

Current Direction for Prioritizing the FY 2016-17 Budget

- No specific priorities
- No minimum service levels
- No service cuts
- No layoffs
- No Increase in Taxes
- No transfer of \$'s from the Water Fund

Approach to Prioritizing the Upcoming Budget

Develop the recommended FY 2016-17 on the basis of the priorities the Council established in their strategic planning session of April 2014 and updated/reaffirmed in last month's resolution setting out the policies and principles for managing the city's finances. See cross comparison table below. As the scope for these priorities statements and principles are broad, they should be defined in terms of operational performance metrics and/or service levels that allow for a comparison with other cities:

Suggested Comparable Cities

- Bloomington, MN (home to mall of America)
- Alameda, CA
- Palm Springs, CA
- Sarasota, FL
- Asheville, NC
- Las Cruces
- Flagstaff
- Lubbock
- Omaha
- Carson City
- Colorado Springs
- Boise
- Topeka
- Des Moines

Where service level levels exceed the average of an approved list of comparable cities, resources will be directed to where service levels are below the average.

Programs not identified as priorities will be considered first priority for budget cuts.

NOVEMBER 11, 2015 RESOLUTION TO HELP GUIDE THE MANAGEMENT OF THE CITY'S FINANCES						
APRIL 2014 STRATEGIC PRIORITIES	<i>Example Operational Indicator(s)</i>	<u>Equity</u>	<u>Fully Participatory</u>	<u>Economic Growth:</u>	<u>Sustainable</u>	<u>Stable</u>
	Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Violent crime rate</i> • <i>Property Crime rate</i> 				
Fire/EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Property loss rate</i> • <i>Survivability rate</i> 					X
Water	•			X	X	X
Wastewater	•			X	X	X
Solid Waste	•			X	X	X
Housing	•			X	X	X
Job Creation	•			X		
Infrastructure	•			X	X	X
Staff Training	•					
Performance Mgt.	• <i>% services w metrics</i>			X	X	X