

PROPOSED BUDGET

2015-16

FISCAL YEAR



California



PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016

MARY CASILLAS SALAS
MAYOR

PATRICIA AGUILAR
COUNCILMEMBER

PAMELA BENSOUSSAN
COUNCILMEMBER

JOHN MCCANN
COUNCILMEMBER

STEVE MIESEN
COUNCILMEMBER

GARY HALBERT
City Manager

DONNA NORRIS
City Clerk

GLEN R. GOOGINS
City Attorney



ADMINISTRATION

Gary Halbert	City Manager
Kelley Bacon	Deputy City Manager
Maria Kachadoorian	Deputy City Manager/Chief Financial Officer

DIRECTORS

Kelly Broughton	Director of Development Services
Eric Crockett	Interim Director of Economic Development
Jim Geering	Fire Chief
Courtney Barrett	Director of Human Resources
Edward Chew	Director of Information Technology Services
Betty Waznis	Director of Library
David Bejarano	Chief of Police
Richard Hopkins	Director of Public Works
Kristi McClure Huckaby	Director of Recreation



**CITY OF
CHULA VISTA**

ORGANIZATION CHART




Table of Contents

BUDGET MESSAGE	1
Letter from the City Manager	3
Budget Process	7
Strategic Plan	9
Economic Overview	13
All Funds Summary	17
Summary of Staffing Changes	25
GENERAL FUND SUMMARY	37
General Fund Expenditure Summary	39
General Fund Revenue Summary	51
General Fund Net Cost	61
Department Summary Reports	63
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND	81
SUCCESSOR AGENCY AND HOUSING FUNDS	89
Successor Agency Funds	91
Housing Authority Funds	99
SEWER FUNDS	103
TRANSIT FUNDS	115
FLEET FUND	123
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS	131
DEBT SERVICE FUNDS	143

OTHER FUNDS	149
PROGRAM SUMMARY	179
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)	233
Capital Improvement Program Summary	235
CIP Revenue Summary	237
CIP Expenditure Summary	241
Capital Improvement Projects Summary	249
SUMMARY TABLES	253
Fund Appropriations by Department and Expenditure Category	255
Schedule of Revenues	261
Fund Balance Projections	277
Schedule of Interfund Transfers	287
Authorized Positions by Department	295
APPENDIX	309
Fiscal Policies	311
Investment Policies	317
Debt Administration	325
GANN Appropriations Limit	329
Legal Debt Margin	331
Accounting Systems and Budgetary Control	333
List of Acronyms	335
Glossary	339
Chula Vista at a Glance	343

Document Guide

The budget document is organized in a manner to facilitate a general understanding of the City's fiscal status, to present management's assessment of major issues and, finally, to present the plan for allocating resources to address those issues during the coming fiscal year. The budget document is organized as follows: Budget Message, General Fund Summary, Other Funds, Program Summary, Capital Improvement Program, Summary Tables, and Appendix.

BUDGET MESSAGE

This section provides an executive summary of the City's all funds budget, summarizes the region's economic outlook, and highlights significant budgetary changes for fiscal year 2015-16. It also highlights the sources and uses of funds and provides information on the General Fund reserves. A summary of staffing changes is provided at the end of this section.

GENERAL FUND

The General Fund budget funds the day-to-day operations of most city services. This section of the document provides an overview of General Fund revenues and expenditures, staffing changes, and budgetary trends. This section is followed by Department Summary reports that include departmental mission statements and operating budgets for each General Fund department.

OTHER FUNDS

In order to facilitate understanding of the different funding sources, this portion of the document has been organized into the following categories: Development Services Fund, Redevelopment, Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, and Housing funds, Sewer Funds, Transit Funds, Fleet Fund, Capital Project Funds, Debt Service Funds, and Other Funds. Detailed descriptions, funding and staffing levels are provided for each fund. Due to various legal restrictions these funds are limited in their uses and generally cannot be applied to fund day-to-day operations such as Police and Fire services.

PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORT

This report is intended to identify key functions in each department and provide a management assessment of the current level of service, using Continuous

Improvement Visual Controls for ease of reference. The visual categories assist the reader in determining the status of the current level of service for each function of the department.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

This section provides an overview of the City's Capital Improvement Program for the coming fiscal year. The Capital Improvement Program accounts for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of major capital facilities, infrastructure, or equipment. More detailed information about each capital project, including project area maps, project status, expenditures to date, current year appropriations, and future funding, can be found in the Capital Improvement Program budget document.

SUMMARY TABLES AND APPENDIX

The summary tables provide a quick way to view budget allocations by department (or fund) and expenditure category, revenues by fund and type, projected fund balances by fund, and Council authorized positions by department. The appendix contains supplementary information on a variety of topics including an overview of the budget development process along with relevant timelines and milestones, fiscal and investment policies, debt administration, and a glossary of finance and budget terms.



GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

*Distinguished
Budget Presentation
Award*

PRESENTED TO

**City of Chula Vista
California**

For the Fiscal Year Beginning

July 1, 2014

Executive Director

BUDGET MESSAGE

Letter from the City Manager

Budget Process

Strategic Plan

Economic Overview

All Funds Summary

Summary of Staffing Changes



OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

May 21, 2015

HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

I am pleased to submit for your consideration the operating budget and capital improvement program for fiscal year 2015-16. The combined budget for all City funds totals \$294.5 million. This amount includes a General Fund operating budget of \$139.2 million and a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget of \$27.7 million. The General Fund presented in this document is balanced and includes funding for programs supported by the City Council in prior fiscal years.

The City's financial outlook is more stable than it has been in recent years. Positive revenue growth, implementation of efficiency measures, the cooperation of City labor groups, and strong Council leadership have helped stabilize the City's financial base. The City continues to seek new ways maximize limited resources to deliver high quality services to our community. In preparing the General Fund budget for fiscal year 2015-16, staff focused on the following budget development goals:

- Develop a balanced budget using fiscally responsible financial practices
- Maintain service levels adopted in the Council's 2014-15 budget
- Fund the highest level of municipal services possible based on available resources
- Make significant progress on key programs and projects in support of the City's Strategic Plan
- Continue growing Chula Vista's financial base
- Continue to improve efficiency and effectiveness of government services through the implementation of Continuous Improvement principles

The City's General Fund reflects positive growth in most major revenue sources. This modest growth in projected revenues allowed for a limited number of funding enhancements. It is important to note that

departments identified millions of dollars in funding requests in order to improve service demands and only a small portion of those requests were improved for inclusion in the fiscal year 2016 proposed budget.

Budget Highlights

The following budget enhancements that support the City's Strategic Goals are included in the fiscal year 2016 budget:

- Connected Community
 - Otay Ranch Library and the Hub – Added 1.0 Senior Librarian to ensure stable and enhanced hours of operation at the Otay Ranch Library and the Hub.
 - Civic Center Library/Museum – Added \$75,000 in funding to match the Mayor's and Department's fund raising efforts towards renovations at the Civic Center Library auditorium.
 - Cultural Arts Manager – This new position will manage the City's cultural arts programs and take the lead in developing and implementing the City's Cultural Arts Master Plan.
- Economic Vitality
 - Special Events - Included \$40,000 in funding to support three Citywide special events such as Starlight Parade and HarborFest
 - Economic Development – Converted hourly staffing to a new Project Coordinator position to support Economic Development's efforts to assist our local business community and to attract investment and jobs.

- Health Community
 - Storm Drain Maintenance – Added 1.0 Maintenance Worker to provide staffing for the operation of the third storm drain vector. This will help address new NPDES regulations that increased inspections and cleaning requirements of storm drain pipes and catch basins to reduce pollutants to the bay.
- Strong and Secure Neighborhoods
 - Equipment Replacement – Added \$330,000 for the replacement of the highest priority vehicles; includes two vehicles for Fire, 1 vehicle for Police, and 1 vehicle for Public Works.
 - Tree Trimming - Increased funding for tree trimming by \$100,000 for the removal of dead and dying trees as identified in the Asset Management program. This funding will also allow the City to address some high risk tree trimming requests.
- Operational Excellence
 - Training and Continuous Improvement - Added approximately \$70,000 in new funding for Citywide training for Leadership training and the Continuous Improvement Academy.
 - Computer Replacement - The budget includes a \$60,000 increase for the lease of an additional 200 computers in year 2 of a 4 year plan to modernize and standardize the City's aging computers.
 - IFAS Upgrade - includes approximately \$160,000 in funding to transition the City's accounting system to a newer version that will improve efficiency and user interface.

