

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
1	7010	Reynolds	Please recap YFS counselor staff FTE allocation by school in 2025-2026 school year and (if different) the head count budgeted for 2026-2027 and 2027-2028	2025-2026 • Mercer Island High School: 1.66 FTE (2 employees) • Islander Middle School: 0.83 FTE + 0.83 LTE (2 employees) • Northwood Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • West Mercer Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Island Park Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Lakeridge Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) 2026-2027 • Mercer Island High School: 1.66 FTE + 0.60 LTE (3 employees) • Islander Middle School: 0.83 FTE + 0.83 LTE (2 employees) • Northwood Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • West Mercer Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Island Park Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Lakeridge Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) 2027-2028 • Mercer Island High School: 1.66 FTE (2 employees) • Islander Middle School: 0.83 FTE + 0.83 LTE (2 employees) • Northwood Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • West Mercer Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Island Park Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee) • Lakeridge Elementary: 0.83 FTE (1 employee)
2	7009	Reynolds	A-19: 1.1 refers to “long-term fiscal outlook. Most of this book (except capital) is focused on two years. Will we see a six-year outlook at the planning session?	The Financial Forecast (AB6997x1) for the 2027-2028 Preliminary Biennial Budget was shared with the City Council at the September 15, 2026 City Council meeting. It included a seven-year projection (2026-2032) for the City’s general government service funds, including the General (001, page 7) and Youth and Family Services (160, page 14) funds.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
3	7009	Reynolds	A-19: If we want to add items to the work plan, when is the appropriate time to bring this up? This meeting? The next meeting? The planning session?	The appropriate timing depends on the type of work item being considered. The October 6 City Council meeting is the appropriate time to discuss and direct changes to the capital budget, including the capital project list. Individual capital projects are not specifically called out in the Work Plan but are generally implied through the capital program. Any addition to the project list would require a corresponding decision to cancel, defer, or postpone another project given available funding and staff capacity. The October 20 City Council meeting is the appropriate time to discuss and direct changes to the operating budget, which supports many of the work items. Any proposed addition should include discussion of the resources needed to complete the work, how those costs would be funded, and impacts to staff capacity or other priorities. It is important that Council provide its budget direction during these two October meetings. November is dedicated to incorporating that direction and preparing the Final 2027–2028 Biennial Budget for Council approval on December 1. Substantive changes requested in November will not provide sufficient time for staff to evaluate and incorporate them into the Final Budget. Requested budget changes should be made by motion to ensure a clear record of City Council action in the meeting minutes and clear direction to the City Manager. The February 5, 2027 Planning Session will focus on financial sustainability and facility planning. The specific work items for these two priorities have intentionally been left open to allow for a more focused discussion with the City Council before the scope and direction of the work is established.
4	7009	Reynolds	B-9: Why is 1% for the arts zero in 2019?	Reflecting no qualified capital projects are expected to contribute 1% in 2028.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
5	7009	Reynolds	B-17: Remind me (again) what the Freeman Landing Reserve is. Can those funds be released?	Use of the reserve is restricted by RCW 35.79.035(3) which states in part that: <i>Moneys received from the vacation may be used by the city or town only for acquiring additional beach or water access, acquiring additional public view sites to a body, or acquiring additional moorage or launching sites.</i> See also AB 5316 .
6	7009	Reynolds	E-5: Some services are shown as long-term debt as a financing strategy. But that only shifts timing. Which of the other columns of the table does the debt service for these items go?	Per the table on E-5, debt service may be used to help finance Utilities (e.g., sewer conveyance, water distribution, and stormwater systems) and Public Buildings (acquisition). This aligns with the City Council’s financial management policies, which state long-term debt may finance large capital investments such as construction of public infrastructure or significant property acquisition (Resolution No. 1667, page 13). From a policy perspective, the City uses debt as a financing strategy to: • Allocate costs appropriately: Intergenerational equity ensures that the costs of long-lived infrastructure improvements are shared between present and future beneficiaries. • Manage cash flow: Spreading out payments reduces the immediate cash strain that would otherwise result from funding substantial public improvements all at once. Yes, debt issuance shifts the timing of the cash outlay. The ongoing debt service (principal and interest repayments) is supported by the ongoing revenue sources tied to those assets. For example, rates utility customers pay for drinking water pay the debt service tied to water system improvements financed by debt.

