

MINUTES

Eugene Budget Committee
Downtown Library—Bascom-Tykeson Room—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

May 12, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: John Barofsky, Chair; Claire Syrett, Vice Chair; Andrea Ortiz, George Brown, Mike Clark, George Poling, Chris Pryor, Doug Smith, Jennifer Solomon, Betty Taylor, Alan Zelenka, Mary Ann Holser, Terry McDonald, Shanda Miller, Joseph Potwora (participated by phone in the early portion of the meeting), Ramin Shojai, Doug Smith, members; City Manager Jon Ruiz, Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary, Sue Cutsogeorge, Kristie Hammitt, Pavel Gubanikhin, Larry Hill, Mia Cariaga, Central Services Department; Police Chief Pete Kerns, Lori Kievith, Eugene Police Department; Deputy Chief Karen Brack, Fire & Emergency Medical Services; City Attorney Glenn Klein; Rene Grube, Mike Magee, Library, Recreation and Cultural Services; Scott Luell, Planning and Development; Kelly Osborn, City Manager's Office; Kurt Corey, Public Works Department.

Mr. Barofsky convened the meeting. He stated that information regarding the Lane County Animal Services (LCAS) had been circulated along with a handout containing the intended motions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Deb Frisch, 3003 West 11th Avenue, reiterated her unhappiness with city priorities. She supported licensing cats.

Deanna Diehl, 1343 Taft Street, asked the Budget Committee to reverse the decision to cut funding for LCAS. She related that she volunteered there through the Lane Workforce Partnership. She said it was kitten season and the animal shelter was unable to take in all of the cats. She recommended that the City take a lesson from the City of Roseburg, which considered animal control to be part of the public safety budget.

Jenny Broich, 85818 McBeth Road, spoke about the possible \$200,000 budget cut to LCAS. She had started a fundraiser at her middle school. She said the kids at her school cared about shelter pets and many of them had pets that had come from the shelters. She felt that the reason many pets were taken to shelters was that people were too lazy to deal with behavior problems. She stated that taking away officers would mean more animals loose on the street. She believed they could save a lot of animal lives if there was adequate funding, adding that animals are considered family members by many people.

Kathy January, 82971 Scott Lane, Creswell, spoke in support of funding LCAS. She pointed out that the service had taken a lot of cuts. She said animals needed a lot of help. She worked to educate people to spay and neuter, but many people could not afford it. She listed some of the cases of abuse and neglect that she knew of. She favored an ordinance that required spaying and neutering and also licensing cats. She passed out an informational brochure.

Molly Craig, 1306 Pleasant Street, LCAS volunteer, spoke in support of continued funding for LCAS. She saw the financial stress that was already there. She stated that the facility was built in the 1960s and was now not adequate and crowded. She noted that the staff there had come up with “ingenious” ways of getting the dogs out. She said some dogs came in and became frustrated with living in a cage and were more violent as a result. She declared that leaving animals on the street was not a good thing, but there were many people now who just could not afford to keep their pets.

Lisa Wolverton, 2288 Potter Street, member of the LCAS advisory committee, said she could attest to how much the staff and volunteers did with what little they had to work with. She did not see any way they could make further cuts except to cut officers in the field. She declared that they needed those officers in the field and they needed the cattery. She said everyone was stretched to the limit and the animals needed a place to go.

W. Scott Bartlett, 1445 East 21st Avenue, chairman of the Animal Regulation Task Force that was convened in 2002 and 2003, said the task force had tried to look at the whole issue. He stated that the service had “three legs”: its partnerships with Lane County, Greenhill Humane Society, and a multiplicity of private volunteer groups. He averred that it would be ill-advised and premature to talk theoretically about alternate models and different ways to provide the service. He underscored that the task force had looked at all of them and produced an “exhaustive” report. They had concluded that the partnership between the City and the County was doing its job and had made progress. He noted that County Commissioner Pete Sorenson had gone to Allegheny County to see how they had put a stern warning in their tax bills that had resulted in an increase in dog licensing from 44,000 to 100,000. He said they had pleaded with the assessor to include a similar message and the assessor had done so the previous year. He asked that they “look before [they] leap” because they were already getting a good deal for the money they spent. He suggested that the County should designate a property in the Autzen Stadium area for a much-needed new animal shelter.

