

Municipal

Summer 2008

Research News

Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington



What's Inside

New MRSC Staff 4

SAS 112 5

MRSC Rosters 7

Ask MRSC 8

Heads Up 10

New Acquisitions 11

New Publications
– Coming Soon 12

Managing Council Meetings

We are including in this issue of *Municipal Research News* a couple articles from our website, mrsc.org, relating to the management of local government meetings. The first is written by Ann Macfarlane, Registered Parliamentarian; and the second by Steve DiJulio, Attorney at Foster Pepper, PLLC.

How Much Should a Mayor Talk at Meetings?

By Ann G. Macfarlane, Registered Parliamentarian

One of the challenges facing newly-elected mayors is knowing how much they should speak at meetings. Many mayors are hard-charging individuals accustomed to influencing the course of events and are not shy about speaking their minds. It can be a challenge to adapt to the different requirements of running council meetings.

In a democratic system, the person running the meetings of a body of peers is not the boss. She is in charge of certain aspects of the meeting, such as making sure the meeting is fair, and that everyone has an equal chance to speak. With regard to substance, though, she is the servant of the group. Her role is to help the group make up its mind – to assist the group – rather than to tell the group what to do.

Robert's Rules of Order, the standard procedural guide for most meetings in this country, recognizes the temptation that a gavel presents to the presider. (The members also may be tempted to give undue weight or influence to the presider.) *Robert's* specifies that ordinarily the person running the meeting does not take part in debate at all. The presider has the right to debate and vote, but refrains from exercising that right in order to remain impartial.

A city council is a little different, because of its size. In a city council, the rules for “small boards” apply. (Generally a small board includes a dozen or fewer people.) *Robert's* states that in a small board, the presider may participate in debate.

My experience, however, is that a mayor who is willing and able to hold back will serve her council better than one who waxes on and gives her opinion freely. It is not easy to distill the best course of action for a city council from among the many differing options, facts, and opinions that must be considered. When a mayor speaks out at length, she becomes a factor in the debate. When she refrains and earnestly, genuinely seeks to learn the opinions of others, she is more of a facilitator. Best practice says that even in smaller boards, a presider who chooses this role will help the organization more than one who sees herself as a full-contact participant.

I recommend, therefore, that mayors speak and debate last, after everyone else has had a chance. Besides making the mayor more impartial, this also allows her to sum up the debate, which can be critical in helping everyone see the big picture.

continued on page 3

Municipal Research News is published quarterly by the Municipal Research and Services Center
2601 4th Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98121-1280
206.625.1300 • Fax 206.625.1220
www.mrsc.org • mrsc@mrsc.org

MRSC

BOARD

PRESIDENT	Don Davidson
VICE PRESIDENT	Kirke Sievers
SECRETARY	Ted Gathe
PAST PRESIDENT	Robert R. Hart
DIRECTOR	Randy Beehler
DIRECTOR	Louise Bjornson
DIRECTOR	Pam Carter
DIRECTOR	Donald Krupp
DIRECTOR	Dave Mercier
DIRECTOR	Tom Metzger
DIRECTOR	Mary Place
DIRECTOR	Kathryn Quade
DIRECTOR	David Ramsay
DIRECTOR	James Reinbold
DIRECTOR	Jay Weber

