53 Action Items for Council Budget Committee Meeting of 11/12/08

ACTION ITEM 1 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

The current MOUs with our labor organizations require meet and confer to impose a furlough in the middle of the year. If you opened them up for this one item, it may or may not come to resolution. ***What are the steps that need to be taken and how long do you estimate that timing would be? Is it two weeks? Is it three weeks? It is a month?***

ACTION ITEM 2 (from Councilmember Faulconer)

Reduction in the project funding for CCDC – so they would have to adjust their budget accordingly. ***Has CCDC provided information as to what that would mean in terms of putting either projects on hold or stopping projects?***

ACTION ITEM 3 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

Redevelopment and borrowing monies. There are legal requirements and restrictions on what can work and what cannot. ***What are the areas, and what is eligible for repayment when you make that decision? What restrictions are on that money and how does that affect timing versus debt in Redevelopment agencies? What are the rules?***

ACTION ITEM 4 (from Councilmember Faulconer and the IBA):

As we are looking at the budget cut proposals there are a lot of questions with respect to what's included in 2010 and beyond. ***What is temporary and how is temporary defined versus long term? If the proposed cuts to libraries, as an example, are temporary, how long is that and how would we be able to figure out which of those are temporary versus long term? There is no end date? Are all reductions assumed through the five-year outlook – not just through 2010? We need to know the list, if there are some that are one year versus two years, versus five years. So – if we could just have three lists.***

ACTION ITEM 5 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

I wanted to get to the issue the IBA talked about in terms of the new facilities and the funding. ***How is that going to work in terms of new facilities, the proposal? Can we get a list of the projects that are currently under construction to see if they have started construction or not before we build and have to make that decision?***

ACTION ITEM 6 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

The timing of upcoming BPRs: ***How do we save money that's capital? Are there any BPR savings that are out there that are part of either this midyear or next year's***

budget that are coming down the path? And for what reasons? What are some of the potential BPR's that are coming down to the Council and do you have a list of those? What is the ball park of potential savings on all of those items?

ACTION ITEM 7 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

New user fee analysis working with the general fund departments. ***Do you have an estimate at this time about how much that would entail?***

ACTION ITEM 8 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

The five-year fiscal report. ***This includes no salary increases for five years? On any level in any department?***

ACTION ITEM 9 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

The City Attorney budget. ***Is there a possible $1.8 million overrun? Can Mr. Tomanek or Larry or the right person answer for me the reasons behind that and then how do we prevent that from happening, because you said at the current spending rate and we're only a quarter of the way through the year, the fiscal year? We're going to need to address that. Can I just do the math and say if it stopped after the first quarter than that's what it would be in terms of the overage? To try to prevent that $1.8 from being realized If you were able to make some changes and got back those positions that you could potentially keep that overage of $1.8 million potentially to $500,000 if you stopped it now, is that a correct assumption or an incorrect assumption on my part?***

ACTION ITEM 10 (from Councilmember Faulconer):

The impact on the 127 settlement.

Ms. Lewis which is the $1 million impact as I was looking at your presentation today? I thought that was going to be higher for some reason. Does the 127 settlement have to come back to Council? That's a one year or a multiple year impact? I had the 3 year $4 million in my mind and maybe that's just incorrect.

Goldstone: It will be a multiple year impact because it goes retroactive essentially to July 1st 2005 when the new MOU or the then MOU went into effect because the City was not able to contribute an extra $600 million into the pension system. It calls for the returning of all monies collected by the City from that MOU.

Faulconer: Which was about $6 or $7 million? That money was segregated?And that $1 million will cut across multiple years ? That number will remain constant because that has to do with part of the pick up or not, correct?

ACTION ITEM 11 (from Councilmember Hueso):

City Attorney's budget. ***If you give any department including the City Attorney's office a specific number on employees they can hire or FTE's or whatever you want to call it and a specific budgetary amount; how can they exceed that? How can they hire somebody outside of that process? What's the loophole? What are they getting around? Is it auditing that's not doing their job and just releasing funds to pay for costs that are not in the budget? How does that happen? Can somebody explain that to me? How do we keep people within budget? I know we have to respond to emergencies. How can a department go over budget and especially when we go through this process of hiring outside counsel and spending money on that?***

Tomanek: We had projected $1.6 a couple of months ago now it's down to $1.3. There will probably be changes coming up in the next few weeks but the disconnect is the office operates as an independent office and therefore the thinking was being independent—

