

SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT
BUDGET ANALYSIS – FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

DATE: May 28, 2010
SUBJECT: UNRESOLVED & FOLLOW-UP BUDGET ISSUES (2010-11)
FROM: Jennifer Bruno, Karen Halladay, Lehua Weaver, Sylvia Richards
cc: David Everitt, Gordon Hoskins, Gina Chamness, Kay Christensen, Randy Hillier

Following the Council’s May 25 briefing, staff updated the unresolved issues list and provided new information where available. Staff continues to finalize some information and will forward it to the Council.

Unresolved REVENUE Items:

This chart provides a list of **unresolved revenue** items, and includes items straw-pollled by Council Members during the May 25 briefing. For each item on the chart, additional information is provided on the following pages.

If necessary, the Council may wish to consider taking a straw poll on the following items.

Revenue Items		Amount in Mayor's Budget	Council Change
	Item Description		
1	Emergency Services: Double Taxation on Property Tax (County)	1,011,185	
2	Public Facility Parking Taxes (County - Salt Palace)	400,000	(280,000)
3	(TBD Administration's item to cover parking tax gap)		
4	Appropriation from Fund Balance (FY10 was 80,000, FY11 increase by 574,000)	654,000	
5	<i>Add item: Fire False Alarms charging, begin mid-year (confirm amount)</i>		50,000
6	<i>Add item: Reimbursement for Airport Fire services? (\$225,587)</i>		225,587
7	<i>Add item: Snow Removal Fines?</i>		10,000
8	<i>Add item: Permits for fences, accessory structures, etc.?</i>		10,000
9	<i>Add item: Additional Collection efforts?</i>		
10	<i>Add item: Billing for re-inspections (\$10,000)</i>		
11	<i>Add item: Transfer from Ins. & Risk or Gov't Immunity Funds for Streets Response Team</i>		
Total General Fund Revenue Items:		186,785,704	186,801,291

➤ *Based on the May 25 straw poll, \$15,587 was added in revenue (net amount).*

Item Descriptions:

- Property Tax item – County emergency services tax on City residents: \$1,011, 185 *Straw Poll: Keep item in the budget.*
- Public Facility Parking Tax at the Salt Palace: MRB was \$400,000; *Straw Poll: reduce the anticipated revenue amount by -\$280,000 to \$120,000.*
- Pending* – The Administration has indicated that they will submit an updated budget, which will include an alternative to address the \$280,000 reduction to the Public Parking Facility Tax.
- Fund Balance – the Mayor’s Recommended Budget includes the use of \$654,000 from Fund Balance. The Council indicated that they may review this item depending on other decisions.

(Council Added Revenue items):

5. Charging for False Alarm fees – *Straw Poll: add \$50,000 in revenue to the budget, estimating a partial year of collections.*
6. Reimbursement for other Fire services provided to the Airport – *Straw Poll: add \$225,587 in revenue to the budget.*
7. Increasing snow removal fines – *Straw Poll: add \$10,000 in revenue to the budget.* Based on the Council’s discussion, staff has provided information about current ticketing rates and amendments that the Council might consider at a later date. Below is a brief summary. ***Please see Attachment A for more information.***

Under current ordinance, the City charges \$75 for failure to remove snow and ice from sidewalks. The fine is reduced to \$25 if paid within 10 days. If paid between 10-24 days, the fee is \$50. (No differentiation between residential and commercial properties.)

Between 12/15/09 and 1/22/10, the Justice Court processed 234 ‘failure to remove snow/ice from sidewalks’ citations and collected \$4,565. Another \$3,928 remains outstanding.

There are two potential options for the Council’s consideration, which differentiates fines based on whether the property is residential or commercial, and escalates the fine based on delinquency rather than offering discounts.

8. New permit fees – *Straw Poll: add \$10,000 in revenue to the budget.* Council staff has requested assistance from the Attorney’s Office to draft an ordinance assessing a fee for fence permits and accessory structure permits (minimum of \$31.00). ***More information will be provided for the June 1 briefing.***
9. Additional collection efforts – on June 1, the Council will hold a briefing and discussion on the City’s efforts for collecting outstanding debts.
10. **(New item for June 1)** Billing for re-inspections by the Fire Department – the Council may wish to recognize \$10,000 in revenue for charging for necessary re-inspections.
11. **(New item for June 1)** Transfer from Insurance & Risk or Governmental Immunity Funds - Based on the Council’s May 25 discussion, a transfer from one of these funds could be used toward the restoration of the Streets Response Team. **New Information:** The Administration has indicated that the work performed by the SRT that could be billed to Public Utilities is minimal.
 - If the budget for the Streets Response Team is restored, *the Council may wish to consider a Legislative Intent Statement requesting that the Administration conduct a time study on the tasks and time by Department and Enterprise Fund.* Some services may relate to Golf Courses, Refuse Fund, etc. With a better understanding of where time is spent, the Administration and Council could decide whether inter-fund billings are needed.

