

Kathy C. Graziano, Chair
Council Member 4th District

Parker C. Agelasto, Vice Chair
Council Member 5th District

Ellen F. Robertson
Council Member 6th District, Member

Charles R. Samuels, Alternate
Council Member 2nd District, Member



Richmond City Council
The Voice of the People *Richmond, Virginia*

Meghan Brown
Interim Council Deputy Chief of Staff
Bill Echelberger
Council Budget Analyst

Finance & Economic Development Standing Committee Staff Report & Supplemental Information

July 21, 2016

Committee's Mission Statement

To provide legislative stewardship of Richmond's financial
and economic resources by:

- 1) establishing sound fiscal policy and legislation;
- 2) maximizing the return on citizen investment; and
- 3) expanding economic opportunities.



Richmond City Council
The Voice of the People Richmond, Virginia

Finance & Economic Development Standing Committee Table of Contents

Staff Report..... Page 3

Staff Analysis of Committee Legislation.Pages 4-15



Richmond City Council

The Voice of the People

Richmond, Virginia

STAFF REPORT

July 21, 2016

The last Committee meeting was held on June 23, 2016

Presentations, Reports and Discussion Items at the June 23rd Meeting

Follow-Up Items Requested by Committee Members

- To have an existing economic development package be put through the new fiscal and economic impact report template that has been designed per Ordinance 2015-144-154. (Follow-up from September 2015)

Expected Presentations, Reports or Discussion Items at the July 21st Meeting

The following items are on the agenda for review at the July Committee meeting.

Discussion Item(s):

- Washington Redskins/Bon Secours
Pro Forma – Status Update.....Lee Downey, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer,
Economic & Community Development

Report(s):

- Staff Report & Supplemental Information
- Monthly Financial Report

Board Recommendations/Actions

- Boards and Commissions..... Alexander Rawls, Boards and Commissions Administrator

Next Committee Meeting

- The next Committee meeting is scheduled for 3:00 P.M. August 18, 2016.

SUMMARY OF PAPERS

1. **Ord. No. 2016-091 (Patron: Mrs. Robertson) To amend and reordain City Code § 2-301, concerning certain definitions applicable to City Code §§ 2-301—2-304, for the purpose of modifying the definition of “economic development project” to include public investment. – Continued from June with amendment.**

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

The ordinance is amending the current City Code that requires fiscal and economic impact statements be submitted to City Council for certain economic development projects, to now include public investment as well.

City Council adopted an ordinance which authorized the Chief Administrative Officer to execute a project development agreement. The project met only two of the three criteria for requiring fiscal and economic impact statements be submitted to Council. The one criteria that was not met was that the project funding did not include any private investment. The total funding for the project was all federal, state and local government funding. Since there was no private investment the submission of the impact statement to Council was not required.

The original purpose for establishing the requirement for fiscal and economic impact statements for economic development projects was as such:

Purpose:

To assist both the governing body (City Council) and the public with understanding the potential financial and economic impacts prior to the adoption or amendment of any proposal for approval for City-funded development projects; such as, an expenditure (whether or not debt financed), moral or other financial guarantee by the City or the sale, purchase or lease of property. The impact statements are to provide Council with the information necessary to consider the intended outcomes against the financial impact of proposed City-funded development projects.

An amendment to the current City Code is necessary in order to ensure that the criteria for requiring the impact statements for economic development projects is in line and fully supports the intended purpose of the originally adopted legislation.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

The amendment, if adopted by Council, would require the fiscal and economic impact statements be submitted to Council if the following criteria are met:

- (i) A City expenditure of grant of at least \$5 million or with a value of at least ten percent (10%), pledge of moral obligation or financial guarantee;
- (ii) Any private investment or any expenditure or contribution by a political subdivision of the Commonwealth or any other legal entity owned or controlled by one or more political subdivisions, or any combination thereof, totaling at least \$5 million or with a value of at least ten percent (10%);
- (iii) Requires Council’s approval to authorize the execution of a cooperation agreement, development agreement, or other contract between the City and one or more separate

political subdivisions of the Commonwealth or any other legal entity owned or controlled by one or more political subdivisions.