Hueso: ***Independent from what? Do we have to freeze spending?***

ACTION ITEM 12 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Prop 40 funds. I've been hearing different information that the Governor is going to take back Prop. 40 and we've been using Prop. 40 within our own districts and I know that I use Prop. 40 to fund the swim programs within my district. ***Are we going to lose Prop. 40 funds?***

ACTION ITEM 13 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Blue level swim team funding. ***RZH is not intact anymore, so we can't continue to apply that, correct? That money is not applied for Blue Level? If we have staff that can continue to provide that function, why aren't we providing it? If we have the staff that can continue to provide the service, why can't they continue offering that program? Then I'd like to have an accounting on Blue Level specifically to see if we can keep that going.***

ACTION ITEM 14 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Ordinance that allows Council infrastructure funds. ***If we can apply these funds to a service within our district I want to know what we would have to do to allow our infrastructure funds to be used for services not necessarily bricks and mortar but services. If it requires a Council vote, I'd like to know what we can do to program those funds specifically for services to keep some of these programs going and if we can apply those to our respective districts.***

ACTION ITEM 15 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Anticipated cuts with community service centers***. If we found a way through partnership, what is the possibility of entering into an agreement with some of these organizations in exchange for rent, or in addition to rent, or some kind of partnership?***

Some are non profits, some are for profits ,but specifically the non profits that are out there that depend on these community service centers to provide services. ***What can we do to enter into agreements with them to help us manage the service centers to keep them open and would that require any amendments to our MOU's with the labor unions? I'd like to see an analysis on San Ysidro if that's something we can do.*** I know we have MAAC Project there, we have a mediation center, we have the San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce, we have different non profits there that can possibly step up and help us keep these service centers open.

ACTION ITEM 16 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Real Estate Assets and sales of property that have not necessarily been added to the budget. ***Is that something that you are considering in these adjustments?***

ACTION ITEM 17 (from Councilmember Hueso):

We can use capital improvement project dollars wherever we can use capital improvement dollars from our general fund to provide services. We can use these sales dollars to replace those funds. ***Have you anticipated that? Has it freed up service funds from the general fund?***

ACTION ITEM 18 (from Councilmember Hueso):

We have deferred maintenance back logs, we have unfunded parks, we have a number of things in our City that we are not addressing and we currently don't have a plan. ***I would like our City Attorney's office to come back with some processes to help us really tackle items that have been ignored for the past 15 years by our City.***

ACTION ITEM 19 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Use of money set aside for bond payments. ***The money that we've set aside to pay for the bond for this fiscal year has been absorbed? We can't count on that money to help balance shortfall? Have you had a chance to look at some of the recommendations by the IBA on other revenue options? That's something we can work through. I'd like to know from our City Attorney's office a legal opinion in terms of how we get to discussion. I know we may look at it through some of our committees but I want a more formal recommendation in terms of how do we get to a process of evaluating some of these issues and what do we need to do? Is this an internal Council vote? Is that a voter approved measure on some of these issues; it would be nice to have some direction on how we go through that on a legislative process?***

ACTION ITEM 20 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Elimination of free small business refuse collection. ***What is that? Small business refuse collection? Is that a program that we're funding currently?***

ACTION ITEM 21 (from Councilmember Hueso):

Other recommendations that were proposed on Attachment 2 that amount to about $9 million, I know they were not considered but that's an amount of money that does not affect Police and Fire and it doesn't affect parks and library services and I'd rather really try to focus on reducing cut backs to Police, Fire, Library and Parks. We really want to put an emphasis on making those specific departments a priority and it doesn't seem like a lot of these here are within those specific departments so anything we can do to that it would be good. ***Maybe our IBA can work on that some more.***

ACTION ITEM 22 (from Councilmember Madaffer):

Moving criminal prosecution to DA's Office (asked of Jay Goldstone). ***I would ask that you look at this from a fiscal standpoint and what the potential savings, if any, might be if we were to examine the contracting out of the criminal prosecution part of the Attorney's office to the District Attorney's office. Given the potential for savings there I wanted to make sure at least that something that you raised with the City Attorney Elect as an issue that could have some potential budgetary savings***.

