

**CITY OF REDMOND  
ORDINANCE NO. 2676**

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REDMOND,  
WASHINGTON, ADOPTING THE FINAL 2013-2014  
BUDGET OF THE CITY COMMENCING JANUARY 1,  
2013

---

WHEREAS, on or before the first business day in the third month prior to the beginning of the fiscal year of 2013, the estimate of revenues and expenditures was submitted to the Mayor for the next fiscal year as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor reviewed the estimates and made such revisions and/or additions as deemed advisable and prior to 60 days before January 1, 2013, filed the said revised preliminary budget with the City Clerk, as his recommendation for the final budget; and

WHEREAS, the Finance Department provided sufficient copies of such preliminary budget and budget message to meet the reasonable demands of taxpayers and published notice of filing and the availability of said preliminary budget together with the dates of the public hearings for the purpose of fixing a final budget, all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the City Council scheduled hearings on the preliminary budget for the purpose of providing information regarding estimates and programs; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held public hearings on June 19, October 16, and November 20, 2012, for the purpose of fixing a final budget at which all taxpayers were heard who appeared for or against any part of said budget; and

WHEREAS, following the conclusion of said hearings the City Council made such revisions and changes as it deemed necessary and proper.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDMOND, WASHINGTON, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The final 2013-2014 budget, three copies of which have been and now are on file with the office of the City Clerk, by this reference is hereby incorporated herein as if set forth in full and said final budget shall be and the same is hereby adopted in full.

Section 2. Attached hereto and identified as Exhibit 1, is the total of estimated revenues/appropriations for each fund and the aggregate totals for all such funds combined. The total 2013-2014 final budget equals \$581,628,452 inclusive of a total 2013-2014 General Fund of \$231,302,752.

Section 3. A complete copy of the final 2013-2014 budget, as adopted, together with a certified copy of this adopting ordinance shall be transmitted by the Finance and Information Services Department to the Division of Municipal Corporations of the office of the State Auditor and to the Association of Washington Cities.

Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect January 1, 2013.

ADOPTED by the Redmond City Council this 4th day of  
December, 2012.

CITY OF REDMOND

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN MARCHIONE, MAYOR

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MICHELLE M. MCGEHEE, MMC, CITY CLERK

(SEAL)

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES HANEY, CITY ATTORNEY

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK:	November 28, 2012
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:	December 4, 2012
SIGNED BY THE MAYOR:	December 4, 2012
PUBLISHED:	December 11, 2012
EFFECTIVE DATE:	December 16, 2012
ORDINANCE NO. 2676	

ADOPTED 5-2: YES: Allen, Flynn, Margeson, Stilin and Vache  
NO: Carson and Myers

**EXHIBIT 1  
SUMMARY OF CHANGES  
2013-2014 BIENNIAL BUDGET**

<b>Fund</b>	<b>Fund Title</b>	<b>Mayor's Preliminary Budget</b>	<b>Changes</b>	<b>2013-2014 Final Budget</b>	<b>Comments</b>
100	General Fund	159,257,119		159,257,119	
	Increase Human Service Funding		50,000	50,000	
	Decrease Executive Budget		(25,000)	(25,000)	
	Decrease Council Budget		(25,000)	(25,000)	
	Increase Grant Funding for Fire Department		140,000	140,000	Council approved grant on Novemeber 5, 2012
	<b>Subtotal Fund 100 Changes</b>	<b>159,257,119</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>159,397,119</b>	
✓	011 Arts Activity	581,981		581,981	
✓	012 Parks Maintenance & Operations	3,260,317		3,260,317	
✓	013 Community Events	875,855		875,855	
✓	019 Human Services	1,522,373		1,522,373	
	Increase Human Services Funding		50,000	50,000	Grants determined by Human Services Commission
	<b>Subtotal Fund 019 Changes</b>	<b>1,522,373</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>1,572,373</b>	
✓	020 Fire Equipment Reserve	4,980,455		4,980,455	
✓	021 Operating Reserves	8,062,368		8,062,368	
✓	027 Capital Equipment Reserve	4,450,947		4,450,947	
✓	030 Business Tax	9,348,677		9,348,677	
✓	035 Fire Levy	7,417,919		7,417,919	
✓	036 Police Levy	8,634,689		8,634,689	
✓	037 Parks Levy	1,111,528		1,111,528	
✓	095 Parks Maintenance Projects	1,969,906		1,969,906	
✓	096 Transportation Maintenance Projects	7,041,984		7,041,984	
✓	099 General Government Maintenance Projects	12,596,634		12,596,634	
	<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>231,112,752</b>	<b>190,000</b>	<b>231,302,752</b>	

**EXHIBIT 1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**  
**2013-2014 BIENNIAL BUDGET**

<b>SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</b>			
110 Recreation Activity	5,784,333		5,784,333
117 Cable Access	1,519,262		1,519,262
118 Transportation Demand Management	3,640,010		3,640,010
122 Advanced Life Support	13,495,004		13,495,004
124 Aid Car Donation	467,109		467,109
125 Real Estate Excise Tax	6,792,525		6,792,525
126 Drug Enforcement	96,071		96,071
131 Hotel/Motes	965,818		965,818
140 Solid Waste/Recycling	1,727,633		1,727,633
<b>Subtotal Special Revenue Funds</b>	<b>34,487,765</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34,487,765</b>
<b>DEBT SERVICE FUNDS</b>			
230 Debt Service - Excess Levy	285,815		285,815
233 Bear Creek Parkway	7,093,785		7,093,785
<b>Subtotal Debt Service Funds</b>	<b>7,379,600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,379,600</b>
<b>CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS</b>			
314 Council Capital Projects	280,247		280,247
315 Parks Capital Projects	9,568,616		9,568,616
316 Transportation Capital Projects	50,709,493		50,709,493
Increase 166th Rechannelization		850,000	850,000 Changes to Transportation Capital Projects
Decrease 148th Ave NE Study		(250,000)	(250,000) Changes to Transportation Capital Projects
Decrease Overlake Village Ped Bridge		(500,000)	(500,000) Changes to Transportation Capital Projects
Decrease Targeted Safety Improvements		(100,000)	(100,000) Changes to Transportation Capital Projects
<b>Total 316 Fund</b>	<b>50,709,493</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50,709,493</b>