Question & Answer Matrix
 October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
7	7009	Reynolds	E-7 (though it is labeled as D-7): I note that the majority of the expense for Groveland and Clarke are deferred to 2031. What risk do we run of having to shut down features (docks, swim areas) or lose the right to upgrade certain features as a result of this delay? What is the sequencing of projects for Dragon Park Phase 1? Could the non-accessibility items be moved later to allow faster work on Groveland or Clarke?	Clarke and Groveland were developed in the 1960s and 1970s, and their overwater structures and other amenities are aging and need replacement. The 2023 preliminary assessment indicated that the in-water structures at both parks need to be addressed within the next 5 to 10 years to avoid further deterioration or loss. While delaying the design and permitting work is not ideal, the financial resources available this biennium are insufficient to support this scope of work, which requires a multi-year review involving multiple agencies. Ongoing assessments of these facilities will continue, and closures may be necessary if the structures deteriorate beyond repair. The improvements at Deane's park are funded through the dedicated Mercer Island parks levy, and the funds were approved for playground replacements. The levy funding is also used as a grant match for the various grant programs we are pursuing. These funds cannot be transferred to expedite work at Clarke Beach and Groveland Beach parks. Here is some additional information on the grants being pursued for Deane’s. The City Council authorized applications for two grants, each requiring a 50% match. - Phase I: On July 7, 2026, Council authorized a \$500,000 state grant application (AB 6958) for the initial improvements. The local levy funds committed to the project would satisfy the required match for this grant. - Phase II: On September 15, 2026, Council authorized a \$1,046,000 federal grant application (AB 6996) for potential 2029–2030 improvements. The intent of the Phase II funding strategy was to leverage the Phase I investment: the Phase I grant award and levy funds may provide the matching funds required for the Phase II grant application.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
				If the City Council reallocated the levy funding from Deane’s to another playground, the City would need to withdraw the grant applications mentioned above. For City Council awareness, the City’s most recent grant application to the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office was impacted by the City’s non-compliance with the Growth Management Act per the GMHB order related to the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, which resulted in a loss of points during the preliminary scoring process. The City is now in compliance with the Growth Management Act and does not expect this issue to affect future applications; at this time, it is too soon to know whether the lost points will ultimately affect this grant award.
8	7009	Reynolds	E-10: Ground water intrusion sounds like a big deal. What is the additional risk we are creating by deferring this work to 2029?	A 2026 investigation identified localized water intrusion at the gymnasium egress doors and where electrical conduits enter the electrical room, rather than a widespread below-grade groundwater issue. Due to this investigative work, the scope of work was modified and “right sized.” Deferring the full improvements until 2029 does not create significant additional risk. The scope and cost of improvements – including egress door canopies, weatherstripping replacement, and conduit sealing where needed – will be refined in 2029 to address the identified issues.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
9	7009	Reynolds	E-13: Naively, 745K sounds like a lot for planning (the title). Is this really just for planning or does it include doing the construction? Is it decided yet what functions will be housed in that building once the work is done	The \$745,000 covers planning and construction, including roofing and parapet flashing replacement, replacement of the rooftop HVAC unit and a mini-split heat pump, fire-water line repairs, localized parking lot repairs, and minor interior repairs. The funding also supports workspace preparation, security, door access, and Wi-Fi for initial occupancy. Staff workspaces and hoteling areas are planned, with specific departments and occupancy needs to be confirmed as the space plan is finalized. We'll update the title to "9655 Building Planning and Improvements" to better reflect this scope. The City Manager will be discussing the 9655 occupancy plan at the February 5, 2027 Planning Session. The short-term plan is to make use of as much as the facility as possible to re-house City services. The long-term plan for 9655 depends on the plan to re-house police and emergency response services.
