

SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT
BUDGET ANALYSIS – FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

DATE: May 26, 2009
SUBJECT: **UNRESOLVED ISSUES – FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION
OVERVIEW OF MAJOR BUDGET ISSUES
MAYOR’S RECOMMENDED BUDGET**
STAFF REPORT: Jennifer Bruno, Karen Halladay Lehua Weaver, Sylvia Richards
cc: David Everitt, Gina Chamness, Gordon Hoskins

Outstanding/Unresolved Issues/Follow-up Information

1. **Business License Base Fee increase** – The Administration’s proposed budget includes an increase the base business license fee from \$100 to \$130, generating \$262,500 in revenue. The Council has discussed this proposal, and has requested that the Administration obtain feedback from the Business Advisory Board. The Board’s next meeting is on June 10th, which may be after the Council adopts the budget. The Administration has not provided feedback from the Business Advisory Board as of the printing of this staff report. It is possible that the Administration will have feedback in time for the Council’s work session.

a) During the May 26th Council Work session, Council Members requested that options for fee increases be prepared, including splitting the fee increase evenly between the base fee and per employee fee increase:

Option	Description	Fee Change
1	Mayor's Proposed Budget - \$30 base fee increase	Base Fee - \$100 to \$130
2	Per Employee Fee Increase of \$2.73	Per Employee Fee - \$15 to \$17.53
3	Combination Per Employee and Base fee increase (Base Fee - \$15 increase; Per Employee Fee - \$1.37 increase)	Base Fee - \$100 to \$115 Per Employee Fee - \$15 to \$16.37
4	no fee increase (\$262,500 revenue shortfall)	-

b) The above chart details various options that hold the general fund revenue harmless (with the exception of option #4). Option #3 represents a combination of a base business license fee increase and a per employee fee increase.

c) The Administration has provided the **attached** explanation of business license fee methodology, based on a state-required cost analysis (conducted in 2005).

- The base business license fee partially recoups City administration, fire inspection and fire administrative costs.
- The “Disproportionate Fee” is determined by a higher (disproportionate) level of city services (and therefore City costs) being provided to certain classes of businesses. The specific extra City costs (for extra police or fire service for example) were tracked by common business classifications and charged accordingly. All businesses are charged at least a basic disproportionate fee.
- The per employee fee is a result of not being able to allocate the remainder of the “disproportionate cost” to a specific class of business in a methodical

fashion. It recognizes that City services are provided to all businesses and their employees.

d) The Council may wish to discuss if a majority is interested in pursuing any of the above options relating to business licenses.

2. **CERT** – The Administration has indicated that certain federal grants that the City was pursuing for the CERT program were not awarded to the City. As such, the Administration has indicated it will not be able to offer a CERT program at the same level as was provided in FY 2009. *The Council may wish to discuss the future of this program with the Administration in greater detail, given this new information.*

3. **Citywide Collections**

The Administration has responded to Council inquiries regarding citywide collections and indicates that many City departments including Police, Public Services, Management Services, CED, and Public Utilities participate in collection activities, but currently there is no one tasked with ensuring collections of all accounts receivable. The Administration is having discussions with regards to citywide collections efforts to determine how to best address the issues and develop related policies and processes.

As a first step, in July, they will begin using the IFAS Accounts Receivable System with the intent to bring each department online for all collectables and receivables in order to better monitor and evaluate. According to the Administration, each department has different rules and practical problems with the collections process. In the General Fund, there are approximately four to five FTEs involved with collection activities in various departments. In Public Utilities, four dedicated FTEs act as collectors/investigators. Additional information regarding Justice Court collections is addressed in the Justice Court budget staff report. *The Council may wish to add citywide collections to the list of interim study issues.*

4. **Online Processing Fee** – As mentioned previously, the Administration is proposing a \$1.00 per transaction fee for the use of the City’s website to pay bills and fines and to obtain permits and renew licenses. During the May 26th Unresolved Issues briefing, a suggestion was made that the City assess an administrative fee across the board for every payment transaction, and offer a discount for online transactions. A response from the Attorney’s Office indicates that the City may be able to charge an administrative fee across the board and offer an online transaction discount, but there are conditions. The administrative fee would have to be cost-supported. Second, the amount of discount would have to be based on the reduced cost to the City for the online transaction. *Council staff has requested an analysis of transactions from the Administration.*

Additionally, the Attorney’s Office indicates that convenience fees must be cost-based and may not be used to raise revenue (unless authorized by statute), even though the service is being provided for the convenience of the customer.

5. **Ground Transportation enforcement/fines** – The Administration has responded to a number of Council Members questions and has provided the following information:

- a) The Administration has provided telephone survey results including comparisons with other cities; however, the Administration indicates that comparisons to different jurisdictions are problematic in that one of the major differences between Salt Lake City's program and other jurisdictions is the access to an International Airport. Salt Lake City allows the ground transportation industry to access the inner curb at the airport, while other jurisdictions may not. This access necessitates additional security measures imposed by the TSA (FBI Ill background check and Threat Assessment). Please refer to the attachment.

- b) During the May 27th Budget and Finance subcommittee meeting, ground transportation staff responded to a number of question from Council Members Garrott and Christensen. One question relates to taxis operating without current business licenses, and complaints Council Members are hearing from taxi drivers who are operating legally. The Administration provided a memo indicating there are 202 taxi companies currently operating in Salt Lake City. Of that number, 184 have current business licenses, 10 have inactive business licenses, 4 have gone out of business, 1 changed their business name, 1 is a non-profit, 2 do not have current business licenses, 1 moved and 1 does not do business in Salt Lake City. From reports from other companies and drivers, the Administration estimates there is no more than about four or five companies now that are operating illegally.

- c) Council Members have asked whether the City has the tools to enforce across the board, and whether the proposed fees increases pose a burden to ground transportation companies, given the concerns that have been expressed that "there still isn't a level playing field." The Prosecutor's office indicated that the City does have the tools to enforce; however, there are specific costs related to the increased enforcement of fines. There was discussion regarding civil enforcement and creating the ability for the City to charge the primary business and management for the fines. Ground Transportation staff indicated they could propose an increase to the fine structure to more appropriately cover the costs of increased enforcement, and come back to the Council in July. The Prosecutor's Office suggested that ordinance language could be added such that whether the fine is a misdemeanor or infraction, the license could be revoked for a period of time, and if there are two or more offenses in a specific timeframe, the parent company could lose its license to operate. There was also discussion of tightening up the definition of shuttles and limousines.

During further discussion, Ground Transportation staff indicated that citations and warnings are being issued to non-taxi services (ie: limousines, vans) and not exclusively to taxi drivers. In response to questions raised by the Council they also indicated that restoration of the \$40,000 of funding to increase their undercover enforcement efforts to hire off-duty officers, cross-train current vehicle inspectors to issue citations, and to create/print new citation forms for civil enforcement. Further, they indicated that they would address the fine structure in the ordinance, as well as amend one section to require all hotels to post taxi rates which can be plainly seen. *Does the Council wish to identify \$40,000 of funding to assist with enforcement? Does the Council wish to allocate time of the City Council's outside attorney to prepare the ordinance changes?*

- d) Another question from Council Members relates to whether the City's ground transportation fees are cost-justified. The Administration has provided 2 attachments defining the costs associated with badging fees and vehicle inspection fees. According

to the Administration, the policy decision was made to obtain 100% of cost recovery for ground transportation fees.

Fees for business licensing are not set at 100% cost recovery by policy at this time. Business license fees are based on a cost analysis study conducted in 2004, while the proposed fee increases for ground transportation are based on a 2008 cost analysis. The proposed increases to ground transportation fees result in approximately \$45,000 in additional revenue based on the number of drivers anticipated and the actual costs of operating the program.

Type of Fee	Direct Costs	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Background Check & Badge	\$ 148.07	\$ 112.00	\$ 114.00
Lost/Stolen badge replacement	100.82	No Charge	66.00
2 nd Badge (working for 2 companies)	100.82	No Charge	66.00
Vehicle Inspection	151.13	90.00	110.00
Missed Inspection	TBD	No Charge	52.00
Re-inspection	TBD	No Charge	30.00

- e) The Council also asked whether the Prosecutor’s office needs additional staffing in order to make the enforcement process work. According to the Justice Court, there have been 10 violations of 5.72 filed with the Court since January 1, 2009. None were filed in 2008 but there were twelve filed in 2007. All but one of the cases that were filed in 2009 is active and the case that is closed was dismissed on the prosecutor’s motion. Ten of the twelve cases that were filed in 2007 were entered as plea in abeyances and one case went to a bench trial where they were found guilty. One was a failure to appear. Based on this information from the Court, it appears that the Prosecutor’s office is following up on the enforcement; however, ground transportation staff indicate that the Administration continues to discuss these issues.

Given the amount of questions generated during Ground Transportation discussions, the Council may wish to consider an approach similar to the Legislature; putting a few big budget/policy issues that can’t be resolved easily into an ‘interim study’ mode. The Council could then schedule follow-up briefings and make a decision in the fall.

6. **Baseball stadium naming rights** (\$109,000 - revenue) – The Administration has indicated that an agreement with Spring Mobile for the naming rights of the previously-named Franklin Covey field will result in \$109,000 in revenue per year for at least five years, at which point Spring Mobile can renew for two additional five year periods. There are significant maintenance needs at the stadium that the City is responsible for, under the current agreement with the Salt Lake Bees baseball team. Public Services Administration has indicated a preference to dedicate this revenue stream to pay for these capital projects. The Council may wish to discuss whether a majority would follow the Administration’s preference, or allocate these additional revenues to the general fund (to be spent in any City department).
- The following table presents the actual expenses paid by Salt Lake City to repair and maintain the ballpark for Fiscal Years 2006 to 2009. In addition,

the Administration has provided a list of Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) that will need to be funded over the next several years.

Actual - Repair and Maintenance Costs for Ballpark			
FY 2006	\$	33,217	
FY 2007	\$	42,991	
FY 2008	\$	94,900	
FY 2009	\$	140,578	
Estimated - Future Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Costs for Ballpark			
Franklin Covey Field Concourse "B" Level Waterproofing Project	\$	368,915	CIP Application Submitted - Not Funded for FY 2010
Franklin Covey Field – Building Steel and Roof-deck Painting Project	\$	1,079,763	CIP Application Submitted - Not Funded for FY 2010
Repleace and upgrade Chiller	\$	500,000	
HVAC Controls Upgrade	\$	100,000	
Outfield turf replacement	\$	170,000	
Sewerline replacement	\$	130,000	
Lighting Changeout	\$	110,000	
Total - Estimated - Future CIP Costs for Ballpark	\$	2,458,678	

- *Note: the CIP applications for FY 2010 are not recommended for funding by the Mayor. The Council will have a detailed discussion of CIP allocations later in the summer, and could decide to allocate funds towards these projects.*
- In FY 2010, the Baseball Stadium account includes a Miscellaneous Repairs and Projects budget of \$75,000 and a Capital Outlay budget of \$50,000.
- **Attached** to this report is a report of the Ballpark Stadium Sources and Uses from FY 99 to FY 2010 – FY 2009 and FY 2010 are projected budgets. The remaining years are based on actual revenues and expenses. (Note: Salt Lake City entered into a lease agreement effective for the Spring 2005 baseball season. The structure of the new lease reduced the rental income substantially, but as an offset, the operations and management responsibilities and related expenses also decreased significantly. The City was able to reduce the amount of the ballpark subsidy with the new lease agreement.)

7. **Purchase of new Fire apparatus** – The Administration’s proposed budget includes a one-time allocation in the Fire Department budget totaling \$74,466 to equip new apparatus. The Fleet Division has indicated that it has scheduled four new apparatus (engines) for purchase in FY 2010 (through the City’s lease/purchase program with Bank of America), in addition to a new Utility vehicle, which has already been purchased. The lead time for this equipment is approximately nine months from the time of ordering.
- The Fleet Division held off on purchasing two engines in FY 2009 due to mid-year budget reductions. As a result, these two engines were rolled into FY 2010’s request, and added to two engines that were previously scheduled to be purchased in FY 2010 (independent of the FY 2009 budget situation).
 - The Fire Department would be receiving 5 new apparatus if the budget request were to proceed as proposed.
 - The Fire Department has only budgeted for the equipping of two of these four engines (in addition to budgeting for the Utility vehicle, which has already been ordered). If the Council wishes to pursue the purchase of all apparatus (4 engines and a Utility), additional equipping funds would be required in the SLCFD budget.
 - The Fire Department indicates that it requires the two engines that were deferred in FY 2009 in order to maintain effective fleet readiness, and to avoid further increases

in Fleet maintenance costs (beyond what is currently requested for the FY 2010 budget). The Administration indicates that it currently costs approximately \$5 per mile to service these older apparatus, compared to \$2.50 per mile for a newer apparatus.

