REGULAR MEETING DES MOINES CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES January 6, 2005

The regular study session of the Des Moines City Council was called to order at 7:37 p.m. by Mayor Sheckler in the City Council Chambers, 21630 11th Avenue South, Suite B.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE to the Flag was led by Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson.

ROLL CALL - Present: Mayor Bob Sheckler, Mayor Pro Tem Scott Thomasson, Councilmembers Richard Benjamin (arrived at 8:55 p.m.), Gary Petersen, Dan Sherman, Maggie Steenrod and Susan White (arrived at 7:57 p.m.). Also present were City Manager Tony Piasecki, City Attorney Linda Marousek, Harbormaster Joe Dusenbury, Chief of Police Roger Baker, Police Commander Kevin Tucker and City Clerk Denis Staab.

Council Chamber Upgrades

At the request of Mayor Sheckler, City Manager Piasecki advised that upgrades to the Council Chambers include a new video system, with a remote control room for camera operations and new Council microphones. He noted that a new camera operated projector for visual presentations of view foils and written material has been installed. He concluded by advising that this is a work in progress and should greatly improve sound quality during meetings and delayed video broadcasts of Council meetings.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Spillman Upgrade - Authorization to Sign Agreement

Police Chief Baker informed Council that his department is fully committed to implementing new strategies and goals to help shape the future of Des Moines and make it a safer place to live, play, work or visit. He noted that the current records management system is very limited and outdated in the areas where the Police need to gather data. The current system is staff intensive, user unfriendly and cumbersome to retrieve critical data. He informed Council that the new updated Spillman system will be Windows compatible, able to maintain photograph images, tie into Valley Communications for Computer Aided Dispatch Data and searches, evidence bar code and audit, maintain training information on department staff, track and maintain gang member databases and, integrate the information to share with other agencies.

Mayor Sheckler informed Council that he had the opportunity to observe the new system and is very impressed with its capabilities.

7:57 p.m. Councilmember White arrived at the meeting.

It was pointed out to Council that it is important to get on Spillman's calendar now and that if we are unable to sign the necessary agreements until later in 2005, the Police department will probably not see any upgrades essential to the programs until the third quarter of 2005.

Police Commander Tucker stressed the importance of the GIS mapping capabilities, enabling personnel to track officer's locations, and specific layouts of neighborhoods.

Upon questioning by Councilmember Steenrod, City Manager Piasecki confirmed that this item was discussed and approved during the 2005 budget process.

MOTION was made by Councilmember Sherman, seconded by Councilmember Steenrod, to approve the Spillman Purchase Agreement and to authorize the City Manager to sign said agreement substantially in the form as submitted. Motion passed unanimously (6 to 0).

Marina Master Plan Update - Consultant Contract

Harbormaster Dusenbury reminded Council that the Master Plan is now five years old, and that staff has recommended the Plan be updated. The update will focus on the central part of the Marina, and update the market survey portion of the plan to check assumptions and projections, and the recommended order of projects. He listed the seven main points as follows:

1. Update the Market analysis, including some information about potential retail activity.
2. Generate three potential site development concepts for the project area.
3. Identification of the most appropriate uses of the existing Marina office building, including the adjacent restroom.
4. Possible relocation and/or reconfiguration and expansion of the existing boatyard.
5. Location of a marine hardware retail store.
6. Development of a facility north of the existing Marina office building.
7. Site of a potential passenger ferry dock and the related upland infrastructure.

He further advised that the delivered product will include:

- A project description of the potential site development capacity based on zoning and land use constraints.
- A summary of potential project development costs based on the construction of similar projects.
- A site development plan drawing illustrating site development, circulation and building site potentials.
- A brief summary of key opportunities or constraints affecting the site; i.e., zoning or environmental regulations or similar issues.