**EXHIBIT 1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**  
**2013-2014 BIENNIAL BUDGET**

**CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS (continued)**

317 Fire Capital Projects	2,300,000		2,300,000
318 Police Capital Projects	150,958		150,958
319 General Government Capital Projects	6,092,902		6,092,902
<b>Subtotal Capital Project Funds</b>	<b>69,102,216</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69,102,216</b>

**ENTERPRISE FUNDS**

401 Water/Wastewater Operations & Maintenance	73,693,275		73,693,275
402 Novelty Hill Operations & Maintenance	13,362,350		13,362,350
403 Water Capital Projects	9,595,892		9,595,892
404 Wastewater Capital Projects	9,136,068		9,136,068
405 Stormwater Operations & Maintenance	28,545,447		28,545,447
406 Stormwater Capital Projects	41,191,763		41,191,763
407 Novelty Hill Water Capital Projects	6,345,079		6,345,079
408 Novelty Hill Wastewater Capital Projects	6,457,963		6,457,963
<b>Subtotal Enterprise Funds</b>	<b>188,327,837</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>188,327,837</b>

**INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS**

501 Fleet Maintenance	7,674,821		7,674,821
510 Insurance Claims and Reserve	2,604,817		2,604,817
511 Medical Self Insurance	28,935,281		28,935,281
512 Workers' Compensation	2,522,533		2,522,533
520 Information Services	9,290,830		9,290,830
<b>Subtotal Internal Service Funds</b>	<b>51,028,282</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51,028,282</b>

<b>Final 2013-2014 Budget All Funds</b>	<b>581,438,452</b>	<b>190,000</b>	<b>581,628,452</b>
---	--------------------	----------------	--------------------

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>BUSINESS COMMUNITY</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PLN 2468 Sustainable Economic Development (page 48)</b></p> <p>How would scalability of 1-2% affect levels of service?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> When scalability levels were selected for this offer as well as others, the goal was to have a scalability level which resulted in a measurable effect on service. At the five percent the elimination of printed marketing was chosen as a meaningful reduction that would have a demonstrable effect on service delivery. While a reduction at a lower level, such as one to two percent, would have a negative effect on service delivery; it is not possible to quantify the level of effect due to its incremental nature.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>PLN2456 Access to Business Through Parking Management (page 60)</b></p> <p>With parking enforcement and management how many additional parking spaces are available and what is the turnover rate on a daily basis?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> This offer does not increase the overall number of parking spaces available in the Downtown but rather increases the intensity of use of each of the existing 345 monitored and enforced parking spaces. Of these spaces, approximately 100 (based on monthly on-street parking pass sales) are used continuously throughout the day. The turnover rate for the remaining 245 spaces varies from twice a day to over 5 times a day, based on location and activity levels (e.g., proximity to retail, construction, transit, etc.)</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>PLN2457 Business Access and Mobility (page 63)</b></p> <p>The salary and benefit amount appears too high for the number of FTEs in the program.</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The Mobility offer's salary and benefits (S&amp;B) are presented differently this biennium than in 2011-2012. Last biennium the limited duration (LTD) staff in the Mobility offer were itemized as supplemental employees; supplemental employee salary and benefits are included in the "Ongoing-Others" total as opposed to the "Ongoing-Sal/Ben" total. For this biennium, the LTDs are charged to regular salary and benefit accounts, meaning that their salary and benefits are included in the "Ongoing-Sal/Ben" total, but these LTD FTEs are not included in the FTE count due to the way they were input into the system. There are a total of 5.15 FTEs including the 2.5 LTD FTEs. With the increase to 5.15 FTE, 2013 S&amp;B would then be an average of \$102,797 and the 2014 S&amp;B would be an average of \$106,169.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>BUSINESS COMMUNITY</b>		
Issue	Discussion	Status
<p><b>PLN2457 Business Access and Mobility (page 63) cont'd</b></p> <p>Describe programs and dollar amounts that make up the "other" ongoing expenditure budget.</p> <p>(Councilmember Stilin)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response: R-TRIP Program:</b> Computer tracking, reporting and administration system; starter incentives: bus subsidies, vanpool subsidies; carpool, bike and walk incentives; employer transportation events; marketing and promotional materials. <b>\$750,500</b></p> <p><b>Employer Grants:</b> Employer grants to large and small businesses. <b>\$400,000</b></p> <p>Residential and school promotions; community events (e.g., Bike to Work Day Bike Bash) <b>\$150,000</b></p> <p><b>GTEC:</b> Develop and implement a performance-oriented small employer commute options program to achieve enhanced center-focused TDM goals; Residential ORCA Pass demonstration program in Downtown; Consultant-assisted survey of travel option use in urban centers. <b>\$355,000</b></p> <p><b>Transportation Management Programs:</b> Administer compliance with site level conditions of development. <b>\$15,000</b></p> <p><b>City Employee Commute Program:</b> Employee transit passes, vanpool and alternate commute incentives; GRTMA membership. <b>\$112,193</b></p> <p><b>TOTAL: \$1,782,693</b></p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>