- e) *The Council may wish to discuss requesting the Fleet Division to hold off on purchasing the two additional engines that were “scheduled” for FY 2010, in favor of purchasing the engines that were originally scheduled for FY 2009. Note: This request would result in two new engines for the SLCFD, in addition to the new Utility vehicle. The SLCFD has necessary budget to cover these purchases.*
 - f) *The Council may wish to discuss requesting the Fleet Division not purchase any new apparatus until the City’s budget situation changes, and/or directed by the Mayor/Council. Note: This request would result in no new apparatus in the Fire Division, except for the Utility vehicle which is already ordered. The Council could recognize a one-time budget savings of \$53,250.*
 - g) The Fleet Division had planned a \$280,000 lease payment for these apparatus in FY 2010. The Administration has indicated that if the Council requests that two of the four engine purchases be delayed, it would recommend not reducing the lease payment budget, as there are other fleet replacement needs that are not currently funded. *The Council may wish to discuss this issue with the Administration further.*
 - h) Further research by the Administration and Council Staff on the issue of impact fees has determined that because these apparatus will not be used to serve new growth exclusively, the cost for this equipment would not be eligible for impact fees.
 - i) However, there may be fire apparatus in the future that do qualify for impact fees. As such, the Administration will pursue an amendment to the Capital Facilities plan to capture this potential revenue.
8. **Speed Trailers** – The Administration has purchased enough speed trailers for deployment of one in each district. However, due to budgetary challenges in the police department, Police is no longer towing these to locations around the City. Some Council Members have expressed an interest in allocating funds to hire part time or seasonal employee time to tow these speed boards to various City locations. One Council Member has suggested that the boards could be moved on a voluntary basis by Council Members. Note: the speed trailers have an SLCPD logo, and may require one-time funds to remove the logo (if Police officers are no longer responsible for towing and placing the signs). *The Council may wish to discuss if a majority are supportive of adding more funds into the proposed budget to allow for distribution of this equipment.*
9. **\$1.8 million loan to RDA for expansion of the Salt Palace** –The Mayor’s recommended budget does not anticipate repayment of a \$1.8 million loan due to the City from RDA. The Council has the option of recognizing the revenue in the General Fund or CIP budget and allocating it to a project. There has been some discussion of forgiving the loan and allowing the RDA to retain the funds to support the development of the downtown cultural district, including the purchase of the Utah Theater, but most of the discussions took place before the Council Members had the opportunity to review the City’s General Fund budget for FY 2010. There is currently no formal request before the Council to forgive the loan.
- a. *Background* - In 2005, Salt Lake County indicated a need of \$8 million in City funds to fill a construction gap for the necessary expansion of the Salt Palace Convention Center. The City Council identified \$6.4 million in cash (made available through a one-time refinancing of bonds) to use for this purpose, and

voted as both the RDA Board and City Council to fund the remaining amount (\$1.6 million) through the RDA. As the RDA did not at the time have cash on hand to fund the \$1.6 million, the City entered into an interlocal agreement with the RDA to loan the RDA the funds.

- b. With interest, the current amount due to the City from the RDA is \$1.8 million. This loan is scheduled for repayment in 2009.
- c. Currently, the RDA does have enough cash built up to pay the City back for the loan.
- d. RDA staff has recently been reviewing the financial situation of the Agency, in anticipation of a need to find a funding source for the downtown cultural district (land acquisition, etc). Staff has indicated that it will need to combine funding from a variety of sources in order to be in a position to assist the development of the downtown cultural district, and has recommended that the City forgive the \$1.8 million owed by the RDA. The Mayor supports this recommendation.
- e. If the City does not forgive the RDA loan, staff has indicated that the \$1.8 million "gap" for land acquisition will need to be funded through existing Revolving Loan Fund cash (thereby reducing the amount of funds available for the RDA to lend), or through outside financing (in which case interest costs will be incurred).
- f. It should be noted that in any funding scenario, the RDA will likely need to pursue a combination of funding sources, including outside financing.
- g. If the Council elects not to forgive this debt, the RDA intends to repay the city on time with current cash on hand. This would be considered "one-time" revenue to the general fund, and could be used for any general fund purpose.
- h. The decision to forgive the debt would rest with the City Council.

10. **Refuse Fund Class - Proposed Changes & Yard Waste / Recycling Programs**

- a) 100% Yard Waste Roll-Out - During the Refuse Fund briefing on May 19, the Council asked various questions about possible roll out of yard waste cans to 100% of the city's residential garbage collection customers in combination with establishing one fee (or a "combo fee") for all collection services.

The Administration has estimated the start-up costs and operating costs for these changes, and prepared an estimated rate structure that would accomplish these changes.

- Assumptions - the budget estimates are based on the following program assumptions:
 - Cans would be delivered and service would begin in March 2010
 - Service would be extended one month to run March thru December each year - the potential impact or resulting changes to the following programs has not been calculated in this round of estimates due to the quick turnaround on providing information. For example, perhaps the Administration or Council would consider altering or eliminating the collection of leaf bags in favor of picking them up in yard waste through December. These decisions and the impacts could be evaluated over the coming months if the Council decides to move ahead. However, it is certain that the 100% roll-out would affect these other collection services to some degree:
 1. Potential impact to leaf bag collection
 2. Potential impact to Christmas tree pick-up

3. Potential impact to utilization of the Neighborhood Clean-up program
 4. Potential impact to size and quantity of general waste cans users request (changing size selections has not been included, however, estimating that customers will return cans if they have more than one has been incorporated)
 - The Administration has estimated numbers based on best-known current information, for example:
 1. Assumed in-house collection of waste, results in purchase of new trucks and hiring FTEs. (If an RFP process is pursued and/or combining with existing contracts, a lower bid and contract may be realized.)
 2. Assumed purchase of cans from existing contractor.
 - Use of the 'one-time' \$1.5 million from the Landfill toward can purchase, in order to offset the draw on reserve funds.
 - Continued use of reserves in 2009-10 and 2010-11. Services would be self-sustaining beginning in 2011-12.
- Estimates for 100% Yard Waste roll-out:

Start-up Costs:

Start-Up Costs			
37,000 Cans	\$	2,044,320	
Fleet / Trucks*		107,423	1-CNG packer, 7-three wheel units

* Since trucks are purchased on a lease-purchase program in the Refuse Fund, there would be an ongoing capital cost of \$98,923 for the truck leases.

Operating Costs - please note, these are the estimated increases in costs to the existing collection budget in order to implement the 100% roll-out.

Increased Ongoing / Operating Costs			
	FY09-10	FY10-11	FY11-12
Staff	113,237	239,577	395,552
(3FTEs plus seasonals)	4.46 FTEs	5.25 FTEs	9.94 FTEs*
Fleet (mainten. & fuel)	109,400	280,979	290,745
Tipping Fee Expense	(41,175)	(171,674)	(143,998)
Other (office supplies, safety equipment, fliers, etc.)	41,225	24,600	24,600
	\$ 222,687	\$ 373,482	\$ 566,899

* The significant increase in FTEs would be due to increased can maintenance and enforcement efforts.

Revenues: The proposed fees and estimated expenses would generate some net income beginning in 2010-11. *The Council may wish to ask how this would affect the existing budget and what the impact would be to future use of reserve funds.*

- Estimated Rate Structure - please see the attached fee structure, which also includes a few examples of the impact to various customers.

During the discussion with Council Members Christensen and Garrott (for the Budget & Finance Subcommittee Meeting), the Administration mentioned the possible benefit to delaying this implementation while some aspects are further explored. There may be some benefits to considering this change in conjunction

with a broader picture of “accelerated diversion”, which includes roll-out and education of three components: a) encouraging smaller general waste cans, b) mandatory recycling for the remaining customers (sub-component would be expanding glass recycling), and c) mandatory yard waste. In addition to a more fully developed plan, the Administration has identified some areas where more time may result in better prices for the implementation of the yard waste roll-out. For example, contracts may be obtained for different aspects that are less expensive than currently known estimates for hauling, can purchase, etc.

It was also discussed during the subcommittee meeting that the Council could consider approving the combination fee with the intent to implement the 100% yard waste roll-out in March of 2010, with the understanding that changes to the estimates may require adjusting the rate accordingly. This would set a more firm timeline for implementing the yard-waste component and does not prevent the other components from moving ahead as well.

- b) Update on Glass Recycling Expansion Efforts – Some questions have been raised about what the Administration priorities are for expanding various recycling efforts, specifically the progress on glass recycling efforts. *If the Council would like some information about the Administration’s expansion plans and options for glass recycling, the Administration is prepared.*

The Council may recall that for the current fiscal year, the Administration had received funding to expand drop-off glass recycling locations throughout the city. However, as reported in the staff report for FY09-10, the money was not spent toward this project, because of the difficulty in finding suitable locations for the drop-off sites, however the Administration is pursuing other options for expanding glass recycling. (Sites are difficult to identify, because of the space needed for the very large bunker-style receptacles; the liability associated with the resulting broken glass near the receptacles; the need to restrict hours and access especially in cases where the location is near a residential area; and other various obstacles.)

- c) Setting up the Environmental Fund as a stand-alone Enterprise Fund – A question has been raised about the reason for grouping both the newly proposed “Environmental & Energy Fund” with the “Recycling & Operations Fund” under the “Refuse Fund Class” umbrella. The short answer is that according to Governmental Accounting Standards, an Enterprise Fund is funded by user fees – a steady stream on income based on fees for services provided. The annual landfill dividend (which is the proposed primary revenue source in the Environmental Fund) does not qualify as a user fee, and therefore, the Environmental Fund would not be eligible to be set up as its own Enterprise Fund.

Given this, the Administration considered either a) keeping the environmental functions in the General Fund and diverting the annual dividend to the General Fund to cover those expenses, or b) doing as proposed and creating a separate fund within the Refuse Fund Class. The benefits, as described by the Administration, are that setting up a separate fund allows for increased financial review through a separate fund rather than a piece of the big General Fund picture. Setting up the Environmental Fund as proposed will allow for assets and liabilities (as they are acquired), cash flow, debt ratios, as well as revenues and expenses to all be more closely evaluated. The Council has the option of structuring this program in the manner it desires. The Council could allocate funding from the Landfill dividend to

the general fund and the City Administration is capable of providing accounting reports as requested.

- d) Proposal to move Tree purchases & planting into the Operations Fund – In fiscal year 2001-02, the total Urban Forestry budget was funded out of the Refuse Fund through the user fee revenue generated from collection services. At the time, concerns were raised about the residential property owners funding the entire Forestry program when businesses and commercial property owners also benefited. (Collection services are not provided to businesses by the City, therefore user fees only came from residences.) Based on the review of the issue and options explored, it was decided to transfer the whole Urban Forestry budget into the General Fund, which resulted in a property tax increase. *The Administration has been refreshing their analysis and legal review of this issue, and someone from the Attorney's Office will be present to provide information to the Council.*

(Budgetary information: for FY09-10 this affects a \$40,000 proposed reduction to the Public Services budget, and a proposed \$101,200 budget item in the Recycling & Operations Fund.)

- e) Significant Ordinance Change Regarding Monies from the Landfill – With the proposed creation of the new “Environmental & Energy Fund” and a proposed rate increase, an ordinance was forwarded with the budget for the Council’s consideration. One of the changes proposed in the ordinance is to establish a restriction on the receipt of monies from the Landfill so that they would be placed into the Environmental & Energy Fund, and that if the money is not placed in the Environmental Fund, the money would be placed in the Operations Fund. This would affect the annual landfill dividend, the anticipated one-time \$7 million payment, and any other (yet unknown) future money received from the landfill. *The Council may wish to discuss whether this restriction is necessary, or whether there may be some reason to have more flexibility to receive and expend the money through another fund at the Council's discretion.* For example, until the briefing later in the summer where plans and options for the \$7 million are finalized, the Council may wish to hold the \$7 million in the General Fund’s Fund Balance.

Given the complexity of these items the Council could elect to allow more time for discussion by adopting an appropriation that would allow the programs to continue operating but would not make the long-term structural changes proposed. The issues could be discussed and refined in future briefings and the Council's decisions could be implemented through ordinance adoption and/or budget appropriation later in the summer (similar to the “interim study” items listed on the last page of this report).

11. Public Utilities -

- a) Consideration of a Rate Increase in the Storm Water Fund – During the last Budget & Finance Subcommittee meeting, there was a discussion with the Public Utilities Administration about the possibility of adopting a rate increase for the Storm Water Fund - either for implementation sometime in fiscal year 2009-10 or to increase the anticipated rate adjustments in future years. Among other pre-existing capital projects, the Fund will need to fund projects identified through the Riparian Overlay Corridor study. However, even with a planned 3% increase in future years (there is no proposed increase for 2009-10), the reliance on reserve funds is constant. The current storm water fee is \$3.00 per month. *The Council may wish to discuss*

whether there is consensus to change the proposed rate increase schedule and/or increase the rate adjustment.

