

# City of SeaTac

## Council Workshop Minutes Synopsis

July 27, 2010  
5:00 PM

City Hall  
Council Chambers

**CALL TO ORDER:** The SeaTac City Council Workshop was called to order by Mayor T. Anderson at 5:00 p.m.

**COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Terry Anderson, Deputy Mayor (DM) Gene Fisher, Councilmembers (CMs) Rick Forschler, Anthony (Tony) Anderson (*participated by phone*), Ralph Shape, Pam Fernald, and Mia Gregerson.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Interim City Manager (ICM) Todd Cutts, Senior Assistant City Attorney Mark Johnsen, and City Clerk Kristina Gregg. Additional staff was in attendance to listen to the presentation.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM:**

#### **•Reorganization Study**

ICM Cutts stated that at the March 9, 2010 Regular Council Meeting (RCM), Council approved a Resolution directing the ICM to investigate, research, and provide options for the City Council regarding the potential reorganization of the Public Works (PW), Planning and Facilities Departments and the Economic Development (ED) Division. The main objective was to improve the experience of permit applicants seeking to construct new developments in the City. ICM Cutts then recommended to the City Council that the City contract with a third party consultant in order to conduct a thorough, objective, third-party analysis of this situation and to make recommendations for potential reorganization. The City contracted with the Prothman Company.

ICM Cutts introduced Prothman Company President Greg Prothman and Senior Consultant Paul Roberts.

Mr. Prothman and Mr. Roberts reviewed the attached report.

Upon a question posed by Mayor T. Anderson, Mr. Prothman stated that the span of control will still apply with an elected Mayor form of government.

Council discussion ensued regarding the report. Council thanked Mr. Prothman and Mr. Roberts for their work on this study.

Upon a question posed by CM Shape regarding page 12, section I. Develop an Implementation Strategy – “Although we believe the recommended reorganization will go a long way towards achieving the objective of creating a more development friendly permit review process, it may complicate other procedural issues within the impacted departments.”, Mr. Prothman explained for example that if you move development review / engineering over to planning, and that is 80% of their work, they still have other duties identified in the engineering side that would still have to be coordinated. As another example, in the PW Director’s comments, he points out that the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) is another area that would need to be managed. It just requires cooperation between departments.

CM Forschler stated that while working at Boeing, they focused very heavily on quality improvement programs with many classes on statistical process control. In order to have continuous quality improvement, there needs to be some type of measurement device(s). He questioned the need for staff training in statistical process control and quality improvement programs.

Mr. Prothman stated that the first issue that needs to be addressed is that the City has good people trying hard to do good jobs while struggling with the structure they are working under. Once the structure is addressed, then success can be measured using a variety of tools (customer service, surveys, focus groups, etc).

Mr. Roberts agreed that there does need to be a training component, but the questions are how to start it and where to start it.

DM Fisher stated that this is a great report.

CM A. Anderson commented on the additional comments provided by PW Director Gut and Planning Director Butler, specifically Mr. Gut’s concern regarding separating the responsibility of right-of-way (ROW) and storm water utility permits and Mr. Butler’s early design guidance process comment.

Mr. Prothman stated that Mr. Gut’s comments are good and need to be thought through as to how they are handled. The over arching issue that needs to be resolved is the development review process; making it business, user, and client friendly. Thus, that’s where the prevalent work is, but it doesn’t ignore the fact that there is other work that still has to be coordinated and accomplished. That is a management challenge to ensure that work still occurs.

**DISCUSSION ITEM (Continued):**

**Reorganization Study (Continued):**

Mr. Roberts stated his agreement with Mr. Butler's comments about early design guidance. That's where they determined the pre-application process needs to be strengthened. He exemplified how this process works in several jurisdictions. The comments from Mr. Butler are consistent with what the Prothman Company found.

CM Gregerson questioned the placement of the Facilities Division under the PW Department. Mr. Prothman stated that Facilities can go in a number of different areas. The only reason for the recommendation of placing it under PW is the capacity for management.

CM Fernald stated that this recommendation is a stepping stone to getting some structure and giving employees the tools, management support and authority they need to do their jobs.

Mayor T. Anderson stated that staff has generally done a good job in the past 20 years, but the City is growing up and it's time to make some changes.

Mr. Cutts stated that he is supportive of a majority of the recommendations. However, if Council chooses to move forward with the Prothman proposal, there are a lot of details that will need to be worked out through the implementation process. He requested Council direction as to whether to continue with implementation of this proposal.

Council consensus was given to move forward with implementation.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mayor T. Anderson adjourned the Council Workshop at 5:52 p.m.