



1

DEPARTMENT OF  
FINANCE

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

CITY HALL  
ROOM 14  
915 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2685

December 21, 1988  
88153:EM:ldc

916-449-5736

BETTY MASUOKA  
DIRECTOR OF  
FINANCE

Budget and Finance Committee  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF MEASURE G

SUMMARY

As requested by Council, this report back summarizes the estimated impact that Measure G - the freezing of the Utility Users' Tax rate - will have on the City's budget and how this additional revenue will be addressed in the budget process.

BACKGROUND

As reported to Council in July, 1988, the following table projects the increased revenue which will result from freezing the Utility Users' Tax at 7.5%. These projections will be updated in February as part of the Midyear Review.

(\$ in 000's)

	<u>Revenue with 7.5% Rate</u>		<u>Revenue with rate reductions Rate Revenue</u>	<u>Revenue Gain</u>
1988-89	28,480	7.5%	28,480	0
1989-90	32,470	7.0	30,840	1,630
1990-91	37,430	6.5	33,070	4,360
1991-92	40,870	6.0	33,380	7,490
1992-93	44,950	5.5	33,710	11,240
1993-94	49,830	5.0	34,050	15,780

This additional revenue shall be used to augment the Public Safety budget beginning in 1989-90. The current Public Safety base is \$87.9 million. The additional \$1.6 million projected for 1989-90 represents a 1.8% increase to this budget. Detail on the specific allocation of the Utility Users' Tax

Budget and Finance Committee  
January 3, 1989  
page two

increment will be presented in the City Manager's Proposed Budget, which will be released in May.

Attached is the table originally presented to Council in July which identifies some of the major areas of unmet need in the area of Public Safety. In addition, staff will be issuing a Phase I Request for Proposal, which will include identification and review of overall goals and procedures for the Police Department, problems which are specific or unique to this City (e.g., significant increase in daytime population) and preparation of the Phase II RFP calling for a specific staffing study. The Phase I RFP is scheduled for release this month.

The purpose of breaking up the study into two phases is to provide City management and the Council an opportunity to review the prioritization of goals in the Police Department prior to making staffing recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only and requires no action from the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,



Betty Masuoka  
Director of Finance

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:



JACK R. CRIST  
Deputy City Manager

Attachment

January 10, 1989  
All Districts

Table 1  
Unmet Public Safety Needs  
(\$'s in 000's)

	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	TOTAL
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY CIP DEBT</b>						
North Area Police Substation			500	500	500	1,500
Public Safety Complex			5,500	5,500	5,500	16,500
North Area Fire Station					200	200
-----						
Subtotal CIP debt	0	0	6,000	6,000	6,200	18,200
<b>POLICE OPERATING</b>						
Officers needed to get to 2 per 1,000 (104 FTE)	6,860	5,460	5,730	6,020	6,320	30,390
Officers to keep pace with pop. growth (14 FTE/yr)		970	1,720	2,460	3,210	8,360
South Substation staffing (13 FTE)	1,470	630	670	700	730	4,200
North Substation staffing (13 FTE)			1,630	700	730	3,060
Civilian Support (59 FTE)	2,360	2,170	2,280	2,390	2,510	11,710
-----						
Police Subtotal	10,690	9,230	12,030	12,270	13,500	57,720
<b>FIRE OPERATING</b>						
Natomes staffing		1,210	930	970	1,020	4,130
Downtown staffing				1,340	1,020	2,360
North Area Staffing					1,400	1,400
-----						
Fire Subtotal	0	1,210	930	2,310	3,440	7,890
<b>ANIMAL CONTROL OPERATING</b>						
Staffing to keep up with Pop. growth (2FTE/Yr)	110	180	250	320	390	1,250
Increased service (1FTE/Yr)	50	90	130	170	200	640
-----						
Animal Control Subtotal	160	270	380	490	590	1,890
<b>TOTAL UNMET NEEDS</b>	<b>10,850</b>	<b>10,710</b>	<b>19,340</b>	<b>21,070</b>	<b>23,730</b>	<b>85,700</b>
<b>Public Safety Base Expenditures</b>	<b>87,880</b>	<b>92,280</b>	<b>96,890</b>	<b>101,740</b>	<b>106,820</b>	<b>485,610</b>