ROSS C. "ROCKY" ANDERSON

SALT' LAKE: CHIY CORPORATION



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

TO:

Jill Remington Love, Chair

Salt Lake City Council

FROM:

Rocky J. Fluhart, Chief Administrative Officer

DATE:

November 18, 2004

SUBJECT:

Budget Amendment No. 4

Recommendation: We recommend that on December 14, 2004, the City Council set a date to hold a public hearing on January 4, 2004, to discuss Budget Amendment No. 4.

<u>Discussion and Background</u>: The attached amendment packet is transmitted to the City Council Office for the briefing on December 7, 2004.

<u>Legislative Action:</u> The attached ordinance to amend this budget has been approved by the City Attorney.

cc:

Dan Mulé, City Treasurer

Shannon Ashby

SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE

No. of 2004

(Amending Salt Lake City Ordinance No. 63 of 2004 which adopted the Final Budget of Salt Lake City, including the employment staffing document, for Fiscal Year 2004-2005)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE NO. 63 OF 2004 WHICH APPROVED, RATIFIED AND FINALIZED THE BUDGET OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, INCLUDING THE EMPLOYMENT STAFFING DOCUMENT, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 2004 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2005.

PREAMBLE

On August 24, 2004, the Salt Lake City Council approved, ratified and finalized the budget of Salt Lake City, Utah, including the employment staffing document, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2004 and ending June 30, 2005, in accordance with the requirements of Section 118, Chapter 6, Title 10 of the Utah Code Annotated, and said budget, including the employment staffing document, was approved by the Mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The City's Policy and Budget Director, acting as the City's Budget Officer, prepared and filed with the City Recorder proposed amendments to said duly adopted budget, including the amendments to the employment staffing document, copies of which are attached hereto, for consideration by the City Council and inspection by the public.

All conditions precedent to amend said budget, including the employment staffing document, have been accomplished.

Be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. <u>Purpose</u>. The purpose of this Ordinance is to amend the budget of Salt Lake City, including the employment staffing document, as approved, ratified and finalized by Salt Lake City Ordinance No. 63 of 2004.

SECTION 2. Adoption of Amendments. The budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, attached hereto and made a part of this Ordinance shall be, and the same hereby are adopted and incorporated into the budget of Salt Lake City, Utah, including the employment staffing document, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2004 and ending June 30, 2005, in accordance with the requirements of Section 128, Chapter 6, Title 10, of the Utah Code Annotated.

SECTION 3. <u>Certification to Utah State Auditor</u>. The City's Policy and Budget Director, acting as the City's Budget Officer, is authorized and directed to certify and file a copy of said budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, with the Utah State Auditor.

SECTION 4. Filing of copies of the Budget Amendments. The said Budget Officer is authorized and directed to certify and file a copy of said budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, in the office of said Budget Officer and in the office of the City Recorder which amendments shall be available for public inspection.

SECTION 5. <u>Effective Date</u>. This Ordinance shall take effect on its first publication.

| Passed by the City Council of Sa. | it Lake City, Utan, this day of |
|--|---------------------------------|
| , 2004. | |
| | |
| | |
| | CHAIRPERSON |
| ATTEST: | |
| | |
| • | |
| CHIEF DEPUTY CITY RECORDER | |
| • | |
| fransmitted to the Mayor on | |
| Mayor's Action: Approved | _ Vetoed |
| | |
| | |
| | MAYOR |
| ATTEST: | |
| | |
| | APPROVED AS TO FORM |
| CHIEF DEPUTY CITY RECORDER | Sait Lake City Attorney's O |
| | By Jam A Pm |
| SEAL) | |
| Bill No of 2004. | |
| blished: | |
| :\ordinance 04\budget amendment #4 2004-2005 | |
| Totalitation 04/budget amendinent #4 2004-2005 | |

FY 2005 Initiatives in Budget Amendment #4 – January

| | | | FY 2005 | | FY 20 | 06 |
|------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Initiative Name | Initiative Amount | Gen. Fund Impact | FTE | Gen. Fund Impact | FTE |
| | | New Items | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | |
| 1. | Airport Fire Captain | \$48,328 | \$48,328 | 1.0 | \$82,848 | 1.0 |
| 2. | Leonardo Center Utilities | \$105,000 | \$105,000 | | | |
| 3. | Fee Waiver (This is the | \$2,283 | \$2,283 | | | |
| | Place Foundation) | | | | | |
| 4. | Plan Review Services | \$170,000 | \$170,000 | 3.0 | \$180,000 | 3.0 |
| 5. | Economic Development | \$55,000 | \$55,000 | | | |
| 6. | North Temple | \$40,000 | | | | |
| | Improvement | | | | | |
| 7. | Yale Avenue SID | \$205,000 | | | | |
| 8. | Wal-Mart Private | \$50,000 | | | | |
| | Donation - Modesto Park | | | | | |
| 9. | Sugarhouse CC 700 E | \$500 | | | | |
| | Trees | ma 4 co 0 | | | | |
| 10. | Justice Court | \$24,600 | | | | |
| | Fingerprinting System | 600 000 | | | | |
| 11. | Ottinger Hall | \$90,000 | • | | | |
| 10 | Improvements | CO 4 100 | | | | |
| 12. | Modesto Park | \$94,188 | | | | |
| 12 | Improvements | ድን ደሰብ ሰብብ | | | | |
| 13. 14. | Solid Waste Facility 900 South SID | \$2,500,000 \$130,000 | | | | |
| 14. 14 | Grant Tower Design / | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | | | |
| A. | Commuter Rail | \$25,000 | \$2,000 | | | |
| | er annager i de la companya de la c | or Existing Sta | ff Resources | | | |
| 15. | Rocky Mtn. HIDTA | \$145,800 | | Alania i as | aman and made partition in | of Lordon Francisco |
| | المراكبة والمتراف في المنطال فيهم ياهم المراج الرجم ينهم المراجع المراجع المراجع | For New Staff | Resources | | | |
| 16. | Project Safe | \$10,000 | The Towns of Marian Table 1888 | . Lin se end e | eran ad an Sadrahaalaan | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| 200 | Neighborhood | ,. | | | | |
| TO SEE | Grants Req | uiring No New | Staff Resources | | | |
| 17. | Police Bomb Squad Van | \$40,205 | | | | |
| 18. | American Dream Down | \$177,518 | | | | |
| | Payment | | | | | |
| 19. | Housing Opportunities for | \$21,209 | | | | |
| | People with AIDS | | | | | |
| 20. | FEMA Medical Response | \$400,000 | l Sint di Sussen aka kacamatan | , ggar aren | seo o y lubornos a real (1999) | and the second |
| | | Housekeepin | | | | |
| 21. | Refuse & Fleet Encumb | \$996,596 | | | | |
| | Carryover | \$3,337 | | | | |
| 22. | Rose Park SID Increase | \$236,873 | | | | |
| 23. | CIP & CDBG Recapture | \$319,625.32 | | | | |
| | | \$7,930.53 | | | | |

FY 2005 Initiatives in Budget Amendment #4 – January

| | | | FY 2005 | FY 2006 |
|-----|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | Initiative Name | Initiative Amount | Gen. Fund FTE Impact | Gen. Fund FTE Impact |
| 24. | US Depart of Education Adjustment | \$127,506.31 | | |
| 25. | California Ave Bridge | \$41,447.92 | | |
| 26. | Water Utility Carryover CIP | \$3,016,682 | | |
| 27. | Sewer Utility Carryover CIP | \$1,683,495 | | |
| 28. | Storm water Fund Carryover CIP | \$240,000 | | |
| 29. | Transportation Downtown Master Plan | \$100,000 | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable

Fire Department

Department

Airport Fire Captain Initiative Name

CJ Lawrence / John Vuyk

Prepared By New Item

Type of Initiative

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #1

Initiative Number

799-4210

Phone Number

CEDA Number

| Type of Initiative | | | <u>-</u> | C | FDA Number | | |
|---|----------|----------|------------|----------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Fiscal Impact o | f Prop | ose | d Change | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1 | st Year | | 2nd Year | | 3rd Year |
| | | | 2004-05 | | Y 2005-06 | | |
| 1, General Fund | | ••• | | | | | |
| Airport Reimbursement (1952) | ļ | \$ | 48,328.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 |
| Anpoit i tollibulouloulou (1002) | | * | , | , | , | • | , - |
| | Total | \$ | 48,328.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| • | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | - | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| • | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | - | | | | |
| Fire department (at Airport) | | \$ | 48,328.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 48,328.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | <u> </u> | | ļ | | <u> </u> | |
| | Total | | . \$0 |) | \$0 | <u> </u> | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | } | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | - | | | _ | | | * ** |
| 4.00 | Total | | \$0 | <u> </u> | \$0 | | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | ┼ | \$0 | - | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | l Otal | | <u> 40</u> | <u> </u> | - | <u> </u> | ΨΟ |
| Salaries and Wages | | \$ | 40,670.00 | \$ | 69,720.00 | \$ | 69,720.00 |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | \$ | 7,658.00 | | 13,128.00 | \$ | 13,128.00 |
| Comployee Benefits Complete Benefit | | ۱۳ | 7,050.00 | * | 10, 120.00 | * | 10,120.00 |
| 4. Charges and Services | | | | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | | | | | | |
| | Tota | \$ | 48,328.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 | \$ | 82,848.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

| D. Personnel Service Detail: | FTE | Grade/Step | America |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| D. Personnel Service Detail: | | Grade/Step | Amount |
| enter the position title | | | |
| ·· · | | | |
| ire Captain | ` | 1 901 C | \$ 82,848.0 |
| iic daptairi | | 1 301 0 | Ψ 02,040.0 |
| · | | | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | |
| <u></u> | | | - |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| ## | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | 1 |
| " | | | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | · · | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | · | + | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | |
| | · - · · | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | i | |
| | | · · · · · · | |
| | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | |
| • | | | |
| · | · | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ł | | |
| | | | |
| | | | · · |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | + | |
| | | | |
| | | | 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | · | | + |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | - " | |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | ļ |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization, or plans.

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management.

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Criteria - The Fire Department would increase its staffing by one Captain Position to assign two Fire Captains to adminstrative functions at the Airport

Condition - The Fire Department currently has one Fire Captain assigned to administrative functions at the Airport.

Effect - The Fire Department would have the ability to separate the ARFF Training Captain and the Airport Fire Marshall functions into two poistions allowing for better management and oversight of the assigned responsibilities for each position.

Cause - The Fire Department decreased its staffing in FY2004 to attain a cost savings for the Airport Fund. However, it has been determined by the Airport and the Fire Department that separating the functions would allow for better management and oversight. The Airport has determined that the separation is worth the additional costs it would incur.