STAFF

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Richard Yukubousky
LIBRARY CLERK	Peter Breen
PUBLIC WORKS CONSULTANT	John Carpita
PUBLIC FINANCE CONSULTANT	Judith Cox
SENIOR RESEARCH CONSULTANT	Lynne De Merritt
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN	Erich Dewald
LEGAL CONSULTANT	Jim Doherty
WEB DEVELOPER/E-GOVERNMENT SPEC.	Don Edlin
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE	Connie Elliot
PLANNING CONSULTANT	Sue Enger
MRSC ROSTERS MANAGER	Ellen J. Hutchinson
LEGAL CONSULTANT	Pam James
PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANT	Byron Katsuyama
CONTROLLER	Marcie Klobucher
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	Donita Knutson
LEGAL CONSULTANT	Joe Levan
SENIOR LEGAL CONSULTANT	Pat Mason
LEGAL CONSULTANT	Bob Meinig
PUBLIC POLICY & MGMT. CONSULT.	Lynn Karl Nordby
WEB SERVICES SPECIALIST	Quinn Robinson
DESKTOP PUBLISHING SPECIALIST	Holly Stewart
LEGAL CONSULTANT	Paul Sullivan
PUBLIC POLICY CONSULTANT	Carol Tobin
ACCOUNTANT	Sandra Vong
MGR. OF LIBRARY & INFO. SVCS.	Fred Ward
TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIAN	Erica Zwick

CONTACTING MRSC

Staff members may be reached through the Internet using first initial and last name @mrsc.org: for example, ryukubousky@mrsc.org.

Municipal Research News is published quarterly by the Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington, 2601 4th Avenue, Suite 800, Seattle, WA 98121-1280. Your ideas and comments are appreciated. If you have news you would like to share or if you would like to write a short feature article, please contact us.

Editor: Connie Elliot

Designer: Holly Stewart

It is also essential that a city council follow the most neglected rule in all of *Robert's*, the rule that no one may speak twice until everyone has had a chance to speak once. This includes the honorable mayor! By giving everyone a chance in turn, all voices are heard. The extroverts and old-timers are not allowed to dominate the situation, and a better decision can be made for the good of the city.▶

Ann G. Macfarlane is a Registered Parliamentarian. She created Jurassic Parliament to make parliamentary procedure easy to learn and memorable. She provides training on leadership, meeting management, parliamentary procedure and organizational development across the United States.

Balancing the Council's Right to Manage Meetings with Expectations of Citizens

By Steve DiJulio, Attorney, Foster Pepper, PLLC

The tragedy at the city council meeting in Kirkwood, Missouri on February 7, 2008 is a stark reminder of the physical and personal attacks that may be encountered by elected officials. In Kirkwood, a man who had frequently disrupted previous council meetings shot and killed two council members, two police officers, and the public works director and seriously wounded the mayor and a journalist before himself being shot and killed by other police officers.

Fortunately, such instances of extreme violence are a rare occurrence in most cities and counties, and for that reason, few city councils or county councils maintain security like that found at the state legislature or the United States Congress. Nevertheless, most local councils do have an interest in assuring that meetings are conducted in an orderly way and are not disrupted by threatening, irrelevant, or overlong comment. These types of disruptions are common. And, many councils may be unsure about their ability to respond to disruptive conduct for fear of violating their citizens' First Amendment rights to free speech. A recent decision from the Federal Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals highlights and provides guidance on these issues.

Chesterfield County, Virginia has a population of a little over 300,000. Like many communities, it maintains a planning commission to "promote orderly development" within the

county. At one meeting of the Chesterfield County Planning Commission, a scheduled item was requested to be "deferred" until the next meeting. The commission chair asked for public comment only on the issue of deferral. The first two speakers addressed deferral but also briefly, but politely, addressed some substantive issues regarding the application. However, the third speaker, Steinburg, began to speak about the development proposal and not on the question of deferral. Steinburg's comments also attacked the chair of the planning commission. The chair "cut off" Steinburg and asked him to sit down. An excerpt of the dialog follows:

Chairman Litton: I am asking you just to sit down please.

Steinburg: I know you are. I understand what you're doing. And when I'm through speaking I will sit down.

Chairman Litton: No I think you're going to sit down now.

Steinburg: I'm not!

At which point the Chair called for a police officer to request that Mr. Steinburg be seated. When Steinburg refused, two officers escorted him from the podium and out of the meeting room.

