

## **FISCAL YEAR 2017/2018 CITY COUNCIL BUDGET ISSUES**

Near the beginning of each year's budget preparation cycle, the City Manager and Finance staff presents City Council with a budget overview. This presentation has four main purposes:

1. Present the "big picture" of the coming year's budget, including factors that may impact Council's later decisions on the budget
2. Share budget-related input and requests that have been received from local citizens and organizations
3. Seek Council direction on select components of the budget (e.g., overall funding levels for human services and arts)
4. Receive any general funding or service level direction Council wishes to give for incorporation into the budget

### ***OVERALL ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE CITY***

The theme of the upcoming budget year could be considered one of stability. Statewide property tax reform has now been fully implemented, and the City's overall financial situation continues to remain relatively strong. For FY 2017/18, we expect continued improvement in retail sales and increases in property valuation to have a positive financial impact on the City budget. We are anticipating smaller than average increases in health care costs and a continued modest rate of inflation on goods and services.

Modest increases in assessed property valuations along with a slight increase in the rollback rate will result in an increase taxable valuation for residential property. Commercial and industrial property will continue to be taxed at 90% of value with state replacement tax frozen at the FY 2016/17 level. A new property classification was implemented in FY 2016/17; multi-residential property formerly taxed at 90% of value will take another step toward rollback at the residential rate and will be taxed at 82.5% of value, with no state replacement tax.

Interest revenues for the City investments are expected to increase during FY 2017/18, but remain at relatively low rates. Though this will provide some additional revenue, rates for G.O. Bonds are likely to increase from the current very favorable levels.

## **GENERAL FUND**

The General Fund ended FY 2015/16 with a balance of \$11,968,935, creating a beginning balance that is \$2,938,894 higher than what was anticipated in the FY 2016/17 adopted budget. Revenues for FY 2015/16 were \$395,399 higher than what was budgeted due to increased Hotel/Motel tax revenue (\$262,348) and building permit revenue (\$214,875). Other City revenues in the General Fund were actually \$81,824 lower than what was budgeted. Expenditures for FY 2015/16 were \$2,543,495 lower than what was budgeted, largely due to incomplete CIP and other special projects, as well as salary and other savings in various City departments.

Of the \$2,938,894 additional General Fund balance, \$1,986,870 has been earmarked for incomplete FY 2015/16 projects that have been carried over into the FY 2016/17 adjusted budget. These projects include the City Hall roof replacement project (\$579,541), the City Hall parking lot reconstruction project (\$551,970), outside consulting for special projects for the Planning Department (\$317,313), body cameras for the Police Department (\$64,000), as well as a number of smaller expenditures. Excluding the carryovers, a balance of \$952,024 remains, which is available for programming into the FY 2016/17 adjusted budget.

The Council could decide to use some amount of this additional balance to subsidize operating costs, thereby lowering property tax rates in FY 2017/18. This strategy, however, would only lead to a larger increase in the following year when this one-time balance would need to be replaced with a more permanent revenue source. Therefore, the staff recommends that one-time available balance be used for one-time expenses.

## **SCHOOL DISTRICT CHARGE FOR USE OF GYMS**

Currently, Parks and Recreation utilizes School District facilities (e.g. gyms, classrooms) for conducting multiple programs. In turn, Parks and Recreation pays \$1.25 per program participant, which was approximately \$2,000 in FY 2015/16. For the past two years, District administrators have informed City staff that they are considering establishing a new hourly fee for all users of their facilities. Because we understand the District's desire not to incur any out-of-pocket expenses related to our use of their space, City staff has urged that our recreational programs only be charged for the incremental costs associated with the City use. Consequently, we have offered to work with the District to identify these costs.

**It now appears that the District is about to impose a new hourly facility fee. At this time it is not clear what that fee will be. However, it is important to emphasize that the current Parks and Recreation philosophy is to recover direct program costs through user fees. Therefore, any substantial increase in cost to our recreation programs that results from the imposition of an hourly facility fee from the School District will have a significant impact to the City's recreation fees.**

## **REORGANIZATION – PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT TO ASSUME GREENSCAPE AND CEMETERY MAINTENANCE**

Traditionally, the primary responsibility to maintain the greenscape on City property has been shared by two departments. The Public Works Department maintains the Cemetery grounds and public street rights-of-way, while the Parks & Recreation Department focuses on maintaining the park system and recreational facility grounds. With two separate departments handling greenscape maintenance, it is sometimes difficult to assure a consistent level of service for all City property.

With the recent retirement of the two supervisors in the Right-of-Way Maintenance Division of the Public Works Department, staff turned to one of our thirteen Excellence Through People (ETP) values, “continuous improvement”, to determine if there is a better way to provide greenscape maintenance to our customers.

Guided by the objectives to: 1) organize around the work, 2) improve efficiency, 3) increase service levels, 4) improve effectiveness, and 5) improve utilization of resources (staff, equipment, funding, and knowledge); it was decided to explore the possibility that the Department of Parks and Recreation would assume the total responsibility to maintain our public rights-of-way and manage the City cemeteries, along with our park system.

This change seems logical since most of the work to be done at the cemeteries and along street rights-of-way involve turf/forest maintenance skills which are the primary function of the Park Maintenance crews. Combining this responsibility will result in a consolidated division to respond to the maintenance needs of an ever-expanding park and street system. While the total number of FTEs will increase by one, the impact on the overall budget is minimal.

The staff will be working to finalize the changes in the program budget that will reflect this reorganization. This reorganization could be initiated as early as April 2017.

## **CYRIDE – BUDGET CHALLENGES**

With the significant increase in student enrollment at ISU over the past years, ridership has grown to a record number of over 6 million rides per year. While everyone can take great pride in the success of our public transit system, the CyRide Board is concerned about the long-term financial viability of the system as we try to maintain the same level of exceptional service in the face of ever growing needs and desires of our customers.

While federal and state funding will remain the same or be slightly reduced, CyRide's budget in FY 2017/18 will be impacted by an increase of approximately \$350,000 related to health insurance issues. Most of this increase can be attributed to the requirements of the Affordable Care Act, where many of our part-time drivers will be eligible to receive a health insurance benefit for the first time. As a result, the CyRide Board will be working hard over the next months to develop a budget that reflects an acceptable level of support from the three funding bodies.

## ***FIRE AND POLICE RETIREMENT AND IPERS***

### ***-MFPRSI***

The City contribution rate to the Municipal Fire and Police Retirement System of Iowa (MFPRSI) will be slightly lower. The current rate is 25.92% of covered wages and will be 25.68% for FY 2017/18. The rate remains well above the City's minimum contribution rate of 17% and is expected to remain so in the foreseeable future.

### ***-IPERS***

The IPERS rate remains unchanged for the upcoming year, with the City contributing 8.93% of covered wages and the employees 5.95%, with the fixed 60/40 sharing of the pension cost.

## ***HEALTH INSURANCE***

For several years, the City of Ames experienced health insurance increases between 5% and 9% per year. With more recent favorable claims experience and a strong self-insurance fund balance, we are projecting a 4% rate increase for FY 2017/18. With this increase in premiums charged under the self-insured plan, we expect a small draw down in the fund balance, but the balance will still be above the requirements to maintain a self-insured plan and provide an adequate balance to fund possible claims fluctuations. We will review the status of the plan again after the end of December and evaluate the need for a larger increase.

