

1. 10:00 A.M. Agenda

Documents:

[2020-09-16 Finance Committee Agenda.pdf](#)

2. Meeting Materials

[Financial-Report-General-Fund](#)

[2020-08-Financial-Report-Public-Works](#)

[Financial-Report-Debt-Services](#)

[2020-08-Financial-Report-Urban-Renewal](#)

Documents:

[2020-05-21 Budget Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)

[2020-05-21 Urban Renewal Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)

[2020-05-28 Budget Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)



**CITY OF YACHATS
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
441 Hwy 101 N., Yachats OR
Wednesday, September 23, 2020 at 10:00am
To Be Held Via Zoom**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86800313811?pwd=NnJiOUNvYUg0NWRHSDZHVGfjeW55QT09>

Meeting ID: 868 0031 3811

Passcode: 005624

One tap mobile

+12532158782,,86800313811#,,,,,0#,,005624# US (Tacoma)

+13462487799,,86800313811#,,,,,0#,,005624# US (Houston)

Dial by your location

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 868 0031 3811

Passcode: 005624

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kZKIVJSvK>

AGENDA

- I. Call Meeting to Order
- II. Minutes
 - A. Draft Minutes of May 21, 2020
 - B. Yachats Urban Renewal Agency Draft Minutes May 21, 2020
 - C. Draft Minutes of May 28, 2020

****June, July and August Meetings were cancelled due to COVID19****
- III. New Business
 - A. Review July Financial Reports
 - B. Update on FY20 Audit
 - C. Discussion of Financial Policy updates
 - D. Discussion of Finance Committee 2020 goals
- IV. Other Business
 - A. From the Committee
 - B. From the Staff
 - C. From the Floor

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are invited to attend. This meeting will be audio taped. All items to be considered by the Commission must be submitted to City Hall no later than one week prior to the meeting. Minutes of all public meetings are available for review at City Hall, or on the City website at www.yachatsoregon.org

In accordance with ORS 192.630, City of Yachats will make a good faith effort to provide accommodations for any person desiring to attend a public meeting, if the request is made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting time. The meeting room is physically accessible to persons with mobility devices; a sign language or foreign language interpreter may be available, with advance notice. Call City Hall at 541- 547-3565 or Oregon Relay 1-800-735-2900 (TDD) two days in advance.

POSTED 09/17/20



**BUDGET HEARING
CITY OF YACHATS
May 21, 2020**

Draft Minutes

I. Call to Order

City Beaucaire called the May 21, 2020 regular meetings of the Budget Committee to order at 10:05 am in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, Lance Bloch, John Purcell, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Absent: none. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald and Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 8.

II. Election of Chair

Glenn moved to elect John Moore as Chair of the Budget Committee: Aye – 10; No – 0.

III. Approval of Minutes

Vaaler indicated she would send minor corrections to Helen Anderson.

Vaaler moved to approve the May 15, 2019 budget hearing minutes as amended: Aye – 10; No – 0.

IV. Public Comment - none

V. Public Hearing – State Revenue Sharing

Moore opened the public hearing on State Revenue Sharing at 10:07 am.

Moore explained the City is required by law to have a public hearing to be eligible to participate in state revenue sharing.

There was no public testimony.

Glenn moved to accept the state revenue sharing: Aye -10; No – 0.

Moore closed the hearing at 10:10 am.

VI. Public Hearing – City of Yachats Budget

Moore opened the City of Yachats Budget Hearing at 10:10 am.

A. Debt Service

Webb asked for clarification on the flow numbers. Beaucaire indicated she and the finance people from the Council of Governments (COG) were in the process of consolidating to get the

1 flow numbers to agree. Webb noted the summary description was not equal to details in the
2 document. Beaucaire explained the numbers in her document.

3
4 Tom Lauritzen asked that there be some notation of the loan forgiveness amount to increase
5 transparency (page 25). Groth clarified the original loan was \$1.7 million and with the
6 forgiveness the actual amount due is \$1.030 million.

7
8 **Webb moved to approve the debt service section as presented:** discussion

9
10 Groth suggested that the transfer section be expanded.

11
12 **Call for vote: Aye – 10: No – 0.**

13 14 **B. Public Works Operating and Capital**

15 16 Streets

17 Webb noted fuel prices were significantly down. McClung stated the impact of that decrease
18 had not yet shown up in material costs, and he expected to see the impact shortly.

19
20 Vaaler noted \$50,000 was from the state highway tax. She suggested that this tax would likely
21 decrease this year. Beaucaire stated the state had not yet provided a revised estimate. Vaaler
22 suggested they take a more conservative estimate at this time. Beaucaire noted any cuts to
23 revenue must be reflected in a corresponding decrease in expenditures. Webb agreed with
24 Vaaler that this estimate should be more conservative.

25
26 The amount of mowing showed an increase of 35%. Beaucaire indicated she got an estimate
27 from the mower. Buckwald noted this amount also includes tree removal.

28
29 Vaaler asked about street lighting and whether some of this could be reduced while still
30 maintaining safety. Beaucaire indicated this would be a discussion for Council. Beaucaire and
31 Moore discussed conversion to LED lighting.

32
33 Groth asked what the \$38,000 in labor included. Buckwald indicated that amount included tree
34 removal, pot hole filling, and any other work on streets.

