

**CITY OF TEMPLE TERRACE, FLORIDA
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
REPORT OF WORK SESSION**

**Tuesday, July 20, 2010
Council Workroom
4:00 p.m.**

Having been duly advertised as required by law, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Temple Terrace, Florida, met in a work session, beginning at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 20, 2010, in the Council Workroom in the rear of Council Chambers, for a Budget Workshop for Fiscal Year 2010-2011.

PRESENT WERE: Mayor Joe Affronti, Council Members Alison M. Fernandez, Ron Govin, Ken Halloway, Mark A. Knapp, and Mary Jane Neale, City Manager Kim Leinbach, and City Clerk Lisa Small.

ALSO PRESENT WERE: Finance Director Diane Reichard, Police Chief Ken Albano, Human Resources Director Woody Hubbard, Public Works Director Joe Motta, Public Information Officer Michael Dunn, Fire Chief Keith Chapman, Leisure Services Director James Chambers, Community Development Director Charles Stephenson, IT Director Bob Keel, Deputy City Clerk Jeannie Barlow, Assistant City Engineer Michael Hall, Assistant Fire Chief Ian Kemp, Joyce McKenzie, and several other persons.

Mayor Affronti called the work session to order at 4:00 p.m.

The City Manager reviewed that at the last City Council workshop, the Finance Director presented the various issues affecting the budget for the coming fiscal year, including the deficit the City is facing, which had increased since the April budget workshop due to a revised downward trend of property values, State-shared revenues, and other sources, making efforts to balance the budget even more difficult. At that workshop, the City Manager stated various facts and figures were presented, along with the administration's recommendation.

The City Manager noted that the presentation from the previous workshop, along with a Memorandum reiterating the recommendation from the Department Directors and the administration, was provided to Council in their packet for this evening's meeting. He reviewed that the recommendation to Council was to make up the \$1.2 million deficit by using a millage rate of 5.95 mills, which is slightly lower than the full roll-up millage rate, along with using about one-half of the red light camera revenue. He commented that he believes that was something that Council Member Knapp previously mentioned. In addition to utilizing a portion of the red light camera revenue funds to balance the coming fiscal year's budget, the City Manager also recommended that the Council look at a Fire Service Fee, or at least to authorize a study, to see how that could be based in the future in terms of revenues.

The City Manager pointed out that the non-union employees did not have a pay increase this fiscal year, nor is one programmed into the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year; therefore, in the memorandum the amount to provide a 3% salary increase to all non-union employees, which is estimated at \$188,035, is included for consideration. He reviewed that the Council had asked for additional time to review all of this information, which was the reason for today's workshop. Commenting that the administration is running out of time in order to put together the final version of the proposed budget, he expressed the need for direction for the coming fiscal year's budget.

Mayor Affronti questioned how utilizing the roll-up millage rate would affect the average household, with property values going down. The City Manager responded there would be a slight decrease - \$62,000 spread over the entire City, emphasizing it is not a tax increase over what they are paying now.

Council Member Fernandez questioned whether the summary page includes the potential outcome of the Fire Department negotiations and if it anticipates any outcome in this budget. The City Manager responded affirmatively, confirming it would anticipate what they have discussed in negotiations, as well as contractual obligations to both the Police and Fire Departments.

Regarding previous discussions concerning cuts, reducing expenses, and passing on costs to users, Council Member Fernandez questioned whether included in this budget will be requiring the ball teams to pay half the cost of ball field lighting.

The City Manager responded that all of the cuts that were discussed in the presentation, including frozen positions, have all been incorporated into these calculations.

Council Member Fernandez expressed concern that many of the teams have already set their fees for next year; she cited several examples, such as those published in The Recreator, which may result in some negative feedback. She noted that the City also requires the teams to have an outdoor sports membership to participate, the purpose of which is to pay those expenses. She suggested the conflict may come from those affected saying that they have already paid for those things, such as maintaining fields and paying for lighting. The City Manager responded that he was not sure those fees cover that expense. He asked the Leisure Services Director to respond.

Leisure Services Director James Chambers commented that all of the City's sports fields are in the negative. He acknowledged that some of the fees are set; however, teams that start their season before October 1 will not be affected by the increase until their 2011 season. He said in the first year they may not realize the whole amount, which they understand. He understands that the soccer group has some questions about it; the pony league is fine with it; and he has not heard back officially from Little League. He mentioned that all of the City's own internal leagues, such as flag football, adult and youth, have new fee structures in place in the event this is approved, in order to pass the costs on to the City's leagues as well – just like the affiliated leagues, the internal leagues will be charged, too. Council Member Fernandez commented that was one of the questions she had.