## ***ROLLBACK AND VALUATION***

Since 1978, residential and agricultural property has been subject to an assessment limitation order, or "rollback," that limits annual growth of property values (all other classes of property were eventually added). Prior to the 2013 overhaul of the property tax system, property value growth was limited to 4% per year for agricultural, commercial, industrial and residential properties. If property values grew by more than 4%, the taxable value was rolled back to comply with the assessment limitation system.

In addition, the rollback included a formula that tied the growth of residential property to that of agricultural property. This connection is commonly referred to as "coupling" and limits the valuation of either property class to the smaller of the two. Since the law's inception, residential property has always been subject to significant rollbacks while the other property classes did not grow as much and were usually taxed at or near their full assessed value.

While the property tax rollback system remains in place, several major changes were made during the 2013 legislative session. For each assessment year beginning in 2013, residential and agricultural property value growth is now capped at 3%, or whichever is lowest between the two classes (the coupling provision remains).

Commercial, industrial and railway property now have their own rollback, which began at 95% for valuations established during the 2013 assessment year (affecting FY 2014/15)

and 90% for the 2014 assessment year and thereafter. The rollback percentage for these properties will remain fixed at 90% regardless of how fast or slow valuations grow.

The legislature created a standing appropriation, beginning in FY 2014/15, to reimburse local governments for the property tax reductions resulting from the new rollback for commercial and industrial property (railroad not included). The “backfill” was funded at 100% by the legislature for current fiscal and future backfill appropriations will be capped at the current level.

A new property class was established for multi-residential property, which first took effect in FY 2016/17. For buildings that are not otherwise classified as residential property, the definition of multi-residential property is broad and includes:

- Mobile home parks
- Manufactured home communities
- Land-leased communities
- Assisted living facilities
- Property primarily used or intended for human habitation containing three or more separate living quarters

The following rollback percentages will be phased in over eight years, beginning in budget FY 2016/17. **There is no backfill provision for this class, and estimated valuation in Ames is \$124.7 million, or a reduction of property tax dollars of approximately \$48,500 in FY 2017/18.**

<b>Multi-Residential Property Rollback Schedule</b>	
<b>January 1, 2015</b>	<b>86.25%</b>
<b>January 1, 2016</b>	<b>82.5%</b>
<b>January 1, 2017</b>	<b>78.75%</b>
<b>January 1, 2018</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>January 1, 2019</b>	<b>71.25%</b>
<b>January 1, 2020</b>	<b>67.5%</b>
<b>January 1, 2021</b>	<b>63.75%</b>
<b>January 1, 2022 and thereafter</b>	<b>same as residential</b>

<b>Rollback Percentage Rates</b>				
<b>Property Class</b>	<b>FY 14-15</b>	<b>FY 15-16</b>	<b>FY 16-17</b>	<b>FY 17-18</b>
Residential	54.4002	55.7335	55.6259	56.9391
Com. & Ind.	95.0000	90.0000	90.0000	90.0000

## **LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX**

### ***Estimated Revenue***

For the current year, local option sales tax receipts are expected to be \$7,711,124, down \$88,876 or 1.1% from the adopted budget. Part of the reduction in local option tax revenue is expected to be offset by additional Hotel/Motel tax revenue, resulting in a reduction of revenue to the local option tax fund of a little less than one percent. These numbers indicate that the recovery in retail sales has continued, though slightly less than forecasted. The staff forecast for local option sales tax revenue for FY 2017/18 is a 2.85% increase from the FY 2016/17 adopted budget, or \$7,930,900. A summary of the Local Option Sales Tax Fund with some illustrative options for the FY 2017/18 budget is included as Attachment 1 to this document and is by no means a recommendation for the upcoming budget. Though we do not need specific budget decisions at this time, staff is requesting Council direction on funding levels for ASSET, COTA, and other outside organizations.

## **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDING FOR HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES**

On November 24, 2015, the City Council directed staff to look into developing a one-time program in FY 2017/18 to fund capital projects for Human Service Agencies. The impetus for this new program was the apparent substantial available balance that was reflected in the Local Option Sales Tax Fund. The first task was to send out a survey to determine the needs of the agencies.

On August 23, 2016, Brian Phillips reviewed a report with the City Council highlighting the agencies' wish list for projects, possible grant program criteria, and status of the Local Option Sales Tax Fund balance. Following this discussion the Council passed a motion that this issue be placed on the Budget Guideline meeting agenda.

**It should be noted that an additional directive that will impact the budget involves the commitment of \$1.2 million per year in the CIP for bike route/path related improvements. This new initiative will greatly impact the available balance in the Local Option Sales Tax Fund. In order to identify sufficient Sales Tax funds for a new capital program for human service agencies as well as for the increased support for bike facilities, it will be necessary to delay certain projects reflected in prior CIPs, switch funding sources for some projects, or eliminate some projects from the CIP.**

## **ASSET HUMAN SERVICES FUNDING**

The City Council adopted the following priorities for human services program funding in FY 2017/18:

### **1. Meet basic needs, with emphasis on low to moderate income:**

- Housing cost offset programs, including utility assistance
- Sheltering

- Quality childcare cost offset programs, including daycare and State of Iowa licensed in-home facilities
- Food cost offset programs, to assist in providing nutritious perishables and staples
- Transportation cost offset programs for the elderly and families
- Legal assistance
- Disaster response

## 2. Meet mental health and chemical dependency needs

- Provide outpatient emergency access to services
- Provide crisis intervention services
- Provide access to non-emergency services
- Ensure substance abuse prevention and treatment is available in the community

## 3. Youth development services and activities

- Provide services for social development

The table below summarizes each year's ASSET allocations by funder.

	Story County	CICS	United Way	ISU Student Gov't.	City Budgeted Amount	City % Increase	Total
2011/12	\$ 995,618	\$ --	\$ 814,333	\$ 149,960	\$ 1,111,437	3.0%	\$ 3,071,348
2012/13	1,029,339	--	819,607	136,755	1,150,278	3.5%	3,135,979
2013/14	1,193,438	--	883,256	138,178	1,184,786	3.0%	3,299,850
2014/15	1,082,602	--	955,145	152,605	1,139,226	-3.8%	3,329,578
2015/16	879,857	349,856	1,002,833	167,339	1,212,375	6.4%	3,612,260
2016/17	1,031,870	430,718	1,084,827	178,882	1,278,973	5.5%	4,005,270

The large increase in Story County funds in FY 2016/17 reflects the County moving funds that had been previously allocated through the Juvenile Court system into the ASSET process.

This year, ASSET added one agency, the Iowa Able Foundation, to the ASSET process. This agency provides lending and education services to individuals who are disabled or aging. The Iowa Able Foundation is not requesting City funds in FY 2017/18. ASSET received notice from Visiting Nurse Services that it will no longer conduct its Foster Grandparent program, and therefore that agency did not submit an ASSET budget for FY 2017/18.

The prior budget year is not the only way to evaluate the amount to budget for the next fiscal year. The amount budgeted at this time each year can vary if the volunteers do not recommend funding the entire amount. The amount contracted with agencies is often not entirely drawn down each year. In FY 2015/16, \$13,750 (1.1%) of the City allocation was not drawn down by agencies.

