



**CITY OF KIRKLAND**  
City Manager's Office  
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3001  
www.kirklandwa.gov

---

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Kurt Triplett, City Manager  
**From:** Lorrie McKay, Intergovernmental Relations Manager  
**Date:** October 4, 2013  
**Subject:** Special Presentation from the Sound Cities Association (SCA)

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

City Council receives a presentation from Deanna Dawson, the Executive Director of the Sound Cities Association (SCA), to highlight the work of the SCA and the benefits of membership. The City Council requested this presentation.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Sound Cities Association (formerly the Suburban Cities Association) was founded in the 1970s to help cities with populations less than 150,000 act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities through advocacy, education, leadership, mutual support, and networking (Attachment A). The SCA provides a collaborative structure through which member cities can play a role in shaping public policy in the region.

Of the 39 cities within King County, 35 are dues-paying member cities of the SCA, representing a combined total population of about 956,000. The cities of Bellevue, Medina, Seattle, and Yarrow Point are not SCA member cities.

**SCA Organizational Structure:** The SCA has a Board of Directors; an Executive Committee; a Public Issues Committee, a Communications Committee, a Finance Committee, a Membership Committee, an Events Committee, and four Regional Caucuses.

SCA Board of Directors has 13 directors: four from the North Caucus; one from the Snoqualmie Valley Caucus; four from the South Caucus; one from the South Valley Caucus; the Past President of the Board; the Public Issues Committee (PIC) Chair; and the City Manager/Administrator representative. The position of Secretary is served by the Executive Director.

A city may have no more than one representative on the SCA Board. Each caucus elects its own representatives to the Board. Board members are elected to staggered two-year terms, and there is a three-term limit. Board elections are held in December.

The Board of Directors oversees the general activities of the SCA, and governs the organization by establishing its broad policies and objectives. The Board recommends the Annual SCA Budget to the SCA Membership for approval.

Executive Committee is composed of the President, Vice President, Past President, Treasurer, and Director-at-Large. SCA's current Executive Committee consist of: Denis Law, Mayor of Renton (President); John Marchione, Mayor of Redmond (Vice President); Don Gerend, Sammamish Councilmember (Treasurer); and Matt Larson, Mayor of Snoqualmie (Director-at-Large). The position of Secretary is served by the Executive Director.

Executive Committee Members chair the following committees:

- Communications Committee
- Finance Committee, and
- Membership Committee

In addition to these committees, Directors serve on the Events Committee.

Public Issues Committee (PIC) brings forward public policy positions and makes recommendations on appointments to regional boards and committees. Each SCA member city has a seat and an equal vote on the PIC. Meets monthly to discuss issues of common interest to member cities. Issues may come before the PIC for information, discussion, or for potential action. Any member city may request an item be placed on the agenda. SCA does not take position on divisive issues. "Divisive" is defined as "creating disunity or dissension" among SCA member jurisdictions. SCA will not take positions that are harmful to the interests of any member city, even if favored by a supermajority of members.

Generally, it is a two meeting process to establish an SCA public policy position. At the first meeting, the PIC discusses the proposed position and decides whether to bring the issue back to the PIC the next month for action. This is intended to allow each member city sufficient time to discuss the matter at their Council meeting, and to give direction to their PIC representative before action is taken at the second meeting.

Four Regional Caucuses meet every December to review nominees for open seats on the SCA Board of Directors and elect their own regional representative(s).

1. **North Caucus:** Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Issaquah, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island, Newcastle, Redmond, Sammamish, Shoreline, and Woodinville (*Total population of 367,400*)
2. **Snoqualmie Valley Caucus:** Carnation, Duvall, North Bend, Skykomish, and Snoqualmie (*Total population of 26,060*)
3. **South Caucus:** Auburn, Burien, Covington, Des Moines, Federal Way, Kent, Maple Valley, Normandy Park, Renton, SeaTac, and Tukwila (*Total population of 532,030*)
4. **South Valley Caucus:** Algona, Black Diamond, Enumclaw, Milton, and Pacific (*Total population of 25,640*)

#### **SCA Staff:**

- Executive Director - Deanna Dawson. Manages the business and office of the SCA; supervises all staff and contract employees; submits an annual report and financial statement at each annual membership meeting; submits an annual budget to the Executive Committee for the coming fiscal year; and serves as Secretary to the Board and committees of the Board.
- Senior Policy Analyst - Monica Whitman. Transportation and Environmental policy.
- Policy Analyst - Doreen Booth. Planning and Economic Development.
- Administrative Services Manager - Kristy Burwell.

**SCA Appointments to Boards and Committees:**

SCA appoints members to and staffs various boards and committees throughout King County and the region.

At its August 6, 2013 regular meeting, [Council discussed the open seats](#) to which SCA will be appointing members 2014, as well as individual councilmember interest in serving on those boards or committees. \* Applications for 2014 boards and committees are due on October 18, 2013 (Attachment B)

Next Steps: The PIC Nominating Committee (each caucus has one representative on the Nominating Committee) will convene to review all nominations and make recommendations to the PIC at the November meeting. The PIC will then make recommendations to the SCA Board. The SCA Board will make appointment selections with notification mailed in December. Newly appointed members convene in January for an orientation.

**Training, Education, and Networking:**

In 2012, the SCA conducted a membership survey to better understand what member cities find valuable about the organization (Attachment C).

SCA offers a [calendar of upcoming meetings and events](#) on its website. Early in 2014, the SCA will offer a workshop for newly elected officials. The SCA also offers workshops on policy items; free trainings for elected officials on a variety of topics; networking dinners; and a Women's Leadership Breakfast.

**SCA Finances:**

SCA's finances are comprised of membership dues and sponsorship fees and other moneys from other sources, such as Networking Dinners, etc.

Dues from the 35 member cities represented approximately \$477,000 in revenue toward the total of SCA's \$537,000 in income in 2013. Of the approximately \$535,000 budgeted expenses in 2013, roughly 79.6% was allocated toward payroll expenses and the remaining 20.4% toward various operational expenses (Attachment D).

