

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN THE 10th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
2400 Washington Avenue
March 23, 2010
3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Madeline McMillan; Sharon P. Scott; Tina L. Vick; Joseph C. Whitaker; Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Herbert H. Bateman, Jr.; and Joe S. Frank ----- 7

ABSENT: None ----- 0

OTHERS PRESENT: Neil Morgan; Stuart Katz; Mabel Washington Jenkins; Alan Archer; Cynthia Rohlf; Allen Jackson; Wanda Pierre; Lisa Cipriano; Steve Carpenter; Stephen Hawks; Chad Pritchett; Bill Keeler; Robyn Rose; Monique Warren; LaVerne Lovett; Florence Kingston; Jerri Wilson; Joe Lawlor; and Jennifer Walker

I. FY 2011 Budget Presentation

Mr. Neil Morgan, City Manager, stated the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget position papers would be delivered to City Council by Friday, April 2, 2010, to allow them ample time to study the information for discussion at the April 13, 2010 Work Session. He encouraged members of City Council to contact him or Ms. Lisa Cipriano, Director, Department of Budget and Evaluation, prior to April 13, should they have questions or suggestions.

City Manager Morgan reported the State General Assembly had adopted its FY 2011 – 2012 Biennial Budget shortly before submission of the City’s FY 2011 recommended budget. City staff was trying to sort out how the state’s budget affected the City. He felt the City had \$100,000 or more in revenue than it had before the state’s budget was adopted. He asked City Council to keep that in mind as they studied the budget in search of savings, and indicated an update would be provided at the April 13, 2010, Work Session of City Council.

City Manager Morgan reported the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget totaled \$745,706,785, which was a decrease of \$25.2 million or 3.3% over the adopted FY 2010 Operating Budget. He stated the total budget amount included the General Fund, Schools, Public Utilities, and all Special Revenue and Trust Funds. The FY 2011 Recommended General Fund Operating Budget totaled \$410,497,000, which was a \$10.6 million or a 2.5% decrease over the adopted FY 2010 Operating Budget. Real estate property assessments were expected to decrease by 5%. The budget maintained the basic services and programs that were highly valued and expected by citizens and avoided tax and fee increases where possible.

City Manager Morgan stated the General Fund Revenue decreased over the past three fiscal years, from \$433 million in FY 2009 to \$410 million in FY 2011. He hoped the end of the recession, and its affect on the City’s revenue, was near. General fund revenue had declined

by approximately \$23 million or 5.3% over the past two years. The FY 2011 recommended budget increased over FY 2010 in three areas: 1) pension contributions; 2) healthcare premiums; and 3) energy costs. The FY 2011 budget included an increase of approximately \$5 million (from \$22 to \$27 million) that was consistent with the commitment to begin complete restoration of the pension fund's actuarial position. To maintain the healthcare premium ratio of 75% City contribution and 25% employee contribution, funding was increased by approximately \$1.5 million. Healthcare was an important benefit for employees, particularly in a time when there had been no general wage increases over the past two years. The increase in energy costs was primarily associated with fuel for vehicles. Aside from the above increases, the FY 2011 recommended budget reflected a downward trend in most other areas.

City Manager Morgan recommended a net reduction of 112 positions in the General Fund, with the elimination of 118 City-wide vacant, frozen and filled positions. He stated this reduction represented a 4.2% decrease in the work force. There was a net reduction of six positions in Other Operating Funds. Three positions would be eliminated from the Historical Services Fund and five positions would be reduced from the Public Utilities Fund (Waterworks). Three positions would move from the General Fund to the Stormwater and Wastewater Funds. City Manager Morgan was relieved that the number of actual recommended reduction-in-force positions was relatively small (14 positions), compared to the number of vacant positions being eliminated.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the departments that realized the reductions in positions. City Manager Morgan replied the reduction-in-force positions included: 1) Six positions in the Department of Juvenile Services, by closing the kitchen and privatizing its operations. Six months of its operation was included in the budget and a vendor process would be undertaken. He was under the expectation that the employees could work for the vendor if they chose; however, there was no guarantee; 2) Three positions in the Commissioner of the Revenue's office. The City expected a reduction in funding from the State for the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer's offices; however, much of the funding had been restored. This recommendation was significantly less than what he had first proposed due to the restoration of State funding. He suggested that the State Income Tax Division of the Commissioner of Revenue's office be eliminated, based on the philosophy that the service was available in the private sector and offered by volunteers. However, in some degree, the State Income Tax Service had to be offered and further discussion would be forthcoming on the matter; 3) One position at the City Farm; 4) Two positions in the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism; 5) One position in the Department of Libraries and Information Services; and 6) One position in the Department of Human Resources.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether the memo from Ms. Pricilla S. Bele, Commissioner of the Revenue, was written before or after funds were restored in the budget by the General Assembly. City Manager Morgan replied that Ms. Bele's memo was written after the funds were restored. (A copy of the memo from Pricilla S. Bele, Commissioner of the Revenue,