For the Council's information, there is an attachment with information about the impact of different rate increases on different size accounts; the cash flow for the Storm Water Fund through fiscal year 2014-15; and a comparison of the Salt Lake City rate to other local storm water utilities.

- b) Review of Water Fund Capital Projects and Bonding Opportunities** - Also during the BFS meeting, there was discussion about the possibility of relying more heavily on bonding in order to more quickly schedule some capital improvement projects within the Water Fund. *The Council may wish to ask what type of projects might be advanced in this situation.* The proposed budget includes almost \$40 million in capital improvement budget for all three funds.

As more information on this item, the Administration has prepared for the briefing:

- Discussion of necessary additional resources - If additional funding is available, all project design, inspection, and construction will be contracted out to third parties with only a small additional work load kept within the department.
- Included in the Public Utilities related attachments is a chart that shows the estimated effect on water rates in order to cover an additional debt service payment in the event that a bond is pursued. (No rate increase is proposed for 2009-10, however per the transmittal information, the Administration already estimates that a 7% increase will be needed for 2010-11.)
- If additional funding is made available the following projects could be financed and accelerated:
 - Department share of a state loan project to install a micro turbine power generator and replacement control valves at the Parley's Treatment Plant. Cost: \$1.3 million.
 - Department share of Recovery Water for America Irrigation SCADA Grant to install automatic controllers on irrigation system. Cost: \$120,000
 - Department share of Stag Grant to study PCE from well site at 1500 East and 500 South. Cost: \$134,000.
 - Replace Artesian Basin Water Lines from Artesian Basin to Marcus Reservoir and 300 East from 3300 South to 3900 South. Cost: \$3.2 million.

The Council may wish to ask what "stimulus" or grant money is being pursued or has been received that will also address some additional capital projects.

The Council may wish to discuss whether there is consensus to consider bonding and adjust the rate increase schedule in order to support the acceleration of capital improvement projects.

(Public Utilities Attachments: 1) Options & Impacts to the Storm Water rate; 2) Storm Water Fund Cash Flow; 3) Storm Water Rate Comparison; 4) Water Fund Cash Flow; 5) Options to the Water rate.)

12. Budget Fine Tuning/Adjustments - The Administration has provided a transmittal outlining a number of adjustments to the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2010. There are a

couple of technical adjustments that result in a net revenue of \$248,457. However, the Administration is recommending that the Council adjust the Sales Tax revenue number downward by this amount, given the most recent Sales Tax receipts data (this would bring the total Sales Tax revenue decrease to \$4,248,457, and would bring the budget into balance). More detailed information is provided in the **attached transmittal**. The Administration will be available to address any Council questions relating to these adjustments. *The Council may wish to discuss if a majority would take the Administration's recommendation.*

13. Weigand Center Funding

There are indications that the funding request for the Weigand Center needs to be considered with the annual budget process and not through the budget amendment as initially thought. Council staff will have more information on Tuesday.

Interim Study issues

Over the course of discussions regarding the FY 2010 budget, a number of broader issues have been identified that require further research by the Administration and Council staff. Rather than pursue these as legislative intents, the Council may wish to consider establishing “interim study issues,” so that work and research on these topics will continue. Council Staff has identified the following list (the Council may wish to discuss, remove, or add):

1. City-wide collections strategy
2. Refuse/Recycling/Green Waste & Environmental Initiatives Strategy
3. Fleet Usage/Replacement
4. Special Events
5. Citywide Collections

FY 2010 Budget issues previously discussed/resolved

1. **Residential Parking Permit Fee Increase** - At the May 26 briefing the Council indicated via straw poll that they were supportive of the Administration's recommendation to raise the residential parking permit fees from \$12 to \$36 per year.

A copy of the original Overview staff report can be provided upon request.

Business License Fees Cost Analysis Methodology

Utah Code 10-1-203 5(a) requires that revenue received from municipal business license fees be based on the costs of the services provided. The law requires a cost analysis every six years. In 2005, Salt Lake City conducted an analysis to determine the actual costs associated with issuing business licenses.

City costs were determined by analyzing direct, indirect and disproportionate activities.

Base License Fees

The base license fee is charged to all businesses in the City and consists of the actual direct costs associated with issuing a business license. Costs include total Business License Division costs, fire inspection and fire administrative costs.

Special Regulatory Costs

Certain business license applications require additional processing activities such as police service application processing, criminal background checks, interviews, identification photographs, and fingerprints. In addition, these businesses require ongoing dedicated regulatory services performed to insure legal compliance and public safety. The time requirement for these activities was calculated and additional fees are assessed to affected businesses.

Disproportionate Impact Costs

The analysis determined that a disproportionate level of municipal services are provided to certain businesses within the City in comparison with that level of services provided to other businesses and to residences within the City. Costs for such services that could be specifically identified were grouped into common business classifications. These disproportionate costs were allocated to each business class and additional fees were assessed to these classes.

A portion of the cost of disproportionate services could not be allocated methodically to any specific business classification. This cost is, therefore, allocated to all businesses in the form of an employee fee that is based on the total number of employees working in the City.

Telephone Survey-Ground Transportation Licensing and Badging 5-28-09

San Diego International Airport

- Do not use curb lanes (5 lanes and two islands out)
- County Sheriff's department does local background check only – taxi cost \$25.00
- Over 4000 vehicles
- NOTE will be changing to FBI III background checks in the near future.

Denver International Airport

- Do not use curb lanes (remove island)
- Airport does a local check only – taxi cost \$25.00 – limited access
- Over 4000 vehicles

Las Vegas International Airport

- All done by State

Palm Springs Airport

- Do not use curb lane
- City issued background checks (local only), ID Badges, and vehicle inspections - \$2,000.00
- 200 vehicles

San Jose International Airport

- Taxicabs pick-up on the far side of the parking structure – not at curb
- Airport does no background check and does not print ID badges
- City Police do a permit and local background check – fee is small
- Whole process is under review

Oakland International Airport

- Taxicabs pick-up on curb
- Airport does no background check and does not print ID badges
- City Police do a permit and local background check – fee is small
- Whole process is under review

Larry Bowers, Landside Operations Manager, Salt Lake City International Airport

I can almost guarantee you that if you won't find anywhere that does it exactly like us, many like Las Vegas & New York have their own taxi commission that does the certifications for vehicles & drivers & the airports just charge fees to operate.

Dr. Ray Mundy, Director, Center for Transportation Studies, University of Missouri – St. Louis

Comparisons of this type are like not comparing apples to apples – not even apples to oranges. There are a number of factors that weigh into each jurisdiction's process, some of which are:

- The economy
 - Proximity of commercial pick-up lanes to the Airport doors
 - Airport and its city may issue separate ID Badges
 - Jurisdictions opt to subsidize that process: i.e.: Norfolk costs \$60 per badge but charge \$15
 - Insurance rates and state laws impact the process with their requirements
 - Differences in types of jurisdictions – Airport vs. municipality vs. State vs. commission etc.
 - Scale of volumes i.e.: LAX over 10,000 GT vehicles at \$65.00 per driver vs. Palm Springs with 200 GT vehicles at \$2000.00 per driver
-

From: Kovac, Brent
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2009 12:57 PM
To: Kirwan, Laura
Cc: Weeks, Russell; Goff, Orion
Subject: Business Licensed GYPSY Companies

Laura:

Mr. Winder wrote the following in a letter addressed to the Mayor on February 4, 2009:

"Our Memorandum (with exhibits) details the 186-195 gypsy cabs extant in Salt Lake City as well as 97 Limousines competing with the 269 licensed taxicabs."

I went through the above provided list and identified each company then tried to determine the nature of their business license. In the above mentioned list, there are 202 companies which can be broken down as follows:

- 184 Current active business licenses
- 8 Interstate bus operators (thus not regulated by City Code)
- 10 Inactive Business Licenses:
 - 4 Gone out of business
 - 1 Name changed,
 - 1 Non-profit
 - 2 No Business License
 - 1 Moved
 - 1 Does not do Business in SLC

Therefore the only companies we are truly concerned about are the two that do not have a business license. We have already charged the one of the two companies twice and he will be charged again next week. The other company is being pursued.

My numbers do not account for the other companies who still may be operating illegally. Over the last few weeks, we have actually been able to talk (and cite as required) to about eight of these operators. From reports we get from other companies and drivers, we estimate there is no more than about four or five companies now that we have not talked too.

I hope this is helpful.

Brent M. Kovac



*Ground Transportation Administrator
Salt Lake City Corporation
P.O. Box 145483
Salt Lake City, UT 84114 - 5483
P: 801-908-7195
C: 801-706-0941*

GROUND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE - Remote Location

Background and Badging Cost Summary

Major assumptions:

- 1) FTE
 - Two (2) Office Tech (216)
 - Process GT applications, issue badge, and process inspection payments.
- 2) BCI cost per background check \$47.25

2 Clerks @ 70%	
Grade 216 & 218 including benefits.	\$67,221.00

ONGOING COSTS	
Operations & Maintenance	\$8,140.00
Charges and Services (Includes Landscaping)	\$44,662.98
Equipment	\$16,586.73
Total per year	\$69,389.71

START UP COSTS	
Office Equipment & Furniture	\$3,613.68
Leashold improvements	\$55,500.00
Start up costs (amortized for 5 yrs)	\$11,822.74

DIRECT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
Personnel	
GT Administration	\$15,246.40
Building Services Administration	\$10,668.95
CED Administration	\$6,873.84
Operations, Services, and Equipment	
Building Services Administration	\$7,919.16
CED Administration	\$4,436.55
Total per year	\$45,144.90

Summary

Direct Personnel Costs for the year	\$67,221.00
Ongoing and Start Up Costs for the year	\$81,212.45
Direct Administrative Costs for the year	\$45,144.90
Total direct costs for the year	\$193,578.35

Per badge cost W/Out BCI \$100.82 Based on 1,920 Badges
 Cost per BCI background check \$47.25

Per badge cost W/BCI \$148.07

Recommended Fees	
Recommended fee W/BCI	\$114.00
Potential additional revenue	\$3,360.00
Lost/Stolen Badge (replacement)	
City cost w/o BCI. TSA requires new file on each badge.	\$66.00
Possible FY2010 Revenue	\$7,920.00
Second Badge (working for two companies)	
City cost w/o BCI. TSA requires new file on each badge.	\$66.00
Possible FY2010 Revenue	\$7,920.00

GROUND TRANSPORTATION OFFICE - Remote Location

Vehicle Inspection Cost Summary

Major assumptions:

- 1) FTE
 - Two (2) Vehicle Inspection Techs (119E) @ 100%
 - Inspect all vehicles for compliance.
 - Two (2) Office Tech (216) @ 30%
 - Process GT applications, issue badge, and process inspection payments.

2 Vehicle Inspection Technicians @100%	
Grade 119 including benefits.	\$122,048.00

2 Clerks @ 30%	
Grade 216 & 218 including benefits.	\$28,809.00

ONGOING COSTS	
Operations & Maintenance	\$11,660.00
Charges and Services (Includes Landscaping)	\$156,320.43
Equipment	\$23,759.37
Total per year	\$191,739.80

START UP COSTS	
Office Equipment & Furniture	\$5,176.35
Leasehold improvements	\$150,000.00
Equipment	\$45,000.00
Start up costs (amortized for 5 years)	\$40,035.27

DIRECT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
Personnel	
GT Administration	\$15,246.40
Building Services Administration	\$13,336.19
CED Administration	\$8,592.30
Operations, Services, and Equipment	
Building Services Administration	\$9,898.95
CED Administration	\$5,545.68
Total per year	\$52,619.53

Summary

Direct Personnel Costs for the year	\$150,857.00
Ongoing and Start Up Costs for the year	\$231,775.07
Direct Administrative Costs for the year	\$52,619.53
Total direct costs for the year	\$435,251.60

Cost per inspection \$151.13 Based on 2,880 inspections/year.

Recommended Fees

Recommended inspection fee	\$ 110.00
Potential additional revenue	\$48,000.00

Missed inspection fee (based on inspectors time wasted)	\$52.00
Possible FY2010 Revenue	\$18,720.00

Reinspection fee (based on effort to reinspect)	\$30.00
Possible FY2010 Revenue	\$5,400.00

BASEBALL STADIUM SOURCES AND USES
Salt Lake City Corp. PS Dept.