The new language was written and drafted in a way that the impact statements would apply to economic development projects and not for routine CIP projects, such as CIP transportation projects, which receive state funding.

Fiscal Impact:

There is no fiscal impact.

2. Ord. No. 2016-137 (Patron: Councilman Baliles) To amend ch. 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, concerning the disposition of revenues from the City's meals tax, for the purpose of funding the operation of public schools in the city.. – Continued from June with amendments.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-137, as amended, amends chapter 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, that dedicates one-sixth (16.7percent) of the City's Prepared Food (Meals) Tax Revenues to operation of Richmond Public Schools. The amended ordinance contains a sunset clause that provides for expiration of the dedication of the funds four years after adoption of the ordinance.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- This amended ordinance dedicates one-sixth (16.7percent) of the City's Prepared Foods (MEALS) Tax Revenues for operation of Richmond Public Schools.
- For FY 2017 the City's Prepared Foods (MEALS) Tax Revenues are estimated at \$33,491,077.
 - One-sixth of this amount is \$5,581,846.
 - This one-sixth is 3.8% of the \$145,999,657 local funds for operating support included for Richmond Public Schools in the FY 2017 Proposed Budget.
- Council may want to determine the impact that dedicating \$5.6 million for support of Richmond Public Schools would have on other City programs.
- Council may want to determine if dedication of the proposed one-sixth of the City's Prepared Foods (MEALS) Tax Revenues for support of Richmond Public Schools would be in addition to the funds currently appropriated.

Fiscal Impact:

- This ordinance dedicates one-sixth (16.7percent) of the City's Prepared Foods (MEALS) Tax Revenues, estimated at \$5,581,846, for operation of Richmond Public Schools.

3. Ord. No. 2016-139 (Patron: Councilman Baliles) To amend ch. 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, concerning the disposition of 75% of the City's year-end General Fund surplus, for the purpose of funding the operation of public schools in the city.. – Continued from June.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-139 amends chapter 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, that dedicates 75% of the City's year-end General Fund surplus to operation of Richmond Public Schools.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- This ordinance dedicates 75 percent of the City's Year End General Fund Surplus, exclusive of the amount required to meet the City's Unassigned Fund Balance Policy to the operation of Richmond Public Schools.
- Council may want to determine the impact that dedicating 75 percent of the City's Year End General Fund Surplus for support of Richmond Public Schools would have on other City programs.
- Council may want to determine if dedication of 75 percent of the City's Year End General Fund Surplus for support of Richmond Public Schools would be in addition to the funds currently appropriated.
- Council may want to determine how 75 percent of the City's Year End General Fund Surplus would be determined in years where no Consolidated Annual Financial Report is available.

Fiscal Impact:

- The actual amount available will vary annually.

4. Ord. No. 2016-140 (Patron: Councilman Baliles) To amend ch. 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, concerning the disposition of certain revenues from real estate taxes, for the purpose of funding the operation of public schools in the city. – Continued from June.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-140 amends chapter 12, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 12-37, that dedicates 60.8 percent of the City's Current and Delinquent Real Estate Tax Revenues to operation of Richmond Public Schools.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- Ord. No. 2016-140 does two things:
 1. It dedicates 60.8 percent of the City's Current and Delinquent Real Estate Tax Revenues to the operation of Richmond Public Schools, and

2. It requires that the percentage of the City's Current and Delinquent Real Estate Tax Revenues to the operation of Richmond Public Schools shall be reevaluated every five years.
- Council may want to determine the impact that dedicating 60.8 percent of the City's Current and Delinquent Real Estate Tax Revenues for support of Richmond Public Schools would have on other City programs.
 - Council may want to determine if dedication of 60.8 percent of the City's Current and Delinquent Real Estate Tax Revenues for support of Richmond Public Schools would be in addition to the funds currently appropriated.

Fiscal Impact:

- The actual amount available will vary annually.

