

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF JUNE 26TH CITY COUNCIL MEETING RE DRAFT 17-19 BUDGET

6.26.17 Council Meeting - Bob Lingl said no progress had been made.....

47:10 Mosby: "First of all I'd like to say we have made progress. It wasn't too long ago you said we couldn't cut our way out of it & actually with what staff brought back it does show that we can with a simple 4% cut, one simple 4% reset. We can reposition ourselves & we can fund everything including animal services, all the non-profits including their advertising budget. And I think it's important to understand what we're looking at doing this for. And this 4% net cut is still protect & preserve the pension funds of the city employees. And in going back & looking at some of the areas we could do this, we've had some experiments we've tried over the years, in the last 4-6 years. I think some of them need to be reset. We need to readjust, tighten the belts. Maybe 1-2 of these areas need to go away right now. And understanding that in 2 years our general fund will be back right at the same number where it is now because we're anticipated at 2% personnel increase each year for the next 10 years, according to page 138 in the budget book, and a 2.2% annual increase in operational expenses.

I think we've come a long way. You see there is an opportunity and there is another way out. I think it's not proper to anticipate, I don't think it's a balanced budget if you put forward & accept it on potential, hypothetical taxes of \$1/6m and \$.5m in sales in real estate. So I don't think that's truly a balanced budget. I would be surprised if the state would accept that as a balanced budget because the taxes haven't passed. They haven't even been put forward to be put on. (*the ballot*). But I think there's an opportunity, and there's a way to get that. We just need to look at areas that have gone up. As one example:

(1) **City Administration** expenses from (20)11-13 to what they're asking for now have gone from \$2.8m to \$4.2m. So I think there's an area there that we can go. That's 4 years. In 4 years the movement has moved that far.

(2) **Public Works Engineering** \$1.8m to \$2.7m. So I think there's some areas there we can look at. We're fully staffed in engineering. We don't have a lot going on.

(3) **Community Development and Planning** has gone from \$600k to \$2.7m.

(4) **Economic Development** from \$.5m to \$1.1m. *(64% of Economic Development is coming out of utilities)*

(5) **Building Inspection** from \$600k to \$1m.

(6) We have **4 GIS Techs** they are trying to bring in. I don't think we need that many GIS Techs. I think 2 of the vacancies are still right there so if we held those positions off you wouldn't have to bring in.

(7) You know I can go further ... The **Fire Department** went from \$7.3m to \$11.6m in 4 years. There was a little bit of an experiment there. We came in after the SAFER grant went out, we funded some positions. For many, many years we operated with an auxiliary of position. We don't have to reset that all the way back but I think there's opportunities there. We've been very experimental with the Fire Marshall. The Fire Chief used to be our Fire Marshall and Acting Battalion Chiefs were the Deputy Fire Marshalls. Now we have an isolated all stand-alone Fire Marshall position. So we've had some experiments that we've tried. Economics are telling us that we need to tighten the belt and take a look at this. *(first full-time employee in the position sworn in at the city council meeting 5.6.14 - as the new fire prevention specialist, a deputy fire marshal and fire captain position. Former Battalion Chief Stan Hart acted as the previous fire prevention specialist by an agreement with the department*

- http://lompocrecord.com/news/local/fire-dept-hires-fire-prevention-specialist/article_0af09adc-d4e7-11e3-a31a-0019bb2963f4.html)

(September 2015 - present Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal)

But there is several millions of dollars right here that we need to focus on and look at.

We haven't even put one, not one single cut has come on here.

(8) We have **5.5 new positions right now. We have 10.5 positions last budget cycle.** We have a **multitude of new titles coming to people out here** and not one cut has been put forward

except asking the people to give up, which potentially would be a \$300-500 tax per household. I'm calling it **The Christmas Tax**. Give up Christmas as you have known it everybody if this tax passes. That's \$500 a year of disposable income for the people in this town that the people don't have.

(9) We saw some more footage up here of **the hypothetical taxes** and taxes that are solid in other areas but it's apples to oranges comparison. It really is and I really don't see.. your Councilman Starbucks says this - that people are not going to impose thisespecially when you're imposing a tax to cover pension obligations. This isn't to fix streets, sidewalks, keep the library open longer. **This is a tax for pensions**. So I think we need to look at it this other way. We did a report, an independent report came in from city hall to show that with a 4% net, one-time reset, and mind you, the following year you'de still have a 2% increase in personnel expenses and the next year you have a 2% increase as well. So I think there are other alternatives."

I pose these as questions. I'm not making a statement. I'm just putting it out there.