	Actual FY99	Actual FY00	Actual FY01	Actual FY02	Actual FY03	Actual FY04	Actual FY05	Actual FY06	Actual FY07	Actual FY08	Budget FY09	Budget FY10
SOURCES												
Stadium rental for baseball	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 303,485	\$ 300,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500
Parking revenue for baseball	86,312	89,721	76,333	68,704	55,811	60,458	29,909					
Baseball misc. revenue	-	53,472	10,000	825	-	(555)						
Concessions	12,307	-	-	17,446	-	-						
Facility Rental	75,393	107,287	101,100	153,493	77,178	37,050	1,500					
Miscellaneous revenue		450	2,587		44	3,550		8,492				
Total Sources	474,012	550,930	390,020	640,468	436,518	400,503	131,409	23,492	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
USES												
Personal Services	157,868	250,683	257,281	292,060	383,222	278,721	184,431	45,667	42,277	54,708	56,052	41,484
Utilities	142,385	139,697	170,570	153,743	157,527	148,071	182,651	150,956	-	-		
Janitorial	73,184	87,655	84,056	71,434	66,152	76,214	40,495	-	-	-		
Security	37,803	44,118	49,741	83,039	40,355	62,950	13,993	-	-	-		
Misc repairs, projects	151,613	184,752	147,520	128,206	156,092	164,019	124,066	38,748	77,421	43,526	75,000	75,000
Capital Outlay	-	52,241	14,975	-	-	-	38,910	19,595	28,347	91,696	50,000	50,000
Total Uses	562,853	759,146	724,143	728,482	803,348	729,975	584,546	254,966	148,045	189,930	181,052	166,484
NET	\$ (88,841)	\$ (208,216)	\$ (334,123)	\$ (88,014)	\$ (366,830)	\$ (329,472)	\$ (453,137)	\$ (231,474)	\$ (140,545)	\$ (182,430)	\$ (173,552)	\$ (158,984)

Note 1: Per Public Services Staff, FY2004 is a good example of a typical operating year. The timing of stadium rental revenue for FY 2001 was not received until FY 2002, which explains the differences in net loss for those years.

Note 2: Salt Lake City Corporation entered into a ten year lease agreement (with 2 five year renewal options) with Buzas Baseball, Inc. The lease commenced during FY 2005 with required annual payments of \$7,500. The rental payments under the renewal options will be \$15,000 each year.

1. Fee Schedule

FY0809		Combo Fee - YW 100%					
		March 2010	FY1011	FY1112	FY1213	FY1314	FY1415
	Incremental / Can	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Yard Waste	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	90 Gallon	\$5.50	\$0.00	\$3.75	\$3.25	\$0.00	\$0.50
	60 Gallon	\$5.25	\$0.00	\$3.75	\$3.25	\$0.00	\$0.50
	40 Gallon	\$5.00	\$0.00	\$3.75	\$3.25	\$0.00	\$0.50
	MF Recycle...always at FY beginning	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.25
	Single Family Recycling	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Total / Can						
\$3.50	Yard Waste	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
\$11.25	90 Gallon	\$16.75	\$16.75	\$20.50	\$23.75	\$23.75	\$24.25
\$9.25	60 Gallon	\$14.50	\$14.50	\$18.25	\$21.50	\$21.50	\$22.00
\$8.25	40 Gallon	\$13.25	\$13.25	\$17.00	\$20.25	\$20.25	\$20.75
\$3.75	MF Recycle	\$4.00	\$4.25	\$4.50	\$4.75	\$5.00	\$5.25
\$0.00	Single Family Recycling	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Price increase - citizens who currently do not have a yard waste container

Example: 90 Gallon $(16.75-11.25) / 11.25 = 49\%$

	FY0809 vs FY0910	FY0910 vs FY1011	FY1011 vs FY1112	FY1112 vs FY1213	FY1213 vs FY1314	FY1314 vs FY1415
90 Gallon	49%	0%	22%	16%	0%	2%
60 Gallon	57%	0%	26%	18%	0%	2%
40 Gallon	61%	0%	28%	19%	0%	2%

Price increase - citizens who currently have a yard waste container

Example: 90 Gallon $(16.75-(11.25+3.50)) / (11.25+3.50) = 14\%$

	FY0809 vs FY0910	FY0910 vs FY1011	FY1011 vs FY1112	FY1112 vs FY1213	FY1213 vs FY1314	FY1314 vs FY1415
90 Gallon	14%	0%	22%	16%	0%	2%
60 Gallon	14%	0%	26%	18%	0%	2%
40 Gallon	13%	0%	28%	19%	0%	2%

**STORMWATER UTILITY
CASH FLOW**

	ACTUAL YEAR 2007-2008	CURRENT YEAR 2008-2009	BUDGET YEAR 2009-2010	BUDGET YEAR 2010-2011	BUDGET YEAR 2011-2012	BUDGET YEAR 2012-2013	BUDGET YEAR 2013-2014	BUDGET YEAR 2014-2015
STORMWATER CHARGES	5,314,824	5,245,000	5,245,000	5,402,350	5,564,421	5,731,353	5,903,294	6,080,393
OTHER INCOME	38,365	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
INTEREST INCOME	458,970	150,000	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
OPERATING INCOME	5,812,159	5,405,000	5,405,000	5,512,350	5,674,421	5,841,353	6,013,294	6,190,393
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	-2,757,977	-3,928,101	-3,825,169	-3,660,395	-3,715,233	-3,957,094	-3,996,665	-4,036,632
NET INCOME EXCLUDING DEP.	3,054,182	1,476,899	1,579,831	1,851,955	1,959,188	1,884,259	2,016,629	2,153,761
IMPACT FEES	1,050,371	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
OTHER RECEIPTS/ BOND PROCEEDS								
OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS	302,951	516,000	516,000	516,000	516,000	516,000	516,000	516,000
CAPITAL OUTLAY	-231,117	-628,000	-102,000	-444,000	-295,000	-365,000	-438,000	-560,000
DEBT SERVICE (NEW)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEBT SERVICE	-582,224	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000	-600,000
OTHER INCOME & EXPENSE	539,981	-512,000	14,000	-328,000	-179,000	-249,000	-322,000	-444,000
AVAILABLE FOR CAPITAL	3,594,163	964,899	1,593,831	1,523,955	1,780,188	1,635,259	1,694,629	1,709,761
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	-3,315,530	-4,170,428	-4,290,000	-4,239,500	-3,006,000	-1,650,000	-1,650,000	-1,950,000
CASH INCREASE/(DECREASE)	278,633	-3,205,529	-2,696,169	-2,715,545	-1,225,813	-14,741	44,629	-240,239
BEGINING CASH BALANCE	10,282,057	10,560,690	7,355,161	4,658,992	1,943,447	717,634	702,893	747,522
CASH INCREASE/(DECREASE)	278,633	-3,205,529	-2,696,169	-2,715,545	-1,225,813	-14,741	44,629	-240,239
ENDING BALANCES	\$10,560,690	\$7,355,161	\$4,658,992	\$1,943,447	\$717,634	\$702,893	\$747,522	\$507,283
DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE	5.25	2.46	2.63	3.09	3.27	3.14	3.36	3.59
RATE CHANGE	0%	0%	0%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL STORM WATER BILL								
BILL (1991=\$36.00)	\$36.00	\$36.00	\$36.00	\$37.08	\$38.19	\$39.34	\$40.52	\$41.73
Cash Reserve Ratio	382.91%	187.24%	121.80%	53.09%	19.32%	17.76%	18.70%	12.57%

PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
 AREA STORM WATER RATE COMPARISON - MAY, 2009

RANKING	CITY OR DISTRICT NAME	MONTHLY CHARGE
1	OGDEN CITY	5.52
2	SANDY CITY	5.00
3	SOUTH JORDAN CITY	5.00
4	OREM	4.75
5	PROVO	4.03
6	AMERICAN FORK	4.00
7	BOUNTIFUL CITY	4.00
8	DRAPER CITY	4.00
9	TAYLORSVILLE CITY	4.00
10	MURRAY CITY	3.55
11	PLEASANT GROVE	3.00
12	SALT LAKE CITY	3.00

WATER UTILITY CASH FLOW

	ACTUAL YEAR 2007-2008	BUDGET YEAR 2008-2009	BUDGET YEAR 2009-2010	BUDGET YEAR 2010-2011	BUDGET YEAR 2011-2012	BUDGET YEAR 2012-2013	BUDGET YEAR 2013-2014	BUDGET YEAR 2014-2015
WATER SALES	52,191,821	50,232,000	50,057,000	53,560,990	57,310,259	61,895,080	66,846,686	72,194,421
OTHER INCOME	2,775,150	2,308,000	2,389,450	2,389,450	2,389,450	2,389,450	2,389,450	2,389,450
INTEREST INCOME	2,358,540	900,000	870,000	300,000	250,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
OPERATING INCOME	57,325,511	53,440,000	52,816,450	56,250,440	59,949,709	64,484,530	69,436,136	74,783,871
METROPOLITAN WATER ASSESSMENT	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892	-7,021,892
METROPOLITAN WATER PURCHASES	-9,496,040	-9,600,000	-10,224,000	-11,169,000	-11,752,000	-12,349,000	-12,960,000	-13,585,000
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	-24,971,085	-25,895,633	-26,226,850	-26,960,879	-27,331,587	-28,288,193	-29,278,279	-30,303,019
NET INCOME EXCLUDING DEP.	15,836,494	10,922,475	9,349,708	11,098,669	13,844,230	16,825,445	20,175,965	23,873,960
OTHER RECEIPTS / BOND PROCEEDS	9,798,493	0		0			12,000,000	0
IMPACT FEES	1,924,326	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS	3,415,081	955,000	955,000	955,000	955,000	955,000	955,000	955,000
CAPITAL OUTLAY	-2,281,824	-3,141,400	-1,993,300	-2,655,000	-2,090,000	-2,180,000	-1,990,000	-2,115,000
WATERSHED PURCHASES	-2,015,046	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
DEBT SERVICE	-2,725,659	-2,750,000	-2,750,000	-2,750,000	-2,750,000	-2,750,000	-2,750,000	-2,750,000
DEBT SERVICE (NEW)	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1,200,000	-1,200,000
OTHER INCOME & EXPENSE	8,115,371	-5,436,400	-4,288,300	-4,950,000	-4,385,000	-4,475,000	6,515,000	-5,610,000
AVAILABLE FOR CAPITAL	23,951,865	5,486,075	5,055,408	6,148,669	9,459,230	12,350,445	26,690,965	18,263,960
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	-10,561,551	-17,637,900	-21,376,160	-10,809,940	-13,690,200	-10,061,300	-20,920,000	-20,130,000
CASH INCREASE/(DECREASE)	13,390,314	-12,151,825	-16,320,752	-4,661,271	-4,230,970	2,289,145	5,770,965	-1,866,040
BEGINING CASH BALANCE	23,749,966	37,140,280	24,988,455	8,667,703	4,006,432	-224,538	2,064,608	7,835,573
CASH INCREASE/(DECREASE)	13,390,314	-12,151,825	-16,320,752	-4,661,271	-4,230,970	2,289,145	5,770,965	-1,866,040
ENDING BALANCES	\$37,140,280	\$24,988,455	\$8,667,703	\$4,006,432	-\$224,538	\$2,064,608	\$7,835,573	\$5,969,533
WATER DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE	5.81	3.97	3.40	4.04	5.03	6.12	5.11	6.04
RATE CHANGE	5.00%	4.00%	0.00%	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL WATER								
BILL (1997=\$180.00)	\$339.43	\$353.00	\$353.00	\$377.71	\$404.15	\$436.49	\$471.40	\$509.12
Cash Reserve Ratio	89.52%	58.77%	19.94%	8.87%	-0.49%	4.33%	15.91%	11.73%
Metropolitan water rate	188.00	200.00	213.00	219.00	226.00	233.00	240.00	247.00
Metropolitan water purchases in acre feet	50,510.85	48,000.00	48,000.00	51,000.00	52,000.00	53,000.00	54,000.00	55,000.00
Water Supplied in Million Gallons	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Revenue per million gallons	1,739.73	1,674.40	1,668.57	1,785.37	1,910.34	2,063.17	2,228.22	2,406.48

**Salt Lake City Public Utilities
Increase Capital Improvement Program Options
May 29, 2009**

Options	Options Description	Current CIP Budget Program	Possible New Grants	Additional Funding	Total Capital Improv. Program	Estimated Rate Increase July 1, 2010	Bond Issue	Cash Balance July 1, 2012	Average Annual Residential Bill
	Current Annual Res. Bill								\$353.00
	Current Budget Proposal	\$21,376,160			\$21,376,160	7%	\$0.00	(\$224,538.00)	\$377.71
			A, B, C						
1	Increase funding by \$2 M \$2 M Bond	\$21,376,160	\$1,879,600	\$2,000,000	\$25,255,760	8%	\$2,000,000.00	\$611,642.00	\$381.24
			A, B, C						
2	Increase funding by \$3M \$2 M Bond	\$21,376,160	\$1,879,600	\$3,000,000	\$26,255,760	9%	\$2,000,000.00	\$647,822.00	\$384.77
			A, B, C						
3	Increase funding by \$3M \$3 M Bond	\$21,376,160	\$1,879,600	\$3,000,000	\$26,255,760	8%	\$3,000,000.00	\$511,642.00	\$381.24
			A, B, C						
4	Increase funding by \$4M \$4 M Bond	\$21,376,160	\$1,879,600	\$4,000,000	\$27,255,760	8%	\$4,000,000.00	\$411,642.00	\$381.24
			A, B, C						
5	Increase funding by \$4M \$3 M Bond	\$21,376,160	\$1,879,600	\$4,000,000	\$27,255,760	9%	\$3,000,000.00	\$547,822.00	\$384.77
	A Federal SRF State Loan- Low interest loan to install a micro turbine power generator and replacement control valves at Parley's Treatment Plant for \$1,513,600. Total project cost are estimated at \$2.8 million.								
	B Recovery Water for America Irrigation SCADA Grant -to install a new irrigation control system for \$80,000. Total project costs \$200,000.								
	C Stag Grant - to study PCE contaminate around well site at 1500 East and 500 South for \$286,000. Total project costs \$420,000.								
	D Utah Wastewater Project Assistance Program - Zero interest sewer loan for \$6,920,000 not listed. The loan would be secured by a revenue bond issued by Public Utilities for a twenty year period with a zero interest rate. The funds would replace existing digester covers at our Sewer Treatment Plant. This will require notification to all customers, public hearing and the issuance of taxable bonds to the State.								



