount, \$90,000, was included as a one-time item for all the continued litigation and property acquisition matters. The prosecuting attorney services are increased 90% of CPI annually and went out for request for proposals (RFP) in 2017, which lead to an increase for the service. There was also an increase in court dates per year starting in 2017 and 2018 for the prosecuting attorney to allow for additional court days as needed to decrease costs of incarceration pending arraignment as well as to address issues related to right to speedy trial.

The budget going forward for 2019 decreases budget in this area by \$73, 826 and 2020 decreases another \$5,000 (\$78,827 decrease from 2018 budget).

Prof Serv Budgeted Item	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Ongoing:					
Outside Legal Counsel for Various Matters	\$55,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Pros Atty (Adjust annually for 90% CPI. 2017 adjusted for ongoing RFP results and increased court dates)	\$162,190	\$194,800	\$209,287	\$215,461	\$220,460
One-time:					
Transfer for RWD assumption	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
RWD and Sound Transit	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Transfer for additional legal prof serv	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
RWD Assumption, acquisition of property, Sound Transit stations, and environmental remediation			\$90,000		
Expert Witness	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$0
TOTAL	\$232,190	\$359,800	\$374,287	\$300,461	\$295,460

The remaining differences from the totals in the “Other Services & Charges” on the tables on page 162 and the budgeted amounts above are various items ranging from postage, travel and training, dues & subscriptions, filing fees, and more.

13. For the performance measures citing average weeks to first review/approve permits, how does our average compare to other jurisdictions' review time and targets? (ROBERTS)

"Average weeks to first review" refers to the amount of time in weeks it takes the City to complete the first review of a permit application and issue the applicant a review letter. This time period begins the day a complete application is submitted to the City. There are many factors that influence how long the first review takes, but delays related to the applicant are not generally a factor during first review. Factors that influence the length of time it takes the City to complete the first review include: quality of the items submitted by the applicant as part of the permit application; number and type of permits under review when the application is submitted; complexity of the project; the availability of all review staff to complete the first review; and the total number of permits and revisions submitted for intake at the same time.

"Average weeks to approve permits" refers to the amount of time in weeks it takes the City to approve a permit for issuance from the date a complete application is submitted. The same factors noted above influence the number of weeks it takes the City to approve a permit with one addition. After first review, the applicant contributes to the amount of time it takes to finish reviews and approve the permit. The applicant is responsible for correcting plans and submitting revisions in response to comments relayed from staff via review letters. The applicant is also responsible for making sure that responses are complete and accurate to limit the number of review cycles needed for a permit. This time, which the applicant controls is also factored into the number of weeks it takes the City to approve a permit.

The 2019-20 Budget anticipates an increase in the total number of permits to be submitted over the number of permits submitted in 2018. The 2019-20 Budget does not include any requests for additional resources to assist with the delivery of permits, with the exception of \$20,000 annually for extra help to assist with permit intake related to the addition of wastewater permitting to the list of permits accepted by the City. Assistance with permit intake could reduce the "average weeks to first review" by days and therefore approval but is mainly intended to reduce the wait time for customers submitting permits at the permit counter. With the same resources, we do not anticipate being able to reduce the amount of time it takes on average to process permits. In order to set realistic expectations for customers PCD is projecting a slight increase in the average number of weeks it will take for first review and subsequently approval of permits.

However, staff continues to work on streamlining processes to gain efficiencies by:

- Working with IT to launch on line permitting for customers;
- Training staff to review plans electronically;
- Updating permit checklists;
- Offering express permitting for simple single-family or commercial permits with a 1-3 day turnaround;
- Processing paperless mechanical and plumbing permits saving time at intake and inspections
- Use of mobile devices for inspectors to enter inspection results and manage workloads;
- Providing automated inspection notification of results to the customer as they occur;
- Online inspection request scheduling at the permit customers' convenience (24/7);
- Conducting quarterly Developer Stakeholder meetings to receive feedback from and collaborate with local developers on ways to improve processes and development standards;
- Using revenue backed contracts to maintain the current level of service for first reviews;
- Offering for an extra fee expedited permitting which generally reduces the number of weeks for first review by half. This service uses contractors or overtime; and
- Participating in a cross departmental "Process Walk" as part of this year's final Continuous Improvement project.

Staff did find statistics from a few jurisdictions on permit review times. These jurisdictions have also been through a LEAN or similar process for permitting. As described above, permitting is the subject of the next Process Walk for City staff.

Jurisdiction	Permit Type & Goal	Time Period & Outcome
Kitsap County	Residential	2018
	Average Days to Approval or Notification of Required Corrections	30 days
	Average days to approve resubmittal	15
	Average days to approve revisions	30
	Total Permits in Review	91
Tacoma	Commercial	2018
	Goal of issuing 60 % of permits in 8 weeks or less	Currently achieving this goal 21% of the time
	Goal of completing first review cycle in 28 days or less	Currently meeting that goal
	Goal of completing review of permits in two or less cycles	Currently meeting that goal
	Residential	
	Goal of issuing 60% of permits in two weeks or less	Currently achieving this goal 37% of the time
	Goal of completing first review cycle in less than 7 days	Currently first review is taking on average 9 days
	Goal of completing review of permits in two or less cycles	Currently meeting that goal
Oak Harbor	Residential	2015-2016
	Percent of single family home permits issued within two weeks	95-100%