

City of SeaTac

City Council Retreat Minutes Synopsis

June 4, 2010 – 9 AM – 5 PM

June 5, 2010 – 9 AM – 5 PM

City Hall
Council Chambers

Friday, June 4, 2010

Council Present: Mayor Terry Anderson (*left at 4:31 p.m.*), Councilmembers (CMs) Rick Forschler, Anthony (Tony) Anderson (*left at 3:00 p.m.*), Ralph Shape, Pam Fernald (*arrived at 9:22 a.m.*), and Mia Gregerson. Absent: Deputy Mayor (DM) Gene Fisher.

Administrative Staff Present: Interim City Manager (ICM) Todd Cutts, City Attorney Mary Mirante Bartolo, City Clerk Kristina Gregg, Finance Director Mike McCarty, Planning Director Steve Butler, Acting Fire Chief Brian Wiwel, Police Chief Jim Graddon, Interim Assistant City Manager (IACM) Jeff Robinson, Public Works (PW) Director Tom Gut, Human Resources (HR) Director Anh Hoang, Executive Assistant Lesa Ellis, Police Administrative Captain Annette Louie, Municipal Court Judge Elizabeth Cordi-Bejarano, and Administrative Assistant Amber Russ.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

2010 Budget Update

Finance Director McCarty briefed on the 2009 year end (YE). He noted that both sales tax and interest and miscellaneous were substantially decreased from the estimate.

	2009 Adopted Budget	2009 Amended Budget	2009 YE established during the 2010 Budget development	2009 Actual at 12/31/2009
Revenues	29,726,525	29,746,525	27,226,685	26,600,043
Expenditures	29,390,242	29,012,835	28,719,187	28,600,439
2009 Estimated/Actual YE Deficit			(1,492,502)	(2,000,396)
2009 Estimated/Actual Ending Fund Balance			8,738,862	8,230,968
Fund Balance Target			7,179,797	7,150,110
Over (Under) Fund Balance Target			1,559,065	1,080,858

CM Fernald arrived at this point in the meeting.

Discussion ensued regarding the 2009 actuals summary for all funds.

Mr. McCarty reviewed the 2010 Budget/Projected YE Estimates with projected 4.5% and 8% increases.

Sales tax received for January, February, and March 2010 are approximately 4.5% above 2009. The 2010 budget only anticipated 3%. Prior to 2009, the City was averaging 8% increases.

	2010 Adopted Budget	2010 Amended Budget at 5/31/2010	Projected 2010 YE Estimate	
			4.5%	8%
Revenues	\$28,255,739	\$28,255,739	\$27,610,319	\$27,889,419
Expenditures	\$29,208,441	\$29,376,703	\$28,868,000	\$28,868,000
2010 Budgeted / YE Estimated Deficit	(\$952,702)	(\$1,120,964)	(\$1,257,681)	(\$978,581)
2010 Estimated YE Fund Balance			\$6,973,287	\$7,252,387
Projected Fund Balance Target			\$7,217,000	\$7,217,000
Projected Over (Under) Fund Balance Target			(\$243,713)	\$35,387

Council discussion ensued regarding the proposed 4.5% and 8% increases. Council direction was to project 2010 YE balances using the conservative 4.5% estimates.

Mr. McCarty stated that the estimates do not include any International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) Contract negotiations, but the King County (KC) Animal Services contract costs are included.

ICM Cutts stated that staff will review options for covering the estimated \$243,713 2010 budget deficit.

Upon a question posed by Mayor T. Anderson, Mr. McCarty stated that staff will be presenting quarterly reports from this point forward. Council directed that the reports be given to the full Council.

2010 Budget Update (Continued): Upon a question posed by CM Gregerson, Mr. McCarty stated that it's difficult enough in this climate to estimate budgets for one year. Biennial budgets would be even more difficult. Council concurred to postpone discussion of biennial budgets until 2012.