Major Projects and the Future

The City has a number of major projects that will help shape the future of the City of Chula Vista. These unique projects will help strengthen Chula Vista's economic base, create new jobs, and attract new visitors. The Bayfront and University projects as well as the ongoing negotiations with the U.S. Olympic

Committee will have a positive impact in ensuring a bright future for Chula Vista. In the coming fiscal year, staff will also focus on the implementation of Smart City concepts which focus on the use of technology to improve and streamline service delivery and communications with our residents.

Bayfront – The Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan is Southern California's largest development opportunity at 535 acres. The Bayfront will offer panoramic views from Baja California to San Diego. With proximity to both Baja California and San Diego, the Bayfront will supply a unique bi-cultural tourist opportunity for South San Diego County. The Bayfront project includes the future development of 3,100 new hotel rooms, 415,000 square feet of conference meeting space, 1,500 new high-rise residential units and 225,000 square feet of waterfront visitor serving retail uses and 750,000 square feet of new office and commercial space. The following projects are being pursued to implement the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan:

- Bayfront Hotel and Conference Center – in negotiations for an option to lease with the RIDA Development Corporation for the development of a hotel and conference center.
- Residential Development – in negotiations for a development agreement with Pacifica Companies for development of residential units, hotel rooms, and mixed commercial space.

University and Innovation District – The City of Chula Vista is a leader in innovation and is committed to attracting a future four-year University and Innovation District. The proposed educational and business format is being designed to engage students, faculty and corporations in the creation and application of knowledge that will spur innovative economic, social, and cultural development. In the coming fiscal year, staff will continue working towards this important goal. Staff is seeking to secure a development partner for the University and Innovation District by the end of fiscal year 2016.

Olympic Training Center - The USOC and the City have entered into a joint agreement with consultant JMI Sports to analyze the feasibility of an operations transfer, including determining alternative compatible uses for the facility. The USOC is seeking to change their operating model and focus more of their

resources on sustained competitive excellence and not in operating and maintaining buildings and fields. It is both the USOC and the City's desire that we be able to preserve and improve on the great sport legacy that is the Chula Vista Olympic Training Center. The City, JMI representatives and USOC staff are continuing to work on a memorandum of understanding for the City's takeover and operation of the facility. The focus is to have the facility remain as much as possible an elite Olympic training center with events and other activities that would be compatible uses of the facility.

Smart City – Chula is making strides as a Smart City to provide businesses, institutions, and residents with access to state of the art technology and a communications system that empowers them with tools to improve their quality of life, build their prosperity, and provide the most efficient government to our citizens. The City is working to assemble a communications infrastructure system and provide a gigabyte level of broadband that will drive the economic, healthcare, education, and innovation sectors to levels that distinguish Chula Vista as a national Smart City leader.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Staff developed a budget for fiscal year 2015-16 that is both responsive to community needs and continues to fund core services most important to our community. City staff is the key component in delivering high quality municipal services to our residents. I am proud of the men and women who work for the City of Chula. They work tirelessly to deliver the best services we can deliver to our community with the resources we have.

I would like to thank the City Council and Executive Team for their leadership and support. Finally, I would like to recognize the Finance Department for their exceptional work in once again preparing a balanced budget using good financial management practices.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gary Halbert". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Gary Halbert
City Manager



Budget Process

The City of Chula Vista's budget is created in conjunction with City Council, City staff, and City residents. The budget process begins each year with development of the preliminary base budget and is completed with the City Council adoption of the budget in June.

The fiscal year 2015-16 budget cycle began in January 2015 with the development of a preliminary base budget by the Finance Department's Budget and Analysis staff. The base budget accounts for the normal operating costs of the City. Through April, Finance worked with departments to refine the base budgets and incorporate departmental changes to align the budgets with current department operations.

The budget process provided Departments the opportunity to recommend budget adjustments based on department operational requests and/or one-time funding requests. Requests are reviewed by City Administration and are included in the City Manager's Proposed Budget.