**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>SAFETY</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>POL2552 Police Criminal Records/Evidence Division (page 310)</b></p> <p>If we scaled the offer up, what would be the effect on response times to records requests? (Councilmember Margeson)</p> <p>Provide additional information on the cost of a .50 FTE and 1.0 FTE increase. (Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The Records Unit completes 100-175 public records requests per month in addition to their other duties. These requests vary greatly in the level of complexity and volume of work required to fulfill each request. We currently utilize 10-14 hours of overtime each month to meet our current performance level of 58% with a target of 90% of all public records requests completed within 5 days.</p> <p>With the addition of a 1.0 FTE, the Police Department will be able to attain and maintain the 90% average for the year.</p> <p>Effective January 1, 2013, the Support Services Specialist will also be responsible for cashiering functions (credit card and checks only) This will be a great customer service improvement but ultimately involves more of the specialist's time.</p> <p>With an increase of .5 FTE the Police Department would strive to attain a 75% completion of public records requests within five days.</p> <p>The biennial cost of a 1.0 FTE Police Support Services Specialist equals \$160,600. As an alternative, supplemental dollars to fund temporary help equivalent to a .50 FTE totals \$49,000 for the biennium.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>EXE2507 Prosecutor's Office (page 325)</b></p> <p>What are the budgeted advertising funds used for? (Councilmember Stilin)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The advertising line item is for advertising a position opening in the Prosecutor's Office during the biennium. This is a historically budgeted expenditure as there are no anticipated recruitments at this time.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PW2413 Utility Billing (page 193)</b>            Provide information on how long it takes to resolve utility billing issues and how the number of staff affects the average rate. What impact would increased staffing have on service levels?            (Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Over 90% of the customer service calls into Utility billing are resolved within 5-10 minutes during the initial phone call. Email response time varies depending upon customer call volume, type of issue and workload, but is normally responded to <i>within one day</i>. For those issues of longer duration, such as leak detection and consumption outside of normal parameters, Utility Billing works with the customer and Public Works Maintenance to resolve the issue as soon as possible – typically within a few days. Staffing levels are sufficient to maintain the current customer service metrics. However, with the transition to a new utility billing system, temporary staffing may be used to back-fill some positions during implementation.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>PW2439 Provide Dependable Vehicles and Equipment (page 259)</b>            What did the Fleet Study say about exceeding manufacturer's guidelines in preventive maintenance?            (Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> One of the preventive maintenance recommendations by Fleet Counselor Services in the fleet study stated:              "Fleet Services should design a PM program around each class of vehicle and equipment in the fleet. Programs that have only one schedule for the entire fleet usually result in higher PM cost. The PM program should mirror or exceed the original equipment manufacturers minimum maintenance requirements using multiple level PM inspections."    <i>Additional information is available in the "Comprehensive Study of Redmond Fleet Operations" prepared by the Fleet Counselor Services.</i></p>	<p>(send the link of the Fleet Study to Councilmember Allen)            See email dated 11/2/2012    <b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>EXE2480 City Administration and Management (page 191)</b></p> <p>Prepare one page overview of legal services (including data back-up activities for litigation) and how the legal budget relates to the City's risk tolerance.</p> <p>(Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><u><b>Staff Response:</b></u> The City's legal services budget has historically included funding for Redmond's legal counsel on a wide range of City issues, as well as attorney help on litigation, property acquisition, personnel matters/investigations and labor relations/negotiations. Throughout the late 90s and early 00s, the legal budget was often exceeded, due in large part to binding interest arbitrations primarily related to the City's health care premium cost sharing efforts. Over time, the City augmented its budget proportionate with these actual expenses.</p> <p>Since 2008 and the adoption of health care premium cost sharing by all of the City's labor groups, coupled with HR staff's assumption of greater labor relations/negotiations responsibilities, the City has been well within its legal services budget. Beginning in FY 11-12, the City began to reduce its legal budget commensurate with actual expenses, though did so prudently in the knowledge that any budget could be exceeded with unforeseen litigation and/or labor issues. With the Executive and Human Resources Departments working together to assess budget vs. actual legal expenditures, the two departments jointly proposed another legal services budget reduction for FY 13-14.</p> <p>As with FY 11-12, it should be noted that this reduction is warranted given recent historical expenditures, limited litigation and HR staff's professional management of labor relations. Changes to any one of these factors may necessitate increases in future legal budgets, and the FY 13-14 budget is predicated on this caveat.</p>	<p>(Closed)</p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT</b>																																												
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>			<b>Status</b>																																								
<p><b>EXE2487 City Council (page198)</b></p> <p>What does the \$133,000 (On-going other Expenditures) budget represent and how does the amount compare to historical expenditures? (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The "Other-Ongoing" expenditures in the Legislative budget represent items such as, the Council Contingency, legal fees, travel and tuition for Council participation in regional activities, wireless connection fees and contributions to organizations like the Redmond Saturday Market. A complete listing of the types of expenditures compared to the 2011-2012 budget is shown on the next page.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Council Operating Expenses</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 35%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">2011-2012 Budget</th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">2011-2012 Actuals Thru 11/8/2012</th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">2013-2014 Budget</th> <th style="width: 20%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Council Contingency</i></td> <td style="text-align: right;">125,100</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10,000</td> <td><i>2011-2012 includes one-time \$90,000 for Metro Parks Study</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Legal</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">21,169</td> <td style="text-align: right;">29,000</td> <td>Includes Council legal charges</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Miscellaneous</td> <td style="text-align: right;">16,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13,591</td> <td style="text-align: right;">26,400</td> <td>Includes Board &amp; Commission dinner; \$5,000 annual contribution to Saturday Market;</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Office Supplies/R&amp;M</td> <td style="text-align: right;">250</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6,250</td> <td>Includes wireless connections for tablets (\$3,000/yr)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professional Services</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9,084</td> <td style="text-align: right;">26,000</td> <td>Includes Council retreat facilitators</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel &amp; Tuition</td> <td style="text-align: right;">33,700</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17,122</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35,830</td> <td>Includes Council participation in AWC, NLC, Suburban Cities, etc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>215,050</b></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>72,966</b></td> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;"><b>133,480</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				2011-2012 Budget	2011-2012 Actuals Thru 11/8/2012	2013-2014 Budget		<i>Council Contingency</i>	125,100	12,000	10,000	<i>2011-2012 includes one-time \$90,000 for Metro Parks Study</i>	Legal	25,000	21,169	29,000	Includes Council legal charges	Miscellaneous	16,000	13,591	26,400	Includes Board & Commission dinner; \$5,000 annual contribution to Saturday Market;	Office Supplies/R&M	250	-	6,250	Includes wireless connections for tablets (\$3,000/yr)	Professional Services	15,000	9,084	26,000	Includes Council retreat facilitators	Travel & Tuition	33,700	17,122	35,830	Includes Council participation in AWC, NLC, Suburban Cities, etc.	<b>Total</b>	<b>215,050</b>	<b>72,966</b>	<b>133,480</b>		<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
	2011-2012 Budget	2011-2012 Actuals Thru 11/8/2012	2013-2014 Budget																																									
<i>Council Contingency</i>	125,100	12,000	10,000	<i>2011-2012 includes one-time \$90,000 for Metro Parks Study</i>																																								
Legal	25,000	21,169	29,000	Includes Council legal charges																																								
Miscellaneous	16,000	13,591	26,400	Includes Board & Commission dinner; \$5,000 annual contribution to Saturday Market;																																								
Office Supplies/R&M	250	-	6,250	Includes wireless connections for tablets (\$3,000/yr)																																								
Professional Services	15,000	9,084	26,000	Includes Council retreat facilitators																																								
Travel & Tuition	33,700	17,122	35,830	Includes Council participation in AWC, NLC, Suburban Cities, etc.																																								
<b>Total</b>	<b>215,050</b>	<b>72,966</b>	<b>133,480</b>																																									