is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

City Manager Morgan cautioned there was a practical limit in continuing to ask employees to do more with less; there were diminishing returns for remaining employees to provide similar levels of service, and the City was close to that point. There would be some level of degradation of service in some places as fewer people were tasked with providing services.

City Manager Morgan felt the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget reflected a deliberate effort to minimize impacts on service delivery to citizens. Newport News continued to have a robust range of services, which was an important quality-of-life issue. He recommended the following service reductions for the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget: 1) Elimination of the curbside loose leaf collection program in Public Works, which would result in a direct annual savings of \$150,000; 2) Reduction of funding for the annual vehicle replacement program and street maintenance program; 3) Reduction of operational hours and changes to the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism's Historical Services Division, which would result in an annual savings of \$109,000; and 4) Elimination of the State Income Tax Service provided by the Commission of the Revenue's office.

Councilwoman McMillan understood there was \$100,000 allotted each year for Vehicle Replacement, and inquired whether vehicles should be replaced each year. She inquired about a suggestion made to replace vehicles every three years. City Manager Morgan replied the sum spent on vehicle replacement was much larger than \$100,000. The funding allotted for Vehicle Replacement in FY 2010 was approximately \$1.5 million. The number he recommended for FY 2011 totaled \$750,000. Staff would offer a detailed briefing on the life cycle of the City's vehicles at an upcoming Work Session. He pointed out that the size of the City's vehicle fleet had substantially been reduced over the past three years. He felt the recommended funding would allow replacement of the most critical vehicles.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about reducing the number of take-home vehicles by department heads and employees. City Manager Morgan reminded there had been a detailed review of the take-home vehicle program, which was modified. He believed, with the exception of Public Safety, the only employees with take-home vehicles were those who were on-call for emergency response. He was open to a more detailed discussion on the program, if desired by City Council.

City Manager Morgan stated the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget included no funding for either across-the-board salary or merit increases for City employees. As of July 1, 2010, City employees would have worked for 24 continuous months without a general salary adjustment. He asked that City Council support his recommendation for a \$500 one-time salary supplement, to be paid in July, to all full-time employees. The supplement would partially compensate employees for their increased out-of-pocket health insurance costs. It would be a

payment that would not be added to an employee's base salary and would not be factored into their pension.

City Manager Morgan reported the Leave Exchange Program was initially intended as a method of reducing the City's large liability for unused employee vacation pay. The resulting effect was that the City traded one long-term liability for another. The Leave Exchange Program was a valued benefit for employees, but it also placed an additional, long-term pressure on the pension fund. While the ability to accelerate achieving retirement had been eliminated, this program still existed and allowed employees to trade vacation for a larger pension benefit. With an annual cost of approximately \$1.8 million, and the need to reduce overall expenditures in the upcoming budget, he recommended that the Leave Exchange Program be eliminated. In fairness to employees who had managed their leave this year, anticipating the Leave Exchange option, he would allow one final exchange in July 2010. The program would be terminated thereafter.

City Manager Morgan stated it was his intention to phase out the education supplement for undergraduate degrees in the Police and Fire Departments. In the past, such supplements were given to attract a better applicant pool. In the current environment, many applicants came to the City with degrees as a part of their experience. No similar automatic benefit existed for the civilian workforce and he felt this should be eliminated as a matter of equity.

Councilwoman Vick inquired about the number of employees that benefitted from the Leave Exchange Program. Ms. LaVerne Lovett, Director, Department of Finance, replied it was approximately 1,500 employees who participated in the Leave Exchange Program.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether there was any delineation when an employee was hired if they had a degree. City Manager Morgan replied it would be considered in the future.

