

From: James Ogonowski <james.m.ogonowski@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2025 4:30 PM

To: Council <council@edmondswa.gov>

Subject: Budget Amendment

Councilmembers,

With the city officially withholding payments to South County Fire following annexation on June 1st, there are still some loose ends to address, particularly regarding the additional money saved by annexation. To date, the city has paid SCF \$4,995,316 in 2025 per our previous contract's terms and conditions. We had budgeted \$12,100,000 for the fire district contract, resulting in a savings of approximately \$7.1 million for the remainder of the year – about \$1 million per month.

Our General Fund burn rate for the first four months of the year was about \$5 million per month, which included fire contract costs. Without those costs going forward, the approximately \$1 million per month savings represents 20% of our monthly expenditures! The question now is, where is this \$1 million per month going?

As being responsible for the city's budget, the Council must demand a budget amendment to reallocate these funds since the current budget line item is no longer applicable. There is no contract to expense against.

With \$7 million at stake, this is not a trivial matter and cannot be overlooked. If you want to repair the city's financial position and accountability moving forward, start now by demanding full transparency. Ideally, the city should bring this forward at the next city council meeting for your review and approval. The amendment should include where the money is proposed to be reallocated and how the fund balance changes as a result.

This must be done before you determine the levy lid lift amount you will propose to the citizens.

Jim Ogonowski

From: James Ogonowski <james.m.ogonowski@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 8:53 PM

To: Council <council@edmondswa.gov>

Cc: Teresa Wippel <teresa@myedmondsnews.com>; Edmonds Beacon Editor <edmondseditoryourbeacon@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Consent Agenda & Budget Amendment

Councilmembers,

Just a reminder that you should remove the Resolution Expressing Operational Budget Impacts for 2026 from the consent agenda. I have repeatedly asked for documentation which authorizes the city to pay South County Fire after the contract was terminated upon annexation into the RFA (June 1, 2025) and have received no response. Without a signed, valid contract, I see no requirement for further expenditures - saving the city \$7 million for the remainder of the year. Hence the resolution as proposed is inaccurate and misleading (saying it nicely). You were elected to represent the citizens of Edmonds. If the RFA has a problem, don't make it your problem. The RFA negotiated, reviewed and signed the annexation documents just as the city did after your review and vote to authorize the mayor to sign said documents. No excuses.

Since the savings to the General Fund represents 12% of the operating budget, the next step should be a budget amendment which reflects this fact. The reallocation of the budget and fund balances should be

adjusted accordingly. The budget is a City Council responsibility and a public process. After the budget amendment, then the resolution can be revisited.

Thank you,
Jim

From: James Ogonowski <james.m.ogonowski@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 9:09 AM
To: Council <council@edmondswa.gov>
Subject: Consent Agenda & Budget Amendment

Councilmembers,

I noticed that in the consent agenda for next week the "Resolution Expressing Operational Budget Impacts for 2026" is in it. I would encourage you to remove it from the consent agenda and table it until some future date once you approve the upcoming budget amendment. Now that you know of a material change to the budget as a result of annexation into the RFA, I believe you are fiduciarily obligated (if not required by the state) to amend the budget. A \$7 million dollar savings in expense as a result of the fire contract termination on June 1st represents 12% of the General Fund operating budget. The reallocation of those funds must be disclosed.

Once the budget is amended then you'll be able to reevaluate Scenario 3 with updated numbers. That should give us a more realistic view of our current financial situation.

Jim Ogonowski

Good morning Diane,

This is just to confirm I received this and to thank you for including me in the email.

I will absolutely give this some thought.

I hope you are enjoying this beautiful Edmonds weather.

Mike



Mike Rosen | Mayor

121 5th Avenue N | Edmonds WA 98020

425.771.0246 (office) | 425.771.0252 (Fax)

Mike.rosen@edmondswa.gov

www.edmondswa.gov

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from the City of Edmonds are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

From: Diane Buckshnis <d.buckshnis@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 8:51 AM

To: Dotsch, Michelle <michelle.dotsch@edmondswa.gov>; Chen, Will <will.chen@edmondswa.gov>

Cc: Olson, Vivian <Vivian.Olson@edmondswa.gov>; James Ogonowski <james.m.ogonowski@hotmail.com>;

Rosen, Mike <mike.rosen@edmondswa.gov>; Niall McShane <nialljmcshane@gmail.com>

Subject: General Fund changes in General Fund Report

Good Morning,

Looks like I have this Council oversight report created by Scott James (at a request of CM Mesaros) dating back to 2015 info.