Recommendation - It is recommended that the Fire Department increase its staffing by one Fire Captain. This position would be assigned to the Airport and would be reimbursed by the Airport Fund.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Public Services Department 2004-05 Department For Fiscal Year Salt Lake Arts Academy at the Leonardo Center Amendment #4 Initiative #2 Initiative Name Initiative Number Greg Davis <u>535-6397</u> Prepared By Phone Number New Item CFDA Number Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year FY 2004-05 FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 1. General Fund Facility Maint. Rental Income 07-00093 1802 \$ 105,000.00 105,000.00 \$0 Total \$ \$0 2. Internal Service Fund \$0 Total \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Total \$0 \$0 \$0 4. Other Fund Total \$0 \$0 \$0 B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund Natural Gas 07-00093 2331 35,000.00 70,000.00 Electrical 07-00093 2332-01 Total \$ 105,000.00 \$0 2. Internal Service Fund Total \$0 \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Total \$0 4. Other Fund Total \$0 \$0 \$0 C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 105,000.00 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) Total \$ 105,000.00 \$0 \$0

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In ot

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

On July 27, 2004 the Salt Lake Arts Academy signed a lease with Salt Lake City Corporation for 15,000 square feet at the Leonardo Center. The leased space is to be used for a public charter school. The lease payment is \$8,750 per month. The leasehold period is July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005. As part of the leasehold agreement, Salt Lake City Corporation will pay the utilities for the leased space. It is believed that the utilities cost paid by Salt Lake City Corporation will be covered by the lease payments being made by the Salt Lake Arts Academy. Any utilities expense not covered by the lease payments will be recovered from the Salt Lake Arts Academy.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the incremental budget which supports the receipt of lease payments from the Salt Lake Arts Academy and the payment of utilities, by Salt Lake City Corporation, in support of the leased space.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

<u>Community Development</u>

Department

Fee Waiver

This is the Place Foundation

Initiative Name

LuAnn Clark/ Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #3

Initiative Number

535-6136 535-6150

Phone Number

New Item Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable Type of Initiative Not Applicable Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year <u>2nd Year</u> 3rd Year FY 2004-05 FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 1. General Fund **Fund Balance** 2,283,00 Total \$ 2,283.00 \$0 \$0 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary Total \$0 \$0 \$0 4. Other Fund Total \$0 B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund 06-00200 - 2550 Refund 2,283.00 Total \$ 2,283.00 \$0 \$0 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary Total \$0 \$0 4. Other Fund Total \$0 \$0 \$0 C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance 4. Charges and Services \$ 2,283.00 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) 2.283.00 Total \$

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Chairman of This is the Place Foundation requested reimbursement of building permit fees paid to the City from 1998 through 2003. He calculated that the fees paid totaled \$27,521.24 and requested reimbursement of \$20,000 as a comprised amount.

The Fee Fund Protocol in effect during the period in which the fees were paid did not address the timeliness of refund requests. The City Council and Administration amended the Building Permit Fee Refund Protocol on September 14, 2004. The amended protocol requires requests for refunds to be provided within six months from the date the building permit fee was paid.

For this reason, it is recommended that the City Council approve a refund in the amount of \$2,283. This amount includes \$1,437 in permit fees paid six months prior to the Foundation's November, 2002 request and \$846 paid for permit fees subsequent to this request.

It is recommended that the City Council appropriate the budget and cash to facilitate this reimbursement.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable

Community Development

Department

Plan Review Services

Initiative Name

David Dobbins / Orion Goff

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #4

Initiative Number

<u>535-7236</u>

| David Doublins 7 Offort Golf. | Kimir-rei | <u> </u> | | | | | i |
|--|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|-------------|------|------------|
| Prepared By | a. o. Poeta Pilipi | Phone Number | | | | | I |
| New Item | | CFDA # (If Applicable) in this Cell | | | | | Cell |
| Type of Initiative | | | | С | FDA Number | | |
| Fiscal Impact o | f Prop | 1056 | ed Change | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | 1st Year | | 2nd Year | 3 | Brd Year |
| - (: : (O) O : : | | | | | | | Y 2006-07 |
| | ٠. | J.F | Y 2004-05 | | Y 2005-06 | أداب | 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | |
| Building permit fees 06-00200-125101 | | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 |
| Plan Check Fees 06-00200-125105 | | \$ | 140,000.00 | \$_ | 120,000.00 | \$ | 120,000.00 |
| | Total | \$ | 170,000.00 | \$ | 180,000.00 | \$ | 180,000.00 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | } | | | į |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | Total | | \$0 | | . \$0 | | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | - 5,541 | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | T-4-1 | -, - | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | Total | | <u>\$U</u> | | \$ U | | Ф О |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | İ | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | <u>. </u> | \$0 | | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | | | | | |
| 1, General Fund | - | | | i | <u> </u> | | |
| Building Inspector (06-00200) | | \$ | 30,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 |
| Building Plans Examiner (06-00600) | | \$ | 30,000.00 | | 60,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 |
| Development Review Planner (06-00600) | | \$ | 30,000.00 | | 60,000.00 | \$ | 60,000.00 |
| | | \$ | 80,000.00 | | 00,000.00 | \$ | 00,000.00 |
| Plan Review Outsourcing (06-00600) | Total | | 170,000.00 | | 180,000.00 | \$ | 180,000.00 |
| | Total | → | 170,000.00 | 1 2 | 100,000.00 | 1 3 | 180,000.00 |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | | | ŀ | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| , | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | i - | | Π- | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| monade detail in tina con, and rows in necessary | Total | ┢ | \$0 | ╁╌╴ | \$0 | 1 | \$0 |
| C. Europeliture Import Potail | rotta | | Ψ0 | | | 1 | + - |
| C: Expenditure Impact Detail | | 6 | 67,500.00 | \$ | 135,000.00 | \$ | 135,000.00 |
| Salaries and Wages | | \$ | | | | 1 ' | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | \$ | 22,500.00 | \$ | 45,000.00 | \$ | 45,000.00 |
| Operating and Maintenance Supply | | ۱_ | | _ | | _ | |
| Charges and Services | | \$ | 80,000.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | | | $oxed{igspace}$ | | 1 | |
| | Tota | \$ | 170,000.00 | \$ | 180,000.00 | \$ | 180,000.00 |
| | | 7 | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

| D. Personnel Service Detail: | FTE | Grade/Step | Amount |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| Building Plans Examiner Development Review Planner Building Inspector III | 1 | 311 | 30,00 |
| Development Review Planner | 1 | 311 | 30,00 |
| Building Inspector III | 1 | 311 | 30,00 |
| Building Inspector in | <u> </u> | | |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | - |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | - | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| - | | | |
| | | | ··· |
| | | t | |
| | | | 1 - 1 - 7 - 7 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | L | | |
| | ļ | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | - |
| | | | i |
| | | | |
| · | | | |
| | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | 1 |
| | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | |
| | <u>"-</u> " | | |
| | - | <u> </u> | 1 |
| | | | · |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | <u></u> | |
| | 1 | 1 | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization, or plans.

Plan reviews and inspections will be completed in a more timely manner. Department goal is 3 weeks review time on plan reviews and inspection response within 24 hours of request. Current staffing levels do not allow

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Building Services and Licensing Division has seen a significant and unexpected increase in development activity. Current resources do not allow the division to process plan reviews and perform inspections in a timely and acceptable manner. In order to process the increased workload the division is requesting 2 new FTEs, one building plans examiner and one development review planner. The annual plan review fee revenue is \$600,000 and as of the end of October the division had collected nearly \$500,000, so there is sufficient revenue to cover this expense. Future year expenses will be covered by the unbudgeted 20% increase in the plan review fees that are a result of the 20% building permit fee increase (plan review fee is 65% of the building permit fee)

The division is also requesting one building inspector FTE. The annual cost of the position for the current year will be covered by the revenue so far this year that is in excess of what was budgeted.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Mayor's Office

Department

Economic Development

Initiative Name

Sam Guevara / Alison McFarland

Prepared By

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #5

Initiative Number

<u>535-7732</u>

Phone Number

| New Item | Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------------|------------|--|--|--|
| | Type of Initiative | | | | Not Applicable | | | | |
| Fiscal Impact | of Pro | oose | d Change | | | | | | |
| A. Revenue impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1 | st Year | , | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | | | |
| A. Revenue impacted by I und and course. | | | 2004-05 | | Y 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | 2004-05 | - | 1 2000-00 | 1 2000 01 | | | |
| Fund Balance | | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | | | | |
| 1 till Dalatio | Total | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Ī | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary |] | | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | <u></u> | \$0 | \$ | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Ì | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Tatal | | \$0 | + | \$0 | 9 | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | | <u> </u> | + | \$0 | . 4 | | | |
| 4. Other Fulld | | | Į. | # | | | | | |
| | Total | | | | \$0 | \$ | | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source |):): | | | | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| Mayor's Office | | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | | | | |
| | | | | + | 55,000,00 | 9 | | | |
| 0 1-1 | Total | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| include detail in this cen, and lows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | . 512. | | | ┪ | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | ļ | | | | | |
| • | Total | | \$0 | 1 | \$0 | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | • | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$ | | | |
| C Evacaditura Impact Datail | rotar | | ⊅ ∪] | | . 40 | 7772 | | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Employee Benefits | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Charges and Services | | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | | | | | [| | | |
| | Total | \$ | 55,000.00 | \$ | 55,000.00 | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | | | <u> </u> | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here: Use additional cells if necessary

The budget is being requested to provide funding for an increase in the Economic Development.

Program. The budget would cover the design and printing of marketing materials used for recruitment expansion and retention of businesses. It would also be used for promotional advertising, advertorial in business and economic development trade publications, credit reports run for the revolving loan fund applicants, and professional services such as neighborhood retail study and setup of business incubator models.

Line Item Detail:

Retention and Expansion Mailers \$20,000

Layout, design, copyrighting, graphics, printing and mailing: promotional and marketing materials (small business services, revolving loan fund, business/commercial nodes of the City and available development opportunities). Economic development quarterly newsletter.

Research / Economic Data / Targeted Study Areas \$20,000

EDCU handles a portion of the City's research. Specific projects and survey materials require expanded research materials including study by the University of Utah Bureau of Business Research and various economic data for comparisons in preparing expansion and retention proposals. Targeted study areas for economic development in the City as well as evaluation of feasibility of business incubators, technology transfer from the University of Utah and Utah State University, specific Westside development projects, and survey of specific areas or neighborhood projects.

Seminars/Memberships: \$10,000

Salt Lake City Corporation Management and Fiscal Note Worksheet Budget Development and Budget Amendment

International Conference of Shopping Centers (ICSC) retail trade show where City forms partnerships with retail real estate agents to attract retailers to specific sites in the City. International Council of Economic Development (ICED). Best case practices from economic development practitioners around the country. Lead sharing of major businesses considering relocation, site selection research. Revolving loan fund, venture capital funding seminars and Vest Pocket Business Coalition Membership.

Promotion / Event Programs \$5,000

Advertising/advertorial budget for trade and business publications. This line item would also provide seed funding for the Downtown Living Tour event.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Community Development -Transportation Division

Department

North Temple Improvements

North Temple, 600 West

Initiative Name

Tim Harpst/Gordon Halght//Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

New Item

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #6

Initiative Number

535-7148/535-7147/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

| Type of Initiative | | Not Applicable | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Fiscal Impact of | of Prop | osed (| Change | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | <u>1st \</u> FY 20 | <u>Year</u> 04-05 | <u>2nd Year</u> FY 2005-06 | <u>3rd Year</u> FY 2006-07 | |
| General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ | |
| 4. Other Fund 83- New CIP Cost Center (UDOT Reimbursement) | | \$ 4 | 0,000.00 | | | |
| The state of the state of the Erich and Spirres | Total | \$ 4 | 0,000,00 | \$0 | \$ | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source 1. General Fund | | <i>:</i> | | | | |
| • | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | \$0 | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | ф. | \$0 | \$0 |) | |
| 83- New CIP Cost Center | Total | | 40,000.00 10,000.00 | \$0 | 1 | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services Capital Outlay Other (Specify)) | | \$ | 40,000.00 | | : | |
| | Total | \$ | 40,000.00 | \$0 | - | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) agreed to provide funding in conjunction with the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) in 2004, for improvements to include new safety lighting. ADA sidewalk replacement, asphalt, and concrete curb and gutter and other drainage improvements under the West end of the North Temple Viaduct at 600 West.