City Manager Morgan stated he kept most fees at their current levels and had proposed only modest increases. He recommended the establishment of a \$25 per season fee for the soccer and basketball youth sports programs. The revenue from those fees would defer some of the costs for referees and coaches. This would generate \$75,000. He advised such fees were typical in other communities. Additionally, he recommended an increase in EMS response fees. For Basic Life Support (BLS), the proposed rate would increase to \$425 from \$375. For Advanced Life Support (ALS), the rate would increase from \$475 to \$525. The mileage rate would remain the same at \$8.25 per mile. The increased fee would allow the City to

recover the full amount that could be reimbursed by most insurance companies and would be comparable to what other communities charged. City Manager Morgan also recommended eliminating the waiver of applicable insurance co-payments and/or deductibles for City residents. Currently, any remaining ambulance fee that a citizen's insurance does not pay would be written-off and the account closed. The elimination of this provision would require the entire ambulance fee to be paid. The City would continue to file insurance claims, on the patient's behalf, but any remaining portion of the fee would be billed to the patient. The waiver for hardship cases would remain intact. The combined changes would generate \$415,000 in additional revenue.

Mayor Frank felt the concept was fine, but voiced concern for citizens who truly could not afford to pay the difference in the user fee. He stated some communities sued individuals for such fees, which impacted upon their credit ratings. He inquired whether citizens would still be able to apply for a waiver in cases of hardship. City Manager Morgan felt more discussion was warranted on the matter. He voiced concern that the ambulance service was somewhat abused, where citizens called for EMS service repeatedly.

Councilwoman McMillan pointed out that the EMS fee was substantially increased, in the past, to alleviate the need for people to use the service as a taxi-cab.

City Manager Morgan stated the reason for the suggestion was due to the fact that 87% of Fire calls were for EMS service.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether City Council could consider charging a fee to facilities, i.e. a nursing home and skill care units who were required to have a doctor on site. If such facilities had a situation that required further medical interpretation, such facilities called the EMS to transport their residents to a hospital. She inquired whether the City could charge a fee to such facilities because they would be less apt to make unnecessary calls to the City. City Manager Morgan recalled that Councilwoman Scott had inquired about this before; however, in looking into the matter, he found there could be legal issues about how the City billed such facilities. He stated he would look into the matter further.

City Manager Morgan recommended a 6.9% increase in water rates. He stated this was less than the amount projected last year when the decision was made to have no rate increase. The recommended increase was held down by eliminating five positions in Waterworks, holding more positions vacant, and using some retained earnings. This proposed rate increase reflected a rise in actual Waterworks costs, as well as a sustained demand reduction. By adopting the increased water rate, it would preclude from implementing a larger increase in the future. He pointed out that the Life Line rate of \$2.78 for the first 600 cubic feet (HCF) was being held at the same level as when it was first established. Consumers with minimal water

usage would not see an increase in their water bill. There were no recommended increases in the Solid Waste, Stormwater or Wastewater fees. He was preparing a detailed briefing on the matter. The sustained level of demand was lower than what many felt it would be, combined with fixed costs that did not change, i.e. chemicals, treatments and maintenance of infrastructure. The increase covered one-half of fixed costs.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the percentage of customers who stayed within the lifeline rate category. City Manager Morgan felt approximately one-fourth of Newport News residents stayed within the lifeline rate; however, he would provide accurate information in his briefing paper. Sixty-percent of users were non-Newport News residents, which made it a regional issue.

City Manager Morgan recommended a contribution of \$109.2 million to Newport News Public Schools (NNPS), which was a \$4 million or 3.5% reduction from FY 2010. The FY 2011 contribution included \$12.4 million in City funding for NNPS's debt service. He indicated the reduction was made reluctantly and with the Superintendent being fully briefed on his intention to do so. He noted that the City only reduced funding to NNPS by \$100,000 in FY 2010, wherein neighboring localities reduced funding to their schools by more significant amounts. A briefing would be scheduled for the April 13, 2010 Work Session.