Mark McConnell, 103 West ‘Q’ Street, Springfield, co-owner of the Emergency Veterinary Hospital, stated that they worked closely with the Eugene and Springfield Police Departments as well as LCAS. He said there were about 40 veterinary hospitals and 100 veterinarians in the community and most worked with LCAS. He stated that LCAS played an integral part in dealing with law enforcement of animal cases; they saw abuse cases and the officers would bring animals in day or night, sometimes in rough shape. He wanted LCAS to function effectively.

Christopher McGill, 1687 Larkspur Loop, stated that he and his wife had been walking dogs for LCAS for the last two years a couple of times per week. He wished to echo the points that some of the other supporters of LCAS had made. He stressed that based on their experience with LCAS it did not seem that there was any excess that could be cut from the service, should the funding be cut.

Mr. Barofsky opened the floor for comments.

Ms. Ortiz noted that she would have to leave at 6:30 p.m. She thanked everyone for coming and testifying. She acknowledged their concerns. She stressed that they were in “really hard times” and that the Budget Committee and City Council were not heartless; they were facing hard decisions with no easy answers. She believed those that said there was nothing left to cut at LCAS. She expected the City Manager to do everything he could to make the dollars go as far as they could. She was not certain how they would decide but, for her, when it came to cutting services for people or cutting services for animals she leaned more toward not cutting services for people. She noted that the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) budget had been cut.

Mr. Clark expressed his appreciation of the public testimony. He asked what the revenue split was for animal licensing. Assistant City Manager Sarah Medary replied that 5% was for spay/neuter vouchers and 95% for operations.

Mr. Clark recalled that the City had split a portion of revenues and after a certain cap number the City took all of the revenues. City Manager Jon Ruiz responded that the cap had been \$300,000 and the proposal had been to remove the cap.

Mr. Clark ascertained that licensing had brought in \$250,000 the previous year. He thought that removing the cap would require a great deal of extra work to get more animals licensed, but it would allow for a greater revenue share when the revenue came in. He was happy that this was being proposed as part of this.

Mr. Poling thanked the young woman who spoke before the committee. He thought she had done an excellent job. He said Ms. Ortiz had touched on his point. He agreed that LCAS budget reduction was a tough decision and he hoped that they would be able to work through it.

Mr. Potwora joined the meeting by telephone.

Ms. Syrett thanked everyone who spoke. She hoped they would be able to restore the funding to LCAS. She said they would have to work together to find other places to take money from. She had asked the Police Chief to provide an analysis of how losing animal control officers would affect the work that police officers did in terms of the public safety issue. She stressed that this would impact both people who owned pets and those who just had a stray dog in their yard. She pointed out that the City could provide \$200,000 for the Olympic Trials but the City did not want to fully support LCAS.

MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Poling, seconded by Mr. Pryor, moved to approve the minutes from the Budget Committee meeting held on April 28, 2010, as presented. The motion was approved unanimously, 15:0:1 (Ms. Ortiz abstaining).

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Ms. Ortiz recalled that they had asked for a graph indicating how much money an increase in animal licensing would net. Mr. Barofsky responded that staff was working on this.

Mr. Clark observed that he had not experienced a budget process in which so few motions were set forward. He wanted to compliment the City Manager and the Finance staff for proposing a budget that needed little revision.

INTENDED MOTIONS

Mr. Poling read his first motion, which if approved would mandate that no one-time money would be allocated to ongoing costs in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. He had watched almost \$6 million be spent out of the Facilities Reserve Fund over the past five years, all of it for ongoing expenditures. He said they could take one-time funds to restore the \$200,000 cut to LCAS but then where would they be next year. He was weary of doing this and intended to vote against any use of one-time funds for ongoing costs. He declared that if they were going to fund something, they should just fund it.

Ms. Holser was concerned that the motion would cripple their ability to rescue services that were important.

Mr. Brown thought that in the normal course of events he would agree with Mr. Poling's motion but he was not certain he could support it. He said they were not in normal times, "band-aids" were needed to keep things going through the current financial disaster.

Ms. Solomon indicated her support for the motion. She said the continued use of one-time funding forced them to have the same conversations year after year and budget items were a litmus test of whether people supported particular issues.

Mr. Barofsky said he would like to hear from the legal counsel about whether the motion was appropriate. It seemed to him that all the money in the budget was one-time money, because they were only voting on the 2011 budget. He thought that if it was the will of the body to fund a service for 2011, they should be allowed to make the motion and let the body decide. He intended to oppose Mr. Poling's motion.