Membership dues are based on a formula that includes population (Attachment E). As an incentive to keep larger cities participating in the SCA, the Board capped population at 70,000. Cities with populations over 70,000 are Federal Way, Kent, Kirkland and Renton. Kirkland's 2013 dues were determined by multiplying 70,000 by the membership rate of .5598 for a dues total of \$39,186. Prior to the 2011 annexation, Kirkland's population was approximately 49,000 and its SCA membership dues were \$27,434.

Each of the Attachments to this memo were provided by the SCA staff as helpful background for the special presentation.

- Attachments:
- A. About Sound Cities Association
  - B. 2014 Regional Boards and Committees Nomination Form
  - C. 2012 SCA Membership Survey - Executive Summary
  - D. SCA Board Recommended 2013 Budget as Amended
  - E. SCA 2013 Draft Assessment



## **About SCA:**

The Sound Cities Association (formerly the Suburban Cities Association) was founded in the 1970s to help cities act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities through advocacy, education, leadership, mutual support, and networking. Collectively, our members represent nearly one million constituents in King County.

Our vision is to be the most influential advocate for cities, effectively collaborating to create regional solutions. We provide leadership on economic and community development, transportation, land use, health, government operations, environment, education, public safety, social welfare and other public policy issues.

SCA provides support to our member cities through committee appointments and staffing; policy research, analysis and advocacy; training and education; networking opportunities; and more. We welcome suggestions from member cities on ways that we can provide additional value.

SCA aspires to create an environment that fosters mutual support, respect, trust, fairness and integrity for the greater good of the association and its membership. SCA operates in a consistent, inclusive, and transparent manner that respects the diversity of our members and encourages open discussion and risk-taking.

## **The value of regionalism:**

90% of residents in King County reside in cities, and the majority of those reside in cities other than Seattle. By working together, our cities can play a substantial role in shaping public policy in the region- but only if they work together. SCA gives our member cities, both large and small, a greater voice in the region than they would have if they acted on their own.

Providing high quality services to citizens in a fiscally sound manner requires local governments to work together. The issues that we face as cities do not stop at our boundaries. Tackling regional challenges requires smart, thoughtful collaboration. SCA is committed to helping its member cities build strong partnerships with each other and with other local governments, including King County.

## **SCA Organizational Structure:**

SCA is governed by a 13-person Board of Directors: four from the North Caucus; one from the Snoqualmie Valley Caucus; four from the South Caucus; one from the South Valley Caucus; the Past President of the Board; the Public Issues Committee (PIC) Chair; and a City Manager/Administrator representative. A city may have no more than one representative on the SCA Board. Each caucus elects its own representatives to the Board. Board members are elected to staggered two-year terms, and there is a three-term limit. Board elections are held in December. Board officers are elected by the Board, based on recommendations of a regionally balanced nominating committee of the Board consisting of the immediate Past-President, and three other members. SCA's current Executive Committee consists of: President Denis Law, Mayor of Renton; Vice President John Marchione, Mayor of Redmond; Treasurer Don Gerend, Sammamish Councilmember; and Member at Large Mayor Matt Larson of Snoqualmie.

Among its other responsibilities, the SCA Board is responsible for adopting public policy positions and making board and committee appointments. They adopt positions and make appointments based on recommendations from the Public Issues Committee, commonly referred to as the "PIC." Each SCA member city has a seat and an equal vote on the PIC. The PIC meets monthly to discuss issues of common interest to our member cities. Issues may come before the PIC for information, for discussion, or for potential action. Any member city may request that an item be placed on the agenda. Issues often, but not always, come before the PIC for action in order to give direction to the SCA members serving boards or committees.

The establishment of an SCA public policy position is generally a two meeting process. At the first meeting, the PIC discusses the proposed position and decides whether to bring the issue back to the PIC the next month for action. This is intended to allow each member city sufficient time to discuss the matter at their Council meeting, and to give direction to their PIC representative before action is taken at the second meeting. If not immediately addressing a policy issue would render SCA unable to take a position on a timely basis, 85% of those present at a regularly scheduled meeting may declare an issue an emergency and the issue may be discussed and voted upon at the same meeting. The vote of two thirds (2/3) represented in person at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall be necessary for the advancement of a public policy position to the Board.

SCA does not take position on divisive issues. "Divisive" is defined as "creating disunity or dissension" among SCA member jurisdictions. SCA will not take positions that are harmful to the interests of any member city, even if favored by a supermajority of members.

A complete list of all public policy positions adopted by SCA can be found on our website at: <http://soundcities.org/current-issues-and-public-policy-positions/>.

## **Boards and Committees:**

SCA appoints members to and staffs various boards and committees throughout King County and the region. The topics that these committees tackle include:

- Economic Development
- Health and Human Services
- Public Safety and Emergency Management
- Water Quality
- Land Use
- Transportation

A list of the committees that SCA staffs and appoints to can be found on our website at: <http://soundcities.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/2013-appointments-booklet.pdf>.

Additional details including meeting times and locations, current committee members, and the SCA staff responsible for each committee can also be found on our website.

For 2014 boards and committees, applications are due on October 18, 2013. Appointments are made by the SCA Board based on recommendations of the PIC (made no later than December 1 of each year), which in turn relies on the recommendations of the PIC Nominating Committee. Each caucus has one representative on the Nominating Committee. In making its recommendations for appointments, the Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors. Some boards and committees have specific requirements for appointments. The committee also strives to maintain balanced geographic distribution, and a balance of membership from large and small cities. The background and interest level of applicants is considered, as is the applicant's past service on boards and committees. The committee also looks to balance the need for institutional knowledge and expertise with a desire to obtain fresh perspectives and new voices. SCA values diversity, and strives to create an inclusive environment. All SCA members are encouraged to apply for boards and committees.

Appointments are generally for one year, unless otherwise required by the particular board or committee. Reappointments are not automatic. In determining whether to reappoint a member, the Nominating Committee, PIC, and Board consider the applicant's level of past participation, continued interest in serving, whether the applicant has successfully represented the interests of SCA members in the past, feedback from the caucus chair, and the need for organizational continuity. At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the SCA membership voted unanimously to impose a 6-year limit for service on boards and committees.

SCA provides an orientation for all board and committee appointees in January of each year. Last year's orientation can be found on our website at: <http://soundcities.org/about-2013-sca-regional-orientation-video/>.