ACTION ITEM 23 (from Councilmember Madaffer):

Cut to attorney's FY2010 budget. (asked of Jay Goldstone). ***Did I hear you say accurately, Mr. Goldstone, that he's indicated that he would even accept a 10% cut in the 2010 budget as well?***

ACTION ITEM 24 (from Councilmember Madaffer):

Higher unfunded ratio with the city's pension fund. (asked of Jay Goldstone and SDCERS), ***You and perhaps the pension office could address at some point for this committee the fact that there's going to be a higher unfunded ratio here. That's going to mean higher payments by the general fund. I believe you accounted for those, have you not, in your five year forecast? Is that a number you're still going to need? I understand it's going to cost us anywhere from $15 to $25 million more perhaps for a couple of more years. That isn't something that I understand is going to last forever either, correct?***

ACTION ITEM 25 (from Councilmember Frye):

Cost recovery from Fire-Rescue services. ***There had been talks about negotiating cost recovery for Fire-Rescue Services and et cetera, et cetera as far as getting some additional revenues. I had asked specifically about providing EMS and Fire services to the universities that apparently was being provided for free. So that we might get some additional revenues. Now, I don't know what has happened with that.***

ACTION ITEM 26 (from Councilmember Frye):

Closing bathrooms along the beach and in Mission Bay Park vs, sand fluffing. ***Please provide a list of the bathrooms that are proposed to be shut down.***

ACTION ITEM 27 (from Councilmember Frye):

Waiving the Mission Bay Park Ordinance for 2000 – for 08-09. now, it's my understanding that most of that has already been spent or encumbered specifically related to the lifeguard dock, the boat dock for Mission Bay. (directed to Stacey LoMedico)

Lo Medico: We will send you a list of the CIP.

ACTION ITEM 28 (from Councilmember Frye):

Reduce the program costs and eliminate the removal of the kelp, maybe keep the berm building, say for example, in winter (asked of Jay Goldstone). ***In the winter months where you might have to do the construction of the berms, things like that, just do – for erosion issues and – and you know, protection of the houses along the beach. So, maybe you could give us some ideas of what that would be for winter.***

ACTION ITEM 29 (from Councilmember Frye):

Re: Page 19 of budgetreport: "Other expenditure assumptions removed below," and it then says, "2.6 million." The PowerPoint pages aren't numbered or else I would refer you to a numbered page. But it starts off with the General Fund projected deficit as of October 15th, 2008, you down to the bottom of the page, there's an, ***"Other expenditure assumptions," and then there's a, in parenthesis, "Removed below." Can you prepare something that would explain that to us when it comes back.***? ***Furloughs or to look at the mandatory furloughs was because it was part of the meet-and-confer process?***

ACTION ITEM 30 (from Councilmember Frye):

Fees and fee increases. ***Is there a way that you can do a calculation that would show a cost of, you know, a cost where you could just immediately adopt, across the board, some sort of an increase, like a one percent, and what that would is there some sort of legal basis why we could not do that in order just to go for a couple of months to keep some of these facilities open until we have more time and more information?***

Mary Lewis: ***We can get back to you with that looking at a CPI increase for some of the fees.***

ACTION ITEM 31-44 (from Councilmember Young):

Request directed to IBA to bring back to the Council***:***

(31) To review the adopted 2009 budget's golf course enterprise fund that has a balance of $7.8 million understanding that there is an Ordinance that keeps that in a enterprise capacity. Explore the feasibility of using some of those funds to address the budget deficit with an action of an ordinance.

(32) PETCO Park fund reserves of $5.6 million and the feasibility of using some of the funds to address the budget even more than what is proposed from the Mayor's office.

(33) Qualcomm Stadium fund balance, it's about $1 million and the feasibility of using that.

(34) The 2009 budget, trolley extension reserve fund, that's $2 million and the feasibility of using that.

(35) Come back to us this next meeting that we'll have on the budget, is the 2009 budget bond interest and redemption fund balance. It's $2.1 million and the feasibility of using some of that.

(36) Emergency medical services fund. It's $3.3 million there, if you could look at the feasibility of using that.

(37) The City's airport fund balance of $2.9 million. See that looking at that also.

(38)The police seized-forfeit asset fund balance of $491,000, look into that.

(39) The 2009 budget appropriated reserve of $10 million, the feasibility of using that.
(40) View the status of the Tourism Marketing District, the funds, the amount of funds that will be provided to these agencies. Requesting that they increase funding to certain agencies that they are receiving for City TOT funds, if feasible, we could actually then reduce TOT funding to those agencies in like amounts and use the additional money to off-set budget deficits.