Steinburg brought an action against the planning commission and its members,

claiming violation of First Amendment rights to free speech. In discussing Steinburg's assertions against Chesterfield County, the court acknowledged that the planning commission meeting was a public forum. Generally, the First Amendment provides protection to and opportunity for free speech in public forums. But, a meeting of a council (or a planning commission) was not a traditional public forum such as a soapbox in a public park. Rather such meetings are "limited public forums" which may be managed by the government entity.

In the case of Chesterfield County, a policy prohibited "personal attacks" on the commissioners. Steinburg argued that such a policy violated his First Amendment rights. The court rejected that claim concluding that a "content-neutral policy against personal attacks is not . . . unconstitutional as it is adopted and employed to serve the legitimate public interest in a limited forum of decorum and order." The court emphasized that such a policy does not preclude a speaker from expressing an opinion on the subject matter before the board, council, or commission. The court also recognized that argumentative or disruptive behavior cannot be shielded by a claim of First Amendment rights. A presiding officer must be able to control the course and decorum of a meeting.

Officials presiding over such meetings must have discretion . . . to cut

off speech which they reasonably perceive to be, or imminently to threaten, a disruption of the orderly and fair progress of the discussion, whether by virtue of its irrelevance, its duration, or its very tone and manner.

See *Steinburg v. Chesterfield County Planning Comm'n*, ___ F.3d ___, 2008 WL 2211886 (4th Cir. May 29, 2008).

It is well recognized in Washington law that a council may order the removal

of people who disrupt meetings. The Open Public Meetings Act specifically authorizes the clearing of a meeting room and continuation of a meeting, including reconvening without the public (even at another location), in response to such disruptive behavior that causes the ongoing meeting to be infeasible. See RCW 42.30.050. Council members may readmit an individual or individuals not responsible for the disruption. And, representatives of the news media, except those participating in a disturbance, are required to be readmitted to such meetings.

It is one of the more difficult responsibilities of a council to limit the rights of people to speak at the council's meeting. Nevertheless, when the conduct of people at meetings are disruptive to the council's action, legitimate steps may be taken to assure that the public's work is conducted by the council and not interfered with by others.

For further discussion on this issue see MRSC Inquiries on "Legislative Body" at <http://mrsc.org/askmrsc/Legislative.aspx>. ■

P. Stephen DiJulio, a partner at Foster Pepper & Shefelman PLLC <http://www.foster.com/attOverview.aspx?AttorneyID=31>, focuses on litigation involving state and local governments, and land use and environmental law. Particular experience includes representation of jurisdictions on eminent domain, utilities (water, wastewater, storm water, solid waste systems), local improvement districts, facility siting and contractor litigation.

New MRSC Staff

Lynn Nordby
Public Policy & Management
Consultant

Lynn has over thirty years of experience in local government management and four years as senior project manager/principal consultant with a major public sector financial consulting firm. Lynn's public sector management experience includes virtually all municipal services, including the operation of a wide variety of municipal utilities and enterprises such as water, sewer, solid waste, natural gas, cemetery, parking, and stormwater. Lynn received his BA in Political Science from UCLA and a Master of Public Administration from the University of Puget Sound. He is also a Credentialed Manager through the ICMA Voluntary Credentialing program.

Ellen Hutchinson
MRSC Rosters Manager

Ellen came to MRSC to market the benefits of the shared Small Public Works & Consultant Rosters – MRSC Rosters to Washington State municipalities. Outreach includes presentations, conference booths, and direct assistance for both municipalities and contractors/consultants listed on the Rosters. Prior to coming to MRSC, Ellen worked on the Energy Star program in Washington, DC, for Earth Economics in Seattle, and in different capacities with nonprofit organizations. Ellen has an M.A. in Social Change Marketing from Antioch University Seattle and a B.A. in Political Science/Environmental Studies from Western Washington University.



Welcome Lynn & Ellen!