5. **Ord. 2016-154 (Patron: Mayor Jones):** To declare that a public necessity exists and to authorize the Chief Administrative Officer or the designee thereof, for and on behalf of the City of Richmond, to acquire, at a tax delinquent judicial sale, the property located at 3102 1st Avenue and to authorize the conveyance of such property for \$1,750 to Adult Alternative Program Inc. for the purposes of eliminating blight and making such property available for redevelopment. – **Continued from June.**
6. **Ord. 2016-155 (Patron: Mayor Jones):** To declare that a public necessity exists and to authorize the Chief Administrative Officer or the designee thereof, for and on behalf of the City of Richmond, to acquire, at a tax delinquent judicial sale, the property located at 3205 Midlothian Turnpike and to authorize the conveyance of such property for \$1,750 to Adult Alternative Program Inc. for the purposes of eliminating blight and making such property available for redevelopment. – **Continued from June.**

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Two ordinances authorize the Chief Administrative Officer or the designee thereof to acquire properties at tax delinquent judicial sales and to convey such property to Adult Alternative Program Inc. for the purposes of eliminating blight and making such property available for redevelopment:

	Address	Price	Organization
1	3102 1st Avenue	\$1,750	Adult Alternative Program Inc.
2	3205 Midlothian Turnpike	\$1,750	Adult Alternative Program Inc.
Total Revenue		\$3,500	

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- The purchase price for the properties is -\$165,500 less than the assessed value of \$169,000.

Address	Price	Assessed Value	Difference
7 3102 1st Avenue	\$1,750	\$78,000	(\$76,250)
8 3205 Midlothian Turnpike	\$1,750	\$91,000	(\$89,250)
Total Revenue	\$3,500	\$169,000	(\$165,500)

- The committee may want to inquire about the process used to determine the purchase prices of these properties. Would the City receive greater value if these properties were sold at auction?
- The committee may want to inquire about the process of how this organization was selected and designated to purchase these properties.
- The purchasing organization enters into a development agreement with the City that requires:
 - Completion of work within two years from the date of title transfer and compliance with all zoning and building code requirements., and
 - Renovation or construction of a single-family dwelling upon the parcel that will be made available for sale to a family owner-occupant whose income is at or below the area median income. (The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has set Richmond's 2016 area median income at \$72,400 for a family of four.)
- The Committee may wish to know what mechanism the City has in place to monitor the organization's compliance with the requirements of the development agreements. What happens if the organization does not meet the requirements?

Fiscal Impact:

The City will receive a total of \$3,500 and future real estate tax revenues.

7. Ord. No. 2016-194 (Patron: Mayor Jones) To authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to accept funds in the amount of \$14,739.20 from the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority and to appropriate the increase to the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Special Fund Budget by increasing estimated revenues and the amount appropriated to the Department of Economic and Community Development's Affordable Housing - Non CDBG Project Areas special fund by \$14,739.20 for the purpose of funding the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-194 is to authorize the CAO to accept funds from RRHA and to amend the FY17 Special Fund Budget and appropriate \$14,739.20 to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund special account.

On November 28, 2012, the City and RRHA entered into a cooperation agreement for the redevelopment of the Dove Street area, now referred to as Highland Grove. The City provided \$1.5 million to RRHA to make a loan to Dove Street II, LLC to assist with financing the new

construction of an affordable housing complex. As part of the cooperation agreement the City is to receive an annual return of up to 1% or \$15,000, which is contingent upon available cash flow after the first mortgage payment and the asset management fees required of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) bonds. The 1% or \$15,000 annual return to the City is reduced by \$1,000 as an administrative fee for RRHA, which leaves the City's actual net annual return of up to \$14,000.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- The O&R request and the attached agreements indicate that the City's annual return is 1% or \$15,000 less an administrative fee of \$1,000 to RRHA for an actual net return of up to \$14,000.
 - The Committee may be interested in knowing if the City is to receive up to \$14,000 in annual interest income is there a reason for the City receiving more - \$14,739.20?
- The ordinance is recommending that the \$14,739.20 in net interest income should be deposited in the City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund – Special Fund Budget.
- Council staff was not able to locate within any of the development agreements indicating that the interest income the City is to receive is to be deposited into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
 - The Committee may be interested in knowing what prompted the decision to allocate this funding to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund versus being deposited back to the General Fund where the original loan of \$1.5 million was disbursed from.
- The City made its investment of \$1.5 million into the project during 2013.
 - The Committee may be interested in receiving a status update on the project and what developments have occurred since providing the loan in 2013.
- On an annual basis, the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Oversight Board is to deliver to City Council and the mayor a brief summary of the Board's activities for the preceding year. With the beginning of a new fiscal year, the Committee may wish to consider receiving a report from the Board.