Upon questioning, Harbormaster Dusenbury noted that updates will be provided to the Municipal Facilities Committee pretty much on a step by step basis. He responded that the agreement provides for the consultant’s hours to accomplish this. He noted that dry shed storage issues will be examined, and cautioned Council that this is different from the “dry stack storage” issue.

Councilmember White felt that the timing is right, and noted that Des Moines is included in the King County Metro study regarding water transportation.

MOTION was made by Councilmember Sherman, seconded by Councilmember White, that the City Council approve the agreement with Moffatt & Nichol Engineers for the amount of $44,810 and a 10% contingency, for a total of $49,290 and authorize the City Manager to sign the agreement substantially in the form as submitted.

Councilmember Sherman stated that he will be interested to see the consultants report since it has been about six years since the Plan was completed. In regards to the potential passenger ferry services, he felt that this is a remarkable new development that was not foreseen in the development of the Plan. He noted that sometimes moving slowly does pay off.

Harbormaster Dusenbury remarked that that this update is critical and needs to be accomplished before the Rate Study can be undertaken and needs to be completed in the first quarter of this year.

Upon questioning by Councilmember Steenrod, Harbormaster Dusenbury noted that the economic data report will be an essential part of reviewing the Marina Plan. He noted that along with the vacancy rates, the biggest component will be reviewing the launcher use and revenue for the future, along with the recommended order of projects. He advised that he hopes to have preliminary data available for Council review by the end of February.

City Manager Piasecki noted that there are three main aspects of the Economic Development Consultants work and one of them is preliminary base line data which has already been accomplished and will be refined and presented by the end of the month. He advised that a public input process will be held and a lot of this work will be shared with the Marina consultant.

VOTE ON MOTION: Motion passed unanimously (6 to 0).

Highline Forum

Mayor Sheckler commented that over the last several months, the cities surrounding the airport and the Port of Seattle have been discussing the development of an organization aimed at improving our relationship and forming a process for working on issues of mutual concern. He advised that Council needs to determine who will be the representative and alternate, and what the agenda is going to be. He noted that questions have been raised concerning Normandy Park. Also a facilitator will be used for the first meeting and it is proposed that the Port pay 50% of the cost with the remaining costs to be shared and paid by the participating cities. The first meeting is proposed for January 27th. He questioned whether Council is willing to pay a portion of the cost of having this one time facilitator.

Councilmember Sherman stated that he does not have great high hopes, but feels it is reasonable to sit down and share information. However, his experience in working with the Port is “you do what they want”. He noted that the Port is not keeping to their commitments to build a separated direct connection south access to the Airport as part of the SR 509 project. He expressed reluctance in expectations, but willing to have conversations, but not willing to spend City funds.

Councilmember White noted while there was some of the feeling Councilmember Sherman expressed, participants did put an effort forward to work together in some fashion. She felt it would be helpful to know what the facilitator will charge. In regards to Normandy Park, she noted they are a neighboring City, and all the cities need to be at the table, without exclusions.

City Manager Piasecki stated that he would estimate a 5 hour facilitated session, along with some preliminary work for an agenda and process to be followed, would be somewhere around $2,500 to $4,000.

Councilmember Steenrod noted that the first kick-off meeting was very tentative as this was the first time this group had decided to sit down and start talking again after fighting over the 3rd runway. She noted that normally she is not in favor of spending money on facilitators, but in this case feels it may be wise to have someone who was not involved in the conflict and help the entire group get off to a fresh start.

City Manager Piasecki advised that C.A.S.E. filed an appeal regarding the 402 Permit put out by D.O.E. The appeal went to the Pollution Control Sound Hearing Board, who rendered a ruling. He noted that Normandy Park filed a motion with the PCHB to allow them to be named a party during the D.O.E.s review of the Permit and the Port has objected.

