

**FY18 Budget Process
City Council Budget Questions
Group 2**

Permitting and Inspections Questions

26. Provide fee comparisons for development (i.e., permits, etc.).

The following charts are provided for comparison purposes based upon current fee schedules for local communities. The building fee schedules for each of these communities are posted with the budget questions on the Budget Chronicles web page:

Municipality/County	Residential Building Permit Fee – 2,000 sq. ft. heated with 500 sq. ft. unheated
Hoke County	\$1,075
Moore County	\$382
Sanford	\$340
Pinehurst	\$450
Hope Mills	\$822
Spring Lake	\$860
Lumberton	\$860
Average	\$684
Fayetteville - Current	\$600
Fayetteville - Proposed	\$675

Municipality/County	Commercial Building Permit Fee – 2,000 sq. ft. mercantile
Hoke County	\$1,100
Moore County	\$360
Sanford	\$800
Pinehurst	\$800
Hope Mills	\$712
Spring Lake	\$534
Lumberton	\$534
Average	\$691
Fayetteville - Current	\$640

Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Questions

27. Why are Parks and Recreation functional revenues projected to be less than FY16 actuals?

Revenue projections for FY2017 and FY2018 are developed based on comparisons of year-to-date revenues as compared to prior fiscal years and adjusted based upon trends and any other known factors.

For athletic programs, revenues and participation levels were ahead of prior year levels as of February and continue to surpass prior fiscal year as of April. Staff conservatively projected FY2017 year-end and FY2018 athletic program revenues to be approximately 3% above FY2016 levels. If the current pace of revenues continues, revenues may exceed projections by \$10,000 and FY2016 actuals by \$19,000.

For non-athletic revenues, such as recreation program fees and facility rental fees, year to date revenues as of February were almost 3% below fiscal year 2016. Recreation staff reports that the year-to-date enrollment numbers as of February were lower than prior year for instructional activity programs and for registrations for special population programs. Additionally, facility rental revenues for Festival Park and recreation buildings also lagged FY2016 for the same period. As of April, those revenues are lagging the prior year by 2%. Staff conservatively projected FY2017 year-end and FY2018 revenues to be 3% below prior year. If the current trend continues, revenues may exceed projections by \$11,000, but still lag FY2016 by \$28,000.

28. What is the status of the litter crew initiatives? Should there be a litter campaign conducted?

According to the most recent data available, 116.75 tons of trash has been collected and there are 12 contracted employees assigned to the litter crews.

Planning is underway for a collaborative effort with Corporate Communications, Fayetteville Beautiful and Parks and Recreation staff to create an anti-litter campaign aimed at elementary and middle school students throughout Cumberland County. Staff would also like to increase the number of streets that are adopted by residents. Data will be collected and entered into a database to indicate areas that need additional attention and aide in the scheduling of volunteers and litter crews.

Parking Questions

29. Why is parking revenue projected to be down?

Parking revenues are projected based upon comparisons of current year revenues to date and prior year actual revenues for leased spaces, pay stations and parking violation revenues.

At the time revenue projections were prepared, current fiscal year-to-date revenues for leased spaces and pay stations were approximately 9.8% (\$6,250) below revenues as of January, 2016. This variance primarily reflects a decline of approximately 15 leased spaces per month, with the greatest loss in the parking deck. As of April 30, 2017, these revenues continue to be down approximately 9.6% (\$8,483) as compared to the prior year. On this basis, fiscal year-end revenues were projected to be \$10,501, or approximately 10% below fiscal year 2016 revenues.

For parking violation revenues, fiscal year-to-date revenues through January were in-line with prior year revenues. Through the end of April, however, revenues are approximately 7.2% above revenues received as of April, 2016. If this pace continues, year-end revenues may exceed current projections by up to \$8,000 and exceed fiscal year 2016 revenues by \$7,000. This revenue can be impacted by "debt-set off" collections that can fluctuate significantly.