Fiscal Impact:

The City is expected to receive up to \$14,000 in net annual interest income over the term of the loan which is 20 years. Assuming the City received the net annual interest income every year the City is expected to receive approximately \$267,000 in additional revenue over the 20 year period.

The O&R request indicates that the adoption of this paper will provide the Affordable Housing Trust Fund with its first designated funding source outside of the annual general fund allocation it has received in recent fiscal years.

- 8. Ord. No. 2016-195 (Patron: Mayor Jones)** To authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to accept funds in the amount of \$86,345.00 from the County of Henrico and to appropriate the increase to the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Special Fund Budget by increasing estimated revenues and the amount appropriated to the Department of Emergency Communications by \$86,345.00 for the purpose of funding the Text-to-911 Project, a shared services initiative to enhance the ability of citizens to contact the Department of Emergency Communications through text messaging.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-195 does three things to fund the Text-to-911 Project:

1. Accepts \$86,345 from the County of Henrico.
2. Increases the FY 17 Special Fund Revenues by \$86,345.
3. Increases the FY 17 Special Fund appropriation for the Department of Emergency Communications by \$86,345.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- Text to 911 project is a joint undertaking of the City of Richmond, the County of Chesterfield and the County of Henrico.
- These localities have been awarded a \$272,054 grant from the Virginia Information Technology Agency (VITA), that is allocated as follows:

VITA Text to 911 Grant	
Amount	Locality
\$90,641	Henrico
\$95,068	Chesterfield
\$86,345	Richmond
\$272,054	Total

- The grant provides that the funds must be spent within 24 months.
- The grant covers the costs of annual services, equipment, and one-time start-up costs.
- Council may want to determine if any matching funds are required.
- Council may want to determine if additional general fund support will be required after the two year period covered by the grant (FY 17 and FY 18).

Fiscal Impact:

- FY 17 Special Fund Revenues are proposed to be increased by \$86,345 and the Special Fund appropriation for the Department of Emergency Communications by is increased by \$86,345. This appropriation increase covers the costs of the program for FY 17 and FY 18.

9. Ord. No. 2016-196 (Patron: Mayor Jones) To amend Ord. No. 2016-048, adopted May 13, 2016, which adopted the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Special Fund Budget and made appropriations pursuant thereto, by transferring and reappropriating funds in the amount of \$363,000.00 from the Department of Public Works' Parking Enterprise Fund to the Department of Public Works' Special Parking Districts special fund for the purpose of providing services in accordance with the Special Parking Districts Program established by City Code §27-281.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

This ordinance is to amend the FY17 Special Fund Budget by transferring and appropriating funds from the Parking Management Enterprise Fund to the Special Parking District Special Fund account for the purpose of providing services in accordance with the Special Parking District Program (SPDP).

The SPDP was established by Ord. 2011-78-62, adopted April 25, 2011, to provide for the expenditure of funds derived from certain parking fines be used to provide clearly marked crosswalks, off-duty police patrols and to maintain and improve safety and cleanliness in residential restricted parking districts. Ordinance 2010-55-52, adopted March 22, 2010, established a \$50.00 fine for parking in excess of the time limit in restricted parking districts without a valid parking decal, temporary parking pass or visitor's parking pass for that restricted parking district. Ordinance 2010-73-86, adopted May 24, 2010, provided that of each \$50.00 fine collected, \$30.00 is to be directed to the SPDP account. The SPDP account shall continue to collect the \$30.00 until it reaches \$363,000 annually. The remaining \$20.00 of the \$50.00 fine gets collected as parking revenue in the Parking Management Enterprise Fund and annually once the SPDP account reaches \$363,000 any additional revenue will be collected in the Parking Management Enterprise Fund.