Committee members and alternates are expected to attend all meetings. On many committees, alternates are seated at the table and invited to participate in discussions of the committee. Members and alternates are also expected to give reports back to the SCA via the PIC, and to seek direction from the PIC as needed.

In addition, SCA appointees to boards and committees are expected to meet with other members of the SCA caucus in advance of each meeting to discuss the issues coming before the board of the committee. These caucus meetings are often held immediately prior to the meeting, but may be held at other times depending on the committee schedule, the need for advance consultation and discussion, and the wishes of the caucus chair and other members of the committee. For each committee to which SCA appoints and staffs, there is a designated chair of the SCA caucus. The caucus chair works closely with SCA staff and is responsible for leading caucus discussions. These caucus chairs are elected by their fellow SCA representatives on the committee at the beginning of each year.

SCA appointees to boards and committees are expected to serve the interests on the SCA membership as a whole, not just that of their member city. And as noted above, SCA representatives serving on regional boards and committees shall endeavor to avoid taking positions that are harmful to any SCA member cities. When SCA has adopted a formal policy position through the PIC and Board, that position is binding on SCA appointees to a committee. If SCA has not adopted a position, the SCA caucus of a given board or committee shall attempt to develop a caucus position that represents the consensus of the caucus, based (where applicable) on existing SCA policy positions. Where no policy position has been adopted by the PIC and Board, and the caucus is unable to reach a consensus position, individual members shall be free to vote their conscience, with the caveat that no SCA representative to a regional board or committee shall vote in a manner that is at odds with an adopted SCA policy position.

### **Training, Education, and Networking:**

SCA provides a forum for workshops on policy items of interest to our member cities. We also provide free trainings for our elected officials on a variety of topics to enhance their abilities as regional leaders. SCA provides a forum for members to discuss issues of common interest, and to meet and learn from elected officials from other jurisdictions. Our networking dinners are a great way for our members to meet and learn from the experiences their fellow elected officials. Our newest event is our Women's Leadership Breakfast, an opportunity for elected women leaders to come together once a month to network, share ideas, and develop skills to become more effective leaders.

### **For More Information:**

Please contact SCA Executive Director at (206) 433-7170, or [Deanna@SoundCities.org](mailto:Deanna@SoundCities.org).



SOUND CITIES ASSOCIATION

35 Cities. A Million People. One Voice.

## 2014 CALL FOR NOMINATIONS Appointments to Regional Boards and Committees

Sound Cities Association (SCA) makes appointments or recommends for appointment to 26 regional boards and committees. For 2014, there will be open seats on 22 boards and committees (please see attached).

For detailed information about each committee, please refer to:

<http://soundcities.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/2013-appointments-booklet.pdf>

This guide contains helpful information about each committee, including: the roles and responsibilities of each committee; the dates, times, and location of committee meetings; the SCA staff person responsible for each committee; and the 2013 representatives to each committee.

Nominations for 2014 board and committee appointments are due **October 18, 2013**. All interested members (including those currently serving on boards and committees) must submit a nomination form in order to be considered for appointment.

Applications for boards and committees are reviewed by the PIC Nominating Committee, which is comprised of one representative from each SCA Caucus (South, North, South Valley, and Snoqualmie Valley). The PIC Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors in making appointments. Some boards and committees have specific requirements for appointments. The committee also strives to maintain balanced geographic distribution, and a balance of membership from large and small cities. The background and interest level of applicants is considered, as is the applicant’s past service on boards and committees. The committee also looks to balance the need for institutional knowledge and expertise with a desire to obtain fresh perspectives and new voices. SCA values diversity, and strives to create an inclusive environment. All SCA members are encouraged to apply for boards and committees. The Nominating Committee recommends a slate of appointments to the SCA Public Issues Committee (PIC), which in turn submits recommendations for appointments to the SCA Board of Directors for approval.

### October 2013

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

### November 2013

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

### December 2013

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Deadline for nominations to 2014 boards and committees  
 PIC Nominating Committee forwards recommended slate of appointees to PIC  
 PIC makes a recommendation on the slate to the Board of Directors  
 SCA Board of Directors finalizes 2014 board and committee appointments  
 Board and Committee Appointee Orientation

**October 18, 2013**  
**November 6, 2013**  
**November 13, 2013**  
**December 18, 2013**  
**January 2014**

Please submit your completed nomination form via email to [sca@soundcities.org](mailto:sca@soundcities.org) on or before the **October 18, 2013** deadline.

	<b>Board/Committee Name</b>	<b># of Seats</b> M = Member A = Alternate	<b>Nominee's Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Preference</b> 1 = first choice, 2 = second choice, etc.
Regional Committees	Regional Policy Committee (RPC)	4M / 2A			
	Regional Transit Committee (RTC)	8M / 4A			
	Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC)	4M / 2A			
PSRC Committees	PSRC Executive Board	3M / 3A			
	PSRC Operations Committee	1M / 1A			
	PSRC Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB)	3M / 3A			
	PSRC Transportation Policy Board (TPB)	3M / 3A			
	PSRC Economic Development District Board (EDD) *	2M / 2A			
Other King County Committees	Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC)	6M / 4A			
	Regional Law, Safety, and Justice Committee (RLSJ)	6M			
	King County Consortium Joint Recommendations Committee for CDBG (JRC)	4M			
	King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) *	4M / 4A			
	Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Coordinating Committee (LHWMP)	1M			
	Board of Health (BoH)	2M / 1A			
	Domestic Violence Initiative (DVI)	4M			
	South Central Action Area Caucus Group (SCAACG)	2M			
County Executive Appointments	Emergency Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) (electeds or staff) *	1M / 1A			
	Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) *	1M			
	Mental Illness & Drug Dependency Oversight Committee (MIDD) *	1M / 1A			
SCA Recommendation	Economic Development Council (EDC) (formerly enterpriseSeattle) – City must be EDC Investor				
Staff Committees	King County Regional Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) (staff) *	1M			
	Interagency Advisory Council to End Homelessness in King County (IAC) (staff) *	1M			

\* Indicates that this appointment is for a multi-year term. Two-year terms: EDDB, KCFCDAC, CEH, and MIDD. Three-year terms: EMAC, AFIS, and IAC.