RALPH BECKER
MAYOR


SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

RECEIVED

MAY 28 2009

CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

CITY RECORDER


David Everitt, Chief of Staff

Date Received: 5/28/2009
Date sent to Council: 5/28/2009

TO: Salt Lake City Council
Carlton Christensen, Chair

DATE: May 28, 2009

FROM: David Everitt, Chief of Staff

SUBJECT: FY 2009-10 Adjustments to Mayor's Recommended Budget

STAFF CONTACT: Gina Chamness, 535-7766

DOCUMENT TYPE: Ordinances

RECOMMENDATION: The Administration recommends the following adjustments to the Mayor's Recommended Budget, submitted to the Council on May 5, 2009 be considered when adopted the FY 2009-10 budget for Salt Lake City. These include a series of technical adjustments to revenue and expenses as well as corrections in our original Compensation Plan ordinance submittal.

BUDGET IMPACT: These adjustments increase revenue by \$84,752 and decrease expenses by \$163,705, leaving a difference of \$248,457. Given the volatility of the sales tax revenue in the last several months, the Administration recommends that the Council reduce revenue expected from sales tax by \$248,457.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Administration proposes the following adjustments to revenue:

- An increase of \$84,752 to the revenue expected from G.O. Bond Property Tax collections. This amount corrects an error in our original submission and correctly supports the general obligation bond debt service reflected in the Capital Improvement Program.

In addition, the Administration proposes the following adjustments to expenses:

- A decrease of \$229,000 in Non-Departmental Interest Expense Line Item. This reflects an adjustment in the interest the City expects to pay for Tax Anticipation Notes.

- An increase of \$15,295 in the Non-Departmental Legal Defenders Line Item. This amount will correctly annualize a budget amendment approved in Budget Amendment #1 in FY 2008-09.
- An increase of \$50,000 in Community and Economic Development associated with the Sorensen/Unity Center child care workers, originally budgeted in FY 2008-09. These positions will be contracted with Salt Lake County in FY 2009-10, and were inadvertently removed from the budget twice, one in a base-to-base salary adjustment line and once as a separate line item, leaving the department short \$50,000 to support the cost of this contract. This adjustment corrects a technical error and supports the intent of the Mayor's Recommended Budget.

The Administration is also revising our original submittal of two ordinances, an ordinance approving employee overtime and other pay allowances for non-represented employees, and an ordinance approving a holiday, vacation, and leave accrual plan for all non-represented employees. In addition, we are correcting two attachments to the ordinance approving a compensation plan for all non-represented employees.

The changes in the employee overtime ordinance add clarifying language about how overtime is compensated and corrects language regarding potential severance payments. In addition, this version reflects a modification in the time periods which are eligible for Swing & Graveyard shift differentials.

The changes in the holiday and other leave accrual ordinance reflect a change in approach with regard to Plan A and R/L leave accumulations that has occurred since these ordinances were submitted to the Council. In addition, some clarifying language has been added to better explain current practice.

Finally, the Administration is making a small technical correction in Appendix C of the Ordinance adopting the Compensation Plan for All Non-Represented Employees, and is making technical corrections in Appendix E.

PUBLIC PROCESS: n/a

“HOLIDAY, VACATION & LEAVE ACCRUAL”

This ordinance shall apply to all City employees not otherwise represented by a recognized collective bargaining unit and not covered by the provisions of an applicable memorandum of understanding.

I. HOLIDAYS

Full-Time employees shall receive holidays and vacation as provided in this section. Employees do not earn or receive holiday and vacation benefits while on unpaid leave of absence. However, employees on an unpaid military leave of absence may be entitled to the restoration of such leave benefits, as provided by federal laws, regulations and city ordinance.

- A. The following days shall be recognized and observed as holidays for Full-Time employees covered by this plan. Such Full-Time employees shall receive their regular rate of pay for each of the unworked holidays. Regular Part-time “700 Series” employees shall receive four hours of pay at their regular rate of pay for each of the unworked holidays:
1. New Year's Day, the first day of January.
 2. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, the third Monday of January.
 3. President's Day, the third Monday in February.
 4. Memorial Day, the last Monday of May.
 5. Independence Day, the fourth day of July.
 6. Pioneer Day, the twenty-fourth day of July.
 7. Labor Day, the first Monday in September.
 8. Columbus Day, the second Monday of October (only for eligible employees assigned to the Justice Court Division)
 9. Veteran's Day, the eleventh day of November.
 10. Thanksgiving Day, the fourth Thursday in November.
 11. The Friday after Thanksgiving Day (floating holiday, see explanation below).
 12. Christmas Day, the twenty-fifth day of December.
 13. One personal holiday, taken upon request of the employee and at the discretion of the supervisor.
- B. When any holiday listed above falls on a Sunday, the following business day shall be considered a holiday. When any holiday listed above falls on

a Saturday, the preceding business day shall be considered a holiday. In addition to the above, any day may be designated as a holiday by proclamation of the Mayor and/or the City Council.

- C. No Full-time employee shall receive in excess of one day of holiday pay for a single holiday. No regular part-time “700 Series” employee shall receive in excess of four hours of holiday pay for a single holiday. Employees must work or be on authorized leave their last scheduled working day before and the next working day following the holiday to qualify for holiday pay.
- D. Holiday Exception: Employees may observe the following holidays up to 50 days prior to the actual holiday, with prior management approval: 1) the Friday after Thanksgiving Day (for all eligible employees except for those assigned to the Justice Court Division); or, 2) Columbus Day (only for eligible employees assigned to the Justice Court Division).
- E. Police Lieutenant & Captain: Employees classified as “800 Series” Police Lieutenants and Captains who retire or separate from City employment for any reason shall be compensated for any holiday time accrued and unused during the preceding 12 months. Employees shall not be compensated for any unused holiday time accrued before the 12 months preceding the employee’s retirement or separation.

II. VACATION LEAVE

- A. Full-Time employees shall be entitled to receive their regular salaries during vacation periods earned and taken in accordance with the following provisions. No employee shall be entitled to use any vacation unless the employee has successfully completed his or her initial probationary period.
- B. Except for “900 Series” Fire Battalion Chiefs and those listed in Paragraph C of this section, Full-Time employees and Appointed employees shall accrue vacation leave based upon years of City Service as follows:

<u>Years of City Service</u>	<u>Hours of Vacation Accrued Per Biweekly Pay Period</u>
0 to end of year 3	3.08
4 to 6	3.69
7 to 9	4.62
10 to 12	5.54
13 to 15	6.15
16 to 19	6.77
20 or more	7.69

- C. For Department Directors, the Mayor’s Chief of Staff, up to two additional senior positions in the Mayor’s Office as specified by the Mayor, the Executive Director of the City Council, and the Director of the Redevelopment Agency, the following schedule shall apply:

<u>Years of City Service</u>	<u>Hours of Vacation Accrued Per Biweekly Pay Period</u>
0 to end of year 14	6.15
15 or more	7.69

- D. “900 Series” Fire Battalion Chiefs in the Operations Division of the Fire Department shall accrue vacation leave according to the following schedule:

<u>Years of City Service</u>	<u>Shifts of vacation per year for Operations Fire Employees</u>
0 to end of year 3	5
4 to 6	6
7 to 9	7.5
10 to 12	9
13 to 14	10
15 to 19	11
20 or more	12.5

- E. For any plan year in which there are 27 pay periods, no vacation leave hours will be awarded on the 27th pay period.
- F. Years of City Service shall be based on the most recent date the person became a Full-Time salaried employee.
- G. Regular full-time and regular part time employees re-hired by Salt Lake City are eligible to receive up to three years of prior service credit for vacation and personal leave accrual.
- H. Full-Time and Appointed employees (except those listed in Paragraph C of this section) may accumulate vacations, according to the length of their full-time years of City Service up to the following maximum limits:

Up to and including 9 years	Up to 30 days/ 15 shifts/ 240 hours
After 9 years	Up to 35 days/ 17.5 shifts/ 280 hours

After 14 years

Up to 40 days/ 20 shifts/ 320 hours

"Days," herein, means "8-hour" days. "Shifts," herein, means "24 hour" combat shifts.

- I. Department Directors and those included in Paragraph C of this section may accumulate up to 320 hours of vacation without regard to their years of employment with the City.
- J. Any vacation accrued beyond said maximums shall be deemed forfeited unless utilized prior to the end of the calendar year in which the maximum has been accrued. However, in the case of an employee returning from an unpaid military leave of absence, related provisions under city ordinance shall apply.
- K. Vacation Allowance: The Mayor or the City Council may, as a recruiting incentive, provide an allowance of up to 120 hours of vacation leave, if it would be in the City's best interest to do so.

III. SICK AND OTHER RELATED LEAVE OR PERSONAL LEAVE

- A. Benefits in this section are for the purpose of continuing income to employees during absence due to illness, accident or personal reasons. Some of these absences may qualify under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The City requires all employees using FMLA leave to exhaust their paid leave allotments for FMLA-qualifying events prior to taking FMLA leave unpaid. Employees are not eligible to earn or receive leave benefits while on unpaid leave of absence. However, employees on an unpaid military leave of absence may be entitled to the restoration of such leave benefits, as provided by city ordinance.
- B. Employees hired on or after November 16, 1997 shall receive personal leave benefits under Plan B. All other employees shall participate in the plan they participated in on November 15, 1998, except as provided in paragraph III(C) below.
- C. Employees who were hired before November 16, 1997, shall participate in Plan B if they so elected during any City-established election period occurring after 1998.
- D. Plan "A"

1. Sick Leave

- a. Sick leave shall be provided for Full-Time employees under this Plan "A" as insurance against loss of income when an employee is unable to perform assigned duties because of illness or injury. The Mayor may establish rules governing the interfacing of sick leave and Workers' Compensation benefits and avoiding, to the extent allowable by law, duplicative payments.
- b. Each Full-Time employee shall accrue sick leave at a rate of 4.62 hours per pay period. For any plan year in which there are 27 pay

periods, no sick leave hours will be awarded on the 27th pay period. Authorized and unused sick leave may be accumulated from year to year, subject to the limitations of this plan.

- c. Under this Plan “A,” Full-Time employees who have accumulated 240 hours of sick leave may choose to convert up to 64 hours of the sick leave earned and unused during any given year to vacation. Any sick leave used during the calendar year reduces the allowable conversion by an equal amount.
- d. Conversion at the maximum allowable hours will be made unless the employee elects otherwise. Any election by an employee for no conversion, or to convert less than the maximum allowable sick leave hours to vacation time, must be made by notifying his or her Personnel/Payroll Administrator, in writing, not later than the second payperiod of the new calendar year. Otherwise, the opportunity to waive conversion or elect conversion other than the maximum allowable amount shall be deemed waived for that calendar year. In no event shall sick leave days be converted from other than the current year's sick leave allocation.
- e. Any sick leave hours, properly converted to vacation benefits as above described, shall be taken prior to any other vacation hours to which the employee is entitled; provided, however, that in no event shall an employee be entitled to any pay or compensation upon an employee's separation for any sick leave converted to vacation. Any sick leave converted to vacation remaining unused at the date of separation shall be forfeited by the employee.