Note: For the Council’s reference, staff has estimated (for discussion purposes only), what the property tax impact would be for a variety of general property tax increase scenarios:

Estimation of Property Tax Increase Impact by Property Type		
City Property Tax Increase	Annual Increase	
	\$250,000 House	\$1 Million Commercial Property
\$1,000,000	\$8.53	\$62.00
\$5,000,000	\$42.64	\$310.10
\$10,000,000	\$85.26	\$620.10

(Removed Items during the May 25 Briefing):

- Reimbursement for Fire Marshal services provided to the Airport: – *Straw Poll: do not add any revenue, because a position would have to be added and would either be funded directly by the Airport or an expense would be added to the General Fund budget offsetting any reimbursement transfer from the Airport.*
- Possible charge for use of dog parks – – *Straw Poll: explore options, but include in future discussions about Parley’s Historic Nature Park Management Plan.*

Unresolved EXPENSE Items:

This chart provides a list of **unresolved expense** items. For each item on the chart, additional information is provided on the following pages.

Expense Items		Amount in Mayor's Budget	Council Change
	Item Description		
12	(Citywide) Restore 1.5% Salary Suspension (total General Fund)	1,500,000	
13	(Citywide) Restore Merits for non-topped out union employees (total G F)	1,100,000	
14	(Attorney's) Restore Career Ladder Program	70,000	
15	(Attorney's) Market adjustments (Aptd CA and paralegals to 90%)	79,673	
16	(Police Dept.) Market adjustments (Evidence Tech II to 90%)	10,100	
17	(CED) Permit Counter Related Items:		
18	a. MRB: Permit Outsourcing reduction	(50,000)	
19	b. MRB: Eliminate Fire Protection Engineer position (Vacant)	(84,168)	
20	c. Add item: Permit Counter service improvement tools		
21	i. Building Permit Audit?		
22	ii. Public Utilities engineer & documentation (General Fund neutral)		
23	iii. Documentation Funding (\$58,000 one-time)		
24	(CED) Add item: Funding for Master Plans / Small Area plan updates?		
25	(CED) New item: Reconfigure Capital Asset Management (\$46,000 savings)		
26	(HR) Transfer Civilian Review Board staff person from Admin Services (\$98,052 sal; 29,736 ben; supplies 6,900)	132,440	
27	(Public Srv) Eliminate Office Facilitator I / Technical Planner	(79,736)	
28	(Public Srv) Add item: Volunteer Coordinator		
29	(Public Srv) Flower Related Items:		
30	a. MRB: Close Jordan & Liberty Park Greenhouses (2 FTEs)	(129,943)	
31	b. MRB: Reduced watering for parks (part for flowers)	(187,122)	
32	c. MRB: Reduce Parks Maintenance (including seasonals) (part for flowers)	(141,584)	
33	d. Add item: restore funding for water costs?		
34	e. Add item: restore funding for seasonal employees?		
35	f. Add item: restore funding for Spring 2011 flowers?		
36	(Public Srv) Eliminate Streets Response Team positions (3) (offsetting transfers?)	(233,840)	
37	(Public Srv) Eliminate speed board deployment (\$20,000 to restore)	(40,000)	
38	(Public Srv) Global Artways Related Items:		
39	a. MRB: Discontinue Global Artways program positions (3) (2 Lay-offs)	(363,786)	
40	b. Add item: Global Artways - Council Considering Options:		
41	i. Provide partial year funding for transition (thru summer, fall, ??)		
42	ii. Increase budget for Arts Council Grant (MRB = \$75,000)		
43	iii. Fund a position for transition assistance, grant writing, etc. (part-time?)		
44	iv. Restore full funding & program		
45	v. Adopt Mayor's Recommended Budget		
46	(Non-Dept) New Sales Tax Rebate (Komatsu)	30,000	
47	(Non-Dept) Funding for Northwest Quadrant Follow-up	100,000	
48	(Non-Dept) Reduce funding for Sugar House Park Authority	(18,000)	
49	(Non-Dept) Add Item: Parley's Historic Nature Park Mgmt Plan implementation?		
50	(Non-Dept) Add Item: Begin shift to an automated payroll system? (\$15,000)		
51	(Non-Dept) Add Item: Begin other updates to Financial System (\$35,000)		
Total General Fund Expense Items:		186,785,704	186,785,704