The RDA budgeted \$60,000 for this project and UDOT agreed to provide an additional \$13,320. As the construction plans were finalized, engineering's construction estimate clearly indicated that additional funds would be needed. The City approached UDOT who agreed to provide \$40,000 for this project.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant and to pass the Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Community Development -Transportation Division

Department

Yale Avenue SID

1300-1500 East

Initiative Name

Tim Harpst/Gordon Haight//Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

New Item

Type of Initiative

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #7

535-7148/535-7147/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

Not Applicable

| Fiscal Impact | of Pro | pose | ed Change | Not Applicable | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|------------------|----------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | lst Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | | | | |
| | 2 1 22 | F۱ | / 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | ···· | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | T-4-1 | | . 60 | 0 | 60 | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | | \$0 | <u> </u> | \$0 | | | | |
| CIP 83- New Cost Center SID (Yale Ave) | | \$ | 205,000.00 | | | | | | |
| on so her oost osmer old (rate ///o) | 1 | Ψ | 200,000:00 | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 205,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | <u>e:</u> | | | | , | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | IOLAI | | \$0 1 | 1 40 | Ψ0 | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | į | | | | | | |
| , | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | <u> </u> | | ** | | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | <u></u> | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund CIP 83- New Cost Center SID (Yale Ave) | | s | 205,000.00 | | | | | | |
| on so new cost contol old (rate /110) | | * | 200,000.00 | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 205,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee Benefits Operating and Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services | | | į | | | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | \$ | 205,000.00 | | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify)) | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 205,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The residents of Yale Ave., from 1300 to 1500 East has requested that the City proceed with creating a street lighting SID for their neighborhood. A total of 50 households are involved with this SID and have submitted the necessary petition to Transportation. This project would include installation of new decorative streetlights with underground wiring on Yale Ave., 1300-1500 East.

This is the capital improvements portion of the SID and would include paying for design, engineering, materials, construction and the associated Bond finance costs. The City is currently reviewing options that could reduce this cost by allowing the residents to collect the funds up front to reduce Bond finance charges or combining with other proposed SID's to share associated costs.

An additional maintenance SID will be created at a later date to facilitate on-going power and maintenance.

It is recommended that the City Council establish a new budget to facilitate the Yale Avenue SID Street lighting Project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

<u>Community Development</u>

Department

Walmart Private Donation
Westside Landscaping Donation

Initiative Name

LuAnn Clark/ Sherrie Collins

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #8

Initiative Number

535-6136/535-6150

| Prepared By | .Hie • 41.11.1 | | _ | Phone Number | |
|--|----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| New Item | | | <u>Enter Gra</u> | ant CFDA # As Ap | <u>plicable</u> |
| Type of Initiative | | | | Not Applicable | _ |
| Fiscal Impact of | Prop | ose | ed Change | | |
| | | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1 | st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| | | | 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| i. Solidiai i and | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$(|
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ |
| Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | |
| CIP 83 - New cost center - Westside Landscaping Donati | on | \$ | 50,000.00 | | |
| Modesto Park Project 83-04061 | Total | œ. | 50,000.00 | \$0 | \$ |
| | Total | Ф | 50,000.00 | ψο | 4 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | ľ | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$ |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | , 51 | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Ī | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| · | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | |
| CIP 83 - New cost center - Westside Landscaping Donat | ion | \$ | 50,000.00 | | |
| Modesto Park Project 83-04061 | | | 50,000,00 | | |
| | Total | \$ | 50,000.00 | \$0 | \$ |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | | 1 |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | 1 |
| Employee Benefits Operating and Maintenance | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services | | | | 1 | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | \$ | 50,000.00 | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | , | , . | | |
| (| | | | <u> </u> | |
| | Total | • | 50,000.00 | | 1 |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary

Wal-mart Corporation has donated \$50,000 to Salt Lake City Corporation to be used for landscaping at a Westside city building or park. The donation was made after Wal-Mart determined that placing planter boxes on the top of its parking structure at it's 1300 South 300 West store was prohibitive. Placing planter boxes on the parking structure had been one of the conditions of approval made by the Planning Commission for the project, but the Planning Commission subsequently removed that condition after Wal-Mart showed that the cost to engineer the structure increased significantly with the required landscaping.

The Public Services Department is recommending that the \$50,000 be used to fund a portion of the costs for the Modesto Park project.

It is recommended that the City Council appropriate the budget to accept this private donation and facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Salt Lake City Community Development

Department

Sugarhouse Community Council

Cash Donation -Trees 700 East Median Project

Initiative Name

<u>LuAnn Clark/ Sherrie Collins</u>

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #9

Initiative Number

535-6136/535-6150

Phone Number

| Prepared By | renta una more | Phone Number Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Agricial control of the control of t | New Item | | | | | | | |
| Type of Initiative | Not Applicable | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal Impact of | or Prop | osed Change | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | | | | |
| | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | İ | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | *** | <u>***</u> | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | ŀ | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| 4 Other Fund | Total | \$0.00 | 301 | Ψι | | | | |
| CIP 83-05075 - 700 East Median Island Project | | \$ 500.00 | | | | | | |
| CIP 83-05075 - 700 East Median Island Project | Total | | \$0 | \$(| | | | |
| D. Furnanditures Imposted by Fund and Sources | | Ψ 300.00 | 401 | | | | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund | : | | | | | | | |
| i. General Fund | | Į, | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$(| | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | l | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | , | | | | | | |
| , | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$ | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | _ | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$ | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | - | | | | | | | |
| CIP 83-05075 - 700 East Median Island Project | | \$ 500.00 | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ 500.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | - | | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services | | | | | | | | |
| Charges and Services Capital Outlay - Trees | | \$ 500.00 | | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | - | | | | | | |
| c. canal (alexant) | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ 500.00 | | | | | | |
| | | | | - | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The East Central Community Council in a joint funded project with Salt Lake City and the Utah Department of Transportation has committed to refurbish the 700 East Median Islands, 900 to 1300 South. The Sugarhouse Community Council has donated \$500.00 cash to Public Services for the purchase and installation of trees in the median islands. The Sugarhouse Community Council is interested in extending this project south to the City limits at a future date.

The \$500.00 donation was deposited in the 700 East Median Island Project. This request is to increase the budget by \$500.00 to facilitate expending the funds.

It is recommended that the City Council increase the budget to accept this private donation and facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Management Services - Justice Court Division

Department

Administrative Office of the Courts

Donation

Initiative Name

Mary Johnston Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #10

Initiative Number

535-6421/535-6150

Phone Number

| New Item Type of Initiative | | Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable | | | |
|--|---------|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | Not Applicable | | |
| Fiscal Impact | of Prop | oosed Change | | | |
| A. D | | 4-4-W | · Ond Vana | and Vanu | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | |
| 1, General Fund | ٠. | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | |
| r. General Pund | | } | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Ī | | | , | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | . ! | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | T-4-1 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | \$0.00 | 20 | ⊅ ∪ | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous - Donation | 1 | \$ 24,600.00 | | | |
| 72 Faile Missellarious Bollaton | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | | , | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | }- | | | *** | |
| 0.1.1 | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| include detail in this ceil, and rows il necessary | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | , , , , | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous | Total | \$ 24,600.00 \$ 24,600.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | Total | \$ 24,000.00 | \$0 | , | |
| Salaries and Wages | | | | , | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | ļ | | } | | |
| Charges and Services | | | | | |
| Capital Outlay - Equipment Other (Specify) | | \$ 24,600.00 | | | |
| o. Other (Specify) | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ 24,600.00 | | | |
| | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Salt Lake City Justice Court applied for and received this one time allocation of funds to purchase a live-scan fingerprinting system. The funding agency is the Management Committee of the Judicial Council, who voted to allocate \$24,600 in one-time funds for the equipment. It is not a grant, it is a donation or allocation.

This equipment would be used to fingerprint defendants during their arraignment at the Justice Court, if they were not booked/fingerprinted at the time of arrest as required by CJA Rule 4-609. This is important in order for all information to be submitted to BCI who retains arrest history of defendants. Currently BCI is having to manually input the fingerprints sent by the Justice Court so it is not uncommon for BCI to have the conviction information before they have the arrest information into the system. By scanning fingerprints, the Justice Court would be able to submit the information to BCI electronically, who would be able to compile all information in a more timely manner.

It is recommended that the City Council establish the budget to accept this one-time donation and facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

| Public Services Department Ottinger Hall improvements Private Donation Initiative Name Greg Davis/Sherrie Collins Prepared By New Item Type of Initiative | | For Fiscal Year Amendment #4 Initiative #11 Initiative Number 535-6397/535-6150 Phone Number NA CFDA Number | | | |
|---|-----------|---|------------|------------|--|
| Fiscal Impac A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | t of Prop | osed Change 1st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | |
| | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | ļ | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| CIP 83 Fund New Cost Center - Donation | Total | \$ 90,000.00 \$ 90,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Sour | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | · | | 0 | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| · | Total | \$(| \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund CIP 83 Fund New Cost Center | Total | \$ 90,000.00 \$ 90,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | 13 | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages Employee Benefits Operating and Maintenance Supply Charges and Services Capital Outlay | | \$ 90,000.00 | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | Total | | | # 0 | |
| · | Total | \$ 90,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization, or plans.

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

The Public Services Department's Youth and Family Division is preparing to expand the YouthCity recreation programs into the Capitol Hills/Avenues communities at Ottinger Hall in Memory Grove. Ottinger Hall was awarded \$100,000 of US Department of Education funds for refurbishment. The Salt Lake Rotary Club, through the Salt Lake Rotary Foundation, has committed to donate an additional \$100,000 (\$90,000 in cash and \$10,000 of in-kind architectural services) to this project. The SL Rotary Foundation's contribution will be established via a contractual donation agreement between the Foundation and Salt Lake City Corporation. These funds will be used for building improvements to include: HVAC upgrades, restroom improvements, light fixtures, floor coverings, interior and exterior painting, and some building seismic improvements.

Recommendation:

That the City Council pass the necessary Resolution allowing the Mayor to sign and accept the donation and to establish the budget to facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Dev -Housing and Neighborhood Dev <u>2004-05</u> For Fiscal Year Department Modesto Park Improvements Amendment #4 Initiative #12 Initiative Name Initiative Number Max Peterson/LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins 535-6136/535-6150 Prepared By Phone Number New Item Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable Not Applicable Type of initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year FY 2005-06 FY 2004-05 FY 2006-07 General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 **\$0** \$0 Total Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary Total \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 4. Other Fund \$ 94,188.00 CIP 83 - 83-04061 Tranfer from other projects \$ (37,000.00)CIP 83 - 83-05064 Parkway Trail Lighting (57, 188.00)CIP 83 - 83-03098 CDBG Cost Overuns \$0 \$0 Total \$ B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund \$0 \$C Total \$0 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 4. Other Fund 94,188.00 CIP 83 - 83-04061 Budget Increase Modesto Park Project CIP 83 - 83-05064 Parkway Trail Lighting \$ (37,000.00)CIP 83 - 83-03098 CDBG Cost Overuns \$ (57, 188.00)\$0 \$0 Total \$ C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance 4. Charges and Services 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify)) \$0 \$0 \$0.00 Total

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Modesto Park is being developed as a Nature Park with opportunities for youth and residents to learn and understand the development of natural landscapes in the urban environment. The existing detention basin for road run-off will remain and be upgraded to make it more aesthetically pleasing as a natural detention and absorption basin. A ground monitoring well will be constructed so that youth may learn about and monitor the ground water depth throughout the various seasons of the year. In addition, trails made of natural stabilized gravel and a learning area where students from local schools can gather to discuss the natural environment and development of natural parks will be constructed and new trees, shrubs, etc., will be introduced to the area long with an associated drip irrigation system.

Currently the Modesto Park project has a total budget of \$164,812 allocated in years 2002 and 2004 from CDBG and a private donation. The project has been bid and the bids are higher than anticipated. The total cost of the project is \$309,000. To construct the complete project a budget increase of \$144,188. is required.

