## Revenue Discussion

SEPTEMBER 6, 2017

#### Recap

- u Growth of major General Fund revenue sources lagging expenses
  - u Unlikely oil sector will rebound to 2014 levels in foreseeable future
  - u Online retail sales impacting sales tax
- u Significant known cost increases on horizon
  - u PERS
  - u Healthcare
  - u Utilities (electricity, water)

#### Recap

- u City continues to grow service levels need to coincide
- Council Goals and priorities focus on maintaining and enhancing basic public services
  - u Police, Fire, Streets, Code Enforcement
- u Emphasis placed on enhancing quality of life programs/services
  - u Parks, Recreational Activities, Lighting, Beautification
- Employees have not received any wage adjustment since 2014 or 2015, depending on employee group

#### Downsizing and Adjustments

- u City has taken difficult, comprehensive and wide-ranging steps to align General Fund expenses with revenues:
  - u **FY 2014-15:** City received \$2 million unanticipated state reimbursement, otherwise cuts were imminent
  - u FY 2015-16: \$10.4 million (deferred COLA adjustments, new equipment)
  - u FY 2016-17: \$4.5 million (including elimination of 13 full time positions)
  - u FY 2017-18: No significant discretionary increases allowed
- Services, programs and full-time positions have been reduced or eliminated
- Non essential travel ban, temporary employees, overtime, tuition reimbursement program, council contingency

#### Downsizing and Adjustments

- u Have shifted some Gas Tax from capital improvement budget back to the Streets Division operating budget
  - u Supplants General Fund revenues
- Taken one time actions in an effort to bide time for economy to recover
  - Eliminating/deferred capital projects shifted funds to operating budget
  - u Reduced City's compensated absences reserve
  - u Deferred a retiree healthcare trust payment

#### What More Can Be Done?

- u All Position Hiring Freeze/Staffing Reduction
  - u Must include Public Safety (62% of General Fund)
  - u Further reduce levels of service, response times to non-urgent matters
  - u Frequency of basic services impacted further
  - u Response times impacted
  - u Retention and employee morale issues
- u Close City Facilities
  - u Fire Stations
  - u Community Centers
  - u Pools, Spray Parks
- Stop expansion or planning efforts associated with new capital projects that are anticipated to have an operational impact on the General Fund

### New Revenue Opportunities

- u Sales tax measure
  - u Use can be unrestricted or defined voter approval thresholds apply
  - u \$7 million to \$50 million estimated to be generated annually
  - u November 2018
- u Parcel tax
  - u Use is defined
  - u Normally a flat assessment, not based on property value
  - u Requires 2/3rds vote (no exceptions)
  - u \$5 million to \$11 million estimated to be generated annually
  - u November 2018

# General Fund and CIP Budgets Top 10 Cities

Population Rank	City	Adopted General Fund Budget (16-17)	General Fund \$ Per Capita	Capital Improvement Budget (16-17)
1	Los Angeles	\$ 5,580,000,000	\$ 1,381	\$ 417,750,859
2	San Diego	1,337,981,387	951	420,996,485
3	San Jose	1,271,288,298	1,215	878,413,605
4	San Francisco*	4,859,781,042	5,559	522,138,927
5	Fresno	294,265,000	560	318,331,000
6	Sacramento	438,834,000	890	71,400,000
7	Long Beach	478,431,377	996	594,577,825
8	Oakland	530,689,270	1,246	32,150,843
9	Bakersfield	195,975,000	511	54,077,840
10	Anaheim	303,800,000	847	295,558,169

#### Next Steps

- u Additional staff research and/or Council discussion
- u If Council is interested in pursuing, early 2018 is recommended target to begin formal process
- u Engage a consultant for survey research
  - u Help provide the Council and staff with a clear understanding of the opinions, perceptions, priorities, and behaviors of voters