While Finance staff was developing the operating budget, Public Works staff worked to develop and finalize the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget during this same time frame. On March 3rd, a public hearing was held for City Council to consider and adopt the TransNet Local Street Improvement Program of projects for fiscal years 2015-16 through 2019-20. And on April 2nd, staff held a Council Workshop on Infrastructure.

Finance will present the City Council with a balanced General Fund budget on May 26, 2015. The City Council will then set a public hearing date prior to Council taking action on the adoption of the budget.

Copies of the proposed budget will be made available for public review in the Office of the City Clerk, City libraries, and the City's website at least 10 days prior to the public hearing.

As set forth in the City Charter, at any meeting after the adoption of the budget, the City Council may amend or supplement the budget by motion adopted by affirmative votes of at least four members. Throughout

the year, the Finance Department provides the City Council with quarterly financial status reports comparing expenditure and revenue projections to budgeted amounts, highlighting any variances and recommending corrective actions as necessary.

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT MILESTONES

- March 3, 2015
Public hearing to adopt TransNet Local Street Improvement Program
- April 2, 2015
Infrastructure Workshop
- May 19 and May 21, 2015
Public workshops to provide overview of the City Manager's Proposed Budget
- May 21, 2015
Budget Document submitted to City Council

As required by City Charter, the City Manager's proposed budget was submitted to the City Council at least thirty-five days prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. Copies of the proposed budget are available for public review in the Office of the City Clerk, City libraries, as well as on the City's website.

- May 26, 2015
Presentation to City Council of the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 City Manager Proposed Budget and Council consideration and acceptance of City Budget.

The City Council's Proposed Budget will be made available for public review.

- June 2015
A public hearing will be held before the City Council considers the adoption of the budget in order to give residents an additional opportunity to participate in the budget process. In compliance with the City Charter, a notice of this meeting will be published in the local newspaper at least ten (10) days prior to the public hearing. Adoption of the budget requires the affirmative votes of at least three members of the Council.



Strategic Plan

The City of Chula Vista is implementing a Citywide Strategic Plan. This plan is an annual cycle that encourages focused, meaningful service delivery to benefit all of Chula Vista. It is a comprehensive framework that ensures: priorities set by the City Council are clear to all employees, goals are laid out that respond to priorities, objectives are achieved that meet the goals, and that the City government is accountable to meeting community needs.

General Process

Strategic Plan - Begins with a long-range Strategic Plan that identifies where we want to get to. This ensures we are all working in same direction toward clearly defined goals

Annual Plan - Development of a short-term annual plan that identifies Initiatives for the next year in support of achieving the strategic goals. Resources are aligned with annual initiatives through service levels identified in the budget process. This step is where we align and

link the city’s initiatives and resources in pursuit of goals.

Performance Measurement - Based on the annual plan, performance measurements are created to track achievement toward service levels/Initiatives identified through the annual plan. When implemented at the departmental and individual performance goal levels, everyone understands how they are contributing to City goals.

Tracking - Verify progress towards goals. Constant monitoring allows us to evaluate progress and make any necessary corrections.

Report Out - Reporting out on our progress against identified goals is an essential component of accountability. Evaluation of past performance also helps identify necessary changes in initiatives/resource allocation/measurements.

The following chart reflects the annual Strategic Planning Update Process.

Strategic Plan Process



HOW DID WE GET HERE

A staff committee, which included representatives from every department, was formed to assist in the creation and oversight of the Plan. They met regularly between November, 2012 and March, 2013 to create the Plan; their work included developing the long-term strategies and annual initiatives. The Strategic Plan was presented to nearly all City Boards and Commissions. The final Plan was presented to the City Council with the fiscal year budget in May, 2013.

The committee now meets periodically to review performance on the objectives, recommend any needed adjustments and check in on initiatives. The feedback loop is continuous, not a start and stop process. The “Plan, Do, Check, Act” philosophy is a foundation of Continuous Improvement. Reporting out to City Council and staff on our progress against identified goals is an essential component of accountability. Evaluation of past performance also helps identify necessary changes in initiatives and recommendations for resource allocations. The most recent report-out to City Council was February 2015.

City of Chula Vista is committed to maximizing its service delivery through continually looking to eliminate waste in the processes of service delivery and maximizing the value of those services to our customers.