Ames Requested FY 15/16	Ames Budget FY 15/16	Ames Contracted FY 15/16	Ames Request FY 16/17	Ames Budget FY 16/17	Ames Contract FY 16/17	Ames Request FY 17/18
\$1,375,822	\$1,212,375	\$1,212,375	\$1,359,822	\$1,278,973	\$1,278,973	\$1,418,203

## FY 17/18 Program and Service Requests

**For FY 17/18, City ASSET funds requested by agencies total \$1,418,203, up \$139,230 or 10.9% over the current FY 16/17 contracted services of \$1,278,973.**

Since last year's budgeting process, the four-panel categorization system for services has been converted into three core areas: Education, Income, and Health. Overall, the service requests to the City are flat or slightly increased. There are two major changes worth noting:

- MICA Dental Clinic** – MICA has again requested a large increase for the Dental Clinic. The City allocated \$37,905 in regular contract funding for the Dental Clinic in FY 16/17 (and authorized one-time funding in the amount of \$50,000 for it in November 2016). MICA is requesting \$70,905 in ASSET funds from the City for FY 2017/18, an 87% increase. MICA's requests to United Way and to Story County are also substantial increases.
- Heartland Senior Services and MGMC Home Health Services Meals on Wheels**  
 In the current year, Heartland and MGMC Home Health Services arrived at an arrangement whereby Heartland would take over responsibility for the City Meals on Wheels program from MGMC Home Health Services. MGMC would act as a vendor for Heartland in providing the meals, and Heartland would receive the operational funding and organize the delivery logistics. This arrangement will result in \$13,500 in City ASSET funds dropping from MGMC Home Health Services' request and the same amount being added to Heartland's budget request.

In last year's budgeting cycle, the City Council requested information as to which services indicated they had turned away clients due to a lack of funding. In FY 2017/18, there are 72 individual services for which agencies have requested City funding. The table below shows the breakdown of whether clients were turned away in the last full fiscal year and for what reasons:

<b>Agency response to whether clients were turned away</b>	<b># of services</b>
No clients turned away	39
Clients turned away	17
No information provided regarding clients turned away	8
Some clients turned away due to ineligibility under criteria or rules violations	4
No clients turned away, but other sources of funding used or services curtailed	3
No data – new service	1

The "Clients Turned Away" category includes services where there is a waiting list. Of the 17 services in which clients were turned away, 13 involved a service where there are capacity limitations due to licensure or the number of available beds. The four remaining services where individuals were turned away are:



1. **MICA Family Development and Education.** MICA is not requesting an increase from the ASSET funders this year for this service.
2. **Raising Readers Out-of-School Learning.** Raising Readers indicated that several families asked to register after the deadline, and extra volunteers were located for most, but not all the children. More could have been served if there had been more volunteers. Raising Readers is requesting an increase from the City from \$7,491 in FY 2016/17 to \$9,000 in FY 2017/18.
3. **Salvation Army Representative Payee Services.** The Salvation Army indicated there were 13 clients on its waiting list for this service, but mentions none have been turned away. The agency is requesting an increase from \$12,359 to \$12,500.
4. **Youth and Shelter Services Mentoring Program.** YSS indicates that 40 youth were on the waiting list at the end of the school year and would be matched at the beginning of the school year. YSS is requesting an increase from \$23,220 in City funds for FY 2016/17 to \$27,000 in FY 2017/18.

In addition to the amount authorized for human services programs, the City will also budget its share of the ASSET administrative expenses. These expenses include services provided by the ASSET Administrative Assistant and printing costs. The City's estimated share for these expenses in FY 2017/18 is \$3,571. This is an increase from FY 2016/17 of 2.4%.

In last year's budget cycle, the City Council chose to authorize an ASSET increase of a fixed percentage, plus the amount necessary to fully fund the requests where clients were turned away due to a lack of funding. The table below indicates allocation options based on the percentage increases from the FY 2016/17 contracted amount of \$1,278,973.

<b>Increase From Current</b>	<b>Dollar Increase</b>	<b>Total City Funding Authorized</b>
0.4% (amt. to fully fund turn-away svcs.)	\$ 5,430	\$ 1,284,403
2%	25,579	1,304,552
4%	51,159	1,330,132
5%	63,949	1,342,922
6%	76,738	1,355,711
8%	102,318	1,481,291
10.9% (request)	139,230	1,418,203
+		
<i>ASSET Admin. Share</i>	\$3,571	<i>In addition to services</i>

The attached spreadsheet (Attachment 2) indicates the services requested from the City compared to the current year, as well as the total amount requested from ASSET funders for each of these services. It does not include funding requested from other funders for services the City does not participate in.

**COTA – PERFORMING ARTS FUNDING**

The Commission of the Arts (COTA) allocation for FY 2016/17 is \$156,170, which was 5% higher than the \$148,733 allocated for FY 2015/16. For FY 2016/17, COTA organizations have requested funding in the amount of \$197,721 (excluding special Spring and Fall Grants). This is a 26% (\$41,551) increase over the FY 2016/17 appropriation.

A total of 17 organizations submitted applications for funding this year, including one new organization (KHOI Community Radio). As always, a range of options is available for establishing an authorized allocation for FY 2017/18.

<b>Increase From Current</b>	<b>Dollar Increase</b>	<b>Amount Authorized</b>
2%	\$ 3,123	\$ 159,293
4%	6,246	164,416
5%	7,809	163,979
6%	9,370	165,540
26% (request)	41,551	197,721

**FUNDING REQUESTS FROM OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS**

City staff accepts applications from outside organizations wishing to receive Local Option Sales Tax funds for their organization’s operations. The City Council has exempted the Ames Economic Development Commission’s business development partnership, the Ames/ISU Sustainability Coordinator and the Ames Human Relations Commission from this process, since those activities are conducted in an official capacity on behalf of the City government.

The total amount allocated for FY 2016/17 was \$136,900. The total FY 2017/18 request is \$178,225, which is a 30.2% increase over the 2016/17 total.

<b>Organization/Program</b>	<b>16/17 Funding</b>	<b>17/18 Request</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Ames Historical Society	\$ 37,000	\$ 40,000	8.1%
Ames Int’l Partner City Association	5,000	8,000	60%
Campustown Action Association	27,000	27,000	0%
Hunziker Youth Sports Complex	28,300	28,925	2.2%
Main Street Cultural District	39,600	70,000	77%
Flying Cyclones	0	3,500	--%
Colleges Against Cancer	0	800	--%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 136,900</b>	<b>\$ 178,225</b>	<b>30.2%</b>

It should be noted that the City Council approved a separate allocation of \$20,000 in FY 2016/17 for MSCD to install the downtown holiday lighting. That allocation is not reflected in the totals above, since it was considered a one-time request. MSCD’s application for FY 2017/18 contains a request for funds to expand the downtown holiday lighting.

