

CITY OF SPARKS
CITY COUNCIL BUDGET WORKSHOP
Wednesday, May 3, 2006 at 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

A City Council Budget Workshop was called to order by Mayor Geno Martini at 3:04 p.m. in the City Hall Training Room, 431 Prater Way, Sparks, Nevada.

Roll Call

PRESENT: Mayor Geno Martini, Deputy City Clerk Lenda Ulrich, Council Members John Mayer, Phillip Salerno, Judy Moss, Mike Carrigan, Ron Schmitt, City Manager Shaun Carey, City Attorney Chet Adams.

ABSENT: City Clerk Deborine Dolan.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Biselli, Tom Clewell, Steve Driscoll, Pete Etchart, Joyce Farley, Bill Finley, Andy Flock, Frank Frievault, Stacie Hemmerling, Debi Hunt, Ben Hutchins, Neil Krutz, Adam Mayberry, JoAnn Meacham, Robin Pagni, Linda Patterson, Margaret Powell, Wayne Seidel, Heidi Shaw, Stan Sherer and Carrie Brooks.

Comments from the Public

None.

2. Consideration and possible approval of Resolution No. 3018, a Resolution outlining the Sparks City Council position on Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (SCR26), Feasibility and Advisability of Consolidating Water Related Services in Washoe County

City Manager Shaun Carey noted that the Public Works Department presented an update on the activities of the SCR26 and at that time the Council asked for an opportunity to consider this issue prior to the next meeting of the SCR26 Committee. He said staff looked through the information provided and the Council's comments during the meeting and prepared a resolution.

He then reviewed the resolution, stating the City is supporting a regional water acquisition conservation management structure; a governance that equitably represents the ownership of water rights in service delivery territories. He said the second resolve talks about the Sparks City Council supporting legislation that moves the Water Planning Commission from being governed by Washoe County and the last one is that the Council thinks the Legislature should go slow on legislative action, basically looking for further research to be conducted.

Council Member Mayer made a motion to approve Resolution No. 3018 as outlined by staff. Council Member Carrigan seconded the motion for discussion, and then said there is a meeting tomorrow night with all the water purveyors and in order to carry the Council's wishes forward at that meeting, he wanted to make sure he understood what the resolution said.

Council Member Carrigan asked if the resolution was saying that we support what they are doing as far as an umbrella agency. Mr. Carey directed him to the second page of the staff report, stating the bullets may make the points clearer. He explained that under the first paragraph we are talking about **any** regional water governance structure should provide for equitable representation, and that considers ownership. That was the point that the Council discussed regarding whether Sparks would

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

adequately be represented in a consensus model where everyone had to agree or if Sparks would be better represented if the number of customers represented was in balance.

Mr. Carey said the second paragraph addresses the point raised by the Council that there is merit to moving the Water Planning Commission from being governed by Washoe County. He said the third point is that the Legislature needs to do further research before they consolidate the water.

Council Member Carrigan said he did not feel that the third point was reflected in the “resolve” [section of the resolution]. He explained [it was his understanding] that the first “resolve” is saying that the City Council supports a regional entity as long as we have rule by a majority equal to the number of customers and the second “resolve” is pretty self-explanatory. However, the third resolve says, “...that the Sparks City Council supports no additional legislative action regarding regional acquisition, conservation and management of water resources...” and he felt that this was different from water consolidation. Council Member Carrigan said that to him, water consolidation means bringing in Washoe County with TMWA and Sun Valley. He asked if this is what we were talking about; or are we talking about we don’t want to do anything for two years, until we see how something works.

Mr. Carey said that as he recalled the previous discussion, we feel that we may not know enough about consolidation and what the effect would be on our rate payers and this may take more study that we can do between now and the next legislative session.

Council Member Carrigan then suggested that the third resolve read that the City Council supports no additional legislative action regarding *water consolidation*.

City Manager Carey said there is an awful lot that needs to be ferreted out before the Committee should entertain legislation in the next session. He said the genesis of the issue was the run-a-way water-rights pricing and those types of things, but he felt it was such a complex issue that additional study and a report from this region to the next session of the legislature might allow us to put forth something that would ferret out those complex issues.