- Implement Continuous Improvement efforts throughout the organization
- Leverage new and emerging technology to provide efficient, effective and secure Information Technology solutions
- Retain and attract quality employees
- *Ensure interaction with the City is a positive experience*

The City of Chula Vista provides services to a diverse customer base. They rely on the City to perform those services in a cost effective and quality manner. The City of Chula Vista strives to make the interaction of service delivery a positive experience in which our customers can have confidence that they are valued.

- Foster public trust through an open and ethical government
- Provide quality customer service

Strategic Goals and Initiatives



OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE

Collaborate with Residents and businesses to provide responsive and responsible public service by implementing effective and efficient operations.

- *Uphold a commitment to Fiscal Health*
Establishing a financially resilient City is a long-term goal that can be reached by first stabilizing the City’s financial condition, then working towards financial sustainability, and finally establishing an organization that is financially resilient. Financial resiliency better positions the City to withstand future economic downturns with minimal impacts to service levels.
 - Develop a Long Term Financial Plan
- *Excel in service delivery by continuously improving*
Cities by their very definition are service delivery organizations. Many of these services are critical to the well-being of the citizens, but all city services enhance residents’ “quality of life”. The



ECONOMIC VITALITY

Strengthen and diversify the City’s economy by: supporting and advancing existing businesses; targeting and attracting new businesses; promoting balanced land use decisions; and engaging the community to reinvest in the city.

- *Provide policies, planning, infrastructure, and services that are fundamental to an economically strong, vibrant city*
A strong, vibrant city relies on a foundation of forward looking decisions and quality infrastructure that support education, high quality jobs, and well-balanced livable communities. The City has made great progress in several long-term major development projects. These significant projects are vital to revitalizing the City.
 - Implement the Bayfront Master Plan
 - Foster opportunities for investment in Western Chula Vista
 - Promote and support development of quality master-planned communities
 - Plan and implement the University Park

and Research Center

- *Promote an environment for residents and businesses to prosper*

The City wants to strengthen and diversify the City's economy by supporting existing local businesses as well as identifying and recruiting new industries and businesses. We want to encourage opportunities for businesses and residents through quality job creation.

- Implement strategies that build prosperity and quality employment opportunities for existing businesses
- Identify and recruit complementary businesses that provide quality employment and expand the goods and services available to residents



HEALTHY COMMUNITY

Protect resources and environmental health for both current residents and future generations. Foster the health of our physical environment through balanced, connected and sustainable land uses.

- *Support an environment that fosters health & wellness*

The City will encourage residents to choose healthy lifestyles by promoting and facilitating healthy options in our community and make it easier for residents to lead healthy lives. The City will promote policies and programs that enhance the well-being of residents. We are also committed to connecting residents in need with critical services that increase their potential for wellness and self-sufficiency.

- Implement policies and programs that support a healthy community

- *Develop and implement strategies and programs that restore and protect natural resources and promote sustainability*

Promote responsible development and land use decisions that benefit current and future residents. The City is committed to protecting and promoting the sustainability of natural resources through innovative programs and policies. We will continue to show leadership in the area of climate change.

- Design and implement innovative

environmental & conservation programs

- Update and implement the Climate Action Plan

- *Provide parks, open spaces, outdoor experiences, libraries and recreational opportunities that residents can enjoy*

The City is supporting residents in choosing healthy lifestyles. Essential to a healthy community is the community infrastructure the City implements through libraries, parks, trails, and other recreational areas where residents can be active.

- Plan, construct, maintain, and operate community and neighborhood facilities
- Preserve and restore City Infrastructure through the Asset Management Program (AMP).



STRONG AND SECURE

NEIGHBORHOODS

Create and maintain safe and appealing neighborhoods where people choose to shop, work, play and stay.

- *Ensure a sustainable and well maintained infrastructure to provide safe and appealing communities to live, work, and play*

One of the key functions of city government is to provide citizens and businesses a safe environment to live, work, play and conduct business on a daily basis. As such, the provision and maintenance of public infrastructure is vital to the quality of life for the residents. Ensuring that the homes we live in, the businesses we frequent and the roads we drive on are safe, is key to attracting home buyers, businesses and visitors to our community.

