

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	LP 1		Pay hydrant maintenance from utility tax revenue. Staff Response: <i>Position: Oppose</i> <i>This amendment will create a \$256,000 additional expenditure within the General Fund.</i>	\$ 256,650	\$ 256,650	-
GF	LP 2		Add \$ 12,000 for prosecutor expense. Staff Response: <i>Position: Support, if amended</i> <i>Councilwoman Petso indicated that this \$12,000 would be taken from the repairs and maintenance line item from the information services department. We oppose this action because the City is in discussions with Microsoft regarding an Enterprise licensing arrangement for Windows 7 and related server licensing updates and the arrangement has yet to be concluded. Therefore \$32,250 allocated in 2010 has yet to be expended. We like to keep the \$32,250 in the budget so we can conclude the agreement. We believe this amount should be funded with ending fund balance.</i>	12,000	12,000	-
REET	LP 3		Adjust 125/126 and public safety reserve fund to reflect changes based on 11/23/2010 council meeting (if needed) Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i> <i>The Administration is open to a review of all city bonds with council and the city's bond advisors</i>	-	-	-
GF	DB 1		Strategic Plan Motion: Add \$100,000 to Economic Development to fund a strategic plan. Offsetting funds can either be a like reduction in Professional Services 411 accounts that are part of all departments or prisoner care. Staff Response: <i>See City Administration response under SP1</i>	See SP 1	-	-
GF/PT	DB 2		Park Trust Fund Motion: Add \$36,500 to the Park Trust Fund for the Flower Program as a result of violation of law during last year's year-end amendment. Offsetting funds can be an increase in discretionary revenue areas such as banners displayed on Caspers' street and/or slight increases in classes as professional services jump eight percent in this down market. Staff Response:	See MP 1	-	-

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>On October 6, 2009, Council voted (Ordinance #3757) to transfer \$36,500 from the Parks Trust Fund Flower Program to the General Fund to offset a portion of the total General Fund program costs of the 2009 flower program, which totaled approximately \$95K. The funds transferred from the Park Trust Fund were donated specifically for the support of the city's Flower Program. Per RCW 35.21.100, the donor funds were used for their intended purposes. The Washington State Auditor's Office (SAO) reviewed the transfer and took no issue with it. They did however have the following statement from the list of Audit Exit Items Exceptions (audit period ending 12/31/2009):</i></p> <p><i>"Donations</i> <i>We found that the City's Ordinance #3466, which created the Parks Trust Fund, contained a clause that allows the Council to use the donations to cover 'unforeseen budgetary needs' not related to the donor's intent. RCW 35.21 .100 requires that, when there are terms or conditions attached to a donation, the City must use those funds only to carry out the terms of the donation."</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, the only issue the SAO pointed out was that the city's ordinance was not consistent with state law. However, the city's action's were consistent with state law. If our actions were not consistent with state law, the SAO would have given the city a finding (which is the most severe reporting action that they can take).</i></p> <p><i>We will place a correcting ordinance before Council within the next month. Given that these action were appropriate, there is no justification for adding the funds back to the Parks Trust Fund. However, if the Council would like to replenish the Parks Trust fund from ending fund balance, we do not oppose this action.</i></p>			
GF	DB 3		<p>Target Ending Cash Balance Motion: To change the Target Ending Cash in exhibit 4A to be one month rather than two.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 4		<p>Compensation Consultant Motion: To include \$50,000 for a compensation consultant to review the NRC policy and to take funds from areas such as Administrative Services where there is a \$30K jump in supplies and an \$18K jump in communications with no supportive language.</p> <p>Staff Response:</p>	50,000	50,000	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Agree with concept; Oppose identified funding source</i></p> <p><i>Staff agrees with Council that the current compensation policy for non-represented employees warrants review. The ideal compensation strategy should address all compensation factors guaranteeing the city's ability to attract, retain and motivate its non-represented work force as well as meet the financial resources, values and business goals of the organization. Our current policy and historic actions related to non-represented compensation do not meet these objectives.</i></p> <p><i>Staff believes that the appropriate funding level for this project is unknown since the City of Edmonds has not used a compensation consultant since 1997. The cost of the service would also be dependent upon the scope of work identified and the desired outcomes. The current understanding is that Council desires the creation of a new non-represented compensation policy. Further, it is staff's understanding that Council seeks an accurate, market based survey of all non-represented positions to determine whether the positions are paid fairly to the market place.</i></p> <p><i>In order to determine the true cost of these services, a RFP process will need to take place. It is staff's opinion that the \$50,000 would serve as an adequate placeholder but may need adjustment based on the conclusion of the RFP process.</i></p> <p><i>The 2011 Administrative Services, Information Services supply line item includes anticipated purchase of "new" software it was anticipated that in 2010 we would upgrade Microsoft Office 2003 to Office 2010. The City is two releases behind on Microsoft office and has been selectively using Office 2007 where the features provide benefits to specific users (budget preparation on SharePoint for example). We'd like to migrate all users to a single installed base for consistent support and maintenance. Differing installed bases causes additional support time for the staff. Installation has not proceeded as quickly as anticipated and not all of the \$60,000 will occur this year but will occur in 2011.</i></p> <p><i>The 2011 Administrative Services, Information Services was estimated in July to be \$27,500, is currently at \$37,318 and will likely end the year at \$40,000. Therefore, we believe that the budget is at the appropriate level.</i></p>			
GF	DB 5		<p>Fire Hydrants Motion to NOT transfer out \$256,650 from Dept 310 - Public Safety and pay for fire hydrants out of utility tax.</p>	See LP 1	-	-