Ms. Taylor did not know how she would vote on the motion. She thought that if they were using one-time money to shore up a service, such as LCAS, with the understanding that over that year the service would make changes in order to figure out a different way to fund it, then one-time funding was justified. She added that the Budget Committee served in an advisory capacity to the City Council and the Council could ultimately change the funding allocations.

Mr. Pryor understood that sometimes one-time funding was needed to maintain a service for a year. He also acknowledged the need to be fiscally responsible. He said they needed to be mindful of not paying for ongoing expenses with one-time money as a general rule.

Ms. Miller agreed with the motion. She believed that to have a sustainable budget they would have to have a structurally balanced budget. She challenged the Budget Committee to do this work and to look beyond one-time money if there was a service that was important to restore.

Mr. Clark appreciated the intent behind the motion. He was uncertain whether he would support it. He believed there could be an exception that would need one-time funding, but he intended to vote in this way as a general rule.

Mr. Zelenka agreed with Mr. Clark; there were exceptions that would need one-time funding but as a general rule this was a good idea.

Mr. Barofsky agreed in concept with the motion but he was uncomfortable with the logistics. He noted that the City Manager had proposed \$450,000 in bridge funding for the ambulance transport service, which was one-time money. He thought in theory they could say the same thing about LCAS. He reiterated his desire for a legal opinion on the motion.

Ms. Holser agreed with the principle behind the motion. She believed that they needed a certain amount of flexibility, though she would support having a policy discussion in this regard outside of the budget process.

Mr. Poling clarified that his motion was not directed at the proposed budget, it was directed at budget amendments that the Budget Committee would put forward. He wanted to stop whittling at reserve funds.

Mr. Pryor thought fiscal discipline was the topic of this discussion. He believed that whether or not the motion passed, it had been constructive to discuss it. He thought that as they deliberated, they needed to have this concept in mind.

Mr. Zelenka's motion was next. He understood that \$14,000 was in the budget for the forest management contract and another \$10,000 was allocated to Hendricks Park for restoration work and \$6,000 for the turfs. He asked what had been in the budget and what had been cut. Public Works Director Kurt Corey replied that \$14,000 was the amount for the specific labor service contract but it did not provide for materials and supplies. He said \$30,000 reflected the entire amount to put the program in place.

Mr. Barofsky provided Mr. Potwora an opportunity to speak to Mr. Poling's motion.

Mr. Potwora also agreed with Mr. Poling's motion in concept, but was concerned about it in practice.

Ms. Ortiz left the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Zelenka said his motion would "hold the line" at Hendricks Park and it would leverage the volunteer hours that went into the work for the park. He was concerned that if they did not keep it whole they would lose ten years of work. He said it was not a lot of money and he suggested that it come from the Council Contingency.

Mr. Poling understood that this would reduce the money budgeted for the Council Contingency in the General Fund from \$150,000 to \$120,000. He asked what they had been averaging in expenditures per year from the Council Contingency. Kristie Hammitt, Executive Director of the Central Services Department, responded that in the average they spent between \$200,000 and \$220,000.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Poling, Mr. Ruiz stated that if the Contingency account ran short, there would be a supplemental budget appropriation from the General Fund reserve. Ms. Cutsogeorge added that it would include a public hearing process. She pointed out that the process would be the same for appropriations from the Council Contingency.

Mr. McDonald liked the idea of reducing the Council Contingency permanently by that amount. He believed that if that was the intent, it had merit. He thought it was easy to go to the contingency account for expenditures and lowering the budgeted contingency amount was one way of addressing that issue.

Ms. Miller stated that contingency funds were for unexpected contingency expenses. She said the proposed budget already reduced the contingency fund by \$90,000. She found this ironic.

Mr. Barofsky recalled that Johnny Medlin, Director of the Parks and Open Space Division, had indicated that if the funding was taken away, the work would be covered by other parks maintenance staff. Mr. Corey responded that this was Mr. Medlin's proposal to backfill the project.

Mr. Zelenka thought the reality was that if the funding went away was that the work would be lumped in with all the other volunteer park work and the park would suffer because the work was specific. He said restoring the funding would free up the volunteer coordinator's time to do other things.

Mr. Barofsky asked Mr. Smith to speak to his intended motion.

Mr. Smith said he had weighed \$8,000 Amazon Pool reduction and how it affected the area swimmers. He could not justify not putting forward a motion to restore the funding, though he now had misgivings about funding it out of the Council Contingency.