Statement on Auditing Standards – SAS 112

Internal Controls over the Preparation of the Annual Financial Report

By Toni Nelson, Small Cities Specialist, State Auditor's Office

A new auditing Statement on Auditing Standards, or SAS 112, is now effective for most fiscal year 2006 financial statement audits. This audit standard, prescribed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), one of the standard-setting bodies for auditing, provides guidance on identifying and communicating control deficiencies related to financial statement reporting. It requires auditors to report serious deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting. The new standard sets a lower threshold for the types of deficiencies that are reported.

The new standard is an attempt to reinforce management's responsibility for ensuring sufficient internal controls over financial reporting, and the auditor's responsibility to report deficiencies in those controls. Such deficiencies may be expressed by the auditor in terms of a lack of internal controls or inadequate internal controls over the preparation of the annual financial report.

For larger entities, the implementation of a review process for the annual financial report is not necessarily a problem if they have adequate staff in

their finance departments. However, the smaller the entity, the greater the challenge is likely to be to implement this key internal control.

In response to this change, the State Auditor's Office developed an "Annual Report – Internal Review Checklist" http://www.sao.wa.gov/LocalGovernment/AnnualReport_InternalReview.pdf to assist smaller entities that report on a cash basis.

The checklist organizes the review process in such a manner that the reviewer not only examines the report but also verifies the statements being made. This provides the reviewer with a greater understanding of the financial condition of the entity.

The checklist includes the following items:

- Verify the bank reconciliation process.
- Verify that entity's financials balance to the money reflected on the bank statements.
- Identify whether or not the budget has been exceeded.

- Identify whether the entity has any funds in a negative cash position.

All these items are key indicators of the financial condition of your entity and provide the required internal control to minimize the likelihood of a misstatement of financial information on the annual financial report.

SAS 112 requires that the audit evaluate your review process of the annual financial report. Using the checklist will help you meet this new audit standard. ▀

Toni Nelson is the "Small Cities Specialist" for the Washington State Auditor's Office, providing both on- and off-site financial training and assistance to smaller cities and towns throughout the state. Ms. Nelson has co-authored the "Small Cities Manual," a detailed reference guide for new clerk/treasurers on governmental accounting procedures and presents numerous training workshops throughout the state.

Why Internal Controls are Everyone's Job

By Tracey Dunlap, Director of Finance & Administration, City of Kirkland

The audit world is changing, and we as governments are beginning to feel the full impacts of events that occurred in the private sector over the last decade (think Enron, MCI, etc.). In the previous article from the April edition of the MRSC *Finance Advisor*, we learned about the new "Statement on Auditing Standards SAS No. 112" titled "Communicating Internal Control Related Matters Identified in an Audit" and its relationship to financial report-

ing. This article expands on the topic of internal controls and the role they play in government organizations.

The implementation of SAS 112 has resulted in a substantial increase in the number of findings that begin with "The [City] does not have adequate internal controls..." In reading those findings, it reinforced for me the importance of internal controls within government organizations and the fact

that everyone in the organization has a role to play. (If you haven't seen the SAO's new subscription service, check it out at <https://www.sao.wa.gov/applications/subscriptionsservices/>.)

The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) "Blue Book" defines an "internal control framework" as an "Integrated set of policies and procedures designed to assist management to achieve its goals and objectives."

What are management's objectives? In this context, they include:

- operate effectively and efficiently,
- provide reliable financial reporting, and
- comply with applicable laws and regulations.

So what does this really mean? Most people think of internal controls as the finance department's responsibility, but in reality, success depends on everyone playing their role. It starts with all employees familiarizing themselves with the agency's policies and procedures, including financial, administrative, and legal requirements, and following them. Periodic training, including refreshers, on policies and procedures can be helpful, as well as using the Internet and reminders to staff to communicate changes.

Management's role is multi-faceted. The chief executive's recognition of the importance of internal controls and visible support for their implementation and enforcement is key. This

support needs to pass down through department directors and managers. In Kirkland, we have instituted a monthly agenda item at the directors' meeting to review "internal control practices" to make sure everyone is on the same page on selected issues. Remember, when a department director or manager signs off on a claim for expense or other approval, they are taking responsibility for having checked for conformity with applicable policies and procedures.