Staff has not assumed the City Council will approve these requests. The past practice has been to include the amount approved for the prior fiscal year in the recommended budget. **City staff is seeking direction from the City Council regarding a total amount available to be allocated for the coming year. The applications will be reviewed by a committee of staff and residents with that budget authority in mind, and recommendations will be made to the City Council. As with other funding processes, a variety of options are available to the City Council:**

<b>Increase From Current</b>	<b>Dollar Increase</b>	<b>Amount Authorized</b>
2%	\$ 2,738	\$ 139,638
4%	5,476	142,376
5%	6,845	143,745
6%	8,214	145,114
30.2% (request)	41,325	178,225

***PUBLIC ART COMMISSION***

City Council will receive the Public Art Commission’s request for funding for FY 2017/18 in January. The funding level of \$41,000 adopted for FY 2016/17 is currently included as the FY 2017/18 allocation for projecting the Local Option Sales Tax Fund balance.

***HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION***

The Historic Preservation Commission is allocated \$2,000 annually in the City’s Planning Services budget for education and training. This year, a request was made by the HPC for additional funding for the Plaques on Historic Buildings Project (attachments 3 and 4). Staff feels that funding for this project would be better administered through the Ames Historical Society, but their request through the Council’s outside organization funding program had already been submitted. To resolve this issue, the \$2,700 in additional funds requested by HPC for the plaque program have been added to the Ames Historical Society’s funding request for FY 2017/18.

***ROAD CONDITIONS/ROAD USE TAX FUND***

In our annual Resident Satisfaction Survey's ranking of capital improvement priorities, the reconstruction of existing streets continues to be a priority for our citizens. This represents a challenge, since the lane-miles of streets continue to expand, existing streets continue to age, and recent winters have been particularly hard on our roadways.

The Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF) is accumulated through motor vehicle registration fees, motor vehicle fuel taxes, an excise tax imposed on the rental of automobiles, and a use tax on trailers. The RUTF revenue is restricted in use and the City uses the funds for operations and maintenance of road right-of-ways as well as capital improvements. The DOT is currently forecasting that RUTF distributions will be slightly lower in FY 2016/17. The adopted budget included \$7,134,765 in RUTF revenue; the adjusted budget will be a

little less than 1% lower at \$7,075,800. For FY 2017/18, the DOT is forecasting a RUTF distribution of \$7,046,318 for the City of Ames. The FY 2016/17 budget is the first full year of distributions of fuel taxes after the 10 cent increase in the per gallon tax. Past experience has generally indicated that actual receipts are impacted by fuel prices and general economic activity. Both factors have been favorable for strong RUT receipts that could exceed current forecasts. Staff will be reviewing the impact of the slightly lower revenue as part of the operating budget and capital improvement plan.

## **TOWN BUDGET MEETING**

On October 4, 2016, the annual Town Budget Meeting was held. Minutes from the meeting are included as Attachment 5 to this document.

### **City Council's Input**

*(Given the information provided, Council's input is requested.)*

### Service Level Increases

### Service Level Decreases

### Other Issues

Attachment 1

LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX FUND SUMMARY

	FY 16/17 Adopted	FY 16/17 Adjusted	5% Increase COTA/ASSET FY 17/18 Estimated	
<b>Revenues</b>				
Local Option Sales Tax	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 7,711,124	\$ 7,930,900	
Transfer from Hotel/Motel	116,571	130,000	132,600	
Grants	-	-	-	
Other Revenue	-	-	-	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<u>7,916,571</u>	<u>7,841,124</u>	<u>8,063,500</u>	
<b>Transfers</b>				
Ice Arena	20,000	20,000	20,000	
Park Development	100,000	100,000	100,000	
60% Property Tax Relief	4,680,000	4,626,674	4,758,540	
<b>Total Transfers</b>	<u>4,800,000</u>	<u>4,746,674</u>	<u>4,878,540</u>	
<b>Expenses</b>				
Human Service Agencies	1,278,973	1,328,973	1,342,922	(1)
Commission on the Arts	156,170	156,170	163,979	(2)
City Council Spec. Alloc.	141,400	140,900	140,900	(3)
Human Services Admin	23,663	18,934	19,502	
Public Art	41,000	41,000	41,000	(4)
Municipal Band	27,170	27,170	27,170	
	-	-	-	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<u>1,668,376</u>	<u>1,713,147</u>	<u>1,735,473</u>	
<b>Net Increase/(Decrease)</b>	1,448,195	1,381,303	1,449,487	
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<u>3,087,739</u>	<u>5,879,089</u>	<u>2,628,703</u>	
<b>Available for CIP</b>	4,535,934	7,260,392	4,078,190	
<b>CIP Projects</b>	<u>1,964,500</u>	<u>4,631,689</u>	<u>1,731,722</u>	(5)
<b>Ending Balance</b>	2,571,434	2,628,703	2,346,468	
<b>Minimum Fund Bal. Rsv.</b>	938,219	1,616,209	896,799	
<b>Avail Un-Resv Fund Bal.</b>	<u>\$ 1,633,215</u>	<u>\$ 1,012,494</u>	<u>\$ 1,449,669</u>	(6)

(1) FY 16/17 Adopted Plus 5% As Example, One-time \$50,000 for Dental in Adjusted

