

(Bold indicates New SBIs and Highlighted items will be delivered when available)

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Status
1	List of revenue options?	5/3	6	6/02 Budget Report
2	Can we develop a website where community can get budget information, ask questions, and make recommendations?	5/3	5	5/12 Budget Report
3	Identify the components of the \$20m labor increase?	5/3	1	Delivered 5/17
4	What would the budget look like if we didn't cut public safety?	5/3	6	Delivered 5/17
5	What is the break out of the \$222.1m discretionary GF by department: \$ and %?	5/3	6	Delivered 5/17
6	Prior four year reductions by departments \$ and FTE?	5/3	6	Delivered 5/17
7	How many of 250 FTE are vacant?	5/3	8	Delivered 5/17
8	How to better describe how we get to \$222.1?	5/3	1	Delivered 5/17
9	How to show value of union concession over time?	5/3	1	Delivered 5/17
10	Economic development opportunities to grow our revenues?	5/3	Mayor	Delivered 5/24
11	How to and how long to get to beyond a 10% reserve?	5/3	Mayor	Delivered 5/17
12	Over last 4 years how much cut and how has that impacted jobs growth?	5/3	Mayor	Delivered 5/24
13	What is oversight and consequences on overspending?	5/3	Mayor	to be determined (TBD)
14	Are there efficiencies (Marina to Transportation, Parking to Police) and/or consolidations that could provide additional savings?	5/3 & 5/17	Mayor	6/02 Budget Report
15	Are there savings if we were to close the Public Safety Center on Freeport Blvd and consolidate staffing at other City facilities?	5/3 & 5/17	1, 6, 7	Delivered 6/02
16	Why can't we change cost allocation to save Public Safety?	5/3	1	Delivered 5/17
17	Report back on the cost of utilities at the smaller clubhouses.	5/12	6	Delivered 6/07
18	Provide solutions to restore \$1 million in funding for Parks and Recreation programs/services - all funds should be looked at.	5/12	6	Delivered 6/07
19	Provide options to get to a minimal level of operations at community centers that are not scheduled to have alternate service providers, or already have alternative service providers.	5/12	3	Delivered 6/07
20	Rightsizing has to be looked at. We need to look at management to employee ratios - provide a span of control report.	5/12	2	Delivered 5/24
21	How much does Transportation bring back to the General Fund?	5/17	1	6/02 Budget Report
22	Provide a break out of the reductions taken by office for the Mayor/Council and Charter Offices.	5/17	6	5/24 Presentation
23	Double check the cost of Fire Station 43 and the cost of the expired contract.	5/17	1	Delivered 5/24
24	Provide a breakdown of the \$9 million revenue reduction estimate?	5/17	6	6/02 Budget Report
25	Can Marina fees be used for General Fund purposes in a similar way as on-street parking?	5/17	3	Delivered 6/07
26	How does Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) and the General Fund (GF) flow to the Arts Program? Would restoring the GF 1/2% and reducing the true GF fully fund the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission (SMAC) program (at the reduced level).	5/17	3	Delivered 6/07
27	How much is left in the Arts Stabilization designation?	5/17	3	Delivered 6/07
28	How much would the City really save by contracting out Golf? Would we work with the contractor to pick up our staff if we do contract this out?	5/17	1	Delivered 6/07
29	Is there a tie in between green waste pick-up and illegal dumping. Can we revisit Proposition 218 relative to illegal dumping?	5/17	3	Delivered 6/07
30	What is the cost of all of the Gang Violence/Cease fire operations?	5/17	5	Delivered 6/07
31	How many exempt staff currently in the Police Department's administrative services? Can some of the sworn exempt be moved out of administration and into patrol?	5/17	2	Delivered 6/07
32	Will Police Department layoffs result in Police Officers replacing the reserve staff currently working in City Hall and/or as the Mayor's drivers, etc?	5/17	2	Delivered 6/07
33	How much citation money does the City receive from commercial vehicle inspections and who gets this revenue?	5/17	2	Delivered 6/07
34	Provide additional information/detail on Police Department positions, assignments/locations and associated costs.	5/17	1 & 5	Delivered 6/07

FY2010/11 Supplemental Budget Information

Table of Contents

6/06/2011

(Bold indicates New SBIs and Highlighted items will be delivered when available)