10	7009	Reynolds	E-19: Do we have any reason to believe any of our pipes are lead?	The EPA requires the City to prepare and maintain an inventory of service line materials. Work completed in 2025 (Phase 1) did not identify any lead within the City's distribution system. Although the City's asset inventory is robust, information about some galvanized service lines and connection components is incomplete, requiring further investigation. Phase 2 will focus on identifying the materials of the remaining unknown service lines, including connections at the water main and customer-side supply lines. Once Phase 2 is complete, the City will have a better understanding of the system and can develop a program to replace service lines from the water main to the meter, as needed. Customers or homeowners would be responsible for replacing private supply lines on their side of the meter.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
11	7009	Reynolds	E-22: Does the word “Catchup” in the title imply we are operating unlicensed software at this time?	No. The word “Catchup” is meant to indicate that we are “catching up” to Microsoft’s latest offerings.
12	7009	Reynolds	E-24: The title has the word “plan”, but I thought the plan was largely done. Is this actually a budget for implementation? If so, what is actually being built?	The EV Plan is drafted and will be sent to the City Council later this week for review, anticipating adoption in Q1 2027. Yes, the \$150,000 budget is a placeholder for implementation and to fund future projects. It could be used to support installation of EV chargers at City-owned sites. We’ll update the title to “EV Charging Infrastructure Implementation” to clarify the scope.
13	7009	Reynolds	E-34 and E-37 and E-50: Of the various road projects being planned, which are on streets where the PBF called for bike lanes to be installed? Are bike lanes going to be installed for these projects? (My question pertains to Gallagher Hill Road and North Mercer Way and Mercerwood as examples, but it applies equally to all road projects.)	E-34 will install a bike lane along the south bound (uphill) lane on Gallagher Hill Road. There are currently no plans to install a bike lane as part of E-37. Bike lanes will be considered during E-50 project scope development.
14	7009	Reynolds	E-40: The project cost is shown as 160K, but we have grant for 320 K. How can the grant be more than the project cost?	A total of \$160,000 is budgeted in 2026, with the remaining \$160,000 grant funds budgeted in 2027. Staff estimate all grant funds will be fully spent in the next biennium.
15	7009	Reynolds	E-63: What is motivating prioritizing this project?	Trail lighting improvements to increase pedestrian and bicyclist visibility are identified in the Aubrey Davis Park Master Plan following frequent resident requests. The City’s current Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan and Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) schedules the project for implementation in 2027-2028. As proposed, the project is fully grant funded and will only move forward if grant funding is secured.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
16	7009	Reynolds	E-75: What are “backyards” in this context?	“Backyard sewers” is a term first coined in the 2003 General Sewer Plan and describes sewer mains that are located outside of the public right of way and found commonly in resident “backyards.” Access to these sewers is difficult due to either terrain, landscaping, fences, or other improvements, or lack of accurate easement information and documentation which make maintenance difficult or impossible. The 2003 General Sewer Plan identifies approximately 250 mains as meeting this definition. Project ID 90.30.0002 specifically targets the more than 100 locations that would be fixed through installation of a cleanout or manhole.
17	7009	Weinberg	E-79: I’m trying to get a feel for the overall size of the lake line project. The Reach 1 project on page E-79 has budget of \$12.7m. Reach 2 on page E-84 is \$4.2m for the “Map and Model” portion. How many reaches are there? Was reach 1 the first one we addressed in the project? Is each reach likely to need both “Map & Model” and “Replacement” phases? Will they all likely be in the same general size range, adjusting for inflation, as those phases were for reaches 1 & 2? Just trying to get a general idea of how much iceberg there is below the surface on this one – and how much of that iceberg our generation can realistically expect to chisel off.	There are five reaches totaling approximately 10.8 miles, all installed between the mid-1950s and late-1960s. Reaches 1 through 5 are approximately 2.4, 5.0, 1.4, 0.3, and 1.7 miles long, respectively. To date, only Reach 3, located on the northwest side of the Island, has been replaced (2011). Our current efforts are focused on Reach 1 due to multiple sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) that have occurred at the upstream end of the reach, near Pump Station 25. Following the most recent SSO, the Department of Ecology issued a regulatory order requiring corrective action by December 31, 2028. The City is working to meet the requirements of that order. Although we are still in the data-gathering and assessment phase, the estimated \$12.7 million represents a conservative planning-level cost for replacing a portion of the Reach 1 lakeline between Pump Stations 25 and 24, approximately 3,000 feet in length. Each Reach, except for Reach 3 (replaced in 2011), is expected to need a Map and Model. The map is necessary to identify the current alignment and profile of the lakeline, and the model is necessary to drive future CIP and planning decisions.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
18	7009	Weinberg	E-81: Do we know whether King County’s recent sewer system enhancement project at the north end expanded the system capacity in anticipation of increased population? If it did expand capacity, do we know whether that expansion is in proportion to what is required in HB 1491 – or is that what the update to the GSP will determine?	King County has confirmed that improvements included in the North Mercer Island/Enatai Sewer Upgrade Project account for future growth; however, the specific growth assumptions and supporting details have not been shared with the City. As a note, the design capacity of the County’s North Mercer Pump Station has more than doubled, increasing from 5.17 million gallons per day (MGD) to 10.53 MGD, as a result of the project.