Engineering proposes to fund the \$144,188 budget increase by recommending that the Wal-Mart donation of \$50,000 be allocated to this project (this request is addressed in Initiative #8 Budget Opening); by allocating an additional \$57,188 of CDBG Cost Over run funds and by reducing the amount of the Jordan River Parkway Trail Lighting at Modesto Park project by \$37,000. This project currently has a budget of \$100,000. Bids received indicate the low bid to be approximately \$50,000. Reducing the budget by \$37,000 will leave a balance of \$63,000 to complete the project.

It is recommended that the City Council increase the budget to facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Public Services - Engineering Division

Department

Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Facility

Initiative Name

Max Peterson/LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

New Item

Type of Initiative

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #13

Initiative Number

535-6136/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

Not Applicable

| Type of Initiative | | | | Not Applicable | |
|--|-------|----------|---|----------------|------------|
| Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change | | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | <u>1st Year</u> | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| | | ·F | Y 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | F | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | L | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | . |
| CIP 83 - new cost center Reimbursement From County | | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | | |
| | Total | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | TOLLI | Ψ | 2,000,000.00 | ΨΟ | <u> </u> |
| 1. General Fund | | - | | · | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | <u> </u> | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | TOtal | - | Ψ0 | 1 40 | 1 99 |
| CIP 83 - new cost center | | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | | |
| GIP 00 - New coar deficer | | 1 | _,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services | | Į . | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | | . , | | |
| J. 38.0. (Sp. 20.)// | | L | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

Salt Lake Valley Solid Waste Facility has budgeted and received approval for capital projects and landfill permitting, leachate, air and water quality monitoring at the Landfill. In accordance with an agreement between Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County, the City provides engineering support for projects at the landfill by designing and constructing the required facilities. The City pays the consultant, contactors, etc., and then is reimbursed by the County.

This request establishes a budget in the amount of \$2,500,000 to facilitate these projects, and to authorize the City Engineer's Office to establish budgets within the \$2,500,000 to accomplish the projects.

It is recommended that the City Council establish the necessary budget to facilitate this project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Dev - Housing and Neighborhood Dev

Department

900 So., Main to 900 West

<u>Job No. 102004</u>

Initiative Name

Max Peterson/LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

New Item

Type of Initiative

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #14

Initiative Number

535-6736/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

Not Applicable

| Type of Initiative | | | | Not Applicable | |
|--|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| Fiscal Impact | of Prop | osed Change | 9 | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| | | FY 2004-05 | | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | П | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | Ш | | |
| | Total | \$ | 0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | Ī | | П | | - |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | Щ | | |
| | Total | \$ | 이 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | 40 | |
| | Total | \$ | 0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | 400,000,00 | | | |
| CIP 83 - 83-04050 9th So. SID | | \$ 130,000.00 | 1 | | |
| | Total | \$ 130,000.00 | + | \$0 | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | | Ψ 100,000.uc | , | 401 | |
| Experiences impacted by runo and Source General Fund | | | | - | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| · | Total | | 0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | | · · | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | \perp | | |
| | Total | \$ | 30 | \$0 | \$(|
| 3. Enterprise Fund | . | | İ | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | _ | 00 | |
| | Total | | <u> </u> | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | m 420,000.00 | ٦ |] | |
| CIP 83 - 83-04050 9th So. SID | | \$ 130,000.00 | ١, | | |
| | Total | \$ 130,000.00 | a | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | . 0 | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | - { | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | | | | |
| 4. Charges and Services | | | | : | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | \$ 130,000.0 | 0 | | |
| 6. Other (Specify)) | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ 130,000.0 | \pm | \$0 | \$0 |
| | ıotal | φ (30,000.0 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 1 40 |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for companson without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The 900 So., Main to 900 West Project design is nearing completion with an anticipated bid date of February 2005. An accurate estimate of the quantities of work to be assessed to the property owners has been made. This project includes replacement of curb and gutter including base course and excavation, 6 foot wide sidewalks, concrete driveway approach and optimal park strip sod and irrigation. It is estimated that the total amount of the neighborhoods portion of the SID is \$430,000.

A budget of \$300,000 was established for this SID in 2004. This action will increase the budget by \$130,000 for a total budget of \$430,000.00

It is recommended that the City Council increase the current budget of the neighborhoods portion of the 900 So SID to facilitate the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Mayor's Office 2004-05 Department For Fiscal Year Grant Tower Design Conjunction with Commuter Rail Amendment #4 Initiative #14A Initiative Name Initiative Number <u>535-7735</u> D.J. Baxter Prepared By Phone Number New Item Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable Not Applicable Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year FY 2004-05 FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 1. General Fund 25,000.00 Fund Balance \$0 25,000.00 Total \$ 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 8 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 Total \$0 4. Other Fund Total \$0 \$0 B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund 25,000.00 \$ Non Departmental \$0 Total \$ 25,000.00 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 4. Other Fund \$0 \$0 \$0 Total C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance 4. Charges and Services \$ 25,000.00 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) Total \$ 25,000.00 | \$

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The budget is being requested to provide funding to conduct initial track and signal design work to evaluate the feasibility of constructing Grant Tower reconfiguration in conjunction with commuter rail. Total cost of the study is (\$50,000) to be shared 50% with UTA.

UTA is making rapid progress on its Commuter Rail project and intends to begin construction this spring. To bring commuter trains to the Salt Lake City Intermodal Hub, UTA's current plans call for the construction of two new tracks, east of the Union Pacific freight lines, through the Grant Tower area (500 North to 400 South), at an estimated cost of \$10 million. UTA is reaching the final stages of its design process, and is eager to remain on an aggressive schedule that will allow UTA to begin commuter rail service by the end of 2007.

The Administration negotiated an agreement with Union Pacific in which Union Pacific agrees to remove its trains from the 900 South line permanently if the City is able to arrange for the straightening of the Grant Tower rail curves. The rough cost estimate for this project is \$40 million. Union Pacific has agreed to contribute \$4.5 million, as well as deeding to the City all of its land along the 900 South corridor and the Folsom Street corridor.

Our efforts to secure federal funds for Grant Tower have been unsuccessful so far, primarily for two reasons: Senator Bennett's office has expressed doubts that the project would benefit the public, and has questioned the City's commitment to the project without an assurance of some city funds.

Salt Lake City Corporation Management and Fiscal Note Worksheet for Budget Development and Budget Amendment

The Administration has proposed UTA's expenditure of \$10 million in the area could be used to build commuter rail track, while also furthering the Grant Tower reconfiguration project. After some preliminary discussions, City Engineering, UTA, and Union Pacific, all believe it is both feasible and desirable to accomplish the Grant Tower work at the same time commuter rail is being constructed. This would potentially reduce overall costs for all entities, and would enable UTA's \$10 million to complete some major components of the reconfiguration. We believe this would help our cause in securing federal funds, both by leveraging other funds and by reducing the amount we are requesting.

Our immediate need is to hire a rail design engineer to work with Union Pacific and UTA to further explore the feasibility of constructing these projects (commuter rail and the Grant Tower reconfiguration) simultaneously. The budget for this initial design work is approximately \$50,000 over the next two months, and UTA has agreed to share these costs with Salt Lake City.

Because UTA is moving the commuter rail project forward so quickly, we have a brief two-month window in which to accomplish this work. After January 2005, our opportunity for these cost savings on Grant Tower will disappear.

Finally, the Council should be aware that the ultimate completion of the Grant Tower realignment will almost certainly require substantial city funds. UTA, Union Pacific, and the Federal and State governments are other potential contributors, but because Salt Lake City has such a vested interest in the project (the removal of trains from 900 South and the daylighting of City Creek), we will be expected to contribute. Appropriation of the requested \$25,000 does not commit Salt Lake City to any further funding, but merely keeps the door open for us to pursue this joint venture should we decide to do so. It will also provide us with a more reliable cost estimate for the project. If this design work confirms our thinking about the feasibility and desirability of combining these projects, Salt Lake City will have to make some quick decisions about whether and to what degree we are willing to fund the project.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable

Police Department

Department For Fiscal Year Rocky Mountain HIDTA Executive Office of the President Amendment #4 Initiative #15 Office of National Drug Control Initiative Name Initiative Number 799-3824/535-6150 Jerry Burton/Sherrie Collins Phone Number Prepared By Grant For Existing Staff 16.000 **Grant CFDA Number** Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change 2nd Year 3rd Year A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year FY 2004-05 FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 Total \$0 Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 4. Other Fund 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant 145,800.00 145,800.00 \$0 Total \$ \$0 B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 SO \$0 Total Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total \$0 4. Other Fund 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant 145,800.00 Total \$ 145,800.00 \$0 \$0 C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 108,000.00 2. Employee Benefits 37,800.00 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) \$0 \$0 145,800.00 Total \$

| D. Personnel Service Detail: | FILE | Grade/Step | Amount |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------|--|
| Officers Benefits x 3 | . 3 | 501a | \$ 108,000. |
| Benefits x 3 | | | 37,800. |
| | | | ····· |
| | | | |
| Total | | | \$ 145,800. |
| Totali | - | | Ψ 1-10,000. |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | 7147 224 | |
| <u>'</u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | ·-· |
| | | | |
| | .,, | | |
| | | . ' | ····· |
| • | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | |
| <u></u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| , | | | |
| | | | |
| ··· | | | |
| | - | | |
| | | | |
| | • | | |
| <u></u> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| , | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | <u>.</u> | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | ļ |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | _ | |
| | | · · · - | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | · | • | 1 |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization, or plans.

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary...

The Police Department has received regional approval to continue the Rocky Mountain High Intensity. Drug Trafficking Area (RMHIDTA) grant funded by the Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy. This allocation will be used to continue to fund the 3 officers assigned to Metro Narcotics for drug enforcement. Funding provides approximately 86% of total funding needed. The granting agency caps benefit package reimbursement at 35% of base salary. The department proposes to fund the required match of approximately \$24,400 from attrition savings.

HIDTA is a multi-agency enforcement program that targets illegal distribution of drugs and drug

It is recommended that the City Council accept the grant and appropriate the necessary budget to facilitate the Grant. The necessary resolution was previously passed, authorizing the Mayor to accept the grant and to sign all additional agreements pertaining to this particular grant

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - 2 Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- Question 1 Will this grant fund employee positions? Yes, What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program? These funds will continue to pay salary and benefits of 3 Officers assigned to Metro Narcotics Task Force.
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? PD will continue apply if funding is available.
- Question 3 Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? Yes
- Question 4 Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? Yes
- Question 5 Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable? Very Probable, High Community impact when city loses Officer Positions.
- Question 6 Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? No, allocation is geared specifically toward drug enforcement. Other local agencies receive same grant for same use.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Development - Housing & Neighborhood Dev

Department

Project Safe Neighborhood

State of Utah - West Valley Pass Through

Initiative Name

Jacob Brace/ Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

Grant Requiring New Staff

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #16

Initiative Number

535-6035/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

| Type of Initiative | tspetitiokeitusi sus | | | NA | |
|--|----------------------|---------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Fiscal Impact | of Prop | oosed | Change | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | Year 004-05 | 2nd Year FY 2005-06 | <u>3rd Year</u> FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | , , , , | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Į | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | 10101 | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant | Į | \$ | 10,000.00 | | |
| | Total | \$ | 10,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | <u> </u> | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | #0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | <u></u> | \$0 | 1 20 | φυ |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| melade detail in and cen, and rows in reconsulty | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant | Total | \$ | 10,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | Total | D | 10,000.00 | Ψ0 | |
| Salaries and Wages | | \$ | 10,000.00 | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | , | , | . | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | | | | |
| Charges and Services Capital Outlay | | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | 1 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 10,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | <u></u> | |

| D. Personnel Service Detail: | | FTE | Grade/Step | Amount |
|---|--|-----|--------------|--------------|
| Paralegal/Executive Assistant \$16. per hr. @ 12 hrs per wk x 52 wks | | 1 | PTE | 10,000.0 |
| \$10. per 111. @ 12 1113 per WK X 02 WK3 | | 1 | F 1 L. | 10,000.0 |
| | Total | | | 10,000.0 |
| | Total | | | 10,000.0 |
| · <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | _ |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | - | | | |
| | | | · | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| , | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | - | | | |
| | | • | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | • | | |
| · | | | | |
| | İ | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | - | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | , | | , |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | į į | | |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| - | <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | ļ | |
| - <u>,,,,</u> | | · | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | - | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | <u> </u> | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

Housing and Neighborhood Development applied for and received this pass through funding from West Valley City. It is a State pass through grant to West Valley with the City being a Subrecipient of West Valley. This is the second year that Salt Lake City has received these funds. This grant is being awarded to deter gun violence in the Weed and Seed area through the adult and juvenile violent offender re-entry pilot program, gun violence prevention education for at-risk youths, and integrating new crime-mapping software to facilitate cross-jurisdictional data sharing.

