

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

November 5, 2012

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Mayor Earling in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Dave Earling, Mayor
Strom Peterson, Council President
Frank Yamamoto, Councilmember
Joan Bloom, Councilmember
Kristiana Johnson, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT

Al Compaan, Police Chief
Jim Lawless, Assistant Police Chief
Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Shawn Hunstock, Finance Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Rob Chave, Interim Development Services Dir.
Renee McRae, Recreation Manager
Carl Nelson, CIO
Debra Sharp, Accountant
Rob English, City Engineer
Gina Janicek, Associate Planner
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. ROLL CALL

City Clerk Sandy Chase called the roll. All Councilmembers were present with the exception of Councilmember Buckshnis.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETSO, TO EXCUSE COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS.

Councilmember Petso commented the Council has not yet developed standards for excusing Councilmember absences. Because she had prior knowledge that Councilmember Buckshnis would be absent tonight, she will support the motion excusing her.

MOTION CARRIED (5-1), COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON VOTING NO.

2. MEET WITH CANDIDATE FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD.

At 6:50 p.m., Mayor Earling stated the City Council would next meet with a candidate for appointment to the Architectural Design Board (ADB), Cary Guenther. The meeting took place in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. The meeting with Mr. Guenther was open to the public and all Councilmembers were present.

Mayor Earling reconvened the meeting at the dais in the Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Councilmember Bloom requested Item B be removed from the Consent Agenda.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETSO, TO APPROVE THE REMAINDER OF THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

- A. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 23, 2012.**
- C. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #135144 THROUGH #135275 DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2012 FOR \$131,486.85. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT & CHECKS #51772 THROUGH #51787 FOR \$462,236.65, BENEFIT CHECKS #51788 THROUGH #51799 & WIRE PAYMENTS OF \$195,441.47 FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 16, 2012 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2012.**
- D. APPROVAL OF LIST OF EDMONDS' BUSINESSES APPLYING FOR RENEWAL OF THEIR LIQUOR LICENSE WITH THE WASHINGTON STATE LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD, OCTOBER 2012.**
- E. CONFIRM ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD CANDIDATE CARY GUENTHER TO THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN BOARD.**
- F. AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO SIGN AGREEMENT WITH EDMONDS PUBLIC FACILITIES DISTRICT REGARDING DISPLAY OF CHIHULY ARTWORK.**
- G. COMMUNITY SERVICES/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT QUARTERLY REPORT - OCTOBER, 2012.**

ITEM B: APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 30, 2012

Councilmember Bloom thanked the citizen who brought to the City's attention a discrepancy between the minutes and the comments by Councilmember Buckshnis. Because Councilmember Buckshnis' comments referenced work by the committee she chairs, the Public Safety and Personnel Committee, she requested an exact transcription of Councilmember Buckshnis' comments be included in the minutes rather than an edited version.

It was the consensus of the Council to have a verbatim transcript prepared and approval of the October 30, 2012 minutes delayed.

5. PROCLAMATION IN HONOR OF BILL BRAYER, FOUNDER OF MS HELPING HANDS.

Mayor Earling commented although people may be aware of the good work done by MS Helping Hands, few are aware of the extent of what Mr. Brayer has given to the community. Mayor Earling read a proclamation describing Mr. Brayer's efforts and asking all citizens of Edmonds to join him in thanking Mr. Brayer for his dedication and hard work on behalf of the MS cause and also in congratulating him on his well-deserved retirement.

Bill Brayer, Co-Founder, MS Helping Hands, expressed his appreciation for the proclamation. He explained receiving a proclamation from the City completes the circle; he received an award from Congress, the Governor of Washington and now the City of Edmonds. He was honored to represent MS Helping Hands which he and his wife co-founded in 1998. It will be in good hands with his retirement with Executive Director Jan Vance and new President, Traci Shepard.

6. VIDEO ANNOTATION OF AGENDAS.

Finance Director Shawn Hunstock explained this is a demonstration of a concept only at this point. Staff is not prepared to provide specific costs, vendors or options. Before investigating this concept further, staff wanted to ensure Council was interested in staff pursuing it.

CIO Carl Nelson commented one of his interests was keeping costs down. Therefore he began with using existing systems, such as Agenda Quick which is provided by Destiny Software, to add a feature that provides access to video of specific City Council agenda items. He demonstrated how that could work via accessing the agenda from the City's webpage.

Council President Peterson asked if that could be done utilizing the current structure and technology. Mr. Nelson answered there would be a series of phases/steps. The first step would be sending the video that is currently captured to the vendor who would index it to the agenda, assign buttons to specific agenda items and make it available within an amount of time that is negotiated. The second step would be to swap out some of the current technology so that as meetings are recorded, they would be sent to the vendor who would do the indexing and provide access within 4-10 hours. Once the video is digitally captured, an automated broadcast station would be possible that replaces the software/hardware for Channel 21/39 and pulls directly from the storage sources. The final step would be to increase the quality of the video to high definition. Some vendors have suggested a remote control feature where they take control of the cameras as part of their fees and services; that would be a future step.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas inquired about live steaming. Mr. Nelson advised all vendors offer live streaming but there has been some reluctance on the Council's part as well as the potential for the public to use live streaming to their advantage such as grandstanding in a manner that causes a public nuisance/outcry. The preference would be a 5-10 second delay. Councilmember Fraley-Monillas relayed her understanding that a number of nearby cities have live steaming.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas relayed citizens unable to attend meetings have said that live streaming would allow them to watch Council meetings from home as they occur. Mr. Nelson stated live streaming would be part of the proposal; it would be up to the Council whether they wanted it.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas referred to the chart illustrating the possible system and inquired about the section entitled improved Council Chambers and remote control. Mr. Nelson answered that would be replacing the existing cameras with high definition and remote control so a vendor could do the video recording. Having a vendor do the recording is usually a fixed price per meeting or a number of meetings per year. That would assist in the budgeting process by predetermining the cost of videoing, indexing, having them available online, and stored.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas observed remote control would allow a vendor to do the recording from a remote site. Mr. Nelson agreed.