35
36 Groth suggested keeping the \$50,000 estimate and having a supplemental budget to make a
37 transfer in should the revenues be lower.

38
39 **The Committee agreed this fund was satisfactory as presented.**

40 41 Storm Drains

42
43 Vaaler asked why the allocation of labor increased. Beaucaire explained she increased labor
44 15% across all funds except streets. She noted this increase includes contracted costs, cost of
45 living increases, step increases, and possible hiring. Vaaler asked that any new hires be
46 approved by Council. Webb suggested that hiring at this time should absolutely not be done.
47 Beaucaire noted hiring would only be done as is economically allowed.

48
49 Webb asked why there was \$30,000 allocated for labor when there were no line items.
50 Buckwald indicated that the work was maintenance and not part of capital expenses.

1 Groth asked if it was possible to merge streets and drains. Beaucaire indicated this would be a
2 future discussion. Webb noted that previously there was no budget at all for storm drains and
3 they decided they needed to have this category so it was part of ongoing planning on
4 maintenance. McClung added that there were SDC charges specifically for storm drains and he
5 thought it was good to separate the two.

6
7 The Committee agreed this fund was satisfactory as presented.

8
9 Water Operating

10 Groth noted there was excess revenues going forward and suggested that excesses be
11 transferred to capital projects.

12
13 Webb and Vaaler stated that they did not agree with any increases to water revenues. Vaaler
14 wanted to be more conservative. McClung stated 67% of revenue comes from water base rates
15 and that will remain consistent. He predicted they would sell about 25% less water and that is
16 why he suggested they not transfer the \$100,000 to capital.

17
18 Anderson reviewed the Public Works and Streets Commission analysis of April 2020 revenues
19 and where they concluded residential use was up and large user use was down, but this
20 decrease was not as significant as might be expected.

21
22 The Committee discussed possible scenarios. Beaucaire suggested they could use the zero-
23 balance going forward approach next year if there were in a similar situation.

24
25 Groth explained the auditor conversion to cash/contingency funds line.

26
27 McClung explained the \$40,000 contract expense was for testing, calibrations, and engineering
28 not related to a CIP project. Webb asked about main plant outside services. Buckwald
29 explained this was for lab testing and equipment calibrations which were requirements by OHA.

30
31 Bloch asked if action was needed to use the \$83,000 going forward to cover lower revenues.
32 Beaucaire noted they could do a budget transfer resolution to make the adjustment at the end of
33 the fiscal year.

34
35 Vaaler clarified there would be no practical difference in reducing revenues to \$550,000 with
36 \$33,000 in residuals as that would convey a better public image.

37
38 Moore took a straw poll on reducing the revenues to \$550,000 and the net residual by \$50,000:

39 No (4): Purcell, Tooke, Moore, Glenn

40 Yes (6): Keller, Groth, Bloch, O'Shaughnessey, Vaaler, Webb

41
42 Moore took a straw poll on moving \$33,125 to the contingency fund:

43 No (1): Purcell

44 Yes (9): Keller, Groth, Bloch, O'Shaughnessey, Vaaler, Webb, Tooke, Moore, Glenn

45
46 The Committee agreed to change this fund to reflect \$50,000 reduction in revenues to \$550,000
47 and to move \$33,125 to the contingency to make that \$93,125 with a zero balance going
48 forward.

49
50 Wastewater

1 Purcell asked for clarification on the \$20,000 for outside services. Buckwald indicated this
2 money was for rebuilding pumps.

3
4 Vaaler asked about the personnel costs, noting the estimated actual was \$255,000 and
5 \$345,000 was allocated for this year. Webb noted this was \$95,000 increase.

6
7 Buckwald noted \$288,000 from FY18-19 went up to \$340,000 to include training of an additional
8 operator. Webb was ok with that but still does not understand the increase for this budget.
9 Vaaler noted this reflects a \$95,000 increase due to how it is allocated. She asked where there
10 was a corresponding decrease in \$95,000 in the budget. Beaucaire noted there were two
11 factors: allocations and increases. McClung stated its impossible to forecast were extra labor
12 was needed and the budgeted amounts were based on a work plan.

13
14 Groth noted the \$345,000 was assuming a \$300,000 base amount with a 15% increase.

15
16 Groth asked to move the \$94,779 going forward to wastewater capital reserves.

17
18 Webb was not in favor of a 15% increase of labor. Vaaler agreed that the \$345,000 was
19 increased too much.

20
21 Vaaler clarified that education and training was required for certifications.

22
23 A member asked why water has so much more than wastewater in cell phone costs. McClung
24 reported he had both a cell phone and an iPad that links to the SCADA system. Vaaler asked
25 Beaucaire if she has looked into reducing this line item cost.

26
27 The Committee agreed to decrease revenues by \$50,000 to \$525,000 and to move the \$94,770
28 going forward balance to capital reserves.

29
30 Streets Capital

31 Groth asked about the transfers with Visitor Amenities where there was an accumulated
32 unspent balance of \$331,000. Beaucaire stated that was for the Ocean View Drive and
33 Driftwood projects.

34
35 Groth clarified that the \$200,000 for parking would be discussed with other Commissions and
36 Council. Webb stated \$200,000 of the \$264,000 transferred in FY17-18 was for purchase of the
37 501 Building. Lauritzen stated \$200,000 was applied to the 501 for parking portion and
38 \$200,000 was allocated to streets to purchase additional parking. He added that \$200,000 has
39 not been spent and should still be in the reserves. Moore indicated some of these reserves
40 could be added to the Driftwood project.