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Status
35	If we could build back, what are the Police Department priorities/most important restorations?	5/17	5	Delivered 6/07
36	What are the current vacancies for Police Officers and how many layoffs will happen with and without the grant restoration?	5/17	5	Delivered 6/07
37	We need to re-look at our existing policy on covering costs - is there a way to bill the State for response to protests and/or for costs associated with large events that come to Sacramento?	5/17	6	Delivered 6/07
38	How much of the \$2.2 million in furlough savings is related to Police Department furloughs?	5/17	6	Delivered 5/24
39	What is the delinquency rate on Community Development fees/revenues?	5/24	8	Delivered 6/07
40	What is the value of a 10% reduction to Finance? 5 and 10% reductions in IT and HR? 15% in the City Manager's Office?	5/24	7	Delivered 6/02
41	Provide an update at Midyear on the collection rates achieved by the two collection positions recommended in the Proposed Budget for Finance	5/24	2	FY2011/12 Midyear Report
42	Reserved			
43	Is a new Management position being added to IT to deal with Web Services?	5/24	7	Delivered 6/02
44	With proposed cuts, what will effect be on City Attorney's Office ability to retain litigation in-house as much as possible? If there is a lawsuit as a result of department action, not covered by insurance policy, how is cost of defense paid for? What does a department's budget pay for?	5/24	4	TBD
45	Provide comparison staffing and workload information for the CAO with other comparable jurisdictions.	5/24	1	TBD
46	Is there a 218 issue related to depositing revenues received from wireless installations attached to Utility facilities into the General Fund.	5/24	public	TBD
47	Review the Wireless/Billboard Revenue Policy directing these revenues to the General Fund in 3 fiscal years (FY2013/14).	5/24	3	FY2013/14 Midyear
48	What changes need to be made in order to allow Council Members to fundraise for city programs and not have conflicts with election restrictions.	5/24	1	TBD
49	Historically have Fire Department year end results been used to balance the General Fund?	5/24	1, 2, 6	6/2 Budget Hearing
50	Do the revenues from the Fire District contracts fully support the City's cost of service?	5/24	5	Delivered 6/07
51	Has 522 indicated to you that they feel our revenue estimate for ALS should be higher? We need to evaluate and see if there are options to increase our ALS revenue budget to restore brownouts.	5/24	2, 6	Delivered 6/07
52	Bring back a discussion item addressing what policies are needed to address how new revenues are utilized.	5/24	5	After Budget Policy Discussion
53	Is ALS making money or not? Is it self sustainable?	5/24	7	Delivered 6/07
54	Audit golf course maintenance - are things being done maintenance and operationally correct?	6/02	2	Delivered 6/07
55	Prior to recess, bring back tentative schedule of what this might look like for summer and fall. (how to start, when to start, what are first steps.)	6/02	5	TBD
56	Provide back up on the SHRA pass through estimate	6/02	3	Delivered 6/07
57	Provide recent sales tax results (understand other organizations are estimating increases of 2-3 %)	6/02	3	6/07 Budget Report
59	Are there funds to cover the transition period between the City and Non-profits for the community centers?	6/02	2	6/07 Budget Report

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 54

Question/Issue:

Have we audited the Golf contract and golf maintenance?

Response:

In 2001, the City entered into a contract with Morton Golf for the provision of golf professional services, retail and restaurant services at all the City golf courses. This contract is monitored for compliance on a quarterly basis. Audited Financial Statements are reviewed annually and at the request of the Convention, Culture and Leisure Department, the contract was audited by the City's external auditor in 2005. The results of that audit showed that were they found to be in compliance with the contract.

Golf maintenance is reviewed monthly and expenditures are adjusted based on revenue. The Golf courses have not been maintained to the USGA standards due to lack of adequate funds. Staff levels are comparable to industry standards; however, supplies, equipment, repair and capital funds are inadequate.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 56

Question/Issue:

Provide back up on the SHRA pass through estimate.

Response:

SHRA staff has prepared the attached response to this question.



INVESTING IN COMMUNITIES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cassandra Jennings, Assistant City Manager

FROM: La Shelle Dozier, Executive Director

DATE: 6/6/2011

SUBJECT: SHRA pass through payments report back

CC: Tia Boatman-Patterson, Betty Matsuoka

Historically, the City of Sacramento has not elected to receive pass through payments from its redevelopment project areas, but has instead invested those funds in redevelopment efforts through the issuance of bonds to fund projects in the redevelopment project areas. On May 26th 2009 the City made a temporary election to receive pass through payments for a three year period that expires with the 2010-11 fiscal year (See attached staff report and resolution).

The eligibility to receive pass through payments and the methodologies used to calculate them are governed by statute. Under the provisions of California Redevelopment Law, the calculation of pass through payments is extremely complex and varies widely depending upon several factors including but not limited to the following:

Tax Increment Revenues:

- Pass through payments are based on the amount of tax increment generated in a eligible project area.

Date:

- Project areas adopted prior to 1994 are not eligible for pass through payments unless they have a negotiated pass through agreement in place prior to plan adoption; however, some pre-1994 project areas can trigger pass through payments due to major redevelopment plan amendments.

Offsets:

- Redevelopment law requires that pass through payments to the adopting jurisdiction be offset by investments of tax increment in public facilities and infrastructure.

