



CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

~~31~~  
44

OFFICE OF THE  
CITY MANAGER

February 13, 1980

CITY HALL  
915 I STREET - 95814  
(916) 449-5704

City Council  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Resolution Establishing Budget Policies and Guidelines for 1980-81  
Fiscal Year

SUMMARY

The Council on February 5, 1980 directed the Budget and Finance Committee to further review the Council's proposed 1980-81 Budget Policy Resolution in light of one unresolved issue: the amount of Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds that ought to be utilized beyond the existing level (75% of annual allocation) to support the City's general government operations. The Committee, studied the matter, identified three (3) funding level alternatives (Exhibit II) but could not reach a decision at their February 12, 1980 meeting. The Committee finds that this issue requires full Council participation. The Council is asked to select one alternative, incorporate it into the Policy Resolution and thereafter adopt the Resolution.

BACKGROUND

Various 1980-81 budget policy matters have been reviewed with the Council over the past several weeks. The staff report of January 15, 1980 specifically summarizes and forecasts the City's 1980-81 financial budgetary situation. A proposed 1980-81 Budget Policy Resolution accompanied the report. The proposed Resolution has been amended on several occasions by the Council and Committee. Wording for all except Sections 3 and 8 have been mutually agreed upon by the Council and Committee (please refer to Exhibit I). Sections 3 and 8 require action by the full Council and, thereafter, adoption of the Final Policy Resolution.

The issue relative to Sections 3 and 8 center on how much additional Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds should be utilized to support the City general government operations.

APPROVED  
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 26 1980

OFFICE OF THE  
CITY CLERK

Currently, approximately \$4 million in Federal General Revenue Sharing is received by the City. \$3 million (75% of annual allocation) is utilized to support the City's general government operations and about \$1 million (25%) is used for capital improvements.

Staff foresees the need to increase this ratio from 75% to 100% for general operations support. If General Revenue Sharing Funds or some other source is not used to inject \$1 million into general operations, greater reductions in employees, services and supplies will occur beyond the \$5 million cuts anticipated due to the expected passage and impact of Jarvis II (Proposition 9) upon the City.

Discussion has centered on whether to increase the ratio to 100% or retain it at 75% or to leave it unspecified - at this time - between 75% and 100%. Accordingly, three (3) proposed alternatives for Section 3 and 8 have been identified (please refer to Exhibit II) and are summarized as follows:

Alternative A: Increase to 100% <sup>4</sup>

Alternative B: Unspecified level - between 75% & 100%

Alternative C: Retain @ 75%

II - Jarvis  
Fed &  
How long

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council take action to select Alternative A, B or C set forth in Exhibit II and thereafter adopt the 1980-81 Budget Policy Resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

*William H. Edgar*

William H. Edgar  
Assistant City Manager

Recommendation Approved:

*Walter J. Slips*

Walter J. Slips  
City Manager

February 19, 1980

## RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by The Sacramento City Council on date of

### RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING BUDGET POLICIES AND GUIDELINES FOR 1980-81 FISCAL YEAR

- WHEREAS, The City Council and the Budget and Finance Committee have been presented with a budget policy memorandum together with a Preliminary Economic Report, a General Government Fund Balance Analysis, a General Fund Revenue Forecast, and an Analysis and Calculations of the City's "Appropriation Limit" under the provisions of Proposition 4 (Gann Initiative).
- WHEREAS, The "preliminary" fiscal year 1980-81 financial analysis indicates the rise in municipal revenues together with carryover available fund balances will support a no-growth budget given no significant changes in local economic conditions and/or level of Federal and State subventions to the City;
- WHEREAS, Prudent financial planning requires that the City, anticipate the impact of the June 1980 Jarvis II State Income Tax Initiative.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