2. Hospitalization Leave

- a. Hospitalization leave shall be provided for Full-Time employees under this Plan “A,” in addition to sick leave authorized hereunder, as insurance against loss of income when employees are unable to perform assigned duties because of scheduled surgical procedures, urgent medical treatment, or hospital inpatient admission.
- b. Employees shall be entitled to 30 days of hospitalization leave each calendar year. Hospitalization leave shall not accumulate from year to year. Employees may not convert hospitalization leave to vacation or any other leave, nor may they convert hospitalization leave to any additional benefit at time of retirement.
- c. Employees who are unable to perform their duties during a shift due to preparations (such as fasting, rest, or ingestion of medicine), for a scheduled surgical procedure, may report the absence from the affected shift as hospitalization leave, with the prior approval of their division head or supervisor.
- d. Employees who must receive urgent medical treatment at a hospital, emergency room, or acute care facility, and who are unable to perform their duties during a shift due to urgent medical treatment, may report the absence from the affected shift as hospitalization leave. The employee is responsible to report the receipt of urgent

medical treatment to the employee's Division head or supervisor as soon as practical. For purposes of use of hospitalization leave, urgent medical treatment includes at-home care directed by a physician immediately after the urgent medical treatment and within the affected shift.

- e. Employees who are admitted as an inpatient to a hospital for medical treatment, so they are unable to perform their duties, may report the absence from duty while in the hospital as hospitalization leave.
- f. Medical treatment consisting exclusively or primarily of post-injury rehabilitation or therapy treatment, whether conducted in a hospital or other medical facility, shall not be counted as hospitalization leave.
- g. An employee requesting hospitalization leave under this section may be required to provide verification of treatment or care from a competent medical practitioner.

3. Dependent Leave

- a. Under Plan "A," dependent leave may be requested by a Full-Time employee covered by this Compensation Plan for the following reasons:
 - 1) Becoming a parent through birth or adoption of a child or children.
 - 2) Placement of a foster child in the employee's home.
 - 3) Due to the care of the employee's child, spouse, spouse's child, adult designee (as defined in Paragraph H. below), adult designee's unmarried child under age 26, or parent with a serious health condition.

"Adult Designee" shall mean any individual with whom an eligible employee has a long term committed relationship of mutual caring and support. The adult designee must have resided in the same household with the eligible employee for at least the past 12 consecutive months, and must have common financial obligations with the employee. The adult designee and the employee must be jointly responsible for each other's welfare.

Adult designees and adult designees' children are not covered by FMLA.

- b. Under Plan "A," dependent leave may also be requested by a Full-Time employee to care for an employee's child, spouse, spouse's child, adult designee, adult designee's unmarried child under age 26, or a parent who is ill or injured but who does not have a serious health condition.

- c. The following provisions apply to the use of dependent leave by a Full-Time employee:
 - 1) Dependent leave may be granted with pay on a straight time basis.
 - 2) If the employee has available unused sick leave, the employee shall be entitled to use as dependent leave such unused sick leave.
 - 3) The employee shall give notice of the need to take dependent leave and the expected duration of such leave to to his or her supervisor as soon as possible under the circumstances.
 - 4) The employee shall provide, upon request of the supervisor, certification of birth or evidence of a child placement for adoption, or a letter from the attending physician in the event of hospitalization, injury or illness of a child, spouse, spouse's child, adult designee, adult designee's child, or parent within five calendar days following termination of such leave.
 - 5) An employee's sick leave shall be reduced by the number of hours taken by an employee as dependent leave under this paragraph provided, however, that up to 40 hours of dependent leave used during the calendar year will not affect the sick leave conversion options as outlined in paragraph III(D)(1)(d).
 - 6) Probationary employees are not eligible for dependent leave.
4. Career Incentive Leave, Plan "A." Full-Time employees, who have been in continuous Full-Time employment with the City for more than 20 years, and who have accumulated to their credit 1500 or more sick leave hours, may make a one-time election to convert up to 160 hours of sick leave into 80 hours of paid Career Incentive Leave. Career Incentive Leave must be taken prior to retirement. Sick leave hours converted to Career Incentive Leave will not be eligible for a cash payout upon termination or retirement even though the employee has unused Career Incentive Leave hours available. This leave can be used for any reason. Requests for Career Incentive Leave must be submitted in writing to the Department Director and be approved subject to the department's business needs (e.g., work schedules and workloads).
5. Retirement Benefit, Plan "A."
 - a. Persons who retire under the eligibility requirements of the Utah State Retirement System will be paid in cash at their base hourly rate for 25% of their accumulated sick leave hours balance.
 - b. In lieu of the above, Full-Time employees may elect to convert 50% of the sick leave hours provided above to pay for health insurance premiums. The sick leave hours converted to a dollar allowance shall be subject to any state and federal income and social security

tax withholding required by law. Upon an issuance of payment to an employee, the employee shall endorse the payment to the City, which is to be held in a non-interest bearing account from which the City will pay the insurance carrier until the account balance is exhausted. This provision shall not act to reinstate an employee with sick leave benefits which were in any respect lost, used, or forfeited prior to the effective date of this plan.

E. Plan “B”

1. The benefit Plan Year of Plan “B” begins in each calendar year on the first day of the pay-period that includes November 15. Under this Plan “B,” paid personal leave shall be provided for employees as insurance against loss of income when an employee needs to be absent from work because of illness or injury, to care for a dependent, or for any other emergency or personal reason. Where the leave is not related to the employee’s own illness or disability—or an event that qualifies under the FMLA—a personal leave request is subject to supervisory approval based on the operational requirements of the City and any policies regarding the use of such leave adopted by the department in which the employee works.
2. Each Full-Time employee under this Plan “B” shall be awarded, at the beginning of the second pay period of November in each calendar year, personal leave hours based on the following schedule:

<u>Months of Consecutive City Service</u>	<u>Hours of Personal Leave</u>
Less than 6	40
Less than 24	60
24 or more	80

Employees hired during the plan year will be provided paid personal leave on a pro-rated basis.

3. Not later than October 31st in each calendar year, employees covered by Plan “B” may elect, by notifying their Personnel/Payroll Administrator in writing, to:
 - a. Convert any unused personal leave hours available at the end of the first pay period of November to a lump sum payment equal to the following: For each converted hour, the employee shall be paid 50 percent of the employee’s hourly base wage rate in effect on date of conversion. In no event shall total pay hereunder exceed 40 hours of pay, or
 - b. Carryover to the next calendar year up to 80 unused personal leave hours, or

- c. Convert a portion of unused personal leave hours, to a lump sum payment as provided in subparagraph (a) above and carry over a portion as provided in subparagraph (b) above.
4. Maximum Accrual. A maximum of 80 hours of personal leave may be carried over to the next plan year. Any personal leave hours unused at the end of the plan year in excess of 80 shall be converted to a lump sum payment as provided in subparagraph 3.a above.
5. Termination Benefits. At termination of employment for any reason, accumulated unused personal leave hours, minus any adjustment necessary after calculating the “prorated amount,” shall be paid to the employee at 50 percent of the hourly base wage rate on date of termination for each unused hour. For purposes of this paragraph, “prorated amount” shall mean the amount of personal leave credited at the beginning of the plan year, multiplied by the ratio of the number of months worked in the plan year (rounded to the end of the month which includes the separation date) to 12 months. If the employee, at the time of separation, has used personal leave in excess of the prorated amount, the value of the excess amount shall be reimbursed to the City and may be deducted from the employee’s paycheck.
6. Conditions on Use of Personal Leave are:
 - a. Minimum use of personal leave is one hour, with supervisory approval.
 - b. Except in unforeseen circumstances, such as emergencies or the employees’ inability to work due to their illness or accident, or an unforeseen FMLA-qualifying event, the employees must provide their supervisors with prior notice to allow time for the supervisors to make arrangements necessary to cover the employees’ work.
 - c. For leave due to unforeseen circumstances, the employees must give their supervisors as much prior notice as possible.
7. Career Enhancement Leave, Plan “B.” A Full-Time employee covered under this Plan “B” is eligible, after 15 years of full time service with the City, to be selected to receive up to two weeks of career enhancement leave. This one-time leave benefit could be used for formal training, informal course of study, job-related travel, internship, mentoring or other activity that could be of benefit to the City and the employee’s career development. Selected employees shall receive their full regular salary during the leave. Request for this leave must be submitted in writing to the appropriate department head, stating the purpose of the request and how the leave is intended to benefit the City. The request must be approved by the department head and by the Human Resources Director (who will review the request for compliance with the guidelines outlined here).
8. Retirement/Layoff (RL) Benefit, Plan “B”
 - a. Full-Time employees currently covered under Plan “B” who were hired before November 16, 1997, and who elected to be covered

under Plan "B," shall have a retirement/layoff (RL) account equal to sixty percent of their accumulated unused sick leave hours available on November 16, 1997, minus any hours withdrawn from that account since it was established.

- b. Full-Time employees who were hired before November 16, 1997 and who elected in 1998 to be covered under Plan "B," shall have a retirement/layoff (RL) account equal to fifty percent of their accumulated unused sick leave hours available on November 14, 1998, minus any hours withdrawn after the account is established.
 - c. Full-Time employees who were hired before November 16, 1997 and who elected in 2007 or later during any period designated by the City to be covered under Plan "B," shall have a retirement /layoff (RL) account equal to forty percent of their accumulated unused sick leave hours available on the date that Plan B participation began, minus any hours withdrawn after the account is established.
 - d. Payment of the RL Account.
 - 1) All of the hours in the RL account shall be payable to an employee only upon retirement or as a result of layoff. Hours shall be paid according to the employee's base hourly rate of pay on date of retirement or layoff.
 - 2) In the case of retirement only, in lieu of the above, Full-Time employees may elect to convert the RL account payment as provided herein to pay for health insurance premiums. Such payment shall be subject to any state and federal income and social security tax withholding required by law. An employee's available RL account balance, computed by the hours therein times the base salary rate at the effective date of employment separation, determines the number of months of medical and surgical coverage that may be purchased. The purchase is made on a monthly basis, which shall be computed on a monthly basis of charges against the account balance. If insurance costs increase, the number of months of coverage will decrease.
 - e. Hours may be withdrawn from the RL account for emergencies or to supplement Workers' Compensation benefits after personal leave hours are exhausted. RL account hours used to supplement Workers' Compensation benefits, when added to the employee's Workers' Compensation benefit, may not exceed the employee's regular net salary.
9. Short-Term Disability Insurance, Plan "B." Protection against loss of income when an employee is absent from work due to short-term disability shall be provided to Full-Time employees covered under Plan "B" through short-term disability insurance (SDI). There shall be no cost to the employee for SDI. SDI shall be administered in accordance with the terms determined by the City. As one of the conditions for receiving

SDI, the employee may be required to submit to a medical examination by a medical provider of the City's choosing.

IV. BEREAVEMENT LEAVE

- A. Time off with pay will be granted to an employee who suffers the loss of a wife, husband, child, mother, father, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, grandfather, step-grandfather, grandmother, step-grandmother, grandchild, or step grandchild, stepchild, stepmother, stepfather, stepbrother or stepsister, grandfather-in-law, grandmother-in-law, or adult designee or adult designee's relative as if the adult designee were the employee's spouse. In the event of death in any of these instances, the employee will be paid his/her regular base pay for scheduled work time from the date of death through the day of the funeral or memorial service, not to exceed five working days. The employee will be permitted one additional day of funeral leave on the day following the funeral or memorial service if: such service is held more than 150 miles distance from Salt Lake City; the employee attends the service; and the day following the service is a regular work shift.
1. In the event of death of a relative other than those enumerated in paragraph A above, an employee shall be paid for time off from scheduled working hours while attending the memorial services for such person, not to exceed one work shift.
 2. In the event of death of friends, an employee may be allowed to use vacation or personal leave for time off to attend the funeral or memorial service for such person, subject to the approval of his/her immediate supervisor.
 3. In the event of death of any covered family member while an employee is on vacation, the employee's vacation shall be extended by the amount of time authorized as bereavement leave under this subsection.