(2) FY 16/17 Adopted Plus 5% As Example

(3) FY 16/17 Funding Level as Example

(4) City Council will receive request for Public Art funding in January 2017

(5) Estimated CIP From Prior Plan, Still Reviewing Projects

(6) Does not include any reserve of Fund Balance for fluctuations in revenue

Attachment 2

Agency	Service	Index	City of Ames		17/18 Proposed Units of Service	Unit of Service	17/18 Proposed Cost per Unit	Service Statistics
			Contracted 16/17	Request 17/18				
ACCESS	Battering Shelter	2.08	\$ 48,354	\$ 51,739	2,450	24-Hour Period of Shelter	\$ 120.00	131 turned away due to lack of space. 8 turned away due to safety issues. 145 diverted to other services more appropriate for the need
ACCESS	Battering Crisis Intervention	3.07	\$ 2,669	\$ 2,856	160	Staff Hours	\$ 125.00	0
ACCESS	Battering Counseling and Support	3.07	\$ 25,200	\$ 26,964	1,280	Staff Hours	\$ 133.24	0
ACCESS	Rape Relief Crisis Intervention	3.08	\$ 1,859	\$ 2,026	310	Staff Hours	\$ 145.00	0
ACCESS	Rape Relief Counseling and Support	3.08	\$ 4,304	\$ 4,691	1,200	Staff Hours	\$ 124.02	0
ACCESS	Battering Courtwatch	3.10	\$ 5,075	\$ 5,329	720	Staff Hours	\$ 132.41	0
ACCESS	Public Education and Awareness	1.12	\$ 3,578	\$ 3,685	420	Staff Hours	\$ 118.00	0
			\$ 91,039	\$ 97,290				
Ames Comm. Preschool Center	Day Care - Infant	2.02	\$ 5,254	\$ 7,464	3,120	Full Days	\$ 61.04	"It is not possible to realistically estimate unmet need since families put their names on multiple waiting lists"
Ames Comm. Preschool Center	Day Care - Children	2.03	\$ 56,131	\$ 65,376	22,178	Full Days	\$ 40.93	Cannot serve additional children because room space and teacher/child ratios dictate capacity
Ames Comm. Preschool Center	Day Care - School Age	2.04	\$ 26,086	\$ 31,129	55,100	Partial Days	\$ 9.55	Long waiting lists at each school site
			\$ 87,471	\$ 103,969				
American Red Cross	Disaster Services Program	2.12	\$ 9,000	\$ 12,000	70	Staff Hours	\$ 781.43	0
			\$ 9,000	\$ 12,000				
Boys and Girls Club	Youth Development and Social Adjustment - Daily Program	1.07	\$ 102,800	\$ 110,000	25,000	Client Contact/Day	\$ 24.61	Turned away 60 during summer program. 2,880 units of service were not provided because the club was at capacity in the summer.
			\$ 102,800	\$ 110,000				
Campfire	Day Care- School Age	2.04	\$ 2,504	\$ 2,190	4,000	Partial Days	\$ 42.07	There were a few weeks of camp where it was at capacity and some families were turned away. No clients turned away due to an inability to pay. Estimate another 90 days of service could have been provided.
Campfire	Day Care - School Age - Scholarships	2.04	\$ 4,449	\$ 5,110	525	Partial Days	\$ 76.74	No families were turned away, even when the dollars ran out.
			\$ 6,953	\$ 7,300				
Center for Creative Justice	Correctional Services - Probation Supervision	2.09	\$ 55,250	\$ 57,460	4,703	Client Hours	\$ 64.04	0
			\$ 55,250	\$ 57,460				
ChildServe	Day Care - Infant	2.02	\$ 15,700	\$ 6,000	11,484	Full Days	\$ 48.52	No spots open most of the year, and 15 on the waiting list. ASSET funds were exhausted prior to year end which caused one infant to leave our care.
ChildServe	Day Care - Children	2.03	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000	17,960	Full Days	\$ 40.66	There were about 6 openings through the year.
			\$ 20,700	\$ 26,000				
Emergency Residence Project	Emergency Assistance for Basic Material Needs	2.08	\$ 73,500	\$ 83,600	9,100	24 Hr Period Food/Shelter	\$ 29.24	Some referrals are turned away, especially if the referral has no connection to the Ames/Story County community and the shelter is full.
Emergency Residence Project	Transitional Housing	2.07	\$ 3,000	\$ 8,400	6,700	Client Contacts	\$ 15.74	Many applicants are turned away due to the limited openings available. The number has been difficult to track and has not been collected.
			\$ 76,500	\$ 92,000				
Eyerly Ball	Primary Treatment/ Health Maintenance - Crisis	3.09	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	835	Contacts	\$ 47.87	0
			\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000				
Good Neighbor	Emergency Assistance for Basic Material Needs	2.01	\$ 13,578	\$ 13,917	1,020	Client Contacts	\$ 114.79	No clients turned away in 15/16, but 17 households turned away from July to September 2016.
Good Neighbor	Healthy Food Vouchers	2.01	\$ 3,252	\$ 3,333	1,269	Client Contacts	\$ 44.47	0
			\$ 16,830	\$ 17,250				
Heartland Senior Services	Day Care - Adults , Adult Day Center	3.02	\$ 51,844	\$ 54,344	6,300	Client Days	\$ 66.14	Participation days are reduced on occasion due to space limitations
Heartland Senior Services	Congregate Meals	3.06	\$ 28,397	\$ 23,462	11,250	Meals	\$ 6.90	Not indicated
Heartland Senior Services	Home Delivered Meals	3.05	\$ -	\$ 13,500	33,000	Meals	\$ 9.61	0
Heartland Senior Services	Senior Food Program	3.01	\$ 4,177	\$ 4,177	1,215	Client Contacts	\$ 11.27	Not indicated
Heartland Senior Services	Service Coordination - Outreach	3.13	\$ 41,224	\$ 43,176	1,925	Client Hours	\$ 90.72	0
Heartland Senior Services	Activity and Resource Center	3.14	\$ 34,000	\$ 39,000	10,900	Client Contacts	\$ 14.88	0
			\$ 159,642	\$ 177,659				
HIRTA	Transportation - City	2.13	\$ 38,133	\$ 40,000	51,000	One-Way Trip	\$ 15.29	Not indicated
HIRTA	Transportation - Iowa City	2.13	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	60	One-Way Trip	\$ 184.17	Not indicated
			\$ 40,133	\$ 42,000				

Agency	Service	Index	City of Ames		17/18 Proposed Units of Service	Unit of Service	17/18 Proposed Cost per Unit	Service Statistics
			Contracted 16/17	Request 17/18				
Legal Aid	Legal Aid - Society , Legal Aid - Civil	2.10	\$ 94,040	\$ 102,000	4,400	Staff Hours	\$ 62.38	None, except in conflicts of interest or ineligibility under income guidelines
			\$ 94,040	\$ 102,000				
Lutheran Services in Iowa	Crisis Intervention , Crisis Child Care	3.09	\$ 5,461	\$ 5,707	112	Contacts	\$ 439.42	0
			\$ 5,461	\$ 5,707				
Mary Greeley Home Health Services	Community Clinics and Health Education	3.01	\$ 16,000	\$ 17,000	4,670	Clinic Hours	\$ 97.00	Not indicated
Mary Greeley Home Health Services	In-Home Health Assistance	3.04	\$ 13,000	\$ 14,000	8,170	Hours	\$ 50.60	0
Mary Greeley Home Health Services	Home Delivered Meals - Meals on Wheels	3.05	\$ 13,500	\$ -	-	Meals	\$ -	Service shifting to Heartland Senior Services
			\$ 42,500	\$ 31,000				
MICA	Community Clinics - Child Dental	3.01	\$ 1,650	\$ 1,650	108	Clinic Hours	\$ 180.56	0
MICA	Dental Clinics	3.01	\$ 37,905	\$ 70,905	4,842	Clinic Hours	\$ 137.64	Only for missing appointments or inappropriate behavior
MICA	Community Clinics - Fluoride Varnish	3.01	\$ 825	\$ 825	1,256	Clinic Hours	\$ 37.88	0
MICA	Food Pantry	2.01	\$ 16,555	\$ 23,363	6,369	Client Contacts	\$ 9.94	0
MICA	Family Development/ Education	1.10	\$ 7,279	\$ 7,279	428	Client Hours	\$ 91.71	3 families on the waiting list were unable to participate.
			\$ 64,214	\$ 104,022				
NAMI	Public Education and Awareness	1.12	\$ 500	\$ 500	195	Staff Hours	\$ 154.35	0
NAMI	Wellness Center	1.02	\$ 5,500	\$ 6,000	2,000	Staff Hours	\$ 22.84	0
			\$ 6,000	\$ 6,500				
Raising Readers	Thrive by Five	1.10	\$ 8,716	\$ 9,000	2,250	Client Hours	\$ 16.60	0
Raising Readers	Out-of-School Time Learning	1.10	\$ 7,491	\$ 9,000	3,000	Client Hours	\$ 10.74	Several families registered after the deadline. Some were served, but more could have been if more volunteers were located.
			\$ 16,207	\$ 18,000				
RSVP	Disaster Services - Volunteer Management for Emergencies	2.12	\$ 6,333	\$ 6,700	500	Staff Hours	\$ 27.57	0
RSVP	Transportation	2.13	\$ 900	\$ 1,100	2,175	One-Way Trips	\$ 11.55	0
RSVP	Volunteer Management	1.11	\$ 21,866	\$ 22,400	35,000	Volunteer Hours	\$ 4.05	0
			\$ 29,099	\$ 30,200				
The Arc of Story County	Special Recreation - Active Lifestyles	3.19	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,500	9,000	Participant Hours	\$ 7.68	0, but 2,000 units of service that were not billed to ASSET and were paid for with other funding sources
The Arc of Story County	Respite Care	3.11	\$ 3,500	\$ 4,000	625	Client Hours	\$ 19.20	Not indicated
The Arc of Story County	Service Coordination	3.13	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,200	300	Client Hours	\$ 27.00	0
			\$ 6,700	\$ 7,700				
The Salvation Army	Food Pantry	2.01	\$ 6,466	\$ 6,500	1,425	Client Contacts	\$ 33.99	0
The Salvation Army	Rent and Utility Assistance	2.01	\$ 20,500	\$ 20,500	175	Client Contacts	\$ 377.34	155 clients were turned away due to lack of funds, ineligibility, eviction in spite of assistance, failure to follow program requirements, and a pattern of co-dependency on services.
The Salvation Army	Disaster Services	2.12	\$ 629	\$ 629	80	Staff Hours	\$ 56.95	0
The Salvation Army	Representative Payee Services	2.14	\$ 12,359	\$ 12,500	2,000	Client Contacts	\$ 46.92	13 clients are on the waiting list, but none has been turned away
The Salvation Army	Bill Payer	2.14	\$ 3,650	\$ 3,650	144	Client Contacts	\$ 61.06	0
			\$ 43,604	\$ 43,779				
University Community Childcare	Child Care - Infant	2.02	\$ 25,630	\$ 25,630	3,120	Full Days	\$ 69.50	Wait list for services, but remains fluid due to some families no longer being interested in services when contacted. Occupancy was 99% for the year, based on licensed capacity.
University Community Childcare	Child Care - Children	2.03	\$ 30,636	\$ 35,231	8,320	Full Days	\$ 57.83	Wait list for services, but remains fluid due to some families no longer being interested in services when contacted. Occupancy was 98.5% for the year, based on licensed capacity.
University Community Childcare	Comfort Zone	2.05	\$ 960	\$ 1,056	160	Partial Days	\$ 379.44	Children are only turned away if they do not have current immunization information or if they are not "mildly ill"
			\$ 57,226	\$ 61,917				
Visiting Nurse Services	Foster Grandparent Program		\$ 5,386	\$ -	-	Staff Hours	\$ -	Service not continuing.
			\$ 5,386	\$ -				
Volunteer Center of Story County	Volunteer Management	1.11	\$ 7,500	\$ 10,000	6,861	Volunteer Hours	\$ 15.09	0
Volunteer Center of Story County	Youth Engagement	1.02	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,750	2,287	Staff Hours	\$ 15.35	0
			\$ 8,500	\$ 11,750				