Council Member Carrigan said he thought that was what the Council said during the last discussion: that the legislators want to set up an umbrella organization with two people from Washoe County, two members from Reno, two from Sparks, one from Sun Valley, one from STMGID (South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District) and one to be worked out from another agency; and underneath this goes TMWA and Washoe County Water Resources, Sun Valley, and STMGID. He asked if what the Council said the other day was that we don’t want any of that for two years.

Mr. Carey clarified that the first “resolve” is saying that if you are going to do something, make sure the voting is fair; the second “resolve” is saying if you are going to do something with water, give some consideration to moving the Water Planning Commission; and the third “resolve” is saying, Oh by the way, we think you need to do more study before you do anything.

Council Member Carrigan said it sounds like we are coming from a position of weakness and he felt the first resolve should be that the City of Sparks supports no additional legislation and then the next two resolves would come after saying, if you are going to do something, do it this way.

Mayor Martini suggested the motion be amended to move resolve #3 to resolve #1. Council Member Mayer agreed to amend his motion to reorder the resolves. Council Member Carrigan agreed to amend his second.

A motion was made by Council Member Mayer, seconded by Council Member Carrigan to approve Resolution No. 3018, as amended to reorder the resolves as discussed. Council Members Mayer, Salerno, Moss, Carrigan, Schmitt, YES. Motion Carried.

3. Consideration and possible action on the recommendations of the City Manager for the FY2006-2007 Budget

City Manager Shaun Carey noted that as the Council arrived at today's meeting, they were assisted in inserting three key documents into their budget binders which they received last Friday. He said the first one is the City Manager Recommendations and this should be behind the first tab. He said this document walks the Council through the major discussions at previous meetings. He stated there was also a spreadsheet which goes behind the financial summary package. This gives the output from the two-year budget model which shows the financial performance from the prior fiscal year; shows the budget that was adopted; gives the best positioning on how we think the fiscal year is going to end; and then shows the ability of the City to add new needs; shows a status quo budget that adds those new needs and then projects those out years. Finally, the Council was given a spreadsheet which will be used to talk about the Council's selection of new needs. There are two versions of this spreadsheet: the first shows the departmental priorities and the second shows the same new needs against the City Council's priorities.

Council Member Salerno asked if this meeting was for informational purposes only, or if the Council would be asked to vote on these issues. Mr. Carey noted that this was a preliminary workshop and the Council will be asked to act on his recommendations on May 15th; however, if the Council did want to take action today, then they do have the ability to do so.

Council Member Schmitt stated there appeared to be a discrepancy in the ending fund balance. Mr. Carey noted that one of the problems with consolidating information is that it does not allow for capture of restricted funds that we can't use as revenue for operations. He noted that on the General Fund Revenue and Expenditures spreadsheet, the first column is the actual audited results. The next column over shows the budget that was adopted last year (amended in June), which is the budget that the City Council asked us to follow for the year. The next column (yellow) is where you will begin to see the bringing forward of the fund balance from the 2004/2005 year; and at the top of this column, in the first row, is our true beginning fund balance for 2005/2006 (\$13,966,552). He said as we move through the categories, that number falls to \$8,176,691 in available fund balance. The numbers above this are things that are of a restricted nature and while they appeared in our budget as revenue, they are restricted in use. Examples are the Fire Lease Agreement and the Victorian Square Room Tax.

Mr. Carey stated that below the Available Fund Balance line, you will begin to see how our revenues, which are the traditional revenues that flow to the City (mostly through State formulas), are forecast. He then discussed the Expenditures section, which shows how each department is performing. He noted the dashed line around the General Government, stating it is to allow the Council to see some of the increments that provide a little better definition to that area of our funds. He stated the department spending is at \$59 million and those are just the traditional general funds. Then we have to take out the contingencies and the transfers out. The largest transfer out is to the

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

Parks and Recreation and it all comes down to the \$65+ million. He noted that the big difference in the ending fund balance is the use of our restricted funds and the expenditures that we were planning to do on property that were associated with revenues from room tax.

Mr. Carey noted that the fund balance is improving slightly from the 04/05 fiscal year to the 05/06 fiscal year. He said we are going to see our fund balance which is available for the Council to utilize and which would serve as the beginning fund balance for the next year. He said we have seen, through the course of the year, some of these impacts and some of the changes are explained in the budget document.