Recently, many people have reached out to me about understanding our financials and how confusing they

have become especially in 2023. You already know my opinion of Dave Turley and his arranging attitude and how he ignored us and was allowed to by Nelson without sanction for insubordination. I hope the 2023 audit will provide clarity. The city financials need better footnotes and explanations.

Citizens deserve better explanations and in my opinion Nelson's management practices are still prevalent with the lack of transparency and respect towards citizens questions or opinions.

Please reinstate this report and provide clarity to the significant change that occurred in 2023.

Thank you all for your service and dedication to Edmonds,
Diane

GENERAL FUND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 (Jan-Sept) | 2020 (Jan-Sept) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Beginning Fund Balance | 6,446,380 | 9,359,435 | 9,841,718 | 10,273,343 | 11,233,278 | 15,552,188 |
| Revenue | | | | | | |
| Taxes | 28,714,539 | 29,403,794 | 29,572,203 | 30,755,578 | 20,263,957 | 19,831,968 |
| Licenses and permits | 2,132,897 | 2,269,313 | 2,506,800 | 2,401,855 | 1,684,252 | 1,709,258 |
| Intergovernmental | 977,585 | 1,261,998 | 890,572 | 1,014,434 | 579,661 | 783,705 |
| Charges for services | 5,150,816 | 5,403,786 | 5,463,913 | 5,810,961 | 4,835,973 | 3,971,068 |
| Fines and forfeitures | 535,078 | 522,051 | 459,929 | 616,783 | 401,348 | 224,158 |
| Investment earnings | 70,045 | (26,712) | 154,739 | 273,226 | 342,041 | 269,313 |
| Miscellaneous | 435,414 | 441,432 | 471,675 | 931,495 | 513,469 | 172,214 |
| Transfers in | 822,175 | 82,695 | 26,300 | 75,884 | 13,150 | 17,900 |
| Debt proceeds | - | 549,095 | - | - | - | - |
| Sale of capital assets | - | 58,451 | 7,143 | - | 5,273 | - |
| Insurance recoveries | - | - | - | - | 15,570 | - |
| Total Revenue | 38,838,549 | 39,965,902 | 39,553,274 | 41,901,058 | 28,633,850 | 26,979,585 |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| General government | 8,836,333 | 9,969,187 | 9,714,867 | 10,288,694 | 8,718,500 | 8,910,091 |
| Public safety | 19,371,912 | 20,128,896 | 22,228,871 | 22,585,212 | 17,584,076 | 17,466,356 |
| Transportation | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | 4,779 | 4,177 | 4,177 |
| Economic environment | 1,353,548 | 1,313,430 | 1,551,152 | 1,460,763 | 1,149,187 | 1,219,800 |
| Mental and physical health | 69,762 | 70,814 | 126,791 | 178,859 | 100,775 | 199,302 |
| Culture and recreation | 3,591,029 | 3,773,633 | 3,959,731 | 4,331,806 | 3,211,849 | 2,772,409 |
| Debt service | 272,793 | 196,663 | 198,361 | 197,694 | 7,023 | 69,285 |
| Capital outlay | 92,202 | 56,662 | 90,573 | 93,105 | 10,296 | 9,053 |
| Transfers out | 2,334,315 | 3,414,141 | 1,247,703 | 1,800,212 | 625,579 | 449,033 |
| Debt refunding | - | 556,593 | - | - | - | - |
| Total Expenditures | 35,925,494 | 39,483,619 | 39,121,649 | 40,941,124 | 31,411,462 | 31,099,506 |
| Prior Period Adjustments | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Change in position | 2,913,055 | 482,283 | 431,625 | 959,934 | (2,777,612) | (4,119,921) |
| Ending Fund Balance | 9,359,435 | 9,841,718 | 10,273,343 | 11,233,278 | 8,455,666 | 11,432,267 |

CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 Preliminary |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Beginning Fund Balance | 11,233,279 | 15,552,188 | 13,868,744 | 15,915,322 |
| Revenue | 30,846,665 | 30,738,452 | 32,979,704 | 34,129,072 |
| Expenditures | (2,299,972) | (2,276,861) | (2,453,186) | (2,568,363) |
| Change in position | 1,008,432 | 1,633,633 | 1,608,646 | 1,359,083 |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 6,419,836 | 5,412,044 | 5,913,557 | 6,281,412 |
| Revenue | 496,093 | 287,693 | 272,302 | 182,880 |
| Expenditures | (573,806) | (265,627) | (122,257) | (266,012) |
| Change in position | 587,882 | 322,816 | 347,519 | 368,221 |
| Ending Fund Balance | 42,232,686 | 40,937,126 | 43,697,171 | 45,155,043 |
| Revenue | 4,793,650 | 1,535,800 | 388,547 | 26,300 |
| Expenditures | - | - | - | - |
| Change in position | - | 16,977 | - | - |
| Ending Fund Balance | 47,026,336 | 42,489,903 | 44,085,718 | 45,181,343 |
| Revenue | 11,565,563 | 12,514,526 | 11,866,885 | 13,238,057 |
| Expenditures | (23,036,185) | (23,759,212) | (22,765,260) | (26,056,589) |
| Change in position | 5,012 | 5,012 | 2,088 | - |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 1,562,702 | 1,675,334 | 1,991,624 | 2,254,742 |
| Revenue | 164,888 | 147,957 | 84,642 | 38,676 |
| Expenditures | (4,158,397) | (3,732,644) | (4,341,658) | (5,026,796) |
| Change in position | 197,967 | 296,624 | 60,228 | 321,989 |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 110,935 | 835,048 | 268,885 | 694,570 |
| Ending Fund Balance | 40,801,649 | 42,966,358 | 41,381,270 | 47,631,420 |
| Revenue | 1,905,778 | 1,206,990 | 657,870 | 885,000 |
| Expenditures | - | - | - | - |
| Change in position | - | - | - | - |
| Ending Fund Balance | 42,707,427 | 44,173,348 | 42,039,140 | 48,516,420 |
| Revenue | - | - | - | - |
| Expenditures | - | - | - | - |
| Change in position | - | - | - | - |
| Ending Fund Balance | 4,318,909 | (1,683,445) | 2,046,578 | (3,335,077) |
| Total Ending Fund Balance | 15,552,188 | 13,868,744 | 15,915,322 | 12,580,245 |

Attachment: Jan-Sept P&L (September 2020 Quarterly Financial Report)

Attachment: Jan-Dec 2022 P&L (Preliminary December 2022 Monthly Financial Report)

Packet Pg. 79

Packet Pg.

Following is another example. Had the city respected my request, the city could have possibly saved hundreds of thousands of dollars later paid out to settle the Sherman Pruitt situation. My request was made long before Sherman Pruitt applied for the position of Police Chief. Mike Nelson apparently believed he had no duty to follow basic law - just like Jeff Taraday.

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 6:37 AM

To: Council@edmondswa.gov <Council@edmondswa.gov>; Judge, Maureen <Maureen.Judge@edmondswa.gov>

Cc: Michael Nelson <michael.nelson@edmondswa.gov>; Neill Hoyson, Jessica <Jessica.NeillHoyson@edmondswa.gov>; Jeff Taraday <jeff@lighthouselawgroup.com>

Subject: Formal Request for Code Enforcement

Dear City Council,

The review of Appointive Office vacancies, appointment authority and confirmation process are governed by ECC 2.10.010. It is a simple, easy process to accomplish legally under the Edmonds City Code (ECC). I just provided you an example of how this is done legally – the 2016 appointment of Mary Ann Hardy as HR Director.

Steps in this process include:

1. The mayor **SHALL** begin recruitment of candidates to fill vacant appointive offices no later than 30 days after the latter of the two city council actions described in subsections (A) and (C) of this section; **ECC 2.10.010(F)**
2. The mayor or his/her designee will review all applications and determine the persons with the highest qualifications. Any city council member, upon request to the mayor, may review the applications received for a vacant position. Additionally and/or alternatively, the city council may evaluate the qualifications of an applicant for public employment in executive session pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(g). **ECC 2.10.010(B)**
3. The city council **SHALL** interview the top three candidates for each position **PRIOR** to the mayor's appointment; provided, that the city council may waive the three-interview requirement by motion adopted by a majority plus one of the full council and may opt to interview as few as two candidates for any vacant appointive office; **ECC 2.10.010(D)**
4. The mayor **SHALL** appoint, subject to council confirmation, the appointive officers. **ECC 2.10.010(D)**
5. City Council confirms the Mayor's appointment of an appointive officer. **ECC 2.10.010(D)**

On February 18, 2020, 49 days after the Police Chief position became vacant at end of day December 31, 2020, it was announced that Mayor Mike Nelson **WILL be using** a competitive process in order to determine his selection for appointment to the position of Police Chief.

Mayor Nelson or his/her designee was required to review all applications(plural) and determine the persons(plural) with the highest qualifications.

