Alexandria City Council
Retreat
November 5, 2016
Agenda

8:00  Welcome & Opening Remarks
8:10  Budget Forecast
9:10  Budget Topics
12:00 Working Lunch
Agenda

12:10  BFAAC Report
12:30  Council Guidance
1:30  Adjourn
Consumer Sentiment
Nov 2015 = 91.3

University of Michigan Consumer Sentiment

http://www.calculatedriskblog.com/
Consumer Sentiment
Oct 2016 Prelim = 87.9

University of Michigan Consumer Sentiment

http://www.calculatedriskblog.com/
GDP Growth in 2015
(National Average = 2.5%)
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Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL
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Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA
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Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH
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St. Louis, MO-IL
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
Cleveland-Elyria, OH
Unemployment Rates
Past 12 Months

Source: Virginia Employment Commission, Economic Information & Analytics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics.
Office Vacancy Rates by Submarket

- **West End**: Vacancy Rate 31.9%
- **Old Town North**: Vacancy Rate 11.5%
- **Old Town**: Vacancy Rate 10.4%
- **Carlyle**: Vacancy Rate 10.2%
- **Eisenhower West**: Vacancy Rate 79.6%
Vacant Class A Office Buildings

Victory Center I
5001 Eisenhower Ave.

97.3%-100% Vacant
1.4M SF Available

Carlyle Tower
2461 Eisenhower Ave.

4825 Mark Center Dr.

The Ford Building
4501 Ford Avenue
Vacant Class B Office Buildings

90.7%-100% Vacant
110K SF Available
Real Estate Tax Base
CY 2009-2017 (Estimated)

CY 2017 distribution if Multi-family considered Residential: 74.8% Residential/25.2% Commercial
Five Year Financial Planning Model

FY 2017 Approved Budget

- FY17: $0.0
- FY18: $(18.9)
- FY19: $(28.3)
- FY20: $(28.7)
- FY21: $(35.2)

Baseline Shortfall vs. ACPS Approved FY 2017-2026 CIP
Revenue Growth Estimate

- Real Estate Tax: $7.2 M (1.8%)
- Personal Property Tax: $1.2 M (2.6%)
- Sales Tax: $1.1 M (3.9%)
- Other Sources: $0.4 M (0.2%)
- Total: $9.9 M (1.5%)
City Expenditure Current Service Estimates\(^1\)

- Personnel \(+$7.9\) M (3.5%)
- Non-personnel \(+$2.9\) M (2.2%)
- Transit Services \(+$7.2\) M (36.2%)
- City Debt Service \(+$7.0\) M (17.2%)
- Cash Capital \(+$0.7\) M (2.9%)
- Total \(+$25.8\) M (5.8%)

\(^1\) Does not include ACPS
City Funding Gap

- Revenue Estimate +$9.9 M
- Expenditure Estimate +$25.8 M
- Potential Shortfall +$15.9 M
- Real Estate Tax Rate Equivalent = approx: +4.1 Cents

¹ Does not include ACPS
Capital Improvement Program

**Budget Pressures on CIP:**
- State of Good Repair
  - Public Buildings
  - IT Infrastructure
- ACPS Capacity/Modernization
- WMATA Capital Contributions
- Sanitary & Stormwater Sewers
- Street Reconstruction & Resurfacing
  - Unavailability of State Revenue Sharing in FY 2018
Five Year Financial Planning Model

Estimated City Shortfall

FY 2018 Preliminary Update

- $(15.9)
- $(20.3)
- $(24.7)
- $(30.2)
- $(37.4)
Cost to Fully Fund ACPS Enrollment Growth & Facility Expansion
(as of June 2016)

Estimated Future Real Estate Tax Rate Equivalent to Fund ACPS Enrollment Growth and Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Students Projected (Cumulative)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>2,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment &amp; Expansion Costs (in Millions of $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Change</td>
<td>$ 5.7</td>
<td>$ 10.5</td>
<td>$ 15.5</td>
<td>$ 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Costs for Expanded Capacity</td>
<td>$ 3.3</td>
<td>$ 3.5</td>
<td>$ 5.1</td>
<td>$ 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Costs for Expanded Capacity</td>
<td>$ 7.7</td>
<td>$ 13.0</td>
<td>$ 15.5</td>
<td>$ 16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Costs Above FY 2017</td>
<td>$ 6.7</td>
<td>$ 9.6</td>
<td>$ 11.8</td>
<td>$ 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Increase Above FY 2017</td>
<td>$ 23.3</td>
<td>$ 36.6</td>
<td>$ 47.9</td>
<td>$ 53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax Rate Increase Equivalent (In Cents)</td>
<td>+6¢</td>
<td>+10¢</td>
<td>+13¢</td>
<td>+15¢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Year Financial Planning Model

FY 2018 Preliminary Update

- $ (15.9)
- (20.3)
- (24.7)
- (30.2)
- (37.4)

FY17 FY18 FY19 FY20 FY21 FY22

City Shortfall Shortfall with ACPS Added
### ACPS Enrollment Projections

#### FY 2017 Approved Budget Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>14,224</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>15,298</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>16,417</td>
<td>16,943</td>
<td>17,515</td>
<td>17,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual % Change</strong></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### October 2016 Preliminary Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>14,224</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>15,104</td>
<td>15,523</td>
<td>15,897</td>
<td>16,231</td>
<td>16,561</td>
<td>16,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual % Change</strong></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cumulative Decrease in Enrollment Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>194</th>
<th>377</th>
<th>520</th>
<th>712</th>
<th>954</th>
<th>1,063</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Capital Improvement Program

ACPS CIP Comparison
Cumulative Funding (FY 2018 - FY 2027)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019 – FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023 – FY 2027</th>
<th>Total 10Yr CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Board Approved FY 2017 - FY 2026 CIP</td>
<td>51,107,183</td>
<td>134,499,009</td>
<td>61,376,875</td>
<td>291,176,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Funding in City Approved FY 2017 - FY 2026 CIP</td>
<td>32,500,000</td>
<td>84,675,000</td>
<td>112,620,000</td>
<td>273,988,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA (ACPS Proposed CIP minus City Approved School Funding)</td>
<td>(2,728,759)</td>
<td>192,640,579</td>
<td>96,032,835</td>
<td>241,751,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90% Exercise
Instructions to Departments

• High level exercise = $60 M reduction

• What if only 90% of current resources were available to City departments in 3 years?

• Based on FY 2017 Five Year Financial Planning model projection for FY 2020

• What service/policy changes would to be needed?

• Shrinking from current services toward basic services
Potential Options for Future Reductions to Address Gap

- The following are examples of City policy/service changes that could be considered over multiple years

- They are not FY 2018 budget proposals

- In enacted, attrition, not RIFs, would be the goal
Potential Options for Future Reductions to Address Gap

Safe, Secure & Just Community

• Reduce prosecution of misdemeanors
• Reduce court services for at-risk youth
• Increase Fire and emergency medical response times by eliminating 2 Fire engines, 1 truck, and 1 medic unit (including staffing)
• Eliminate Community Oriented Police officers
• Eliminate Inmate Work Detail
• Reduce Courthouse & Jail Security
• Increase emergency communications call processing times
• Eliminate ADA program management
Potential Options for Future Reductions to Address Gap

**Healthy & Thriving Residents**

- Reduce recreation center hours
- Further increase registration fees for recreation center programs
- Reduce locally funded health programs
- Reduce investment to Alexandria Fund for Human Services
- Reduce aging in place services
- Reduce prevention services for children and youth
- Reduce place-based substance use disorder treatment
- Reduce partner services
- Reduce library custodial services
Potential Options for Future Reductions to Address Gap

Livable, Green & Prospering City

- Reduce DASH and Trolley service and/or increase fares
- Reduce economic development marketing, advertising and public relations
- Reduce hours at City museums
- Further reduce park and right-of-way maintenance
- Reduce complete streets planning and management
- Reduce parking planning and management
- Reduce street resurfacing and sidewalk maintenance
Potential Options for Future Reductions to Address Gap

Accountable, Effective & Well-Managed Government

- Reduce resident/business customer service positions
- Reduce City fleet size and extend replacement cycles
- Defer Chinquapin 50 meter pool project
- Reduce maintenance and operating by closing some City facilities
- Eliminate employee wellness program
- Reduce training and professional development
- Reduce IT service up-time for other departments by scaling back infrastructure
FY 2018 Budget Topics
ACPS Proposed FY 2018 – FY 2027 CIP

• Presentation by the ACPS Superintendent
WMATA Funding in FY18

November 5, 2016
FY 2018 WMATA General Manager’s Budget Highlights

• Operating Budget Overview
  • Budget gap is $290M
  • ‘Reality check’ budget proposal

• Capital Budget Overview
  • Proposal will be between $1.2B and $1.45B
  • Proposed Capital budget to be presented in December 2016 by the General Manager
FY 2018 Operating Budget

• WMATA Proposals to address $290M gap
  • Fare increase for rail, bus, and MetroAccess
  • Elimination of 500 positions
  • Internal management actions
  • ‘Right size’ rail and bus service
  • Increase jurisdictional contributions by $130.5 M (15%)
## Proposed Rail Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Rush Hour</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Early Evening</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YL</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alexandria Impact

• Fare Increase for Residents/Visitors

• Metrorail
  • Decreased Yellow Line service
  • Increased Blue Line service
  • Elimination of Yellow Rush Plus

• Metrobus
  • No impact to Alexandria routes

• Alexandria Subsidy Increase
  • Proposed increase of $6.5M (+20%) from $33M to $39.5M
FY17 WMATA City Funding – Operating

- NVTC: $800,000
- NVTA 30%: $5,500,000
- General Fund: $2,700,000
- TIP: $24,000,000

Total: $33M
FY17 WMATA City Funding - Capital

- Prior Year GO Bonds: $1,750,000
- NVTC Funds: $1,100,000
- WMATA Project Closeout: $650,000
- TIP Cash: $1,000,000
- NVTA 30%: $4,000,000

Total: $8.5M
Proposed Stormwater Management Fee: Recommended Framework and Public Feedback

City Council Budget Retreat
November 5, 2016
Why Are We Here?

Respond to state and federal mandates in equitable, fiscally responsible manner.

• Discuss the proposed Stormwater Utility framework
  • Alternative funding to meet increasing cost of stormwater mandates

• Provide feedback on outreach efforts

Not a question of if we’re funding the mandates, but what is the best way to fund the mandates.
What is Stormwater Runoff?

Only Rain Down the Storm Drain!

Runoff from hard surfaces like roofs, driveways, and streets picks up pollutants like:
- Pet waste
- Litter
- Fertilizer
- Motor oils
- Chemicals

Polluted stormwater runoff flows directly into our local streams, the Potomac River, and eventually the Chesapeake Bay.
What are the New Stormwater Mandates?

Driver: Chesapeake Bay TMDL

- Set nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment targets or ‘pollution budget’
- Enforced City’s first Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit
- Three, 5-year permits (2013 – 2028)
- Reduction % mandates each cycle (5/35/60)
- Requires: Costly Stormwater Infrastructure
Stormwater Management Program Video

• Insert and show video here
**Driver: Chesapeake Bay TMDL Cleanup Mandates**

- ‘Pollution budget’ for nutrients & sediment
- Require costly stormwater infrastructure to retrofit nearly ¼ of the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS4 Permit Cycle</th>
<th>Portion of Total Reductions</th>
<th>Approx. Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I (2013 - 2018)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>120 - 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II (2018 - 2023)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III (2023 - 2028)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Phases</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stormwater Infrastructure Projects

Lake Cook Retrofit

Ben Brenman Pond Retrofit
Current Stormwater Funding

• 0.5 cent Real Estate Tax rate dedication

• Additional General Fund contribution
  • Equivalent to an additional 1.2 cents on the Real Estate Tax rate or $4.6 M for FY 2018

• Non-City funding sources
  • State Stormwater Local Assistance Fund (SLAF) Grant
Estimated Tax Rate Impact

Estimated Stormwater Expenditures in Tax Rate Equivalent*

- FY2018: 1.70
- FY2019: 1.78
- FY2020: 1.90
- FY2021: 2.04
- FY2022: 2.24

*Amount in Cents
Regional Stormwater Funding

Legend
- Stormwater Utility Fee
- General Fund Tax
- Tax District
Focus of Staff Recommendations

• Follow Council direction to create draft framework
• Capture stormwater program costs
• Create dedicated non-tax funding source

Criteria Considered:
• Maximize equity
• Minimize administrative cost
• Maximize understandability
Tax Rate vs. Fee Funding: Creating Equity

**Existing SWM Tax Burden**
- Non-Res: 42%
- Res: 58%

**Proposed SWU Burden**
- Non-Res: 63%
- Res: 37%

**City-Wide Impervious Area Distribution**
- Non-Res: 63%
- Res: 37%
Proposed SWU Draft Framework

- Fee Structure
- Fee Reduction / Credit Policy
- Billing Method
Fee Structure / Billing Units

• Goals: Achieve equity, minimize administrative cost, understandable

• Staff Recommendation:
  • Single Family Residential (SFR) Tiered and Variable Non-Residential (NR) / Multifamily

• Other Options Considered:
  • Square Foot Ranges, Calculate Square Footage
  • Flat Fee (not calculated)
Recommended Fee: Single Family Tiered

- Condo: 0.28 Billing Unit
- Townhouse: 0.42 Billing Unit
- Typical Single Family Home: 1 Billing Unit
- Large Single Family Home: 1.67 Billing Units

- Impervious area footprint, not interior living area
- Proposed 1 Billing Unit = 2,062 s.f. (median typical single family home)
# Single Family Residential: Fee Estimate Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Billing Unit</th>
<th>Est. Rate Range (yr.)</th>
<th>Est. Rate Range (mo.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>$35-$40</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>$50-$60</td>
<td>$4-$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Typical Single Family Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$120-$145</td>
<td>$10-$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large Single Family Home</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>$200-$242</td>
<td>$18-$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Based on exterior impervious footprint and not living area
- Used City’s GIS data
Proposed Non-Resid./Multifamily Calculated Fee

• Based on onsite impervious
• Sample fee calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculate Variable Fee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building and parking lot impervious area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Billing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Billing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply by rate for 1 billing unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impervious Area = 6,168 s.f.
## Tax Rate Equivalent vs. Proposed Fee Rate Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Property Description</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($millions)</th>
<th>Impervious Areas (ft²)</th>
<th>Funds to SWM from Real Estate Tax</th>
<th>SWU Fee (at $120/yr)</th>
<th>SWU Fee (at $145/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Building Complex</td>
<td>$17.52</td>
<td>106,521</td>
<td>$3,386</td>
<td>$6,199</td>
<td>$7,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant with Parking Lot</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Building Complex</td>
<td>$8.49</td>
<td>38,231</td>
<td>$1,641</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Building with Parking Lot</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>12,673</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$737</td>
<td>$891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Single Family Home</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$237</td>
<td>$287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>$15.87</td>
<td>34,166</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,988</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>$29.74</td>
<td>115,196</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,704</td>
<td>$8,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Fee Reduction / Credit Policy

• Provide opportunity for fee reduction
• Credits for practices that reduce stormwater flow and pollutant load

Staff recommends two phases

• Phase 1
  • Stormwater quality facility best management practices (BMPs) for (Res/NR)
  • Stormwater quantity controls (Res/NR)
  • Non-structural BMPs (NR)

• Phase 2
  • Menu of Single-Family (Residential) BMPs
  • Voluntary BMPs per design standards
Billing Method

• Goals: Ease of implementation, minimize delinquency, keep administrative cost low, and fewer data needs

• Options Considered:
  • Virginia American Water
  • Alex Renew
  • Stand-alone

• Recommendation: Incorporate into the Real Estate Bill
Public Outreach

Used Council-recommended Framework

- New dedicated webpages
- FAQs
- Social media
- Collaboration with Environmental Policy Commission (EPC)
- Targeted groups (15+ meetings)
  - Residents
  - Chamber of Commerce
  - Federation of Civic Associations + individual associations
  - Non-profits and religious properties
  - Large property owners
  - Large parcel owners
Public Feedback

- Generally supportive of the framework
- Widely understood that funding the mandates is required and not optional
- People like that it’s more equitable
- Generally agree on keeping the administrative costs down
- Some inquiries about what happens to dedicated ½ cent and 1.2 cents if SWU adopted
- Nonprofits/Religious institutions feedback
Next Steps

- **Sept/Oct 2016**: Staff Recommended Draft Stormwater Utility Framework. Public Outreach

- **Nov. 2016**: Propose SWU Framework during City Council Budget Process. Council retreat

- **Feb/Mar. 2017**: Council Work Session

- **May 2017**: City Council Consideration to Adopt SWU as part of the Budget Process (and Enabling City Ordinance)

- **Fall 2017**: Develop Administration Process

- **May 2018**: First Billing for first 6 months of 2018 with real estate billing
Questions?

Dedicated email: Stormwater@alexandriava.gov

More information: www.alexandriava.gov/Stormwater
City Facility Condition Assessment

- FY 2015 assessment completed and used to inform the FY 2017 budget
  - 36 facilities
  - Average FCI of Grade C

- FY 2016 assessment completed
  - 54 facilities
  - 73% of facilities assessed to date
  - Findings to be presented at the November 29th legislative meeting
Affordable Housing

Does Not Include $30 M five-year goal at VOICE
Council Guidance
Civic Engagement

• Priority Issues that All Groups Agreed Upon:
  • Affordable Housing
  • Transportation/Infrastructure

• Priority Issues that At Least Two Groups Agreed Upon:
  • Schools
  • Public Safety
  • Public Health (Health Department)
Review of Proposed Resolutions

• Budget Process Resolution

• Budget Guidance Resolution
Adjourn