Councilmember Steenrod stated that after speaking with a couple of Normandy Park Councilmembers their concern is over clean water and is not part of the 3rd runway fight. She felt that it is important that Council make a determination on this matter of water quality. She informed Council that at the C.A.S.E. meeting last night, folks in attendance including King County Councilmember Julia Patterson, requested attendees to specifically request that their respective Councils put pressure on the Port and the proposed Highline Forum to allow Normandy Park to be part of the group. She noted that she supports the Port paying half the cost for a facilitator and Des Moines and the other participants paying the remaining costs. She suggested that Des Moines may wish to join Normandy Park in their concerns over clean water. She also suggested that a question to be raised at the Highline Forum is whether the Port will agree not to extend the 3rd runway.

Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson expressed agreement with Councilmember Sherman and questioned whether this is just another avenue of the Port for a public relations campaign, and if you are not their puppet, you are not at the table. He would be opposed to Des Moines participation if Normandy Park is excluded. He further felt that if this is truly a forum to promote economic development for southwest King County, then perhaps Renton and Kent should be included. He felt that there are certain things that should not be on the table, such as transportation in regards to 509, as there are already mechanisms and interlocal agreements in place to deal with 509. He sees this forum as another place for the Port to lobby and control. He did not feel that Des Moines should be at the table if the Port is going to be exclusive in the membership and perhaps a geographical area should be determined. In terms of the cost of a facilitator, he felt that if the Port is trying to show that they have changed, then they should pay the whole cost of the facilitator, or elect a couple of skilled representatives to conduct the meeting.

After further discussion, Mayor Sheckler felt he had consensus that Des Moines participation in the forum is okay, unless Normandy Park is excluded, and that Des Moines is not willing to participate in payment of a facilitator. He requested direction from Council on who should be the City's representative and alternate.

MOTION was made by Councilmember Sherman, seconded by Councilmember Steenrod and passed unanimously, to appoint Mayor Sheckler as the City's representative.

MOTION was made by Councilmember White, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson and passed unanimously, to appoint Councilmember Steenrod as the City's alternate.

8:55 p.m. Councilmember Benjamin arrived at the meeting.

8:57p.m. Mayor Sheckler declared a 10 minute break.

City Council Business Process

City Manager Piasecki noted that he first brought this subject about a month ago and how Council works on policy issues that get to the Council level, that there still is a need for a retreat and that he feels Council needs more opportunities for staff to brief Council on things going on in the community. He proceeded to review what he considers three major issues:

Committees

- Set standing meeting times, with minimum number of meeting times of twice per month.
- A "Futures" list of items to be brought and dates on which items will be heard.
- All items within area of responsibility shall be reviewed at least once, except:
  - Extremely routine or non-controversial items.
  - Items that Council as a whole decides to take directly.
  - Items that the Presiding officer places on a Council Agenda before they are heard by a Committee or before a committee finishes its work. A majority of the Council may remand such items back to the during discussion at a regular Council meeting.
- All items shall be heard by only one committee unless a majority of the Council decides to have a second, or third committee hear them.

He noted advantages to operating in this manner would be that at least 3 Councilmembers will have seen and worked on items before the entire Council hears them; Committee meetings offer a less formal setting to discuss and explore options and fine tune items; and agenda items will be more polished and generally in the Council meeting packets on Fridays. He advised the major disadvantage is the extra time that may be needed to move items through committees before they get to Council, and it is possible that the Council could completely "undo" the work of a committee, creating a sense of "why bother" with the committee and staff involved.