30. Within the Parking Fund, provide a budget breakdown for the parking deck on its own.

The table below provides a budget comparison for revenues and expenditures for the parking deck for the current fiscal year and new fiscal year:

	FY18 Recommended Budget	FY17 Adopted Budget		
Operating Revenues			Operating Revenues Per Public Space Per Month	
Paystation	14,000	12,700		
Monthly Leases	25,200	28,800	FY18	16.58
	39,200	41,500	FY17	17.55
PWC Operating Costs (CY)	37,298	33,428		
Total Operating Funding Sources	76,498	74,928		
Operating Expenditures			Operating Expenses Per Space Per Month	
Utilities *	13,500	13,760		
Supplies	-	400		
Building Maintenance	26,300	26,550		
Maintenance - Other	22,420	22,428	FY18	28.85
Telephone	7,120	6,120	FY17	28.42
Insurance	7,488	6,754		
Contract Svcs	25,285	24,612		
Total Operating Expenditures	102,113	100,624		
Net Operating Income (Loss)	(25,615)	(25,696)		
Other Costs:				
Capital Reserve	24,429	23,950		
Debt Service	563,563	583,794		
Other Revenues:				
PWC Capital Reserve Contribution	8,115	7,956		
County Debt Service Contribution	45,506	42,853		
CBTD Debt Service Contribution	31,149	30,791		

Environmental Services Questions

31. Provide a 10 year chart of budget and actuals for Environmental Services expenditures.

	Adopted Budget	Actuals
FY 2007	\$8,325,314	\$9,206,762
FY 2008	\$8,656,670	\$12,911,968
FY 2009*	\$10,522,481	\$10,880,342
FY 2010*	\$9,924,892	\$9,538,674
FY 2011*	\$10,813,246	\$12,545,318
FY 2012*	\$11,054,667	\$11,222,970
FY 2013*	\$10,616,383	\$10,851,311
FY 2014	\$10,412,904	\$9,404,796
FY 2015	\$10,833,161	\$11,101,569
FY 2016	\$11,195,336	\$9,473,123
FY 2017	\$11,483,002	

*Includes Recycling Fund

Please note that FY 2007 and FY 2008 amounts are only for solid waste services. The City began providing recycling services in FY 2009, and accounted for the costs associated with that service in the Recycling Fund. In FY 2014, the costs of providing solid waste services were transitioned from the General Fund to an enterprise fund (the Environmental Services Fund), which includes solid waste and recycling.

Community Development Questions

32. What is the status of the discussed consolidation of Community Development with the County?

City and County staff continue their discussions on the proposed Community Development consolidation. The City is currently waiting for an updated proposal/interlocal agreement from the County.

33. \$100K is proposed to continue partnering with the County to assist homeless persons. What is the status of the agreement with the County and what is the County's contribution?

The agreement has been sent to the County for approval, and City staff is awaiting a response from the County regarding concurrence with the Continuum of Care formal structure and comprehensive plan for homelessness sections of the agreement. The proposed funding from the County is \$100,000. A meeting with City staff and the County Community Development department was scheduled for Wednesday, May 17, 2017 to discuss the issue.

34. The Emergency Communications Center requires \$465K for design from the City to partner with the County. How much will the County pay and where are we on resolving differences with some County Commissioners?

For FY18, the total projected expenditures for this project are \$1,548,147, with \$465,371 to be funded from the City's General Fund, and the balance to be provided from the County (\$997,326) and PWC (\$85,450). The estimated cost allocations were calculated using a projected square footage basis based upon the preliminary study. This is likely to be revised based upon the proposed intergovernmental agreement which proposes an allocation based on incidents. The FY19 projected costs of \$20,663,038 are for the entire construction project, with the City to issue debt (part of the first group of projects for the proposed public safety bond), with each of the three parties funding the debt service costs on the basis of the facility square footage allocation. Finally, there is also a TIP project for FY19 for \$6,704,674, proposed to be funded primarily from E911 grants (\$5,996,385) with the balance rolled into the use of bond proceeds with the debt service costs shared by the City and County.

At the May 22, 2017 regular council meeting, City staff will be presenting a draft intergovernmental agreement on the governance model for the combined center, which has also been forwarded to the County.

35. \$50K is proposed to fund a review of the UDO. Why is this proposed to be a contracted review as opposed to a review by an assembled group or staff, council and homebuilders?

Staff's recollection of Council's direction for this Target for Action was for a fully independent review of the UDO. A consultant would interview staff and stakeholders, and make an independent recommendation for any changes. Given the pending staffing changes due to the retirement of two senior staff members, it would be a lot to ask of a new department director and division manager to handle this in-house, at least in the coming FY, as they will need time to understand the issues and get the new department organized before taking on this major task.