Finally, elected officials have an important role, which is becoming more clearly defined through the implementation of "Statement of Auditing Standards SAS No. 114" titled "The Auditor's Communication with those Charged with Governance." This SAS defines those charged with governance as "Those with responsibility for overseeing the strategic direction of the entity and obligations related to the accountability of the entity" and defines management as "those who are responsible for achieving the objectives of the enterprise and who have the authority to establish policies and make decisions by which those objectives are

to be pursued." A good practice regardless of the requirements is to keep your elected officials informed and involved about internal control matters all year long (not just during the audit). One way Kirkland keeps them involved is to include an item periodically on the Council Finance Subcommittee agenda to discuss the audit and other internal control issues. Overall, the objective of all communication techniques is to keep the topic on everyone's radar.

Finally, the role of finance has many elements, including development of policies and their implementation and enforcement. However, finance professionals are not the only ones tasked with making sure the city has adequate internal controls. City clerks, legal counsel, and others also have obligations to ensure compliance. So, the next time your finance folks ask you for your detailed receipts, or your city clerk follows up on a public disclosure response, or your city attorney reminds you of applicable laws, remember that they are doing it to protect you, your agency, and ultimately the public. ■

Tracey Dunlap, P.E. is the Director of Finance & Administration at the city of Kirkland. An industrial engineer registered in the state of Washington, she has worked with jurisdictions throughout the Northwest to develop and implement cost recovery and fee strategies, set utility rates, and improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Tracey's experience also includes working for a large defense contractor and a major financial institution. She has presented workshops on a wide array of topics.

MRSC Rosters

Small Public Works and Consultant Rosters Expanding!

MRSC Small Public Works and Consultant Rosters continues to receive an enthusiastic welcome from Washington State municipalities, contractors, and consultants eager to utilize the online shared roster system.

MRSC Rosters (www.mrscrosters.org) is expanding throughout the state, with the list of participants growing daily in the Puget Sound and beyond!

What is MRSC Rosters?

MRSC Rosters is an online database for Washington State agencies (cities, counties, school districts, and special districts) to solicit work from contractors eligible to bid on small public works projects (projects under \$200,000) and to solicit work from consultants. As a shared roster system, **MRSC Rosters** provides agencies with access to their current contractors/consultants and more, while at the same time allowing contractors/consultants

the marketing advantage of reaching multiple agencies through just one roster application process.

Who is Involved?

Overwhelmingly, there has been eager interest to participate in the **MRSC Rosters**. After only six months online, there are 77 Agencies, 400 Consultants, and 778 Contractors, with more joining daily. So far there are participating agencies within the following counties: *Clallam, Grays Harbor,*

Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, and Whatcom. (To view the full list of participants, see www.mrscrosters.org.) MRSC is marketing the **MRSC Rosters** throughout Washington State, with more agencies steadily joining. So look for Eastern Washington agencies as **MRSC Rosters** continues to expand!

To find out more and/or to register for **MRSC Rosters** visit www.mrscrosters.org.

MRSC
rosters
www.mrscrosters.org

Things to Wonder About

1. How is it that we put man on the moon before we figured out it would be a good idea to put wheels on luggage?
2. Why are you IN a movie, but you're ON TV?
3. How come we choose from just two people for President and fifty for Miss America?
4. What do you do when you see an endangered animal eating an endangered plant?
5. Why don't sheep shrink when it rains?

Ask MRSC

Summaries of recent inquiries answered by MRSC consultants

If the low bidder withdraws after being awarded a contract, may a county or city award the bid to the next low bidder?

Yes, a county or city may accept the next low bid that was submitted. There is no need to make a new call for bids. This does assume that the next bid is a responsive bid, and the bidder is willing to maintain the same bid. The board of commissioners or the city council needs simply to pass a motion that the award will go to that next lowest bidder, indicating for the record that the initial low bidder withdrew his bid.