Staff Response:

Position: Oppose

See LP 1

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	DB 6		<p>ECA Fund \$20K to the ECA based on Hotel/Motel Tax professional services jumping from \$17K to \$43K without sufficient information to support the increase.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Oppose</i></p> <p><i>Hotel Motel Tax Fund 120 (pg 51) - Professional Services line item funds are used to pay for services such as designing, website hosting, and creation and distribution of rack brochures. For year 2011, the \$20,000 increase from \$23,000 to \$43,000 relates to the LTAC Committee's authorization to use LTAC funds for tourism website development and website related activities, including \$5,000 in matching funds for a Preserve America grant. This is a one-time expense for year 2011. A financial contribution from of \$100,000 to the ECA for years 2010 and 2011 from the ending Fund 120 balance was supported by the LTAC on November 22, 2010. This would be done without having an effect on the Fund 120 Professional Services line item.</i></p>	20,000	20,000	-
CU	DB 7		<p>Stormwater Maintenance Worker 1 Motion: Add a Stormwater Maintenance Worker 1 to the 2011 budget and add \$62,000 to the Combined Utility Fund to support the position.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i></p> <p><i>This position will reside in the Street/Stormwater Division and will assist the City in responding to unfunded State and Federal requirements to provide monitoring and compliance inspections under NPDES Phase II. The Funding for the position will be Stormwater Utility rate revenues generated by the rate increase package approved by Council in September 2010</i></p>	62,000	-	62,000
CU	DB 8		<p>Stormwater Engineering Technician Motion: Add a Stormwater Engineering Technician to the 2011 budget and add \$92,080 to the Combined Utility Fund to support the position.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i></p> <p><i>This position will reside in the Engineering Division of Public Works and will provide the technical direction needed by the City to respond to unfunded State and Federal requirements to provide monitoring and compliance inspections for both public and private stormwater detention and treatment facilities under NPDES Phase II. The Funding for the position will be Stormwater Utility rate revenues generated by the rate increase package approved by Council in September 2010.</i></p>	92,080		92,080

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
SCI	DB 9		Traffic Calming Projects Motion: Add \$50,000 to the Street Construction Fund from the General Fund Ending Balance to pay for Traffic Calming projects.	50,000		50,000
			Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i> <i>The additional funding should be placed in Fund 112 and be used to develop and implement traffic calming projects in those areas of the City where speed control is most needed and existing traffic enforcement efforts have been unable to achieve desired results</i>			
STREET	DB 10		Street Fund 111 funded from General Fund Motion: Add \$200,000 to Fund 111 to help fund TBD short-fall in relation to street maintenance and preservation. General Fund review of the summation of each cost center was not available to help determine where there is excesses and since Police have the majority of labor costs, to review this area and look at decreasing holiday buybacks, overtime, prisoner care, etc.	200,000	200,000	-
			Staff Response:			

