



STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: June 6, 2016
To: Honorable Mayor & City Council
From: Don Rhoads, Director of Administrative Services / CFO
Don Harrison, Budget and Revenue Officer
Subject: Fiscal Year 2016/17 Budget Study Sessions Questions / Answers

INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the recommended adoption of the FY 2016/17 Budget on the formal agenda, the purpose of this report is to provide answers to questions the City Council asked at the budget study sessions of May 3, May 10 and May 12, 2016.

DISCUSSION

Questions asked at the Budget Study Sessions which were unanswered include the following, with the answers following each question:

1. What percent of business tax does leasing activities contribute?

Class E (Residential Property Rental) and Class F (Commercial Property Rental) combined provide approximately 55% of total business tax revenue in the current fiscal year.

2. What is the expected inflation rate for the current year and next year?

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office forecasts inflation of 1.9% for 2016 and 2% for 2017. The Recommended FY 2016/17 Operating Budget would provide for a decrease of 4.5% compared to the Operating budget adopted for FY 2015/16. However, if depreciation expense were removed from the FY 2015/16 budget to be consistent with the FY 2016/17 budget, the decrease would be 0.3%.

3. What is the timeframe for completing an assessment of the need for a second new code enforcement officer?

An assessment of the code enforcement demands and the resources available will be conducted in the new fiscal year and should be completed in a short period of time, within a month or two, depending upon other demands on the Department. Once that assessment is completed staff will provide the Council with an update on whether additional resources are warranted.

- 4. What percent of projects are expected to receive plan review within 4 – 6 weeks (new single family homes, residential remodels, and commercial tenant improvements including new restaurants) actually receive initial plan review within that time frame?**

100% of these projects have their initial plan review completed within this time frame. The succeeding plan reviews are completed after two weeks of re-submittal. Overall, time to complete the plan reviews varies depending on how long the applicant takes to address corrections.

- 5. When large refuse bins were replaced with smaller bins recently, why were they not equipped with the “hatch (lid) within a hatch” design that makes it easier for residents to dispose of their trash?**

When the new smaller bins were purchased and distributed, there was not a design that provided for the “hatch within a hatch.” Because the bins and hatches were smaller than before, it was not anticipated that this hatch design would be necessary. After the distribution of the new bins staff began to hear from some residents who were having difficulty with this. In order to remedy these residents’ issues, we contacted the manufacturer to inquire about a different more user friendly hatch option. As a result, the manufacturer is now fabricating a mold that will have a two piece hatch which will allow residents to leave one side in the up position while emptying their trash. Unfortunately, this also presents another set of issues in that if residents leave the one side of the hatch in the up position after emptying their trash, this invites blowing debris and the attraction of vermin. Once the new hatches are available they will be provided to only those residents who make requests for them in order to minimize the issues just addressed. In the interim, those residents that have requested, have had the old 300 gallon bins returned to them until the new hatches are available on the smaller bins.

- 6. What is the estimated cost per square foot for maintenance of the Dog Park and what is the cost per square foot for maintenance of other parks?**

It is difficult to find a park comparable in maintenance level and dedicated, stable staffing to the Dog Park. However, there are a pair of parks in the City (Will Rogers and Maltz) which share a Park Service Worker who is dedicated to maintaining the non-turf areas of these parks. This allows for the closest comparison available to that planned for the Dog Park. Using the annual personnel cost for this worker and the annual materials budget for these parks and dividing this cost by the portions of these parks which are maintained by this worker calculates to \$3.42/sf per year. The cost of maintenance at the Dog Park is estimated at about \$2.83/sf per year. The difference in cost between the two is substantially due to the potential use of contracted services, subject to the meet

and confer process with the employee association, and the differing levels of experience, training, control and flexibility afforded the City under each situation.

7. When will the study of Greystone planned use and staffing needs be completed?

The study is scheduled to commence in June and should be completed by September. Once the study is completed it will be reviewed by the Recreation and Parks Commission and the Friends of Greystone and recommendations will be presented to the City Council along with any needed staffing resources, if warranted.



Don Harrison
Budget & Revenue Officer
Management, Budget &
Revenue Approval



Don Rhoads
Director of Administrative Services
/CFO

Approved By