The level of pass through payments varies annually based upon the increase or decrease in assessed values for the redevelopment project area. There have been significant reductions in

assessed value for our redevelopment project areas, as property values have been adjusted down based upon the settlement of property tax appeals by owners. The following tables summarize our current pass through estimates and the basis for those estimates.

SUMMARY

City of Sacramento Pass Through Payments

	2010-11 est.	2011-12 est.
Pre-1994		
Amended		
Alkali Flat	17,566	17,766
Del Paso Heights	79,229	80,917
Merged Downtown	338,655	277,939
Oak Park	80,672	82,082
Post 1994 (AB1290)		
River District Amend	12,642	11,678
65th Street	Offset	Offset (1)
Army Depot	Offset	Offset (1)
Army Depot Amend	Offset	Offset (1)
Railyards	Offset	Offset (1)
Stockton Blvd	Offset	Offset (1)
Pre-1994 Negotiated Pass Through Agreements		
Franklin Blvd	Ineligible	Ineligible (2)
North Sacramento	Ineligible	Ineligible (2)
River District	Ineligible	Ineligible (2)
Total Pass Through Payments	528,766	470,382

(1) AB 1290 (Post 1994) project areas are exempt from pass through payment due to offset provision - H&SC 33607.5 pass through payments are to be offset by investments of tax increment in public facilities and infrastructure.

(2) Ineligible - pass through agreements - H&SC 33607.5 project areas were adopted prior to 1/1/1994 with negotiated pass through agreements in place, therefore City is not eligible to elect to receive pass through payments.

DETAIL BASIS FOR PASS THROUGH CALCULATIONS

City of Sacramento Pass Through Payments

RDA	Basis for Payment	2010-11			2011-12			Formula	Note
		Basis	City Share	Estimate	Basis	Estimate			
Pre-1994									
Amended Plans									
Alkali Flat	TI Revenue								
	Assessed Value (AV)	132,317,039			132,704,933				
	Base Year AV	98,166,505			98,166,505				
	AV subject to pass through	34,150,534	25.72%	17,566	34,538,428	17,766		((AV subject to Pass Through) x 1%) x 20% x [City Share]	
Del Paso Heights	TI Revenue								
	Assessed Value (AV)	328,612,263			332,604,721				
	Base Year AV	141,214,710			141,214,710				
	AV subject to pass through	187,397,553	24.16%	79,229	191,390,011	80,917		((AV subject to Pass Through) x 1%) x 17.5% x [City Share]	(1)
Merged Downtown	TI Revenue								
	Assessed Value (AV)	2,665,252,583			2,530,353,850				
	Base Year AV	1,912,829,158			1,912,829,158				
	AV subject to pass through	752,423,425	25.72%	338,655	617,524,692	277,939		((AV subject to Pass Through) x 1%) x 17.5% x [City Share]	(1)
Oak Park	TI Revenue								
	Assessed Value (AV)	458,945,927			461,686,104				
	Base Year AV	302,112,293			302,112,293				
	AV subject to pass through	156,833,634	25.72%	80,672	159,573,811	82,082		((AV subject to Pass Through) x 1%) x 20% x [City Share]	
Post 1994 (AB1290)									
River District Amend	TI Revenue	245,772	25.72%	12,642	227,022	11,678		((Revenue) x 20% x [City Share])	
65th Street	TI Revenue	1,224,603	25.72%	Offset	1,193,413	Offset			(2)
Army Depot	TI Revenue	1,398,490	25.88%	Offset	1,432,058	Offset			(2)
Army Depot Amend	TI Revenue	1,463,163	25.73%	Offset	1,498,283	Offset			(2)
Railyards	TI Revenue	210,950	25.72%	Offset	164,552	Offset			(2)
Stockton Blvd	TI Revenue	1,748,411	16.90%	Offset	1,792,879	Offset			(2)
Pre-1994									
Negotiated Pass Through Agreements									
Franklin Blvd	Negotiated Pass Through Agreements			ineligible		ineligible			(3)
North Sacramento	Negotiated Pass Through Agreements			ineligible		ineligible			(3)
River District	Negotiated Pass Through Agreements			ineligible		ineligible			(3)

(1) Pass through calculation at 17.5% of gross tax increment because project areas pay 30% to Low/Mod Fund due to SB 211 project area extensions (70% x 25%) = 17.5%

(2) AB 1290 (Post 1994) project areas are exempt from pass through payment due to offset provision - H&SC 33607.5 pass through payments are to be offset by investments of tax increment in public facilities and infrastructure

(3) Ineligible - pass through agreements - H&SC 33607.5 project areas were adopted prior to 1/1/1994 with negotiated pass through agreements in place, therefore City is not eligible to elect to receive pass