Council Member Schmitt said it appears that we started out with an actual ending fund balance of \$14 million, this year and we are going to end up with an actual of \$10.3 million, so we actually spent \$4 million more than we took in this year. Mr. Carey confirmed this assumption, stating that was related to the operations that were included in the budget, including the fire lease agreement. Ms. Farley said that most of the lease agreement will be paid out this fiscal year, this was a very different way to show the lease in the budget, but the auditors felt that since we had it in an escrow account, that it had to be considered as part of our fund balance and it did belong to the City, even though it was held in trust by the bank. She said we have paid for most of the equipment, so the balance will come down, but for all intents and purposes, it is not a fund balance that we can use. Mr. Carey clarified that the general fund commitments, as approved in the budget, were \$70,613,000 and we are forecasting to end that same budget year at \$65 million, so we are not overspent in the general fund.

Council Member Mayer pointed out what he felt were discrepancies, stating we were looking at an ending fund balance for 05/06 of \$10 million and we are carrying only \$6 million over to the tentative budget [for next year], but on the preliminary budget it shows \$11+ million. Mr. Carey noted that the spreadsheet is a two-page document and if you look on the second page, in the same column, you will see the \$10,313,000 and the room tax of \$2.5 million, which is in the fund balance, but which is a restricted revenue, that leaves \$7.8 million. He pointed out that in this model we utilize 3.5% as the variance between what we can best estimate today in our actual expenditure performance. This introduces the \$8.867 million back into the budget to leave us with an expectation of \$9.6 million. Following the Financial Policy, we arrive at the \$9 million. He said this flips to the second yellow column, which is the preliminary plan for the following year.

City Manager Carey then directed the memorandum in the packet and talked a little about the current fiscal year, stating we are looking at the fund balance at the end of this fiscal year, in the unrestricted area, being about \$9 million, which is up about a million dollars. He noted the page 2, second paragraph of the memorandum, which discussed the changes that have occurred in the property taxes. He said that in the budget that the Council adopted in June, we were expecting to see \$16,624,000. This has been the source of a lot of discussion by the Council as we were looking for the impacts of the property tax cap. He said obviously we were expecting much more than the \$15.6 million. He said as late as November we were informed that we were not going to reach that number and it was then forecast to be \$15.3 million. Mr. Carey pointed out that a lot has happened in Washoe County and we are on our fifth iteration for Redevelopment and probably our third iteration for the City and the payments that are actually coming to the City are likely to hit this \$16.253 million. He said in the 14 years that he had been with the City, it is very unusual that the property taxes are not very different from one year to the next. He said it was good news that the property tax numbers came in higher than expected; however he felt we were still very prudent in being conservative.

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

Mr. Carey then referred to the next paragraph and pointed out some significant outcomes, noting that the contingency fund of 1.3 million won't be utilized in the operations of the City. He said obviously our expenditures are going to be below those we had budgeted and he pointed out that on a financial basis we took two very bold steps this year with the implementation of the franchise fees, providing us a substantial opportunity to meet the challenges in our road fund and providing a much needed funding source for parks and secondly the actions of the Council to move forward on Phase I facility investments.

Council Member Carrigan asked what the difference was between the contingency fund and an emergency reserve. Ms. Farley said the difference is that we budget contingency for any extraordinary things that might happen that may not be deemed to be important enough to use an emergency fund for... something like a couple of murders that required 3 or 4 hundred thousand dollars in extra overtime, etc. She said the contingency is a budgeted amount and we can use it without going to any extra effort. Mr. Carey added the contingency fund is the first line of defense which can be used for upsets in the line item projections because of unforeseen circumstances and the emergency reserve is the second line of defense, providing a more robust ability to respond to disasters. Mr. Carey noted that contingency use is a Council decision and up until about five years ago, the City used its contingency every year; however we have built a little more financial stability into our budget, so we have enjoyed, through the policies set by the Council, rolling over the contingency to the next year.

Council Member Salerno asked what regulates the minimum we have to keep in our contingency fund. Mr. Carey stated it was a decision of the Council and noted that earlier this year we were putting a larger contingency in, but it was brought back down because we have had good financial performance for a few years and we are also creating the reserve, which is building up its revenues. Ms. Farley noted that the contingency cannot exceed 3% of the budgeted expenditures.

Council Member Salerno asked what other things could we use the contingency fund on and could we use them for capital improvements. The response was that we could, but it would require Council Action.