Retreats

City Manager Piasecki noted that while funding for a traditional retreat was cut from the 2005 budget, Council indicated a desire to conduct some type of retreat process, possibly a series of quarterly "mini-retreats" starting sometime in January. He suggested the mini-retreats would consist of 4-8 hour sessions organized as follows:

1. One eight hour session on a Saturday or Sunday, near the end of January, April, July and October, or 2 four hour session held on two weekday evenings.
2. Topics or themes for the 4 mini retreats would be:
   a. January - Review/revise Council's vision mission and imperatives statements and strategic objectives; review/revise intergovernmental policies and positions.
   b. April - Review and deliberation on work of the economic development and code review consultants; status report on strategic objectives.
   c. July - Preliminary discussion/direction on 2006 budget; status report on economic development, code review and strategic objectives.
   d. October - 2006 budget; status report on economic development, code review and strategic objectives; review/revise intergovernmental policies and positions.
3. Hold mini -retreats in a facility other than City Council Chambers.
4. Do not record but keep minutes.
5. Facilitation - Best to bring in outside facilitator. Funding can and should be found somewhere in the budget. $3,000 to $4,000 will be needed to cover the facilitator's time and expenses.

Staff Reports/Council Updates

City Manager Piasecki noted that in order to keep the Council informed and updated on various issues, projects, events and operations, a more regular process is needed. He noted that a three part process could include the following.

1. Monthly briefings - Establish a standing item at the first study session of each month for each department director to provide a five minute update regarding their department's operations.
2. Month meetings with the City Manager - Each Councilmember would meet with the City Manager once a month to discuss various issues, using the Manager's monthly report as a starting point for the discussion.
3. Quarterly briefings - Use the first hour of the quarterly mini-retreats to allow each department director up to 10 minutes to brief the Council on operations in their departments, with a focus on issues, projects and events that will come up or begin in the upcoming quarter.

Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson stated that Council Committees are important, if used properly. He noted in the past some Committees could spend hours of staff time on issues that were not actually initiated by the Council as a whole. He felt that issues need to be sent to Committee by the direction of the Council, such as committee work on a proposed motorized scooter ordinance which went to committee from the Police Department, not the City Council. He noted that now, due to budget cuts, there is a lack of staff to support all Committees if they meet every two weeks. He commented on the following:

- Works well to hold committee meetings as needed.
- Committee minutes need to be taken and distributed to the whole Council.
- The Committee review of an item needs to be part of the final agenda packet given to whole Council.
- Council as a whole needs to be the clearing house for Committee items, so Committee is not spending staff resources on non-priority items.

Councilmember White commented that she does not feel Committees are as effective as they could be. If they were more effective it could help cut down on Agenda items and the time needed to be spent on issues. She also felt that Committee minutes needed to be kept in order to keep the whole Council up to date on the status of issues.

Councilmember Sherman felt that Committee meetings are not a very efficient use of time. He would support keeping Committees as they now stand, but opposed to expanding duties. In regards to min-retreats could support a one day on a weekend, held quarterly. He does not support having a facilitator.

Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson noted that with employee lay-offs, he cannot support spending funds on a facilitator, at least for this year.

Mayor Sheckler expressed agreement with Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson.

Councilmember Steenrod felt it is important to have committee minutes that are distributed to the whole Council once the committee has approved them. She spoke in support of a min-retreat as it allows more group interaction in a relaxed atmosphere.

Mayor Pro Tem Thomasson noted he would rather see the Council as a whole tackle items such as economic development, rather than at a committee level. He noted these type of items are policy versus detail "nuts and bolts". He would like to see monthly briefings from consultants working on large projects. He feels a committee can do frame work only and that Council needs to set terms and levels of a Council committee's involvement on issues.

Councilmember Benjamin felt Council needs to establish a vision and purpose with clear direction to Council committees.

Councilmember White noted she would prefer a mini-retreat be no longer than four hours. She felt that after four hours, it becomes harder to focus and for any consensus building to occur.

Discussion ensued as to a four hour quarterly meeting, versus having a four hour mini retreat for the first four months of the year. A clear consensus was not achieved.

Mayor Sheckler advised that he will check with Councilmembers regarding scheduling a mini retreat, topics for discussion, and will coordinate with the City Manager.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Mayor Sheckler announced that the next regular meeting will be January 13, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:19 p.m. **MOTION** was made by Councilmember Petersen, seconded and passed unanimously, to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Denis Staab
City Clerk