These funds will be used to hire an hourly Paralegal/Executive Assistant to work with the Salt Lake City Prosecutors Division in identifying and filing appropriate cases involving domestic violence and gang and juvenile incidences with firearms that are coming from the City's Weed and Seed targeted area. This will be an hourly position being paid approximately \$16.00 per hour for providing approximately 624 hours of services.

This is a continuation grant for expansion of the current grant related services.

The City Council previously adopted the Resolution authorizing the Mayor to accept the original grant award and to accept any additional grants that stem as a result of the original grant. It is recommended that the City Council appropriate the necessary budget to facilitate this Grant.

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - **2 -** Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- Question 1 Will this grant fund employee positions? Yes it will hire a paralegal at 12 hrs per week for approximately 624 hours of service. What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program? NA.
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? If funding becomes available SLC will apply.
- Question 3 Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? Yes.
- Question 4 Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? Yes.
- **Question 5** Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable? **This service will not be available.**
- **Question 6 -** Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? **No.**

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Public Services - Fleet Mgmt Division

Police Department

Department

Utah Department of Public Safety

Division of Emergency Services and Homeland Security

DES-2003-ODP2-08

Initiative Name

Bryce Lindeham/Greg Davis /Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

Grant Requiring No New Staff

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #17

Initiative Number

535-6397/535-6150

Phone Number

16.007

| Grant Requiring No New Staff Type of Initiative Grant CFDA Number | | | | _ | |
|---|----------|----------|------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Type of Initiative | of Dog | | | IAIIL CEDA NUMBE | 1 |
| Fiscal Impact | or Pro | 005 | ed Change | | |
| A. Donney Language of the French and Courses | | | 1at Vaar | 2nd Voor | 3rd Year |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | FY 2006-07 |
| | | | Y 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2005-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | · | İ |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | ŀ |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| Fleet Fund 61-00020 1974-72 | | \$ | 40,205.00 | | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 40,205.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Enterprise Fund | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | *** | |
| | Total | | \$0] | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | σ. | 40.005.00 | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant 1360 | Total | <u>ф</u> | 40,205.00 40,205.00 | | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | | Ψ | 40,203.00 | | Ψ0 |
| Experientures impacted by rund and Source 1. General Fund | <u> </u> | | | | |
| i. General i unu | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | | |
| Fleet Fund 61-00020 2750-01 | | \$ | 40,205.00 | | <u>.</u> |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 40,205.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | . ' | 18 |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | — | Ψοι | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant | | S | 40,205.00 | | |
| 721 0110 | Total | | 40,205.00 | | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | ļ | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | | | | |
| Charges and Services - Conitol Outlay | | s | 40,205.00 | 1 | |
| Capital Outlay Other (Specify) Transfer to Fleet 2910-04 | | \$ | 40,205.00 | | |
| o. Other (openity) Translet to Fleet 20 to-04 | | " | 10,200.00 | 1 | |
| | Total | \$ | 80,410.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Salt Lake City Police Department received this grant from the State Division of Emergency Services and Homeland Security. It is the same grant issued to the City to purchase the Command Vehicle two years ago. The grant purpose is to provide Emergency Management Equipment to various State municipalities. This can be an award of cash, equipment or both. This grant award includes a cash reimbursement in the amount of \$40,205 and equipment which includes a Remotect Andros hazardous Duty Robot. The cash was awarded to the City for the purchase of a vehicle to transport the Robot which will be used by the Bomb Squad. The State purchased the Robot and has issued it to the City PD.

The Police Department has opted for a Chev Box Van with specific interior furnishings to include insulated walls, wall cabinets, a steel desk, chair, flooring, and robot tie downs.

Because this grant involves a motor vehicle, it is necessary to include the Fleet internal service fund in the budget opening as well as the Miscellaneous Grant Fund. Fleet will take ownership of the vehicle and inventory it as being purchased with grant funds.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously adopted authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and to sign any grants or agreements resulting in the original grant.

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - **2 -** Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- **Question 1** Will this grant fund employee positions? **No.** What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program?
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? NA.
- **Question 3** Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? **NA**.
- **Question 4** Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? **NA**.
- Question 5 Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable? NA.
- **Question 6** Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? **No.**

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Community Development

Department

US Department of Housing and Urban Development American Dream Downpayment Initiative

(ADDI)

Initiative Name

LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

Grant Requiring no New Staff

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #18

Initiative Number

535-6136/535-6150

Phone Number

<u>14.239</u>

| Type of Initiative | Grant CFDA Number | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Fiscal Impact | of Prop | osed Change | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | <u>1st Year</u> FY 2004-05 | <u>2nd Year</u> FY 2005-06 | <u>3rd Year</u> FY 2006-07 | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| • | | 1 | | | | |
| | | \$0 | \$0 | 9 | | |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | ļ | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | so | \$0 | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | 10.0. | | <u> </u> | | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant | ŀ | \$ 177,518.00 | | | | |
| , | Total | \$ 177,518.00 | \$0 | | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | 21 | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | <u> </u> | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | 7010. | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | - | <u> </u> | sc sc | | | |
| 4.045 | Total | \$0 | <u>Ψ</u> | / <u></u> | | |
| Other Fund Fund Miscellaneous Grant | | \$ 177,518.00 | | | | |
| /2 Furid Misceraneous Grant | Total | | \$0 | | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | • | . 1 | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | l | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | \ | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | \$ 177,518.00 | | | | |
| Charges and Services Capital Outlay | | \$ 177,518.00 | } | 1 | | |
| Capital Outlay Other (Specify) | | | | | | |
| o. oaidi (opodi)) | | 1 | 1 1 | | | |
| | Total | \$ 177,518.00 | \$0 | | | |
| • | Total | φ 111,310,00 | 11 40 | <u></u> | | |

| Cost Center/Project Name | | ebit Credit |
|---|--|-------------|
| Miscellaneous 72 Account | - # | |
| Fiscal Year 2003-04 allocation | | \$81,429. |
| Fiscal Year 2004-05 allocation | | \$96,089. |
| | | |
| Total Allocation | | \$177,518. |
| | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u> | | 1 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 100 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | -+- | <u> </u> |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| <u> </u> | - - - | |
| | | |
| | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| <u> </u> | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 1 | |
| | | "- |
| | | |
| | | - |
| | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development awarded Salt Lake City funding for the American Dream Downpayment Initiative for 2004 and 2005 in July of 2004. This program is administered under HUD's HOME Investment Partnership Program and requires a public process. HAND solicited project applications which were due August 2, 2004. The City Council will make their final recommendations on November 9, 2004 for both funding the 2004 and 2005 allocations.

This action formalizes and establishes budgets for the projects recommended for funding by the City Council on the 9th.

It is recommended that the City Council establish the appropriate budgets to accept the grant funds. A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the original grant agreement and any additional agreements pertaining to the grant was adopted during the normal CDBG/HOPWA/ESG/HOME/ADDI process.

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - 2 Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- **Question 1** Will this grant fund employee positions? **NA.** What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program? **NA**.
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? NA.
- Question 3 Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? NA.
- Question 4 Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? NA.
- Question 5 Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable? NA.
- **Question 6** Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? **NA.**

| | <u>Community Development</u> Department <u>State of Utah</u> | | | 2004-05 For Fiscal Year | |
|---|--|---------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| | Department of Community & Economic Developm Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS HOPWA Initiative Name | | | dment #4 Initiative | <u>e #19</u> |
| | LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins | | <u>5</u> | 535-6136/535-61 <u>5</u> 0 | |
| | Prepared By Grant Requiring no New Staff | | | Phone Number 14.241 | |
| | Type of Initiative | | | rant CFDA Numbe | r |
| J | Fiscal Impact | of Prop | posed Change | | |
| | A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | <u>1st Year</u> | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| | - Transfer of the control of the con | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| | General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| | • | | | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · | <u></u> | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | 1 | (<u> </u> | |
| | moleuse detail in uns ceil, adu rows il necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$ C |
| | 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | |
| 1 | Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | _ | | . | ~~~~ |
| | 4 O4baa Fd | T.otal | \$0 | \$0 | \$C |
| 1 | 4. Other Fund 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant (72-60513) | Ļ | \$ 21,209.00 | 1 | |
| | (12-000 to) | Total | | \$0 | \$0 |
| ١ | B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | | | | |
| ſ | 1. General Fund | | | | |
| ۱ | ı | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| ۱ | 2. Internal Service Fund | · Juan | 901 | | Ψ |
| ۱ | Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | 1 | |
| ١ | | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$(|
| ۱ | 3. Enterprise Fund | } | 1 | į i | |
| ۱ | Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$(|
| ۱ | 4. Other Fund | | | | |
| ۱ | 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grant (72-60513) | _] | \$ 21,209.00 | | |
| ١ | C Evpanditure Invest Batel | Total | \$ 21,209.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| ۱ | C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | |
| ١ | 2. Employee Benefits | | <u> </u> | | |
| ١ | Operating and Maintenance | | \ | | |
| ١ | 4. Charges and Services 5. Capital Outlay | Ì | \$ 21,209.00 | | |
| ١ | 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) | ١ | (| | |
| ١ | \-r/ | İ | 1 | | |
| ١ | | أنييا | ф. 24 200 00 | 60 | 40 |
| | | | | | |

Salt Lake City Corporation Management and Fiscal Note Worksheet for Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary

The State of Utah, Department of Community and Economic Development has awarded an additional \$21,209 in supplemental HOPWA funds to the City. The State identified additional carryover funds, in addition to the \$100,000 already awarded, to specific HOPWA programs in fiscal year 2005. These funds will be combined with the City's HOPWA funds and awarded to the Housing Authority of Salt Lake City's HOPWA program to provide additional rental assistance for clients that are living with HIV/AIDS. These funds were awarded to Salt Lake City to avoid the State and City monitoring the same program.

It is recommended that the City Council increase the appropriate budget to accept the supplemental funds. A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the original grant agreement and any additional agreements pertaining to the grant was adopted during the normal CDBG/HOPWA/ESG/HOME/ADDI process.