City Manager Morgan recommended funding for the Community Support Budget in the amount of \$7,657,551. This represented level funding to FY 2010; however, significant changes had been made to both the Community Support Agencies and the Regional Organizational Agencies. Under the Regional Organizational Agencies, the City was reserving funds for the Hampton-Newport News Criminal Justice Agency (HNNCJA), should federal grant funding not materialize during the upcoming fiscal year. HNNCJA had been a long-time partner with the City to promote public safety by providing community-based pretrial and post-conviction programs. This service was critical in managing the jail population and holding down growing incarceration costs. The reserve amount was \$127,431. Additionally, there were a total of 14 agencies not funded in the current year that solicited support from the City amounting to \$642,750 in requests. Some of those agencies were requesting restoration of funds that were eliminated in the FY 2010 operating budget and some were new requests. It was difficult to consider any new requests in a challenging budget year. Other agencies were deemed to be faith-based initiatives and not eligible for City support. He recommended that no additional agencies be funded in FY 2011.

City Manager Morgan identified four matters that needed careful pursuit in the future: 1) Analysis and implementation of sustainability efforts; 2) Review of potential shared services and contracted services; 3) Implementation of a 3-1-1 Customer Service function in the City of Newport News; and 4) The establishment of a Capital Reserve Fund. The Capital Reserve Fund would allow deployment of any annual budget savings as a ready reserve that

crossed fiscal years and achieved organizational goals, while avoiding the use of the General Fund Balance.

City Manager Morgan stated in developing the FY 2011 budget other alternatives were considered, including an early retirement program, pay cuts, and furloughs. It was his judgment that early retirement would not be cost effective because many eligible employees planned to retire in the near future. To contemplate pay cuts and furloughs at a time when general wage increases had not been forthcoming was an undesirable alternative and was, therefore, not recommended. These were short-term or one-time savings, and he chose not to make sustainable reductions that fit within known revenue streams.

City Manager Morgan stated he and City staff worked very hard to develop a budget that was responsible to current economic conditions, while at the same time protected essential core services to the citizens. He stated detailed Budget Position Papers would be delivered to members of City Council by April 2, 2010, and would be made available to the public on the City's website and in the Newport News public libraries. A Newport News TV program would be aired that contained the budget information outlined in today's presentation. He thanked Ms. Lisa Cipriano and her staff for their hard work on the budget. He introduced Ms. Cipriano to report on FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget's Revenues and Expenditures.

Ms. Cipriano reported the Components of the FY 2011 Financial Plan totaled \$832,453,695 and was comprised of:

- 1) **Total FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget - \$745,706,785** (General Fund – \$410,497,000; Separate Funds - \$374,816,400; and Special Revenue Funds – \$222,556,625); and
- 2) **FY 2011 Approved CIP - \$86,746,910** (General Fund Supported Projects – \$50,711,910; and Self-Supporting Fund Projects - \$36,035,000).

Ms. Cipriano noted the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget included:

- **General Fund** - \$410,497,000
- **City Transfer to Schools** - \$109,200,000
- **School Fund** - \$278,943,620
- **Waterworks Fund** - \$83,597,800
- **Wastewater Fund** - \$17,497,000
- **Solid Waste Fund** - \$12,764,000
- **Stormwater Management Fund** - \$10,917,000
- **All Other Funds** - \$40,690,365

Ms. Cipriano stated the FY 2011 Recommended Operating Budget totaled \$745,706,785, which was a \$25,264,524 or 3.3% decrease over FY 2010.

Ms. Cipriano stated, based on the fact that the City experienced three years of declining revenue, the FY 2011 Operating Budget was developed on known circumstances. It was based primarily on the FY 2010 second quarter known revenue projections and in anticipation of what the effect would be of a reduction in real estate reassessments and state budget reimbursements. She noted the following FY 2011 Recommended General Fund Revenues:

- **Real Estate Tax** - \$165,841,338
- **Personal Property** - \$42,900,000
- **Machinery & Tools** - \$14,705,000
- **Sales Tax** - \$20,627,000
- **Meals Taxes** - \$17,500,000
- **Utility Taxes** - \$18,979,288
- **BPOL Taxes** - \$13,871,000
- **State Aid** - \$47,162,519
- **All Other Revenue** - \$68,910,855

The FY 2011 Recommended General Fund Revenues totaled \$410,497,000, which was a decrease of \$10,599,000 over FY 2010.