Action: Staff to project 2010 YE balances using the conservative 4.5% estimates. / Staff to present quarterly budget reports to the entire Council. / Staff to prepare options to cover estimated deficit and present to Council. / Postpone discussion of biennial budgets until 2012.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 10:05 a.m. to 10:27 a.m.

Presentation on the Open Public Meetings Act and Council/Staff Roles & Responsibilities

Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) Legal Consultant Jim Dougherty stated that the City Council sets the policies and priorities and the administration carries it out.

The Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) and the Public Records Act (PRA) were enacted by an initiative of the people in the early 1970's. Washington is the only State with mandatory penalties for violation of the OPMA.

Any discussion of City business involving a quorum of the Council must take place in an open, public meeting.

Mr. Dougherty stated that it can be inadvertent and unintentional, but still be a legal issue.

He clarified that two members can discuss anything and a quorum of the Council can get together socially as long as there is no business discussed. However, the public will assume business is being discussed, so it is recommended that a quorum not get together socially.

If you don't want to see it in the newspaper, don't type it in an e-mail. Consider all e-mails dealing with City affairs to be public, regardless of the computer or e-mail account that is used.

City Attorney Mirante Bartolo clarified that if Council or staff use a personal computer for City business then their personal computer can be subject to search.

Upon a question posed by CM Forschler, Mr. Cutts stated that staff will clarify the City's current e-mail backup process. Mr. Cutts stated that the City is currently working on an e-mail retention policy.

In regards to Executive Sessions, Mr. Dougherty stated that there are only a few topics that can be discussed but final action must be done in an open, public meeting. Council can provide direction during an Executive Session related to the permissible topics.

Upon a question posed by CM Gregerson, Mr. Dougherty stated that public comments are not required by law.

Action: Staff to clarify the City's e-mail backup process. / Staff to develop an e-mail retention policy.

Records Management (RM) Presentation

City Clerk Gregg explained the City's need for a Records Manager and presented a video on the benefits of RM.

Action: Decision card to be presented during the 2011 budget process.

Recessed: Council recessed for lunch from 12:02 p.m. to 1:01 p.m.

Council Goal Setting Exercise

Michael Pendleton, Ph.D. with Pendleton Consulting, L.L.C. facilitated this exercise.

He reviewed the Policy Leadership Model which locates organizational goals within the larger context of an organizational vision and other key processes found within municipal corporations. He noted that goals should be consistent with the organizational vision while informing annual budgets.

He discussed the nature of goals. The purpose of goals was reviewed along with other key characteristics of effective policy board goals.

Each CM was asked to write down three goals and then clarify them. Council discussion ensued regarding each goal.

CM A. Anderson left at this point in the meeting.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 2:57 p.m. to 3:13 p.m.

Council Goal Setting Exercise (Continued):

Council continued discussing each goal with goals being consolidated that were essentially the same.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 3:52 p.m. to 4:02 p.m.

Council Goal Setting Exercise (Continued):

Using the Paired Comparison Method, Council ranked the order of the goals.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 4:31 p.m. to 4:40 p.m.

Mayor T. Anderson left at this point in the meeting.

Council Goal Setting Exercise (Continued):

Council's top five goals are:

- To promote Economic Development (ED) to attract and retain businesses and jobs while maintaining reasonable laws and regulations.

Action: retain businesses / support the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) / maintain rules and regulations.

- Move forward with the South Street Light Rail Station Area development to establish a clear focus and attract ideas from developers.

Action: begin conversations with developers / let the market dictate / engage surrounding area citizens / avoid mistakes like the ones made with Tukwila Village.

- To promote a greater understanding and utilization of the public safety, fire and police services through effective education and outreach.

Action: look at Alaska area model / help citizens understand public safety processes / emphasis outreach and educations / create confidence and active support for public safety particularly fire services / seek positive interactions with public, particularly children.

- To enhance code enforcement effectiveness within all neighborhoods and areas in the City.

Action: utilize a task force approach / seek improvements in the neighborhoods / emphasis on junk cars / combine both reactive and proactive approaches.