**Please provide a statement detailing your interest in, background, and qualifications for each position.**

Provided by: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Nominee's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

## **2012 Membership Survey**



## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Prepared for SCA Membership 11/4/2012**  
SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson

At the 2012 Suburban Cities Association (SCA) Board of Directors Retreat, the Board identified the need for a membership survey to obtain a baseline assessment of membership satisfaction, to identify areas for organizational improvement, and to seek feedback on how to provide additional value to members. SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson drafted the survey, and recruited and hired an intern to conduct interviews with members. Intern Ella Williams conducted 47 interviews with elected officials representing 29 member cities<sup>1</sup> and one non-member city.<sup>2</sup> This Executive Summary is presented to the SCA Board and membership to summarize and explain the information obtained from members in these interviews, and to give direction to the organization for future improvement.

### **General Satisfaction:**

The membership survey revealed a high level of membership satisfaction. Over 90% of members indicated that they felt that the organization was heading in the right direction. Only one member stated that s/he felt the organization was heading in the wrong direction, and that member made a number of positive comments about the organization.<sup>3</sup>

Overall, responses were overwhelmingly positive:

Members expressed the highest level of satisfaction with SCA staffing at committees. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “very satisfied” and 1 being “not at all satisfied,” fully 100% of members rated SCA staff at either a 4 (13%) or a 5 (87%). Members also offered a number of spontaneous compliments regarding SCA staff during the interviews, including:

- “Staff is awesome. Great, knowledgeable, responsive. Great team on board. Pleased.”
- Committee staffing is “Great. Make us (electeds) look good with complex issues. Provide consistency. Smart, patient.”
- “Doreen – good work.”
- “Monica – great job.”
- “Deanna & Kristy are great.”
- “Deanna is amazing. Great with in-depth responses.”
- “Very responsive – don’t know how they keep up with it all.”
- “Awesome team. Easy to work with. Compassionate, approachable, accommodating.”
- “Great. Amazing. So impressed.”
- “Really good people. Don’t know how they are able to do it.”
- “Superb staffing – have never seen SCA so well run”

Members also expressed an extremely high level of satisfaction with the value they received for their dues at SCA. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “excellent value for my money” and 1 being

“not nearly enough value,” 82.6% of members rated the organization at a 4 or a 5. Only one member each gave the organization a score of 1 or 2.

Members expressed a similarly high level of satisfaction with the Public Issues Committee (PIC). When asked how valuable the PIC was to their city on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “extremely valuable” and 1 being “not at all valuable,” 82.6% of members rated the organization at a 4 or 5.<sup>4</sup> No members rated the PIC as a 1, and only one member rated the PIC as a 2.

Members expressed high satisfaction with the voice their city had on the SCA Board. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “very satisfied with the voice my city has at SCA” and 1 being “I am very unsatisfied with how my city is represented by the SCA Board,” just over 80% of members gave the board a score of a 4 or a 5. Only one member gave the Board a score of a 2, and no members gave the Board a 1.<sup>5</sup> It is worth noting that several members were not sure whether their city had a seat on the Board. Some PIC members also remarked that they wish they had more information on the activities of the Board. Based on this feedback, staff will work with the Board to create greater transparency, and to better inform all members about the actions of the Board.

Members expressed general satisfaction with SCA Networking Dinners. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “very satisfied” and 1 being “not at all satisfied,” 80% of members gave the dinners a score of 4 or 5. Only one member each gave the dinners a score of a 1 or a 2. Yet many members did respond that there was room for improvement at the dinner in terms of quality of food, variety for the location of dinners, and getting more members to attend meetings. The Events Committee is reviewing the specific recommendations, and will be working with staff to address member concerns.

Overall, members expressed satisfaction with the procedures at the annual meeting. On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being “very satisfied” and 1 being “very dissatisfied,” 80% of members gave the meeting a score of 3 or higher. But it is worth noting that 7 members did not feel that they had sufficient information to answer the question, and even many members who did answer the question remarked that they did not know much about the meeting, or the procedures at the meeting. This suggests a need for greater transparency. Still, the number of members expressing dissatisfaction with meeting procedures was remarkably low, with only one member each giving the meeting a score of 1 or 2.

### **“One City, One Vote”:**

One of the longstanding policies of SCA is that each city has a seat on the PIC, and each city’s vote carries the same weight. Similarly, at the annual meeting, each city has one vote, and each city’s vote is equally weighted. Our membership survey sought to determine whether members approved or disapproved of these policies. The membership survey demonstrated strong membership support for the current policies.

Members were asked the following question:

One of the features of the PIC is that every SCA member city has a seat on the PIC, and that every city's voice on the PIC is equal. Do you agree, or disagree with this policy?

Members were given the option of answering that they agreed, disagreed, or were unsure about the policy. 38 of 46 members (82.6%) stated that they agreed with the policy, while 4 members each stated that they disagreed with or were unsure about the policy.

Members offered a number of spontaneous comments about the policy, which included:

- “Fully agree!”<sup>6</sup>
- “Has been the policy since PIC started, important to continue ... PIC gave empowerment to small cities, allowed them to become respected among peers.”<sup>7</sup>
- “Strongly agree.”<sup>8</sup>
- “Agree, but what constitutes a contentious issue needs to be defined.”<sup>9</sup>
- “Will have major problem if that goes away, will leave. Point of SCA is having an equal voice.”<sup>10</sup>
- “Don’t touch one city one vote!”<sup>11</sup>
- “Believer in one city one vote. Appropriate.”<sup>12</sup>
- “Agree- one city, one vote!”<sup>13</sup>
- “Sort of working, working fine.”<sup>14</sup>
- “This is a concern of some cities – small/rural cities impact large cities, steering policy that doesn’t affect them. But every city should have an equal voice. There could be some conversation about weighted votes regarding issues that don’t affect all cities.”<sup>15</sup>
- “Agree, but think that size/weighting process would be reasonable on certain issues.”<sup>16</sup>
- “Being implemented well.”<sup>17</sup>
- “Either members should all pay the same price, or there should be a weighted vote. An issue of equity.”<sup>18</sup>
- “Open to discussion about when it makes sense. Works well for unity, but there may be some circumstances where one member has more invested in an issue. Perhaps there could be a special rule, depending on the issue, where votes are not equal when some have more skin in the game. Balance.”<sup>19</sup>
- “Great. Everyone can weigh in.”<sup>20</sup>
- “Wholeheartedly agree. We already have weighted votes on the board because of the board makeup.”<sup>21</sup>
- “Agree. Big cities already have a stronger voice, big influence. Balance goes toward making SCA stronger. Full time mayors speak with bigger voices, but in interest of SCA members. Not self-city-serving. Impressive.”<sup>22</sup>
- “Different perspectives. Some bigger cities might disagree. Not really opposed to a change, but this is the cleanest way.”<sup>23</sup>