➤ *The Council may wish to consider taking a straw poll on items as possible.*

Item Descriptions:

12. (#s 12-16) Salary Adjustment Items - *The Council may wish to take a straw poll if there are any changes to the salary adjustment items*, including the restoration of the 1.5% suspension or merits, etc.

New Information: Some Council Members requested additional information about the net effect of the restoration of 1.5% employee pay, in combination with the health insurance premium increase. The Administration has provided Council Staff with detailed information, summarized in the following chart. 51% of employees are enrolled in the Summit Care Family category. For employees enrolled in this program, the 100, 200, and 300 series employees (55% of total employees) will see a net decrease in pay.

Pay Class	% of employees	For Employees on Summit Care Double (21% of Employees)				For Employees on Summit Care Family (51% of Employees)			
		Annual Premium Increase (\$22 per paycheck)	Proposed Pay Restoration (1.5%) - Average per pay class	Net Annual Impact <u>with</u> Pay Restoration	Net Annual Impact <u>without</u> Pay Restoration	Annual Premium Increase (\$29.65 per paycheck)	Proposed Pay Restoration (1.5%) - Average per pay class	Net Annual Impact <u>with</u> Pay Restoration	Net Annual Impact <u>without</u> Pay Restoration
		100	27%	\$ 572	\$ 613.08	\$ 41.08	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 613.08
200	12%	\$ 572	\$ 541.63	\$ (30.37)	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 541.63	\$ (221.47)	(\$ 763)
300	15%	\$ 572	\$ 728.83	\$ 156.83	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 728.83	\$ (34.27)	(\$ 763)
600	14%	\$ 572	\$ 969.07	\$ 397.07	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 969.07	\$ 205.97	(\$ 763)
400	8%	\$ 572	\$ 834.91	\$ 262.91	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 834.91	\$ 71.81	(\$ 763)
900	3%	\$ 572	\$ 1,140.36	\$ 568.36	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 1,140.36	\$ 377.26	(\$ 763)
500	13%	\$ 572	\$ 782.50	\$ 210.50	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 782.50	\$ 19.40	(\$ 763)
800	3%	\$ 572	\$ 1,098.24	\$ 526.24	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 1,098.24	\$ 335.14	(\$ 763)
Executive	4%	\$ 572	\$ 1,345.03	\$ 773.03	(\$ 572)	\$ 763	\$ 1,345.03	\$ 581.93	(\$ 763)

17. (#s 17-23) CED Permit Counter Related Items - *The Council may wish to take a straw poll on the items related to the Permit Counter.*

- a. Mayor’s Recommended reduction to permit outsourcing funds (reduced by \$50,000)
- b. *Pending* – Fire Plans review - Due to a miscommunication between CED and the Fire Department, the Mayor’s Recommended Budget proposed cutting too many resources out of Fire Plans review. As part of the updated budget that the Administration has indicated they will submit, a proposal to restore or remedy this item will be included.
- c. In addition to the Administration’s submittal to restore some funding for the Fire Plan review function, the Council might also consider the following items:
 - i. Funding for a Building Permit Audit? (staff estimate: up to \$100,000)
 - ii. Require that Public Utilities: a) fund a position at the One Stop Counter for reviewing Utility permits, and b) document policies and practices for ease of customer understanding. (This would not have a budget impact to the General Fund.)
 - iii. One time funding for additional documentation of guidelines for customers. (staff estimate: \$58,000)

24. Master Plan / Small Area Plan updates? *The Council may wish to take a straw poll on whether there is interest in funding updates to the City’s Master Plans and Small Area Plans.*

25. Reconfigure Capital Asset Management – may recognize \$46,864 in savings.

26. Human Resources – Civilian Review Board administrator position and related duties. *The Council requested that the Administration provide a plan to ensure that this person has additional duties.*

Volunteer Coordination – There were several items for which the Council identified the need for a volunteer position. Staff has two suggestions for the Council’s consideration:

27. Restore the Office Facilitator / Technical Planner position (\$79,736) in Public Services to help the Office of the Director with projects and analysis. This could possibly allow for the employees in the Director’s front office to assist with coordination of volunteer efforts. If the Council is supportive, the budget appropriation could be contingent upon the use as described.
28. In lieu of the above suggestion, the Council may wish to add funding to the Public Services budget for a volunteer coordinator position. On May 25, the Administration indicated that this would likely be a full-time function, however the Council voiced some interest in exploring a part-time FTE.
29. (#s 29-35) Flowers / Greenhouses related items. **Please see Attachment B for restoration options & costs.* The Council may wish to take a straw poll on either restoring cuts in the Mayor’s budget, or adding other items to restore certain functions.*
36. Streets Response Team – the Mayor’s Recommended budget eliminated funding for the Streets Response Team. Those three employees would be re-assigned within the Department of Public Services. The Council discussed possibly utilizing a transfer from the City’s Insurance & Risk Management Fund and / or the Governmental Immunity Fund to restore this cut. **Please see Attachment C for restoration options & costs.**
The Council also requested more information about the amount of support this Team provides to the Department of Public Utilities. **New Information** – the amount of assistance provided to Public Utilities is minimal, and would probably need additional documentation to estimate an accurate amount. However, there is a possibility that certain parts of the Team’s function could be billed to other Enterprise Funds.
 - As was mentioned in the “Revenue Section” above, if the budget for the Streets Response Team is restored, *the Council may wish to consider a Legislative Intent Statement requesting that the Administration conduct a time study on the tasks and time by Department and Enterprise Fund.* Some services may relate to Golf Courses, Refuse Fund, etc.
37. Speed Board Deployment – the Council indicated some interest in restoring \$20,000 in funding to support the deployment of Speed Boards. *The Council may wish to straw poll this item.*
38. (#s 38-45) Global Artways related items: Staff is continuing to finalize options and costs for this item. **More information will be provided for the June 1 briefing.**

(These items were not discussed on May 25. The Council may wish to take a straw poll to determine support for any changes.)

46. New Sales Tax Rebate proposal (\$30,000) - Since this tool had not previously been vetted with the Council, the Council may wish to ask the Administration to identify funds in the existing on-going budget to address the request (budget cut option).
 - *In addition, the Council may also wish to consider a legislative intent requesting the Administration come back to the Council with a defined proposal for this economic development tool. The Council may wish to request that the Administration identify criteria to define businesses are eligible (to avoid jurisdiction shopping), any potential cap of a specific offer, and the definition of the offer as an upfront or ongoing payment.*

47. Funding for Northwest Quadrant follow-up (\$100,000) The Administration has not yet identified a specific scope for the funding, and as such, is not able to break out into more detail which component of the project will be addressed with which funds.
- *The Council may wish to consider a legislative intent asking the Administration to review the scope with the full Council prior to issuing any RFPs associated with the funding. (A stronger tool would be for the Council to make this a conditional appropriation.)*
 - *The Council may also wish to take a straw poll on the amount of the appropriation.*
48. Sugar House Park Authority - the Mayor's recommended budget reduces the funding to the Sugar House Park Authority by \$18,000. Some Council Members have indicated an interest in restoring this funding, possibly with a condition that the Park Authority match it with fundraising efforts or sponsorships during park events. *The Council may wish to consider a legislative intent or conditional appropriation to this effect.*

Other items raised:

49. Consider adding funding to implement recommendations from the Parley's Historic Nature Park Management Plan
50. Consider adding funding to begin shifting toward an automated payroll system (staff estimate: \$15,000)
51. Consider adding funding for other updates to the City's Financial System (staff estimate: \$35,000)

OTHER FUNDS Unresolved Items:

52. *Refuse Fund* – Several questions have been raised from Council Members and constituents, regarding the rate structure (one combined rate) and the mandatory yard waste program. The Council may wish to provide further direction to staff and the Administration regarding support for the Refuse Fund budget as proposed, or requests for changes, if any. The primary questions are:
- a. Is the Council supportive of the Administration's proposal to implement accelerated diversion, including full rollout of yard waste program.
 - b. How to structure the rate for the services. Some items the Council may wish to consider:
 - i. A combined rate is consistent with the message that the City is providing a package of waste management services, rather than a "pay per" system.
 - ii. Diverting waste from the landfill benefits all residents (even if they don't personally use each service), because of delaying the closure of the landfill. (All residents will share the cost of closing and relocating the landfill.)
 - iii. The current rates are a step toward full cost recovery. The current rates are subsidized by the Fund's cash reserves, which artificially keeps rates low.
 - iv. The start-up and capital costs to expanding services has been funded by the Fund's cash reserves, which means that their Fund Balance is less than 30% of ongoing operating expenses. The standard for other enterprise funds has been to maintain a cash balance equal to operating expenses for 3-months.
53. *Watershed Land and Water Rights acquisition fund* – (Public Utilities) The Council had discussed the possibility of not appropriating the full \$1 million in the Department's annual budget, but possibly processing requests through the periodic budget amendment process.
- *The Council may wish to discuss this further and provide staff with additional direction.*

Follow-up Information including Pending Items:

54. *Charging for Parking to encourage transit* – (Non-Departmental) Some Council Members expressed an interest in charging employees for parking at City facilities (currently parking is free). The Administration had done some preliminary analysis, identified City facilities and number of employees based on UTA service level, and conducted an employee survey to estimate current transit ridership. Council Staff has not had sufficient time to completely review and verify this analysis, but preliminary numbers and analysis indicate the following:
- Approximately 900 employees work at City facilities located in UTA service Level A (defined by UTA as - at least 65 transit vehicle trips within ¼ mile walking distance of business location during the morning weekday peak period). *These facilities are the Library/City& County Building, Plaza 349, Justice Court, 6th South Facilities, and Public Safety Building Civilians (sworn officers and Fire were not included due to issues with the existing MOU and the SLCPD take-home vehicle program).*
 - Approximately 1066 employees work at City facilities located in UTA service Level D (defined by UTA as - at least one, but less than 25, transit vehicle trips passing within one-quarter (1/4) mile walking distance of Sponsor's Business Location during the morning weekday peak period). No employees work in Service level B, and 20 work in Service level C.
 - Note: City employees who work at locations in UTA Service Level A may not live in locations that are also service level A. Further analysis would need to be done to match employee residences with work locations.*
 - Based on a voluntary city survey conducted by the City's Sustainability Division, approximately 25% of employees working at locations in UTA Service Level A do not drive a vehicle to work (survey did not include Library Employees).
 - Based on this information, if the City were to charge the remaining 75% (employees who did drive a vehicle to work) of employees working in Service level A \$5 per paycheck (\$130 per year; \$10.83 per month), as well as charge the approximate 150 Library employees for parking, the City could generate approximately \$100,000 in revenue. The Council may wish to consider the implications of charging employees for parking when transit is not readily available (especially at locations where employees work during off-peak hours).
 - The total cost of the Eco-pass program is approximately \$355,000.

The Council may wish to consider a legislative intent asking the Administration to further investigate this issue on the policy basis that charging for parking would encourage employees to use the transit pass. The Administration could consider employee equity issues (equity among locations), employee residential locations, as well as how to charge employees who may use transit and only on occasion drive a vehicle.

55. *Gang Prevention Program* – (Non-Departmental) Based on the Council's request during the May18 Non-Departmental briefing, the Administration has provided the following information about the implementation of the Gang Prevention program and how the funding has been used:

From Michael Stott:

Colors of Success was the sole offerer in the RFP process but was found qualified by the selection committee. The contract start date was 2/2/2010 but the services did not begin until the end of February when the Outreach Workers were hired. The budget allocation of \$70k annually provided for 1.5 FTE's. Ideally, the amount would cover at least 2 FTE's.

The Outreach Workers are filling their case loads and are currently providing gang intervention services to 7 program participants and they are reaching out to an additional 18 program candidates. I see them twice per month at the regular Gang Intervention Team meetings. In

addition to their core intervention work, they are conducting door-to-door interviews of residents to gauge perceptions of the gang problem in various neighborhoods. They are also reaching out to various groups such as schools, community councils, and various youth-serving organizations. In my opinion, these two individuals are qualified and highly motivated for this type of work.

Some of the funding that would not be used this year for Outreach Work has been applied to gang outreach tools including parents' guide flyers, laptops for the Outreach workers, and a local gang conference. Despite those expenditures, which were handled through the Mayor's Office, roughly half of the \$70k funding for FY10 will be unused since the Outreach Work did not begin until month 8 of the fiscal year.

The Outreach Work is the foundation of our Gang Reduction Program. Without them, the program will likely fail.