Ms. Solomon was not inclined to support the motion. She believed that recreation staff could come up with a formula for the 120 or so people who used the aquatic facility during those four weeks to pay for their use.

Mr. McDonald indicated his strong support of Mr. Smith's proposal. He thought it was one of the best approaches used in the community to keep people active. He indicated that he would not support using the Council Contingency and preferred to make a permanent reduction in the contingency. He added that he was appalled that the Budget Committee was even talking about an \$8,000 item.

Mr. Poling asked that the people reading motions clarify that they were using General Fund money earmarked for the Council Contingency. He recalled that he had asked for a rates comparison on pool usage at the last meeting and reiterated his request. He felt that pool users

were “kind of an elite group” of people. He agreed with Ms. Solomon and was inclined to look into whether the people who used the facility during that four-week period could pay more for it.

Mr. Pryor agreed with Mr. McDonald. He said if they were going to approve this, they should do so and make it permanent. He indicated that he would like to support this group of aquatics users.

In response to a question from Ms. Holser, Library, Recreation and Cultural Services Executive Director AIC Renee Grube explained that the motion would open the 50-meter pool for the first four weeks of the season. Ms. Holser ascertained that it would not serve the majority of users of the pool.

Ms. Taylor said she was inclined to support the motion.

Mr. Zelenka left the meeting at 7 p.m.

Mr. Barofsky was generally in favor of the motion. He thought there could be another funding source in the Library Recreation and Cultural Services (LRCS) Department’s budget. He pointed out that if they took 0.1% of the materials and services (M&S) budget, it would offset this budget reduction.

Ms. Grube pointed out that the LRCS budget for M&S was for the whole department including the Hult Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Smith stated that he served on an aquatics advisory board. He thought they could do something to raise more revenue, but the families involved paid thousands of dollars for the sport. He had found in the archives commentary from 11 years before the Amazon Pool opened that discussed the lack of space to meet demand for swimmers. He believed they were short on aquatic facilities and that they were not just for recreation, they were for teaching water safety.

Mr. McDonald could not recall hearing demographic information on the kids that used the aquatic program. He asked if their socio-economic status was known. Mr. Smith responded that some of the kids who were in the swimming program needed scholarships to participate. He said the masters program fundraised for scholarships in the Emerald Aquatics program. He noted that the kids had to pay for coaches, pool time, and travel.

Mr. McDonald asked if the program had made a difference in anyone’s life. Mr. Smith responded that it had made a difference in his life. Mr. McDonald thought the program created a different kind of resource for kids of various ages when it served them well to be engaged in an activity and to do their very best in it.

BREAK

Mr. Barofsky called for a 10-minute break at 7:10 p.m.

INTENDED MOTIONS [continued]

Ms. Holser said she intended to propose a motion to restore the City's proposed \$200,000 funding reduction to LCAS. She believed that animal control was a core city service related to public health and safety. She explained that this cut would leave LCAS with 1.5 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) animal control officers to do the work for the entire county and city. She had handed out a written explanation of her motion. She was concerned about the ramifications of an increase in the feral cat population and the potential for disease outbreaks. She also acknowledged the importance of animals to people as pets and family members. She thought the funding should come from public safety because this was a public safety issue.

Ms. Syrett was supportive of restoring the \$200,000 to LCAS but she wanted to try to find a way to offset it. She agreed that cutting the funds to LCAS would seriously impact the community. She also viewed it as a public safety issue.

Ms. Taylor ascertained that LCAS did not impound feral cats but supported trapping and spaying or neutering them.

Mr. Potwora arrived at 7:29 p.m.

Ms. Solomon remarked that the larger discussion was about the partnership. She said if they did not think the partnership was working, they should figure out what was wrong. She asked what the expectation was in a year to get the services back. She noted that it was a huge issue in her ward.

Mr. Ruiz said the intent was not to cut the partnership. He stated that the City is making cuts in a lot of places. He said they wanted to provide animal services that the partners agreed upon given the current financial realities.

Ms. Solomon thought that 'partnership' was a misnomer because it did not seem that the City had an equal say in the delivery of services. Instead, the City and LCAS have a contractual relationship.

Mr. Barofsky stated that he did not know if allocating \$200,000 less to LCAS in FY11 is the best way to address fiscal concerns. He underscored that the cut was substantial. He wanted to see them move toward a better model. He suggested that one way they could move toward a better model would be to give the City Manager \$100,000 more than what had been proposed to achieve the goals. He was not certain that reducing the contract by \$200,000 was prudent.