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>EXE2510 Innovation Fund (page232)</b></p> <p>Provide examples of program savings attained through the innovation/efficiency initiative.</p> <p>(Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> See email dated 11/21/12 for more information.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>HUM2522 Employee Recruitment and Selection (page 200)</b></p> <p>Explain the increases between this offer in the 2011-2012 budget and the current offer.</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Due to payroll/finance system issues, 2009 salaries were used in setting the Human Resources budget for the 2011-2012 budget cycle. As a result, the Human Resources Department's offers for the 2013-2014 budget cycle appear to have increased greater than actual increases to wages and benefits over the two year cycle. In addition, in the 2011-2012 budget cycle when part-time employees were split between offers the actual cost miscalculated (under) – this issue has been remedied for the 2013-2014 cycle with finance manually calculating and inputting the actual numbers. As noted at the Council meeting, there was some redistribution of staff time among HR offers that resulted in differences between the current and upcoming biennium; however, the overall number of staff in HR has not changed.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>HUM2521 Benefits Program Development and Administration (page 220)</b></p> <p>Explain the increases between this offer in the 2011-2012 budget and the current offer.</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> See response on previous page.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>FIN2589 Information Services Strategic Plan (page 234)</b></p> <p>Provide a brief overview of the Information Services Strategic Plan; include what projects are on the current strategic plan list and high priority items that have been identified.</p> <p>(Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Email sent 11/13/2012 of current Information Services Strategic Plan.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; GROWTH</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>FIN2555 Open Data Repository- Unfunded (page 261)</b></p> <p>Explain how this initiative would benefit the City's records request processes (potential candidate for funding).</p> <p>(Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> While the open data repository would have many applications, the first likely application would be to publish data that currently is provided through public records requests. It is reasonable to expect that implementing the open data repository would enable the city to refer information requestors to a site where they would be able to pull the needed information without relying on the city to research and provide it ad hoc. We reviewed several examples where this technology had been deployed elsewhere and saw that public records was a classic example of how this type of system would enhance city efficiency while also providing better access to public data.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>PLN2452 Regional Transportation Planning &amp; Partnerships (page 171)</b></p> <p>Performance Measure #4: Are there benchmarks related to support of the City's legislative agenda?</p> <p>(Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> An alternative performance measure is below</p> <p>Context: Achieve full or partial support for the regional transportation issues on the City's Legislative Agenda. <i>Base line target: Full or partial support for at least 75% of the regional transportation issues on the Legislative Agenda. (New Measure)</i></p> <p>Measure: Support for Regional Transportation Issues on Legislative Agenda - target – 75%</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; GROWTH</b>																				
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>																		
<p><b>PW2419 Wastewater System Maintenance (page 136)</b></p> <p>Explain the benefits of the size of the maintenance teams (three-man teams).</p> <p>(Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> When deploying two three-man teams simultaneously, we are increasing the efficiency and safety of preventative maintenance and repair activities. The improved safety is very important as crews are either out in traffic making confined space entry or working under overhead hazards. These three-man teams would be utilized on a daily basis. Other programs would benefit as well, such as manhole rehabilitation which has been difficult to perform with the current number of technicians. Three man teams would also improve the timeliness of cleaning the wastewater service areas to every two years rather than every three years and inspection of the system would occur every four years rather than every five years. In addition, repairs would be performed on a more regular basis thus reducing the possibility of a sanitary sewer overflow.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>																		
<p>Why is there a 12% average increase in salaries compared to 2011-2012?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p>The 12% average increase in salaries compared to 2011-2012 is driven by changes in staff and benefit selections. The biggest contributor to the variance is medical costs which have been impacted by the coverage selected by new employees, and changes that current employees have made to their coverage selections.</p>	<p><b>Need more detail (see table below)</b></p>																		
<p>Scalability recommends approving a new 1.0 FTE Wastewater Maintenance Technician which can be funded through the proposed revenue increase. Should this FTE be approved for the Utility?</p>	<p>Changes in line-items:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Dollar Change</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Percentage Change</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Medical</td> <td style="text-align: center;">141K</td> <td style="text-align: center;">49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Salaries</td> <td style="text-align: center;">90K</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PERS</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15K</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MEBT</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10K</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Worker Comp</td> <td style="text-align: center;">(12K)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-32%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Dollar Change</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>	Medical	141K	49%	Salaries	90K	6%	PERS	15K	13%	MEBT	10K	9%	Worker Comp	(12K)	-32%	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
	<u>Dollar Change</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>																		
Medical	141K	49%																		
Salaries	90K	6%																		
PERS	15K	13%																		
MEBT	10K	9%																		
Worker Comp	(12K)	-32%																		