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Support Funding, oppose funding source</i></p> <p><i>The Street Operations Fund (111) could certainly make productive use of the \$200,000 proposed in the amendment. However, if \$200,000 was made available for street overlays, the Street Construction/Improvement Fund (112) would be the best location to place the funding. The City has traditionally paved streets from the 112 Fund rather than the 111 Fund.</i></p> <p><i>Historically the City has paid for all street overlays out of the construction/improvement fund and not the operations fund. When the initial \$20 TBD Fee was established it was restricted to street operations by ordinance. The previous Public Works director indicated to the City Council the first \$20 TBD fee would not be used for overlays. If the intent of the additional \$200,000 is to be used for street overlays, perhaps the amount could be placed in Fund 112 to reduce any confusion regarding the expenditures. If these funds were added to the 112 budget, it could and would be used to pave several of our worst street segments. As a reminder, the identified need for preservation paving is approximately \$1.4 million dollars per year to have a sustainable street network. That is, of course, an on-going annual expense. Clearly a new and stable source of funds is needed to accomplish this.</i></p> <p><i>We have concerns regarding the proposed budget changes in the Police Department that are proposed to generate these funds. The Prisoner Care case is addressed in proposed amendment SB 2. Holiday buy-back is a collective bargaining issue as well as an operational issue since the PD operates 24/7, including holidays. Overtime continues to be authorized on a case-by-case basis and always requires supervisory discretion, oversight, and approval. Both holiday buy-back and overtime are directly related to delivery of service and budget. The dollar amounts budgeted for both of these line items for 2011 are necessary to maintain departmental operations.</i></p>			
GF	DB 11		<p>Exhibit 1, page 3 Motion to add an actual 2009 column and footnote General Fund to state which amended budget is used.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 12		<p>Exhibit 2 page 4 Motion to add an actual 2009 column and footnote significant changes such as the decreased revenue from the sale of the fire (i.e. \$1.5 - \$2.0MM).</p> <p>Staff Response:</p>	-	-	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<i>Position: Neutral</i>			
			<i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i>			
GF	DB 13		<p>Exhibit 4 page 6 Motion to change 2 months to Target Ending Cash to 1 month and provide some current actual numbers including general fund beginning balance.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon. However, the executive forecast reflects a two-month reserve as result of change is the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommendation. The city has not formally adopted this policy. However, we felt it prudent to reflect GFOA's current recommendation. GFOA Best Practice - Appropriate Level of Unrestricted Fund Balance in the General Fund (2002 and 2009) (BUDGET and CAAFR) states:</i></p> <p><i>"The adequacy of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund should be assessed based upon a government's own specific circumstances. Nevertheless, GFOA recommends, at a minimum, that general-purpose governments, regardless of size, maintain unrestricted fund balance in their general fund of no less than two months of regular general fund operating revenues or regular general fund operating expenditures. The choice of revenues or expenditures as a basis of comparison may be dictated by what is more predictable in a government's particular circumstances. Furthermore, a government's particular situation often may require a level of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund significantly in excess of this recommended minimum level. In any case, such measures should be applied within the context of long-term forecasting, thereby avoiding the risk of placing too much emphasis upon the level of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund at any one time."</i></p> <p><i>There also has been some discussion regarding inclusion of the balance of the Emergency Reserve Finance Fund in calculated the City's reserve balances. Please note that these funds are only available for expenditure "in cases of true catastrophic emergencies", as stated in Ordinance 3755.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 14		<p>Exhibit 5 page 7 Motion to footnote the breakout of the Administrative Services to verify Finance FTE and IT FTE.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	DB 15		<p>Add Exhibit 2 as identified in 2009/2010 Budget Book</p> <p>Motion to add a "Total Budget Revenue, Expenditures and Fund Balances using actual 2009 numbers and 2010 Budget and YE Estimates (exhibit 2 page 2 old budget book) so we can tie certain numbers to the CAFR and other reports) and footnote effects of fire sale if necessary.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 16		<p>Add Exhibit 3 as identified in 2009/2010 Budget Book</p> <p>Motion to Add a "General Fund, Revenues, Expenditures and Fund Balance" using actual 2009 numbers and 2010 Budget and 2010 YE estimates (exhibit 3 page 3 old budget book) so we can see the trend of the general fund and the effect the sale of the fire had on revenues as well as expenditures.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 17		<p>Add Exhibit 10 as identified in 2009/2010 - Budget Book</p> <p>Motion to add this statistical but very important macro item to this budget book.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	DB 18		<p>Motion to summarize Total Department Cost Centers as identified in 2009/2010 Budget Book</p> <p>Motion to have a summary page before each department that summarized all components of that cost center.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>This is a policy decision that the Council must agree upon.</i></p>	-	-	-