41
42 Webb suggested that in the name of transparency that a portion of the Driftwood project indicate
43 that some of the funding is coming from this \$200,000 allocation for parking that comes from
44 Visitor Amenities. Vaaler agreed this issue was important to highlight. The Committee
45 discussed ways to account for the source for these funds

46
47 The Committee agreed the budget was satisfactory as presented. Vaaler noted that a note
48 would be made for the Visitor Amenity allocation.

1 Webb asked how much of the Driftwood project would be allocated for parking. Moore stated
2 33% or \$55,000 of the Driftwood project was allocated for parking to be paid with Visitor
3 Amenity funds. Webb suggested they have an amount per spot.

4 5 Storm Drains Capital

6 Groth clarified with Webb that Storm Drains and Streets still need to be separated in the capital
7 reserves.

8
9 The Committee discussed the importance of maintaining reserves in Storm Drains.

10 11 Water Capital Reserves

12 Moore noted there were three capital projects:

- 13 1. \$35,000 for Horizon Hill
- 14 2. \$100,000 for Streets
- 15 3. \$50,000 for Ocean View Drive

16
17 Groth suggested a transfer in from General Fund reserves of \$234,238 to cover the repayment
18 of the Water reserves, as he recalled money was borrowed from water reserves to pay for the
19 501 Building. Beaucaire asked that this be considered in FY21-22 due to the issues around
20 COVID-19 and the need to support the community. Groth asked that this issue be put into the
21 5-year plan.

22
23 Tooke Purcell asked members to better identify what pages and tables they are referring to.

24
25 Webb suggested adding a footnote or table at the bottom for Water Reserves Fund 660-1705
26 that notates this amount was related to the 501 Building loan from the fund. Webb noted this
27 means they are understating their reserves by \$234,238. Tooke noted this amount was not
28 currently reflected in the current budget documents.

29
30 Vaaler asked if they were going to use a 2-step process to move funds from Urban Renewal.
31 Beaucaire indicated she has a note to do this. Lauritzen stated this \$150,000 was a loan
32 repayment and should not be reflected as revenues. Webb clarified they would change the line
33 for "Revenue in Urban Renewal" to "Loan Repayment."

34
35 The Committee agreed to make the following changes:

- 36 1. Make the \$70,000 transfer in from the URD fund and not from the SDC fund (earthquake
37 valve)
- 38 2. Wait until FY22 to transfer \$234,230 to repay the loan taken from this fund to purchase
39 the 501 Building and to note this on the page for fund 660-1705
- 40 3. Change the \$150,000 transfer of "Revenue in Urban Renewal" to indicate "Loan
41 Repayment."

42 43 Waste Water Capital Reserves

44 Webb asked for clarification on the personnel allocations on page 65. Beaucaire stated that the
45 labor charged to projects was estimated at 15% of the total projects outlay.

46
47 The waste water capital projects included:

- 48 • \$30,000 I&I Basin Rehab
- 49 • \$80,000 Pole Building
- 50 • \$10,000 Utility Rate Study
- 51 • \$90,000 Waste Water Master Plan

- \$30,000 Submersible Pumps
- \$100,000 Plant VFD
- \$5,000 Tanks Screen
- \$20,000 Sampler Test Container
- \$90,000 Vac Truck

Purcell noted for the sliding doors for the UV building the description on Page 64 indicates \$15,000 and on sheet distributed it was for \$10,000. He asked if this project should be a capital project. Buckwald estimated the cost would be \$10,000. Beaucaire noted she needed to revise page in the budget document. Beaucaire noted the project was already in process so it should not be in FY20-21.

Vaaler asked for clarification on the need for a labor charge to purchase a vac truck. Buckwald indicated the purchase takes staff time.

O'Shaughnessey moved to approve the Public Works operating and capital projects as revised: Aye – 10; No – 0.

Moore adjourned the meeting at 3:59 pm.

ATTEST:

W. John Moore, Chair

Shannon Beaucaire

Date



**BUDGET HEARING
YACHATS URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
May 21, 2020**

Draft Minutes

I. Call to Order

City Manager Shannon Beaucaire called the May 21, 2020 regular meeting of the Yachats Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee to order at 9:00 am in through the Zoom meeting platform. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, John Purcell, Lance Bloch, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald, Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 6.

II. Election of Chair

Glenn nominated John Moore to be Chair of the Urban Renewal Agency Board: Aye – 10; No – 0.

III. Approve 2019-2020 Urban Renewal Committee Minutes

Vaaler indicated she had minor corrections she would send to Helen Anderson.

__ moved to approve the May 15, 2019 Urban Renewal Agency Budget Hearing minutes as corrected: Aye – 10; No – 0.

IV. Public Comment - none

V. Budget for Urban Renewal Agency

Purcell wanted to apply \$15,000 the unspent Urban Renewal Agency (URA) money for Public Works to cover the UV doors at the Public Works building. Beaucaire listed the approved projects in the URA plan and was not certain the UV door project fell under one of those plans. She clarified with Dave Buckwald that the UV door project was funded in the City budget.