**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; GROWTH</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PW2435 Infrastructure Design, Construction &amp; Compliance (page 142)</b></p> <p>Explain the difference between the \$235 million stated in the offer and the \$112.3 million stated in the Budget Highlights</p> <p>(Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The amount (\$235 million) of capital infrastructure and construction quoted in the offer spans the entire 2013-2018 Capital Investment Strategy. In contrast the \$112.3 million quoted in the budget highlights is limited to the 2013-2014 budget timeframe.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<p><b>PW2423 Water/Wastewater Engineering &amp; Administration (page 176)</b></p> <p>Explain significant increase in “Ongoing-Other” costs and are we treating this offer differently than in the last budget?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> In the 2011/2012 budget, many utility expenses were presented as part of the “Utility Financial Obligations” offer #2205. Due to the size and complexity of that offer it was decided that it would be best to allocate the expenses to offers that better describe why the expenses are incurred. There were many expenses that were allocated to this offer as they are administrative expenses incurred as part of managing the water/wastewater utility. These expenses have significantly increased the ongoing-others and include, depreciation 8.4M, General Fund overhead 3.4M and excise taxes 1.5M paid on utility revenues</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; GROWTH</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PW2416 Purchased Water Supply (page 181)</b></p> <p>What is the required draw the City must make from Cascade and how much of the mandatory share are we actually using?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The city is not required to draw water from Cascade sources. The City takes the water needed from Cascade in addition to the water produced from City wells to meet the needs of customers. Charges by Cascade are based on how much water we take during the summer (June, July, August and September). The total costs of Cascade are distributed amongst Cascade members in proportion to the summer demand of each member (averaged over three years.). Cascade does have supply that is in excess of its member's needs. If Redmond were to use more Cascade water during the summer and decrease the amount of well water produced from City wells our proportion of use would increase and we would pay a higher percentage of Cascade's cost than we do currently. It is less costly to produce well water during the summer than to increase our use of Cascade sources.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>COMMUNITY BUILDING</b>						
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>					<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PRK2438 Shared Experiences Through Community Events (page 112)</b> Explore extending the Derby Days Parade Route (\$30,000). (Councilmember Allen)</p> <p>Relook at the goals for Performance Measure #2 (increasing number of community event participation by 10% annually); the goal is lower than the actual being achieved. (Councilmember Carson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Extending the route would accommodate larger crowds and the increased growth in the kids and grand parade entries. This may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend 161<sup>st</sup> closure all the way down to (but not crossing) Redmond Way</li> <li>• Extend 83<sup>rd</sup> closure all the way down to (but not crossing) Redmond-Woodinville Road</li> <li>• Extend parade route down 85<sup>th</sup> to (but not crossing) Redmond-Woodinville Road</li> </ul> <p>Performance Measure #2 - Increase number of community event attendees and participating organizations by 10% annually and <u>maintain 2011 level of volunteers</u>.</p> <p>Data/goals in measurement statistics section has been revised to reflect the most current statistics, as shown below:</p>					<b>(Closed)</b>
	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>2010 Act</b>	<b>2011 Act</b>	<b>2012 Goal</b>	<b>Measurement</b>
	# of Volunteers 10% annually over 2010	300	271	340	340	Count
	# of Organizations	120	120	150	165	Count
	Rating	75	85	91	91	Percent

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CLEAN &amp; GREEN</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PRK2573 Green Infrastructure Management (page 90)</b> Provide cost of the fully loaded flower pot program. (Councilmember Allen)</p> <p>Provide a comprehensive list of the efficiencies/reductions (\$471,500) mentioned in the scalability section, including the Green Redmond Partnership contract. (Councilmember Flynn)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The cost of the Flower Program in 2011-2012 was \$83,463. This included 200 flower pots and seven landscaped bed “color spots” at various City locations. Proposed funding for 2013-2014 is \$4,500 for flower pots located only at Downtown Park and landscaped beds converted from annuals to perennials and shrubs to reduce on-going expense.</p> <p>For purposes of comparison, the 2009-2010 Flower Program included 310 flower pots, 30 hanging baskets, and 7 landscaped color spots at a cost of \$150,000.</p> <p>Full funding for the flower pot program in 2013-2014 would be \$83,500.</p> <p>The list includes: (\$21,360) – 20% Reduction in Forterra contract (Green Redmond Partnership), resulting in less community outreach, fewer public events, and less restoration work completed. The proposed Forterra contract is in the amount of \$83,700 for 2013-2014. (\$138,640) – Reduction in operating supplies, resulting in fewer materials for community forestry, horticulture, irrigation, turf, and sports field maintenance. (\$311,500) – Reduction in maintenance and repairs using outside contracted landscaping services. All existing landscapes and rights-of-ways will continue to be maintained at a lower frequency still resulting in an acceptable level of maintenance of the landscapes. We are planning to use more mulch in the shrub beds and planting the bare areas with more plants/groundcover to reduce weed growth. Irrigation maintenance in rights-of-ways using contracted labor will be discontinued and instead performed by Park Operations staff, which will result in a budget savings. We feel we can provide better service in-house while reducing the cost.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CLEAN &amp; GREEN</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>PRK2488 Parks and Project Management Planning (page 94)</b>            Explain increase in salary and benefit budgets compared to offer in 2011-2012.            (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The increase in salaries and benefits reflects moving the budget for the Deputy Director position into the Parks and Project Management Planning Offer. In 2011-2012, the deputy position was funded in the Park Operations budget. Another portion of the increase represents the promotion of a senior planner into the Parks and Arts division manager position as well as the movement of a portion of the Arts Administrator position. The balance of the increase is cost of living adjustments and increases in benefits, based on salary rates.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM - DOWNTOWN</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Couplet Conversion Package: 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Extension Project (page 354)</b>            Explain the additional of \$700,000 in the comparison of 2013-2014 budgeted costs versus the total project cost.            (Councilmember Myers)            Brief overview of the timing of the project and projected end date.            (Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The \$700,000 represents prior year's expenditures for design and the beginning of construction in 2012 for the 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Extension project.</p> <p>With the upcoming holidays it is anticipated the work will be completed by January 2013. The signal equipment is scheduled to come in at the end of November with installation shortly thereafter.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM - DOWNTOWN</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Couplet Conversion Package: 164<sup>TH</sup> Avenue NE Rechannelization (page 354)</b></p> <p>How does this project affect the annual maintenance budget?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The 164<sup>th</sup> Rechannelization project will result in new bike lanes on both sides with bike symbols and a bike lane delineation line which will require maintenance as well as a new continuous two-way left turn lane with arrow markings that will need to be repaired and replaced.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM - OVERLAKE</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Tosh Creek Flow Control and Water Quality (page 367)</b></p> <p>Describe how this project was funded and if WIRA8 funds contributed. What was the proposal that went before the Salmon Recovery Board?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> At this time the project is funded entirely from the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program. In June of this year a grant application was submitted as part of the WRIA 8 Cooperative Watershed Management Grant process, but Public Works was not successful in getting the grant funding.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – REDMOND NEIGHBORHOODS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>166<sup>TH</sup> Rechannalization Project</b></p> <p>What were the Council's previous decisions on this project? (Councilmember Allen)</p> <p>What would it take to put this project into the 2013-2014 biennium? (Councilmember Margeson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> In 2007, Council approved a study of the 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE corridor from NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 104<sup>th</sup> Street which was a recommended element from the Education Hill Neighborhood Plan Update.</p> <p>In March 2008, Council agreed with the plan to proceed with the traffic signal at NE 104<sup>th</sup> Street and 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and convert the road from four lanes to three lanes in front of Redmond Junior High; however, Council wanted the remainder of the corridor to be evaluated after the signal was installed and additional citizen input was obtained to discuss the options.</p> <p>In December 2008, the signal at NE 104<sup>th</sup> Street and 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE was completed along with converting the roadway from four to three lanes along the frontage of Redmond Junior High School.</p> <p>In April 2009, staff completed the conceptual study of 166<sup>th</sup> from NE 97<sup>th</sup> St to NE 85<sup>th</sup> St which resulted in a cost estimate of \$620,000 for rechannalizing that section from four to three lanes including bike lanes. This cost estimate did not include widening the roadway. Upon completion of the study, \$35,000 remained in the project. In addition, a citizen survey was conducted and the majority of respondents were not in favor of the remainder of the corridor being converted to three lanes from NE 97<sup>th</sup> St to NE 85<sup>th</sup> St.</p> <p>In 2011-2012, the budget was shown in the CIP as \$35,000 and was not adequate to fully fund the project. In July 2011, at the annual TIP update meeting, Council changed the TIP to start the 166<sup>th</sup> Rechannalization in 2012. It was erroneously stated in the TIP that the project could be completed for \$300,000.</p> <p>On December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012 this project will come up for discussion during a study session on the Targeted Safety Improvement program.</p>	<p>(For additional information see the 166<sup>th</sup> Rechannalization funding alternatives email dated 11/21/2012)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>The 166<sup>th</sup> Rechannalization Project is funded at \$850,000 through decreases in the 148<sup>th</sup> Design Study (\$250,000), Overlake Ped Bridge (\$500,000) and Targeted Safety Improvement Program (\$100,000)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – REDMOND NEIGHBORHOODS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>NE 116th Street and 172nd Avenue NE Roundabout and Improvements (page 378)</b></p> <p>Is this the total cost of the project and what is the total amount funds have we set aside currently? (Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The total project cost is \$6,500,000 and is fully funded through the project offer.</p> <p>Funding sources are as follows:</p> <p>Developer Contributions - \$623,361</p> <p>One-time general fund transfer - \$1,515,155</p> <p>Transportation CIP - \$559,113</p> <p>Impact Fees - \$3,802,371</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>18000 NE 76<sup>th</sup> Street Groundwater Protection (page 379)</b></p> <p>What is the City purchasing for the \$200,000 and what is the timeframe for the project? (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The \$200,000 is for engineering design work that will take place in 2013 and 2014. It is anticipated that this project will be constructed in 2015 and 2016. The total project budget is \$2.4M, of that it is estimated that \$425K will be spent on engineering design work that started in 2010 and will be completed in 2014.</p> <p>The construction costs are estimated to be \$2M and construction is scheduled to begin in 2015 and be completed in 2016. The project is going to construct detention/water quality facilities and conveyance pipe to address existing system capacity and water quality issues, as well as accommodate stormwater currently being infiltrated in the wellhead protection zone.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>



