

MINUTES

Tuesday, July 3, 2012

4:50 PM

Fiscal Committee Carnegie Town Hall

235 West 10th Street

Members Present: Council Member Sue Aguilar, Council Member Jim Entenman, Council Member Greg Jamison and Council Member Dean Karsky

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Tamara Jorgensen, CMC, Assistant City Clerk; Jim David, Legislative/Operations Manager; David Bixler, Budget Analyst; Rich Oksol, Lead Internal Auditor

Guests: Cheryl Rath, Bob O'Connell, Michelle Erpenbach, Sue Quanbeck Etten, Gail Eiesland

1. Call To Order

Councilor Karsky called the meeting to order at 4:50 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

A Tuesday, June 5, 2012

A motion was made by Sue Aguilar and seconded by Greg Jamison to approve the minutes dated Tuesday, June 5, 2012.

Karsky called for a voice vote on that motion and all members voted yes. Motion Passed.

3. Reports and Updates

Developing City-Wide Fees Including Park Department Fees by Rich Oksol, Lead Internal Auditor; Additional Reports by David Pfeifle, City Attorney A (Recodification of All Fees Into One Chapter); Sue Quanbeck Etten, Central Services Director (Placing Comprehensive Fee Schedule on the City's Website); and Jim David, Legislative/Operations Manager (Departmental Survey and City-Wide Policy on Fees)

Oksol reviewed the following three recommendations for the City Wide Fees:

1) Have a city wide policy; 2) Consolidate all the fees in ordinance under one chapter; 3) Provide the information on the city's website.

Karsky asked the City Attorney's Office for an update on the recodification process. Gail Eiesland, Deputy City Attorney, stated that the publisher will be placing all of the fees under one chapter. In addition, the IT Department is going to prepare a website with links to places in the ordinances where the fees are established. Karsky asked Sue Quanbeck Etten, Director of Central Services, if we will be able to set up a webpage that will accommodate the citizens. Quanbeck Etten stated there will be a page set up with links in the codified law. Discussion followed regarding the timeline.

Karsky asked Jim David, Legislative/Operations Manager, if he had any additional comments regarding the city wide fees. David stated he had distributed a survey to city directors which requested their feedback. He received a joint response from the directors stating as follows: They agree on developing a guideline for the frequency of review of their fee amounts and establishing the goals for the level of cost recovery associated with various fees. The directors thought we should start with a few fees first to see how this would work rather than doing all of them at one time. The directors stated they would like to be engaged during this entire process.

Entenman requested clarification on the process. David responded that Oksol's report talked about classifying the fees into five separate categories. The categories would then be reviewed for increases per a predetermined schedule.

B Discussion on Creation of the Capital Program Review Committee

Karsky stated that there was a separate meeting before the Informational Meeting today regarding the Capital Program Review Committee. It was attended by himself, Greg Jamison, Tracy Turbak, Director of Finance; Chad Huwe, City Engineer for Public Works; Dean Borchardt, Business Operations Manager for Public Works; David Bixler, Budget Analyst; and Jim David, Legislative/Operations Manager. The purpose of the meeting was to review the direction of this committee, whether or not it is necessary, and what information needs to be reviewed, etc.

Jamison gave background information on this committee stating the initial goal was to determine a process for handling surplus funds. City Council consensus was that there was a need for a Capital Program Review Committee to review how the CIP information is presented to the City Council.

Discussion was held regarding reviewing Executive Orders and Ordinances and 'cleaning up' the language.

Jamison would like to continue with discussions regarding the following two issues:

- 1) When would this committee review the budget? Discussion was held regarding the current process. With the proposed changes, this committee would be involved with the budget process prior to printing and final preparation. Does the committee want to review the budget after it has been 'finalized' and then the information is reviewed and amended?
- 2) If there are surplus funds, should this review committee determine the next items that should be funded? This was the initial goal for this committee. These recommendations would come before the City Council for review and/or possible revisions.

Entenman asked who was going to be on this committee. Jamison stated that right now a director from each of the following departments would attend: Planning and Building Services, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, and the Finance Department. Other members would include a representative from the following: the Infrastructure Review Advisory Board (IRAB); the Planning Commission; the Parks and Recreation Board; and a citizen from the Sioux Falls Development Foundation or the area Chamber of Commerce.

Entenman stated that he did not understand why we needed a separate

committee. Discussion was held regarding the current process and the input received from the directors prior to the budget being finalized. He stated that it was appropriate for the City Council members to ask questions of the Directors during the budget review process, as it is set up now.

Karsky stated that the group spent a lot of time today reviewing the budget process specifically on how it comes to the Council, who it goes through, and the number of people who review the information. Karsky stated that they do not want to 'legislate by committee' and that this would not be the purpose of this group. Karsky stated that they would just like to ensure that the budgets are thoroughly reviewed prior to coming before the City Council.

Jamison stated they are not removing any authority from the City Council. They are looking for a group of people who come from cross sections of the community, etc. who are visionaries for the community to review these plans. He would like to see more people who are affected by the budget have an opportunity for review and input.

Aguilar stated the timeline is in the current ordinances for review. Eiesland discussed the definitions and differences between ordinances and Executive Orders. Discussion was held regarding initial references to this committee.

Entenman asked how the process would continue if the review committee disagrees with the proposed budget. Discussion was held regarding the current procedures. Aguilar stated that she viewed this committee the same as the Planning Commission, that they may not agree with their recommendations but their input does assist in the process. As budgeting is the main responsibility of the Council, there may be disagreements on the reports, but the Council could use the information in reviewing the budget. She stated this is another way for the City Council to enhance the job that they are doing.

Jamison asked if they see fundamental value in receiving input from other people. They have the opportunity to ask outside groups how they feel about the budget. Karsky stated that the budget is somewhat of a political process. He felt input was important and a lot of progress was made today.

Determine a Process/Procedure for Reassigning Excess Funds to Benefit C Citizens (Rebate Checks, No Property Tax Increases, a Sales Tax Holiday, etc.) by Council Member Kermit L. Staggers

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

4. Open Discussion

Due to the budget hearings scheduled for Tuesday, August 7, 2012, the Fiscal Committee Meeting is cancelled.

Karsky spoke about the July 10, 2012, City Council Meeting stating there would be three Resolutions to consider regarding the pension plan changes. He asked if the committee members had any questions or if they had any input. There was none.

5. Adjournment

Councilor Karsky adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Tamara Jorgensen, CMC

Assistant City Clerk