- “Part of keeping regional equality. Some bigger members could outweigh the entire group, not okay. Set up like Senate. Everyone has a chance to participate.”<sup>24</sup>
- “Don’t disagree, but also don’t demand an equal seat. But if it changes, would think ‘why bother?’ Loss of value.”<sup>25</sup>
- “Agree that every city has seat, but ridiculous that population not taken into account. Change voting rules so that larger cities have proportional representation.”<sup>26</sup>
- “Yes, this is the way it should be. If the PIC went to a different format with larger cities getting a larger vote, would question whether we should belong.”<sup>27</sup>
- “Population differences create different animals. Play regionally, hard to represent 80 thousand versus 5 thousand.”<sup>28</sup>
- “6 on a scale of 1-5. Cornerstone of the organization. Changing this policy would be the only thing that would take [city] out of SCA.”<sup>29</sup>
- “Agree. One city, one vote.”<sup>30</sup>
- “Unsure. Depends on how well it’s working.”<sup>31</sup>
- “Very much agree.”<sup>32</sup>
- “Agree. Like it.”<sup>33</sup>
- “Agree in general. Otherwise, only 5 people at the table! That would work against the regional concept.”<sup>34</sup>

Perhaps the most telling comment came from a member who stated that s/he was unsure about the policy:

- “At first I really disagreed. Dues are tied to the population, but vote is not. Why should we pay more and get the same power? I have come to understand that because of the diversity of members, not really possible to do any other way.”

In sum, members offered very thoughtful, often highly nuanced comments about the policy. A handful of members strongly oppose the policy, and a somewhat larger number value the policy so highly that they would reconsider their membership if the policy were to change. It should be noted that there was disagreement about the policy even within member cities.<sup>35</sup> Many members expressed an understanding of and sympathy for those who wish to amend the policy, but do not see a viable alternative to the current policy, and/or see the harm of changing the policy as outweighing any potential benefits. Overall, the membership survey demonstrated continuing support for maintaining the current policy on voting at the PIC.

Members were also asked the following question:

Much like the policy at the PIC, at the annual meeting, each city has an equal vote in setting dues for the coming year, voting on bylaw amendments, and voting on any other matters that may be submitted to the general membership. Do you agree or disagree with this SCA policy?

As above, members were given the option of answering that they agreed, disagreed, or were unsure about the policy. Here too, 38 of 46 members (82.6%) stated that they agreed with the policy. Five members indicated that they disagreed with the policy, one member was unsure, with one member stating s/he didn't know how the procedure worked, and another stating that s/he has never been to the annual meeting.<sup>36</sup>

Far fewer members offered specific comments about this policy. Comments included:

- Should be a weighted vote.<sup>37</sup>
- Should be the same as the PIC. Don't want it to change. But if it does change, both need to.<sup>38</sup>
- Will probably leave if it changes, because then SCA will have no value. Not a threat, though. Same answer as before [in response to question re PIC]. Need to pick and choose for time and investment. Respect it now, but also respect those other cities [who disagree].<sup>39</sup>
- [From a member who stated s/he disagrees with the policy]: Don't disagree, just don't know the right way to do it ... Feels like "good old boys network". Not confident that there is likely to be an open dialogue re: equal votes.<sup>40</sup>
- Strongly agree. Changing this policy is the one thing that could lead [city] out of SCA.<sup>41</sup>
- Agree in general, but can see the case for weighted voting. Senate vs. House. Maybe in the future, but concerned that small cities will feel underrepresented.<sup>42</sup>
- Fine with one city one vote. Valuable to smaller cities. Great place for small cities to have voice.<sup>43</sup>

Here too we see a number of thoughtful comments, and an understanding and even sympathy from members of both sides of the debate for the opposing point of view. And as with the PIC policy, while we see a handful of members preferring a change, there is overall support for maintaining the current policy on voting at the annual meeting.

### **Recommendations for the Future of SCA:**

While members expressed a high level of satisfaction with SCA, they offered a number of specific suggestions for where they would like to see the organization heading in the future.

#### ***Training, education, and networking:***

Members expressed a great deal of interest in SCA providing additional training and educational opportunities for members, although they also recognized that SCA has a small staff and that the organization's resources should not be stretched too thin. The membership survey also provided helpful suggestions on potential future dinner speakers. The Events Committee and SCA staff will be utilizing these suggestions to better tailor programming in 2013 to meet the interests of members.

### ***Committee staffing:***

The survey demonstrated that SCA is on the right track in regards to committee staffing. But while the survey demonstrated an exceptionally high level of membership satisfaction with SCA staff, we recognize that there is always room for improvement. We saw a number of compliments in the survey about staff's availability and responsiveness. This is clearly an area where members see high value, and we will continue to provide this level of service. We also saw an interest from members in more written briefing materials and white papers. Providing these types of materials will also enable members serving on committees to more easily share information with their fellow elected officials within their cities. This will be an area of policy staff focus in 2013.

### ***PIC:***

When asked questions about the PIC, and what if any concerns they had about the PIC, members frequently raised the issue of "one city, one vote" even before a specific question was asked about the policy. Members also expressed a strong desire to maintain SCA's current policy of not taking positions on "divisive" issues, and many members noted that there was a need to further clarify the definition of "divisive." Some members expressed confusion over whether SCA's policy prohibited taking positions on "divisive" issues (which it does) versus taking positions on "controversial" positions (which it does not). Several members noted that SCA should not be afraid to dive in and take positions on controversial issues, but other members noted that SCA should avoid taking positions on "political hot button" positions. Members made it clear that they wanted SCA to only take positions that have direct relevance to member cities. Members cautioned against duplicating efforts with AWC, but several members saw a need for SCA to take positions on legislative matters that directly affect SCA member cities, particularly when the cities within King County have needs that may differ from those in other parts of the state. The responses derived from this survey will help to guide the work of the PIC in the future: it will help the PIC avoid taking positions that will alienate member cities, while at the same time encouraging the PIC to be proactive in advocating policy positions that will benefit member cities.