On April 9, 2020, Mayor Mike Nelson announced his appointment of Police Chief. When Mayor Nelson did so, Council had not yet interviewed any candidates. Mayor Nelson's April 9, 2020 action clearly was an appointment because he clearly stated his action was subject to Council Confirmation. He then stopped recruiting candidates.

A request was also made on July 21, 2020 to extend an acting directorship 21 days after the acting term had expired. This was not a legal request. **ECC 2.10.040(B)**

Please hold Mayor Mike Nelson accountable for all violations of **ECC 2.10**.

Thank you.

Ken Reidy

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 5:42 AM

To: Joe Scordino <joe.scordino@yahoo.com>; Diane Buckshnis <d.buckshnis@comcast.net>; Dianna Maish <dmm98020@comcast.net>; CLINTON WRIGHT <clint_patwright@comcast.net>; John Brock <jbrock11401@gmail.com>

Subject: Fw: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

FYI - the city has a history of ignoring Formal Requests for Code Enforcement and simply refusing to interact with the party filing the complaint. I can provide several examples of this. See one such example below. Ken

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 6:20 AM
To: Phil Williams <phil.williams@edmondswa.gov>; Dave Earling <dave.earling@edmondswa.gov>
Cc: Jeff Taraday <jeff@lighthouselawgroup.com>; Shane Hope <shane.hope@edmondswa.gov>
Subject: Re: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

Mayor Earling and Mr. Williams,
Not only does the City have different rules for different people, it also responds differently to Requests for Code Enforcement. The City claims that the Code Enforcement Division of the City of Edmonds enforces regulations within the Edmonds City Code and the Community Development Code, generally through a complaint-generated system. Furthermore, the City represents that the person filing the complaint may be contacted at any stage of the investigation by request. I've asked for a status update on my Request for Code Enforcement submitted March 24, 2018 – and my requests for such were not respected. Please correct the false representation on the City's website that says: The person filing the complaint may be contacted at any stage of the investigation by request.

Also - as the City has full knowledge that a servient estate has granted an easement to a 3rd party to use property subject to a City Street easement - please make full and transparent disclosure to the public how these laws work. If a person wants to make use of a City street or alley, do they have the option of pursuing a permit from the City or getting an easement directly from the servient estate instead? The public deserves to know how this works.

Thank you,
Ken Reidy

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 3, 2018 5:29 AM
To: Phil Williams; Dave Earling
Cc: Jeff Taraday; Shane Hope
Subject: Re: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

Mayor Earling and Mr. Williams,
The following is taken straight from the City's website:
What happens after I file my complaint/request? What do you do? How long does it take? Do you contact me afterwards?
The City investigates every written complaint received. Generally, an investigation begins within a week of receipt. The activity or alleged violation would need to be observed, confirmed or determined through subsequent research. Complaints are generally prioritized by receipt, however, complaints are also prioritized by significance in cases of health, safety and environment.
City, County and State records are examined. The various adopted codes are applied. If a violation exists, the property owner is contacted and informed of the violation. Compliance solutions are reviewed and scheduled. Penalty fees may be imposed.
The time to resolve a violation depends on the complexity of the situation. The property owner's competence, resources and level of cooperation are also time factors in achieving compliance. The person filing the complaint may be contacted at any stage of the investigation by request.
As the person filing the complaint - I have made a request that the City contact me at this stage of the process. Once again, please provide me a status update on my Request for Code Enforcement submitted March 24, 2018.

Thank you,
Ken Reidy

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 8:23 AM

To: Phil Williams; Dave Earling

Cc: Jeff Taraday; Shane Hope

Subject: Re: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

Mayor Earling and Mr. Williams,

Once again, please provide me a status update on my Request for Code Enforcement submitted March 24, 2018.

Thank you,
Ken Reidy

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 8:06 AM

To: Phil Williams; Dave Earling

Cc: Jeff Taraday; Shane Hope

Subject: Re: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

Mayor Earling and Mr. Williams,

Please provide me a status update on my Request for Code Enforcement submitted March 24, 2018. Any related investigation should have been completed in minutes as the City already knows the following:

The existing stormwater line is **PRIVATE**.

Per page 3 of 10 of City Staff's REPORT & RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL: **The Edmonds School District has a stormwater line that runs within the proposed vacation area.**

That same **PRIVATE stormwater line** also runs in the unopened right of way to the south of 10502 231st Street S.W. and 10510 231st Street S.W. Page 303 of the March 20, 2018 Council packet clearly documents that GPRS located the manhole cover that is the connection point for the line between lots 13 and 14 to the easement on the plat --it appears to be about 5 feet off the house property line and was at least 8-10 feet down.

