



March 24, 2016

- I. Administrative Services Director Sara Lane opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda for the evening, and asked for the committee to approve the summary of the [March 10, 2016](#) meeting. The committee approved the summary of the March 10, 2016 meeting.

Note: Responses to questions not answered during the meetings are being documented and posted on the City website here: [FSCAC Questions and Responses](#)

II. [Service Options/Budget Simulator Exercise](#)

Committee members were provided a Budget Simulator exercise prior to the meeting. The simulator allowed members to change allocations between 23 categories. Members were asked to consider how they would allocate budget in three scenarios – at the same budget level, a 10% increase in budget and a 10% decrease in budget. The results for the exercise are reflected in the table below.

	Scenario 1 Current Budget Level (Green)		Scenario 2 +10% (Orange)		Scenario 3 -10% (Pink)	
	-	+	-	+	-	+
Efforts to Prevent Crime	2	0	2	5	5	0
Court & Jail	1	3	3	4	4	2
Availability of Public Transportation Options	0	3	0	7	0	0
City Communication with Public	1	1	0	2	4	0
City Code Enforcement Program	2	1	0	1	4	0
Cultural Services & Special Events	0	2	0	7	2	0
Economic Development	0	3	0	5	1	3
Emergency Preparedness	0	1	0	2	2	0
Drug Enforcement and Prostitution Laws	1	0	1	1	4	0
Enforcement of Local Traffic Laws	2	1	1	2	9	0
Enforcement of Property Crime Laws	0	1	0	6	4	1
Environmental Quality	0	2	0	4	1	0
Human Services Support	0	5	0	11	1	2
Land Use & Building Permits	0	0	0	2	4	0
Maintenance of Parks, Trails, Playgrounds	0	2	0	6	3	0
Maintenance of City Streets	0	5	0	8	3	0
Maint. of City Trees & Mowing Along Streets	0	1	0	2	2	0
Neighborhood Support	2	1	0	5	6	2
Outdoor Athletic Fields	0	1	0	2	2	0
Planning Projects & Policy Development	1	1	0	1	1	0
Preservation of Open Space	0	0	0	6	4	0
Traffic & Congestion Management	0	0	0	3	5	0
Variety of Recreation Programs	1	0	1	5	6	2



Scenario One – Same Budget Level

Members were first asked to record any allocation changes they made in scenario one (same budget level) on posters using green dots with associated comments to explain their changes. After the exercise we reviewed the changes for themes. There was no majority agreement on changes to allocations either for increases or decreases at the current budget level.

The exercise was followed with discussion about the exercise. Following are comments captured during this discussion:

- There didn't seem to be enough reductions to offset the increases.
- This is harder than it looks.
- A small change in the larger allocations (like Police) makes a big impact because you have to reduce the smaller allocations.
- It is important to ensure that we are optimizing our services (offering just the right level of service at the lowest cost).

Scenario Two – 10% Increase in Budget

Members performed the same exercise for scenario two where they had an additional 10% of budget to allocate and record this on the posters using orange dots.

The exercise was followed with discussion about the exercise. Following are comments captured during this discussion:

- It was interesting that there were more decreases in some areas.
- Identified a need to look at linkages as we make adjustments:
 - Drug addiction and connection to human services.
 - Rehabilitation options.

Scenario Three – 10% Decrease in Budget

Members performed the same exercise for scenario three where they had a 10% decrease in budget to allocate and record this on the posters using pink dots.

The exercise was followed with discussion about the exercise. Following are comments captured during this discussion:

- Notice that balancing may be more accurate but there is also the greatest disagreement.
- It's still important to consider linkages.

Questions:

Why doesn't the school district pay for the School Resource Officer (SRO)?

Response: The Shoreline School District pays for a portion of the costs for the SRO. The City decided that it's beneficial to have a police presence at the schools. Note: The City of Lake Forest Park does not contribute to the cost of the SRO.



III. [2014 Citizen Satisfaction Survey Findings](#) – Presentation from Eric Bratton, Communications Program Manager

- [2014 Citizen Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire](#)
- [Citizen Satisfaction Survey Web Page](#)
- [Crime Reports and Maps Web Page](#)
- [2016 PRCS Community Interest and Opinion Survey](#)

How much does it cost to conduct the survey?

Response: The Citizen Satisfaction Survey costs \$30,000 to conduct. The PRCS survey costs \$15,000.

Following the presentation and discussion around the Citizen Survey members were asked if what they heard about the Citizens Survey would change their allocations. There were some comments about the survey itself:

- Some members indicated concern about how some of the questions were posed; and
- Whether the respondents were educated on the topics particularly about what services were included in each of the categories.
- Others noted that the Survey results seemed to align closely with the exercise that the committee had just went through
- No one indicated a desire to change their allocations based on the information from the Survey.

IV. [Revenue Options \(10 YFSP\)](#) – Presentation from Rick Kirkwood, Budget Supervisor

Rick Kirkwood briefly reviewed the slides on Revenue Options and the 10YFSP. The committee did not have time to discuss the information and was asked to review the slides before the next meeting when we will finish this discussion.

Next meeting: April 14, 2016 – Meeting 5 6:30 p.m.

Note: Meeting will be held in Conference Room 301 and start at 6:30 p.m. to allow committee members to attend the Volunteer Soiree at 5:30 p.m. in the Shoreline City Hall lobby.

- Revenue Options (Continued)
- Draft Recommendations to City Manager

