

So normally these funds all have contingency cash in 'em. Beginning cash fund balances. **We don't really know what our cash fund balances are, because of the state of our books. I would be willing to guess that we're not at zero. In our general fund I would be willing to guess we're probably at 400-500 thousand in our general fund"**

Unknown: "MmmHmmm"

And, a hundred in each of the other funds if not more.

"Uh huh"

"Ummm, do we raise it 7-8 dollars, eliminate the CSO keep 2.75 until the remainder of the contract? And, go out in the fall for a tax increase?"

"Yeah"

"Yeah"

With the flat out knowledge--

"That its gonna happen again next year?"

"If it doesn't then we're gonna start losing officers. And, it'll go up to start paying for itself"

"Right"

"And..."

"I would rather go up a little bit extra, at least \$29 is below \$30, you know its-- just so it gives the argument of "

" "I'm game either way. I just -- we have to go up. In my opinion we tried it last year with an open house and we got..."

"It's because there's been no bite"

"Right"

"If we put this on there now it stings. Now they think about it."

"And then you come back in the fall and there's your.. Honestly we need to go for at least \$1.50 to \$2.00 per thousand. And get up to where Rogue River and some of the other small communities are."

"Yeah. Right"

"We're still gonna be \$1.50 less than..."

"I think Gold Hill is even two-something..."

"Mmm hmmm. They're -- once you put their sewer fees and stuff in it they're way higher.

And they also have a yearly increase, which we do not"

"Yeah, we need that yearly increase"

"So, the other thing is... I still think it's a good argument with people... People in low-income housing pay the same public safety fee as people in really nice river homes." ...

"I know"

"So, its not progressive like property taxes. And I think if you could win the hearts and minds of the trailer parks and the low-income housing and with the trailer parks, you might--the owners might really get behind you because in 2012 they were so against it, and they got all of their tenants to vote against it. **So if you could give them a little sting this year with RVSS and so forth and convince them**, there might be a better chance of doing it, but I think that's a good argument."

"Right. But I think if we do nothing and put it out to them, they'll want nothing "

"Exactly. They won't see it."

"No, I agree. I say we massage it with -- my input would be to lose the CSO and increase the safety fee. "

"Mhmm... Yeah"

"And then go out in the fall and go for the... and let people know ...this is"

"Yes"

"And if they vote it down, they vote it down. Now we start eliminating... we bring the contract to the public. If it goes down to one officer..."

"Or, we bump the public safety fee another \$8 dollars to pay for it."

"Right. But at some point you're gonna get diminishing returns, people will just stop paying it"

"Yeah"

"And "

"And, especially when its on RVSS, sorry we cannot cut sewers off"

"No, but we get it through tax certification

"I know but..."

"We do get it..."

"We better be right on that tax certification."

"Yeah yeah"

"Another argument too is the property taxes are tax-deductible and public safety fees are not."

"I think property taxes are much fairer to the general public"

[Multiple budget committee members agree]

Well I think you have a higher chance as long as we have a larger pool of renters here. I mean, I know that eventually it gets passed on. But, the homeowners might be more easily able to absorb that than someone who is in a renting situation.

"I just... I don't... Our other option would be to go down all the way to two. [Two deputies] Raise the fee and go down to two and I think if you look at it "

"I would not want to do that this year, I would rather do the increase because I don't think people will... I mean going to \$29... if we would have escalated like every other bill we would have been almost there... And we're just adding a little more.

"That's what I mean, though, if you cut the other $\frac{3}{4}$ [Officer]

"Uh huh?"

"If you do the math, it almost pans out to where you go to \$29, cut the other $\frac{3}{4}$ officer, it almost pays for itself.

"No. OK, but if we can afford it and if we say that we've been absorbing a lot of it – I mean the whole thing up until now.

"Correct"

"We'll absorb a little more for one more year and then the next year when that thing goes on the ballot if they vote it down then we'll say we're cutting. We're gonna start cutting.

So, you want to start having instead of 2.7 officers you just want...

"I'm just saying that

"That's an option. How much would that, how would that impact us? Like, would we see a lot of a decrease in law enforcement presence?"

"Probably. And you're gonna deal—and I think we're already gonna deal with a little bit of the human nature fallout. Cause he -- well you're law enforcement, you know they're a very tight community. And just ..."

"We just have to do it gently, that we just can't afford it"

"Right, I know. But I just... you know.."

[Context: There was a brief discussion about how the CSO works for law enforcement and the impact of cutting additional officer positions from the contract. Leaders acknowledges this isn't ideal.]

"But, I would be willing to go that route if the voters vote down the tax

"Yeah"

[More discussion ensues about the City's options]

"And we'll lay all those options out on either if you don't pass it then either we raise it to pay for it, or we get rid of them. And one of those is going to happen."

[Context: The person commenting appears to mean that if a tax increase isn't passed, either the City raises public safety fees more and/or cuts additional police officer positions.]

"I agree. I mean, we can't just keep paying for it. And here's what's happened throughout the years to us on budget committee, and staff that is present. We have kept paying it out of the general fund. Like absolutely misleading with our budgets. And what I mean by that is we have way overstated our budgetary needs for staff inside City Hall. We've way overstated our budgetary needs and then as we get the income it goes out into the safety fees and not into the personnel that's needed to run the City. Into building upgrades that we need in the City, streets that need to be improved. And we've been doing that on our safety budget.

"Streets. Mmmhmm"

"The general fund has been paying for our safety. "

"Right"

"And, its either don't complain about the streets or lack of service at City Hall or anything else, and you can have your safety. Or you give up your safety. Or you pay for it. And, we really have to be able to just manip – I hate the word manipulation, but we have to manipulate it to the public and make them understand."

"And, just lay it out very clearly... that this is .."

"They'll never pay it till they understand."

"Mmmhmm. Yeah"

"Because, in reality that's what we've been doing for years"

"Yes, and we can't—" "We can't continue" "We can't do it anymore, there's nowhere to go"

"Or we just keep running the City like it is with no growth. I mean, we need a hundred thousand or more to start into Urban Growth and the Urban Renewal Areas. We need that, probably close to \$100,000 to get that set up and going so that we can get fight and give it some new injection into our City.

“Water!”

“Like water’s gonna be expensive even if we get the money that we’re asking for.”