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - 2 Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- Question 1 Will this grant fund employee positions? NA. What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program? NA.
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? NA.
- Question 3 Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? NA.
- Question 4 Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? NA.
- Question 5 Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable? NA.
- **Question 6** Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? **NA**.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Fire Department

Department

2004-05 For Fiscal Year

US Department of Homeland Security

Federal Emergency Management Agency FEMA Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)

EMW-2004-GR-0750

Initiative Name

Amendment #4 Initiative #20

Initiative Number

Raleigh Bunch//Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

799-4217/535-6150 Phone Number

<u>97-071</u>

Grant Requiring No New Staff

| Type of Initiative | Grant CFDA Number | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Fiscal Impact | of Pro | oosed Change | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | <u>1st Year</u> FY 2004-05 | <u>2nd Year</u> FY 2005-06 | 3rd Year FY 2006-07 | |
| General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$(| |
| 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$(| |
| 4. Other Fund 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants | Total | \$ 400,000.00 \$ 400,000.00 | | \$(| |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source 1. General Fund | | | | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$1 | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$ | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary 4. Other Fund | Total | - \$0 | \$0 | \$ | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants | Total | \$ 400,000.00 \$ 400,000.00 | | \$0 | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail Salaries and Wages Employee Benefits Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services - | | \$ 366,500.00 | | | |
| Capital Outlay Other (Specify) | , | \$ 33,500.00 | | | |
| | Total | \$ 400,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The Fire Department received this continuation grant from the US Department of Homeland Security Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under the 2004 Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) Program.

The grant funds were awarded to the Fire Department for the expansion and sustainability of the Salt Lake City MMRS which is responsible for the coordination of multiple local first responder agencies that are essential in managing the medial and public health response to mass-causality weapons of mass destruction (WMD) terrorist attack.

These funds will be used to purchase equipment including geographical information system software, automated vehicle locators, hazardous materials inventory software, a fourth radio control station for Salt Lake City Fire Department, a redundant disaster recovery system, 30 wireless mobile data terminals and modems, pharmaceutical cache supplies, and radiation detectors. In addition, the award provides for the Salt Lake MMRS to offer a total of \$64,000 for sub-grants of \$8,000 each to the fire departments for the cities of South Salt Lake, Midvale, Murray, Sandy, West Valley, South Jordan, West Jordan and the United Fire Authority for on-site MMRS property managers, who will serves as a point of contact for information dissemination, and to maintain equipment/pharmaceutical cache inventories. Salt Lake City Fire Department will retain Dr. Steven Joyce as the Salt Lake MMRS Coordinator. The Coordinator is responsible for providing medical oversight to the emergency preparedness planning of the Salt Lake MMRS and to liaise with the all Salt Lake area hospitals.

The grant funds will also fund an Executive Assistant to provide administrative support to the MMRS Coordinator and the MMRS Steering Committee and to serve as a point of contact for existing and new MMRS agencies. Finally, the Fire Department will contract with City IMS to develop a Salt Lake MMRS website that will serve as a community emergency response preparedness resource for the public and for MMRS agencies.

方面是是企业,是是是国际的人们是国际的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们是是一个人的人们的人们是是一个人们的人们是是一个人们的人们是一个人们

- G. Grant Criteria: A grant will satisfy one of the following four criteria.
 - 1 In some cases, the General Fund or an Enterprise Fund of the City will use grant funding for projects or programs that have been identified by the Council for future funding. The General Fund or Enterprise Fund will provide funding once grant funding
 - **2 -** Grant funding will be used when the use of the grant money will result in long-term financial savings or operating efficiencies.
 - 3 Grant funding will allow the City to build internal capacity to continue the service in the future.
 - 4 None of the above.
- Question 1 Will this grant fund employee positions? No. Contractual Components include the Coordination and Medical Oversight. What programs are funded with this grant and what are the performance measures of each program? The SLC Fire Department acts as the Coordinator over the MMRS Weapons of Mass Destruction Planning and response program.
- Question 2 What is the potential for continued grant funding for the position? NA However the City will continue to apply if funds are available.
- **Question 3** Is it expected that the positions can be eliminated once the grant funds are unavailable? **NA.**
- **Question 4** Is the program that the grant funds, a program that can accomplish its goals within the grant funding time frame? **NA**.
- **Question 5 -** Will there be a significant service level impact on the community once the grant funds become unavailable ? **NA**.
- **Question 6** Does the grant duplicate services that are provided in the private or non-profit sector? Is there a better fit in another jurisdiction or entity? **No.**

| Public Services Fleet and Refuse Divisions Department Refuse and Fleet Encumb Carryovers Initiative Name Greg Davis Prepared By Housekeeping Type of Initiative | | Enter | 2004-05 For Fiscal Year Indment #4 Initiative Initiative Number 535-6397 Phone Number Grant CFDA # As App | |
|---|--------------|--|---|------------|
| Fiscal Impact | t of Prop | osed Change | Estimated | future \$ |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| A. Revenue impacted by I and and Source. | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | |
| | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | \$U | \$0 | \$0 |
| 61 Fund Fleet Fund Balance | | \$ 996,596.00 | | |
| | 7-1-1 | \$ 996,596.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Total | \$ 996,596,001 | \$0 | |
| 57 Fund Refuse Reserve | | \$ 3,337.00 | | |
| | Total | \$ 3,337.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | |
| | - | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | <u> </u> | 90 | <u> </u> |
| 61 Fund Fleet | · | \$ 996,596.00 | | |
| | Total | \$ 996,596.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund 57 Fund Refüse | | \$ 3,337.00 | | |
| | Total | \$ 3,337.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specific) | | \$ 26,618.00 \$ 2,378.00 \$ 970,937.00 | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | \$ 999,933.00 | \$0 | \$0 |

| Fleet Fund Fleet Fund 2222 | D. Encumbrance Roll Detail | | Objec | t Code | | Amount |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------|--|-----|----------------------------------|
| Fleet Fund Pleet Fund Total C&S C &S | Refuse Fund | | Total | 2295 | O&M | 70 39 6 1,16 |
| 2212 2233 9,2 9,2 2298 9 4,9 224101 7 224104 8,9 224101 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | Total | 2305 233609 | C&S | 64 13 1,38 2,17 |
| 224111 0&M 25,4 Total 2395 254970 Total 2395 239 | Fleet Fund | | | 2233 2234 2298 2299 223401 224101 | | 9,2 9 4,9 2 7 8,9 |
| Total C&S 2 Bronto Fire Apparatus 2750 959,0 Band Saw & Drill Press 2750 11,8 | | | Total | 224111 | O&M | 1° 25,49 19 |
| | | Bronto Fire Apparatus Band Saw & Drill Press | | 2750 | | 959,0 11,8 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable impact on functions, structure and organization, or plans.

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management.

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

State law requires that all budgets, except that of the Capital Project Fund, lapse at June 30th or fiscal year end. Historically, purchase orders encumbered near the end of the fiscal year are not paid by June 30th and therefore the payment will occur in the next fiscal year. Because the budget from the prior fiscal year lapsed, it is necessary to again appropriate funds to cover the purchase commitments made in the prior year and paid in the current year. The funding source for this type of transaction is fund balance. Cash or revenue collected in the prior year and not spent lapses to fund balance or cash reserves and is therefore available to cover the commitments made. This amendment request will appropriate budget in the Refuse Fund of \$3,337 and in the Fleet Fund of \$996,596. There is adequate fund balance and reserves available in the funds to accomplish this request:

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Community Development -Transportation Division

Department

Rose Park SID Budget Increase

Initiative Name

Tim Harpst/Gordon Haight//Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #22

Initiative Number

535-7148/535-7147/535-6150

Phone Number

| Housekeeping Enter Grant CFDA # A | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------------|-------------|------------|------------|--|--|
| Type of initiative | | Not Applicable | | | | | |
| Fiscal Impac | t of Pro | pos | sed Change | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | _ | 1st Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | | |
| | | F۱ | Y 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | | |
| 1. General Fund | i | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | , | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$C | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | 1 | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$C | | |
| 4. Other Fund | rotai | | <u> </u> | \$0 | <u> </u> | | |
| Fund 30 Miscellaneous SID Accounts | ļ | \$ | 236,873.00 | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | * | 200,070.00 | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 236,873.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | 2 | | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | 1 0 (13) | | | 1 | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | \$(| | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | • | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | , , | | 40 | | | | |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | | <u>\$0 </u> | \$0 | \$(| | |
| Fund 30 Miscellaneous SID Accounts | | \$ | 236,873.00 | | | | |
| Tana bo Missonariodas orb Accounto | | * | 200,070.00 | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 236,873.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | | | | |
| 1. Salaries and Wages | | | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | | | |
| Operating and Maintenance Charges and Services | | | | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | \$ | 236,873.00 | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify)) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$ | 236,873.00 | \$0 | \$0 | | |

| Cost Center/Project Name | Cur | rent Budget | lnci | ease Amount | N | ew Budge |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | |
| 30-12700 | \$ | 71,000.00 | \$ | 27,567.00 | \$ | 98,567.00 |
| 30-13000 | \$ | 200.00 | | 135,428.00 | \$ | 135,628.00 |
| 30-23100 | \$ | 90,000.00 | | 40,533.00 | \$ | 130,533.00 |
| 30-34100 | \$ | 30,000.00 | | 28,887.00 | \$ | 58,887.00 |
| 30-24800 | \$ | 6,000.00 | | 4,458.00 | \$ | 10,458.00 |
| 30-2-1000 | | | 1 | | _ | |
| | | | 1 | | | |
| | \$ | 197,200.00 | \$ | 236,873.00 | \$ | 434,073.0 |
| | | .07,200.00 | ` - | | Ť | |
| | | | | | ┢ | |
| | | | | | \vdash | |
| | | | | | - | |
| | | | - | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \vdash | |
| | | | - | | ┢ | |
| | | | - | | - | |
| | | | | | \vdash | <u></u> |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | ╀ | |
| | | | | | ↓ | |
| | | | | | ╙ | |
| | | | | | ļ | |
| | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Т | |
| | | | | | | - |
| | | | | | Т | |
| | | ***** | | <u> </u> | \top | |
| | | · | | | 1 | • |
| | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | \vdash | | ╈ | |
| | | | | | + | |
| | | | + | | + | |
| | | | \vdash | | + | - |
| <u> </u> | | **** | - | | + | |
| | | | +- | | + | |
| | | | | | + | |
| | | | \vdash | | | |
| | | | - - - - - - - - - | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ╁ | |
| | | | 11 | | + | |
| | | | Н_ | | <u></u> | .,. |
| | | | Ш. | | \bot | |
| | | | $\perp \perp$ | <u> </u> | \bot | |
| | | | | <u>.</u> | _ | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | \prod | |
| | | | 11 | .,, | | |
| | | | | | \top | |
| | +- | | + | | \top | |
| | | | + | | - - | |
| | | | 1 | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

Several of the Fund 30 cost centers for the Rose Park Lighting SID have collected more cash than available budget. This action increases the budgets in those cost centers to facilitate the expenditure of the actual cash received.

The Rose Park Lighting SID was established to provide additional decorative street lighting and to replace existing lighting within the Rose Park area as needed.