**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – REDMOND NEIGHBORHOODS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>116<sup>th</sup> Culvert &amp; Stream Relocation at Fischer Village (page 380)</b></p> <p>What is the City purchasing for the \$200,000 and how is the project staged?</p> <p>(Councilmember Carson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The \$200,000 is for engineering design work that will take place in 2018, it is anticipated that this project will be constructed in 2019.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Education Hill 565 Zone Improvements (page 380)</b></p> <p>Will this fix the Shaunnessy Heights flow issues?</p> <p>(Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The 565 Zone Improvements will not directly address the flow issues at Shaunnessy Heights which is in the 350 Zone. Shaunnessy Heights is in the process of building the necessary water system improvements to provide them adequate flow.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Keller Farm Wetland Bank (page 380)</b></p> <p>Explain the timing of the Wetland Bank?</p> <p>(Councilmember Carson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Keller Wetland Bank property acquisition is scheduled for 2015.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – REDMOND NEIGHBORHOODS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Seidel Creek Dam Fish Ladder &amp; Beaver Deceiver (page 381)</b></p> <p>What is a beaver deceiver?            (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> A beaver deceiver is a device installed to control the elevation of upstream ponding and prevent a beaver from blocking a culvert, or outlet of a dam and creating flooding issues.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Bear Creek Bridge Rehabilitation (Avondale) (page 382)</b></p> <p>Would this project feed into the Avondale Corridor Study?            (Councilmember Flynn)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The Avondale Road Study and the Bear Creek Bridge Rehabilitation are separate projects. The Avondale Road Study includes safety improvements from the intersection of Avondale Way, north to Novelty Hill Road. The Bear Creek Bridge Repair is a bridge maintenance project located between Avondale Way and Union Hill Road.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>North Rosehill Booster Pump Station Replacement (page 383)</b></p> <p>Are we coordinating this with Kirkland and is Kirkland contributing to the project?            Do we know what Kirkland is budgeting for this project?            (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Kirkland is the lead for the capital projects for facilities that are jointly owned by the two cities. The projects do not proceed until funding from both entities has been secured. The costs are shared based on the amount of ownership that each entity has in the facility. Prior to developing proposed CIP budgets the capital projects for the joint use facilities are coordinated with Kirkland. Kirkland notifies Redmond of the projects that they are proposing funding for in their CIP and what Redmond's portion of the project costs will be. This process ensures that funding for joint use projects is approved at the appropriate timeframes and amounts for both entities.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – REDMOND NEIGHBORHOODS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Pump Station 3 Replacement (page 384)</b>  Describe a fall arrest system.  (Councilmember Myers)</p> <p>Describe the average life span of the pumps.  (Councilmember Carson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> At the sewer pump stations, Labor &amp; Industries requires the use of safety equipment such as a harness and fall arrest system. This system is used when a person entering the station requires assistance and needs to be pulled out safely.</p> <p>Different components of a pump station, which include pumps, generators and electrical panels, have varying life spans. The pumps typically have a life span of 15 to 20 years.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>West Lake Sammamish Parkway Monitoring (page 385)</b>  For the different monitoring projects, describe the reasons for the different costs associated with the projects.  (Councilmember Carson)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The three monitoring projects are very different in many aspects, including, size, permit requirements, types of mitigation, and habitat types. We use King County staff to monitor the York Bridge (as it was a KC project), while the two other sites are monitored by different consulting firms. We now use one consulting firm for all new mitigation monitoring in an effort to improve consistency in reporting.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Public Works Trust Fund Loan Debt Service (page 396)</b>  What is the outstanding principle and interest on the loans?  (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> From 2013 forward:</p> <p>148th Ave NE Rehabilitation – remaining principle and interest - \$134,488 – last payment 2013</p> <p>Willows Road to 116th – remaining principle and interest - \$294,732 – last payment 2015</p> <p>161st Ave NE Extension – remaining principle and interest - \$1,841,672 – last payment 2032</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – CITYWIDE PROGRAMS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Neighborhood Planning and Community Connections (page 396) and Preserving and Sharing Redmond’s History (page 398)</b></p> <p>What is the policy of including projects such as this in the CIP instead of in the operating budget?</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> It has been the City’s long-standing practice to fund costs that result in a capital asset out of the Capital Improvement Program. For example, Redmond sets aside a yearly contribution for A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) to support the building of affordable housing in the region. Although this would not end up on the City’s books as a capital asset it does result in a “capital” type item. The same is true for both the Neighborhood Planning and Community Connections (Spotlight) program as well as the contributions we make to historical restoration.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Pavement Management (page 397)</b></p> <p>Provide a trend line on how much we have spent and the amount of lane miles paved per year.</p> <p>(Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Annual allocations to the program include \$1 million annually prior to 2013. Between 2013 and 2015 the program is funded at \$1.2 million annually and 2016-2018 is supported at \$1.5million annually.</p> <p>Approximately 2.5 miles of streets are paved each year through this program. The streets are rated every other year based on the State’s Pavement Condition Index. The ratings are shown below:</p> <p><u>Pavement Ratings</u></p> <p>2007 – 85</p> <p>2009 – 79</p> <p>2011 - 77</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – CITYWIDE PROGRAMS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Bicycle Facilities Improvement Program (page 399)</b></p> <p>Describe the types of projects funded by this money.            (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> The projects included in the 2013-2014 Bicycle Facilities Improvement Program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$800,000 will be used in partnership with funding from the Parks Capital Investment Program (CIP) to leverage grant funding to complete Redmond Central Connector (RCC) Phase 2 from the Sammamish River Trail to the PSE Trail as well as to leverage grant applications.</li> <li>• Design and construct a citywide bicycle wayfinding system.</li> <li>• Leverage the NE 51st St project in the 2012 Sidewalk Program so the completed project better accommodates bicyclists.</li> <li>• Annually upgrade bicycle channelization based on Redmond Bicycle Facilities Design Manual at individual locations and partnering with other projects, including the Pavement Management Program.</li> <li>• Update the Redmond Bicycle Facilities Design Manual based on newly released National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) bicycle guidelines.</li> <li>• Expand education and encouragement programs through partnerships to promote safe and comfortable cycling.</li> <li>• Provide some of the match in 2013 for Overlake Village Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge grant.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM – CITYWIDE PROGRAMS</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Street Lighting Program (page 400)</b></p> <p>Is there a list of places we need to install street lights? (Councilmember Carson)</p> <p>What portion of our street lights is owned by PSE and what is their policy for replacements and upgrades? (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Included in the Street Lighting Program are plans to install 12 streetlights at unprotected crosswalks and 16 streetlights for infill along corridors over the next two years. The priority list is generated by analyzing high conflict areas and citizen requests.</p> <p>There are currently 1350 City owned and 2500 PSE owned streetlights (see page 139 of the preliminary budget). Regarding replacements and upgrades, PSE adopted an LED program in late September 2012. The City is now able to request the installation of LED fixtures for new and retrofit by paying the cost differential of the LED fixtures. The monthly rate will be adjusted to reflect the lower energy usage. The monthly maintenance rate will not change. Staff plans to come back to Council early next year to discuss LED street lights.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<b>REVENUES</b>		
<p><b>Provide utility rate presentation to the City Council.</b> (Councilmember Myers)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Email sent 11/15/2012 with requested information.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>
<p><b>Provide revenue graphs on page 10 and 21 showing dollar amounts instead of percentages.</b> (Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Email sent 11/15/2012 with requested information.</p>	<b>(Closed)</b>