Mr. Ruiz agreed that \$200,000 was a significant reduction. He said it was approximately 10% of the total LCAS budget. He noted that over the past couple of years the City had reduced its General Fund spending by 15% to 17%. He averred that he was not interested in laying off city employees in lieu of reducing the LCAS contract.

Mr. Zelenka returned to the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

Mr. Potwora noted that he had read the contract with LCAS and that the very first clause addressed in it had to do with enforcement. He said there had been 4,700 enforcement contacts. He thought they were not getting that much for their money. He felt there were more efficient ways to provide the service.

Ms. Syrett was not certain they had given the same kind of attention to the cut that was proposed for LCAS. She suggested that one idea would be to fold an enforcement officer into the City who would answer Eugene calls for service. She added that she had seen strong evidence that LCAS had worked hard to bring more volunteers in and to make it a more volunteer-friendly place.

Ms. Holser observed that Eugene was part of Lane County and vice versa. She said the county was lean and had done a lot with what it had. She felt that LCAS was not broken, but the City is proposing to take money out of something that was already very lean. She wanted the County and the City to talk about how they could work together to provide this service. She underscored that once the funding was taken away, it would be gone in perpetuity.

Mr. Clark believed that animal control was an important public safety function. He related that a woman in his ward had called him after coming home to find two pit bulls killing her cat in her front yard. She had wanted him to propose a motion to ban pit bulls in Eugene and he told her that would be a difficult thing to accomplish. He said the reality of what had happened was that the neighbor who owned the dogs was fined a couple hundred dollars and the dogs were back in a few days and were required to be kept in a special pen and wear special collars. He believed that if that sort of thing could happen and the dog owner only received a fine of a couple hundred dollars, then the fine structure needed to be reevaluated so that the fine was more significant. He said if they were removing the cap on the revenue from licensing, they still had a long ways to go. He thought that if they licensed more animals the cost of licensing could be reduced and then if they increased the fines to owners who were irresponsible, more revenue could be generated.

Mr. Smith agreed. It seemed to him that the community had a problem with domestic animals. He said he probably would support restoring the \$200,000 with the caveat that it could dry up at a later point.

Mr. Poling had asked for a comparison chart of license fees and fines. He agreed with Mr. Clark that people in Eugene were basically slapped on the hand. He believed that fines should be heftier.

Mr. McDonald recalled that a couple of sessions ago Mr. Ruiz had talked about the strategy behind it and that he had said there were other models and that they were looking at best practices. He related that Mr. Ruiz had suggested that there were other ways to deliver the service; they could not do business as they had done in the past.

Mr. Barofsky said as someone who was on the fence on the issue, it would take creative thinking regarding the funding to sway him. He needed to know what the tradeoffs would be.

Mr. Potwora asked how much revenue is generated from fines and forfeitures. Ms. Hammitt replied that the revenue from enforcement went back into the General Fund. She said Municipal Court fees brought in between \$2.2 and \$2.3 million in fine revenues.

Ms. Hammitt said the cut to LCAS was not a reflection on the service quality, it was about making tough choices within the budget process.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Police Chief Pete Kerns asked Public Safety Finance Manager, Lori Kievith, to briefly discuss the police budget.

Ms. Kievith stated that the overall public safety budget had stayed the same. Chief Kerns added that they had maintained the overtime budget in the patrol division for many years and to make the expenditures match a little better they had reapportioned it. Ms. Kievith said the FTE had gone up slightly but the overall budget had been reduced.

Mr. Barofsky presented his proposed motion, which would move to recommend to the City Council that \$200,000 of the FY11 marginal beginning working capital in the General fund, after the \$900,000 was transferred, be transferred for the repair and resurface unimproved streets. He thought this was a good use of one-time money.

Mr. Pryor stated that he was interested in transportation improvements. He was intrigued by the creativity of the proposed motion, but he was concerned about whether unimproved streets are really the best project on which to spend \$200,000. He pointed out that they could put \$200,000 into one unimproved street and hardly notice that something had been done. He thought that those sorts of projects were better done using Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) and assessments.

Mr. Corey shared his perspective. He said the City staff had worked hard to get to the \$6 million General Fund reduction. He stated that if there was \$200,000 more available it could potentially be used for extending the pothole program. He reiterated that there were some unknowns, such as House Bill (HB) 2001 which would institute a state gas tax increase. He thought one way to consider the motion would be to express that the first portion of that revenue should go to this type of program. He said this would get them to the same end result.