GF	SB 1		<p>Reduce City Attorney Budget (page 21) from \$597,000 to \$497,000 exclusive of Prosecutor and Public Defender</p> <p>Staff Response:</p>	(100,000)	(100,000)	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Oppose</i></p> <p><i>The \$597,000 figure refers to the entire City Attorney budget, which contains: \$450,000 for the City Attorney, \$144,000 for the City Prosecutor and \$3,000 for miscellaneous. Given that the prosecutor's is not subject to this amendment this leaves the City Attorney's budget as the only option to accomplish this reduction.</i></p> <p><i>Our total (council and city) legal expenditures have increased by 15% since 2008. Given the litigious nature of governmental work, we believe that this trend will continue. Additionally, Council approves of our involvement in all litigation. Therefore, reducing this line item would also reduce Council's ability to respond to the litigation needs of the city. Additionally, we have amended (increased through budget amendment) the City Attorney's budget in 2006, 2008, 2009, and 2010 due to under budgeting. Our approach for 2011 ensures that adequate authority exist for the entire year, with hopefully no need for future amendments. Therefore, we believe that reducing the budget for the City Attorney is not advisable at this time.</i></p>			
GF	SB 2		<p>Reduce Prisoner Care budget (page 87) from \$664,000 to \$614,000 by reducing discretionary booking.</p> <p>Staff Response:</p> <p><i>Due to prisoner care savings realized because of our video arraignment system that went on-line earlier this year, as well as the municipal court's carefully applied sentencing discretion, the PD is able to reduce the 2011 amount requested in BARS 001.000.410.523.600 from \$664,733 to \$614,733. In addition due to other economies realized, the PD is able to reduce the 2011 amount requested in BARS 001.000.410.521.210.480.00 from \$5,164 to \$-0- AND reduce BARS 001.000.410.521.910.410.00 from \$3,200 to \$1,400.</i></p> <p><i>Total reductions are \$50,000 + \$5,164 + \$1,800 = \$56,964</i></p> <p><i>The PD suggests its Decision Package for bulletproof vests be paid for with these unencumbered funds. That Decision Package costs \$25,130. That would leave \$31,834 still available for reallocation.</i></p> <p><i>The PD also suggests that the entire Prisoner Care budget be moved from the PD to Non-Departmental, as Prisoner Care services are utilized/shared by the PD and Municipal Court.</i></p> <p><i>Please see statistical data from Snohomish County Corrections provided in Dec 7th Council agenda memo at: http://agenda.ci.edmonds.wa.us/docs/2010/CCOUNCIL/20101207_478/3581_Snohomish%20County%20Booking%20Information.pdf</i></p>	(50,000)	(50,000)	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	SB 3		Appropriate \$5,000 to Fourth of July/Chamber of Commerce (page unknown) (willing to go down to \$3,000 which was the amount of the Council's 2008 appropriation) Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i> <i>City Administration supports the allocation of \$5,000 for this purpose. From an economic development perspective, this event brings many individuals and families to Edmonds, sometimes for the first time. Visitors to the downtown area not only help celebrate the 4th of July, they also shop and eat within the downtown area</i>	5,000	5,000	-
GF	SB 4		Designate \$35,000 to complete Old Milltown Park (page 127) Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i> <i>An appropriation of \$40,000 is in the preliminary budget to fund this project (listed on page 197 in Parks Improvement – Fund 125). The project was scheduled for 2010, but was delayed due to a number of issues including easements, allowed depths for structures, and design. Because the project was not constructed in year 2010, City administration recommends adding \$40,000 to year 2011 budget. The project will commence construction in 2011.</i>	35,000	35,000	-
GF	SB 5		Charge Woodway more for police services (page unknown) (this contract expires at the end of 2011 so does not impact the 2011 budget year) Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i> <i>The current contract for police services with the town of Woodway is valid through December 2012. Mayor Cooper has recently been in contact with Woodway Mayor Nichols. Terms of the present contract can be renegotiated as the contract comes due in 2012. Should the city of Edmonds decide in the interim to give its six months notice to Woodway and opt out of the present agreement, and absent ability of the parties to renegotiate terms for a new agreement, Edmonds PD would still respond to Woodway in exigent circumstances under mutual aid. In such eventuality, and absent a contract with Woodway, Edmonds would realize no compensation.</i>	-	-	-
