

**Financial Sustainability Task Force  
Draft Meeting Summary for September 11, 2013**

Attending:

<b>Panel Members:</b>			
Pierson Clair	X	Ryan Mudie	
Scott Ramsey	X	Christopher Tracy	X
Tyler Shillito		Toby Murray	
Eve Bowen	X	Andrew Buelow	
Jenny Harris	X	Robert Marsh	X
Reggie Frederick	X	Lyle Quasim	
Ken Kingsbury	X	Allan Trinkwald	
Lois Bernstein	X	Troy Goodman	X
Jim Leonard	X	Gary Gilchrist	
Alice A Phillips			
<b>Alternate Members:</b>			
William King	X	Kit Evans	X
Budd Wagner		Nick Leider (audience)	
Ruth Smith		Bill Dickens	
Matt Frank		Emily Hall	X
Terry Krause		Bruce Kendall	
Brian Haynes		Mary Byrne	
David Schroedel	X		
<b>Staff and Others<sup>1</sup>:</b>			
Karen Reed (facilitator)	✓	Danielle Larson	✓
Andy Cherullo	✓	Tyler Aitken	
Tadd Wille	✓	Teresa Green	
Ebony Peebles			
Susan Ramirez	✓		

**Welcome and Introductions.** The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

Karen Reed, the facilitator, reviewed the agenda.

**Review and Approval of Today's Agenda, Housekeeping Items**

Karen presented the meeting structure and agenda and homework.

**Approval of Meeting Summary.** The meeting summary from Meeting 5 was reviewed. *The minutes were approved as submitted.*

**Review/action: Consensus Problem Statement**

---

<sup>1</sup> Only those individuals sitting at the head table or giving presentations to the Task Force are included on this list. A number of other staff attended the meeting.

There were a few requests for information and the information gathered was provided and posted to the web.

Andy noted that additional information regarding the Convention Center will be provided.

Two articles from today's Tacoma News Tribune were mentioned regarding City funding to help prevent collapse of historical buildings and the other on the potential sale of City property on Jefferson Street. Andy noted there is a proposal before Council creating a Historic Building Preservation Fund. – Currently the City has a Dangerous Building Fund which used to demolish a building when it is unsafe. The proposal would carve-out a portion of that fund to be used for preserving historic buildings, and providing a mechanism to recover money spent by the City for remedial actions.

Regarding the potential Jefferson Street property sale, there was only one respondent to the City's Request for Proposals to sell the Jefferson Street property and the respondent did not specify any proposed redevelopment for the site. There is about \$12 million in debt on the property.

A question was asked regarding yet another article regarding the acquisition of a piece of property from Sound Transit. Andy will find out if the acquisition was to correct a City right-of-way issue.

### **Proposed Consensus Statement on Budget Gap**

The group discussed the consensus statement. *The group agreed that statement reflects their discussion from the last meeting. A request was made to add a qualifying statement that the consensus is "based on the City's forecast" and the group agreed.* It was noted that the draft includes reference to information provided to the Task Force, which would include the forecast.

### **Discussion: Criteria for Task Force Definitions – opening discussion on defining terms. Presentation and Discussion:**

Discussion ensued regarding definitions for three key terms in the Panel's mission statement::

- Fiscal Sustainability? What are key components of this?
- Competitiveness?
- Fiscal Integrity?

Karen will present a write-up of the input at the next meeting.

### **Review Task Force "Homework: "Ideas on Short Term and Long Term Revenue and Expenditure Ideas**

Karen asked the group to review the handout from the homework assignment which collated the entire set of responses from the Task Force on short term and long term revenue and expenditure ideas. It was noted that there was considerable overlap between the short term and long term expenditure reductions.

Karen suggested the group should identify ideas around which there is a consensus and forward a potentially prioritized consensus list as part of the final Task Force report. She will present a

draft proposal for a process to do this later in the meeting. Between now and the next meeting, the staff will provide rough information on the magnitude of savings and revenue for each idea, as well as the implementation path for the ideas (is a state law change needed? Is it bargainable with unions? Etc.)

If there are additional items to be added to the list, forward them to Karen.

**Panel Work Plan:**

**a. Review/Potential Action: Report back from Benchmarking Subcommittee**

The subcommittee has met. Their findings and recommendations will be presented at the September 25 meeting.

**b. Recommendations for Potential Panel Discussion with Port and Others**

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the Task Force would like to hear a panel discussion with the Port and / or other government representatives regarding how they work with the City to support the greater Tacoma community and the City's budget challenges. The group agreed it did not want a larger Panel discussion but was interested in receiving additional information on how the Port participates in these issues, with some relevant comparisons to how Ports in Seattle, Vancouver, Everett and Bellingham work with their host cities. City staff will work with Port staff to develop this information for the October 16 meeting. A Port representative will attend that meeting in case there are questions; a panel presentation can be presented later if the group desires.

**c. Livability Issues/Other Possible Work Plan Items: Next Steps?** The consensus of the group is that they will not have capacity to delve deeply in this issue and a panel discussion should not be calendared.

Karen outlined a general proposed process for selecting the final Task Force recommendations. The first step would be for Karen to consolidate the ideas list to eliminate duplicates and for staff to provide the initial "topline" analysis. The next step would be for each member of the Task Force to rank each idea; this would be through an offline "homework" assignment. Then, the group would discuss the results and do a further round of prioritization. *The group was generally in support of this two-step approach.* At the next meeting, the group will be asked to refine the proposal, and the consolidated, roughly analyzed list will be presented.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:49pm