			City of Ames			Service Statistics		
Agency	Service	Index	Contracted 16/17	Request 17/18	17/18 Proposed Units of Service	Unit of Service	17/18 Proposed Cost per Unit	Clients Turned Away in 15/16
Youth and Shelter Services	Substance Abuse Treatment - Outpatient	3.16	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,500	2,574	Client Hours	\$ 91.94	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Primary Treatment /Health Maintenance Family Counseling	3.17	\$ 49,000	\$ 54,000	8,333	Client Hours	\$ 107.29	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Transitional Living / Homeless	2.01	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,500	2,600	Client Contacts	\$ 57.88	All transitional living locations were full a majority of the time with a waiting list
Youth and Shelter Services	Emergency Shelter - Rosedale	2.08	\$ 36,750	\$ 31,750	740	24 Hr Period Food/Shelter	\$ 361.50	17 Story County adult clients were turned away
Youth and Shelter Services	Rosedale Crisis	3.09	\$ -	\$ 5,000	140	Contacts	\$ 71.43	New service
Youth and Shelter Services	Storks Nest	2.11	\$ 6,250	\$ 6,400	875	Client Contacts	\$ 45.52	0
Youth and Shelter Services	YSS Mentoring Program	1.07	\$ 23,220	\$ 27,000	5,600	Client Contact/Days	\$ 30.41	40 youth on waitlist at end of school year who will be matched at start of school year.
Youth and Shelter Services	Youth Development and Social Adjustment	1.07	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	5,000	Client Contact/Days	\$ 31.82	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Employment Assistance for Youth - Skills	1.08	\$ 19,800	\$ 21,500	1,200	Staff Hours	\$ 32.21	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Summer Enrichment	1.09	\$ 2,148	\$ 8,000	3,600	Partial Days	\$ 14.86	Not indicated
Youth and Shelter Services	Family Development/Education - Pathways, FADSS	1.10	\$ 9,000	\$ 10,000	2,000	Client Hours	\$ 82.39	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Public Education/ Awareness - Substance Abuse Prevention	1.12	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	5,000	Staff Hours	\$ 42.00	0
Youth and Shelter Services	Public Education/ Awareness - Child Abuse	1.12	\$ 9,750	\$ 9,750	450	Staff Hours	\$ 75.74	Not indicated, but some school districts are no longer interested in the program
			<b>\$ 223,718</b>	<b>\$ 242,700</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 1,278,973</b>	<b>\$ 1,418,203</b>				



Agency	Service	Index	City of Ames			% Change Contract to Request	ASSET Total		
			Contracted 15/16	Request 16/17			Contracted 15/16	Request 16/17	% Change Contract to Request
MICA	family dev/ed family development	4.1a	\$ 7,279	\$ 7,279	0.00%	\$ 22,462	\$ 22,462	0.00%	
Raising Readers	Thrive by Five	4.1a	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,000	12.50%	\$ 13,000	\$ 17,000	30.77%	
Raising Readers	Out of School Time Learning	4.1a	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,000	33.33%	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,000	33.33%	
Youth and Shelter Services	family dev/ed pathways, FaDSS	4.1a	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	0.00%	\$ 18,063	\$ 20,000	10.72%	
RSVP	volunteer mngmnt	4.2b	\$ 21,600	\$ 21,900	1.39%	\$ 61,400	\$ 62,300	1.47%	
Volunteer Center of Story County	volunteer mngmnt	4.2b	\$ 6,775	\$ 7,500	10.70%	\$ 67,576	\$ 78,800	16.61%	
Visiting Nurse Services	Foster Grandparent Program	4.2b	\$ 5,386	\$ 5,386	0.00%	\$ 17,867	\$ 17,867	0.00%	
The Arc of Story County	Service Coordination	4.2c	\$ 1,043	\$ 1,000	-4.12%	\$ 3,924	\$ 3,000	-23.55%	
Heartland Senior Services	service coordination outreach	4.2c	\$ 37,000	\$ 41,655	12.58%	\$ 97,686	\$ 11,806	-87.91%	
Heartland Senior Services	service coordination friendly visitor	4.2c	\$ 2,671	\$ -	-100.00%	\$ 8,140	\$ -	-100.00%	
Heartland Senior Services	act & res center	4.2d	\$ 33,481	\$ 34,000	1.55%	\$ 37,019	\$ 39,000	5.35%	
ACCESS	public ed & awareness	4.3a	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,578	19.27%	\$ 16,635	\$ 17,726	6.56%	
NAMI	public education & awareness	4.3a	\$ 500	\$ 500	0.00%	\$ 5,247	\$ 17,985	242.77%	
Youth and Shelter Services	pub ed/aware substance abuse ed	4.3a	\$ 27,500	\$ 30,000	9.09%	\$ 38,888	\$ 92,940	138.99%	
Youth and Shelter Services	pub ed/aware child abuse kidability	4.3a	\$ 8,838	\$ 10,000	13.15%	\$ 25,203	\$ 30,500	21.02%	
Youth and Shelter Services	Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention	4.3a	\$ -	\$ 500			\$ 1,400		
Youth and Shelter Services	Pub ed/Aware Human Trafficking	4.3a	\$ -	\$ 1,500			\$ 6,000		
NAMI	wellness center	4.3b	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,500	10.00%	\$ 36,512	\$ 38,080	4.29%	
Volunteer Center of Story County	service learning	4.3b	\$ 700	\$ 1,000	42.86%	\$ 8,888	\$ 10,500	18.14%	