Bloch noted there was a goal for the URD to address parking but there were no parking projects in the URD capital improvement projects. Mayor Moore noted the goal was a Council goal. Beaucaire stated it was a goal in the original URD document but was not listed as a current project.

Vaaler asked about the property tax line item with the possibility of people not paying taxes due to COVID-19 financial strains. Groth explained he, Beaucaire, and Tom Lauritzen got an estimate of \$395,000 and they took 90% of that to reach \$357,000 figure.

Vaaler noted there was \$150,000 capital project moved from a previous year, which would require an audit due to the expenditure level. She recalled the City's Auditor, Theresa Hanford, noted they could transfer more so that an audit would not be required in the following year.

1 Vaaler noted Tom Lauritzen suggested the URD should reimburse street fund and then the street
2 fund should reimburse the water reserves. Beaucaire indicated that would be fine if the Committee
3 agreed.

4
5 The Committee discussed options for additional transfers in this budget year. Groth noted that
6 they do a base transfer of \$195,000 so the audit would be required each year.

7
8 Webb stated he believed the audit was extremely high. Manager Beaucaire noted the audit fee
9 was \$1,700-\$1,800 and there were additional filing fees for the State.

10
11 Vaaler clarified that she was recommending to transfer more now and allow it to sit for payment in
12 the following year. Vaaler stated she thought it was important to look at every \$1,700 in savings.

13
14 Groth moved to approve a capital outlay transfer to the Water Capital fund 660-1705 for the
15 earthquake valve at the south tank for \$70,000 for FY21 and for the Highway 101 bridge
16 earthquake valve for \$100,000 for FY22: discussion

17
18 Webb clarified that this transfer would free up \$70,000 in the SDC fund.

19
20 Manager Beaucaire explained the City is contractually obligated to transfer \$100,000 for the debt.
21 Groth clarified he was not suggesting to eliminate that but to transfer \$170,000 in FY21.

22
23 McClung stated the earthquake valve was part of the south tank project and it was not completed.
24 This transfer would reduce the reserves from \$404,000 to 334,000

25
26 Call for vote: Aye – 10; No – 0.

27
28 Groth clarified that the URD funds must only be spent on projects within the URD boundary or to a
29 system that supports the URD district.

30
31 Groth noted he pays the tax and does not see himself in the district Lauritzen explained the county
32 has a software limitation that indicates a tax for the URD on every tax payer within in the City limits,
33 but funds from only those within the URD get put into the URD fund. Taxes from those outside of
34 the URD go to the county.

35
36 Groth asked if the transfer for I&I would be for a project within the URD. Manager Beaucaire
37 stated Public Works could definitely find projects that fit that criterion.

38
39 Webb clarified that it would be in the best interest to fund as much as possible from the URD.
40 Groth suggested they look at the scheduled projects to determine if there were other projects that
41 could be added. Vaaler clarified that the URA Board would need to approve any changes.

42
43 Glenn moved to approve the Urban Renewal Agency Budget for FY20-21 as amended: Aye – 10;
44 No – 0.

45
46 Moore adjourned the meeting at 9:58 am.

47
48
49
50
51 _____
52 W. John Moore, Chair

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

ATTEST:

Shannon Beaucaire, City Manager

Date

DRAFT



**BUDGET HEARING
CITY OF YACHATS
May 28, 2020**

Draft Minutes

I. Call to Order

City Beaucaire called the May 28, 2020 regular meetings of the Budget Committee to order at 9:00 am in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, Lance Bloch, John Purcell, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Absent: none. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald and Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 8.

II. Public Comment - none

III. Public Hearing – City of Yachats Budget

Moore opened the City of Yachats Budget Hearing at 9:00 am.

A. Continuation of FY21 City Budget

General Construction

Beaucaire explained the General Construction fund was a cleanup from the Highway 101 Project. The proposal is to move to \$2,951.15 of the remaining balance to streets capital and \$210,353.77 to water capital.

All members approved this fund as presented.

SDC Administration

Beaucaire noted that \$70,000 to capital reserves was now from taken from URD as decided in the previous meeting. Groth noted that there was a lot of construction going on and they would likely see continued income for SDCs. Keller hoped they were conservative enough. Beaucaire noted the reserve for future years would be \$570,000.

All members approved of this proposed fund with the noted changes.

City Hall

Beaucaire noted the major contribution to City Hall was transient lodging tax. She explained she calculated an average of last three years of tax income and took 50% of

1 that. Taxes from tobacco state revenue sharing were expected to decrease . Marijuana
2 and liquor were expected to increase.

3
4 Groth suggested dropping the interest earned line to \$5,000 per month or \$60,000 for
5 the year (down from \$78,000). Webb asked for information on income for the most
6 recent months in these categories. Bloch clarified that the proposal meant that the
7 reserve for future years would drop by \$18,000.

8
9 Purcell asked for clarification on professional, IGA, services line. Beaucaire explained
10 this line included the costs for all service contracts.

11
12 She stated the budgeted amount was currently at \$173,000 and the proposed at
13 \$190,000. Beaucaire stated the increase includes increases in cleaning costs due to
14 COVID. Purcell clarified that no one contract was increased by more than 10%.

15
16 Webb wanted to separate out the joint fund for this as it was such a large amount
17 compared to other items. He believed that some of the components should be
18 separated out. He noted the significant increases over the past few years. He also
19 noted a 25% in auditor expenses, a 33% increase legal expenses, additional software,
20 the need for a maintenance plan to justify the \$18,000, and the additional monies for
21 advertising.