- Section 1. That the City Council endorses the general concept of preparing the fiscal 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) assuming that the June 1980 Jarvis II State Income Tax Initiative will be approved by the voters.
- Section 2. That the City Council preliminarily anticipates the impact of the Jarvis II Initiative will be, at minimum, a loss of \$5 million in revenue to support the General Government Fund activities of the City.
- Section 3. NOTE: WORDING FOR SECTION 3 TO BE INSERTED FOLLOWING COUNCIL'S SELECTION OF EITHER ALTERNATIVE WORDING A, B, OR C.
- Section 4. That the City Manager is instructed to make the necessary reductions using the following priority listing of services as a general guideline:
- Public Safety
  - Enterprise
  - Public Works
  - Community Services
  - Administrative/Support
- Section 5. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the remaining portion of the operating preliminary budget (s) such as the enterprise activities at a no-growth level, or less, depending upon whether the existing or proposed revenue sources support the related activities.

- Section 6. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare a separate report regarding budget additions which could be restored in priority order in the event circumstances justify their reinstatement.
- Section 7. That the City Council indicate its intention to not levy an add-on ad valorem property tax for either general obligation debt service or local retirement pension costs until conditions are such that the add-on levy is absolutely necessary to maintain City services.
- Section 8. NOTE: WORDING FOR SECTION 8 TO BE INSERTED FOLLOWING COUNCIL'S SELECTION OF EITHER ALTERNATIVE WORDING A, B, OR C.
- Section 9. That the City Council intends to maintain an unappropriated available General Government Fund Balance approximately equal to 7% of General Government expenditures (\$5.4 million) which is subject to change after the June 1980 State-wide election, in addition to the \$1.0 million "cash basis reserve" required for dry period working capital financing.
- Section 10. That the 1980-81 funding for the Contributions to Other Governmental Agencies, Entertaining and Advertising, and Contributions to Other Agencies be established, at a maximum, at \$200,000 for all of the activities related to these budget units.
- Section 11. That the City Council formally approves the closure of the AB-8 State Assistance Fund effective June 30, 1980 and that all future receipt of revenues from this source to be considered as General Government Fund Revenue.
- Section 12. That any revenue growth from the Transient Occupancy Tax, in excess of that required to operate the Community Center on a self-supporting basis and the Convention Bureau, be considered first for total repayment of the debt to the General Fund and then for Capital Improvements with direct benefit activities related to the source of the revenue.
- Section 13. That the City Council does not intend to approve any new or expanded programs beyond the amended 1979-80 budget service level unless cost savings can be demonstrated.
- Section 14. That generally, General Government fees or charges may be increased in accordance with the demonstrated need for the increases and the existing costs of activities related to the revenues subject to City Council approval.
- Section 15. That with specific reference to the "Lawn and Garden Excise Tax", the City Manager is instructed to prepare a report and recommendation regarding the legal and administrative feasibility of converting the existing "Excise Tax" to a "User Fee". This report and recommendation is to be submitted to the City Council prior to the presentation of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget.
- Section 16. That the City Manager is directed to prepare a report and related budget amendments necessary to correct the current Fiscal 1979-80 Budget deficiencies (estimated at \$1.0 million) related to vehicle operating costs.

Section 17. That this resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

Three alternatives for Section 3 and 8 of Proposed 1980-81 Budget Policy Resolution relative to amount of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds to be used to support General City Government Operations.

ALTERNATIVE A: (Increase to 100%)

Section 3. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the General Government portion of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) at a minimum level of \$5 million below the existing (1979-80) service level costs as adjusted for certain known cost increases.

Section 8. That the City Council endorse the concept of utilizing up to 100% of Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds to support general government operations.

ALTERNATIVE B: (Unspecified Level Between 75% and 100%)

Section 3. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the General Government portion of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) at a minimum level of \$5 million below the existing (1979-80) service level costs, as adjusted for certain known cost increases; however, this amount will be proportionally increased as a result of General Revenue Sharing resources not being increased beyond that level which has existed in the past for support of General Government operations.

Section 8. That the City Council endorse the concept of utilizing additional resources of Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds beyond that level which has existed in the past to support General Government operations.