19	7009	Weinberg	E-24: Does the 2027-2028 portion of implementing the EV charging infrastructure plan currently include completing the EV charging stations at the Tully’s site? There is significant need already for public EV chargers in Town Center. Also, considering its proximity to light rail and the freeway, King County has expressed willingness to help cover the cost. All we need to do is ask.	The proposed 2027–2028 budget supports EV charging installations at City-owned sites. Staff plan to bring the draft EV Plan, including implementation recommendations, to the City Council in Q1 2027 for review and guidance. The specific installation scope and timing will be finalized following that discussion. Although King County has expressed a willingness to cover some of the costs, all grant applications are not equal and the County is not offering to cover the full costs, which is problematic. Many require additional matching City funding and have additional requirements that may limit the application and use of funding. Staff will talk with King County again and explore additional grant funding options once a scope is identified for implementation.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
20	7009	Weinberg	A-13: What is the city’s approximate total debt carrying capacity? Will the \$26m in sewer bonds we plan to issue in 2027 bring us close to that limit? Other than affordability impacts (i.e. higher water & sewer rates), what other risks are there of approaching that limit (e.g. the Aaa rating)?	The amount of debt a government may incur is limited by the State constitution (constitutional debt limit) and individual statutes (statutory debt limit). Debt limits are based on total taxable property value and vary by type of government. Debt that is not voter-approved is limited to 1.5% of assessed value for all local jurisdiction types. When debt has been approved by three-fifths of the voters, total allowable debt increases to 5% of assessed value. Based on 2025 Assessed valuation, the City’s estimated non-voted debt capacity (1.5% of AV) exceeds \$300 million. Even with the additional \$26 million in Sewer debt the City will remain well below the limit and no impacts to the current bond rating are anticipated.
21	7009	Weinberg	A-14: Is \$3.3m about the practical limit of what a city can borrow from the Public Works Trust Fund, or is there more capacity there? I presume the State’s trust fund isn’t large enough for us to use it instead of pursuing our current plan of issuing \$26m in sewer bonds in 2027. Correct?	Correct. The Public Works Trust fund is limited by the resources available in each funding cycle. The process for applying for project funding is also very competitive as jurisdictions statewide are applying for limited available funds. In the 2027 application cycle (applications due June 2026) the Public Works Board had \$202 million available and limited each jurisdiction applicant to a maximum of \$10 million. The City submitted an application requesting \$4.09 million for pump station rehabilitation to support construction costs specific to the Pump Station 20 Replacement Project (90.30.0005). The funding application was denied by the Public Works Board in August on the basis of the City’s non-compliance with the Growth Management Act per the GMHB order related to the 2024 Comp Plan Update. The City is now in compliance, but unfortunately that came too late for the last round of PW Board applications.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
22	7009	Weinberg	E-87,88,89: Are pump stations' backup diesel generators located within the pump stations? Do they emit diesel smoke directly into the air at the station location? Are there any pump stations whose backup generators are located nearby but not on-site in order to reduce the environmental impact on neighboring homes?	Backup diesel generators were not installed at each station until the 1980s, so their proximity to the pump stations they serve varies. At the time, factors such as the location of existing utility poles and the amount of available right-of-way likely guided placement decisions. As a result, generators are located either directly adjacent to their station or within about 500 feet. Street ends and street shoulders were favored. All generators exhaust to the atmosphere, but current installations are regulated by emissions and noise. All replacement generators meet EPA Tier 3 emissions standards and are equipped with sound-attenuating enclosures or placed in below-grade vaults to ensure compliance with residential noise limitations.