That same **PRIVATE stormwater line** may run behind 10410 231st Street S.W., 10518 231st Street S.W., and 10526 231st Street S.W. Either way - the City has evidence that **the Edmonds School District has a PRIVATE stormwater line that runs within the proposed vacation area** and in the unopened right of way to the south of 10502 231st Street S.W. and 10510 231st Street S.W.

Please provide me a status update on my Request for Code Enforcement submitted March 24, 2018.

Ken Reidy

From: Ken Reidy <kenreidy@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2018 8:12 AM

To: Phil Williams

Cc: Jeff Taraday; Shane Hope; Dave Earling

Subject: Re: Formal Request For Code Enforcement

Dear Mr. Thies or Williams (City Council, others blind cc'd),

Per City Council's March 20, 2018 Agenda Packet, Public Hearing for Gunn Street Vacation (File No. PLN20170052):

No public utilities are located within this portion of unopened right-of-way; however, one known **private utility** (a stormwater line owned by the Edmonds School District) has been confirmed to be located within this portion of unopened right-of-way.

Related to an UNOPENED right-of-way, the City of Edmonds has argued and acted on the following in the past:

Obstructions to the public right of way are a public nuisance under RCW 7.48.140. The City has both a right and a duty to remove an obstruction and liability if it fails to do so.

Former City Attorney Scott Snyder stated the following in the City's Pre Hearing Brief dated January 27, 2010: *Holders of easements in favor of the public have a duty to remove obstructions **and encroachments** into the public rights of way. RCW 7.48.140(4) declares it to be a public nuisance to " ... obstruct **or encroach** upon a public highway, private ways, streets, alleys... " Municipalities have a duty to remove obstructions in the public ways and liability if they fail to do so. Lund v. City of Seattle,⁴ Turner v. City of Tacoma⁵.*

4 99 Wash. 300, 169 P. 820 (1918)

5 72 Wn.2d 1029> 435 P.2d 9276 (1967)

Snyder made this legal argument related to an UNOPENED right-of-way, fee title owned by the Reidy family. Please contrast this to the Edmonds School District's **private** use of an UNOPENED right-of-way. The Edmonds School District has no fee ownership interest of the UNOPENED right-of-way where their **private** utility is located. Reidy owned the fee title and had every legal right to make efficient use of our property prior to the City using its easement rights for its stated purpose of ingress and egress. Despite Reidy's servient estate rights, the City pursued Code Enforcement against Reidy's building. The Edmonds School District has no servient estate rights.

Please consider this a formal request for Code Enforcement. If Scott Snyder was right, the City or Edmonds as the holder of an easement in favor of the public have a duty to remove obstructions **and encroachments** into the public rights of way. RCW 7.48.140(4) declares it to be a public nuisance to " ... obstruct or **encroach** upon a public highway, private ways, streets, alleys... " Municipalities have a duty to remove obstructions in the public ways and liability if they fail to do so.

The City of Edmonds went to **great lengths** to require the Reidys to remove our building from the UNOPENED easement that we held title to - even when the City had full knowledge that the setbacks could be grandfathered.

I would prefer that the Edmonds School District simply obtain an Encroachment Permit – but in my case former Hearing Examiner Sharon Rice ruled that had Reidy applied for an Encroachment Permit, such application would have been denied. Rice didn't explain why – she just stated such as if it were fact.

Again, **please consider this a formal request for Code Enforcement to remove the private utility encroachment** (a private stormwater line owned by the Edmonds School District) located within the UNOPENED RIGHT-OF-WAY ADJACENT TO THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARIES OF 10410, 10430, 10502, 10510, 10518 AND 10526 231ST ST. SW.

Please keep me fully informed of all communication related to this **formal request for Code Enforcement**. **I have also submitted the request using the City's online form.**

As a citizen, I suggest the City consider the following:

As I think Sharon Rice was very wrong about my eligibility for an encroachment permit - I recommend the Edmonds School District simply apply for an Encroachment Permit from the City of Edmonds. Related to the Gunn Street Vacation petition, I recommend the City of Edmonds follow the law and *require a grant of an easement to the City*. By doing so, the City will of course not have to charge Mr. Gunn the \$28,800. As all know:

The City may require monetary compensation OR require a grant of an easement to the City.

Thank you,

Ken Reidy