Ms. Cipriano noted the following FY 2011 Recommended General Fund Expenditures:

- **Salaries** - \$118,883,457
- **Benefits** - \$55,425,632
- **Utilities** - \$7,200,202
- **Fuel** - \$2,141,326
- **Other** - \$69,021,098
- **Vehicle Replacement** - \$750,000
- **IT Replacement** - \$500,000
- **Local Support to Schools** - \$109,200,000
- **Community Support** - \$3,153,141
- **HRT Operating and Capital** - \$4,504,410
- **Debt Service** - \$35,384,967
- **Cash Capital** - \$2,809,246

FY 2011 total Expenditures were \$410,497,000, which was a decrease of -2.5% over the FY 2010 adopted budget.

Ms. Cipriano stated the initial FY 2011 Service Expenditure Estimate of \$433.2 million had to be reduced to the FY 2011 City Manager Recommended Operating Budget that totaled \$410,497,000. She noted the following General Fund Expenditure Reductions made to reduce the \$433.2 million initial service expenditure estimate:

- **73 Full Time Positions Eliminated** – \$4,631,000
- **Attrition Credit** – \$5,030,600
- **Other Operating Expenses** - \$4,354,138
- **Reduction of Cash Capital Contribution** - \$2,465,700
- **Suspension of Leave Exchange Contribution** - \$1,800,000
- **Contribution to Schools** - \$4,000,000
- **Reduction of Street Repair/Maintenance, Leaf Collection** - \$378,562
- **Community Support Contribution Reductions** - \$140,000

Ms. Cipriano stated FY 2011 Recommended General Fund Expenditure Additions included:

- 1) **Parks Landscaping** - \$120,000 for completion of Warwick Boulevard and for the upper Warwick Boulevard corridor;
- 2) **Denbigh Early Childhood Center** - \$21,460 for utilities. The building was now owned by the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism;
- 3) **Regional Jail Per Diems** - \$337,537 to cover rate increase at the Regional Jail;
- 4) **HNN Criminal Justice Agency** – \$127,431 was reserved should the Federal Grant not fully fund operations;
- 5) **LINK** – Worker’s Comp - \$5,000 to fund Worker’s Comp for individuals that helped run the PORT and Shelter Program;
- 6) **HRT** - \$12,534 for HRT’s net increase;
- 7) **Medical Services Contract** - \$15,000 to cover increase for employee annual physicals and correctional care for the City Farm, Jail and Juvenile Services; and
- 8) **Employee Applicant System** - \$10,000.

Ms. Cipriano noted Other Funds Expenditures Recommended for FY 2011:

- **Waterworks** – \$83,597,800 (an increase of \$3,495,800)
- **Solid Waste Fund** – \$12,765,000
- **Wastewater Fund** - \$17,497,000
- **Stormwater Fund** - \$10,917,000

(A copy of the presentation, “FY 2011 Operating Budget Overview,” is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about Waterworks increased debt service of \$1,702,480 for FY 2011 and what it entailed. Ms. Cipriano reminded that Waterworks refunded some outstanding debt and rather than spreading the debt out over a number of years, it was taken at one period of time. City Manager Morgan replied it was a combination of the King William Reservoir, the Lee Hall Operations Center, and all of the other debt projects.

Councilwoman McMillan stated, she always had a problem with the summer conservation rate, which was proposed to increase by \$.21 cents. She stated everyone used more water in the summer and the rate kept increasing. City Manager Morgan felt the summer was the time when the water supply was at risk and the summer conservation rate was an encouragement for citizens to use less water.

Councilwoman Woodbury felt a \$.21 cent rate increase along with the summer conservation rate increase of \$.04 cents was ridiculous. Ms. Cipriano recalled Waterworks had originally projected an 8% rate increase for FY 2011.

City Manager Morgan introduced Ms. Jerri Wilson, Management & Legislative Program Analyst, City Manager's Office, to offer a Legislative update on State budget actions and the impact to the City of Newport News.