Council Member Fernandez concluded she has given this a tremendous amount of thought over the past few months, knowing it was not going to be a great budget year. While she is in favor of setting the millage rate higher to give the Council options; they can always reduce it.

The City Manager noted they did not propose a tentative millage rate as high as they have in the past, which is generally set at a half mill higher than the anticipated need, but it still gives the Council a little flexibility to work with.

Council Member Neale emphatically stated that everywhere she goes, everyone has asked that their services not be cut, adding that they are willing to pay the difference. She commented that she, too, has given the matter a tremendous amount of thought; however, not one person has asked that they please don't raise their taxes – it is “please don't cut my services” over and over again. She relayed the citizens' comments that they don't care if they have to pay more, and she is in total agreement with them. In addition, she said she will have trouble supporting a budget that won't support *all* of the employees, including non-union and union employees; they all need to have some kind of a raise.

Mayor Affronti confirmed that Council Member Neale was speaking about the 3% salary increase at a cost of approximately \$188,035. If that is the consensus, Mayor responded, the Council will just have to figure out where to get it.

Council Member Knapp said his biggest issue was where they were discussing not living up to obligations from what the Council promised last year, although morally and ethically he could not support that much; however, with the changes that they have made, with creative financing, they will be able to take care of those obligations, so he is in support of the budget. As far as the 3% is concerned, he said is certain if staff will do a little more tweaking, they will find the funds to cover that.

Council Member Halloway commented he is in favor of balancing the budget with the red light camera funds as recommended. Regarding the 3% salary increase for the non-union employees, he related that someone once said the City is in a service mode. He said when they speak of personnel cuts, they are cutting service. As far as a 3% salary increase to the non-union employees, he said he definitely favors the increase and believes that doing so will enhance the services provided to the residents.

Having arrived a few minutes late and unsure of the discussion he had missed, Council Member Govin said he believes the budget, as prepared, has been cut in many places by small portions. He expressed concern about borrowing too much from the red light camera revenue, believing that to be borrowing with the possibility of future debt. While that debt is probably a couple of years away, he assumed it was invested now. The Finance Director interjected it is earning .2%.

Council Member Govin continued that he isn't sure he is ready to roll up the millage to 6.671, which seems to be high in this economy. He said he does not have a problem with a bit of a roll up, but not all the way to 6.671, which he believes is asking an awful lot. The Finance Director explained that .6671 is the amount it is going to increase; the rate is only proposed to go up to 5.95 mills. Council Member Govin confirmed with the City Manager that 5.95 mills was the rate that was presented at the last meeting.

Mayor Affronti commented that Council Member Govin was not here at the beginning of the meeting when he had asked how the increase to 5.95 mills would affect the average homeowner's taxes compared to last year; it was explained it would be a slight decrease over last year. Council Member Knapp interjected that the dollar amount won't increase; the percentage will.

Council Member Govin remarked that he does not have as big a problem with 5.95 mills, adding his belief that they need to be awfully careful with it. He expressed concern that indications are that next year will fall into the same footsteps and they are simply postponing some of the bad news by pushing it off to another Council to contend with this.

Regarding the 3% salary increase, Council Member Govin said he cannot support it in this economic condition. He remarked he asked for further cuts from the very beginning and staff has not come up with further cuts. By producing a budget with the same number of employees, he said he assumes they are saying there is no wasted time in staff and 100% of the time is needed. He commented that he does not believe that is a possibility, adding his belief that there is wasted time out there, because he has personally seen some of it. He continued that he believes there should be a minimal cut in staff positions; he would be open to saying the next five positions, as they open, would not be filled; he would be satisfied with that. He explained he is not trying to say the administration needs to fire people; he believes there is room for savings in the City's operations, which he does not believe is operating at 100%. He summarized that he cannot and will not support a 3% salary increase. He added that his employees are not getting 3% and he would be hard pressed to tell what employees are getting 3%, with the exception of government employees; government seems to be the only place where people are getting raises and he does not support that as an across the board increase. He remarked if someone changes positions or takes on additional responsibility, that would be considered, but not a 3% increase across the board.

Council Member Fernandez commented that she is in favor of some increase, but she wanted to know whether it could be structured as a bonus, rather than changing a salary, which she thought would give the Council more flexibility. She concurred with Council Member Govin that next year they may be looking at the same financial situation. Considering what is going on in the private sector, she said she thought 3% was high in comparison. She commented that here at the City, they have a group of employees with a different method of negotiating compensation, and she doesn't believe they should ignore the employees who aren't in that group; therefore, she would be more likely to agree to a 2% increase as a bonus structure.

Mayor Affronti interjected he believes that was what the City Manager had in mind, to which the City Manager commented that a one-year help for employees would be one way of not creating a future liability. He acknowledged that he would be foolhardy to say that every employee, including himself, always works at 100%. He explained the difficulty he has as their City Manager is that he hears great ideas from all of them, but he needs a consensus to go forward. He said he did not want Council Member Govin to think that the administration ignored his previous requests or was insubordinate, but he has not had direction from the Council as a whole to proceed as Council Member Govin had recommended.

Council Member Knapp asked when the non-union employees last received a salary increase. The Finance Director explained that on October 1, 2008, there was a structure where those making less than \$50,000 received a larger increase than those making more than \$75,000; those earning more than \$75,000 received about \$.29 per hour, while those earning less received \$1,500 per year; it was spread out over the year. She summarized they did not have an increase in the current budget year, and there is no increase in the proposed budget for next year.

Human Resources Director Woody Hubbard asked to provide supporting documentation for the proposed 3% salary increase and why he believes the 3% increase is so important. He explained that on Friday, July 16, 2010, he learned that the City's health insurance program through Blue Cross/Blue Shield will be increasing the health insurance rates by 11.2%, which all employees will have to pay out of their own pockets.

The Human Resources Director informed the Council that most of the City's "blue-collar" non-union employees have family health insurance coverage. He explained that under the "Blue Option" plan, there is a high deductible of \$1,000 per employee and \$3,000 per family, but it is the least costly of the four plans the City offers to its employees; therefore, most blue-collar employees have gravitated to that plan. He continued that the current monthly cost of this dependent health insurance coverage is \$1,099.80, which will increase by \$123, with the 11.2% rate increase, to \$1,222.00 per month. He emphasized the employee will have to pay an additional \$123 per month out of pocket, which amounts to \$1,478.00 for a year. He reviewed that last year the City changed health insurance providers because the increase in premium cost was projected to be about 26% with United Healthcare, the City's previous health insurance provider, compared to the low bidder, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, whose increase was 18.77% over the previous year's premium rate. Putting it into perspective, he said the average blue-collar employee for the City of Tampa makes around \$30,000 per year; when the 11.2% increase of \$123 per month is added to the 18.77% increase last year, it comes to \$267 each month – or for a \$30,000 per year employee, an additional cost of \$3,210 per year, which is a 10.7% decrease in pay. In other words, he said with no increase in the last two years, they are actually making \$3,210 less than they were making two years ago, because of having to pay these increases out of their own pocket. While it can be said that health insurance is a problem across the country and hopefully the government will straighten it out, he said that doesn't help the employees. He shared that the morale of the non-union employees is incredible; those with dependent health coverage, making an average of \$30,000 a year, will have to pay another \$123 per month out of their own pocket. He said he doesn't know how they can do it – to him it would be extremely difficult, and he has heard rumors that some have said they won't be able to afford health insurance any more or will have to drop coverage for their families. He reminded the Council that is the lowest level family coverage with the highest deductible that the City offers. He reiterated that over the last two years that is 10.7% off their \$30,000 pay; 3% is a token. He concluded that he would sincerely appreciate Council considering the 3% salary increase to non-union employees.

Council Member Neale stated that she supports the 3% salary increase to non-union employees. Council Member Fernandez said the increase coming from health insurance is coming to everyone in the country, so that everyone is experiencing that same situation where the increase is passed on, but salaries don't go up; therefore, that would not necessarily be the reasoning for the increase. She said she would want to give them some kind of increase, because in years past, they have been able to do that for other employees and she would not want to necessarily eliminate an entire group of employees, because they work just as hard. She said she would be more willing to consider an increase, where those making less would get more, since the health insurance increase would have a greater impact on their salaries.

The Human Resources Director added one other caveat – two groups in the City are getting an increase, but these non-union employees are not getting anything; he questioned whether that was fair.

Council Member Fernandez said that was her point – she would not want to eliminate an entire group from consideration.

Mayor Affronti suggested they come to a consensus of the amount and if they approve the 3% increase, they could discuss whether to leave it to the discretion of the City Manager and Finance Director as to how to spread the increase among the employees. The City Manager interjected that the administration has not discussed that yet, as they did not want to be presumptuous at this point.

Council Member Knapp commented that he wanted to clarify a couple of points. He said that where Council Member Govin used the words “borrowing” from the red light camera revenue, in his opinion, they are not “borrowing” the funds; those funds are revenue from the red light camera program, which they were leaving there unused in the event that they were to lose a lawsuit. He remarked they could have easily taken the money from the reserves, rather than the red light camera revenues, but he felt it was more prudent to use those funds that were available and leave the reserves intact. He continued that in the event they eventually lose a lawsuit on the red light camera revenue, it would be paid back out of the reserves, if necessary, rather than leaving those funds sitting there unused.

Council Member Govin commented that Council Member Knapp is just playing with words; it is all out of reserves, no matter what it is called; it may not be in the main reserve fund, but it is in a reserved fund.

Council Member Knapp responded it is in a fund based on an assumption the City will lose a lawsuit; his point is that now the State Legislature has changed the laws and the City will be operating within those laws, there will be more red light camera revenues coming in over the next five years. Council Member Govin disputed the statement, saying the City will be giving half of the revenue to the State. The City Manager interjected the City currently has cameras at two approaches out of 48, and Council Member Knapp added over the next five years there will be additional revenue from the other approaches.

Council Member Knapp stated he does not believe that when they do zero-based budgeting to not budget this year appropriately, anticipating next year being worse. He opined they have to stick with each individual year. He suggested where they find themselves in trouble is in the “fat” years, rather than reducing the millage rates or increasing reserves, they added services. He continued that over the last three or four years, they have had to remove as many services as they can to the point now where they are at the bare minimum of services and still able to call themselves the City of Temple Terrace. He concluded that he is in favor, as it is set and believes a 3% salary increase is warranted in order to get non-union employees back to their net revenue of two years ago.

Council Member Govin questioned where they proposed to get the \$188,035 from, to which the City Manager responded one alternative is to use additional monies from the red light camera funds. Council Member Knapp added that it could be taken from reserves.

Council Member Neale questioned when they come back to discuss the Fire Service Fee, which will add revenue if, after the study is done, it is approved, whether there is a possibility of replacing some of these funds.

The City Manager responded that is what they would strive for, but emphasized the study must be done first in order to give them concrete answers relative to a Fire Service Fee.

Council Member Fernandez stated she could be swayed to agree to the 3% increase, but still believes a bonus structure would be best, even though they may not want to base the budget on what they believe may happen next year. However, she suggested part of the problem they find themselves in is that over the course of 10 years, salaries have naturally increased, taking a larger portion of the revenue, but now, as the revenue declines, they are locked into salaries, leaving the option of cutting people as the only way to cut payroll; however people are where their service comes from. She concurred that it is difficult to function at 100%, but she believes that to be impossible – one gets as close as they can. She continued that she doesn't believe the City has ever been over-paying its employees, so she doesn't believe they can cut their salaries; being locked into the salaries limits their flexibility as years go on. Therefore, she said she is more in favor of a bonus structure so that next year's Council is not locked into certain salaries, but will have more flexibility to pay based on what the budget will allow.

Council Member Govin commented that at 3% he does not believe they are doing salaries based on what the budget can allow, because they are borrowing money and raising taxes in order to do it. He continued that when he looked at it, it struck him that from 2008 to 2011, there was a reduction in FTEs (full-time equivalents) of six. He remarked they have just gone through and are still in the worst economic position that this country has been in for 40 years, which is the reason he keeps coming back to the fact that he finds it difficult to believe that over that period of time all that the City has been able to cut is six positions. He acknowledged it was shown where sixteen positions were reduced, but did see where it showed what positions have been added. He mentioned tightening the belt has to be done everywhere, not just expenses, and while he hates to talk of employees and cutting salaries, the reality is he has had to do it in his business, like most other businesses, and positions have been cut unless there was commensurate increase in volume, which the City has not had.

Not wishing to be argumentative, the City Manager said the City's volume has not diminished; it has increased. As the City manager began to explain how fire and police calls have increased, Council Member Govin interjected that it was not true the volume has increased; while some areas may have increased, permitting has decreased. He compared cutting six positions in this economic slow-down is not commensurate with what has happened outside of government. He mentioned the City of Tampa is talking about cutting hundreds and thousands of real layoffs, where Temple Terrace is only talking about non-replacement. As the City goes forward, Council Member Govin said he would be willing to do some of these things if he had some kind of promise from management (City Manager and Department Heads) that when an open position occurs it would not be filled under every condition, so that the City can begin to make up some of the difference. He explained that if six to ten people, which is the average Council was told that leave each year, will be eliminated during a year, with an average salary of \$40,000, it would result in \$250,000 to \$400,000 that would come back in; if they can't tell him that would happen, then they are doing debt financing of what has been proposed, with part coming from the citizenry and part from the red light camera funds/reserves. He remarked that nothing is going to change that will pay for those raises; they will be doing it with borrowed funds and taxes.

Council Member Knapp disagreed; some things are going to change. He noted that the City has annexed property in the past couple of years and the revenue is not showing yet; however, the City still has to service those areas with fire, police, and sanitation services. He continued that there are minimum established through accreditation for police and fire, which would result in not replacing employees in Leisure Services, Administration, etc.; in the last three or four years the administration has done a good job in doing that, having eliminated two director positions already.

Council Member Knapp commented that it is easy to discuss employee cutbacks, but difficult to make those decisions, because the same amount of people, if not more, are going to the recreational centers when times are tough; the City is providing services, such as after school day care, and with more people going to work who were not working before, the demand for the City's services is still there; the grass is still growing and requires mowing; and kids are still playing baseball and soccer. He said the City is increasing the millage rate and using the City's own revenue to cover those costs. He remarked he is fine to call it reserves, because he can still recall his second year on City Council when the City's total reserves were \$1.4 million, from which the Council took \$400,000 to balance the budget and avoid raising the millage rate, for what they believed was a temporary problem. He said he views the current situation as a five-year, or less, problem. He predicted the revenues will increase over the next five years, including the revenue base from the annexations, additional revenue base from construction and permitting from the downtown redevelopment, and they will be reducing the debt from the downtown on which the City is making payments and which is a large portion of the budget.

Council Member Knapp surmised they would not be having this conversation if they were to take out the downtown redevelopment project and act like it never happened, because they would have the income from those properties, with no deficit payments for property the City does not own. He commented they have created their own issue; the question is who they are going to make pay for that and who will ultimately receive the benefits from that. He opined it is the citizens who will receive the overall benefit. He commented that they are continually told the reason people come to Temple Terrace is because of the City's recreational centers, police and fire, and other services available; if they continue to cut services in an attempt to match the income after already having handicapping themselves with payments on downtown redevelopment, he believes they are doing a disservice to the citizens.

Council Member Knapp suggested if they want to see where they "went left" when they should have "gone right," in his opinion it was when the tax base was continually going up; they probably should have lowered the millage rate, rather than absorbing and using the additional income. He noted that was the first thing he sat down to discuss with the City Manager and Finance Director after he was elected; the City Manager commented he remembered the conversation clearly.

In response to Mayor Affronti questioning the amount held in reserves, the City Manager responded the goal was 25%, which was achieved, adding the reserves are currently at 20%.

Mayor Affronti commented it would be difficult for the administration to say that when someone leaves, they will not be replaced; many of the positions *must* be replaced.

Council Member Govin suggested they could reach an agreement that an equivalent would be lost; it would not have to be that specific position, agreeing there are certain jobs that have to be filled.

The Finance Director interjected that the City is down six positions over the last two years; however, they did reduce a total of 16 positions in the general fund; 11 positions were added back, 10 of which were firefighters – four were added back due to annexation to prepare for a third fire station; six firefighters were added through the SAFER grant, which diminishes each year and impacts the budget by \$50,000 in this budget year. She commented the other new position was a Communication Officer, which had been removed, but put back into the budget due to receipt of a grant to fund the position. She continued that the City is realizing the savings from frozen positions.