56. *Costs for services provided to Business Districts* – (Public Services & CED) Several questions have been raised to understand the true cost of the services provided by the City within the Central Business District and Sugar House Business District. Per information previously provided by the Administration, services include: snow removal, sidewalk and planter repairs, graffiti removal, clean-up, trash removal, electrical, and sprinkler repairs. The Administration is providing a more detailed accounting of the costs associated with each of these services.

Remaining Budget Schedule:

JUNE 1 Council Meeting

AGENDA ITEMS:

- IMS (SR)
- Justice Court (SR)
- Unresolved Issues (all)
- Legislative Intentions / Interim Study Report (LW)
- CIP (JB)
- *(Budget Amendment No. 4 –Public Hearing)*

JUNE 8 Council Meeting

AGENDA ITEMS:

- Unresolved Issues (all)
- Property tax numbers MAY be final by this point (June 8th is date required by state)
- Briefing on Tax Anticipation Notes
- CIP Follow-up (JB)
- Adopt Annual budget if possible
- *(Budget Amendment No. 4 –Action Item)*

JUNE 15 Council Meeting

AGENDA ITEMS:

- Action on Tax Anticipation Notes
- Adopt Annual budget if not possible to adopt on June 8

JUNE 22 Council Meeting (not a regularly-scheduled meeting)

AGENDA ITEMS:

- Last day possible to adopt budget

Additional Information
Current Fine Structure & Options for Council's Consideration

Brief summary:

- Under current ordinance, the City charges \$75 for failure to remove snow and ice from sidewalks. The fine is reduced to \$25 if paid within 10 days. If paid between 10-24 days, the fee is \$50. (No differentiation between residential and commercial properties.)
- Between 12/15/09 and 1/22/10, the Justice Court processed 234 'failure to remove snow/ice from sidewalks' citations and collected \$4,565. Another \$3,928 remains outstanding.
- Currently, Parking Enforcement personnel enforce the snow removal ordinance. Parking Enforcement has suggested the following fee structure options:
 1. Residential citations: \$40. Fee could increase to \$80 if not paid within 15 days and increase to \$120 if not paid within 25 days with a maximum of \$120.
 2. Business citations with sidewalk frontage of less than X linear feet could be \$80. Fee could increase to \$120 if not paid within 15 days and increase to \$160 if not paid within 25 days.
 3. Businesses citations with frontage of more than X linear feet could be \$120. Fee could increase to \$160 if not paid within 15 days and then increase to \$200 if not paid within 25 days with a maximum of \$200.
- The following option was presented to the Council's Transportation & Mobility Subcommittee in 2009.
 1. Residential citations: \$25 per day for each day snow/ice is not removed within 48 hours; increases to \$50 if not removed within 72 hours, and increases to \$75 if not removed within 120 hours.
 2. Commercial citations: \$75 per day for each day snow/ice is not removed within 48 hours; increases to \$150 if not removed within 72 hours, and increases to \$300 if not removed within 120 hours.

General Info:

Under the current ordinance, the "base fee" for failing to remove snow and ice from sidewalks is \$75. However, if one pays the civil fine within 15 days, the fee falls to \$25. If one pays the civil fine after 10 days but before 25 days, the fee is \$50. After 25 days, the fee rises to the original \$75 base fee. There is no differentiation between residential and commercial properties. Owners of both kinds of properties can be fined every day sidewalks remain uncleared.

According to the Salt Lake City Justice Court, the court administration processed 234 citations for failure to clear sidewalks of snow and ice from sidewalks between December 15, 2009, and January 22, 2010. Of those, 17 citations were listed as void. Of the remaining 217 citations, 138 (64 percent) were issued at residential properties; 45 (21 percent) were issued at business properties; and 34 (15 percent) were issued either to trusts or at places that could not be defined by citation as either a residential or business property.

The City collected \$4,565 from the citations. Another \$3,928 remains outstanding from 33 citations (15 percent of citations issued). Of the 174 citations paid, 122 of them (70 percent) paid \$25, meaning the citations were paid within 15 days. Another 28 citations (16 percent of 174) were for amounts less than \$25, probably reflecting the latitude of hearing officers to take into account the age and physical ability of people who might receive civil citations for failing to clear sidewalks of snow. The remaining 24 citations (14 percent) paid amounts of more than \$25, including one for \$93.