ALTERNATIVE C: (Retain @ 75%)

Section 3. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the General Government portion of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) at a minimum level of \$5 million below the existing (1979-80) service level costs, as adjusted for certain known cost increases; however, this amount will be proportionally increased as a result of General Revenue Sharing resources not being increased beyond that level (75% of annual allocation) which has existed in the past for support of General Government operations.

Section 8. That the City Council endorse the concept of not utilizing additional resources of Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds beyond that level (75% of annual allocation) which has existed in the past to support General Government operations.

80-114

# RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by The Sacramento City Council on date of

FEB 26 1980

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING BUDGET POLICIES AND GUIDELINES FOR 1980-81 FISCAL YEAR

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

FEB 26 1980

APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

WHEREAS, The City Council and the Budget and Finance Committee have been presented with a budget policy memorandum together with a Preliminary Economic Report, a General Government Fund Balance Analysis, a General Fund Revenue Forecast, and an Analysis and Calculations of the City's "Appropriation Limit" Under the provisions of Proposition 4 (Gann Initiative);

WHEREAS, The "preliminary" fiscal year 1980-81 financial analysis indicates the rise in municipal revenues together with carryover available fund balances will support a no-growth budget given no significant changes in local economic conditions and/or level of Federal and State subventions to the City;

WHEREAS, Prudent financial planning requires that the City, anticipate the impact of the June 1980 Jarvis II State Income Tax Initiative.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

Section 1. That the City Council endorses the general concept of preparing the fiscal 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) assuming that the June 1980 Jarvis II State Income Tax Initiative will be approved by the voters.

Section 2. That the City Council preliminarily anticipates the impact of the Jarvis II Initiative will be, at minimum, a loss of \$5 million in revenue to support the General Government Fund activities of the City.

Section 3. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the General Government portion of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget (s) at a minimum level of \$5 million below the existing (1979-80) service level costs, as adjusted for certain known cost increases; however, this amount will be proportionally increased as a result of General Revenue Sharing resources not being increased beyond that level which has existed in the past for support of General Government operations.

Section 4. That the City Manager is instructed to make the necessary reductions using the following priority listing of services as a general guideline:

- Public Safety
- Enterprise
- Public Works
- Community Services
- Administrative/Support

Section 5. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare the remaining portion of the operating preliminary budget (s) such as the enterprise activities at a no-growth level, or less, depending upon whether the existing or proposed revenue sources support the related activities.

APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 26 1980

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

- Section 6. That the City Manager is instructed to prepare a separate report regarding budget additions which could be restored in priority order in the event circumstances justify their reinstatement.
- Section 7. That the City Council indicate its intention to not levy an add-on ad valorem property tax for either general obligation debt service or local retirement pension costs until conditions are such that the add-on levy is absolutely necessary to maintain City services.
- Section 8. That the City Council endorse the concept of utilizing additional resources of Federal General Revenue Sharing Funds beyond that level which has existed in the past to support General Government operations.
- Section 9. That the City Council intends to maintain an unappropriated available General Government Fund Balance approximately equal to 7% of General Government expenditures (\$5.4 million) which is subject to change after the June 1980 State-wide election, in addition to the \$1.0 million "cash basis reserve" required for dry period working capital financing.
- Section 10. That the 1980-81 funding for the Contributions to Other Governmental Agencies, Entertaining and Advertising, and Contributions to Other Agencies be established, at a maximum, at \$200,000 for all of the activities related to these budget units.
- Section 11. That the City Council formally approves the closure of the AB-8 State Assistance Fund effective June 30, 1980 and that all future receipt of revenues from this source to be considered as General Government Fund Revenue.
- Section 12. That any revenue growth from the Transient Occupancy Tax, in excess of that required to operate the Community Center on a self-supporting basis and the Convention Bureau, be considered first for total repayment of the debt to the General Fund and then for Capital Improvements with directly benefit activities related to the source of the revenue.
- Section 13. That the City Council does not intend to approve any new or expanded programs beyond the amended 1979-80 budget service level unless cost savings can be demonstrated.
- Section 14. That generally, General Government fees or charges may be increased in accordance with the demonstrated need for the increases and the existing costs of activities related to the revenues subject to City Council approval.
- Section 15. That with specific reference to the "Lawn and Garden Excise Tax", the City Manager is instructed to prepare a report and recommendation regarding the legal and administrative feasibility of converting the existing "Excise Tax" to a "User Fee". This report and recommendation is to be submitted to the City Council prior to the presentation of the 1980-81 Preliminary Budget.
- Section 16. That the City Manager is directed to prepare a report and related budget amendments necessary to correct the current Fiscal 1979-80 Budget deficiencies (estimated at \$1.0 million) related to vehicle operating costs.