November 28, 2016

Mayor Ann Campbell and Ames City Council  
515 Clark Avenue  
Ames, IA 50010

Dear Mayor Campbell and City Council,

Thank you for your continued support of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and your continued appreciation for the importance of historic preservation in Ames. **Our current annual budget of \$2000 covers educational opportunities for the citizens of Ames, training opportunities for commission members, and our annual Preservation Awards given out each spring.** We gratefully acknowledge the support of Ray Anderson, City Planning staff, and City Council as we continue working to enrich the Ames community through the preservation of historic resources and to inform residents of the cultural, economic, and social advantages of historic preservation. We look forward to the Council's support in the upcoming year as we continue this important community work.

The HPC began working with partners including the Ames Historical Society (AHS) and the Main Street Cultural District (MSCD) in 2014 as part of the Sesquicentennial celebration of Ames to create the Plaques on Historic Buildings Project (PHBP). The objective of the project is to educate the public on the architectural and historical significance of the buildings in downtown Ames and to promote preservation within Ames. In the past three years, twenty plaques have been installed in the downtown area, 16 of which utilized \$200 grants provided through the city through additional funding sought by the HPC. There are at least 10 additional buildings that the PHBP committee have identified with historic or architectural significance as well as building whose owners have expressed interest in having plaques installed.

Please see the attached document Plaques on Historic Buildings for a breakdown of the anticipated 2017 cost increase to create and install plaques and more information on the history of the plaques in Ames.

**For FY 2017-18, the HPC would like to request additional funding that could be granted to six businesses to have historic plaques installed, for a total funding request of \$2700.** Five businesses would receive a \$300 grant and 1 business (The Depot) would receive a \$1200 grant. Due to The Depot's historical and architectural significance to Ames, the narrative, description, and illustration are anticipated to be larger than the typical plaque and have an increase in cost.

Sincerely,



Kim Hanna, Chair  
Historic Preservation Commission  
[hanna\\_kimberly@yahoo.com](mailto:hanna_kimberly@yahoo.com)  
515-450-7313

# Plaques on Historic Buildings

November 10, 2016

The Plaques on Historic Buildings Project began in 2014. Its objective is to educate the public of the architectural and historical significance of the buildings in downtown and to promote preservation within Ames. It is a combined effort between the City of Ames Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), the Ames Historical Society (AHS), and the Main Street Cultural District (MSCD). The committee members are Sharon Wirth (AHS), Judy Gilger (MSCD) and Jason Dietzenbach (HPC) and previously Roberta Vann (HPC).

Each plaque is personalized for its respective building and follows a basic template including 3 things:

- 1.) an illustration of the building's major architectural features
- 2.) a narrative of the building's history, and
- 3.) a description of the building's major architectural features.

Each of these three components serve to educate the community about the building's architecture and history while promoting preservation of our community's historic buildings.

Each plaque installation involves working individually with a building/business owner, researching building history, writing and editing text, and coordinating the image of the architectural features. Pella Engraving, Pella, IA, produces the plaques and all of their work is done in Iowa. An artist on staff creates the graphic image working from a digital photograph supplied by the committee. The plaques are 10 x 12 inches in size and are fabricated from zinc.

In the past 3 years 20 plaques have been installed in the downtown area, 16 of which utilized the \$200 grants provided through the city. There are an additional 10+ buildings that the committee has identified with historic or architectural significance as well as buildings whose owners have expressed interest in having plaques installed.

Looking forward to the 2017-2018 fiscal year the committee requests grant funding for 6 plaques, which is feasible for the committee to complete in one year.

The material cost has gone up each year since 2014 and the anticipated 2017 cost increase is an additional \$40 per plaque. The projected 2017 costs are as follows:

Fabrication (in Pella):	\$605.00
Installation:	\$ 65.00
Research, writing:	<u>\$150.00</u> (done by volunteers, 10-15 hours/plaque)
Total cost:	\$820.00

Because of these additional costs, the committee proposes the city council provided 5 grants of \$300.00 per plaque.

The committee would also like to pursue a building plaque for the depot with a special grant. Due to the depot's historical and architectural significance the narrative, description, and illustration are anticipated to be larger than the typical plaque and have an increase in cost. Because of this, the committee proposes the city council provide a special grant of \$1,200.00 for the Depot plaque.

The committee's total grant request is \$2,700.00. (5 at \$300 each and 1 at \$1,200)

There has also been some discussion of changing the purchasing to go through the AHS or MSCD. Currently, Pella Engraving provide a 25% discount on the zinc plaque, a 20% discount for the aluminum backer, as well as no taxes as the City of Ames is purchasing. These add up to \$138.06, which would be an anticipated increase in fabrication costs if the AHS or MSCD would purchase in lieu of the city. As well, Sharon Wirth has worked with the city to purchase all 20 of the plaques. It is the committee's desire to continue with a similar purchasing process that has been used thus far to finish out the remainder of the plaque project.

## MINUTES OF THE TOWN BUDGET MEETING

AMES, IOWA

OCTOBER 4, 2016

The Town Budget Meeting was called to order by City Manager Steve Schainker at 7:01 p.m. on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016, in the Council Chambers of Ames City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue.

Mr. Schainker welcomed the audience and informed them that this meeting was the beginning of the process to prepare the 2017/18 City Budget. Mr. Schainker invited the audience watching on television to call in and for residents to provide written comments and suggestions via email to the City Council.

Mr. Schainker reviewed the budget calendar, including the Resident Satisfaction Survey, the development of departmental budgets for review, the guidelines from the City Council, and the budget hearing and adoption process.

Finance Director Duane Pitcher reviewed the overall health of the City's Budget. Mr. Pitcher explained where the City's revenues came from and where expenditures go. He compared the City's property tax rate with other large communities in the state of Iowa.

### **PUBLIC INPUT:**

A member of the public asked whether the University contributed to the cost of services. Mr. Schainker explained that the University pays for a portion of the Fire Department budget. Another resident asked where beautification projects were contained within the budget. Mr. Schainker stated that these projects were in a variety of locations in the budget.