- To create and utilize more public engagement strategies.

Action: emphasis on school engagement.

In addition to the Council's top five goals, the following goals were also discussed:

- To create a healthier community.
- To be recognized locally and within the region as an organization and community for commitment to sustainability and sustainable practices.
- To focus municipal government on providing only core services such as police, fire, sidewalks etc.
- To seek ways to help the diverse populations in the City to become involved with one another to seek similar goals.
- To continue an aggressive City sidewalk building strategy.
- To create an Ombudsman system.
- To promote ED to create more jobs and industry with an emphasis on minimizing regulations and restrictions on business.
- To make SeaTac a proud place to live, work, and play.

Mr. Pendleton stated he will provide a draft report to the City and encouraged Council to conduct this goal setting exercise every year.

Action: Staff to draft concepts and come back to Council with detailed costs and needed resources.

Recessed: Council recessed the Retreat at 5:02 p.m. until Saturday, June 5 at 9 a.m.

Saturday, June 5, 2010

Council Present: Mayor Terry Anderson, DM Gene Fisher, CMs Rick Forschler, Anthony (Tony) Anderson, Ralph Shape, Pam Fernald, and Mia Gregerson.

Administrative Staff Present: ICM Todd Cutts, City Attorney Mary Mirante Bartolo, City Clerk Kristina Gregg, Finance Director Mike McCarty, IACM Jeff Robinson, PW Director Tom Gut, Acting Fire Chief Brian Wiwel, Fire Training Officer John Gallup, HR Director Anh Hoang, Assistant City Attorney Julia Yoon, and Police Chief Jim Graddon.

Reconvened: Council reconvened the Retreat at 9:03 a.m.

Public Comments: Earl Gipson commented on the June 4 presentation regarding OPMA, stating that he feels the rules are outdated. The more information CMs have, the better decision they can make.

Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac Planning Commission (PC) member, commented on the June 4 goal setting exercise. He stated that there was a lot of discussion about ED and removing regulations. He stressed that Council needs to be careful with removing regulations.

Sandra Cook encouraged Council to set a regular schedule for the Council Coffee Chats and encouraged the Council to protect the City's logo.

Discussion Regarding Council Coffee Chats (objectives, format)

ICM Cutts stated that a couple of CMs requested this item be placed on the retreat agenda to discuss the objectives and format for the coffee chats.

CM Gregerson explained the history of how these came to be. This is another way to engage the community. Council is there to listen, not to answer questions. These meetings are not subject to the OPMA.

Council discussion ensued as to the objectives and format for the chats.

CM Fernald stated that she originally attended Tukwila's Coffee Chats which are very casual with one CM at a time and each person can chat one on one.

City Attorney Mirante Bartolo stated that the Council needs to decide the purpose of the coffee chats. CMs in attendance at the chats cannot represent a commitment to those in attendance because CMs aren't a Council body at these chats.

Mr. Cutts stated that there is a form on the City's website for the types of issues that continue to be brought up during the Council Coffee Chats. CMs could direct the residents to this form or a standard form could be made available at the chat.

CM Forschler suggested that the chats be scheduled during early evenings or Saturdays.

Council concurred that these chats should be as casual as possible. Council will listen to comments, but recommend that people with problems bring them to a Council meeting or to the City Manager.

Ms. Mirante Bartolo stated that the Council is not obligated to take notes at the coffee chats.

Mr. Cutts suggested that staff could provide a draft mission statement for the Council Coffee Chats which could be read at the beginning of each chat in order to create expectations for the residents before it begins.

Action: N/A

Discussion Regarding Protection of City Logo Against Unauthorized Use

Ms. Mirante Bartolo stated that this issue came up because the Angle Lake Manor Community Club used the City's old logo at some point. She questioned whether Council wants to be able to enforce the rights under the logo by trademarking it. If yes, she questioned how it will be enforced.

Council discussion ensued that they don't believe it was used maliciously.