### ***Board, dues structure, policies and procedures:***

Members expressed general satisfaction with the SCA Board, dues structure, and organizational policies and procedures. But the survey also revealed that many members feel that they do not have a great deal of information about any of these. There is significant room for improvement in this area. SCA staff will work with the Board in 2013 to bring additional information to members about the activities of the Board, and to increase our level of transparency. Staff suggests initiating a regular "Message from the President" email in order to keep members informed about Board activities. Introducing all of the SCA Board Members at each networking dinner could also help to remind members who represent their caucus on the Board, and council visits from

Board members could help to open lines of communication between the Board and the membership.

### ***Organizational Perception:***

The information gathered in the survey about organizational perception will be helpful in a number of ways. The information has already been utilized to inform the ongoing organizational rebranding and website upgrade project, and SCA was able to save money on that project by conducting the survey in house. The feedback gained from the survey will also enable the Board to set goals for the organization's future that are closely aligned with member's expectations for the future of SCA.

Of particular note, a number of members expressed concerns about the organization's name and in particular, expressed dissatisfaction with the word "suburban." Some typical comments included:

- "Suburban is not my favorite word. 'Suburban' has a connotation with sprawl, and that is a negative."
- "Suburban implies non-urban."
- "Our cities are not strictly suburban, but I don't know a better name."
- "Suburban to who?"
- "'Suburban' sounds like rural communities. Our name should be more inclusive. Don't want to be pigeon holed by our name."
- "Suburban sounds old-fashioned."
- "Our name should better reflect who we are to attract members."
- "The word 'suburban' makes me think of the Flintstones. 'Suburban' has a 50s connotation."
- "Suburban is the wrong word. Our cities are not suburbs."
- "The word is not reflective of our member cities, which are vibrant communities. We could do better."

Based on these comments, it is clear that while members place a high value on the work of SCA, many do not feel that the organization's name accurately describes the member cities. Further, the organization's name is not well-aligned with the members' vision for the future of the organization, as summarized below.

### ***Moving Forward:***

Members were remarkably consistent in their vision for the future of SCA. When asked what words they would like to see used to describe SCA five years into the future, the most common responses were:

- Effective (also, "gets things done," "high impact," "successful")

- Powerful (or “strong”)
- Respected
- Influential (also, “listened to,” “known,” and “prominent”– “When SCA talks, people listen!”)
- Representative of member city interests
- Unified (or “connected,” “cohesive,” “collaborative,” “collective voice,” “cooperative,” “speaking with a single voice”)
- Leader
- Innovative (also, “pioneering,” “ahead of the curve,” “creative,” “dynamic,” “exciting,” “forward thinking,” “frontline,” “forefront on issues”)
- Collegial/congenial/camaraderie/friendly/inclusive/cooperative/accommodating
- Advocating/advocacy

It is noteworthy that these comments are remarkably similar to the comments made by the Board in its 2012 Retreat as it discussed its vision for the organization’s future.

When asked what SCA could be doing to raise awareness of and enhance the image of the organization, the most common response was to do more outreach to member cities. Specific suggestions included visits to council meetings to explain the work of SCA, and creating a monthly or quarterly email for members.

A high number of members identified a need for SCA to create an awareness and understanding of SCA from the general public. Several members identified a need for SCA to “tell our story” to the public through marketing, public relations, and media releases. A number of members spoke to the need to get SCA’s name in the paper. Several members also identified the need for SCA to create a better organizational image through a new logo, rebranding, and a new website.

Finally, several members noted that the best way for SCA to enhance its image is to continue to achieve success as an organization.

***Measuring Success:***

Members were also highly consistent in how they thought SCA should measure success as an organization.

Membership satisfaction (measured by surveys like this one) was most frequently mentioned as the best measurement of organizational success. Membership retention and increased membership were also mentioned frequently, with a number of members identifying “all cities but Seattle as members” as a good measure of success. The retention and attraction of regional associate members was also noted frequently.

The level of member involvement was also mentioned frequently. Members suggested tracking the number of members who volunteer to serve on regional boards and committees, and the

number of attendees at networking events. The degree to which members turn to SCA for assistance on regional issues was also mentioned as a way to measure success. Members also noted the need for SCA to serve the interests of all cities, both large and small.

Members also frequently noted that we should measure success based on our degree of influence on regional and, to a lesser extent, statewide policy. “King County listens to SCA” was a very frequently mentioned measure of success. King County adopting policies and/or ordinances for which SCA advocated (and/or does not pass policies that would have an adverse effect on SCA cities and residents) was another frequently mentioned measure. Expansion of SCA’s number of seats on regional boards and committees was also mentioned as a way to measure the organization’s success.

SCA members also want to see the organization set goals each year, and achieve them. Members noted that these goals should be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely). Members also expressed a desire to see an annual recap of the organization’s progress on achieving its goals.

### **Conclusion:**

The 2012 membership survey revealed that members have confidence in SCA, and feel positive about the direction in which the organization is heading. At the same time, the survey provided the Board, staff, and PIC with invaluable feedback on how to improve and better serve the needs of its members. All of this was done at little or no cost to the organization, proving once again that SCA provides high value to its members while respecting the financial challenges facing all cities. In addition, the survey demonstrated to members that the organization is committed to continual improvement, and is responsive to the needs of members. In order to track our success as an organization, this survey should be repeated on a regular basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> All SCA member cities participated in the survey except the cities of Hunts Point, Milton, Normandy Park, and Pacific. These cities either declined to participate, or did not respond to repeated requests.

<sup>2</sup> Councilmember Mike Cero from Mercer Island volunteered to participate. Except as otherwise noted, the results contained in this Executive Summary refer to responses made by current SCA members.

<sup>3</sup> Positive comments from this member included statements that the organization is “making a noble effort” and that in a better world, there would be more staff for SCA. S/he stated that ED Dawson is an “excellent leader” who is “doing a good job.”