Ms. Wilson stated the State Budget cuts that Impacted Local Government included:

- 1) **Aid to Localities** – Flexible cut of \$120 million over biennium - \$60 million per year;
- 2) **599 Public Safety Funding** – decrease of \$108,401 or 1.2% in FY 2011 and \$1,026,836 or 11.2% in FY 2012;
- 3) **Aid to Local Libraries** – 15% reduction each year;
- 4) **Jail Per Diems** – Local responsible inmates reduced from \$8 to \$4 and State responsible inmates reduced from \$12 to \$14;
- 5) **Local Electoral Board and Registrars** - 20% reduction in FY 2011 and FY 2012;
- 6) **Sheriff** – 100% restoration in FY 2011 and 2.6% reduction in FY 2012;
- 7) **Commonwealth's Attorney** – 96.1% restoration in biennium;
- 8) **Commissioner of the Revenue** – 85.2% restoration in biennium;
- 9) **Treasurer** – 81.3% restoration in biennium;
- 10) **Circuit Court Clerk** – 99.0% restoration in biennium;
- 11) **Local Composite Index (LCI) was unfrozen** – 100% Hold Harmless in FY 2011 and 50% Hold Harmless in FY 2012;
- 12) **Virginia Juvenile Crime Control Act Funding** – 5.1% reduction in State Aid to Localities;

- 13) NN Public Schools** – FY 2011 State Share - \$165,483,647 or -12.29%, and City Share - \$47,521,197 or +1.37% and FY 2012 State Share \$162,820,013 or -13.70% and City Share \$46,851,900 or -0.06%;
- 14) Communication Sales & Use Tax Trust Fund** - \$460 Million per year. Include language directing comptroller to include as General Fund for annual report to Governor; authorize three State programs [Department of Taxation for administrative cost and Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Relay Center operations cost] to use Funds;
- 15) Definition of Local/State Responsible Offenders** – Budget implications unclear; and
- 16) VRS Employer Rates.**

(A copy of handout, “State Budget Actions of Impact to Local Government as of March 23, 2010,” is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman McMillan inquired how the per diem rate reduction was justified by the State. Ms. Wilson noted that the State changed the definition of Local/State Responsible inmates, in stating inmates were not the State’s responsibility. She felt that was paving the way to reduce the per diem rate further.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about Communication Sales & Use Tax Trust funding and recalled a fee was charged on a resident’s phone bill to be used as a designated fund to pay for that service. Ms. Wilson concurred; however, if the State designated the funding as General Fund they could use it for other programs in the biennium. Ms. Wilson suggested that City Council include a provision in their 2011 Legislative Packet that objected to any redistribution of the Communication Sales and Use Tax Trust funding.

Councilwoman McMillan felt this went back to the need to read bills more carefully. She recalled being very supportive of the initiation of the Communication Sales fee and was distinctly under the impression that this would be strictly an untouchable, designated fund for this service.

Mayor Frank suggested that the City Attorney have the State City Attorney’s Association look at the actual terms of the Communication Sales & Use Tax Trust Fund that was created to see whether it really had a lock box or whether it was just a name that did not mean anything, just as the Lottery Fund turned out to be.

Ms. Wilson stated Virginia Municipal League felt one reason to treat the funding as General Funding was to increase the State’s debt capacity.

Councilwoman McMillan understood Ms. Wilson, but felt one did not levy a fee on the public as a pretense and then use the funding for something else. This was a very important service and they should not be stifling off for something else.

City Manager Morgan inquired whether City Council was in support of the following Budget Work Sessions and Public Hearing dates: April 13, 2010 – Budget Work Session to include Schools, Position Papers, Fee Based Programs (Waterworks, EMS Fees, etc.) and an overview of Community Support, to begin no earlier than 2:30 p.m. and no later than 3:30 p.m.; April 27, 2010 Budget Work Session to include Position Paper Follow-up, Regional Agencies/Community Support; April 13, 2010 – First Budget Public Hearing in City Council Chambers; and Second Budget Public Hearing in April 2010 at a time and place to be determined.

Councilwoman McMillan expressed her preference for scheduling a budget public hearing after the final work session.

City Manager Morgan stated he preferred voting on the School and City Budget at the May 11, 2010 Regular Meeting of City Council.

After further discussion, City Council was in consensus with the above dates as proposed by the City Manager.

Councilwoman Woodbury made a motion; seconded by Vice Mayor Whitaker, to fix the time and place of the public hearings on the City Manager's proposed budget as follows: City Council Chambers, April 13, 2010, 7:00 p.m. and a second public hearing in April 2010 at a time and place to be determined.

Vote on Roll Call:

Ayes: McMillan, Scott, Vick, Whitaker, Woodbury, Bateman, Frank

Nays: None

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 5:20 P.M.

Jennifer D. Walker
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Joe S. Frank
Mayor
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk