

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and Italicized)

Request #	Proposed budget amendments or questions from Councilmember Teitzel:
-----------	---

- 1) DP #2 remove this request from the budget and defer a decision about staffing the Human Services Coordinator position until later in 2020. There is an effort underway to assemble a collaborative South County group of cities, Verdant, the Y, faith community and others to determine how we can pool our resources to effectively address common issues—such as homelessness and our common need to address contributing factors such as substance abuse—we all share. This would be modeled on a similar collaborative initiative now in place in So. King County. This effort would likely require a level of investment by the participating cities, but may be a way to attack the problem more cost-effectively than if we each staff up in-house. I strongly believe the collaborative effort (which will initially be led by Stephanie Wright) needs to be launched before we decide to add in-house FTEs. After the cities decide how best to pool resources, we may still determine we need our own manager. If so, the request can be introduced as a mid-year budget amendment.

This part-time Human Services Coordinator position is envisioned as a "community resource guide" by providing direct information and referral to inquiring citizens of Edmonds in need. Many services, resources and programs are not readily visible or accessible and may require a guide or navigator for optimal access. This position would also work with regional partners and agencies, together with other jurisdictions, representing Edmonds to ensure that our city and citizens receive proportional and adequate resources. This is a different scope of services from the Social Worker who works with the Police Dept in providing direct point-of-contact services to individuals encountered through Police contact. The Social Worker's principal goal is to provide immediate-need resources to these individuals, while the Human Resources Coordinator works at a more comprehensive, system-wide level, addressing both individuals and systems. The County, strapped financially and providing only the bare minimum to service countywide needs, is not in a position to provide direct service to individual cities. This ½ FTE will also be seeking and managing grants to fund this position and programs.

- 2) DP #80 I'd like to pull this item and abeyance it for future consideration. The fact is the transfer of ownership of the Unocal property to WSDOT is still pending and it is not clear when it will occur. That situation has prevented the designers from creating an optimal channelization design to support salmon. There is a petition effort ongoing to have WSDOT turn over that property (after they have ownership) to the city for permanent habitat for fish and wildlife. If that happens, the optimal stream channel will run through the old Unocal site. Proceeding with design now may end up costing our taxpayers more, as any design prior to finalization of the WSDOT issue may require significant redesign. It makes more sense to remove this item from the budget, abeyance it and bring it back as a budget amendment once we have clarity about future use of the WSDOT property.

Request #	Proposed budget amendments or questions from Councilmember Buckshnis:
-----------	---

- 1) New: add Full-time Field Arborist – would replace the 10 hours per week (\$20,000) outlined in Decision Package #49. Net impact to the budget is \$79,715.

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

- 2) New: Add \$7,500 for Students Saving Salmon
- 3) Council question cost center 511.60 fund 001
- Professional services is at \$62,160 - why has this odd number been chosen or is it a carry forward?
This amounts represents the Baseline budget for Council's Professional Services account.
 - DP 1 is for \$19,300 and what part of the budget line items will this impact as I remember travel, but can't recall the others - so can we see them itemized so the public can understand as well.

DP #1 includes the following narrative, explaining the need for this budget increase:

<i>Supplies for new Councilmembers</i>	<i>\$500</i>
<i>Small equipment for Council office</i>	<i>\$1,000</i>
<i>Communications cost increase</i>	<i>\$2,000</i>
<i>Travel & training expense increase for new Councilmembers</i>	<i>\$10,800</i>
<i>Council Contingency increase in lieu of leaving unexpended 2019 Professional Services Budget</i>	<i>\$5,000</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$19,300</i>

- 4) Mayor's Office
- DP #2 This is a Manager level position out of the Mayor's office? Is this from the Kone report and how will this .5 FTE coordinate with the Social worker out of the Police department? Why not make the Social Worker in the Police Department a full-time FTE and have that person perform these job duties?
Please see response to DP #2 under Teitzel's question.
- 5) Non-Departmental
- DP 9 \$245,650 being brought down to \$236,975 - Great job Scott on this and the AAA rating. Why is this a DP as Council has already approved these bonds - is this merely a identifiable item for Council and the Public to know?
Yes, Council approved the issuance of the Civic Park bonds, however, Council still has to approve the budget for the annual debt service for the bonds.
- 6) Technology
- DP #14 at \$183,434 - this is self-funding and Brian can you more fully explain the composition of how this number was determined?
The Technology Rental Fund allocates IT services and equipment costs to City departments. The \$183,434 is being added to the budget for 2020 allocate the cost of decision package numbers 15 – 18, and 20 and 21, which collectively total \$183,434.
- 7) Community Services
- DP #30 Federal Lobbyist - I thought this person was for working on the connector - which seemed to be the gist of what I saw from the meetings I attended with the Mayor. Shouldn't this be a decision of the new Mayor? *The federal lobbyist is an important resource in DC to assist with seeking federal funds on any and all capital projects we may be pursuing at any*

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

- time, including the Edmonds Marsh restoration, Highway 99, etc., as well as monitoring and responding to legislation of importance to us. Most of the cities in Snohomish County have federal lobbyists under contract. This DP is a budget line placeholder that appropriates the funds for this contract position for 2020 to allow for the new Administration to decide to use or not. This is not necessarily a renewal of the existing lobbyist contract.*
- ii. **New comment for DP #30:** remove Federal Lobbyist. Rationale - no need to put a placeholder in the budget for Mike as he can always add it in the future as an amendment. The \$72K can either be used for his travel budget or split with his travel budget and the Councils. The reasoning for this decision is I plan on attending Salmon Days on the Hill put on Puget Sound Partnership in conjunction with all the WRIA's and it is an invaluable networking event and Patrick or Jason (WRIA 8) can schedule any legislator meet and greets with those that we should see (Governor's advisors, Cantwell, Murray, Jayapal, Del Bene, Kilmer, Heck - etc) and Mike at that time can interview any consultants at that time and make any decision. Since this is a May Salmon Days on the Hill soirée - it gives him time to settle in and figure this area out as we can always put in a budget amendment.
The federal lobbyist is an important resource in DC to assist with seeking federal funds on any and all capital projects we may be pursuing at any time, including the Edmonds Marsh restoration, Highway 99, etc., as well as monitoring and responding to legislation of importance to us. Most of the cities in Snohomish County have federal lobbyists under contract. This DP is a budget line placeholder that appropriates the funds for this contract position for 2020 to allow for the new Administration to decide to use or not. This is not necessarily a renewal of the existing lobbyist contract.
- iii. DP 31 PIO person - Patrick, can you explain this again to me as well as how this person is different from what Carolyn Brown does or is this an enlargement of her work duties?
Please see response to DP #31 under Tibbott below.
- iv. DP #35 Trolley - Patrick, can you explain to all about the process of operating the trolley and insurance, etc and potential partnerships.
This DP is comprised of two parts: purchase of the trolley and operations/maintenance for 2020. Purchase could be approximately \$50,000 (although we would hope for a lower final purchase price). Operation/maintenance, including staff hours, fuel, service, insurance, etc., for Saturdays and Sundays from mid-May to the beginning of October, plus December, would cost approximately \$25,000. To date we have already secured partner commitments in the form of \$20,000 from the Lodging Tax Advisory Committee and a pledge of up to \$11,000 from the Edmonds Downtown Alliance. The Port has indicated interest. So we believe we will be able to find additional contributions/sponsorships. This may end up covering most of the cost of operations/maintenance.
- v. DP 38 Lodging Tax was originally -\$4K and I have it on my notes as \$125,250 K - can you explain that as it was estimated that \$95K was the projected revenue vs \$97K in expenses.
The Lodging Tax Advisory Committee (LTAC) recommends expenditure of both its ongoing revenue and fund balance funds. The ongoing revenue projected for 2020 is \$95,250, plus \$2,500 in interest, for a total of \$97,750. Their proposed "ongoing" budget appropriates all of these funds (including a \$4,763 contingency). The original DP failed to include two proposed one-time expenditures from the lodging tax fund balance: \$7,500 for Downtown

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

Wayfinding, and \$20,000 for the trolley. This additional \$27,500 raises the total for this DP to \$125,250.

- vi. DP #113 \$80,510 to Ed! What does this amount represent?

This is the amount proposed to be spend by Ed! in 2020 from their fund, which will be presented in detail, together with their proposed 2020 Work Plan, on 11/19/19. This is the first time that we are formally including the Ed! budget in the City's overall budget approval process, rather than treating is an outlier.

8) Parks and Recreation

- i. DP #49 UFMP implementation - I have put through a request for a full-time arborist and her replacement of a level F person to work under Rich Lindsay. Total salary and benefits change is about \$6.5K per month (lots of emails back and forth regarding this with Shannon, Jessica, Scott and Dave T if anyone interested).

See Councilmember Buckshtnis' #1 above "new"

9) Street Fund

- i. #63 - Phil would it be cheaper to rent a cement mixer for months working on streets - or will this be used continually.

This would be used very frequently. It is likely going to be a 2.5 to 3.0 cubic yard mixer that can be skid mounted in our 5-yd dump truck. It will allow us to do larger pours with our sidewalk crew while keeping our concrete fresh. It will also save considerable time during clean-up each day. Renting one as frequently as we would be using it would not be cost-effective.

10) Utility

- i. DP#75 - Phil, just asking as there are so many 2019 carry-forwards so I will just ask on this one carry-forward- well done on the explanation - is the contract services an inter-fund like engineering or is it an expectation of contracting with an outside firm?

No. This \$20,000 is the overhead fee paid to the General Fund for staff time worked on the project.

- ii. DP #81 - contract work for Keeley O'Connell for the Edmonds Marsh grant writing - why is this now being charged in Stormwater utility fund? Shouldn't this still reside in Parks considering her expertise and training? How was this dollar amount determined?

This is the same amount as last year and it has proven to be a good tool for the City. Keeley's technical expertise, relationships with regulatory agencies and funding sources, and her familiarity with our project have made her very efficient and effective on this project. She has been available to us on short notice and provides rapid turn-around on tasks assigned to her. This indefinite scope arrangement is much like an on-call contract. The REET budgets in 2020 Are very tight and revenues look to be decreasing slowly beyond that. When we sat down internally to balance the REET revenues against project needs in 2020 it was decided to cover this contract with Stormwater funding. I had no problem with that. Fund 422 will carry a heavy load in getting this project delivered. The current cost estimate for the daylighting project is \$16.65M. We have assumed this could be 75% grant-funded, although that might be optimistic. That suggests we will need more than \$4M in match for a mix of grants.

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

Fund 422 will be deeply invested in the project financially and the Public Works Department will be managing the permitting, design, and construction phases of this large capital project. We have the hydraulic, Stormwater engineering, contract administration, construction management, and consultant contact management skills and experience to put this complex project together. The Parks Department will be heavily involved throughout, especially since they frequently access RCO funding and have good relationships there. We have the relationships with WSDOT and the Ferries Division. Also, Parks will be the lead on the follow-up project of re-constructing Marina Beach Park after the channel is day-lighted through it.

- iii. **New comment on DP #81:** remove this scientist grant writer from Stormwater and return this position back to Parks and Recreations or remove all together until next year when Council “scrubs the CIP/CFP” to look at all projects (especially capital) and determine if language is correct and dollar amounts are accurate for either the utility funds or the park construction funds. In this regard, the scientific grant writer will concentrate on the “park and ecological aspect of the restoration” rather than concentrate on the stormwater aspect of this \$16.6MM project.

- iv. DP#85 - has carry forward of \$38,402 and I can't seem to reconcile this amount to what is being asked? Is the \$48 new money or just total funds needed and includes the \$38K carry forward? (again good work on all these carry forwards)
The \$38,402 is the estimated carry forward from the 2019 budget to the 2020 budget. The current and proposed Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) has \$68,000 programmed in 2020 to continue the Lake Ballinger work. This means an additional \$29,598 in stormwater funds are needed to provide the \$68,000 budget in 2020.

- v. DP #94 is very complex and lots of dollars involved. Have we received written commitments from the other cities on their share as this would be a large carry forward if we can't obtain those commitments in 2020.
Our partners have been involved all the way through the development of this project. Under our contract with them, they are required to provide their share of each project the City of Edmonds, as the managing partner, determines is necessary. That said, we have worked closely together as partners for many years. They all are aware of what is coming with the incinerator replacement project. This is, as you point out, a big and expensive project through and continued, frequent communication will be very important as we move into final design and construction.

- vi. **New comment: DP #80,** Change the language from Willow Creek Daylighting Design to be Edmonds Marsh Estuary Restoration. Lower the amount to \$450,000 (change BARS code 422.000.72.594.31.41.00 from \$700,000 to \$400,000). Change the language of the DP 80 to remove any direction for “design” and include some or more of the following verbiage (CIP/CFP should also include language of this type as well) and Keeley or some scientist can more effectively write this - but the City needs to move away from calling it Willow Creek Daylighting. “The Edmonds Marsh near-shore estuary restoration will restore the tidal exchange between the Puget Sound and the Edmonds Marsh. This project, if completed successfully, will assist in restoring the Edmonds Marsh estuary to a fully functioning Marsh that will enhance many features and wildlife found within the interior of the Marsh. The restoration will allow Coho and chum salmon to again migrate

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

into Willow Creek for spawning. The tidal exchange will allow juvenile chick salmon and other marine species to utilize the estuary and improve the conditions from wildlife such as migratory birds and waterfowl. Further contaminants and other estuarine functions will be improved by the saltwater exchange. Lastly, this project will increase the tourism both at Marina Beach and the Marsh, bird watching, sea level rise and act as a natural carbon sequestration spot (blue carbon offset) for all generation to enjoy, learn about and utilize as a wildlife sanctuary in an urban environment.” Until ownership of property is determined funds will be utilized to work on areas within the Marsh with no presumption that the current exhibit 6 present by Shannon Wilson will be the desired alternative.

11) Street Capital

- i. Good work - on the DP's 98-99-100 - I imagine all those 2019 carry forwards are part of these calculations?

Yes, all three projects have carry-forwards as part of the 2020 budget.

DP#98 has a carry-forward of \$458,744 from the first \$1,000,000 we received from the \$10,000,000 Connecting Washington allocation for HWY99.

DP#99 has a carry-forward of \$1,613,137 to finish the project in 2020 which was always anticipated. The expenditures out of Fund 112 will be reimbursed by a grant.

DP#100 is carrying forward all of the construction funding from the 2019 budget (\$1,268,493) since the project was delayed

- ii. DP #102 Guardrail - new program - how are guardrail locations determined? (note: There was an issue with a potential guardrail to be installed on 190th street when there is already a hardscape on the south side and a natural vegetation (guardrail) on the north side and all neighbors in that area were upset that an armored guardrail was to be installed as it would have narrowed the street - this issue was resolved to the neighbors satisfaction and I appreciate you and Bertrand dealing with the neighbors).

Answer:

A detailed assessment of where guardrails are needed throughout the City was completed in 2004 and this list was revised in 2019 to account for modified unit costs and establish a priority rating (see attachment below). Since 2004, very few guardrail improvements have been made which is why Decision Packages were completed for the 2019 and 2020 Budgets. The 20 locations of existing or needed guardrails on the current list are prioritized based on traffic volumes, and improvement costs. The locations in Priority #1 are estimated at approx.\$100,000 total cost, while those in Priority #2 and #3 each amount to approximately \$50,000 for each priority category. Projects ID #1 and ID #3 will be completed in 2019 (from \$20,000 budgeted for this program in 2019).

[\\edmsvr-usersfs\userprof\\$\williams\Documents\Copy](#) of Revised Guardrail Assesment (002) (002) PHW

Guardrail Inventory (revised in 2019)

Project		Project				Note		
ID #	Priority	Location	Issue	Solution	Priority	Type	Costs	
1	1	1231 - 12 Ave N	2:1 slope, paralleling road and adjacent residences	Install guardrail approx. 150 LF	1	CIP	\$10,000	to be completed in 2019
2	1	9425 190th St. SW	Timber Guardrail with Object Marker	Install Steel Beam Guardrail	1	CIP	\$19,000	Could be re-evaluated in the future

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and Italicized)

3	1	75th Ave W - 230th St. SW	2:1 Slope, 60 LF Old Steel Guardrail	Install New Steel Guardrail 110 LF	1	CIP	\$8,000	to be completed in 2020	
4	1	24305 Firdale Ave.	Multiple accidents near day care facility	Install Steel Beam Guardrail with End Termination 100 LF	1	CIP	\$10,000	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
5	1	24315 104th Ave. W- West Side	3:1 Slope, 12' height	Install Steel Beam Guardrail with End Termination 120 LF	1	CIP	\$11,000	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
6	1	1056 Alder Street	Old Steel Guardrail with Street End Markers	Install Steel Beam Guardrail 65 LF	1	CIP	\$8,250	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
7	1	23422 74th Ave W	2:1 Slope with Old 6" x 6" Timber Posts	Interurban Trail Project will Install Proper Railing	1	CIP	\$7,500	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
8	1	842 Bell St.	1:1 Side Slope; 24 LF Old Steel Guardrail	Rebuild New STD; Make 30 LF; Add 2 End Street Markers	1	CIP	\$5,000	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
9	1	827 Edmonds St.	1:1 Side Slope; 38 LF Old Wood Guardrail	Rebuild to Correct Height; Add 2 End Street Markers	1	CIP	\$2,500	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
10	1	9425 190th St. SW	Timber Guardrail with Object Marker	Install Steel Beam Guardrail	1	CIP	\$12,500	Considered for 2020 (pending budget)	
SUBTOTAL							\$93,750		
11	2	10414 Robin Hood Dr.- North Side	3:1 Slope, 10' height, curbed street	Install Steel Beam Guardrail with End Termination 90 LF	2	CIP	\$10,000		
12	2	16116 68th Ave. W - North side	4:1 Slope, 4' height,	Install Chain Link Fence and Consider Guardrail 130 LF	2	CIP	\$12,000		
13	2	205th Street NW - 5th Ave	100 LF of old Guardrail	Install New Guardrail and Double Arrow Sign at T- intersection	2	CIP	\$10,000		
14	2	1040 Maple St.	12 LF Old Steel Guardrail with 1 end of Street Markers	Rebuild Guardrail 36 LF; Keep End of Street Markers	2	CIP	\$7,800		
15	3	86th PI W - OVD	2:1 Slope, 10' height, 450 LF, curbed street	Install Guardrail 80 LF	3	CIP	\$9,000		
Subtotal							\$39,800		
16	3	180th and OVD - 100' to East	3:1 Slope, 10' height, curbed street	Install Guardrail 280 LF	3	CIP	\$19,000		
17	3	180th - OVD North Side 100' to East	3:1 Slope, 8' -10' Off Roadway 100' to East	Install Guardrail 280 LF	3	CIP	\$19,000		
18	3	21318 - 21314 Pioneer Way	2:1 Side Slope, Wood Guardrail 100 LF	Replace with Steel Guardrail When Wood Guardrail Deteriorates	3	CIP	\$10,000		
19	3	68th Ave W - 162nd PI SW	125 LF Wood Railing	Replace With Chain-link Fence	3	CIP	\$3,750		
20	3	68th Ave W - 164th St SW	150 LF Wood Railing	Replace With Chain-link Fence	3	CIP	\$4,500		
Subtotal							\$56,250		
TOTAL							\$200,000		

COST ESTIMATE DATA

Guide Post	\$10.00
End Street Markers	\$75.00
Other Signs	\$150.00
Chain Link Fence	\$30.00
Guardrail	\$50.00
Guardrail Terminals	\$2,500.00

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and Italicized)

12) Parks

- i. DP #106 Marina Beach Design - Shannon would you consider this contingent on the stormwater ask of \$750K for Edmonds Marsh Restoration? – *No, this would be to advance the technical aspects of the park design just enough to apply for RCO grants in 2020. This does not rely on the stormwater funds to match, we have matching funds programmed in REET in 2022 – 2025. While it is true we would not go into construction on this project without the daylighting / marsh project; we anticipate the park portion of the project taking more than one grant cycle to fund (RCO grants can be extended 2 years as needed) and we want to be as prepared as possible for when/if the marsh ownership is transferred and the project moves forward. Missing the 2020 (for 2021) grant cycle would limit our ability to mobilize on the park portion down the road.*

13) Development Services cost center 558.60

- i. Shane - professional services are non-consistent with all our other departments and I am guessing the UFMP contract has some play in this - but don't want to assume. So, can you explain its fluctuations? --*The Development Services Cost Center 558.60 is for professional services of the Planning Division. It includes Hearing Examiner services in the amount of up to \$42,000 maximum per year (which is paid to the Hearing Examiner on an hourly basis only after the work is done), as well as for minute-taker services for the Planning Board, Architectural Design Board, and Historic Preservation Commission. It also includes environmental/critical area reports and arborist reports that occasionally the Department takes on. In the last couple years, professional service costs for the Hearing Examiner have been considerably lower than budgeted; however, the maximum contract amount is the same, recognizing that any unspent money from this cost center would not stay in the Planning Division budget past the current year but revert unallocated to the City's General Fund for the following year, where it is available for other City Council purposes. The need for critical area and arborist reports also varies from year to year; the Planning Division has historically had budget on hand to move ahead immediately if a critical area or arborist report was needed because when such items are needed, there usually isn't enough time to go through a quarterly budget amendment process. Again, any unspent money reverts to GF use for other needs. However, because of the lower annual expenditures, the budgeted amount for 2020 was reduced by more than \$6,000 from the 2019 amount. We would monitor this next year and, if the trend continues, reduce the 2021 budget for this cost center.*

Request #	Proposed budget amendments or questions from Councilmember Mesaros:
-----------	---

- 1) New: add \$40,000 for a non-presented employee comparative salary study during 2020.
- 2) New: Add \$10,000 for the Edmonds Chamber of Commerce to support their work in promoting Edmonds and making this a worker friendly and visitor friendly city.

--	--

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and italicized)

Request #	Proposed budget amendments or questions from Councilmember Tibbott:
1)	<p>DP #13 I think the ½ FTE for Human Services in Edmonds is premature. What options have we explored with the County? What partnerships currently exist that we could buttress instead? Its not clear what benefit we receive by providing these services via the city.</p> <p><i>Please see response to DP#2 under Dave Teitzel above.</i></p>
2)	<p>DP #6 What is Tyler?</p> <p><i>Tyler is the software company that provides our ERP / financial software for finance, payroll, accounts payable, budget, project accounting and utility billing. Decision Package #6 will cover Tyler's anticipate annual maintenance fees for 2020.</i></p>
3)	<p>DP #31 How does the proposed PIO/Communication strategist dovetail with the personnel helping with the Housing Commission? Would it make more sense for the PIO to be aligned with the Mayor's Office? Would it make sense to combine the consulting with the Housing Commission and the PIO into one FTE and align the assignment with Community Services?</p> <p><i>Since 2014 the Public Information Officer/Community Engagement Specialist has been a contracted staff resource under the direction of the Community Services Director, yet at only approximately 50 hours per month. The proposal is to increase the commitment to public information and community outreach/engagement to a 1/2 FTE, in-house regular position - an almost doubling of the hours dedicated to this important function. As seen over the past year or two, especially as related to major projects and programs, comprehensive, strategic community engagement and outreach is needed within the City. This position would be in-house and available most every day to be a valuable resource when planning public engagement processes related to major projects and programs - someone who can be called into a meeting on short notice as an in-house team player. Most cities have from 1/2 to full-time PIO/Community Engagement positions. This position would be integrally involved in shaping and guiding the public engagement process related to the Housing Commission's work, as well as planning processes, parks projects, public works projects, and other major city activities, events, etc. This position would also pick up the functions that have been performed to date by the contractor, including managing social media, conducting press relations (including oversight of press releases), attending key community meetings and events, etc.</i></p>
4)	<p>DP #40 While I support the update of the Development Code, this agenda item seems to be inadequate for addressing the larger goal of revising the entire code. I would like to know if this is a priority with the rest of the Council and how we could more adequately staff for this project besides the use of a consultant.</p> <p><i>From Shane: The \$25,000 proposed would be added to a few thousand dollars of likely carryforward from the 2019 budget. It would fund consultant assistance to existing staff for updating the code. The main challenge of updating the development code is that it can't be done adequately without considerable input from key Development Services staff (who already have full workloads). The most efficient and timely way to move forward would be to hire an additional experienced staff person who could either do the bulk of the code update work <u>or</u> take on other duties from management level staff who could then do the code update work (perhaps with a small amount of consultant support). A full time-staff person, with benefits, would be over \$100 K. If the position could be hired for two to three years, tremendous progress could be achieved. The alternative is that, as other projects (such as the UFMP) get done, existing staff can focus</i></p>

Council Questions / Proposed 2020 Budget Amendments

Updated November 22, 2019

(Staff Responses are in red and Italicized)

additional time on the code and, using a relatively small amount of consultant support (i.e., the \$25 K from DP # 40), get a lot done.

- 5) DP #42 Plan Review Consultant seems like a poor description for Construction review services. Since these services are paid for through increased construction activity, does it make sense to create an outgoing relationship with a review service and outsource the work when projects require it? This is not a consultant relationship as much as it is an outside service.
- I think we depend on consultant to much.
 - I think outsourcing review services is valuable especially to meet the demand for design review.

From Shane: You are right; building plan review is not the City’s typical consultant-type service, but “professional services” is the catch-all budget category that is the closest fit for this work. We have been using building plan review consultants (contractors, you might call them) for complex projects for years. While residential projects and small-scale commercial are reviewed by City staff, the complex building plans (major commercial buildings, schools, etc.) benefit from someone with a structural engineering background or advanced commercial building review experience. As you mention, these services are fully compensated from permit fees.

DP #80 I have concerns with the timing of this budget item. I am not in favor of setting aside funds for design until we're able to create an ILA. Perhaps we focus more on short-term improvements. Like with DP 81

Request #	Proposed budget amendments or questions from Councilmember Fraley-Monillas:
-----------	---

- 1) **New Comment - Funding for Arborist:** My question is to Shannon if this position was needed by the department why hasn't it been asked for prior to this by the city staff? How will this affect your FTE allotment? Will you have to cut back in other areas to pay for it? How much is contracting a arborist cost in the past? Do you have enough work for a full-time position all year long?