Council Member Carrigan asked if we could use the \$1.3 million in contingency from last year and budget an additional \$1.3 million for next year, but we have chosen for the last couple of years to carry it over to the next year. Mr. Carey stated that yes, we could; however last year, because of the way the revenues were coming in, we chose to put it into the fiscal investment plan to advance the design of the West End Community Center, so we did invest part of our contingency last year.

Mr. Carey then discussed the year ahead, stating we continue to see robust growth, with 1,900 single family lots approved, but not built. He then talked about what is changing from one fiscal year to the next, stating we don't have labor agreements with Police and Fire, so money that has been put into the budget for Police and Fire cost of living increases and contract issues will not be expended in this fiscal year. He emphasized that it is not lost, because the contracts will be retroactive.

Mr. Carey said our motor vehicle and utility costs continue to rise and we are using \$3.50 per gallon for fuel next year as a budget number and we have worked closely with the power company on rate increases on both gas and electric. He said we are increasing the transfer to the Parks and Recreation Department because we are opening the West End Community Center, which will have

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

operating costs and employees. He noted the emergency reserve funding is also provided. Mr. Carey said the Worker's Compensation Insurance fund has \$345,000 in the general fund, but it is more like \$500,000 city-wide. He noted that we did establish a grant matching fund, because the Council is looking to increasing our grant capturing abilities and staff felt it would be prudent to have a fund to help with grant match requirements. He noted there was a Special Events transfer of \$500,000 and the budget also provides for operational increases at 3%.

Mr. Carey then discussed some key items that change in FY 05/06 and will transfer to 06/07: The funding for the Master Plan Update that was approved in December will not be completed by June 30th, so this funding will continue into next year. We have also been doing a lot of work in the planning for Victorian Square, so we will be rolling the acquisition money from room tax into next year.

Mr. Carey said we budgeted \$70 million last year in revenues and we will come in at about \$75.6 million for the year. For next year, we are assuming the State numbers, and we did not increase the estimates from the State. He said we are trying to be conservative in our revenue projections this year for several reasons: if the national economy should slow, we will have a buffer; and we will have some weatherability should the State Legislature make changes in our revenues. He said he is making a more moderate investment than we have in the past in new positions in the General Fund. He said that assuming the State revenue forecasts are accurate and pushing a more moderate level of new needs, without assuming growth in revenues beyond what the State has told us, this will give us a cushion with a fall-back position.

He said his budget recommendations do not include a tax increase in either debt or operating; however the Council does have 2.935 cents by which we could increase. He said the value of a penny for Sparks, because our City is growing, is now up to \$235,000. He said the Council could reduce the tax rate in the debt by a penny and put it in the operating; and this would generate an additional \$235,000.

In the area of new expenditures, Mr. Carey said the Council heard from all the departments and they were considered on the basis of Departmental priorities and the Council priorities. He noted his preliminary recommendations and asked the Council for feedback on the suggestions.

Mr. Carey said, at the request of Council Member Mayer, the Customer Services Coordinator costs were revised to remove the car allowance and some of the training. He noted he is not recommending this position for next year.

He said he was recommending funding for a pilot program for youth participation in our local government and this program would require \$12,500 for start up costs. He said the program would be administered by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Carey then reviewed the positions requested by each Department and explained the details behind his recommendations as follows:

Administrative Services – not recommending the Web Developer position. Is recommending the Vacant Building Abatement Fund (\$20,000), because it is a tool that we can use to make a difference in some of our neighborhoods.

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

City Clerk's Office – He is recommending funding the part-time position as a full-time position.

City Attorney – He is recommending filling the frozen Civil Attorney position. He is not recommending the re-codification of the SMC.

Finance – they had some compelling statistics for their new needs request and based on the significant growth in the City, he is recommending funding the Revenue Assistant position.

Judicial – He said he was unable to recommend the request for a new Court Clerk, based on available funding.

Police Department – In consultation with the Police Chief, he is recommending one dispatcher, two records specialists and a reclassification and three detectives. He said we are looking at the public safety issue and it will involve the Council making some decisions on funding sources in a broader perspective in the near future. Council Member Mayer asked if this was the ¼ cent sales tax that Reno is proposing and how much would it raise. Mr. Carey said yes, it was the sales tax proposal that Reno is discussing and it would raise \$19,600,000, county wide and it appears that Sparks would receive around \$2.7 million. He said staff is working on a 40/40/20 split agreement, which would be around \$4.2 million, which we would be able to use for public safety. Council Member Mayer asked if the issue would be on the ballot in November. If it is approved by the voters, then we would go to the Legislature for approval of the sales tax increase. Discussion ensued regarding the probability of the sales tax increase being enacted.