22
23 Beaucaire noted that advertising has gone up because of additional mailings and legal
24 advertising and postings. She explained the building and land maintenance cost was
25 based on a standard per square foot. She suggested legal costs were rising due to
26 more review of vacation rental restrictions and RFP reviews. Auditor costs were
27 consistent and split among three funds. Beaucaire added that the software costs were
28 based on three years so the next year should decrease.

29
30 Webb asked suggested that the maintenance costs should be in the building and land
31 maintenance lines and not under contracted services. Beaucaire stated there was a
32 decision put contract costs together. Webb noted they created this 3.5% maintenance
33 cost based on national group, but they were not allocating expenses to that to specific
34 items or areas based on that. He asked if there was a plan in place. Beaucaire stated
35 the Facilities Manager was developing a plan.

36
37 Vaaler asked about the increase in property tax revenues as some people might not
38 meet their tax payments in this economic downturn. Beaucaire explained they used
39 data from Lincoln County which had not yet shown a decrease. Vaaler asked if the
40 estimated actual was a best estimate of what they will have at the end of the fiscal year.
41 Beaucaire explained the process of generating the estimated actuals as a way to
42 estimate how much they would have at the end of the year.

43
44 Vaaler asked way the franchise income for electricity increased. Beaucaire stated she
45 probably underestimated the estimated actual of the \$37,000 rather than overestimated
46 the proposed \$40,000.

1
2 Vaaler had a tremendous concern about increase in labor beyond what is mandated by
3 union contracts. She noted increases both in labor and allocated labor throughout the
4 budget. Beaucaire noted allocated labor was estimated at a 15% increase. She also
5 noted she was proposing adding a few position if economy allowed. Beaucaire noted
6 many of these costs were for required services.
7

8 Vaaler stated the allocated labor increased from \$656,200 to \$897,500, an increase of
9 \$241,300 above the estimated actual. She noted the considerable increase for contract
10 labor.
11

12 O'Shaughnessey asked what the criteria were for, "if the economy allows" for hiring.
13 Beaucaire stated the Plan Ahead team was using a metric of watching water production,
14 and quarterly taxes of food and beverage and transient lodging taxes. O'Shaughnessey
15 asked if they had established a percent increase target number. Beaucaire stated they
16 would be looking at the three trend lines of increase.
17

18 O'Shaughnessey noted that Hoen's contract for facilities manager would be going away
19 as she was converting to an employee position. Beaucaire stated the money might still
20 be needed if something went awry with the Community Services new position.
21

22 O'Shaughnessey suggested it would be helpful to see the allocation to each service
23 area under contract labor. She also wanted to see the overall salaries to get big picture
24 of personnel costs. Beaucaire indicated that was her goal. O'Shaughnessey also
25 wanted to see total cost of legal expense.
26

27 Keller had concern about paying for a lot of things that they are not using, such as the
28 Commons. She noted the Commons was not currently being used and may not be for a
29 long time. She noted all they needed was a basic empty building maintenance plan.
30 She wanted to see a worst-case scenario plan. She wanted to remove these types of
31 expenses. She suggested it appeared that the city is plowing ahead like nothing was
32 happening with the pandemic. Beaucaire noted that costs could be higher when
33 classes and other uses resume because of COVID. She stressed the need for investing
34 in their buildings.
35

36 Moore stated they budget for what they might need, but they do not need to spend
37 everything that is budgeted.
38

39 Webb noted investing in buildings was a capital issue, not an operating expense. He
40 suggested now was a good time to invest in the building as it is not being used.
41

42 Webb asked if they had information about people who pay on the three-tiered tax
43 payment system from the county. Groth did not see that information in the data.
44

45 Webb asked about insurance costs, noting Beaucaire said last year that she was
46 looking to save on insurance.

1 Beaucaire noted they changed to a square foot based insurance cost. She was told to
2 estimate a 12% increase in insurance. They are looking at options other than CIS as an
3 insurance provider. Webb asked that they need an executive summary on insurance,
4 especially when changing the costing method. He did not think a square footage basis
5 for insurance was the best method where there were plants with high risks and small
6 buildings with lower risk, such as the Log Church. Webb noted the over 100% increase
7 since 2017.

8
9 Vaaler suggested that they could add an extra line to allocated labor that indicated what
10 was needed now and what would be allocated if certain thresholds are met.

11
12 Moore noted the only change agreed upon was change in interest earned from \$78,000
13 to \$60,000.

14
15 Groth asked if the Council was going to look at the community support contributions.
16 Beaucaire reviewed the organizations requesting funding.

17
18 Bloch did not have recommended changes but had concerns. He asked what the
19 purpose of budgeting was. He asked if the process was to precisely identify what
20 revenues would be and limit spending accordingly or whether these were rough
21 estimates so that they would not need a supplemental budget later. He noted the
22 expenditures going up in a year when revenues are going down. He believed it looked
23 bad for the City to be spending more when people's personal budgets were going down.

24
25 Beaucaire stated she tried to be conservative but not cut to the bare bones.