May a public utility district enact an internal personnel policy prohibiting employees from carrying firearms to work?

The authority of a city to enact a local personnel policy restricting the carrying of firearms was upheld for public employers in *Cherry v. Metro*, 116 Wn.2d 794 (1991). This case is still valid and should be applicable to all jurisdictions, including special districts.

Can local jurisdictions let lodging tax recipients use funding for personnel costs?

Yes, the definitions of “tourism promotion” and “tourism-related facility” in RCW 67.28.180 were amended in 2007 to allow local jurisdictions to use lodging tax revenues for the operation of tourism promotion agencies and of special events and festivals designed to attract tourists. However, rather strict reporting requirements have been put in place. See RCW 67.28.1816.

Are there any requirements that public records be “maintained” on a jurisdiction’s premises?

MRSC’s position is that records must remain in the office where they are filed, except for limited circumstances or on a temporary basis.

A provision in the Washington Administrative Code promulgated by the Secretary of State’s office supports this conclusion. WAC 434-615-020 provides in part:

Unless otherwise provided by law, public records must remain in the legal custody of the office in which they were originally filed, which shall be considered the office of record, or shall be destroyed or transferred pursuant to instructions from the state or local records committee as required by Ch. 40.14 RCW. They shall not be placed in the legal or physical custody of any other person or agency, public or private, or released to individuals, except for disposition pursuant to law or unless otherwise expressly provided by law or by these regulations.

This makes clear that original records should not be allowed to be taken from the office in which they were originally filed, except under certain specific circumstances.

May the mayor speak in favor of an annexation election in a state of the city address?

Since this involves a ballot proposition, the restrictions in RCW 42.17.130 apply. This statute allows an elected official to take a position on a ballot proposition in certain limited circumstances. Those circumstances include making a statement in support of or in

opposition to a ballot proposition at an open press conference or in response to a specific inquiry. However, a state of the city address is *not* an open press conference, and it is *not* in response to a specific question. Both of these circumstances are different from a prepared statement given by an elected official as part of a planned speech. If a question arises after his speech about his position on this, then he may respond.

The mayor, however, could provide objective factual information concerning the annexation during his speech. This would not violate RCW 42.17.130. See WAC 390-05-271.

May cities and towns restrict the placement of manufactured/mobile homes based upon their age and size?

SSB 5524, recently adopted by the state legislature, now prohibits cities and towns from restricting the placement of mobile or manufactured homes in existing mobile or manufactured home parks based on the age or size of that mobile or manufactured home. The relevant language of this legislation is as follows:

A city or town may not adopt an ordinance that has the effect, directly or indirectly, of restricting the location of mobile homes or manufactured homes in mobile home parks or manufactured housing communities, as defined in RCW 59.20.030, which were legally in existence before the effective date of this section, based exclusively on the age or dimensions of the mobile home or manufactured home. This does not preclude a city or town from restricting the location of a mobile home or manufactured home in mobile

home parks or manufactured housing communities for any other reason including, but not limited to, failure to comply with fire, safety, or other local ordinances or state laws related to mobile homes and manufactured homes.

The House Bill Report on this bill provides the following explanation:

Current statutes (RCW 35.21.684, 35A.21.312 and 36.01.225), which allow jurisdictions to place age and design criteria on manufactured housing, apply only to housing to be sited in *new* mobile home parks or manufactured housing communities, or to be sited *outside* of mobile home parks and manufactured home communities.

(Emphasis in original.)

The Senate Bill Report indicates that this was an affordable housing issue – (“Single wide mobile homes are an important source of affordable housing.”) SSB 5524 became effective on June 12, 2008.

What is the statute of limitations for filing an unfair labor practices complaint?