The FY17 proposed budget did not have this appropriated as part of the Special Fund budget. During the budget process, Council budget staff brought this to the attention of the Administration. By Code, Council could not include this item as part of their budget amendments because it provides for additional revenue. Administration indicated that they would submit a separate paper after adoption, which is this ordinance before the Committee.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

The funds should have been appropriated in the proposed FY17 budget.

- When the SPDP was established there were performance measures established that requires the Department of Public Works to conduct an annual study to determine if the program has achieved the intended goals set forth in City Code 102-303. The report is to be submitted to City Council by no later than March 1 of each year. The report is to include:
 - Details concerning expenditures from the SPDP special fund account;
 - The sufficiency of the fund to achieve the goals set forth in City Code 102-303 and for the services and activities for which monies may be expended;
 - Results of the surveys conducted in accordance with City Code section 102-306; and
 - Any recommendations for improvement of the program.

- The Committee may be interested in receiving a report on the performance measures and may wish to get a full account of the total revenue and expenditures by fiscal year from the establishment of the SPDP in FY11 to FY16.

Fiscal Impact:

- The FY17 Special Fund adopted budget will be amended to increase appropriations by \$363,000 for the Special District Parking Program that will be administered by the Department of Public Works.

10. Ord. No. 2016-197 (Patron: Mayor Jones) To amend sections 21-4, 21-42, 21-44, 21-47, 21-53, 21-54, 21-63, 21-67, and 21-68 of the City Code, concerning public procurement, and to amend ch. 21, art. II of the City Code by adding therein a new section 21-73, concerning job order contracting, for the purpose of reflecting amendments to state law that Va. Code § 2.2-4343(A)(12) requires the City to follow.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution, Background:

Ord. No. 2016-197 makes changes to the *Code of the City of Richmond* to conform to mandatory General Assembly changes in the Virginia Public Procurement Act.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- Although the City has adopted alternative procurement policies and procedures, certain mandatory provisions of the Virginia Public Procurement Act still apply to the City.
- The City has complied with state law; however, in some cases, changes to the City Code have not been made to reflect mandatory changes in state law.
- Ord. No. 2016-197 is effective upon adoption.
- Ord. No. 2016-197 makes the following changes to the Code of the City of Richmond to conform to mandatory General Assembly changes in the Virginia Public Procurement Act:
 - **Sec. 21-4. Definitions.**
Conforms definitions of best value, job order contracting, competitive negotiation, competitive sealed bidding, and nonprofessional services to the code of Virginia.
 - **Sec. 21-42. Competitive sealed bidding or competitive negotiations of State-aid projects.**
Increases the threshold for sealed bids on state-support projects from \$30,000 to \$50,000.
 - **Sec. 21-44. Design-build and construction management contracts.**
Conforms design-build and construction management contracts provisions to the requirement that the contract be awarded to the fully qualified offeror who submits an acceptable proposal determined to be the best value in response to the request for proposals.
 - **§ 21-47 Competitive sealed bidding; procedures.**
 - Requires that any invitation for bids shall be in writing and shall include any qualifications required for potential contractors.

- Requires publication of an invitation for bids on the City's website for ten days, and allows for publication in a newspaper of general circulation, or on the Virginia Department of General Services procurement website.
- **Sec. 21-53. Withdrawal of bid due to error.**
 - Establishes procedures for withdrawal of a bid.
 - Provides that work papers, documents and materials submitted by the bidder shall, at the bidders request, be considered trade secrets or proprietary information subject to the conditions of Section 21-5(f) of the Richmond City Code. This section requires that the bidder: (1) Invoke the protections of this section prior to or upon submission of the data or other materials; (2) Identify the data or other materials to be protected; and (3) State the reasons why protection is necessary.
 - Bidder's original work papers used in the preparation of the bid must be submitted at or prior to the time of bid opening.
- **§ 21-54 Bid evaluation under competitive sealed bidding.**