Ms. Mirante Bartolo stated that there are also other instances where the logo is being used, such as when Request for Proposals (RFP) are submitted.

CM A. Anderson stated he has also seen it used as a link to the City's website from other websites.

Discussion Regarding Protection of City Logo Against Unauthorized Use (Continued):

Ms. Mirante Bartolo explained that there may be instances when the City will want someone to use the logo. It will cost \$2,000 for each logo to be trademarked. If the City doesn't enforce the logo, then there's no point in spending the money.

Council discussion ensued as to whether to trademark the logo and how to enforce it.

Mr. Cutts explained that the City's *Everywhere's Possible* logo was trademarked as part of the branding package.

Action: Staff to contact the Angle Lake Manor and request them to discontinue use of the City's logo. / Staff to begin the process to trademark the logos and draft a policy for enforcement and present it to the Administration & Finance (A&F) Committee. / Staff to research technology options for prohibiting use of the City's logo online.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 10:04 a.m. to 10:20 a.m.

Discussion Regarding Fire Services Consolidation

Acting Fire Chief Wiwel stated that this is a follow up to the March Council retreat. Since then, he attended a conference where experts discussed this issue.

He reviewed cost definitions – hard costs (directly in the fire department budget), soft costs (costs not in the Fire Department's Budget, provided by the City, that a Fire District or RFA [Regional Fire Authority] would have to provide) and capital costs. In a 2008 study, the consultant identified SeaTac's hard and soft costs to be equivalent to \$1.66 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (AV). A 2010 analysis by the Finance Directors of Renton, SeaTac and Tukwila identified SeaTac's hard costs to be equivalent to \$1.45 per \$1,000 AV.

The Fire Department provides the following services: suppression, emergency medical services, rescue, service calls, and hazardous materials, technical rescue, fire prevention, training, facilities, apparatus and equipment maintenance, and community events.

He detailed the various fire divisions and their duties: operations division, training division, administration, fire prevention, administration and fire prevention.

Since 1992 staff in Training, Administration and Fire & Life Safety has been reduced from 12 to 8. However, demands and duties have increased, including Water Rescue, and Regulatory Requirements.

Future costs depend on added demands, needed staff personnel, service demands for aid cars or ladder truck, aging workforce, Collective Bargaining Agreement increases, and healthcare increases.

The department can't continue as is. It has hit the breaking point.

If consolidation with another agency is completed, there will be fiscal savings in other departments and increases in capacity. He listed support provided by other City departments. If the City chooses to consolidate fire services, the District or RFA will need to figure out those issues.

He reviewed the variables in the cost comparisons.

The four available options are: (1) continue to operate as a separate Municipal Fire Department; (2) annex to KC Fire District 39; (3) create a new RFA with Tukwila; and (4) join the Kent RFA.

He reviewed each option, including Master Plan recommendations, other future costs, financial impact to the City, level of service, assets, implementation, timeline, and governance.

The potential property tax impact to homeowners:

option 1 - if the City wants to maintain, restore, or improve service, the City will have to find a funding source or cut somewhere else;

option 2, 3, or 4 - a SeaTac homeowner currently pays for fire protection service through the \$2.58 per \$1,000 of AV paid to the City on their property tax bill.

Under options 2, 3, or 4 the RFA or the annexing Fire Protection District will levy \$1.00/\$1,000 AV because they also assess a Fire Benefit Charge (FBC), the potential exists for a homeowner to pay more in combined property taxes and FBCs than they currently pay in property taxes alone to the City. This could occur if the City chose to levy the \$.50 available to it in addition to the fire protection district or regional fire authority assessing a FBC. This could also occur if the FBC exceeds \$.50, even if the City doesn't avail itself of the additional \$.50 property tax authority.

Discussion Regarding Fire Services Consolidation (Continued):

Mill rate vs. Hard and Soft Costs

	City of SeaTac	South King Fire and Rescue	City of Tukwila	City of Kent
hard and soft costs	1.66	1.50	2.74	1.63
Hard costs only	1.45	N/A	2.00	1.54

The FBC needs to be structured so that with only \$1.00, the loss can be offset without impacting the homeowner.