It is recommended that the City Council increase the budgets in the various Fund 30 Cost Centers for the Rose Park Lighting SID to facilitate expenditure of the actual cash received.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Community Development

Department

Recaptured CIP General Fund 2000-2003

& Recaptured CIP CDBG 2003

Initiative Name

LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

Housekeeping

Type of Initiative

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #23

Initiative Number

535-6136/535-6150

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

Not Applicable

| | | | Not Applicable | |
|---|----------|---|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Fiscal Impact of | of Propo | osed Change | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | <u>3rd Year</u> FY 2006-07 |
| | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| | | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | Γ | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | 10tai | | 1 95 | |
| CIP Fund 83-04099 Fund Balance | | 319,625.32 | | |
| CIP Fund Miscellaneous General Fund Projects | s | | | |
| CIP Fund 83-03098 CDBG Fund Balance | 9 | 7,930.53 | <u> </u> | ļ |
| CIP Fund Miscellaneous CDBG Fund Projects | | 1 | | # 0 |
| | Total | - | \$0 | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | 1 | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Ĺ | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | · |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | <u>_</u> | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | <u> </u> | 1 30 | |
| 4. Other Fund CIP Fund 83-04099 Fund Balance | H | \$ 319,625.32 | | |
| CIP Fund Miscellaneous General Fund Projects | | \$ (319,625.32) | | |
| CIP Fund 83-03098 CDBG Fund Balance | | \$ 7,930.53 | | |
| CIP Fund Miscellaneous CDBG Fund Projects | L- | \$ (7,930.53) | | |
| | Total | \$ - | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages Employee Benefits | ŀ | | | ĺ |
| S. Operating and Maintenance | 1 | | | |
| Charges and Services | | | | |
| T. Offgrges and Oct 11000 | | 1 | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | ĺ | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| Cost Center/Project Name | | | Debit | | Credit |
|---|----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|
| CIP Fund (Genral Fund Funding Source) | | # | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 83-99006 Backflow Prevention, Phase II | · | ; | \$ 428.83 | | |
| 83-00008 Drinking Fountain Cross Connection | | | 1,666.22 | <u> </u> | |
| 83-02022 Jordan River Peace Garden Irrigation | | \coprod | 34.44 | | |
| 83-02048 Guardsman Way | | Ш | 314,424.65 | L | |
| 83-03013 Sugarhouse Business District | | П | 3,071.18 | <u>L</u> | |
| | | Ш | | | |
| 83-04099 CIP Fund Balance | | Ш | | \$ | 319,625.3 |
| Tables | · ··· | ₩ | \$ 319,625.32 | \$ | 319,625.3 |
| Total GF | | ₩ | \$ 319,625.32 | 120 | 313,023.0 |
| | | ╁┼ | | | |
| | <u> </u> | ╌┼╌ | - | | |
| | | ╫ | | | |
| CIP Fund (CDBG Funding Source) | | ++ | | | |
| On Tuna (OBBOT analig Course) | | 11 | | 1 | |
| | | 11 | | | |
| 83-03057 100% Sidewalk Replacement | | ++ | 7,930.53 | \top | · - |
| | | \sqcap | | 1 | • |
| 83-03098 CDBG Fund Balance | | $\dagger \dagger$ | | \$ | 7,930.9 |
| | | \sqcap | | | |
| Total CDBG | | | \$ 7,930.53 | \$ | 7,930. |
| | | Ш | | <u> </u> | |
| Total all funds | <u></u> | 44 | \$ 327,555.85 | \$ | 327,555. |
| | | 11 | | <u> </u> | |
| | | \perp | <u></u> . | <u> </u> | |
| | | 44 | | \bot | |
| | | ++ | | + | |
| | ļ, | ++ | | + | |
| | <u> </u> | | · | + | |
| | | $\perp \downarrow$ | | _ | |
| | | | · | \perp | |
| | | Ш | | 1 | |
| | 1 | \prod | | $oldsymbol{\perp}$ | |
| | 1 | 11 | - | - | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here... Use additional cells if necessary...

This action will decrease the remaining budgets and cash balances of completed and or closed CIP Funded Projects from Years 1999-2003 and increase the budget and cash of CIP Fund Balance in year 2004 for CIP project cost over-runs. This action involves closing five (5) projects totaling \$319,625.32

In addition, this request will decrease the remaining budget of one (1) completed Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund Project, totaling \$7,930.53 from Year 2003 and increase the budget of the same years CDBG Fund Balance for project cost over-runs.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the appropriate action to decrease the remaining budgets and cash of completed CIP Fund Projects and increase the 04 CIP Fund Balance account; and decrease the remaining budget in the completed CDBG project and increase the 03 CDBG Fund Balance.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Development - Housing & Neighbor Dev

Department

US Department of Education

<u>Budget Adjustments</u>

Initiative Name

Greg Davis/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

Housekeeping

Type of Initiative

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #24

Initiative Number

<u>535-6150</u>

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

NA

| Type of Initiative | limpos | t of Proposed Cl | hango | |
|---|----------|---------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| FISCA | ıı-ımpac | t of Proposed Cl | nange | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | 1st Year | | 2nd Year | 3rd Year |
| | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| · | T-4-1 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | Total | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| menade detail in this con, and lowe it incomes, | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | Ī | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Ĺ | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 4. Other Fund | | \$ 127,506.31 | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants | ľ | \$ 127,506.31 \$ (127,506.31) | | |
| 721 drid Wiscenarieous Oranis | ŀ | \$ - | \$0 | \$0 |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source | 2: | | | |
| 1. General Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | i Ottai | | T | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| , | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | T-4-1 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | Total | \$0 | 20 | 40 |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants | | \$ 127,506.31 | | |
| 72 Fund Miscellaneous Grants | | \$ (127,506.31) | | |
| | | \$ - | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | | - | · |
| Salaries and Wages Employee Benefits | | | | |
| 3. Operating and Maintenance | | | | |
| Charges and Services | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify) | | | | |
| | Total | | \$0 | |
| | , 0.01 | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| <u> </u> | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| | Rec | uce Budget | | nere | ase Budget | | Remaining Budget |
|---|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 72-63001 Fairmont Cottage Programming | \$ | 16,032.54 | + | | | \$ | 47,406.00 |
| 72-63001 Fairmont Cottage Programming | \$ | 17,163.36 | + | | | \$ | 52,406.00 |
| 72-63002 Ottinger Hall Programming 72-63003 Liberty Park Programming | | 17,100.00 | + | \$ | 64,904.67 | \$ | 57,406.00 |
| 72-63003 Liberty Park Programming 72-63004 Sorenson Center Programming | - | | | <u>*</u> \$ | 7,161.72 | \$ | 32,000.00 |
| 72-63004 Sorenson Center Programming | - | | | \$ \$ | 14,881.89 | | 10,000.00 |
| 72-63005 Central City Programming | - | 13,255.30 | + | Φ | 14,001.09 | \$ | 40,500.00 |
| 72-63006 Global Artways Programming | \$ | 13,255.30 | + | | | \$ | 19,586.6 |
| 72-63008 Grant Admin year 1 - No Change | | | +, | | 0.005.44 | | 100,000.0 |
| 72-63009 Fairmont/Ottinger Refurbishment | _ _ | | - : | \$ | 6,295.41 | \$ | 100,000.0 |
| 72-63010 Boxing Building Refurbishment/Admin Offices | \$ | 81,055.11 | _ | | | \$. | 60,000.0 |
| 72-63011 2nd year Admin | | | | \$ | 34,262.62 | \$, | 147,454.9 |
| Total | \$_ | 127,506.31 | 1 | \$ | 127,506.31 | \$ | 566,759.6 |
| | | | + | | | | |
| | | | + | | | | |
| | · - | | | | | | |
| | | | + | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | \vdash | | | | |
| | | | Ħ | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | Н | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | - | <u>.</u> | - | | |
| | | | Ħ. | | | | |
| | _ | | ${\mathbb H}$ | | | | |
| | | | Ħ | • • • • | | | |
| | | | ${f H}$ | | | | <u></u> |
| | | | \prod | | | | |
| | | | + | | | | |
| | | | \Box | | | | |
| | _ | | + | . — | · | | |
| | | | Ħ | • | | 1 | |
| | - | | ╁┼ | | | + | |
| | | | ↔ | | | + | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The first US Department of Education appropriation (\$1.2 Million), received in FY 02-03 has a current balance of \$566,729.80. This request is to make adjustments to the current budget by reducing various budgets of completed projects and/or where the original budget established will not be expended before the end of the grant period; and by increasing various budgets where additional funds are needed to continue programs at various Youth City sites.

The revised budgets are as follows:

It is proposed to reduce the Youth City program budgets at Fairmont Cottage by \$16,032.54, Ottinger Hall by \$17,163.36 and Global Artways by \$13,255.30. These budgets currently pay the site FTE Coordinator's salary and the PTE teachers who provide services at each site. It is also proposed to reduce the Boxing Building refurbishment budget by \$81,055.11 leaving a remaining budget of \$60,000 to facilitate the refurbish admin office space.

The proposed increases include the Youth City program budgets at Liberty Park by \$64,904.67 and Central City by \$14,881.89 to support increased costs within these two (2) budgets due to program expansion. Program expansion will increase at Sorenson Center by \$7,161.00. These three (3) budgets currently pay the FTE site Coordinator's salary and the PTE teachers who provide programs at the sites. It is proposed that the Fairmont/Ottinger budget be increased by \$6,295.41 creating a budget of \$100,000 for refurbishments that are currently underway. It is proposed that the 2nd year Admin budget be increased by \$34,262.62. This budget pays for supplies, equipment, O&M, and contracts with outside providers. All budget adjustments have been approved by the Department of Education pending approval of the Council's recommendations.

It is recommended that the City Council appropriate the necessary budget changes to facilitate this Appropriation.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Develop - Housing and Neighbor Dev

Department

<u>California Ave, Bridge</u> <u>Job No. 107004</u>

Initiative Name

Max Peterson/LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins

Prepared By

<u>Housekeeping</u>

2004-05

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #25

Initiative Number

<u>535-6136/535-6150</u>

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

| Type of Initiative | Shassade. | Not Applicable | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Fiscal Impact of | of Prop | osed Change | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | 1st Year | 2nd Year | <u>3rd Year</u> | | |
| | | FY 2004-05 | FY 2005-06 | FY 2006-07 | | |
| 1. General Fund | Y | | 1 | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | ļ | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | 10.0. | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| Enterprise Fund | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0]_ | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 4. Other Fund | | \$ (41,447.92) | | | | |
| CIP Fund - Class "C" Cost Overrun 83-04094 CIP Fund - New cost center Class "C" | | \$ (41,447.92) \$ 41,447.92 | | | | |
| CIP Fund - New Cost Center Class C | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: | | | | | | |
| 1. General Fund | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | } | *** | | φ <u>0</u> | | |
| O. I. L. Co. See Food | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| include detail in this cen, and rows it necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | | | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$C | \$0 | | |
| 4. Other Fund | | - /// // 00 | | | | |
| CIP Fund - Class "C" Cost Overrun 83-04094 | | \$ (41,447.92) \$ 41,447.92 | | | | |
| CIP Fund - New cost center Class "C" | Total | | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail | | <u></u> | , | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | | | | | | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | | | | |
| 3. Operating and Maintenance | | 44 447 00 | | | | |
| Charges and Services Final UDOT Bill Capital Outland | | \$ 41,447.92 | | | | |
| Capital Outlay Other (Specify)) Transfer from Overrun | | \$ (41,447.92) | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify)) Hansler from Overruit | | Ψ (+1,++1.52) | | | | |
| | Total | \$ - | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| · | | | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

Condition is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

<u>Effect</u> is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

The California Ave., Jordan River Bridge Replacement project received a UDOT grant under the Federal Bridge Replacement Program in 1997. These grants require a 20% Match: In the March 2004 budget opening, a Class "C" Cost Overrun Account was established by recapturing funds from old and completed Class "C" projects. This overrun account was created to cover the City's share of cost over-runs of Class "C" Projects, to pay final invoices of completed UDOT administered projects and to meet the City required match for these grants.

The bridge project was completed in July of 2002. In July 2004, UDOT finalized the project and billed the City for the remainder of the project match in the amount of \$67,731.00. Of this amount, Public Utilities portion is \$26,283. leaving a balance of \$41,448 to be paid from the City's Class "C" Fund. The timeframe of the project being finalized and invoicing the City for final payment, is typical of UDOT administered projects.

The Engineering Division is requesting that a new budget in the amount of \$41,448 be created in the 83 fund, reducing the Class "C" Cost Overrun Account budget and cash by the same amount to pay the final invoice submitted to the City by UDOT.

It is recommended that the City Council establish a new budget and reduce the Class "C" Cost Overrun Account budget and cash in the amount of \$41,448 to facilitate final payment to UDOT.