26
27 Moore asked for a straw poll on this fund:

28 Bloch – yes

29 Groth – yes

30 Keller – no

31 Keller had an issue with the whole thinking behind the budget process.

32 She believed they should be doing everything in a tight and transparent
33 way. She also believed they should do things in the proper order, such as
34 take public input before they pursue any grants. She noted they get the
35 finished product first, and then they have to justify any changes. She feels
36 like this is "Shannon's budget," not the city's budget. She does not think it
37 has passed the test to have the public give their feedback.

38 Purcell – yes

39 Webb – yes

40 Webb noted they have to pass a budget and agreed they need to be
41 better in getting input from public. He noted things like the extra \$13,000
42 in community support should be restricted. Beaucaire asked for
43 clarification on what Webb was uncomfortable with. Webb indicated he
44 was uncomfortable with having an open wallet.

45 Glenn – yes

46 Tooke – yes

1 Vaaler – no

2 Vaaler had concern about transparency on many levels, such as
3 preparation of this document, decisions that come before Council, and not
4 having enough time to evaluate and discuss decisions. She believed it
5 was most important to get this budget correct, even if it took additional
6 time. Moore noted the plan was to start the budget process early with
7 Finance Committee but COVID changed the ability to start the process.

8 O'Shaughnessey – no

9 O'Shaughnessey asked how long it would take to do a supplemental
10 budget. Beaucaire indicated that could take three to four weeks.

11 O'Shaughnessey noted she heard comments about the process that was
12 use to get here. She noted they do get items late. She was torn because
13 she cannot get all of her questions answered.

14 Moore – yes

15
16 Moore summarized this fund was accepted with the \$18,000 change in interest earned
17 by a 7-3 vote.

18
19 Beaucaire asked to speak about the transparency process. She noted Oregon's budget
20 process was one of the most transparent in the nation. Beaucaire noted that grants
21 often have quick timelines so the City needed to act quickly. Beaucaire noted she and
22 the team tries to be transparent. She added they were always looking for ways to get
23 better. She added her descriptions in the document helped with transparency.

24 25 Visitor Amenities

26 Points of discussion:

- 27 • Beaucaire stated the transient lodging tax (TLT) reflected the 50% of the 3-year
28 average.
- 29 • Beaucaire noted she does have an in-house marketing position in the allocated
30 labor.
- 31 • Bloch noted the extreme jump in marketing costs and assumed it was due to
32 COVID.
- 33 • Beaucaire noted that fireworks were typically spent on July 1 and may not be
34 spent this year.
- 35 • Groth clarified that the Chamber of Commerce did not have input on the
36 marketing issue.
- 37 • Keller asked what the community support item was. Beaucaire stated it included
38 banners, Cape Perpetua, landscaping, and other beautification projects.
- 39 • Purcell asked if the visitor center line item funds the Chamber. Beaucaire
40 explained that the contract has gone to the Chamber and it was out to bid at
41 present.
- 42 • Webb stated they should eliminate fireworks for FY21 and bring it back in FY22.
- 43 • Webb thought the city was trying to do marketing when that should be done by
44 someone who better knows how to market.
- 45 • Beaucaire stated the \$50,000 for allocated labor for marketing was specifically
46 for in-house marketing and she vetted through attorney that it was proper to fund
47

1 this position under restricted portion of TLT. She indicated this would be a new
2 position.

3
4 Webb moved to eliminate allocated labor for \$50,000 for a marketing position: Aye 5;

5 No – 5. Motion does not carry

6 Bloch: yes

7 Groth: no

8 Keller: yes

9 Purcell: no

10 Webb: yes

11 Glenn: no

12 Tooke: no

13 Vaaler: yes

14 O'Shaughnessey: yes

15 Moore: no

16
17 Webb moved to eliminate the fireworks funding of 2,000: Aye – 3; No – 7. Motion does
18 not carry

19 Bloch: yes

20 Groth: no

21 Keller: no

22 Purcell: no

23 Webb: yes

24 Glenn: no

25 Tooke: no

26 Vaaler: yes

27 O'Shaughnessey: no

28 Moore: no

29
30 Webb wanted to keep the community support amount to what it was the previous year.

31
32 Beaucaire noted the plan ahead team has talked about creating signage to increase
33 safety awareness. She noted they were creating banners reminding people to practice
34 safe habits. Vaaler clarified that Beaucaire did not have an estimate of what the banner
35 project would cost. Webb asked if that could be expensed under COVID funds.
36 Beaucaire indicated they would be related to COVID.

37
38 Webb moved to reduce community support from \$25,000 to \$17,850, the amount in last
39 year's budget: Aye -5; No – 5. Motion does not carry.

40 Webb: yes

41 Purcell: no

42 Keller: yes

43 Groth: no

44 Bloch: yes

45 Glenn: no

46 Tooke: no

1 Vaaler: yes

2 O'Shaughnessey: yes

3 Moore: no

4
5 Moore noted there was no concurrence on any adjustment to this fund. Moore asked
6 for a vote on approving the visitor amenities fund as presented. (No stated motion)

7 Webb: no

8 Purcell: yes

9 Keller: no

10 Groth: yes

11 Bloch: no

12 Glenn: yes

13 Tooke: yes

14 Vaaler: no

15 O'Shaughnessey: no

16 Moore: yes

17 Vote was 5 ayes and 5 nays so there was not majority support.

18
19 Purcell moved to reconsider the motion to reduce community support from \$25,000 to
20 \$17,850, the amount in last year's budget: Aye – 8; No – 2.