23	7009	Weinberg	E-123: Does this mean we expect to have the last AC mains decommissioned and replaced by end of 2030?	Yes. This is the final phase of the AC main work.
24	7009	Weinberg	E-127 and E-128: Will these projects factor in the long-term density changes likely to result from HB 1491?	Yes. Both projects will account for anticipated additional growth associated with HB 1491. Once the planned density is known, the project scopes will be adjusted as needed to address the resulting infrastructure needs, which may include upsizing pipes or making other modifications. These changes will be incorporated into project designs before construction, based on updated water system modeling that uses the new growth targets.
25	7009	Reynolds	You have effectively provided a six-year forecast of the CIP expenditures. Is there an equivalent forecast of the associated fund balance? Perhaps I missed it in the packet.	At the September 15 City Council meeting, staff provided a six-year forecast on the Capital Improvement Fund. Please see Table 1 and Table 2 below. Table 1 is from AB 6997x1. Table 2 illustrates the work completed by the City Council Finance Ad Hoc Committee to help stabilize Fund 320 given the limited resources projected through 2028 and beyond.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
26	7009:	Reynolds	A-12: Two departments show decreasing FTE head count from 2026 to 2027 and one shows an increase. What is driving these changes in head count? It looks like CPD is a net INCREASE if one adds in LTE. Are some positions moving from FTE to LTE, and, if so, why? Why is parks facilities going from 0 to 5 FTE in 2027?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
27	7009	Reynolds	A-15: Should I read "Recreation" on this and similar tables to include all of parks and recreation?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
28	7009	Reynolds	A-16: I always had a rule of thumb in my head that salary and benefits are 70% (approx.) of general fund budget. It now looks like 46%. I presume this is because I need to add in contractual services to get to (just over) 70. Am I correct that contractual services is mostly fire to EFR? What else is in that category?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
29	7009	Reynolds	B-3: I see property tax going up only 1% from 2026 to 2027? Does this mean we are assuming no new construction? Why? Don't we usually get 1-2% per year?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
30	7009	Reynolds	B-3: Why is CPD expenditure zero in 2027 and 2028? Is it flowing through the now separate fund? If so, when did that start and why do we see non-zero numbers in 2025 and 2026?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
31	7009	Reynolds	B-8: I note the contingency fund balance is flat. What is our target? Are we over or under target?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
32	7009	Reynolds	B-31: Am I correct that the retiree LTC does NOT flow through the pension fund? Where does it show up? Are we on track with our prior funding plan?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
33	7009	Reynolds	C-4: Why is LEOFF LTC showing as REVENUE?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
34	7009	Reynolds	C-6: Does the sales tax forecast take into account that SB 6346 has eliminated sales tax on some items?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
35	7009	Reynolds	C-11: My understanding is that MI effectively does not allow marijuana shops because everything in a commercial or retail zone is too close to a school or park. Is that correct? If so, why do we get a share of the excise tax?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
36	7009	Reynolds	C-12: What is the rationale between the big difference in the growth of fire insurance premium tax from 2027 (7.1%) to 2028 (0%)?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
37	7009	Reynolds	C-13: How do the ambulance fees to the user compare for EFR BLS and Medic One?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
38	7009	Reynolds	D-3 (and others): There is a big variation in the growth rate for employee benefits by department. Most appear to be down (surprising), but not all, and not by close to the same amount. Why the inconsistency?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.

Question & Answer Matrix
October 6, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	Staff Response
39	7009	Reynolds	D-3: Why were there no public defense expenditure in 2025 and 2026?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
40	7009	Reynolds	D-3: Why the big jump in city clerk expenses from 2026 to 2027?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
41	7009	Reynolds	D-5: Why the big drop in prosecution & Criminal Mgt, and Public Records Requests, from 2026 to 2027?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
42	7009	Reynolds	D-15: Why is there no ambulance transport fee revenue from 2026-2028?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
43	7009	Reynolds	D-15: What is GEMT?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
44	7009	Reynolds	D-17: Where would I see the revenue from other cities that outsource their court services to us?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.