V. MILITARY LEAVE JURY DUTY

- A. Leave of absence for employees who enter uniformed service. An employee who enters the service of a uniformed services of the United States, including the United States Army, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Air Force, commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, United States Coast Guard, or the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, shall be entitled to be absent from his or her duties and service from the City, without pay, as required by state and federal law. Said leave shall be granted for no more than five cumulative years, consistent with the federal Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Act.
- B. Leave while on duty with the armed forces or Utah National Guard. Employees covered by this Plan who are or who shall become members of the reserves of a federal armed forces, including United States Army, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Air Force, and the United States Coast Guard, or any unit of the Utah National Guard, shall be allowed full pay for all time not in excess of 11 working days per calendar

year spent on duty with such agencies. This leave shall be in addition to the annual vacation leave with pay. To qualify, employees claiming the benefit under this provision shall provide documentation to the City demonstrating duty with such agencies. To qualify, duty herein need not be consecutive days of service.

VI. JURY LEAVE

- A. An employee shall be released from duty with full pay when, in obedience to a subpoena or direction by proper authority, the employee is required to either serve on a jury or appear as a witness as part of their position for the federal government, state of Utah, or other political subdivision.
 - 1. Employees shall be entitled to receive and retain statutory juror's fees paid for jury service in the State and Federal Courts.
 - 2. On any day that an employee is required to report for jury service and is thereafter excused from such service during his or her regular working hours from the City, he or she shall forthwith return to and carry on his or her regular City employment. Employees who fail to return to work after being excused from jury service for the day shall be subject to discipline.

VII. INJURY LEAVE

- A. The City shall establish rules governing the administration of an injury leave program for employees of the Operations Division of the Department of Airports who are required to carry firearms as part of their jobs, under the following qualifications and restrictions:
 - 1. The disability must have resulted from an injury arising out of the discharge of official duties and/or while exercising some form of necessary job related activity as determined by the City;
 - 2. The employee must be unable to return to work due to the injury as verified by a medical provider acceptable to the City;
 - 3. The leave benefit shall not exceed the value of the employee's net salary during the period of absence due to the injury, less all amounts paid or credited to the employee as Workers' Compensation, Social Security, long-term disability or retirement benefits, or any form of governmental relief whatsoever;
 - 4. The value of benefits provided to employees under this injury leave program shall not exceed the total of \$5,000 per employee per injury; unless approved in writing by the employee's Department Head after receiving an acceptable treatment plan and consulting with the City's Risk Manager;
 - 5. The City's Risk Manager shall be principally responsible for the review of injury leave claims provided that appeals from the decision of the City's Risk Manager may be reviewed by the Chief Administrative Officer who may make recommendations to the Mayor for final decisions;

6. If an employee is eligible for Workers' Compensation as provided by law; and is not receiving injury leave pursuant to this provision, said employee may elect in writing to the Director of Management Services to use either accumulated sick leave or hours from the RL account, if applicable, and authorized vacation time to supplement Workers' Compensation so that the employee is receiving the employee's regular net salary.

VIII. ADDITIONAL LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Additional unpaid leaves of absence may be requested in writing and granted to an employee at the discretion of the Department Director.

“EMPLOYEE OVERTIME & OTHER PAY ALLOWANCES”

This ordinance shall apply to all City employees not otherwise represented by a recognized collective bargaining unit and not covered by the provisions of an applicable memorandum of understanding.

I. OVERTIME COMPENSATION

A. Payment of Overtime Compensation To Non-Exempt Employees.

Management may authorize or require FLSA non-exempt employees to perform City work on an overtime basis as defined by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Overtime shall be compensated by actual payment of 1 ½ times the regular hourly rate or given compensatory time off at a rate of 1 ½ hours for each hour of compensable time for which overtime compensation is required.

1. In addition to hours actually worked, all holiday leave hours paid shall be used in the calculation of overtime. Determination whether an employee receives cash payment or compensatory time off shall be at the discretion of the Department Director, subject to the limitations of the Fair Labor Standards Act and City policy.

2. An employee may receive compensatory time for overtime up to a maximum of 80 hours. The City may, at its sole discretion, pay an employee for any or all accrued compensatory hours.

B. Labor Costs—Declared Emergency. The City may pay exempt “600 Series” and “Appointed” (excluding Department heads /officials) employees overtime pay for any hours worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of 1-1/2 times their regular hourly rates of pay. The City shall only make such payment when all of the following conditions occur:

1. The Mayor or the City Council, pursuant to Salt Lake City Ordinance 2.04.030, or its successor provisions, has issued a “Proclamation of Local Emergency;” and,
2. Exempt employees are required to work over forty (40) hours for one workweek during the Emergency period: and,
3. Funds are available. The City shall determine if funds are available and obtain prior approval from the Mayor to use available funds to cover the overtime payments.

The City shall distribute any overtime payments consistently with a pre-defined standard that treats all employees equitably. Hours worked under a declared Emergency must be paid hours and cannot be accrued as compensatory time.

II. LONGEVITY PAY

A. Eligibility. Full-Time employees who have completed 6 full years of employment with the City shall receive a monthly longevity benefit in the

sum of \$50.00. Said benefit shall be \$75.00 per month for employees who have completed 10 full years of employment with the City. Said benefit shall be \$100.00 per month for employees who have completed 16 full years of employment with the City. Said benefit shall be \$125.00 per month for employees who have completed 20 full years of employment with the City. The computation of longevity pay shall be based on the most recent date the person became a Full-Time salaried employee.

1. "Appointed" employees shall not be eligible for longevity benefits.
- B. Pension Base Pay. Longevity paid to full-time employees pursuant to paragraph A of this section shall be deemed included within base pay for purposes of pension contributions.
- C. Longevity pay is paid pro-rata each bi-weekly pay period, based on the most recent date the person became a full-time salaried employee. Employees do not earn or receive longevity payments while on unpaid leave of absence. Upon return from an approved, unpaid leave of absence, longevity payments shall resume on the same basis as if the employee had not been on such leave of absence.

III. WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

- A. Call-back and Standby. Full-Time "300 Series" employees may receive call-back and standby compensation based on Department Director approval and the following guidelines:
 1. Employees who have been released from normally scheduled work and standby periods, and who return to their normal work site upon direction of an appropriate department head or designated representative prior to their next normal duty shift and without advanced notice or scheduling, shall receive a minimum of three (3) hours straight-time pay and in addition shall be guaranteed a minimum four (4) hours work or straight-time pay thereof.
 2. Employees who have been released from normally scheduled work but have not been released from standby status and who return to their normal work site upon direction of an appropriate department head or designated representative prior to their next normal duty shift and without advanced notice or scheduling, shall be guaranteed a minimum four (4) hours work or straight-time pay thereof.
 3. Employees may be eligible for: (1) two hours of straight time pay for each 24 hour period of limited standby status; or (2) two hours straight time pay for each 12-hour period of limited standby status if they are Department of Airports or Public Utilities Department employees.

Any employee on standby as a member of the Snow Fighter Corps shall not receive standby/on-call pay or shift differential when on standby or called back to fight snow.

B. Shift Allowance/ Differential. Full-time “300 Series” and “600 Series” employees who work a swing shift or night shift may receive an allowance or differential.

1. All shift differential pay shall be included when computing overtime. Employees who are receiving the snow fighter corps differential pay shall not receive a shift differential while receiving snow fighter corps differential pay.
2. Swing Shift: If the majority of the hours in a regularly scheduled shift are between the hours of 3:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m., a “300 Series” employee shall receive an allowance of \$0.70 for each hour of that shift; a full-time “600 Series” employee is eligible to receive an allowance not to exceed \$73.60 per pay period.
3. Night Shift: If the majority of the hours in a regularly scheduled shift are between 10:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m., a “300 Series” employee shall receive a premium of \$0.90 for each hour of that shift; a full-time “600 Series” employee is eligible to receive an allowance not to exceed \$97.43 per pay period.
4. ”700 Series Employees: Employees classified as “700 Series” may receive a shift differential based upon Department Director approval. The same rates paid for shift work performed by regular full-time employees in similar classifications apply.

C. Police Lieutenant Shift Differential: Employees classified as “500 Series” Police Lieutenants shall be paid shift differentials according to the approved wage schedule. Shifts are to be determined as follows:

1. Day shift begins at 0500 hours until 1159 hours.
2. Swing shift begins at 1200 hours until 1859 hours.
3. Graveyard shift begins at 1900 hours until 0459 hours.

D. Acting/Working out of Classification. Management, with guidance from a department head, may temporarily assign additional higher-level job duties to employees which may include some or all of the duties of a supervisor or other team member. In consultation with the Division of Human Resource Management, a department head may elect to grant additional compensation to an employee for work performed in an acting capacity or otherwise beyond the employee’s regular job classification, as deemed appropriate.

1. Typically, additional compensation is provided when a temporary assignment lasts for more than 20 working days. Compensation adjustments may be retroactive to the start date of the temporary job assignment.

E. Snowfighter Pay for Full-Time “300 Series” Employees Designated by the City. Full-Time “300 Series” employees designated by the City as members of the Snow Fighter Corps shall receive a pay differential equal to \$200 per pay period for the snowfighter season not to exceed \$2,000 during each fiscal year of this compensation plan. Such pay differential shall be for work

related to snow removal and shall be separate from regular earnings on each employee's wage statement.

1. Employees who are qualified to operate snow-removal equipment shall be assigned to the Snowfighter Corps by department seniority on a volunteer basis. If the City does not have enough volunteers to staff a snowfighter crew, as determined by the supervisor or department head, employees shall be assigned on a department seniority basis, with the junior employees assigned first.
2. Any employee otherwise qualified for the allowance, who is absent from normal scheduled work more than five working days in a pay period, shall be ineligible to receive the allowance for that pay period. Vacation and compensatory time shall not be considered as absent work days for purposes of determining eligibility for this allowance.

IV. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PAY

A. Education Incentives. The Mayor may adopt programs to promote employee education and training, provided that all compensation incentives under such programs are authorized within appropriate budget limitations established by the City Council.

1. Police Captains and Lieutenants are eligible for a \$500 per year job-related training allowance.
2. Fire Department employees shall be eligible for incentive pay following completion of degree requirements at a fully accredited college or university and submission of evidence of his/her diploma to the Fire Chief or designee. Education incentive pay shall be awarded according to the following monthly allowances according to the educational degree held:

Doctorate.....	\$100.00
Masters.....	\$75.00
Bachelors.....	\$50.00
Associate.....	\$35.00

- a. No employee shall be entitled to compensation for an educational degree which qualifies the employee for his/her position of employment; or for any degree which is not specifically related to the employee's actual employment duties.

V. ALLOWANCES

A. Meal Allowance. Employees shall be eligible for meal allowances in the amount of \$10.00 when said employees work two or more hours consecutive to their normally scheduled shift, as pre-approved by their supervisor. Said employees may also receive \$10.00 for each additional four hour consecutive period of work which is in addition to the normally scheduled work shift, as preapproved by their supervisor.

1. Fire Department employees shall provided with adequate food and drink to maintain safety and performance during emergencies or extraordinary circumstances.

B. Business Expenses. City policy shall govern the authorization of employee advancement or reimbursement for actual expenses reasonably incurred in the performance of City business. Advancement or reimbursement shall be approved only for expenses documented and authorized in advance within budget limitations established by the City Council.

C. Automobiles

1. The Mayor may authorize, subject to the conditions provided in City policy, an employee to utilize a City vehicle on a take-home basis, and may require said employee to reimburse the City for a portion of the take-home vehicle cost as provided in City ordinance.
2. Employees who are authorized to use, and who do use, privately owned automobiles for official City business shall be reimbursed for the operation expenses of said automobiles at the rate specified in City policy.
3. A car allowance may be paid to Appointed employees, as determined by the Mayor, at a rate not to exceed \$400 per month.

D. Uniform Allowance. Employees shall be provided the following monthly uniform allowances when required to wear uniforms in the performance of their duties:

1. Airport Police supervisory employees—\$75.00
2. Field Supervisor (Parking Enforcement)—\$65.00
3. Non-sworn Police and Fire Department employees—\$65.00
4. Watershed Management Division Personnel—\$65.00
5. Fire: “900 Series” Battalion Chiefs shall be provided uniforms and other job-related safety equipment, as needed. Employees may select uniforms and related equipment from an approved list. The total allowance provided shall be \$475 per year, or the amount received by the 400 Series employees, whichever is greater. Appointed employees shall be provided uniforms or uniform allowances to the extent stated in Fire Department policy.
 - a. Dangerous or contaminated safety equipment shall be cleaned, repaired, or replaced by the Fire Department.
6. Police: “800 Series” Police Lieutenants and Captains in uniform assignments, as determined by their Division Commander, may purchase authorized uniform items up to \$450.00 per fiscal year.
 - a. The City shall provide for the cleaning of uniforms as described in Police Department policy.

b. Employees in plainclothes assignments, as determined by their Division Commander, shall be provided a clothing and cleaning allowance of \$ 39.00 per pay period.

c. In addition to the above uniform, clothing and cleaning allowances, employees shall be allowed one additional uniform consisting of a uniform pant, shirt, and tie. The cost of this additional uniform shall be paid for by the Police Department.

d. Uniforms or uniform allowances for Police Appointed employees shall be provided to the extent stated in Police Department policy.