GF	SB 6		Reduce City Council budget by \$500 by eliminating Community Outreach, City-Wide Parking, Economic Development, Long Range Task Force and Municipal Court Review committees (page 11) Staff Response:	(500)	(500)	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<i>Position: Neutral</i>			
			<i>City administration does not object to this proposal</i>			
GF	SB 7		Update City Council 2010 budget estimate figures on page 11 to show lower figures. Staff Response: <i>Position: Oppose</i> <i>These figures were computed using actuals through 07/31/2010. We typically do not restate estimates in the Preliminary Budget, because restating the Council's estimate would necessitate restating all estimates for all line items in the budget. We would prefer to leave the estimates as is.</i>	-	-	-
GF	SB 8		Move fiber and IT out of Administrative Services to Community Services (pages 39,41,95) Staff Response: <i>Position: Oppose</i> <i>There is a clear separation of powers between the council and the mayor. It is the mayor who has the authority to organize department heads and managers. RCW 35A.12.100 and ECC Chapter 2.01.010 both state; "The mayor shall be the chief executive and administrative officer of the city, in charge of all departments and employees, with authority to designate assistants and department heads."</i>	-	-	-
GF	SP 1		Fully fund the \$100,000 dollar request from the Citizens Economic Advisory Commission for a City-Wide strategic plan. Expenses will be offset by the following savings. - Economic Development (Pg 97) \$20,000 - Development Services-Planning (Pg 101) \$7,500 from Professional Svc line item - Development Services-Administration (Pg 105) \$60,000 from salaries/benefits line items (vacant director position for Q1) - City Council (Pg 11) \$2500 from Professional Svc and/or Council Contingency - Other \$10,000	100,000	100,000	-
			Staff Response:	(100,000)	(100,000)	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Support</i></p> <p><i>A strategic plan reflects the views of the community and can be a very important tool for City decision makers. Because a citywide strategic planning process includes an extensive public outreach component, it can often be very helpful in assisting with the decision making process by establishing a framework for setting priorities and educating leadership about the citizens' priorities for public and private funding. Strategic plans can help Mayors and City Councils prioritize matters that are most important to the citizens in order of need. This in turn can help legislative and executive bodies better utilize all resources available more effectively, especially when all governments and business are faced with the challenge of doing more with less.</i></p> <p><i>City administration supports this funding option to pay for a strategic planning process as the request is based on using funding that comes from several sources that tie to a strategic planning effort. Specifically, a strategic plan serves somewhat as planning tool (roadmap), thus, the use of Development Services funding is a logical financial mechanism for this purpose. A significant portion of the funding will come from not filling a budgeted Development Services Director position, and from the Development Services Planning Department professional services line item. Regarding the Director position, City administration will work to time the advertising and filling of the position to obtain at least a \$60,000 savings as indicated in the proposal. Additionally, because the request to prepare a strategic plan came from the Edmonds Economic Development Commission, using funds, in part, from the Economic Development Department budget to pay for a strategic planning effort is an appropriate expenditure. Lastly, because strategic plans can help mayors, city councils and city managers prioritize matters that are most important to the citizens in order of need, a contribution from the City Council contingency relates to this effort.</i></p>			
GF/PT	MP 1		<p>Apply \$36,500 ending cash to the Parks Trust Fund for flowers to rebuild one of the City's most important services and rebuild the City's trust with those who have donated funds and will hopefully do so in the future.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>See response under DB 2.</i></p>	36,500	36,500	-
GF	MP 2		<p>Fund \$7,500 from ending cash to continue efforts of Edmonds Historic Preservation Commission to promote the small town character and charm of Edmonds with printing of 4-5 issues of the Commission newsletter and 15,000 walking tour brochures.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i></p> <p><i>This is a proposed one-time expenditure. The expenditure will support an important public information effort, and is also supportive of the city's economic development and tourism programs. The funding source (ending cash) is identified. The administration supports the amendment as proposed.</i></p>	7,500	7,500	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
------	---------	-------	-------------	---------------------------------------	---	---