Requires that bids are to be evaluated according to criteria set out in the invitation for bids.
- **Sec. 21-63. Performance and payment bonds.**
 - Increases the threshold for bonds on transportation projects from \$250,000 to \$350,000.
 - Bond requirements for transportation projects that are valued in excess of \$250,000 but less than \$350,000 may only be waived by the Director if the bidder provides satisfactory evidence that a surety company has declined an application from the contractor for a performance or payment bond.
- **Sec. 21-67. Competitive negotiation for goods, nonprofessional services, insurance, and construction.**
 - Allows the use of either competitive bids or competitive negotiation for the purchase or lease of goods, non-professional services, or insurance.
 - Eliminates need for written determination for use of RFP
 - Allows the use of either competitive negotiation for highway construction, excavation, and drainage projects only after a written determination that a sealed bid is impractical or not in the best interest of the public.
 - Requires the disclosure of a numerical scoring system either in the request for proposals or prior to receipt of proposals, when a numerical scoring system will be used to evaluate proposals.
 - Requires negotiations with two or more qualified offerors.
- **Sec. 21-68. Contracting for professional services by competitive negotiation.**
 - Requires the disclosure of a numerical scoring system in the request for proposals, when such system will be used to evaluate such proposals.
 - Prohibits the requirement that offerors of architectural or engineering firms list exceptions to proposed contractual terms until after such offerors are ranked for negotiations, unless such disclosure is required by state law.

- Increases the threshold for the total values of multiple architectural and engineering projects covered by a contract from \$5.0 million to \$6.0 million, and increases the value of any one project from \$2.0 million to \$2.5 million.
- **Sec. 21-73. Job order contracting. (New City Code Section)**
 - Allows the City to award a job order contract if (1) the jobs require similar experience and expertise, (2) the nature of the jobs is clearly identified in the solicitation, (3) the contract is limited to a term of one year, (4) the cumulative total project fees are not greater than \$5.0 million with no individual job valued in excess of \$500,000.
 - Job order contracts may generally not be used for architectural or engineering services, unless such services are incidental to the job, and do not exceed \$25,000 per job or \$75,000 per contract term.
 - Job order contracts may be renewable for two additional one-year terms

Fiscal Impact:

- There is no revenue or expenditure impact of the proposed changes.

11. Res. No. 2016-R045 (Patron: Baliles and Agelasto) To request that, commencing Jul. 1, 2016, (i) the Chief Administrative Officer cause to be prepared and submitted to the Council and the Mayor a quarterly report that compares actual expenditures to adopted appropriations for each City agency and presents projected expenditures by each City agency for the remainder of the fiscal year and (ii) the Mayor introduce any ordinance to amend the City's budget and modify the amounts appropriated for City agencies following the end of the first, second, and third quarters of each fiscal year for the purpose of reconciling adopted appropriations with projected actual expenditures for City agencies no later than the first day of the second month following the end of each such quarter. – Continued to September 15.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

Resolution No. 2016-R045 requests the administration to do two things to keep the budget reconciled with actual expenditures:

1. The Chief Administrative Officer shall provide City Council with a quarterly report that compares the adopted appropriations for each agency with projected actual expenditures. This report shall be provided no later than the first day of the second month of the next fiscal quarter.
 2. The Mayor shall introduce any budget ordinance for the purpose of reconciling adopted appropriations with projected actual expenditures no later than the first day of the second month following the end of the first, second, and third quarters of each fiscal year.
- The ordinance shall be effective on July 1, 2016.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

- The schedule for quarterly reports and budget amendment ordinance, if warranted, would be as follows:

Fiscal Quarter	Due Date
1st	November 1
2nd	February 1
3rd	May 1

- This resolution expresses the intent of City Council that a systematic program to continually monitor city expenditures against the adopted appropriations, and make needed adjustments quarterly shall be established.
- As part of the 'Well-managed Government' strategy the administration currently makes adjustments to the budget "...to more closely align agency budgets with their projected expenditure..."
- Such adjustments were made In FY 2012, FY 2013, FY 2014, and FY 2015 in third quarter re-appropriation papers. Ord. No. 2016-181 was introduced on June 13, 2016 for the same purpose.
- These third quarter adjustment are introduced too late in the fiscal year for City Council to have any meaningful input on the final disposition.
- Continually monitoring and reporting on City expenditures in comparison to adopted appropriations, will strengthen the City's financial management.

Fiscal Impact:

- There is no expenditure or revenue impact.

Analysts: Brown and Echelberger