(41) IBA to determine if the Mayor factored in pending sales of City land as additional sources of revenue to off set his projected budget deficits, particularly, the sale of the World Trade Center.

(***42) (directed to Chief Jarman) Fire training in the County of San Diego, there's a cost there. Training the Fire recruits – how much money can be saved? How long will it take and how much money will it save us? (*****Jarman replied: "**Let me talk with the County Chiefs and then I'll get back to you.")

(43) Evaluation or estimates on how much we could actually raised if we charged for parking at Balboa Park of specifically, not the Park, but more so the zoo? Because it's free to park at the zoo right now. Can you give us an analysis back next week so we can have an idea at least? 2,000 to 3,000 spaces at the zoo. $5.00 a day.

(44) In regards to the Administrative Leave Program for City Directors, is it true that City Directors receive 80 hours of additional leave on top of regular City-employee leave benefits? How much would—how much would we able to raise if we eliminated that? We'd have to do the calculation. Could you do that for us? What about City-sponsored vehicles to Police Department executives? Do we pay for that? Do they have that? How much does that cost us?

(Goldstone replied: We'll have to get that information for you nonprofits being more involved in operating or at least partially operating some of these facilities that we plan on closing down, YMCA, Boys and Girls Club type of folks. You know, I would love to see those, you know, before we have our next meeting.)

ACTION ITEM 45 (from Council President Peters):

Local 127– there is an issue about $7 million that need to be refunded as a result of not being able to leverage money that they had donated. ***How much of that $7 million was General Fund?***

(Lewis replied: I don't have the exact break out – And I don't have the break out, but I can get that for you.)

ACTION ITEM 46 (from Council President Peters):

Ballpark bonds. 11 million plus being an obligation of the downtown revenues. So, while I support moving that number up from five to seven and a half, to 11 and 6, I guess it is – ***I do think we need an understanding of exactly what that entails.***

ACTION ITEM 47 (from Council President Peters):

Clairemont and South U.C. I wanted to know, maybe not today, but it seems to me that you might want to leave one of those open just for geographical reasons. ***So, I would need to be able to agree to that, at least on behalf of South U.C. which is what's proposed in my district, until there is some understanding about what the plan is to reopen it***. It doesn't appear that that is part of the plan at this point.

ACTION ITEM 48 (from Council President Peters):

The junior guards***. I would like to know what a full-cost recovery fee would be. If that means that people have to pay the full cost, we ought to at least know what that is and maybe give them that opportunity.***

ACTION ITEM 49 (from Councilmember Atkins):

The temporary versus permanent is something I think we really have to look at, and it changes the whole course--whether we close facilities or we look at hours reductions.

ACTION ITEM 50 (from Councilmember Atkins):

Public safety academies. ***I want to know how many people who are in DROP, how many retirements you know of coming up in the next five years because if the five-year outlook talks about reducing academies for five years, I want to know what we're putting our future population in—in the place of as it relates to, if we're cutting***

academies for police and fire. Are we going to be back to where we were two years ago when we were frantic and concerned about the loss of public safety officers? So, I would like those numbers. I know that we have them. I know that we have some information because DROP is used heavily by public safety. And so we have some information, and I think we need to know it before we make determinations about five years worth of reducing academies.

ACTION ITEM 51 (from Councilmember Atkins):

State Budget. ***But I would ask the Mayors' office, if you have any understanding of what might be coming from them further, you know, we know we have no idea what's going on with booking fees, more Redevelopment dollars, all of those issues, if you have any sense, I think we'd like to know what you know. And it may be that you don't know anything, but if you have any projections.***

ACTION ITEM 52 (from Councilmember Atkins):

Constituent services and route slips and requests that come into the Council offices and come into the Mayor's office***. I really think you need to give us some idea of what that that is going to mean because we're reducing—we're going to have service-level impacts And if you're cutting staff that actually responds to constituent services or management of that program, then I want to know what the proposal is for how you're going to do that because this is about response to the public.***

ACTION ITEM 53 (from Council President Peters):

Library sponsorship. ***Can I know what it would take if I could get someone to sponsor a library? What would it take—how much money would it take, you can give me a ballpark amount, to keep a library open for a year, f I could find a corporate sponsor for that?*** (Mary Lewis replied: **"**We can get you that information on the operating costs and make some assumption.")