Previous information indicates that between June 30, 2008, and July 1, 2009, the City issued 518 citations for failing to remove snow and ice from sidewalks. It should be noted that during that winter season the City also issued about 1,000 warnings, according to previous information. The previous information did not differentiate between residential and commercial property.

After the City Council discussed snow removal citations in January 2010 the idea more or less had evolved to this: Three classes of civil citations for residences, for businesses with less than "X" linear feet of sidewalk, and for businesses with more than "X" linear feet of sidewalk.

At the time, the division in charge of enforcing the snow removal ordinance also enforced parking violations. To allow parking enforcement officers to use the same hand-held computerized equipment used to issue parking citations, the head of Parking Enforcement suggested that:

- Residential citations could start at \$40, increase by \$40 if not paid within 15 days, and increase by \$40 again if not paid within 25 days. That would mean the owner of a residence would pay a maximum of \$120 if the citation failed to be paid within 25 days.
- Citations for businesses with sidewalk frontage of less than "X" linear feet could start at \$80 and increase by \$40 if not paid within 15 days and by another \$40 if not paid within 25 days. The maximum would be \$160 if not paid within 25 days.
- Citations for businesses with sidewalk frontage of more than "X" linear feet could start at \$120 and increase by \$40 if not paid within 15 days and by another \$40 if not paid within 25 days. The maximum would be \$200 if not paid within 25 days.

Again, the suggestion was based on using the same hand-held equipment used by parking enforcement officers because the equipment is programmed to give a "base fee" and two alternate fees for paying within certain dates.

Under the Mayor's Recommended Budget, the new Civil Enforcement Division would enforce snow removal and probably use different equipment to issue citations. Enforcement would not necessarily have to use the \$40 progression suggested by Parking Enforcement.

Two other outstanding issues included whether to class residential buildings larger than a duplex as a business or a residence and how should any new or amended ordinance address repeat offenses.

Another proposal broached to the City Council Transportation and Mobility Subcommittee in mid-2009 was to create an escalating series of fines based on how long a property owner did not clear snow from sidewalks. An ordinance was drafted by a lawyer under contract to the City Council. The draft ordinance contained the following fine structure.

1. For residential property:
 - a. Twenty-five dollars (\$25) for each day hail, snow, or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within forty-eight (48) hours;
 - b. Fifty dollars (\$50) for each day snow or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within seventy-two (72) hours; and
 - c. Seventy-five dollars (\$75) for each day snow or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within one hundred twenty (120) hours.
2. For commercial property:
 - a. Seventy-five dollars (\$75) for each day snow or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within forty-eight (48) hours;
 - b. One hundred fifty dollars (\$150) for each day snow or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within seventy-two (72) hours; and
 - c. Three hundred dollars (\$300) for each day snow or sleet is not removed from sidewalks within one hundred twenty (120) hours.

None of the proposals considered by the Transportation & Mobility Subcommittee appeared to include provisions for the City to clear snow from uncleared sidewalks and then bill an owner for the City's cost to remove snow. Current Salt Lake City ordinances also do not appear to contain provisions for a City response to an uncleared sidewalk. The practice is common among many U.S. cities.

Finally, here are how three cities charge people for not clearing sidewalks:

- Boston, Massachusetts – Charges a \$50 per violation fine to owners of property where land is zoned exclusively for residential use and where the property has six or fewer residential units. For property in exclusively residential zones where the property has more than six residential units or where property is vacant land the fine is \$100 per violation. For commercial or mixed use zones and buildings, the fine is \$150 for each violation.
- Albany, New York – Charges a minimum \$50 fee to the owner or occupant of property abutting an uncleared sidewalk plus a maximum \$100 fine.
- Missoula, Montana – Charges owners or occupants of property abutting uncleared sidewalks a minimum \$25-per-half-hour to clear the sidewalk plus a \$35 administrative fee plus a fine of not less than \$25 or more than \$50.