Acting Chief Wiwel reviewed a table summarizing the different options.

Mr. Cutts stated that staff is looking for some direction on which option to pursue.

Upon a question posed by CM Fernald, Chief Wiwel stated he recommends option 4 which provides Council with governance.

Council discussion ensued regarding the options.

Mr. Gallup stated that the fire fighters (FFs) haven't taken a vote on any one option. The FFs were gravitating towards option 2, but see the benefits of option 4. The union membership would most likely support option 4.

Mr. Cutts stated that the City of Tukwila will discuss this issue at their retreat next week.

Council gave their consensus to move forward with the Kent RFA option.

Action: Staff to move forward with the Kent RFA option (option 4).

Recessed: Council recessed for lunch from 12:09 p.m. to 1:03 p.m.

Street Station Area Redevelopment

IACM Robinson reminded Council that this item was voted as one of the City's top priorities during the June 4 goal setting exercise. The purpose of this discussion is to review the plan, discuss progress made to date, and review the timeline and next steps planned. Also, continue the discussion on the potential for bonding for either a portion or all of the initial acquisition costs of the property.

He reviewed the plan which focuses on the properties within SeaTac that are in close proximity to the Tukwila International Boulevard (IB) Link Light Rail Station.

Council previously directed staff to continue researching bonding a portion of the \$12 million acquisition cost to repay the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) account. The bonding options are: bond a portion or bond the total \$12 million. Mr. Robinson reviewed the estimated profit associated with financing options:

	Reserves 100%	50% Bonds / \$6 million	100% Bonds / \$12 million
Reserves	\$12,000,000	\$6,000,000	
Bonds		\$6,000,000	\$12,000,000
Net Profit	\$797,000	\$357,000	\$77,000

Council direction was requested as to: should staff move forward with the bonding, at what level and by when.

The timing of next steps is highly contingent upon general economic conditions, the real estate market, the availability of financing and the re-activation of the development sector. Next steps are:

- Bonding Decision (2010),
- Engage 2 – 3 private sector developers with transit oriented development (TOD) expertise for input on project timing and suggested measures to best position site for redevelopment (2010 – 2011),
- Work with community on aesthetics, public safety and other neighborhood “health” issues (2011),
- Re-engage community for input and feedback on future use of the site and overall vision for the station area and to determine options for redevelopment (2012),
- Revise, as needed, zoning and/or development standards to reflect overall vision and policy direction from the City Council (2013),
- Prepare RFP for redevelopment of station area (2014),
- Identify prospective developers (2014),
- Distribute RFP and select developer(s) (2014),
- Continue monitoring real estate market and absorption of other TOD on light rail line to the north (ongoing),
- Continue research on other potential acquisitions in station area (ongoing).

Street Station Area Redevelopment (Continued):

Council discussion ensued regarding the station area.

Action: Staff to present 50% bonding level with more detail at a future A&F Committee Meeting.

Planning for Street Light Rail Station

Planning Director Butler stated that Sound Transit is very committed to the Street Station. They are actively considering whether they will be able to accelerate construction of the light rail transit (LRT) guideway and South Street LRT Station to the year 2015, instead of 2021.

Sound Transit's schedule: (1) revision of the 30% design work for the future Street LRT station and the guideway alignment between the existing SeaTac/Airport LRT station and South Street will be started by Sound Transit this August, 2010 (and finished by quarter of 2011), (2) Sound Transit Board decision on construction timeline for either a 2015 or 2021 LRT alignment extension/ Street Station Opening will be made during the quarter of 2011 and according to Sound Transit staff is primarily dependent on receipt of needed funding, and (3) Sound Transit will be talking with ICM Cutts and CMs about the transit agency contacting landowners in the area regarding possible property acquisition.

If Sound Transit decides on the 2015 opening date for the LRT extension, it would make sense for SeaTac to start station area planning for the South Street Station Area in 2011 or 2012 to identify the ED opportunities; and/or to coordinate with the Major Comprehensive Plan (CP) Update (estimated to take 18 – 24 months) that the City needs to finish by the end of 2014.

Funding for the Station Area Planning: federal grant opportunities, negotiate for funding from Sound Transit via a Development Agreement (DA), and/or the City may need to fund some or all of the cost.

The next steps are: (1) a meeting between SeaTac and Sound Transit staff about the LRT station location will take place in mid to late-June, 2010; (b) City staff will be included in Sound Transit/Port of Seattle (POS) coordination of preliminary LRT guideway and South Link designs; (c) the City Council will receive briefings on the Sound Transit and POS coordination efforts; and (d) City staff will explore opportunities for a future agreement with Sound Transit to address administrative issues, such as funding for staff time, station area planning (if the City proceeds with this) and expedited plan review/permitting.

Mr. Butler stated that the questions staff needs direction on are: (1) is the City Council interested in conducting a Station Area Planning Process? If yes, should the process start in 2011 or 2012; and (2) should staff begin to pursue outside funding for the planning process?

Council discussion ensued regarding the process. Council stated that the City needs to coordinate closely with the property owners in the station area as to what plans they have for their properties.

Mr. Cutts stated that staff can continue to work on how Station Area Planning is funded in this station area. The message is that it is more of a discussion of when to start that planning, not a question of whether to do station area planning.

Action: Staff to continue to work on how station area planning is funded.

Update on SR509 Extension Project

PW Director Gut stated that this project supports the goals that were stated by Council during the goal setting exercise – can improve public safety, contributes to sustainability, and can provide for ED in the City as well as the Region. He detailed how this project supports these goals.

This presentation is to inform Council on the status of some current work that the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is doing as far as a toll study and future anticipated work activities by WSDOT, suggest how to help contribute to those activities and ensure the success of keeping the project moving forward.

Looking back, in November 2007 the Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) package went to the voters with this project fully funded. Unfortunately, it did not pass. The project is in need of about \$1 billion in construction funding. Right now and for the foreseeable future, there is no funding package in place to provide the \$1 billion. The legislature however has funded a toll feasibility study which WSDOT is wrapping up. The purpose of the study is to identify potential for tolling to generate revenue while also maximizing the efficient traffic operations within the corridor. The legislature required the WSDOT be complete with the study and report back to the legislative joint transportation committee September 30, 2010.

Update on SR509 Extension Project (Continued):

Earlier this year at the Transportation & Public Works (T&PW) Committee, WSDOT Tolling Division Director Craig Stone provided a history of tolling in the state and introduced the tolling concept as related to SR509.

In this study, WSDOT was evaluating different toll combinations with different project configurations to see if a significant portion of the needed funding could be provided through tolling.

WSDOT tried a tolling scenario using the current design and they found that it resulted in a \$575 - \$625 million gap. Less than half of the funding could be provided by tolling under the current design. They then looked at different scenarios of roadway configurations. They found that if the improvements are phased, the initial phase of construction would only have a \$150 - \$230 million funding gap with tolling. WSDOT feels that this project could then have a better chance of being funded with the state legislature. WSDOT intends to request funding for an investment grade tolling analysis. If the result of that continues to be favorable, it is much more likely that the project can at least get funding for an initial phase.

He explained that the City can ensure success with this project by: (1) providing support to WSDOT as they present the report to the Transportation Commission and the Joint Transportation Committee with the state legislature. Having elected officials at the table will send a message that the community supports the project with the tolling concept; and (2) solidifying elected support in the neighboring jurisdictions that stand to benefit from this project - Kent, Federal Way, Port of Seattle (POS), Burien, Des Moines, and Tukwila.

If Council is interested, staff can work with Council on the elements of getting the messages in place to support the study and carrying it through the initial phase.