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable Public Utilities - Water Utility Fund 2004-05 For Fiscal Year Department Amendment #4 Initiative #26 Carryover Capital Projects Initiative Number Initiative Name 483-6773 Jim Lewis Phone Number Prepared By <u>Housekeeping</u> CFDA # (If Applicable) in this Cell **CFDA Number** Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change **Biennial Period** 2nd year of biennium 2nd Year 3rd Year A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: 1st Year FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 FY 2004-05 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 **\$0** Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund 3,016,682.00 51 Water Fund Carryover projects- Reserves \$0 \$0 Total \$ 3,016,682.00 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund 3,016,682.00 51 Water Fund Carryover projects 3,016,682.00 \$0 \$0 Total 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 298,000.00 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify) Capital Improvements 2,718,682.00 \$0 Total \$ 3,016,682.00

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

The Water Department will require this amendment to complete projects that have been delayed or started but not completed at year end, which require funding in this fiscal year.

F. Issue Discussion: The Water Utility is asking to amend the 2004-2005 budget for carryover projects and equipment purchases

<u>Criteria - The Water Utility is requesting that the budget be amended to fund projects which were budgeted in the prior year, but not expended until this year. This will allow the continuation of the Utilities capital improvement program.</u>

<u>condition</u> - This is an established annual process to open the budget for carryover projects for each of the Utility Enterprise Funds.

Effect: The major impact of this amendment is a shift of funding from last year to this year.

<u>cause</u> Due to the fiscal year ending on June 30th of each year, which falls in the middle of a normal summer construction period. Projects are started in one budget period and completed in the next. The Utility tries to anticipate the amount of projects which will carryover into the next year, however projects and timing always change.

Recommendation - We recommend approval of the amendment to allow the existing capital improvement program to continue as approved.

Issue Discussion:

Carryover Waterlines - \$2,718,682 Carryover Equipment - 298,000

Total Amendment \$3,016,682

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable 2004-05 Public Utilities - Sewer Fund For Fiscal Year Department Amendment #4 Initiative #27 Sewer Carryover Capital Projects / New CIP Project Initiative Number Initiative Name 48<u>3-6773</u> Jim Lewis Phone Number Parpared By CFDA # (If Applicable) in this Cell <u>Housekeeping</u> **CFDA Number** Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change Biennial Period 2nd year of biennium 1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 FY 2004-05 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund 683,495.00 52 Fund Carry over projects/ capital outlay- Reserves 1,000,000.00 52 Fund CIP Oil Drain project - Donations \$0 \$0 1,683,495.00 Total \$ 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 3. Enterprise Fund 683,495.00 52 Fund Carry over projects/ capital outlay 1,000,000.00 52 Fund CIP Oil Drain project \$0 \$0 1,683,495.00 Total 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 Total \$0 C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 113,495.00 5. Capital Outlay 1,570,000.00 6. Other (Specify) Capital Improvements \$0 1,683,495.00 Total \$

Salt Lake City Corporation Management and Fiscal Note Worksheet for Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

The Sewer Utility will require this amendment to complete projects that have been delayed or started but not completed at year end, which require funding in this fiscal year.

F. Issue Discussion: The Sewer Utility is asking to amend the 2004-2005 budget for carryover projects and equipment purchases. The Utility is also asking for increased funding for the Oil Drain Project. The original budget was for our share of the project only. The budget needs to be increased to include the portion of the project funded by donations from the other participating agencies.

Criteria - The Sewer Utility is requesting that the budget be amended to fund projects which were budgeted in the prior year, but not expended until this year. This will allow the continuation of the Utilities capital improvement program.

Condition - This is an established process to open the budget for carryover projects for each of the Utility Enterprise Funds.

Effect- The major impact of this amendment is a shift of funding from last year to this year.

Cause Due to the fiscal year ending on June 30th of each year, which falls in the middle of a normal summer construction period. Projects are started in one budget period and completed in the next. The Utility tries to anticipate the amount of projects which will carryover into the next year, however projects and timing always change.

Recommendation: We recommend approval of the amendment to allow the existing capital improvement program to continue as approved.

Issue Discussion:

| Carryover Se | werlines | \$ | 170,000 |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| Carryover Eq | and the section of the section of the | | 113,495 |
| Cogeneration | | And the second of the con- | 400,000 |
| | | NO PERSONAL PROPERTY. | ,000,000 |
| Oil Drain Pro | | 5 | |
| Total Amend | ment | \$ 1 | ,683,495 |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Please enter information into green shaded cells where applicable Public Utilities - Stormwater Fund 2004-05 For Fiscal Year Department Amendment #4 Initiative #28 Stormwater Carryover Capital Projects Initiative Number Initiative Name 483-6773 Jim Lewis Phone Number Parpared By CFDA # (If Applicable) in this Cell <u>Housekeeping</u> CFDA Number Type of Initiative Fiscal Impact of Proposed Change **Biennial Period** 2nd year of biennium 2nd Year 3rd Year A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: <u>1st Year</u> FY 2004-05 FY 2005-06 FY 2006-07 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 Total \$0 \$0 3. Enterprise Fund 240,000.00 53 Fund Carry over - Reserves Total \$ 240,000.00 \$0 \$0 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total 2. Internal Service Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 Total \$0 3. Enterprise Fund 240,000.00 53 Fund Carry over -Capital Imp Projects 240,000.00 \$0 \$0 Total \$ 4. Other Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary \$0 \$0 \$0 Total C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages 2. Employee Benefits 3. Operating and Maintenance Supply 4. Charges and Services 240,000.00 5. Capital Outlay 6. Other (Specify)

Total \$

240,000.00

\$0

\$0

Salt Lake City Corporation Management and Fiscal Note Worksheet for Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

The Stormwater Utility will require this amendment to complete projects that have been delayed or started but not completed at year end, which require funding in this fiscal year.

F. Issue Discussion: The Stormwater Utility is asking to amend the 2004-2005 budget for carryover projects and equipment purchases.

<u>criteria</u>. The Stormwater Utility is requesting that the budget be amended to fund projects which were budgeted in the prior year, but not expended until this year. This will allow the continuation of the Utilities capital improvement program.

<u>condition</u> - This is an established annual process to open the budget for carryover projects for each of the Utility Enterprise Funds.

Effect- The major impact of this amendment is a shift of funding from last year to this year.

Cause Due to the fiscal year ending on June 30th of each year, which falls in the middle of a normal summer construction period. Projects are started in one budget period and completed in the next. The Utility tries to anticipate the amount of projects which will carryover into the next year, however projects and timing always change.

Recommendation - We recommend approval of the amendment to allow the existing capital improvement program to continue as approved.

Issue Discussion:

| North Promise of the State of Company | 7 65. 2530.00 | 81.78 B. 1.15 | 1 to 10 mg/s | and the second | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|---|----------------|---------|
| 400 West Lift S | tation | | Q . | 70.00 | ነበ. |
| HOO WEST FILL C | italion | : 7.141 | Nic. of Active | ** 100 | a 5 F B |
| 1910 West Lift | Ctation | | | FO O | ÓΛ. |
| I 19 TO AMEST FUL | Station | | | 20,00 | יטע |
| 000 11 41 04 | | | | 20.00 | ~~ |
| 800 North Star | crest Di | rive | | 20,00 | JU. |
| liginali i i turgue kajege jaugustaj | Transfelfood | 35) den 200 | erith, E | | _ |
| [12] J. Willer, Phys. Lett. B 25, 27 (2018). | na na mana alima alima | and the second process. | ar na an an an an an an an an an an an an | | |

Total Amendment \$ 240,000

for

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

Comm Dev - Housing and Neighborhood Dev

Department

Downtown Transportation Plan

Initiative Name

DJ Baxter/Tim Harpst/David Dobbins

Prepared By

Houskeeping

Type of Initiative

<u>2004-05</u>

For Fiscal Year

Amendment #4 Initiative #29

Initiative Number

535-7735/535-7236

Phone Number

Enter Grant CFDA # As Applicable

Not Applicable

| Fiscal Impact o | f Prop | osed Change | | |
|--|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| A. Revenue Impacted by Fund and Source: | | <u>1st Year</u> FY 2004-05 | <u>2nd Year</u> FY 2005-06 | <u>3rd Year</u> FY 2006-07 |
| 1. General Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | ĺ | | | |
| | | | 00 | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0] | \$0 |
| 2. Internal Service Fund | | | [| |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund | 1010. | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$ <u>0</u> |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | Į. |
| CIP 83 83-05072 Transportation Master Plan | i | \$ (100,000.00) | | |
| CIP 83 83-05072 Transportation Downtown Master Plan | } | \$ 100,000.00 \$ - | \$0 | \$0 |
| (Change of cost center name) | | φ | ΨΟ | |
| B. Expenditures Impacted by Fund and Source: 1. General Fund | | | | |
| I. General Fund | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Internal Service Fund | | | | |
| Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | 7-4-1 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fatorpring Fund | Total | <u> </u> | 1 40 | 1 |
| 3. Enterprise Fund Include detail in this cell, add rows if necessary | | | | |
| microde detail in this cen, add rows it necessary | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Other Fund | | | | |
| CIP 83 83-05072 Transportation Master Plan | | \$ (100,000.00) | | |
| CIP 83 83-05072 Transportation Downtown Master Plan |) | \$ 100,000.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | Total | <u>ъ</u> - | Ψ0 | ΨΟ |
| C. Expenditure Impact Detail 1. Salaries and Wages | | | <u> </u> | |
| 2. Employee Benefits | | | 1 | |
| Operating and Maintenance | | | | |
| Charges and Services | | | | |
| 5. Capital Outlay | | | | |
| 6. Other (Specify)) | | | [] | |
| | Total | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1 | | | | |

Budget Development and Budget Amendment

E. Measured or measurable Impact on functions, structure and organization

F. Issue Discussion: A complete justification will contain a discussion of each of the elements mentioned below; criteria, condition, effect, cause and recommendation.

<u>Criteria</u> is a definition of what is expected or what can be expected. It provides a basis for comparison without which analysis cannot be effective. The criteria varies from issue to issue. In straightforward cases, it can be an ordinance or policy. In other cases, it may be an industry standard or comparable data from another city.

<u>Condition</u> is a description of current practices. It is the information to which the criteria is compared.

Effect is the difference, if any, between the condition and criteria. It is best described in terms of a dollar impact or a service level impact. If an effect cannot be identified, there is no finding.

<u>Cause</u> is sometimes a difficult element to identify but is essential to a finding. It is simply identifying why the condition varies from the criteria. Sometimes the answer is as simple as a change in policy or budget but often goes deeper into management

<u>Recommendation</u> is made in a way that addresses the cause. By doing so, it is most likely to result in improving the condition to be in line with the criteria.

Issue Discussion:

Type discussion here. Use additional cells if necessary.

In August the City Council appropriated \$100,000 in the 04-05 CIP to update the Salt Lake City Transportation Master Plan. This appropriation was made as part of several actions taken pertaining to traffic calming. However, the exact purpose of the appropriation was not clear. This request proposes focusing the scope for those funds to the Downtown Area. No budgetary changes need be made at this time.

The Transportation Division believes the current City Transportation Plan, specifically it's vision statement, City Council Transportation Policies and Transportation Master Plan Guiding Principles, remains relevant. The master plan was recently enhanced with the adoption of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan as an element of the overall Transportation Master Plan. It is believed that partnering with the Utah Transit Authority coupled with private donations to create a Downtown transportation master plan element would be highly beneficial and the next highest priority for the master plan.

There is an unprecedented amount of development proposed within the downtown over the next few years. Concurrently, UTA and the City are working to implement commuter rail service, an extension of light rail, the Intermodal Hub and a new bus delivery system; all with benefits and impacts in the downtown. This plan would identify solutions to parking issues now and during the impacts of major construction, insure future transportation investments are compatible with desired land use and identify the type and location of transportation services which will assist decision-making regarding future downtown development.