<sup>4</sup> Member satisfaction with value for dues was slightly higher than satisfaction with the PIC. 25 of 46 members interviewed gave the organization a 5 on value for money, while 22 of 46 members gave the PIC a 5 in terms of value to their city.

---

<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, the city of the only member who gave the Board a negative score has a seat on the current SCA Board.

<sup>6</sup> From a small city.

<sup>7</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>8</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>9</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>10</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>11</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>12</sup> From a large city.

<sup>13</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>14</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>15</sup> From a large city.

<sup>16</sup> From a small city.

<sup>17</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>18</sup> From a large city.

<sup>19</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>20</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>21</sup> From a small city.

<sup>22</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>23</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>24</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>25</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>26</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>27</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>28</sup> From a large city.

<sup>29</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>30</sup> From a large city.

<sup>31</sup> From a small city.

<sup>32</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>33</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>34</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>35</sup> The four members who opposed the policy came from only two member cities. In one of those cities, two members opposed the policy, and one member survey supported the current policy. In the other city, two members opposed the policy, one member was unsure, and one member supported the current policy.

<sup>36</sup> This response may also demonstrate a need for greater transparency and information to members about the annual meeting procedures.

<sup>37</sup> From a large city.

<sup>38</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>39</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>40</sup> From a large city.

<sup>41</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>42</sup> From a midsize city.

<sup>43</sup> From a midsize city.

Proposed 2013 SCA Budget

Attachment D

Income/Expense	12 Budget as amended	12 Est Actual	Draft 2013 Budget
<b>Income</b>			
4000 - Dues & Sponsorships			
4010 - City Member Dues	461,382	461,382	477,050
4020 - Regional Associate Membership/Sponsorship	5,000	7,000	38,000
<b>Total 4000 - Dues &amp; Sponsorships</b>	<b>466,382</b>	<b>468,382</b>	<b>515,050</b>
4300 - Program Revenue			
4310 - Registration/Dinners Revenue	20,310	19,450	20,310
4320 - Sponsorship Revenue (rolled into Dues & Sponsorships as of 2013)	24,000	20,000	0
<b>Total 4300 - Program Revenue</b>	<b>44,310</b>	<b>41,540</b>	<b>20,310</b>
4600 - Interest Income	2,500	1,973	1,900
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>513,192</b>	<b>511,895</b>	<b>537,260</b>
<b>Expense</b>			
<b>5000 - Payroll Expenses</b>			
* 5010 - Salaries	295,186	286,548	313,324
5100 - Temporary Staffing	400	9,800	400
5130 - Vacation Liabilities	8,998	0	6,633
<b>5200 - Payroll Taxes</b>			
5210 - Taxes- Unemployment	1,502	3,073	2,907
5230 - Taxes - SS (inc. med reimb/car)	19,726	19,110	18,527
5240 - Taxes - Medicare	4,765	4,519	4,603
5250 - Taxes - L & I	1,316	1,773	853
<b>Total 5200 - Payroll Taxes</b>	<b>27,309</b>	<b>28,475</b>	<b>26,891</b>
5300 - Pension Plan Contributions	15,468	20,578	25,552
5500 - Contract Liabilities	9,356	0	1,864
<b>5600 - Other Employee Benefits</b>			
5610 - Car Allowance	6,000	6,000	6,000
5620 - Cash in lieu of health benefits	29,861	0	0
5621 - Medical/Dental/Vision/Life Ins	0	34,559	40,682
<b>Total 5600 - Other Employee Benefits</b>	<b>35,861</b>	<b>40,559</b>	<b>46,682</b>
<b>5700 - Professional Development</b>			
5710 - Educational Benefit (Contract)	2,067	0	2,500
5720 - Education Benefit	2,710	0	2,647
5800 - Advertising/Personnel	500	0	0
<b>Total 5000 - Payroll Expenses</b>	<b>398,177</b>	<b>385,960</b>	<b>426,492</b>
<b>6000 - Occupancy</b>			
6010 - Rent	14,927	15,980	20,440
Tenant Improvement	35,000	35,000	0
6050 - Office Insurance	500	501	501
<b>Total 6000 - Occupancy</b>	<b>15,427</b>	<b>51,481</b>	<b>20,941</b>
<b>6100 - Insurance (D&amp;O)</b>			
<b>6300 - Telephone</b>			
6310 - Cell Phone	1,500	1,927	1,755
6320 - Internet Connection	1,320	1,403	1,403
6330 - Conference Calls & LD	1,600	453	500
<b>Total 6300 - Telephone</b>	<b>4,420</b>	<b>3,783</b>	<b>3,658</b>
6600 - Office Supplies	1,500	1,152	1,300
<b>6900 - Technology</b>			
6910 - Technicians	6,000	4,406	4,500
6920 - Quarterly Server Maint	3,000	0	0
6930 - Web Hosting	150	137	0
6940 - Computer Equipment	2,000	2,000	500
6950 - Software Upgrade	4,000	234	1,000
<b>Total 6900 - Technology</b>	<b>15,150</b>	<b>7,085</b>	<b>6,000</b>
<b>7000 - Equipment Rental &amp; Mtnc</b>			
7010 - Equipment Rental	3,375	3,488	3,775
7020 - Equipment Maintenance	300	0	0
<b>Total 7000 - Equipment Rental &amp; Mtnc</b>	<b>3,675</b>	<b>3,488</b>	<b>3,775</b>
<b>7200 - Staff at Conferences</b>			
7100 - Business Meals	600	436	600
7210 - Staff Meals	225	0	0
7220 - Lodging	1,200	457	700
7230 - Conf travel/mile/parking	1,100	0	600
7240 - Registration	1,890	432	1,000
<b>Total 7200 - Staff at Conferences</b>	<b>4,415</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>2,300</b>
<b>7300 - Dinners/Conferences/Retreats</b>			
7310 - Speakers Fees	3,000	0	3,000
7320 - Meals	17,500	16,970	17,500
7330 - Meeting Equipment & Misc Exp.	150	167	200
7340 - Audio Visual	850	1,111	1,000
7350 - Conference Room Rental	0	0	0
7360 - Conference Printing	0	0	0
<b>Total 7300 - Dinners/Conf/Retreats</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>18,247</b>	<b>21,700</b>
<b>7400 - Awards and Recognition</b>			
7410 - Awards/Recognitions	540	540	1,500
7420 - Prizes and Give Aways	50	50	0
<b>Total 7400 - Awards and Recognition</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>7500 - Accounting Fees</b>			
7510 - *Payroll Processing Charges	1,440	1,595	1,434
7520 - Accountants	1,500	1,625	1,500
<b>Total 7500 - Accounting Fees</b>	<b>2,940</b>	<b>3,220</b>	<b>2,934</b>
<b>7800 - Professional Fees</b>			
7600 - Staff Travel (mileage/parking)	5,000	5,053	5,000
7810 - Web Site Design/Maintenance	300	0	0
7820 - Legal	0	0	2,500
7830 - Financial Review/Audit	15,000	12,868	0
7840 - Consulting Services	50,000	44,500	12,000
<b>Total 7800 - Professional Fees</b>	<b>65,300</b>	<b>57,368</b>	<b>14,500</b>
<b>9000 - General Operations</b>			
8000 - Depreciation/bal Sht item			
Contingency Fund	20,987	0	20,000
9010 - Water	400	409	400
9030 - Licenses and Permits	30	30	30
9040 - Dues and Subscriptions	1,000	665	650
9050 - Bank Service Charges	75	90	100
9070 - Postage & Delivery	250	142	200
9080 - Printing & Publication	250	1,608	1,600
<b>Total 9000 - General Operations</b>	<b>22,992</b>	<b>2,943</b>	<b>22,980</b>
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>563,186</b>	<b>543,398</b>	<b>535,384</b>