The charge, in most instances, must be filed within 180 days of the incident. Reference should be made to WAC 316-45-020:

WAC 316-45-020 Unfair labor practice complaint – Time limitations. (1) A complaint charging an unfair labor practice may not be filed later than one hundred eighty calendar days after the party filing the complaint knew or should have known of the event, activity, or practice alleged to be a violation of RCW 47.64.130, or the regulations implementing that statute. For the purpose of computing timeliness, each event, activity, or practice in an alleged series of events, activities or practices will be construed as separate, provided that only those events, activities or practices occurring within the one hundred eighty days before the filing of the complaint may be remedied by the commission.■

How to “Ask MRSC.”

Assistance from MRSC may be obtained by **Phone** (206) 625-1300 or 1-800-933-6772; **Letter** 2601 4th Avenue, Suite 800, Seattle, WA, 98121-1280; **Fax** (206) 625-1220; or **E-mail** mrsc@mrsc.org. Telephone inquiry service is available from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. If a consultant is not immediately available, you can record a detailed request on voice mail 24-hours a day, and a staff member will call back as soon as possible.

Heads Up

Emerging information for local government

New Law Enforcement Patrol Vehicle

Carbon Motors of Atlanta has designed the E7 – the world’s first purpose-built, law enforcement patrol vehicle, designed by law enforcement – for law enforcement. Most police cars are passenger cars like the Ford Crown Victoria Interceptor and the Chevrolet Impala, with special equipment added. The E7’s 6-cylinder, 300 hp, turbodiesel uses 40 percent less fuel than the popular Ford Interceptor’s gasoline-fed V-8 and hits 60 mph in 6.5 seconds. It can pursue suspects at 155 mph. For more information read, “A New Automaker is in Hot Pursuit - of the Perfect Police Car,” *Wired Magazine* at http://www.wired.com/cars/future-transport/magazine/16-03/pl_motor or go to Carbon Motor’s website at www.carbonmotors.com.

Government Uses of Web 2.0

What is Web 2.0?

The term “Web 2.0” was coined in 2004, and since then has been assigned myriad definitions and fostered much disagreement as to what it is. Some say Web 2.0 is a new generation of websites promoting user collaboration, creativity, and connectivity - sites such as MySpace, Flickr, Wikipedia, and YouTube. The National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council (**ec3**), a consortium of national organizations and public and private sector leaders identifying best practices for strategic change within government, formally defined Web 2.0 as:

the network as platform, spanning all connected devices. Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their

own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an “architecture of participation,” and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences.

Use of YouTube

YouTube is a free online video streaming service that allows anyone to view and share videos that have been uploaded by members.

In 2007, **ec3** held a symposium on *Government in the Age of YouTube: The Implications of Internet Social Networks to Government*. The symposium’s White Paper notes that Web 2.0 applications open up a variety of new opportunities, but it also points to a paradigm shift, one particularly important in terms of how governments have routinely utilized the Internet.

The report outlines issues, considerations, risks, and structure. It concludes that government has the capacity to foster innovation through the support of the standards, architectures, and regulatory frameworks that can create Web 2.0 opportunities. “Open content,” making government data freely available in usable formats, is perhaps the simplest way to make things possible. Cities that support the use of broadband and WiFi are doing a bit more by providing the infrastructure that enables more of the “always on, always responsive” connection to the web that makes Web 2.0 applications practical. Read the symposium paper at http://www.ec3.org/downloads/symposia/2006/2007_symposium_paper.pdf.

Who Is Using YouTube?

A number of jurisdictions have noted that YouTube and similar social networking services can provide a means to reach across generational lines and governmental jurisdictions. For govern-

ment services, “posting of videos can help explain complicated topics, giving people a chance to absorb the lessons at a convenient time and at their own pace. Videos can help tell your story and can add value to your information and help further or demonstrate the points you are trying to make.” For information on how jurisdictions outside Washington State are using videos on YouTube, read “TECH TALK: Going Viral,” *Governing*, June 2008, by Ellen Perlman at <http://governing.com/articles/0806techtalk.htm>.

The National Association of Counties (NACo) has launched the “NACo Channel” on YouTube to make available in one place all NACo-related video content. NACo will be working to add video content to the channel in the months ahead “to spread the word about counties and our members.”