Cliff Macdonald, of 521 Brown Court, recommended that 13<sup>th</sup> Street be renamed "Welcome Way" or something more appropriate.

Drew Kamp, 304 Main Street, stated there is no safe pedestrian route along Dayton Road adjacent the USDA facility. Mr. Kamp encouraged the extension of Grand Avenue all the way to Airport Road.

Trevin Ward, 1012 Grand Avenue, encouraged the Council to adopt the bicycle infrastructure improvements discussed during last year's CIP planning process.

Sue Wuhs, 2920 Monroe Drive, indicated that the City Council had asked for capital needs of the human services agencies in Ames, and ACPC has significant needs for HVAC repairs.

Victoria Szopinski, 3710 Ross Road, recommended the City Council proceed with providing capital funding for human services agencies in a five-year process.

Erv Klass, 1405 Grand Avenue, asked that a manager be hired to manage the natural areas of City parks.

An individual encouraged a tax abatement program to encourage the conversion of rental housing to owner-occupied housing.

Mr. Macdonald suggested building an accessible outdoor skating rink during the winter.

Jeff Johnson expressed interest in developing a consistent welcoming entryway along the Duff and Lincoln Way corridors.

Casie Vance, 416 Douglas, expressed appreciation for City funds in the past, and indicated the Ames Historical Society intends to apply for City funds again.

Martin Edelson, 2407 Duff Avenue, indicated there is a need for an all-inclusive playground. He suggested that all-inclusive playgrounds be incorporated into other parks within Ames.

Ms. Szopinski urged support for a community solar project.

Mr. Kamp clarified the general area of his request along Dayton.

Mr. Klaas encouraged the City to work towards sustainability and plan for climate change, particularly related to flooding. He suggested the City should have a long-range plan for when we run out of fossil fuels.

Mr. Macdonald encouraged the City to promote deck hockey.

An individual suggested that beautification and maintenance of parks should be a priority of the City. She also suggested there should be an incentive to convert rental properties to single-family.

An individual explained that residents along Duff Avenue have expressed interest in making crossing Duff Avenue to Inis Grove Park safer, such as a refuge island in the roadway.

Mr. Ward suggested the City should develop an overall pedestrian improvement fund to finance pedestrian projects on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Schainker reviewed the list of suggestions from the audience. He explained that the City Council will take these suggestions into consideration as it prepares the City Budget. He thanked the participants for attending.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

---

Brian Phillips, Scribe

To: Steve Schainker <sschainker@city.ames.ia.us>  
From: Debra Lee <deblee58@yahoo.com>  
Date: 09/05/2016 08:39AM  
Subject: An early start to budget suggestions

Dear Steve,

Thank you for inviting input to the 2017-18 city budgeting process. I appreciate this opportunity to call attention to areas where I believe our community would benefit from resource investment. As you will see, the following list is a broad mix ranging from neighborhood focus to the wider community and from bricks and mortar to personnel. The items are in rough priority order, but it is difficult to assign a uniform weighting process to the list. You will see that several of the items are interrelated. I would welcome an opportunity to talk with you in greater detail about any one item or all, as needed.

1) Proactively budget for an amount to improve traffic/pedestrian safety on South 4th from Squaw Creek to South Oak Avenue to address needs created by construction of Stadium View Suites. The details would likely be unspecified at the time of the 2017-18 budgeting process. However, we want to avoid waiting for the 2018-19 budgeting process and beyond for implementation. (I visited with John Joiner about this possibility in March, 2016).

2) Increase the allocation of funds for traffic engineering. I believe that we are stretching our current personnel to the limits. You will see that many of the remaining items on this list relate to transportation planning. I believe that we are paying a cost for past under-investment. Also, as a planning and zoning commissioner, I have observed that traffic planning is frequently a key element in community response at the planning stage and to successful project implementation. It seems that traffic planning has become, and will be increasingly important at we implement infill projects.

3) Allocate funds for design and implementation of improved car/bike/pedestrian/bus interaction in Somerset Village, particularly at the intersections of Stange Road with Northridge Parkway and Aspen Road. There are a couple of ironic aspects to this situation. Some members of the community pushed for implementation of the village concept, with a focus on walkability and it took years for the village commercial area to develop. We now have a village with a major north/south artery running through it and a full set of popular businesses that draw droves of people in cars from the broad community. In my mind, we have an area that was designed for a set of conditions that no longer exist. I have heard the concept that congestion slows traffic and prevents accidents. This may be true on the side streets, but I am yet to be convinced about how this applies to the Stange Road intersections. Visibility at these intersections is a serious concern. Traffic numbers on Stange seem to be making speed irrelevant.

4) Allocate funds to improve car/bike/pedestrian/bus interaction on South 16th Street between University Avenue and Duff Avenue. I recognize that a segment of this is under ISU jurisdiction. Specific concerns are: bus rider safety as residents from the south side of 16th cross to the north side to ride to campus in the morning; left-hand turns into and out of the Copper Beach complex; congestion from all modes of transportation during morning and evening 'commuting' hours.

5) Allocate funds to support pool resources to serve a wide range of community members, rather than focusing on the needs of competitive swimmers. If we can find a way to provide both, great...recognizing that the resulting pool for competitive use might be deemed 'adequate' as opposed to 'premier'.

6) Consider adding a secure 'municipal shredding service'. While many companies are doing their part to obscure portions of our SSNs and account numbers, there are still plenty of documents that need to be securely disposed of. It seems inefficient to have us all sitting at home feeding paper into our small shredding devices, when we could be spending our time volunteering for community service instead :-).

7) Add a street sign to mark the east side of 'Northridge Parkway' at the intersection with George Washington Carver Avenue.

8) This suggestion is an idea from a friend, who lives in the Moore Park area – a) Create a turn-out along Beach Avenue (one to two car lengths) for short-term loading/unloading for people to drop off picnic supplies and/or people who are physically unable to walk the distance to the park, b) Add/improve signage at the Gaskill Drive access point to communicate that Moore Park can be accessed via that route.

9) Broader strokes –

a) I support pursuing design of a multi-generational community center focused on physical and social well-being.

b) I support pursuing a design plan to increase opportunities for residential use in the downtown area, recognizing that identifying how to provide adequate parking is part of the design.

c) I look forward to seeing the ideas from the Lincoln Way Corridor study and hope that there will be some project ideas that we can rally around.

d) I am thankful to be invited to serve on the CyRide review committee. I have been concerned that service expectations are increasingly exceeding available resources. I believe the CyRide is a valuable community resource and has been well managed. I was very glad to learn that the current evaluation process is underway.

e) The residents of west Ames from Dotson Drive to the Campustown area are dealing with a lot of change: the Hunziker project on Lincoln Way, the Breckenridge project, the Old Middle School property design process, the apartment/hotel proposal, the many new apartments in Campustown, potential projects stemming from the LW Corridor study... I hope that we can be generous in allocating resources to soften the impacts. I also hope that we can be part of a positive transition for the uses of the Crawford and former Edwards school properties.

I had intended to stop with item number 8. I realize that I am drifting from budgeting to policy. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input. While this is a list of ideas for improvements, I want to acknowledge the hundreds of positive actions performed by city staff members every day. The primary message is 'keep up the good work'.

Sincerely,  
Debbie Lee