E. Allowances for Certified Golf Teaching Professionals. The Mayor may, within budgeted appropriations and as business needs and market surveys indicate, authorize golf lesson revenue sharing between the City and employees recognized as Certified Golf Teaching Professionals as defined in the Golf Division's Golf Lesson Revenue Policy. Such individuals may be salaried or seasonal employees. Payment to an employee for lesson revenue generated shall be reduced by 1) a 10 percent administrative fee to be retained by the Golf Division, and 2) the employee's payroll tax withholding requirements in accordance with federal and state law.

F. Other Allowances. The Mayor or the City Council may, within budgeted appropriations, authorize the payment of other allowances in extraordinary circumstances (as determined by the Mayor or the City Council) and as dictated by City needs.

VI. SEVERANCE BENEFIT

A. Subject to availability of funds, any current Appointed employee who is not retained, not terminated for cause and who is separated from City employment involuntarily shall receive severance benefits based upon their respective appointment date.

Severance benefits shall be calculated using the employee's salary rate in effect on the employee's date of termination. Receipt of severance benefits is contingent upon execution of a release of all claims approved by the City Attorney's Office.

1. Current Appointed Employees Who Were Appointed Before January 1, 1989 shall receive a severance benefit equal to one month's base salary for each year of continuous City employment, calculated on a pro-rata basis, for a total benefit of up to a maximum of six months.
2. Current Appointed employees appointed on or after January 1, 1989 and before January 1, 2000 shall receive a severance benefit equal to one month's base salary for each continuous year of City employment before January 1, 2000. Severance shall be calculated

on a pro-rata basis for a total benefit of up to a maximum of six months.

3. Current Department heads appointed on or after January 1, 2000 shall receive a severance benefit equal to two months' base salary after one full year of continuous City employment; four months' base salary after two full years of continuous City employment; or, six months' base salary after three full years or more of continuous City employment.
 4. Current Appointed employees who are not Department heads, and who were appointed on or after January 1, 2000 shall receive a severance benefit equal to one week's base salary for each year of continuous City employment, calculated on a pro-rata basis, for a total benefit of up to a maximum of six weeks.
- B. Leave Payout: Appointed employees with leave hour account balances under Plan A or Plan B shall, in addition to the severance benefit provided, receive a severance benefit equal to the "retirement benefit" value provided under the leave plan of which they are a participant (either Plan A or Plan B), if separation is involuntary and not for cause.
- C. Not Eligible for Benefit. An Appointed employee is ineligible to be paid severance benefits under the following circumstances:
1. An employee who, at the time of termination of employment, has been convicted, indicted, charged or is under active criminal investigation concerning a public offense involving a felony or moral turpitude. This provision shall not restrict the award of full severance benefits should such employee subsequently be found not guilty of such charge or if the charges are otherwise dismissed.
 2. An employee who has been terminated or asked for a resignation by the Mayor or Department Director under bona fide charges of nonfeasance, misfeasance or malfeasance in office.
 3. An employee who fails to execute a Release of All Claims approved by the City Attorney's Office, where required as stipulated above.

APPENDIX E - Appointed Employees Bi-Weekly Salary Schedule and Pay Level Assignment
July 1, 2009

Level	Min	Mid	Base Max	Top
099	\$6,275.63	\$7,693.42	\$9,111.20	\$10,192.80
098	\$4,039.29	\$4,948.85	\$5,858.40	\$6,550.00
097	\$2,978.78	\$3,865.50	\$4,752.22	\$5,025.15
001	\$4,039.29	\$4,948.85	\$5,858.40	\$6,550.40
002	\$3,672.08	\$4,498.84	\$5,325.60	\$5,955.20
003	\$3,368.70	\$4,127.55	\$4,886.40	\$5,463.20
004	\$3,090.54	\$3,786.47	\$4,482.40	\$5,012.00
005	\$2,862.02	\$3,506.21	\$4,150.40	\$4,640.80
006	\$2,650.04	\$3,246.62	\$3,843.20	\$4,297.60
007	\$2,476.68	\$3,034.34	\$3,592.00	\$4,016.00
008	\$2,314.36	\$2,835.58	\$3,356.80	\$3,753.60
009	\$2,163.06	\$2,649.93	\$3,136.80	\$3,508.00
010	\$2,021.22	\$2,476.61	\$2,932.00	\$3,278.40
011	\$1,906.96	\$2,336.28	\$2,765.60	\$3,092.80
012	\$1,799.00	\$2,204.30	\$2,609.60	\$2,917.60
013	\$1,697.35	\$2,079.48	\$2,461.60	\$2,752.80
014	\$1,601.22	\$1,961.81	\$2,322.40	\$2,596.80
015	\$1,510.60	\$1,850.90	\$2,191.20	\$2,449.60
016	\$1,424.70	\$1,745.95	\$2,067.20	\$2,311.20
017	\$1,344.33	\$1,646.97	\$1,949.60	\$2,180.00

No position may be removed from or added to this Appointed Employee Pay Plan without approval of the City Council.

Level	001	002	003	
	City Attorney	Chief of Staff Police Chief Public Services Director Administrative Services Director Fire Chief Deputy City Attorney City Council Office Exec Director	Public Services Deputy Director Chief Information Officer Communication Director Senior Advisor - Mayor Dep Dir, Admin Svcs/Finance Director Admin Services Deputy Director City Prosecutor Airport Operations Director Airport Maintenance Director P, Util. Finance Administrator Airport Finance/Acct Director Information Mgt Serv Dir - Airport	Airport Engineering Director Airport Admin/Comm Director Redevelopment Director City Council Deputy Director Appointed Sr. City Attorney Airport Police Chief City Engineer Public Utilities Deputy Director
Level	004	005	006	007
	Assistant Police Chief Planning Director DCED Dep Director - Comm Dev DCED Deputy Director - Econ Dev City Treasurer Human Resource Director Deputy Fire Chief Airport Plan/Cap Prog Dir Wtr. Quality/Treat Administrator Dep City Eng/Major Projects	P.S. Fin/Admin Serv Director Building Official HAND Director Transportation Engineer Public Utilities Chief Engineer Civilian Review Bd Investigator Sustainability Director Assistant Planning Director	Sorensen Center Director Chief Procurement Officer City Courts Director Airport PR/Marketing Director City Recorder	Public Policy Analyst Const Liaison/Pub Pol Analyst Community Facilitator Downtown Transp Dev Coord Emergency Mgt Program Director
Level	008	009	010	011
	Appointments Pending	Coord For Human Rights/Divers Assistant Communication Dir Assistant To Chief of Staff Youth City Programs Manager Planning/Mgt Director - UASI	Appointments Pending	Council Constituent Liaison Econ Dev Mgr Small Business Const Liaison/Budget Analyst Com Affairs/ADA Analyst Community Liaison
Level	012	013	014	015
	Appointments Pending	Assistant To The Mayor Administrative Assistant Off Mgr/Mayor/Comm Affair	Appointments Pending	Admin Asst To Office of Mayor Staff Assistant Admin Secretary II Management Support Coordinator Coalition Coordinator Executive Office Assistant
Level	016	017	097	099
	Appointments Pending	Appointments Pending	Justice Court Judge	Executive Director Of Airports
				098
				Public Utilities Director DCED Director

APPENDIX E - Appointed Employees Bi-Weekly Salary Schedule and Pay Level Assignment
 June 29, 2008 July 1, 2009

Level	Min	-Min-	Mid	Mid	Base Max	Top
099	\$6,275.63	\$6,371.20	\$7,693.42	\$6,283.20	\$9,111.20	\$10,192.80
098	\$4,039.29	\$4,100.80	\$4,948.84	\$5,325.60	\$5,858.40	\$6,550.00
097	\$2,978.78	\$3,024.14	\$3,865.50	\$4,320.20	\$4,752.22	\$5,025.15
001	\$4,039.29	\$4,100.80	\$4,948.84	\$5,325.60	\$5,858.40	\$6,550.40
002	\$3,672.08	\$3,726.00	\$4,498.84	\$4,841.60	\$5,325.60	\$5,955.20
003	\$3,368.70	\$3,420.00	\$4,127.55	\$4,441.60	\$4,886.40	\$5,463.20
004	\$3,050.54	\$3,137.60	\$3,786.47	\$4,075.20	\$4,482.40	\$5,012.00
005	\$2,862.02	\$2,905.60	\$3,506.21	\$3,773.60	\$4,150.40	\$4,640.80
006	\$2,650.04	\$2,690.40	\$3,246.62	\$3,493.60	\$3,843.20	\$4,297.60
007	\$2,475.68	\$2,514.40	\$3,034.34	\$3,264.80	\$3,592.00	\$4,016.00
008	\$2,314.36	\$2,349.60	\$2,835.58	\$3,051.20	\$3,356.80	\$3,753.60
009	\$2,163.05	\$2,196.00	\$2,649.63	\$2,852.00	\$3,136.80	\$3,508.00
010	\$2,021.22	\$2,052.00	\$2,476.61	\$2,666.60	\$2,932.00	\$3,278.40
011	\$1,906.96	\$1,936.00	\$2,336.28	\$2,514.40	\$2,765.60	\$3,092.80
012	\$1,799.00	\$1,826.40	\$2,204.30	\$2,372.00	\$2,608.60	\$2,917.60
013	\$1,697.35	\$1,723.20	\$2,079.48	\$2,237.60	\$2,461.60	\$2,752.80
014	\$1,601.22	\$1,626.60	\$1,961.81	\$2,114.20	\$2,322.40	\$2,596.80
015	\$1,510.60	\$1,533.60	\$1,850.90	\$1,992.00	\$2,191.20	\$2,449.60
016	\$1,424.70	\$1,446.40	\$1,745.55	\$1,879.20	\$2,067.20	\$2,311.20
017	\$1,344.33	\$1,364.80	\$1,646.96	\$1,772.80	\$1,949.60	\$2,180.00

No position may be removed from or added to this Appointed Employee Pay Plan without approval of the City Council.

Level	001	002	003
	Chief-Administrative-Officer City Attorney	Chief of Staff Police Chief Public Services Director Management Administrative Services Director Fire Chief Deputy City Attorney City Council Office Exec Director	Public Services Deputy Director Chief Information Officer Communication Director Senior Advisor - Mayor Dep Dir, Mgt Svcs/Finance Director Mgt Services Deputy Director City Prosecutor Airport Operations Director Airport Maintenance Director P. Util. Finance Administrator Airport Finance/Acct Director Information Mgt Serv Dir - Airport

Level	004	005	006	007
	Assistant Police Chief Planning Director DCED Dep Director - Comm Dev DCED Dep Director - Econ Dev City Treasurer Human Resources Director Deputy Fire Chief Airport Plan/Cap Prog Dir Wtr. Quality/Treat Administrator Dep City Eng/Major Projects	P.S. Fin/Admin Serv Director Building Official HAND Director Transportation Engineer Public Utilities Chief Engineer Civilian Review Bd Investigator Sustainability Director Assistant Planning Director	Sorensen Center Director Chief Procurement Officer City Courts Director Airport PR/Marketing Director Comp-Adm/EE-Rel-Coordinator City Recorder	Public Policy Analyst Const Liaison/Pub Pol Analyst Community Facilitator Downtown Transp Dev Coord Emergency Mgt Program Dir

Level	008	009	010	011
	Appointments Pending	Coord For Human Rights/Divers Assistant Communication Dir Assistant To Chief of Staff Youth City Programs Manager		Council Constituent Liaison Econ Dev Mgr Small Business Const Liaison/Budget Analyst Com Affairs/ADA Analyst Community Liaison

Level	012	013	014	015
	Appointments Pending	Assistant To The Mayor Administrative Assistant Off Mgr/Mayor/Comm Affair	Appointments Pending	Admin Asst To Office of Mayor Staff Assistant Admin Secretary II Management Support Coordinator Coalition Coordinator Executive Office Assistant

Level	016	017	097	099
	Appointments Pending	Appointments Pending	Justice Court Judge	Executive Director Of Airports
				098 Public Utilities Director DCED Director

**APPENDIX C - SALARY SCHEDULE FOR 800 SERIES
EMPLOYEES
Bi-Weekly Rates
July 1, 2009**

LIEUTENANT	A	B	C
	Days	Swing	Graves
Level 822	\$ 3,108.66	\$ 3,186.38	\$ 3,264.09
Level 821	\$ 2,960.52	\$ 3,034.53	\$ 3,108.55
CAPTAIN			
Level 830	\$ 3,516.06		
Level 829	\$ 3,349.00		

Change in pay level assignment depends on approval of Police Chief