**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>REVENUES</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><b>Provide a breakdown of fund balances and how they are deployed in the budget.</b>            (Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Email sent 11/15/2012 with requested information.</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>
<b>COUNCIL DISCUSSION</b>		
<p><b>Human Services Funding</b>            Explore additional Human Services funding            (Councilmember Vache)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Human Services Fund Contingency Plan provided to Council via email on 11/21/2012.</p>	<p><b>Increase Human Services Funding by \$50,000 and decrease Executive Budget by same amount.</b></p>
<p><b>Identify how the City pays for winter shelters.</b>            (Councilmember Allen)</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Redmond funds both Sophia Way winter shelter for women and Congregations for the Homeless winter shelter for men. In 2012 the City will contribute \$27,857 and \$22,200 is slated for 2013. Other regional partners also support the winter shelter programs such as, Bellevue, Kirkland, Issaquah, King County and more recently additional resources have been made available through Committee to End Homelessness (CEH).</p>	<p><b>(Closed)</b></p>

**EXHIBIT G-2  
2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET  
Council Issues Matrix**

<b>COUNCIL DISCUSSION</b>		
<p><b>Language Revisions to three offers:</b></p> <p><b>PW2439 Provide Dependable Vehicles and Equipment</b> – include the study of compressed gas as a fuel alternative when analyzing options for greening of the fleet.</p> <p><b>PLN2468 Sustainable Economic Development</b> – specifically identify activities related to Green Lifestyles and District Energy Plans contained in the offer.</p> <p><b>EXE2563 Connecting Community and Government</b> – realign offer to more clearly describe the future communications plan.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Revisions will be emailed to Council before budget adoption on 12/4/2012.</p>	<p><b>Revised language provided to Council</b></p>



**EXHIBIT G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**Council Issues Matrix**

<b>COUNCIL DISCUSSION</b>		
<p><b>2013 Budget Amendment</b></p> <p>At budget adoption, amend the 2013 budget to include \$140,000 grant from the Washington State Association of Fire Marshals (including 0.75 FTE limited duration employee) to implement fire safety strategies. Council approved the grant on November 5, 2012.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response:</b> Staff will include a change in the Budget Adoption Ordinance, scheduled to go to Council on 12/4/2012, incorporating the grant and FTE in the 2013-2014 budget.</p>	<p><b>Budget amendment included in adoption ordinance.</b></p>