Salt Lake City Flowers\Greenhouses - FY 2011 Annual Budget Schedule of Options			
Description	Option A	Option B	Option C
	Mayor's Recommended Budget - Plant Flowers by June 30th, minimal watering, maintenance, greenhouse closures, no flowers planted in Spring of 2011.	Mayor's Recommended Budget - Plant Flowers by June 30th and provide funding to care and keep flowers during FY 2011 budget season. (Flowers purchased from outside supplier for FY 2011.) This option assumes -no volunteer program.	Keep program as currently developed. ● Renovation needed at Jordan Greenhouse.
Uses:			
Salaries, Wages, and Benefits - Non-seasonal	\$ 135,524	\$ 135,524	\$ 225,108
Salaries, Wages, and Benefits - Seasonal	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 107,432
Materials	\$ -		\$ 21,336
Charges and services	\$ 564	\$ 564	\$ 564
Utilities Expense	\$ 23,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 42,023
Other - Renovation of Jordan Greenhouse			TBD
Subtotal - Before FY 2011 Flower Purchase	\$ 159,088	\$ 259,088	\$ 396,463
Flowers (Purchased from outside supplier.)		\$ 88,000	
Total - Including Flower Purchase	\$ 159,088	\$ 347,088	\$ 396,463

Volunteer Coordinator Position	\$ 55,204
--------------------------------	-----------

Summary of Options:

- It would take an additional \$100,000 of seasonal help to maintain the flowers/beds through FY 2011.
 - Seasonal Help – 4 Months (July, August, September, and October) - \$57,000
 - Seasonal Help – 3 Months (April, May, June) - \$43,000
- The annual budget for the flower program is:
 - Option B - \$347,088 – if flowers (approximately 92,000 plants/flowers for \$88,000) are purchased from an outside supplier.
 - Option C - \$396,463 – if flowers are produced/grown by Salt Lake City. (Renovation costs are not included in the analysis.)
 - A volunteer coordinator position is estimated to cost \$55,204. (This cost is not included in the analysis.)
- The remaining budget after the MRB reduction is \$159,088. Depending on the option, either \$188,000 (Option B) or \$237,375 (Option C) would have to be restored to the FY 2011 budget.

Salt Lake City Response Team - FY 2011 Annual Budget Schedule of Options			
	Option A	Option B	Option C
Description	Mayor's Recommended Budget - Eliminate Response Team - Calls go to Police Dispatch and/or Assigned Supervisor	Keep Response Team, but fund for critical hours only. Provide one-time funding from Insurance and Risk Fund. Additionally, reduce equipment and vehicle costs.	Keep program as currently developed. In addition, provide one-time funding from Insurance and Risk Fund. Additionally, reduce equipment and vehicle costs.
Schedule	Police Dispatch - Outside of Department Business Hours	Weekdays - 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. Saturday - 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Sunday - 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Police Dispatch - Non-covered hours	Weekdays - 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. Saturday - 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Sunday - 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Nighttime (Winter) - 1:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m. (Winter Hours - 24 Hour Coverage) (Two employees from 8 AM until 4 PM - each doing different tasks.)
Total Hours		80 Hours	120 Hours
Sources:			
Transfer from Enterprise Funds - Services Provided	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Transfer from Insurance and Risk Fund	\$ -	\$ 157,596	\$ 222,026
Uses:			
Salaries, Wages, and Benefits	\$ -	\$ 125,397	\$ 187,717
Overtime Compensation		\$ 15,840	\$ 14,969
Equipment - Fleet Maintenance and Fuel	\$ -	\$ 7,637	\$ 11,456
Materials and Supplies	\$ -	\$ 6,724	\$ 10,087
Charges and Services	\$ -	\$ 1,998	\$ 2,797
Total	\$ -	\$ 157,596	\$ 227,026
Staffing:			
Full time	0.00	2.00	3.00
Seasonals	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	2.00	3.00

Summary of Options:

- Option A – Per the Mayor’s Recommended Budget, eliminate the Streets Response Team. All afterhours calls, including nights, weekends, and holidays, would be taken by Police Dispatch. Fiscal year 2011 budget savings would be \$233,840.
- Option B – Fund the Streets Response Team with two full time positions (instead of 3), and provide nighttime and weekend coverage until 1:00 a.m. Calls outside of this timeframe would be handled by Police Dispatch. The required budget for this option would be \$157,596. The \$76,244 savings from the full restoration option comes from a reduction of 1 full time position and additional reductions in personal services, equipment and supply budgets of roughly \$26,000.
- Option C – Restores the full Streets Response Team at three full time positions and includes some reductions in the equipment and supply budgets of approximately \$7,000. The FY 2011 expenditure budget is \$227,026.
- Option B or C - The Insurance and Risk Fund could provide all or a portion of one-time funding.

Note for Option B or C – The Council may wish to consider a legislative intent asking the team to conduct a time study over the course of a year so that the City could recoup costs from services provided to Enterprise Funds by billing those funds.