Council Member Schmitt asked how old the study was that said it was not cost effective for Sparks to be part of the Regional Dispatch Center. Mr. Carey said he would research this and provide him with the information at a later date.

Fire Department – Their only request was for four-person engine staffing at the downtown station. He is recommending this overtime funding for one engine, so the department can use existing staffing and improve service levels. He said the goal is to get four-person engine staffing on all the engines in the downtown area.

Public Works – This Department received a lot of their critical needs met at mid-year. He said he is recommending funding for the Professional Services bank for water rights research, because it is a good investment to get a handle on our water rights assets.

Community Development – He said we are seeing growth in Redevelopment Area II and he believes we can successfully bring on another employee that can concentrate on the much-needed work that needs to be done on Oddie Boulevard and in the Conductor Heights area. He said that with the departure of a Senior Planner to the Government Affairs position, and in close consultation with the City Planner, we felt it was best to replace that one position with two associate level positions.

Parks and Recreation Department – He is recommending funding a crew cab truck and a Parks Maintenance Garbage Truck. He said it was critical with the use of temporary employees to increase our ability to transport them to the various parks and also with the expansion of our park facilities, additional refuse management is needed.

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

Sewer Enterprise fund – He is recommending an additional Street Sweeper and Operator, with the balance of the requests to be treated as contingency requests, where they would come to the Council on an individual basis. He said he wanted to do a little more research to make sure we are making good rate decisions before we add those positions.

Motor Vehicle fund – He is recommending the request for an Equipment Service Worker. He said this cost is charged out to the rates we charged the various departments for maintaining City vehicles.

Development Services – They have asked for 12 positions to be approved as contingency and they will bring them back to the Council, based upon workload. These positions are paid for by the enterprise fund, which is very healthy at this time, and they need this flexibility to meet service level requirements.

City Manager Carey asked that the Council consider approving the three Detective positions today, so that the Police Department can recruit these positions from within the current applicant pool, so we can get them into the academy and started early in the next fiscal year.

Council Member Mayer said he would like to see all the Police Department positions approved now, because it is also hard to recruit for the other positions as well.

Council Member Schmitt said he could not vote yes on this if the dispatcher position was included because we made a commitment for consolidation of dispatching, we are paying taxes for regional dispatching and we are the only entity that is not using that consolidation. He said he felt it was bad for the City to say we are going to increase the budget for police dispatchers, and not use what we are paying for.

A motion was made by Council Member Carrigan, seconded by Council Member Moss, to approve all the recommended Police Department positions to enable staff to recruit for the positions now, so they can be filled by the beginning of the next fiscal year. Council Members Mayer, Salerno, Moss, Carrigan, YES. Council Member Schmitt, NO. Motion Carried.

City Manager Carey asked the Council for any priorities that they felt he had missed. Council Member Mayer asked if we could combine the Web Developer and the Customer Service Coordinator positions into one position. Mr. Carey said that the one position is Customer Service oriented toward what needed to be on the web and the Web Developer more oriented on how the information is put on the web page and he did not feel that the positions were compatible for combining them because one was content oriented and the other was more technical/programming oriented. Assistant City Manager Driscoll further explained the duties of the two positions and said that there are people who are good at public relations and those who are really good at fixing computers and they typically are not congruent. He said there are people out there who can do both, but they are pricey. Mr. Carey said that if the Council wanted to try a hybrid position and if there is an opportunity to advance that type of program, he could support it. Council Member Mayer said he felt that these two positions were important. Mr. Carey said there are things on the list that we are not funding and it was the Council's prerogative to drop or add items.

Council Member Mayer said the court is “up to their eyeballs in alligators” and he felt we ought to look at funding the Court Clerk position. Mr. Carey stated that he did not spend all the money

Minutes for the City Council Budget Workshop of May 3, 2006

available for new needs and there are funds left because he did not want to zero that out, so if the Council felt something was critical and they did not cut out something else on the list, they could go after additional positions without upsetting the apple cart. He said his list is a moderate shot at taking City services forward.

Council Member Carrigan said if the City Attorney's Office gets an additional attorney and we put three more cops on the street, then we should add a Municipal Court Clerk. He said we should also look at the one-time need in the City Attorney's Office to get our municipal code codified. Mr. Carey said that in discussions regarding what we could do with the quarter cent public safety sales tax, it was pointed out that we have to take care of the back end of the business, so if we were to get a sales tax measure, we would need more attorneys for prosecution, more jail rooms, and more people at the courts and these are eligible expenditures in the question that would go before the voters. He emphasized that it would be the Council's decision where we would put the money.

Council Member Schmitt asked if we approve everything as recommended and all the new needs are in place next year, we can anticipate an ending fund balance of \$5.3 million. Discussion ensued regarding the management of the ending fund balance. Mr. Carey said our financial policy says we are going to keep 8.3% in our ending fund balance and create an emergency reserve, and we are managing, in a two year period, to meet those financial policies. He said if we make a moderate set of investments we are right on the numbers and we do go into recovery. He said part of that recovery is "do we do better on revenues?" and rather than assume we would do better on revenues, he chose to be conservative. Mr. Carey emphasized that the ending fund balance is a plan and he wanted to follow the financial policy, so he is being conservative.

Council Member Moss said she also supported the request from the Court for an additional court clerk because they need help. Mr. Carey asked if she also supported the other two positions that were discussed. Ms. Moss said no; although those positions were important; she did not support funding them at this time.

Mayor Martini asked why Mr. Carey did not fund some of the positions on a delayed basis throughout the next year. Mr. Carey responded that he did not feel that this year we needed that kind of control.

Acting Finance Director Joyce Farley commented that they did not put in the request for a new Revenue Assistant the need for a bi-lingual person, but the need is becoming greater because we have to call someone from another department to interpret. She said it would be a minimal increase in the cost for the position. Council Member Carrigan said if we were a private company he would have no problem spending extra money on a bi-lingual person, but we are a government agency and he did not feel it was appropriate to use taxpayer money so we can have someone to translate. Ms. Farley pointed out that there are employees in other departments who were paid extra to translate. Mr. Carey said he believed it was important in the Revenue section, with the variety of customers and clientele that we have, to create this capacity and perhaps we could add this cost by adjusting the timing on this position without it being a major issue. He said he felt that it was important as a community that we do reflect in our services, when we have the opportunity, the ability to communicate in other languages.

Mr. Carey summarized that in following Council's direction, he should listen to Council comments and prepare a couple of alternatives that they could act on at the meeting on the 15th.

Council Member Mayer asked what we were going to do when the Web Intern leaves; get another intern. Mr. Carey confirmed that was the staffing plan, yes. Council Member Mayer also asked if we would just not have a Citizen Services Coordinator. Again Mr. Carey responded yes. Mayor Martini said he did not have a problem with funding the Citizen Services Coordinator and he felt that there were enough students that needed hands-on work experience.

Council Member Mayer said the Citizen Services Coordinator Citizen Services Coordinator was very important because by the time a citizen called a Council Person or the Mayor, they were really mad. Mr. Carey noted that our service levels are constrained in that area and that is why it is recommended. Budget Analyst Debi Hunt requested a clarification on any motion that is made as to what year's budget should be approved for; because if the police officers start in June, what budget do we pay them from. Mr. Carey said that he would cover that with staff later.

Mr. Carey said that we need to talk about the Redevelopment Budgets more at the workshop on the 15th, because we are still struggling with revenues and we want a chance to hammer it out. He said he wanted to make sure everyone is aware that on our property tax collections were substantially revised from the report that we received in December, when we were being informed we would not have enough money for debt service. He said we are getting slightly over the budget in Area I and we are meeting our debt obligations. However, we are just in the throws of some difficult applications of property tax law and redevelopment law and staff needs more time to confer on this.

4. Comments from Mayor, Council and City Manager

City Manager Carey said Council Member Schmitt had a very good idea to get the Council together on the fifth Mondays as they occur throughout the year and this turns out to be a pretty good sequence. He said this month the fifth Monday occurs on the 29th which is Memorial Day. However the following Monday is June 5th, which is the first Monday of the month and we would not have a meeting that day. He asked if the Council could spend half a day in a retreat so we could continue to discuss matters of importance. Consensus was it should be from 8 to 12 noon.

Mr. Carey said there was another day in June, the 24th, which is a Saturday, when we are going to be doing the Leadership Summit on Community Participation.

5 Adjournment

The workshop was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

>>>>