2013  
Est Exp 535,384  
Est Rev 537,260

**2012 Approved Assessment**

**Draft SCA 2013 Assessment**

<u>Municipality</u>	<b>2011 OFM Pop</b>	<b>2011 OFM Pop w/70K cap</b>	<b>Membership Rate 0.5598</b>	<u>Municipality</u>	<b>2012 OFM Pop 4/1/2012</b>	<b>2012 OFM Pop w/70K cap</b>	<b>Membership Rate 0.5598</b>	<b>Increase over 2012 in dollars</b>	<b>Population Change 11-12</b>
Skykomish	195	195	109.16	Skykomish	200	200	111.96	2.80	5
Beaux Arts Village	300	300	167.94	Beaux Arts Village	300	300	167.94	0.00	0
Hunts Point	390	390	218.32	Hunts Point	390	390	218.32	0.00	0
Milton (part)	835	835	467.43	Milton (part)	835	835	467.43	0.00	0
				Carnation	1,785	1,785	999.24	999.24	5
Clyde Hill	2,985	2,985	1,671.00	Clyde Hill	2,980	2,980	1,668.20	-2.80	-5
Algona	3,055	3,055	1,710.19	Algona	3,070	3,070	1,718.59	8.40	15
Black Diamond	4,160	4,160	2,328.77	Black Diamond	4,170	4,170	2,334.37	5.60	10
North Bend	5,830	5,830	3,263.63	North Bend	5,855	5,855	3,277.63	13.99	25
Normandy Park	6,345	6,345	3,551.93	Normandy Park	6,350	6,350	3,554.73	2.80	5
Pacific (part)	6,520	6,520	3,649.90	Pacific (part)	6,535	6,535	3,658.29	8.40	15
Duvall	6,715	6,715	3,759.06	Duvall	6,900	6,900	3,862.62	103.56	185
Newcastle	10,410	10,410	5,827.52	Newcastle	10,460	10,460	5,855.51	27.99	50
Woodinville	10,940	10,940	6,124.21	Woodinville	10,960	10,960	6,135.41	11.20	20
Enumclaw (part)	10,920	10,920	6,113.02	Enumclaw (part)	11,030	11,030	6,174.59	61.58	110
Snoqualmie	10,950	10,950	6,129.81	Snoqualmie	11,320	11,320	6,336.94	207.13	370
Lake Forest Park	12,610	12,610	7,059.08	Lake Forest Park	12,640	12,640	7,075.87	16.79	30
Bothell (part)	17,150	17,150	9,600.57	Bothell (part)	17,280	17,280	9,673.34	72.77	130
Covington	17,640	17,640	9,874.87	Covington	17,760	17,760	9,942.05	67.18	120
Tukwila	19,050	19,050	10,664.19	Tukwila	19,080	19,080	10,680.98	16.79	30
Kenmore	20,780	20,780	11,632.64	Kenmore	21,020	21,020	11,767.00	134.35	240
				Mercer Island	22,690	22,690	12,701.86	12,701.86	-20
Maple Valley	22,930	22,930	12,836.21	Maple Valley	23,340	23,340	13,065.73	229.52	410
SeaTac	27,110	27,110	15,176.18	SeaTac	27,210	27,210	15,232.16	55.98	100
Des Moines	29,680	29,680	16,614.86	Des Moines	29,700	29,700	16,626.06	11.20	20
Issaquah	30,690	30,690	17,180.26	Issaquah	31,150	31,150	17,437.77	257.51	460
Sammamish	46,940	46,940	26,277.01	Sammamish	47,420	47,420	26,545.72	268.70	480
Burien	47,660	47,660	26,680.07	Burien	47,730	47,730	26,719.25	39.19	70
Shoreline	53,200	53,200	29,781.36	Shoreline	53,270	53,270	29,820.55	39.19	70
Redmond	55,150	55,150	30,872.97	Redmond	55,360	55,360	30,990.53	117.56	210
Auburn (part)	63,050	63,050	35,295.39	Auburn (part)	63,390	63,390	35,485.72	190.33	340
Kirkland	80,378	70,000	39,186.00	Kirkland	81,480	70,000	39,186.00	0.00	1,102
Federal Way	89,370	70,000	39,186.00	Federal Way	89,460	70,000	39,186.00	0.00	90
Renton	92,590	70,000	39,186.00	Renton	93,910	70,000	39,186.00	0.00	1,320
Kent	118,200	70,000	39,186.00	Kent	119,100	70,000	39,186.00	0.00	900
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>924,728</b>	<b>824,190</b>	<b>\$461,382</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>956,130</b>	<b>852,180</b>	<b>\$477,050</b>	<b>15,668.80</b>	<b>6,912.00</b>