45	7009	Weinberg	B-25: Please tell me more about the "Permitting Fee-in-lieu" line item. What fee is being paid, by whom, and what actions are they not performing by paying the fee? Does this process make sense because the city has more expertise in stormwater management and can perform the associated actions more efficiently than the party paying the fee? Why does the fee-in-lieu line item drop to zero in 2027 and 2028?	This question relates to the operations budget discussion that is planned for the October 20 City Council Meeting. This question will be moved to the October 20 City Council Q&A Matrix and staff will prepare a response prior to that meeting.

Table 1 – Capital Improvement Fund (320) Financial Forecast

RESOURCES (\$ in thousands)	2026F	2027F	2028F	2029F	2030F	2031F	2032F
Beginning Fund Balance (Includes Reserves)	\$6,782	\$805	\$4,177	\$1,889	\$2,267	\$1,837	\$2,787
REVENUES							
Property Tax	1,178	1,195	1,212	1,232	1,253	1,274	1,284
Real Estate Excise Tax	2,642	2,179	2,230	2,345	2,466	2,595	2,731
Grants	251	5,645	841	0	0	0	0
Impact Fees	21	25	25	25	25	25	25
Shared Revenues	1,271	632	290	290	290	290	290
Miscellaneous Revenues	306	210	250	250	250	250	250
Interfund Transfers	1,311	155	0	0	1,700	0	0
Total Revenues	6,979	10,040	4,848	4,142	5,984	4,434	4,580
Total Fund Resources	13,761	10,845	9,025	6,031	8,251	6,271	7,368
EXPENDITURES							
Bonds and Reserves	137	140	137	139	142	145	148
Project Management Expenses	2,372	1,086	1,119	1,149	1,181	1,213	1,246
Public Buildings	1,061	4,083	3,618	1,523	3,133	1,308	3,084
Parks and Natural Resources	9,386	1,359	2,263	952	1,959	818	1,929
Total Expenditures	12,956	6,668	7,136	3,763	6,415	3,484	6,407
Ending Fund Balance (Includes Reserves)	\$805	\$4,177	\$1,889	\$2,267	\$1,837	\$2,787	\$961
FUND RESERVES							
Operating Fund Balance minimum	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
King County Parks Levy	0	0	0	283	578	884	1,191
Turf Fields Replacement Sinking Fund	955	1,155	1,355	1,555	55	255	455
Impact Fees	29	54	79	104	129	154	179
Reserve - Freeman Landing	330	330	330	330	330	330	330
Reserve - RCO property	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
Unreserved	(652)	2,495	(18)	(148)	602	1,021	(1,337)
Ending Fund Balance (Gross)	\$805	\$4,177	\$1,889	\$2,267	\$1,837	\$2,787	\$961

Note: Slight differences may occur due to rounding.

Table 2 – Finance Ad Hoc Committee Support

Fund 320 Projection <i>(\$ in millions)</i>	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032
<i>As of Sept 2026, pending further analysis</i>							
Before - Ad Hoc Committee							
Beginning Fund Balance <i>(Includes Reserves)</i>	\$ 6.6	\$ 5.2	\$ (0.0)	\$ (9.0)	\$ (20.6)	\$ (30.9)	\$ (28.0)
Total Revenues	8.3	5.6	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.5
Total Expenditures	9.7	10.8	12.9	15.7	14.5	1.5	1.5
Ending Fund Balance <i>(Including Reserves)</i>	\$ 5.2	\$ (0.0)	\$ (9.0)	\$ (20.6)	\$ (30.9)	\$ (28.0)	\$ (25.0)
After - Ad Hoc Committee							
Beginning Fund Balance <i>(Includes Reserves)</i>	6.8	0.8	4.2	1.9	2.3	1.8	2.8
Total Revenues	7.0	10.0	4.8	4.1	6.0	4.4	4.6
Total Expenditures	13.0	6.7	7.1	3.8	6.4	3.5	6.4
Ending Fund Balance <i>(Including Reserves)</i>	\$ 0.8	\$ 4.2	\$ 1.9	\$ 2.3	\$ 1.8	\$ 2.8	\$ 1.0

Note: Slight difference may occur due to rounding.