Section 17. That this resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

---

MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

CITY CLERK ACTING

# California Alternative Investment Task Force

RECEIVED

1932 FOURTH AVE. • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95818 • (916) 443-6418 FEB 20 1980

John C. Harrington



EMPLOYEE SERVICES

Mayor Phil Isenberg  
915 I St., City Hall  
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

February 19, 1980

Dear Phil:

I was recently asked to become the Northern California Political Coordinator for the Service Employees International Union (SEIU). Discovering that the job demands a great deal of my time traveling between the Bay Area, Napa and Sonoma counties and the Central Valley, a move from the Sacramento area has become evident. I am in the process of such a move and sadly must submit my resignation to you as a member of the City Administration, Investment & Fiscal Management Board effective when my replacement is appointed.

I strongly recommend that my replacement on the board represent the Sacramento black community. While I have served approximately a year on the board, I have discovered not only a lack of beneficiary, but of Sacramento community representation. The Sacramento Employees' Retirement System is the only system in the state and perhaps in the nation that not only has no employee or retiree representation, but by charter, specifically prohibits representation by anyone connected with city government. It's frightening to know that the present system with over \$100 million in assets is in the hands of bureaucrats who are not subject to the will of the beneficiaries.

During my time on the board, I have observed the following:

- The City Treasurer illegally voted the system's stock proxies to support corporate management's position economically supporting white-ruled South Africa and Rhodesia
- The board adopted a stock proxy rule of "vote with management or sell"
- The board refused to open meetings for greater beneficiary and public input
- The board adopted a "gag rule" to prohibit a board member from raising specific economic issues
- The City Treasurer and the board chair possibly violated state law in a "self-dealing" conflict of interest action

Because of the above actions, I strongly urge you and the City Council to:

- Place a charter amendment before Sacramento voters to add employee and retiree members to the board
- Require the board to expand public and beneficiary input and to annually poll the beneficiaries for their views on the investments of their pension funds

- Prohibit investments in high risk securities such as nuclear power
- Prohibit board members from having personal involvement in financial institutions, brokerage firms or corporations that also receive investment funds from the Sacramento Employees Retirement System
- Prohibit public employee investments in South Africa and in corporations that discriminate on the basis of race and sex
- Require the City Treasurer to work with local financial institutions and business to link the community's economic needs with that of the employees' retirement system
- Require the board to more adequately communicate with the City Council, beneficiaries and the public

Its time the board was honest with city employees and retirees and let them know that the system's actuarial assumptions to pay future pensions are based on almost worthless dollars, annual 5% city employee pay increases and annual 3% cost-of-living increases for retirees while inflation rolls along at 13%. Its also time to begin to invest in our own state and local economy. For example, we have more pension funds invested indirectly in South Africa and directly in out-of-state utilities than we have invested in the Sacramento economy. This is absurd, especially when one considers the Sacramento Valley housing market and the yield on conventional and federally insured mortgages.

I plan to continue to work with the California Alternative Investment Task Force and local government reinvestment task forces throughout the state, as well as labor and church organizations and others who are pursuing a socially responsible investment strategy to increase total economic yield from our over \$43 billion in public and public employee pension funds in California.

I very much appreciate working with and receiving strong support from several individuals on the City Council. Please let me know if I can be of any additional assistance regarding recommendations outlined in this letter.

Sincerely,

John Harrington

cc: Frederick Kahn  
City Council  
Sacramento Central Labor Council  
Sacramento Area Black Caucus