Washington jurisdictions with videos on YouTube include:

Burien Parks – <http://www.youtube.com/burienparks>

Clallam County Streamkeepers – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LL5Q01sft4>

King County Executive – <http://www.youtube.com/user/KingCountyExec>

Spokane Fire Department – <http://www.youtube.com/spokanefire>

Whatcom County – <http://www.youtube.com/user/WhatcomCounty>

Washington State Department of Transportation – <http://www.youtube.com/user/wsdot>

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife – <http://www.youtube.com/user/TheWDFW>

Department of Social and Health Services – <http://www.youtube.com/user/WAstateDSHS>

New Acquisitions

New resource materials now available

This list contains new publications, ordinances, and other materials recently received by the MRSC library. We also prepare a more comprehensive list of new acquisitions each month which is posted on our Web site at www.mrsc.org/library/newacq.htm. If you would like to borrow one or more of these publications, please contact Peter Breen in our library at (206) 625-1300 or library@mrsc.org.

Economic Development

"Innovative Planning for Small Municipalities Building Asset Based Community Development," by Frank Antonucci, *Illinois Municipal Review*, March 2008 [ED 4.0000]

The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life, by Richard Florida, 2004 [ED 0.0009 R58 2004]

Finance

Local Government Environmental Purchasing Starter Kit: A Guide to Greening Government through Powerful Purchasing Decisions, National Association of Counties, 2000 [F 8.1125 E68 2000]

"Municipal Bankruptcy" (Issue Brief), National Association of Counties, 2003 [F 1.5000 M35 2003]

Past Performance Handbook, by Peter S. Cole and Joseph W. Beausoleil, 2002 [F 8.7000 P38 2002]

Service Contracting: A Local Government Guide, 2nd ed., International City/County Management Association, 2007 [F 8.7000 S455 2007]

Governance

Guide for Consultant Contracting, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2008 [G 9.5100 G85 2008]

Measuring Up 2.0: Governing's New, Improved Guide to Performance Measurement for Geniuses (and Other Public Managers), by Jonathan Walters, 2007 [G 9.7000 M43 2007]

Newly Elected Officials Workshop, Association of Washington Cities, 2008 [G 5.0000 A95 W45 2008]

The Open Public Meetings Act: How It Applies to Washington Cities, Counties and Special Purpose Districts, MRSC Report No. 60, 2008 [G 4.2700 O64 2008]

Personnel

"City of Bothell Personnel Policies," City of Bothell, 2008 [PE 6.0500 B67 P4 2008]

State and Local Government Deferred Compensation Programs, Government Finance Officers Association, 2006 [PE 10.1200 S83 2006]

Planning

Great Places in America: Great Streets and Neighborhoods, 2007 designees, American Planning Association, 2008 [PL 14.0000 G75 2008]

Public Works & Utilities – Water

Getting Started: Water Use Efficiency Guidebook, Washington State Department of Health, 2007 [UW 4.7000 W3 G58 2007]▶



New Publications Coming Soon

Budget Suggestions for 2009 – providing timely information for the budgeting process.

Local Government Citizen Advisory Boards – providing examples, options, and model practices for the effective and efficient use of advisory boards by local governments.

Need a Copy?

These publications are available to Washington State municipal officials for purchase or **on loan** (<http://mrsc.org/library/loanrqst>).

aspx) from the MRSC Library. To order a publication, please send us an **order form** (<http://mrsc.org/publications/puborder.pdf>) with payment (pre-payment is required for all publication purchases). You can also **order online with a credit card** (<http://mrsc.org/publications/order/form.aspx>).

In order to view or download publications in Adobe Acrobat format, you will need to have Adobe Acrobat Reader installed on your computer. The Reader is free, and may be downloaded from the Adobe Website.▶



Municipal Research and Services Center
2601 4th Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98121-1280

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Seattle, WA
Permit #45