21 Webb: yes

22 Purcell: yes

23 Keller: yes

24 Groth: no

25 Bloch: yes

26 Glenn: yes

27 Tooke: yes

28 Vaaler: yes

29 O'Shaughnessey: yes

30 Moore: no

31
32 O'Shaughnessey asked for clarification on whether additional marketing could be done
33 by the person who runs the visitor center. Beaucaire stated that the Chamber had
34 historically been given an additional budget which was \$25,250 for the past year.

35 O'Shaughnessey clarified this additional money was not for a job position. Beaucaire
36 stated both the Budget Committee and Council had concern about getting statistics on
37 how well the marketing was working. Beaucaire added that the proposals received thus
38 far were emphasizing the marketing rather than the operations side of the visitor center.
39 She speculated they might have to divide the tasks and rebid. O'Shaughnessey did not
40 think this time was appropriate to create an additional position.

41
42 Glenn moved to pass the visitor amenities fund with a reduction in community support to
43 \$17,850: Aye – 6; No – 0.

44 Webb: no

45 Purcell: yes

46 Keller: no

1 Groth: yes
2 Bloch: yes
3 Glenn: yes
4 Tooke: yes
5 Vaaler: no
6 O'Shaughnessey: no
7 Moore: yes
8

9 Library Operations

10 Nikki Carlson, Library Chair, clarified that the \$8,000 contract would include the needs
11 assessment and repairs. Vaaler asked where the Petersen gift money was located.
12 Carlson stated that was under capital. Vaaler asked about the increase of \$3,000 for
13 books and periodicals. Carlson said it was based on increases over the past few years.
14

15 **Glenn moved to adopt the Library fund as proposed:** discussion
16

17 Webb asked what happened if they did not reopen the library. Carlson indicated the
18 Library funds were currently frozen.
19

20 **Vote: Aye – 10; No – 0.**
21

22 Commons

23 Groth asked what the allocated labor for Commons included. Beaucaire stated that it
24 included repairs made by Public Works, cleaning contracting and time for community
25 services, the City Manager, and the Deputy Recorder. She noted the current Facilities
26 Manager position would go away if they successfully hire the new position. She noted
27 contract labor was at same level as last year.
28

29 Vaaler noted that the interview process for Community Support was not completed. She
30 believed leaving the Facilities Manager position in contract labor seemed like double
31 counting. Beaucaire stated she wanted to hire a professional company, noting she got
32 an initial quote of \$50,000 just to clean the Commons. O'Shaughnessey asked if there
33 were any local firms that do the cleaning work. Beaucaire noted it would have to be
34 Newport or Florence
35

36 Webb asked about rents and fees. Beaucaire noted the \$13,000 reduction was for
37 classes. The \$17,800 was rent the City paid for rent of the City Hall space.
38

39 **Glenn moved to approve the budget for the Commons fund: Aye – 8; No – 0.**
40

40 Webb: no
41 Purcell: yes
42 Keller: no
43 Groth: yes
44 Bloch: yes
45 Glenn: yes
46 Tooke: yes

1 Vaaler: yes

2 O'Shaughnessey: yes

3 Moore: yes

4
5 Little Log Church and Museum

6 Webb asked for clarification on the building and maintenance line. Beaucaire stated
7 this budget was identical to the 2019 budget and was in accord with national standards.

8
9 Moore noted that the City had been grossly underbudgeting for maintenance, so the
10 City has been gradually increasing that amount. Moore noted they used maintenance
11 money to replace the heater in the Little Log Church and Museum. Webb emphasized
12 the need for doing the maintenance now that it was budgeted.

13
14 Bloch asked why there was a drop in visitor amenities transferring in. Beaucaire they
15 only transferred in what they needed to. Groth reiterated that they were trying to fund at
16 their needed levels only.

17
18 Glenn moved to approve the Little Log Church and Museum fund as presented: Aye –
19 8; No – 2.

20 Webb: no

21 Purcell: yes

22 Keller: no

23 Groth: yes

24 Bloch: yes

25 Glenn: yes

26 Tooke: yes

27 Vaaler: no

28 O'Shaughnessey: yes

29 Moore: yes

30
31 Parks and Trails

32 Groth noted the expenditures exceeded income for last year. The Committee discussed
33 what was contained in the line items.

34
35 Vaaler had concern about funding conference and travel expenses for trails volunteers
36 during this time of COVID. Purcell thought Vaaler's question was valid.

37
38 Vaaler moved to reduce the travel budget from \$2,050 to \$1,000: Aye 10 – 0; No – 0.

39
40 Beaucaire indicated this decrease in an expense line would result in a decrease the
41 amount of transfer in from the general fund.

42
43 Webb moved to approve the parks and trails fund with the reduction in the travel budget
44 to \$1,000: Aye 10 – 0; No – 0.

1 Library Capital Reserves

2 Carlson noted the beginning balance included the Petersen donation. Beaucaire
3 clarified that the Friends of the Library had the Petersen money. Beaucaire clarified that
4 the needs assessment would be paid from the Hall Bequest. Webb noted that
5 Beaucaire has previously stated the needs assessment was part of labor.

6
7 Groth clarified that the first two lines under revenues was the \$306,000 ending balance
8 from the current year. Vaaler clarified this budget does not include any Petersen funds.