Mr. Ruiz requested that the motion include some flexibility given that there was some uncertainty about how much beginning marginal working capital would be available.

Mr. Clark was not certain how he would vote on the motion. He thought it was right that property owners should share in the payment and responsibility for improving unimproved streets. He also felt that the City had a responsibility for maintenance on unimproved roads. He had asked for an action plan for how they would work to bring up the unimproved roads to city standards.

Mr. Poling asked what the cost had been for the resurfacing project on Arcadia Street. Mr. Corey responded that he was not certain but he did know that it was a fraction of what it would have cost for a reconstruction to current standards. Mr. Poling requested the information about the actual cost of the four-block stretch of street. He wanted to know just how much in street improvements \$200,000 would provide.

Mr. Shojai also wanted to know the answer to that question. Mr. Corey replied that it depended on the type of project. He said \$200,000 would “go a good long way” in a maintenance overlay. He recalled that the Bond Lane project had cost approximately \$60,000.

Mr. Zelenka clarified that the \$900,000 transfer from the General Fund went to preserve capital assets, and \$1 million was added to this. He recalled that the value of the City's assets was around \$300 million. He felt that the amount that was allocated for this was "woefully inadequate." He asked how much they had budgeted for filling potholes. Mr. Corey was not certain; the work was included in the operations and maintenance costs of the Public Works Department. He said the total cost of all maintenance services for the transportation network was approximately \$9.8 million.

Mr. Zelenka observed that though potholes were a temporary fix, it did demonstrate to people that the City was working to improve their streets. He agreed that people should have to pay assessments to help rebuild streets.

Mr. Potwora asked what would happen if the motion did not pass. Mr. Barofsky replied that the \$200,000 would become part of the marginal beginning working capital and be put in reserve.

Mr. Barofsky asked the committee to look at the financial management goals and policies. He said policy A-4, Service Priorities, directed that they maintain and replace the City's fixed assets in addition to maintaining services. He stated that his motion fell under this policy.

Mr. Pryor felt that they needed to have a policy discussion on the degree they needed to maintain unimproved streets. He also thought it was important to allow some flexibility in how this would work.

Ms. Holser understood that when people had bought a house on an unimproved street they had not known that they would someday be assessed. She asked how they would deal with the historical aspect of this type of growth-required improvement. Mr. Corey replied that this was a broad topic on which the council had held an extensive discussion. He said through various adopted documents, the expectation was that the public infrastructure within the City would at some point be developed and maintained the City's standard.

Mr. Barofsky asked if there were other proposed motions.

Mr. Potwora said he thought the City had done a good job of showing that the usage of the Amazon Pool was about 4-5% during the suggested period they would delay the opening. He thought that if they just focused on the sports aspects of aquatics it would seem by definition to be tremendously subsidized. He commented that if the YMCA was short \$8,000, it would pass the expenses on to its users.

Mr. Clark observed that the chance of there being excess money in the FY11 budget was small. He said in the event there was some money, he would suggest using it on a one-time capital project. He stated that North Eugene was underserved comparatively for neighborhood parks. He related that they had a number of city-owned parcels in the area that were waiting to become parks. He explained that one, called Creekside Park, was ready to go but because of system development charge (SDC) revenues dropping, had been pushed out to 2014. He said people had actually bought houses in that area because they thought a park would be developed there. He noted that he rarely attended functions at his kids' grade school or neighborhood association

meetings without someone asking him when the City would develop that park that was promised. He wanted to add the development of this park as a potential motion toward the beginning fund balance if it was in excess of \$900,000 and, if Mr. Barofsky's motion passed, the additional \$200,000.

Mr. Potwora asked if he would support some kind of mechanism to help pay for maintenance of this park. It seemed to him that the City had parks that it could not currently afford to maintain.

Mr. Clark noted that there were a number of neighbors who had volunteered to participate in the development and ongoing maintenance of Creekside Park, as well as an area business that owned grounds-keeping equipment.

Mr. Pryor requested the information on the annual maintenance costs for a park of this size.

Ms. Syrett asked if the park was in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Clark affirmed that it was, for fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Zelenka explained that he had left the Budget Committee meeting to attend an Amazon Neighbors meeting.

Mr. Barofsky stated that the Budget Committee public hearing was scheduled for Monday, May 17, at 7:30 p.m. following the Budget Committee meeting scheduled for 5:30 p.m. The Budget Committee would be making motions at the meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 P.M.

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)