Councilmember Bloom relayed her understanding the intent of phasing is to determine cost and fit it into the budget. Mr. Nelson answered the intent of phasing is to put the technology in place, change the business practices with the technology and then go to the next step. He clarified it was not that it could

not be funded all at once but he did not think it would be wise to do it all at once. He suggested using the video that is already captured and annotating the agendas and then considering how the technology can be improved to provide a better product. An improved system would also allow videotaping capacity outside the Council Chambers; the vendors indicated the City's fiber optics would allow remote video access.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether staff would provide final figures regarding Phase 1 in advance of the Council finalizing the 2013 budget. Mr. Nelson hoped so. If the Council gives approval, he will pursue the vendors to get costs and more specifics.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas asked Councilmember Yamamoto, who has been working with Mr. Nelson, to provide input regarding how this would benefit citizens. Councilmember Yamamoto responded in the long run it would include upgrading the current system which would allow recording of remote meetings such as a meeting in the Brackett Room. There are future cost savings. The system would be easier to manipulate and does not require any special training or requirements. Other advantages include the ability to record and broadcast other meetings as well as provide additional information live on Channels 21/39. Phasing will allow additional features to be added which will also increase the cost.

Mayor Earling asked Mr. Hunstock to summarize the action staff is requesting. Mr. Hunstock explained staff wanted to ensure the Council was interested in having staff pursue and develop options with regard to phasing and vendors. If the Council was interested in pursuing the concept, staff will return to a future Council meeting with specific costs, vendor options, etc. It was the consensus of the Council for staff to proceed as Mr. Hunstock described.

7. **CLOSED RECORD REVIEW OF A "TYPE IV-B" REZONE APPLICATION INITIATED BY OWNERS SID ODGERS AND KEN DARWIN TO CHANGE THE ZONING DESIGNATION FOR THEIR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 8609/8611/8615 244TH STREET SW FROM SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL "RS-8" TO MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL "RM-2.4." THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION FOR THESE PROPERTIES WAS AMENDED LAST YEAR FROM "SINGLE FAMILY URBAN 1" TO "MULTI FAMILY MEDIUM DENSITY."**

Mayor Earling described the procedures for the closed record review. He explained a rezone is a Type IV-B application where staff makes a recommendation to the Planning Board and the Planning Board forwards a recommendation to the City Council for final decision. He opened the closed record review. He advised there is no opportunity during the closed record review for public testimony other than parties of record. Parties of record typically include the applicant and any person who testified at the open record public hearing on the application and any person who submitted written comments concerning the application at the open record public hearing. In this case there was no testimony other than the applicant's testimony and staff's presentation and no written comments were received. Therefore, there will only be presentations by the applicant and by staff.

The Appearance of Fairness Doctrine requires each hearing be fair in form, substance and appearance. The hearing must not only be fair but also appear to be fair. He asked if any member of the decision-making body had engaged in communication with proponents or opponents regarding the issues in this matter outside the public hearing process. There were no disclosures by any Councilmember or Mayor Earling.

Mayor Earling asked if any member of the Council had a conflict of interest or believed he/she could not hear and consider this application in a fair and objective manner. There were no conflicts of interested voiced.

Mayor Earling asked whether any member of the audience objected to his or any Councilmembers' participation as a decision maker in this hearing. There were no objections voiced.

Mayor Earling advised the applicant's presentation will be limited to five minutes.

Associate Planner Gina Janicek displayed a vicinity map, Exhibit 1 to Attachment 1, and identified the site which is comprised of three parcels. Last year the Council approved a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the site. The applicant is here to answer questions but does not plan to make a presentation. She identified the parcels colored yellow on the map zoned RS-8 including the subject site. The site is adjacent to RM-1.5, multi-family high density. The proposal is to rezone the site to RM-2.4; there are other parcels with that zoning east of Highway 99 (colored orange on the vicinity map). RM-2.4 is viewed as a good transition zone between single family and the RM-1.5 zone. No public comments or feedback from the neighborhood has been received and none was received when the Comprehensive Plan designation was changed last year.

She referred to Exhibit 2, the Planning Board meeting minutes from the October 10 public hearing. She reviewed factors to be considered for a rezone:

- A. *Comprehensive Plan.* Approval of the rezone would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as the current zoning is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The current zoning is single family and the Comprehensive Plan designation is multi-family, medium density.
- B. *Zoning.* The existing single family homes would be an appropriate use in the multi-family zone as would any multi-family development. Any future proposal for multi-family development would require review by the Architectural Design Board and SEPA review. There are no development plans proposed at this time.
- C. *Density.* There are two zones compatible with the Comprehensive Plan designation, RM-2.4, multi-family medium density and RM-3. Further details regarding the zones are provided on Page 3 of Exhibit 1.
- D. *Changes that merit a rezone.* The Comprehensive Plan designation for the site was changed last year.
- E. *Suitability.* The site is very flat and slopes toward Highway 99 and is located on an arterial.
- F. *Value.* The tax base likely will increase with the rezone.

Ms. Janicek identified the 3 parcels on the vicinity map, approximately 59,000 square feet. The Planning Board unanimously recommends approval of the rezone.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant did not wish to make a presentation.

Mayor Earling closed the presentation portion of the closed record review.

COUNCILMEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE REQUESTED CHANGE IN ZONING AND DIRECT THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE FOR FINAL COUNCIL ACTION.

Councilmember Petso said she will support the motion but as she read the criteria regarding value, the Council was to evaluate the health, safety and welfare with versus without the proposal. She did not see that an increase in the tax base met the criteria regarding health, safety and welfare but she was not aware of any objection to the proposal.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. **PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE NO. 3894 - AN INTERIM ZONING ORDINANCE THAT WOULD ALLOW FARMERS MARKETS IN BUSINESS COMMERCIAL (BC) AND BUSINESS DOWNTOWN (BD) ZONES.**

Community Services/Economic Development Director Stephen Clifton recalled on September 11, 2012, the Council adopted Ordinance No. 3894, an interim ordinance that would allow farmers markets in the BC and BD zones. At that time, he informed the Council that the current code does not expressly allow

farmers markets within these two zones, but allows seasonal farmers markets to operate May through September. The interim ordinance would allow farmers markets in these two zones, on public and private property, and throughout the year. There has been interest expressed in a year-round farmers market; this ordinance would allow that. The interim ordinance was proposed due to the Museum's request to operate a farmers market on Wednesday evenings through late fall which did not occur. The intent is to develop a revised ordinance that allows farmers markets to operate year-round on public and private property.

Mayor Earling opened the public participation portion of the public hearing. There were no members of the public present who wished to provide testimony. Mayor Earling closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER FRALEY-MONILLAS, TO ADOPT THE WHEREAS CLAUSES IN ORDINANCE NO. 3894 AS THE COUNCIL'S FINDINGS OF FACT JUSTIFYING THIS INTERIM ZONING ORDINANCE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. **THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE RESCHEDULED TO A LATER DATE: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE ADDITION OF A TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR STUDY OF STATE ROUTE 104, BETWEEN THE INTERURBAN TRAIL (76TH AVE. W) AND THE FERRY TERMINAL, TO THE 2013-2018 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

10. **PUBLIC HEARING ON 2013 REVENUE SOURCES INCLUDING PROPERTY TAXES.**

Finance Director Shawn Hunstock distributed hardcopies of a PowerPoint presentation, advising it will also be available on the City's website tomorrow. This public hearing on revenue including property taxes is a statutory requirement. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide the Council and the public information regarding revenue sources in the proposed budget.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a bar graph illustrating General Fund, Total Revenue by Type, 2009-2013 (based on numbers on page 35 of the budget document). He summarized overall revenues are down from the high in 2010. The three largest revenue sources are property taxes, sales tax and utility taxes. Total budgeted revenue for the General Fund is \$32,869,792 (page 35 of the budget document):

- Property tax and sales tax together account for 58% of the City's General Fund revenue
- Single largest change for 2013 is the loss of liquor taxes; a \$200,000 decrease in General Fund revenue
- Revenue is projected to be up by 0.5% from the 2012 estimate
- Total revenue in 2013 is projected to be down by 5% from the high in 2010

Mr. Hunstock displayed a graph of assessed value and regular levy rate, 2009-2013 which illustrates how the allowable 1% increase in property tax is captured when assessed values are decreasing. There has been an approximately \$2.2 billion decrease in assessed value between 2009 and 2013; at the same time, the levy rate increases, allowing the City to capture its allowable 1% increase in property tax. The 1% is specifically related to total revenue, not the levy rate. The levy rate could increase by more than 1% to capture a 1% increase in total property tax revenue. He referred to the graph, explaining the levy rate goes from slightly less than \$1.20 in 2009 to a proposed rate of \$1.76 in 2013. He summarized the assessed value and regular levy rate change relative to each other; as one goes down, the other goes up in order to capture the 1% allowable increase in total property tax revenue.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a bar graph illustrating the regular levy and EMS levy 2009-2013. The graph illustrates the regular property tax slight increases each year. The EMS levy is decreasing due to the cap of \$0.50/\$1000 of assessed value. He displayed a comparison of regular property tax levy by city in

Snohomish County; Edmonds is slightly lower than the average but slightly above the median, 10th out of 20 Snohomish County cities.

Mr. Hunstock explained between 2009 and 2013, assessed values (AV) will have declined by \$2.2 billion or 28%:

- In order for the City to levy its allowable 1% increase in revenue year-over-year, the City's regular levy has increased from \$1.20 to \$1.76
- Because the EMS levy is capped at \$0.50, the decline in AV means a loss in revenue in the 2009-2013 timeframe of over \$1 million in the EMS portion of the property tax
- This more than offsets the increase in regular property taxes, for the 1% allowable increase as well as the credit for new construction
- The regular levy increased by \$546,870

Mr. Hunstock reported unpaid property taxes have increased recently. He displayed a comparison of property tax levies and collections for the last ten fiscal years that illustrated the increase in unpaid property taxes. Property tax collections were over 98% in 2007-2010 and 97.6% in 2011 or unpaid property taxes of \$318,000 in 2011; unpaid property taxes 2002-2011 totaled \$483,000. It is not only the City's portion of the property tax that is unpaid; County's, School District's, etc. portions are also unpaid. He expected the taxes would eventually be collected by Snohomish County via liens on the properties and at some point foreclosure.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a pie chart of the 2012 property tax levy by jurisdiction (a corrected version of the chart on page 35 of the budget document). He highlighted the City's regular property tax levy of \$1.66, the EMS levy of \$0.50 and the voted bond levy of \$0.17; of the total tax levy, the City receives 21-22%.

He displayed a bar graph of the next largest revenue source in the General Fund, utility tax. The bar graph illustrates utility tax by type; utility taxes in total are increasing each year. He displayed a comparison of 2009-2013 utility tax by type (external and internal). He displayed utility tax rates:

- External utilities (non-City):
 - Natural gas – 6%
 - Cable – 6%
 - Telephone – 6%
 - Electric – 6%
 - Solid waste – 10%
- City operated utilities:
 - Water – 18.7%
 - Sewer – 10%
 - Storm – 10%

Mr. Hunstock noted the above taxes are in addition to any applicable franchise fees. The higher utility taxes for water are intended to cover fire hydrant maintenance costs.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a chart illustrating sales tax for 2006-2011. Sales tax still has not recovered from the economic decline. Retail sales tax is down by 14.2% between the high of 2007 and 2011. The total retail sales tax rate is 9.5%; the City's component is 0.85%. He identified the top three industries that generate sales tax (page 40):

- Auto dealerships - \$1,028,350 (21.9%)
- Construction - \$625,730 (13.3%)
- Accommodations and food services - \$600,509 (12.8%)

Mr. Hunstock summarized General Fund revenue for 2013 is expected to remain relatively flat compared to 2012 estimates, a 0.5% increase for 2013. It is a mixed bag in other funds (pages 127-180 in the budget document):

- Street Fund 111 – no significant change except for \$100,000 proposed transfer in from General Fund
- REET funds 125 and 126 – REET revenue is expected to increase over 2012
- Equipment Rental 511 – increase for funding of the B Fund
- Utility funds 421, 422 and 423 – revenue increases large depend on proposed rate changes

Mayor Earling opened the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, referred to the 1% increase in property taxes the Council is considering, noting no one likes tax increases. He suggested the Council specify that half the 1% increase would be used for chip seal and road improvements and the other half use to assist with the EMS shortage. He felt most citizens would understand the need for increased taxes if it was used for those two purposes. Next, he referred to the amount citizens pay for utilities, noting it is particularly hard for people out of work or not working at their usual rate due to the economy. He pointed out the City has raised water every year; it was \$551,000 in 2009, \$711,000 in 2010, \$798,000 in 2011 and \$841,000 in 2012 and \$904,000 in 2013. He suggested spreading the workload over more years.

Hearing no further public comment, Mayor Earling closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

No Council action was required.

11. PUBLIC HEARING ON 2013 BUDGET

Finance Director Shawn Hunstock referred to questions asked by the Council at the October 23 work session. Councilmember Yamamoto asked why there was \$209,000 in grant revenue in 2010, and a relative small number budgeted for 2012. Mr. Hunstock explained some of the grants were not expected to continue. He distributed a revenue status report that provided further detail regarding grants by account number in the General Fund, noting there is typically not a lot of grant activity in the General Fund.

Mr. Hunstock relayed a question from Council President Peterson regarding how the City Attorney invoices are reflected in the Council budget. The past practice with the former City Attorney and the current City Attorney has been to the extent work is done on requests by the City Council, the City Council budget is charged for that portion of the invoice. For example, with the current monthly flat fee, the portion of the fee charged to the City Council budget varies based on the amount of time the City Attorney spends on Council requested items. The total flat rate does not vary month to month.

Mr. Hunstock distributed a list of questions from the October 30 budget workshop. He advised the handouts could be available via email and online. Questions asked at and prior to the October 23 budget workshop and staff's responses are on the Finance Department webpage. He noted Councilmember Johnson also submitted several questions today; all questions and responses will be posted online before the Council is scheduled to take action on the budget on November 20.

Mayor Earling opened the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Trudy Dana, Edmonds, explained as an employee of the Lynnwood Police Department for 18 years, she conducted the Lynnwood Police Citizens Patrol and Citizens Academy. Prior to working for Lynnwood, she wrote books on child safety and worked with a number of police agencies. During that time, she learned the importance of a strong public safety agency in a community's life. Edmonds' Police Chief Al

Compaan has done an amazing job working within a tight law enforcement budget while retaining high morale and excellent police services. The loss of additional police personnel would be a mistake; there is a limit to how lean a department can become without realizing a steep decline in law enforcement services. To ensure the quality of life, small town atmosphere and a friendly city, the police department must be adequately funded. She recognized the difficulty of budget decisions, but emphasized public safety is one area that can only be cut so far before a steep decline occurs.

Hearing no further public comment, Mayor Earling closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Mr. Hunstock distributed and displayed a comprehensive list of suggested budget changes he has received from Councilmembers. Due to Councilmember Buckshtnis' absence tonight, he proposed the Council review the suggested changes at the November 20 Council meeting. He invited Councilmembers to contact him if his summary of their suggested changes were incorrect.

Mayor Earling recalled Mr. Hunstock's suggestion that the Council prioritize the suggested changes following the second public hearing on November 20.

Councilmember Petso referred to one of the suggested changes, explaining it was not her intent to draw down the balance in the actuarial funds 617 and 009 all at once or in a single year. Her request was either this year or in future years, to ask the actuary firm about the possibility of beginning to draw down reserves; specifically, to potentially discontinue the \$50,000/year General Fund contribution to the 617 fund and to fund it with fire insurance premiums.

No Council action was required.

12. 2013 PROPERTY TAX ORDINANCE

Finance Director Shawn Hunstock explained the Council packet contains the proposed ordinance as well as calculations of the suggested 2013 levy rates. The assessed value in the City has decreased significantly. The levy rate may change between now and the end of the year as the State has not yet concluded their assessment of the value of private and publicly owned utilities. What typically happens and what happened last year, and the City is presented with an option of levying an additional \$0.01-0.05, the City has the ability to capture that with the Assessor's Office at that time, typically the first week in December. The figures in the Council packet are based on the latest available information from the Assessor's Office. The ordinance can be adopted tonight or Council can delay it until November 20; the ordinance must be adopted by City Council by November 30.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas expressed a preference to review the information further and delay a decision until November 20.

It was the consensus of the Council to consider this again at the November 20 meeting.

13. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, referred to video recording Council meetings, advising Shoreline has live video. He referred to a report in the *Everett Herald* that Everett is spending approximately \$500,000 to upgrade all their video equipment. Everett accumulated \$1.7 million for that project via a \$1/month fee on cable bills. Everett stopped collecting the \$1 once they accumulated sufficient funds for the upgrade. He suggested the City consider that.

14. NONREPRESENTED COMPENSATION POLICY

Parks & Recreation/Human Resources Reporting Director Carrie Hite referred to the Compensation Policy for Nonrepresented Employees, explaining the policy is a culmination of a year of work by a compensation consultant that the City hired last year. The compensation consultant has been working

with staff to update job descriptions and conduct a salary survey as well as provide a recommended Compensation Policy for the Nonrepresented Employees. Presentations were made to the Council in July and September; Council took action in September to move toward a Compensation Policy for Nonrepresented Employees by placing all nonrepresented employees on a step with the intent of reaching an objective compensation policy and awarded a lump sum with the remaining budget authority.

Still outstanding for Council action is adoption of a Compensation Policy for Nonrepresented Employees. The compensation consultant provided a proposal in July which was presented to the Council again in September. At the September 25 Council meeting, two Councilmembers volunteered to review the policy and provide recommended changes. After meeting with Councilmembers Petso and Buckshnis, she prepared a redline version with their suggested changes. After reviewing the changes suggested by Councilmembers Petso and Buckshnis, Mayor Earling prepared his Mayor's recommendation.

Ms. Hite reviewed a comparison between the compensation consultant recommendation, Councilmembers' suggestions and Mayor's recommendation.

Section	Compensation Consultant's Recommendation	Councilmembers' Suggestion	Mayor's Recommendation
Policy Statement	Ensure salaries are equitable	Strive to maintain equity	Strive to maintain equity
Salary Range Progression (current policy for represented employees: step increase at 6-months)	5% step increase after 6 months successful probation. 5% Step increase after one year, with satisfactory performance, and every year after that until at maximum salary range. Automatic with above formula	Completion of 6 months of probation, then 5% step increase in the following January, and every January after that until employee reaches maximum range. This can be proposed as part of budget, but is subject to Council approval.	5% step increase after 6 months of probation, then the January following one year anniversary, and every January after that until employee reaches maximum salary range. Mayor will include this in the budget each year, and as such, will need to be approved by Council
Promotion (current policy: minimum of 5% increase)	Receive an increase not less than 5%, or adjusted to the minimum salary level of the new position, whichever is greater.	Placed on first step of new range, or lowest step of new range that results in an increase in current salary (no minimum).	The employee will get the lesser of 5% increase or the amount to get them onto a step. After that, it would follow the Salary Range Progression plan, which would be a step increase on the January 1st following the anniversary date.
Annual Salary Adjustment (Represented employees received 1.5% COLA in 2012. Nonrepresented employees received a lump sum equal to .0045%. (2013 budget includes a 2% COLA for nonrepresented	Salary ranges will be adjusted at a rate no less than the average adjustment negotiated and approved for represented employee groups. Every three years, based upon the survey data, salary ranges for Nonrepresented positions will be realigned, based on criteria.	Mayor will consider the average adjustment negotiated and approved for represented groups, and will make recommendation to Council for approval in budget process. Mayor will make appropriate and timely recommendations to City Council to maintain internal equity and prevent compression issues.	Mayor will include annual salary adjustments in the budget that are no less than the average adjustment negotiated and approved for represented employee groups. Budget is subject to Council approval. Mayor will include appropriate adjustments in the budget that will mitigate any compression issues and strive to

employees, the average bargained for represented employees.)		Every three years, based upon the survey data, the Mayor will recommend salary range market adjustments to Council based on criteria.	maintain equity. Every three years, based upon the survey data and criteria, the Mayor will adjust salary ranges for Nonrepresented positions as part of the budget process.
External/Internal Equity	To be more competitive in the market place, the City will provide: Deferred Compensation 2% and/or Management Leave, 40 hours Longevity incentive pay, consistent with all represented groups. Commissioned Police management: Educational Incentive Pay Employment Contract	Delete all, and add: Mayor will make appropriate and timely recommendations to City Council to consider changes to the compensation and/or benefits of non-represented employees.	To be more competitive and equitable both internally and externally, the City will provide: Management leave of up to 24 hours per year, on a use it or lose it basis, to non-represented employees that are not eligible for compensatory time. Longevity incentive pay that is consistent with all represented groups.

Mayor Earling respected the suggestions made by Councilmembers Petso and Buckshnis and he agreed with several. One of the objectives of the Nonrepresented Compensation Study was to define equity between nonrepresented employees as well as between union contracts and the nonrepresented employees. Another objective was to address the issue of compression. A third objective was to show value to the nonrepresented employees. The compression issues and lack of equity have resulted in some resentment by some nonrepresented employees. The 5% step increase and the 2% COLA are already included in the balanced 2013 budget.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas referred to “average adjustment” under the COLA and asked the average adjustment for nonrepresented employees if SEIU received 1%, Police received 2%, police support staff received 0% and Teamsters received 2%. Ms. Hite answered it would be 1.25%. Councilmember Fraley-Monillas asked if that would create issues with the union that received a 0% COLA. Ms. Hite answered there would not be any immediate issue but the next negotiations may be harder.

Councilmember Petso asked if the Council needed to approve the policy tonight or was there time for Councilmember Buckshnis and her to meet with Mayor to “close the gap.” Ms. Hite answered that was up to the Council.

Councilmember Petso commented one of the things Councilmember Buckshnis and she were trying to accomplish was policy guidance for the Mayor to address issues of equity without it being mandatory or creating rights of employees. If the Council approved the Mayor’s proposal, she asked whether it created a right of employees that hampers the Council’s ability to make budget adjustments. Ms. Hite responded the Council always has the last word on adoption of the budget. The Mayor’s recommendation, via an automatic inclusion in the budget, adds value to nonrepresented employees.

Councilmember Petso asked if there was any effective difference between Councilmember Buckshnis’ and her suggestion that the Mayor make a recommendation to the Council for approval in the budget and he presumably includes it in his proposed budget, and the Mayor’s proposal. Ms. Hite answered there was no difference.

Councilmember Petso referred to promotion, noting the difference of a minimum of 5% versus moving to the next step. Ms. Hite answered promotion is not a minimum of 5%. The Mayor's proposal regarding promotion is the same as the Councilmembers' suggestion but adds clarifying language that following the increase to place them on a step, it would follow the Salary Range Progression Plan, which would be a step increase on January 1st following the anniversary date.

Councilmember Petso observed the significant changes between the Councilmembers' suggestions and the Mayor's recommendation are adding management leave and longevity incentive pay. Ms. Hite agreed. Councilmember Petso asked about the longevity benefit in union contracts. Ms. Hite answered it begins after 10, 15, and 20 years and ranges between .5% to 1.5%. The cost of placing tenured nonrepresented employees on longevity scale similar to SEIU and Teamsters is approximately \$30,000/year.

If nonrepresented employees receive essentially equivalent treatment as union members, Councilmember Petso asked if it was like being in a union without having to pay dues. Ms. Hite answered no, it was not a guarantee like a collective bargaining agreement; everything was subject to Council approval.

Councilmember Petso commented the recommendations are very close and she asked her fellow Councilmembers to consider allowing Councilmember Buckshnis and her to meet with Mayor Earling to complete the revisions.

Councilmember Yamamoto commented the City paid a compensation consultant \$30,000 to provide these recommendations and it took him a year to complete the study. He expressed concern with the Council hacking up the compensation consultant's recommendation. He pointed out it was not the Council that had developed the suggested revisions, it was only two Councilmembers. He preferred all Councilmembers have input on any revisions. He felt many of the recommended revisions were wordsmithing and he preferred to trust the compensation consultant to revise the policy. He agreed the Council has the final say via the budget adoption. The Council does not have the time or wherewithal to micromanage the changes; he preferred to leave that to the Mayor and staff.

Councilmember Yamamoto questioned the two Councilmembers' suggestion to delete the entire paragraph in the policy regarding external/internal equity. He reiterated his preference for the entire Council to make any revisions to the policy rather than only two Councilmembers.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas commented the full Council can revise the policy once the two Councilmembers complete their review. The Council represents the taxpayers, not necessarily the staff. She was amenable to Councilmembers Petso and Buckshnis meeting with Mayor Earling and returning the policy to the Council for further revision and approval.

Councilmember Petso recalled Ms. Hite invited comments from all Councilmembers and contacted Councilmember Buckshnis and her because they had submitted comments. She pointed out Mayor Earling's recommendations were not identical to the consultant's recommendations either. She was hesitant to take the consultant's recommendations; for example the compensation consultant recommended deferred compensation of 2% which neither Councilmember Buckshnis and she nor the Mayor recommended. She preferred to have one more discussion with Mayor Earling to hammer out an agreement. If Councilmembers were included in that discussion, it would need to be noticed as a public meeting. She summarized reverting to the consultant's recommendation, which does not match Mayor Earling's recommendation, would be a step backward.

Councilmember Johnson apologized she did not provide Ms. Hite her comments but she did not want to defer her vote to three people. She planned to provide her comments during the next week so that all Councilmembers could weigh in on the process.

Council President Peterson recommended any Council comments on the policy be provided to Ms. Hite to avoid a rolling quorum. He also planned to provide Ms. Hite his comments. He explained one of the advantages of the Mayor including increases in the budget is it provides for better planning. Every year the Council makes the final decision regarding allocation of funds to that line item.

Council President Peterson observed Councilmembers Buckshnis and Petso recommended deleting employment contracts and Mayor Earling had not recommended their inclusion. Ms. Hite recalled at the September meeting Councilmembers wanted to postpone that issue until next year and have it discussed by a committee.

Council President Peterson suggested the Nonrepresented Employee Compensation Policy be rescheduled on the November 27 agenda.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas suggested gathering information from other employment contracts. She wants employment contracts moved forward sooner than later to provide the Mayor more flexibility in the hiring process. Mayor Earling observed the intent is to discuss employment contracts early next year. Ms. Hite advised staff has several samples of employment contracts from comparable cities and the City Attorney has also been exploring employment contracts.

Councilmember Petso asked whether employment contracts were contemplated for director level employees or all nonrepresented employees. Ms. Hite answered primarily director level employees which is what most comparable cities have.

Councilmembers agreed with Mayor Earling's suggested deadline of the next Council meeting for Councilmembers to submit comments to Ms. Hite.

15. ADOPTION OF UTILITY RATE ORDINANCE

Public Works Director Phil Williams recalled last week the Council discussed the proposed utility rate adjustments that are included in the 2013 budget. He displayed a page from the current Water Rate Plan that illustrates projected rate increases for the planning period. The City is approximately halfway through the planning period; the approach was to smooth rate adjustments over the planning period to avoid significant variations in the annual adjustment. The recommended increase for the water utility in 2013 is 7.5%. Using the same logic and the rate plan prepared by the rate consultant FCS, the recommended increase for stormwater in 2013 is 8.5%. His revised recommendation is an 8% increase in 2013.

With regard to sewer, there is not a recommendation for a rate adjustment from the rate consultant as a meaningful recommendation cannot yet be prepared. The City is in the process of preparing a new Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. The focus of that plan in the past has been primarily on the treatment plant, this plan will focus on the wastewater collection. The City's water infrastructure has a lot of old water lines; the same situation exists in the wastewater collection system. A great deal of information regarding the condition of the sewer lines has been gathered in the past few years from sewer line videoing. When the Wastewater Comprehensive Plan is completed, it will include an ambitious capital plan. Sewer rates have not been adjusted since 2006. In 2006 sewer rates were reduced 2.2%. The last increase was in 2004. The rates Edmonds residents pay for sewer on a monthly basis is 2.2% lower than it was 8 years ago, a fairly unusual circumstance.

He provided a comparison of 2010 sewer rates, noting Edmonds rates are very low compared to most competitors. He recommended a 5% rate adjustment for sewer in 2013. He did not anticipate that would be anywhere close to the adjustment needed on multi-year basis to start the rehab of the collection system. He summarized a 5% rate adjustment in 2013 was a way of smoothing rate adjustments in 2014 and 2015.

Mr. Williams provided a rate comparison of the average monthly single family utility bill changes (based on 500 cf/month without taxes), noting the numbers changed from the comparison he provided last week which were bimonthly rates:

Utility Bill	2012	2013	Difference
Water fixed fee	\$10.30	\$11.08	\$0.78
Water/HCF/748 gal	\$10.70	\$11.50	\$0.80
Sewer	\$25.32	\$26.59	\$1.27
Stormwater	\$10.47	\$11.31	\$0.84
Total	\$56.79	\$60.48	\$3.69
Taxes	2012	2013	Difference
Water fixed fee	\$1.93	\$2.07	\$0.14
Water/HCF/748 gal	\$2.00	\$2.15	\$0.15
Sewer	\$2.53	\$2.66	\$0.13
Stormwater	\$1.05	\$1.13	\$0.08
Total	\$7.51	\$8.01	\$0.50
Grand Total	\$64.30	\$68.49	\$4.19 (6.5%)

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas asked about a comparison of other cities' water, sewer and stormwater rates. Mr. Williams answered he could prepare a comparison chart, although it is very complex as utilities bill based on different volumes, monthly and bimonthly, different tiers in their water rate structure, different amounts of water with the fixed fee, etc. Councilmember Fraley-Monillas agreed Edmonds water rates were fairly low compared to other cities but it was brought to her attention that at least one neighboring city's water rates include sewer. Mr. Williams responded Edmonds' water rates are in the lower half, not quite as low as wastewater. Stormwater is also about in the middle compared to what other cities are charging. Edmonds has been fortunate to have low wastewater rates for quite some time.

Councilmember Petso asked whether a public hearing was required before utility rates were increased. Mr. Williams responded he could find no evidence that a public hearing was required to adjust rates. The last time the Council changed utility rates was in July 2010; a hearing was held. However, when rates were changed in 2007 and 2008, no public hearing was held and it was approved on the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Petso observed there was no information from the rate consultant on the sanitary sewer CIP and recommended revenue requirements. Mr. Williams answered the information regarding the collection system will identify the capital needs. The City has partners in its treatment facility who provide as much as half the money for capital and operations. Edmonds residents must provide all the funding to operate and maintain the collection system including the pump stations. The Council recently approved a \$3.8 million contract to rehab 9 pump stations. The total capital program next year for wastewater is \$6.47 million. Added to that will be a long term rehabilitation of the wastewater collection system. Those projects have not yet been identified and prioritized to determine the impact on rates. He assured it would not be an insignificant amount.

Councilmember Petso commented a more normal sequencing would have been to complete the plan and then approach the Council for a rate increase. She asked whether the recommended 5% rate increase was a placeholder for an anticipated rate increase that would be instituted in advance of completing the plan. Mr. Williams answered yes; he anticipated the total need will be a great deal higher and be a multi-year rate increase similar to water. He recommended making a modest adjustment now to avoid rate shock in the future, recognizing that Edmonds rates are very attractive and will need to increase.

Councilmember Petso inquired about the section of the ordinance regarding connected and non-connected. Mr. Williams answered the rate for non-connected is less than a third of the connected rate.

Homes in Edmonds that are not connected to sewer but have sewer available within 200 feet are supposed to pay that amount.

Councilmember Bloom recalled the presentation made to the Council regarding hookup fees was very clear and included a comparison of rates and a recommendation. This presentation does not include that information and she was at a loss to make a decision without it. She asked whether a study was available that recommended the rate increases and had a comparison of other cities' rates. Mr. Williams answered the pages he displayed were from the study prepared by the rate consultant FCS in 2010. He offered to provide the study or the relevant pages to Councilmembers.

Councilmember Yamamoto referred to the connected and unconnected portion of the ordinance, and asked why a home in Edmonds would not be hooked up to sanitary sewer. Mr. Williams answered it could be an existing home and the LID that installed the sewer in the area did not bring the sewer close enough to connect. Technically a home within 200 feet of a public sewer is required to hookup; that requirement is typically enforced by the health district. A home that is not on sewer is likely on a septic system; if their septic system fails, they are required to hookup to the public sewer. In the meantime, they are supposed to pay the unconnected fee of \$8.60/month. He noted staff does their best to identify those homes and collect those fees. Water customers can be influenced to pay by turning off their water for non-payment. The City has little leverage with residents who are not water customers. There are only a few unconnected houses in Edmonds.

Council President Peterson observed it appeared the Council also wanted to delay this item to a later date.

Councilmember Bloom suggested, given the economic situation, that the Council hold a public hearing and since it was unclear whether a public hearing was required and a public hearing was held in 2010. City Attorney Jeff Taraday clarified it was not unclear whether a public hearing was required. Staff was unable to find anything indicating a public hearing was required. Some cities hold a public hearing but only because they want to. The City Council can hold a public hearing on anything they want including the utility rate ordinance but it is not required. Mr. Williams pointed out this was an advertised Council meeting and citizens were welcome to provide comment on any of the agenda items.

Councilmember Bloom suggested holding a public hearing since the Council was delaying it to a future date. Council President Peterson commented public hearings typically take more time. Council agendas between now and the end of the year are filling up fast. He reiterated his frustration with the Council continually postponing items and not making decisions.

Mr. Taraday pointed out Finance Director Hunstock mentioned utility rates in his presentation during the public hearing regarding revenues. If one considers the public hearing on all sources of revenues including utility rates, that could be considered the public hearing.

Councilmember Johnson commented she was not a big fan of the concept of a rate increase in advance of the actual study and identifying capital projects. Mr. Williams explained that is his recommendation; if the Council preferred the rates can be adjusted once a capital plan is developed. Councilmember Johnson responded that was more logical and appropriate. She was concerned with implementing rate increases in anticipation. Mr. Williams answered he was not guessing; a sizable increase will be necessary to deal with the wastewater infrastructure and it would be nice to smooth the rate shock somewhat. Since Edmonds' rates are so low, a modest adjustment now would not be seen as inappropriate and would prevent a big increase later.

Council President Peterson said this item can be moved to the November 27 meeting. While he appreciated the desire to look at other cities' rates, Edmonds' older, failing infrastructure needs to be the primary driver of rates. Other cities rates are somewhat immaterial because they likely have newer

infrastructure. Although he appreciated Councilmember Johnson's point of view, if the Council waits until the study is completed, instead of a 5% increase every few years, a 15-17% increase may be necessary in one year. The work that has already been done indicates the costs will be significantly higher than can be generated by a 5% increase. He agreed with Mr. Taraday that a public hearing had been held on all revenue sources. Unless the Council provided direction that they wanted a public hearing, this item will be scheduled on November 27, a noticed meeting where public comment can be provided.

Councilmember Yamamoto pointed out Mr. Williams has explained a rate increase is necessary. He preferred to approve the utility rate ordinance as proposed by staff.

COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, THAT THE COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING NEW UTILITY RATES EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2013.

COUNCILMEMBER PETSO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON, TO AMEND THE MOTION, TO DELETE THE SANITARY SEWER RATE INCREASE IN SECTION 7.30.040.

Councilmember Petso relayed her understanding of Mr. Williams' intent to smooth the rate increase and pick a number. She was not comfortable with the information available to her to adopt a rate increase prior to adopting capital projects and a revenue requirement analysis that justifies the rate increase.

UPON ROLL CALL, THERE WAS A TIE VOTE (3-3), COUNCILMEMBERS PETSO, BLOOM AND JOHNSON VOTING YES; AND COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON AND COUNCILMEMBERS FRALEY-MONILLAS AND YAMAMOTO VOTING NO.

Per Mr. Taraday, Mayor Earling was unable to vote to break the tie because the vote was on an ordinance.

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION FAILED (3-3).

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas advised she will vote no on the motion because she did not believe Councilmembers had all their questions answered or reached agreement on whether to hold a public hearing.

Councilmember Petso advised she will also vote no because she would not mind an opportunity to allow public comment.

UPON ROLL CALL, MOTION FAILED (2-4), COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON AND COUNCILMEMBER YAMAMOTO VOTING YES; COUNCILMEMBERS PETSO, BLOOM, JOHNSON AND FRALEY-MONILLAS VOTING NO.

Councilmember Petso suggested rescheduling this item on November 27 now that the issues have been identified. Council President Peterson clarified it was not currently scheduled as a public hearing.

Mr. Williams asked for clarification regarding information the Council wanted, 1) copies of the studies from which the information was obtained, and 2) a comparison of Edmonds rates to neighboring cities' rates. Councilmember Bloom requested Mr. Williams identify the relevant pages of the study.

16. REPORT ON RESULTS OF BOND REFINANCING

Finance Director Shawn Hunstock displayed a Summary of Refunding Results, explaining the pages he will display are part of a 66 page report. He offered to send Councilmembers the entire report. He explained the sale occurred on October 19 and closed on October 30, 2012. It was a very successful bond

sale; the interest rate was 1.58%. Including all financing costs, the net all in cost was 1.69%, a very favorable interest rate.

He displayed a list of savings for all four bond issues that were refinanced. The total savings, net present value is \$1.9 million. The savings were originally estimated to be \$1.4 million; waiting to do the bond refinancing resulted in lower interest rates and the very favorable rate the City received. He explained negative savings/cost increase shown on the savings summary in 2027-2031 was due to the Marina Beach bonds that were refinanced and the repayment extended at Council direction last November to save money in the short term in REET.

Mr. Hunstock displayed a summary of the cost of issuance, advising the total debt issuance cost was \$72,000. He advised the costs are typically based on a flat percentage for the size of the bond issue. This was a \$9.8 million bond issue. If the amount is under \$10 million, there is a ¼% break in the interest rate.

Mr. Hunstock provided information related to the savings for each bond:

- Refinancing 1998 bond saved approximately \$35,000
- 2001B bonds (related to Marina Beach): refinancing and 10 year extension saved approximately \$99,000/year in the short term in REET funds that can be repurposed for other projects
- Refinancing 2001 bonds saved approximately \$300,000
- Refinancing 2002 bonds (related to PFD) saved \$1.3 million, 86% related to the PFD

Mr. Hunstock reviewed a summary of debt service savings by bond issue by fund, summarizing the original estimated savings was \$1.4 million; the actual savings was \$1.9 million. In response to a Council comment during the budget workshop regarding how the savings are allocated to each fund, Mr. Hunstock explained the savings are allocated to the fund where the original bond issue occurred. For example the 1998 bonds, the savings returns to General Fund, Streets, Storm and REET 126 according to the percentage of debt service from each fund.

Mr. Hunstock explained the proposed 2013 budget assumed the \$1.4 million savings. He displayed the difference between the \$1.4 million savings and the \$1.9 million savings, approximately a \$51,000 total savings in 2013, \$7500 attributable to the General Fund. He proposed the savings be returned to each fund.

17. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Earling reported a couple days were lost on the Main Street project last week due to rain. Asphalt was laid last Friday. The contractor had a crew working last Saturday and likely will have a crew working this Saturday to make up the lost time.

Mayor Earling advised the Antique Mall property owner and Sound Transit have reached a proposed agreement, to be ratified by the Sound Transit Board on November 15, that will provide 103 parking stalls for the Sound Transit commuter rail. He noted that the City has received several emails from people unable to find parking.

18. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas reminded citizens to vote. The newspaper reported the Edmonds-Woodway area had the highest number of ballots already turned in.

Council President Peterson recalled there had been some interest in having the full Council discuss Council meeting procedures at next year's retreat. He noted that topic is on the Public Safety/Personnel

Committee's agenda next week; he asked if that was acceptable to the Council. There were no objections voiced.

19. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.