9
10 Beaucaire stated the allocated labor includes 15% of the cost of capital projects.

11
12 Vaaler moved to approve the Library capital reserve budget as presented: Aye 10; No –
13 0.

14
15 City Hall Reserves

16 Groth moved that capital outlay equipment be increased by \$20,000 for FY21 for
17 emergency supply containers at south and north locations, including installation, to
18 make a total of \$45,000 for equipment and that capital outlay buildings be increased to
19 \$211,300: discussion

20
21 Moore clarified that the equipment outlay increased from \$25,000 to \$45,000; the capital
22 outlay for buildings to increase by \$166,300 from the General Fund for a total of
23 \$211,300; and to transfer in from reserves \$95,000.

24
25 Groth explained the emergency supply containers are paid for through the City Hall
26 budget and the Emergency Preparedness Committee was asking to replace rusting
27 containers. City Hall already has a line item for paying for supplies for the emergency
28 containers. Beaucaire noted this action had been done in the past.

29
30 Groth stated the \$166,300 was to come from general fund to include \$75,000 that was
31 there plus additional items. Beaucaire stated that of the \$166,300, \$91,000 was from
32 the grant and \$75,000 was from the City.

33
34 Summarized the changes for this fund to be:

- 35
- 36 • Beginning balance of \$64,065
 - 37 • Income from grant of \$91,300
 - 38 • Transfer from general fund of \$95,000
 - 39 • No change in allocated labor
 - 40 • Capital outlay equipment of \$45,000
 - 41 • Capital outlay to buildings of \$166,300

42 Vaaler asked about allocated labor at 15% and noted they were not changing the
43 allocated labor accordingly. Webb recommended that they have a separate fund for
44 emergency preparedness. Groth clarified that should include both an operations and a
45 capital fund. Beaucaire stated it would be a good idea to identify this cost in the budget
46 but not necessarily to create new funds.

1
2 Glenn moved to approve the City Hall reserves with the above changes: Aye 10 – 0; No
3 – 0.
4

5 Commons Capital Reserves

6 Vaaler moved to approve the Commons Capital Reserve fund as presented: Aye 10; No
7 – 0.
8

9 Parks & Trails Capital Reserve

10 Beaucaire noted that the county might not be as generous as they have been for Ocean
11 View Drive. She stated that the \$50,000 would be applied to the boardwalk near the
12 Underground Pub.
13

14 Groth noted beginning balance was from visitor amenities and urban renewal so there
15 would be restrictions on expenditures.
16

17 Purcell moved to approve the Parks & Trails capital reserves fund as presented: Aye -
18 9; No – 1 (Webb).
19

20 Webb noted the boardwalk project would be enormously expensive. Keller had concern
21 about the insurance cost of a boardwalk.
22

23 Little Log Church Capital Reserves

24 Beaucaire noted this allocation was made in previous years. She stated the City would
25 be applying for a Ford Family Foundation grant and that would require City matching
26 funds.
27

28 Beaucaire clarified that the labor was 15% of \$150,000 capital project.
29

- 30 • Vaaler recalled a long discussion last year. She remained opposed to moving
31 this issue forward. She did not feel that the community was on board with this
32 project and she wanted to find out what the community truly wanted. She did not
33 think this was a year to be spending on this project.
- 34 • Tooke agreed with Vaaler.
- 35 • Glenn stated the project had been before the community for several years and he
36 had heard nothing negative from the community. He noted the Log Church
37 Board had been fundraising. He noted they were not spending this allocation
38 unless they have to, and he wanted the money to leverage for grants.
- 39 • O'Shaughnessey acknowledged the emotional element but did not think this was
40 the time to be spending this money
- 41 • Bloch indicated he saw the Little Log Church as a museum and wanted to
42 support that, but with the current virus situation, this would not be the best year to
43 do this project.
- 44 • Groth had concern that if they do not proceed, the building might deteriorate so it
45 would not be usable.

- Keller noted they have been fundraising for two years and only have \$10,000. She was not hearing community support for this project. She had concern that moving forward with a \$300,000 project would anger citizens. She noted that nobody will be using the building for potentially several years.
- Beaucaire explained the history of why the project has been on the books for this long.
- Purcell reviewed some history and indicated he believed it was a community decision as to whether they want to rebuild. He suggested they create a timeline for fundraising so the community can show their support.
- Purcell noted there were people using the church prior to COVID.
- Webb stated his daughter was married in the Little Log Church so he had a bias. He believed the bottom-line problem was a lack of inertia. He believed the cost was excessive. He noted this money was already set aside in the reserves. He had an issue with the allocated labor. He would do it personally for half that amount.
- Moore noted the building foundation has no crawl space and there was wood sitting on the ground. He favored on leaving this item as a placeholder and getting additional community input.

Beaucaire stated they were expecting the Ford Family Foundation to give over \$100,000.

Glenn moved to approve the Little Log Church and Museum capital reserves budget and to have Parks and Commons work with the Board to establish a timeline for fundraising: Aye – 9; No – 1 (Vaaler).

Budget Approval

Glenn moved to adopt the 2020-2021 City of Yachats budget as revised: Aye – 7; No – 3 (Vaaler, Keller, and Webb).

Moore adjourned the budget hearing at 12:55 pm.

W. John Moore, Chair

ATTEST:

Shannon Beaucaire

Date