Council Member Govin questioned whether the vacancies are not being filled because they are not needed now, to which the Finance Director responded some are in the process of being filled and others the City Manager will not let be filled at this point, in order to offset some of the departmental expenses. Council Member Govin said that was his point; if they have some positions that are not going to be filled, rather than leave them open, close them until the time is right and funding is available. He said positions are still showing in the general budget that should be removed.

The Finance Director stated that a hiring freeze was started three years ago; positions were held and not filled. She explained there are two terms for positions in that situation – eliminated and frozen; some are carried for a time before being eliminated, which occurred this year. She noted the currently frozen positions are a building inspector, police detective, police officer, housing compliance officer, and a Secretary II, which recently came open and will remain frozen for awhile until it is determined the department can do without them; if so, they will be eliminated in the next budget year. Council Member Govin questioned whether \$300,000 for these positions is included in the budget, to which the Finance Director responded negatively, confirming that if a frozen position is filled, the budget will go up.

Police Chief Albano explained the City Manager has directed cuts be made over the last few years. He reviewed his tenure with the City from heading the patrol division, where he had to make cuts, and later taking over the budget responsibilities and working closely with the Finance Director to make further cuts. He continued that once he became a Director, he sat with the other Directors, who have done what they could every year cutting hundreds of thousands of dollars in every place they could find; this year, he has held two officer positions without being forced to do so, at \$150,000 that he has not filled. Regarding whether he could do without them, he explained that doing without those positions is costing him extra time for the detectives working those positions, and in response time of trying to maintain the goal of three minutes. While the positions are frozen, he asked that they please not be taken away. He further explained that in 2005, 2.2 was established as their ratio and they added four positions; since that time, with annexations and call volume increasing by 19%, not one position has been added. When annexations have come through, he said he has recommended adding positions to keep up. He said they have gotten through this year by working more, but it is affecting them; it is important to tell his people that those positions are being frozen now to help the City out and meet the budget needs, but they haven't lost them, which gives them hope that maybe next year the positions can be filled.

The City Manager reviewed they did annex the dairy farm, putting the City adjacent to half of the industrial park, many of whom have already signed bona fide annexation agreements. He said his goal is to bring those in, which will bring a chance to grow, hopefully mutually beneficial.

Mayor Affronti called for a consensus on three issues – the main budget, using money from the red light camera funds and increasing the millage to 5.95 mills for a balanced budget; the 3% salary increase for all non-union employees and if so, how; and whether to approve going forward with the study relative to a Fire Service Fee, which could offset the millage increase.

Council Member Fernandez responded she is in favor of the budget and millage rate of 5.95 mills as presented; favors the 3% increase in a bonus structure; and agrees to a study relative to a fire service fee, with the understanding that they would be able to reduce the millage rate commensurately. She said she likes the idea of spreading the cost of fire service to all parties who use it, with no one paying twice.

Council Member Govin said he agrees with the statement relative to the fire service fee, only implementing it to even out to some of the people who are currently paying nothing, but wants to see the millage reduced. He said he cannot agree to a 3% salary increase, possibly could agree to 1-1/2% bonus, if staff will assure them that as positions can be eliminated, they will be eliminated and not frozen. He said he concurs with using a portion of the red light camera revenue so long as it is understood that is reserves they are using, and it is stated as such, along with roll-up millage.

Council Member Neale reiterated that everyone has told her to not cut their services; therefore, she concurs with the roll-up rate of 5.95 mills, use of the red light camera revenue, the 3% increase to all non-union employees (how they do it is not an issue with her), adding that non-union employees should be compensated as well as the union employees, and they should go ahead with the Fire Service Fee study.

Council Member Knapp inquired why the study is needed. The City Manager explained it has to be based on non-EMS Services provided by the Fire Department, and on a justified basis for each parcel, according to State law. He said it will cost about \$20,000 for the study, and he will somehow find the money for it. Council Member Knapp concurred with the millage increase; using money from reserves to balance; the 3% salary increase for non-union employees to get them at least to where they were two years ago in regard to compensation; and that the study for a Fire Service Fee should be done as quickly as possible so it could be implemented as soon as possible.

Council Member Halloway concurs with the administration's recommendations for the roll-up rate and red light camera revenue to balance the budget, the 3% salary increase for non-union employees, and while he may not agree with the Fire Service Fee, he will concur with proceeding with the study.

There being no further discussion, the work session concluded at 5:05 p.m.

Submitted by,

Lisa Small, MMC
City Clerk