Upon a question posed by CM Gregerson, Mr. Gut stated that the project is included, as a tolled facility, in the 2040 Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Plan that was just passed.

CM Shape stated the South County Area Transportation Board (SCATBd) supports this project as well as the POS.

Council discussion ensued regarding ways to show support for this project.

Action: Staff to work with Council to support them in their outreach efforts. / T&PW Committee to develop a game plan for outreach efforts.

Recessed: Council recessed for a break from 2:16 p.m. to 2:31 p.m.

Commercial Vehicle Parking in Neighborhoods

Chief Graddon stated that SeaTac Municipal Code (SMC) 9.05.050 prohibits commercial parking if the vehicle is more than eighty inches wide overall on any street or alley in residentially zoned areas between the hours of midnight and six a.m. He defined a commercial vehicle as any vehicle the principal use of which is the transportation of commodities, merchandise, produce, freight, animals, or passengers for hire.

SMC 9.05.060 prohibits any vehicle 90 inches or wider from parking on rights-of-ways and public streets except for a few defined areas in the City due to the areas commercial nature.

Upon a question posed by CM Shape, Assistant City Attorney Yoon stated that SMC 9.05.060 pertains to any vehicle over 90-inches, not just commercial vehicles.

Chief Graddon reviewed options for mitigating this issue, including installation of signage, law enforcement emphasis, and new legislation.

Staff is not advocating for any changes, but may consider increasing the fine.

CM Fernald stated that this seems to be a big issue because there is a lack of adequate truck parking.

CM Shape, on behalf of the Zoning Code Ad Hoc Committee (AHC), stated he wouldn't advocate changing any codes, but need to enforce as written and consider raising fines.

CM A. Anderson stated this issue was discussed during the last Council Coffee Chat and the problem is not restricted to the north end.

Mr. Cutts clarified that staff is looking for Council direction as to whether resources need to be dedicate to enforce this problem and/or does Council want staff to pursue more signage.

Council discussion ensued regarding options.

Commercial Vehicle Parking in Neighborhoods (Continued):

Action: Staff to discuss minimum level of enforcement, including the use of flyers. / Continue to gather input from the Council Coffee Chats.

Countywide Planning Policy (CPP)

Planning Director Butler stated that the CPPs are required by state law. Within each county, they apply to all cities as well as the county itself.

Concerns were expressed at a Council meeting about the ratification process. Amendments shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the City and County governments representing 70 percent of the population in KC. Seattle alone represents 31.53%. They by themselves can veto.

Mr. Butler questioned whether Council wants to initiate discussion at the regional level about amending the ratification process, as part of the upcoming major CPPs amendment process.

CM Shape stated he has been opposed to the concept.

Mr. Cutts clarified that when this issue was brought to Council, CMs voiced frustration over this being put upon them. Staff is not necessarily recommending the City actively advocate for changes, but if that's Council's will, staff will assist Council with determining the best ways to help make those changes.

CM Forschler stated that while he doesn't like a lot of the provisions or how it's ratified, the City's level chances of successfully changing the system are slim.

Action: None.

City Customer Service Campaign

CM Fernald suggested the City implement a customer service campaign. She suggested the following improvements: receptionist in the lobby, partner with students from the Tyee Complex and have students do community service by volunteering for an hour at a time in the lobby to greet and guide City Hall visitors, "Good Idea" program for employees, provide incentives for employees and solicit input from employees.

She provided examples of programs other cities have implemented.

CM Fernald stated that she has heard complaints about the signage in the City Hall lobby.

Mr. Cutts questioned whether Council wants to implement a customer service campaign. He reminded the Council that it wasn't one of the top five priorities.

Council discussion ensued as to potential improvements without initiating a big campaign.

CM Shape stated that he doesn't perceive any problem. If Council wants to improve customer service that should be the policy Council sets and the City Manager determines and implements any potential changes.

Action: N/A

Adjournment: The SeaTac City Council Retreat adjourned at 3:30 p.m.