GF	DW 1		Wilson Amendment #1: Crime Prevention	130,000	130,000	-
----	------	--	---------------------------------------	---------	---------	---

Purpose:

Reinstate the Crime Prevention Unit, which serves the function of "forging partnerships with residents and commercial businesses through education, maintenance of existing preventative programs and by developing new strategies in the prevention of crime."

Amount: \$130,000 in new expenditures

Cost center: 521.300

Page 73

Narrative:

This amount will fund one Crime Prevention Officer and two part time Crime Prevention employees. This reinstates the Unit as was constituted previously, and which was budgeted and approved by Council in the 2009-2010 budget.

Staff Response:

Position: Neutral

The Police Department is generally supportive of this amendment with three caveats. First, to the PD's knowledge, there does not appear to be sufficient General Fund revenue at this time to support re-establishing the Crime Prevention Unit. Second, the Police Department has need for one additional Police Services Assistant within our Records Unit. This need is really our highest personnel need at the present time. Third, should the Crime Prevention Unit again be funded, the PD has intentions to rewrite the Job Description to include crime analyst functions.

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	DW 2		Wilson Amendment #2: ECA Funding	250,000	250,000	-
<p>Purpose: Fund the 2011 shortfall at the Edmonds Center for the Arts.</p> <p>Amount: \$250,000 in new expenditures Cost center: 574.200 Page 111</p> <p>Narrative: The payments of debt service and principal for the Edmonds Center for the Arts (ECA) bonds sold in 2002 and 2008 require payments totaling approximately \$770,000 annually. The Public Facilities District, which operates the ECA, collects approximately \$360,000 annually from Tier 1 sales tax collections. In 2010, they collected approximately \$15,000 in Tier 2 sales tax collections. Given the success of their 2010 Arts Crush event (which increased its net proceeds by 50%) and other major steps forward in fundraising, the PFD staff expect to be operationally in the black by \$160,000. This leaves a shortfall on the debt service of \$250,000.</p> <p>The primary difference between the \$250,000 shortfall in 2011 and the \$100,000 shortfall in 2010 came in the form of ECA staff collecting on back capital pledges. \$170,000 was collected by getting donors to "make good" on pledges which had accumulated since 2002. Those pledges are now extinguished. That \$170,000 is no longer available in that form.</p> <p>It is possible that other revenue will arise, such as selling the naming rights to the facility (Pemco Center for the Arts, or Puget Sound Energy Center for the Arts, for example). For planning purposes, I believe we should budget for the worst and hope for the best - not the other way around.</p> <p>This line item should exist in the Recreational and Cultural Services Program of the Parks Department.</p> <p>Staff Response:</p>						

City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
			<p><i>Position: Oppose</i></p> <p><i>While the City Council should recognize the potential need to financially contribute in year 2011 to the Edmonds Center for the Arts (to help pay the debt service on issued bonds that are guaranteed by the City), City administration recommends the City Council wait until March or April of 2011 to determine what amount, if any, will/may be needed to meet this obligation. We recommend the City Council request a report from the Edmonds Public Facilities District (PFD) on the financial situation related to capital and operational expenditures for the first three months of year 2011. At that time, the Edmonds PFD should have a clearer picture as to whether a financial contribution will be needed from the City for making the June, 2011 semiannual bond debt payment. Any funding that is appropriated should be non-departmental or from the ending fund balance.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the City Council should request expenditure projections from the Edmonds PFD for the remainder of year 2011.</i></p>			
GF	DW 3		<p>Wilson Amendment #3: Sustainable Edmonds</p> <p>Purpose: Continue the funding for public education, outreach, and programming at Sustainable Edmonds.</p> <p>Amount: \$5,000 in increased expenditures Cost center: 511.100 or 550.100 Page 11</p> <p>Narrative: Sustainable Edmonds has built a track record of providing public information and education in areas deemed critical to the future of our community. They are providing a service which would not otherwise be present for citizens in Edmonds.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Support</i></p> <p><i>This is a proposed one-time expenditure. The Council provided funding at the same level in 2010. This amendment would provide budget authorization to enable the city to undertake a new contract with Sustainable Edmonds for a mutually agreed upon project. Based on Sustainable Edmonds' quarterly reports, the organization has a successful track record and has performed a valuable community service. Approving the budget amendment would provide the funding, but the actual expenditure would be contingent on the City Council and Sustainable Edmonds agreeing to a contract (similar to what was done in 2010). The funding source has not been identified; because the amount is small, it could be sourced from the ending cash, but would need to be evaluated against competing needs. The administration supports the amendment.</i></p>	5,000	5,000	-