**Exhibit G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**FUTURE PARKING LOT**

FUTURE PARKING LOT		
Issue	Discussion	Status
1. Economic Development Businesses Contacted	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Communicate to Council the businesses contacted for businesses outreach (e.g. through Mayor's weekly update; other communication method).	
2. Performance Measures	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Look at performance measures in the context of targets, the Dashboard, benchmarks and a better performance measure review process.</p> <p><i>FIN2411 Measure #1: Number of in-city businesses that have held a Redmond business license for seven consecutive years or more (p. 55.) Is this dashboard measure an appropriate measure for this offer?</i></p> <p><i>POL2574 Measure #4: Part I crime clearance rates higher than the national average for cities the size of Redmond (p. 274). Targets need to be in line with what is being achieved in Redmond.</i></p> <p><i>FIR2538 Response Times and survival rate goals (p. 277). Should we use County benchmarks on survivability and add to the current performance measures?</i></p> <p><i>EXE2487 (p.199) Explore a Council performance measure that speaks to Council's success in reaching out to the Community and are there other things we can do to collect citizen perspectives/comments?</i></p> <p><i>EXE2495 Citizen perception of regional leadership (p. 255). Are there better ways of communicating the City's work in the region and the benefit of that work to the community? Look at ways to solicit information from other organizations regarding Redmond's performance and effectiveness. Educate citizens on what we are doing and why. Tell an effective story about Redmond's regional work.</i></p> <p><i>PW2433 Average travel times during peak afternoon and accident rates (p.140). Metrics should be fine-tuned. Explore a customer service measure such as turn-around time on reported hazards or outages.</i></p> <p><i>PW2441 Customers satisfied with overall service (p. 157). Explore other measures such as public input on the maintenance of City buildings or efficiencies in utility consumption.</i></p>	

**Exhibit G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**FUTURE PARKING LOT**

<b>FUTURE PARKING LOT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>2. Performance Measures</b> <i>(continued)</i>	<p><i>PW2590 Asset Management Data Collection (p. 174).</i> For offers that are one-time in nature, either make the measure more relevant or examine not including measures for these types of offers.</p> <p><i>PW2548 Asset Management Mobile Deployment Infrastructure (p. 179).</i> Look at the performance measures to either quantify the relevance of the device usage or how the offer will improve productivity.</p> <p><i>PW2422 Storm &amp; Groundwater Environmental Protection (p. 80).</i> Look at different measures that speak to customer outreach and inspection.</p> <p><i>PW2417 Stormwater System Maintenance (p. 83).</i> Should we measure the quality of water that Redmond is discharging back into the system? Incorporate performance measure that speaks to the NPDES standards.</p> <p><i>PW2414 Solid Waste Management &amp; Recycling (p. 86).</i> Adjust goals to be in line with actual performance. Perhaps include recycling measures for commercial and multi-family groups.</p> <p><i>PRK2573 Green Infrastructure Management (p. 89).</i> Look at measures that tell a story tied to practices we engage in that benefit the community (good example street tree evaluation).</p> <p><i>PRK2488 Parks and Project Management (p. 95).</i> Review targets and actuals for maintaining community and resource park land. Review measures that speaks to spending the right amount of money to meet the needs and delivering service to the community, such as cost per acre.</p>	
<b>3. Parking</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Look at different types of enforcement during contract renewal and after the Downtown parking lot is complete. Create appropriate policies around City's parking activities.</p>	

**Exhibit G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**FUTURE PARKING LOT**

<b>FUTURE PARKING LOT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>4. Greening of the Fleet</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Explore strategies in moving the City to a “green” fleet including an analysis of alternative fuel sources.</p> <p>Consistent with the budget, include compressed gas as an alternative fuel source during analysis of “greening” of the fleet.</p>	
<b>5. Innovations/Efficiencies</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Explore ways to make the innovations/efficiencies the City has accomplished more visible and celebrate successes. Are there things we could have done if Redmond had set aside innovation seed money in the past?</p>	
<b>6. BP Process</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Look at components of the next BP process and identify what worked and what did not. Identify large one-time items specifically identified in the offers.</p> <p>Examine the way large fixed costs items are handled in the process (i.e. Purchased Water Supply offer).</p> <p>Review the way services are bundled in offers and provide rational/criteria on how services are balanced within an offer. Too many services in one offer can cause scalability, transparency and accountability issues.</p> <p>For those offers that have a revenue component, clearly spell out the revenue expected. Explore how rankings for offers are developed.</p> <p>Review the prioritization/ranking process. District Energy Plan offer is a good example of an offer ranked high by Results Team, but was unfunded.</p> <p>Explore ways to track citizen budget input and Council responses.</p>	
<b>6. Network/Data Security</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Explore where/how cyber/infrastructure security fits into the City’s risk portfolio and Information Technology Strategic Plan.</p>	
<b>7. Recreation Services</b>	<p><u>Council Discussion:</u> Review with the Parks and Human Services Committee the components and performance of individual recreation services.</p>	

**Exhibit G-2**  
**2013-2014 PRELIMINARY BUDGET**  
**FUTURE PARKING LOT**

<b>FUTURE PARKING LOT</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>8. Arts</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Examine the maintenance needs of the City's art collection and the costs associated with maintenance activities.	
<b>9. Neighborhood Meetings</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Look at alternative ways to communicate with the neighborhoods. Find ways to get more people involved as well as targeting specific audiences (relate performance measures to target audiences).	
<b>10. Targeted Safety Program</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Describe the rationale behind how a project ends up in the Targeted Safety Program rather than as a stand-alone project.	
<b>11. Septic to Sewer Conversion</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Explore the policy issues and challenges with the Septic to Sewer conversion.	
<b>12. Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Development</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Study and report back to Council on Redmond's codes/regulations regarding single room occupancy (SRO) development. Does Redmond encourage, discourage or remain neutral on this topic?	
<b>13. Police Records</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Identify process improvement alternatives to move the needle on Police Records response from 48% to the goal of 90%.	
<b>14. Capital Improvement Program</b>	<u>Council Discussion:</u> Explore sustainable/expanded funding alternatives for the Capital Improvement Program  Discuss policy implications of using capital investment funding to support projects such as, Redmond's spotlight program, historical treasures and monitoring.	