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	DW 4		Wilson Amendment #4: Adding a uniformed police officer	110,000	110,000	-
			<p>Purpose: Bring Edmonds closer to the median for uniformed police officers</p> <p>Amount: \$110,000 Dept: 410 Page 58</p> <p>Narrative: The median rate of officers per 1000 population is 1.44. The current Edmonds rate is 1.34 officers per 1000, below the median. We have 55 uniformed officers. To be at the median, we would need to have 59 uniformed officers.</p> <p>The perception among the public is that crime is on the rise. More people are hearing about more people having criminal encounters. The data do not appear entirely clear on this matter - some crimes have exceeded previous years' totals in 2010, some have crimes have not. Whether all crimes are being reported or not is another open question.</p> <p>This all, however, overlooks the fact that crime in Edmonds already exceeds in many ways what is expected by Edmonds residents. Doing more to address criminal activity is clearly an issue of concern among many in the public.</p> <p>This would fund a position which was funded in the last budget, but cut through attrition during the last round of cuts in April 2009.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>Comments similar to those in DW 1. The PD is certainly supportive of funding the police officer position (bringing us again the 56 commissioned members) that was defunded in the 2009-2010 budget. However, there does not appear to be sufficient General Fund revenue at this time to support funding of an additional (56th) commissioned police officer position.</i></p>			

**City of Edmonds
Proposed Amendments to the 2011 Preliminary Budget**

Fund	Amend #	Dept:	Description	Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	GF Expenditure Increase (Decrease)	Other Fund Expenditure Increase (Decrease)
GF	DW 5		<p>Wilson Amendment #5: Upgrading the intersection at 196th and 88th Purpose: Increase safety for one of the most dangerous intersections in the city.</p> <p>Amount: \$95,000 Dept:</p> <p>Narrative: In Dec 2007, Council was presented a report by a consultant which concluded that the intersection at 196th and 88th was a hazardous intersection. Because 196th is a state highway, certain warrants must be met for actions like the installations of a traffic signal. The required number of warrants for a traffic light there were not met at the time (and I do not believe have been met in the intervening years).</p> <p>Recognizing the constraints the city faced, the report concluded that some actions could nevertheless be taken for minimal cost. Their recommended action, which would limit traffic crossing through the intersection would cost about \$90,000 in 2007 dollars.</p> <p>More importantly, it would improve safety there dramatically and likely result in the saving of lives.</p> <p>The Council at the time tried to take another route, contrary to the state, the consultant, and the City's ability to act. That action, as was foreseen, was unsuccessful.</p> <p>This amendment would fund the report's recommended action.</p> <p>Staff Response: <i>Position: Neutral</i></p> <p><i>In 2007 at the request of the Council the Engineering Division conducted a thorough review of this intersection and developed several concept level alternatives and cost estimates for changes that would address its identified shortcomings. The initial council request was to evaluate installation of a traffic signal. The project concluded the intersection did not meet warrants for a signal and WSDOT would therefore not support a signal at this location. Several possible changes in channalization on 88th were also evaluated. A recommendation was forwarded to the Council at the conclusion of the study to restrict left turns at 88th northbound to solve the identified sight distance problem. Although accident history at this intersection has not been particularly severe the staff recommendation was to resolve the sight distance problem by limiting north bound traffic on 88th to right turns only. That recommendation was not accepted at that time (2007). The estimated cost in 2007 dollars to implement the recommended alternative was \$15,000-\$20,000. Staff is uncertain what is being proposed at this location that is estimated to cost \$95,000. We would still support the original recommended alternative but would need to know what is being recommended here before we could offer our full support to this amendment.</i></p>	95,000	95,000	-
GRAND TOTALS:				1,266,230	1,062,150	204,080