- Preserve and restore City Infrastructure through the Asset Management Program (AMP).
- Provide comprehensive plan review and inspection services to ensure safety and code compliance

- *Enhance prevention efforts and prepare communities for natural disasters and other emergencies*

Cities provide public safety programs which include various prevention and emergency preparedness efforts. Prevention efforts are designed to help mitigate issues before they become a problem through thorough analysis of problems, enforcement of various codes and laws, and educational efforts to help residents improve their safety. Preparedness efforts are designed to ensure that the City and its residents are ready to respond to, survive and recover from a multitude of emergencies.

- Maintain a responsive Emergency Management Program
- Continue and enhance analysis led policing.
- Increase the public’s perception of safety.
- Promote safety and readiness through community education and engagement.
- *Ensure adequate emergency response and post emergency recovery services to our community*
The citizens of Chula Vista expect that the City’s public safety providers will respond to emergency calls for service quickly, with adequately staffed, equipped and trained personnel to carry out the duties for which they are assigned. Additionally, the City wants to provide adequate follow-up services to help recover from emergencies.
 - Provide and support an efficient and effective Advanced Life Support Program.
 - Restore and enhance public safety service capacity.

volunteer opportunities or serving on a Board or Commission.

- Implement Marketing and Communications Program
- Foster an environment of community engagement
- *Provide opportunities that enrich the community’s quality of life*
The City can contribute to a connected community by having ample opportunities to have citizens to interact with each other. The level of civic pride is also increased when the City can enrich lives with quality programming. Toward that end the City will promote culture, art, and community connections. As much as possible the City will cultivate and promote partnerships that expand and improve services.
 - Provide services/programs responsive to residents’ priorities



CONNECTED COMMUNITY

Promote diverse opportunities that connect community and foster civic pride through comprehensive communication strategies, and cultural, educational & recreational programming.

- *Encourage residents to engage in civic activities*
A key component to a connected community is to have citizens engaged with their government and each other. The City will create a communication strategic plan to better inform the public and staff. Additionally, the City wants to create opportunities for residents to be engaged within their community through such mechanisms as

Economic Overview


This section of the budget document identifies and outlines economic indicators that impact revenue forecasts at the local level. Several sources are used to forecast City revenues using national, state and local area economic trends. Sources include: the UCLA Anderson Forecast (National and State), U.S. Department of Commerce (National), California Employment Development Department (National, State, and Local), California Department of Finance (State and Local), and the University of San Diego Index of Leading Economic Indicators (San Diego region).

NATIONAL



In its first quarter report the UCLA Anderson Forecast characterizes the U.S. economy as “an island of stability in a very volatile world.” The

implication is that the U.S. is still on track for 3% GDP growth for the next two years, despite slow growth and currency devaluations throughout much of the rest of the developed world. Payroll employment is expected to increase at a 250,000-per-month pace and the national unemployment rate is projected to hit 5% by year’s end. While the U.S. economy appears to be stable at this time, UCLA Anderson Forecast Senior Economist David Shulman writes that a number of nations’ central banks are involved in a series of “competitive devaluations” in an attempt to export their economic weakness to the rest of the world. According to Shulman, the United States initiated the phenomenon in 2010; the value of U.S. dollars has risen 16% from the third quarter of 2014 through the first quarter of 2015. Shulman says that for the world economy to thrive as a result of such devaluations, they must ignite global growth. Shulman goes on to point out that most of the world’s major economies are mired at or near zero growth leaving the U.S. economy as an exception for any real growth potential. The forecast further calls for inflation to rise above the 2% level once the economy works its way out the temporary drop in oil prices. Interest rates are expected to rise as the Fed begins a gradual tightening process of the nation’s money supply in June.



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce

CALIFORNIA



In the California report of the UCLA Anderson Forecast report, Senior Economist Jerry Nickelsburg predicts continued steady gains in employment through 2017. He bases his forecast on the impact the increase in U.S. growth rates due to construction, automobiles, and business investment, as well as higher consumer demand, will continue to have on our local economy. Nickelsburg expects this impact will also benefit the state’s unemployment situation as he forecasts a steady decrease in the state’s unemployment rate over the next three years. The estimate for the 2015 total employment growth is 2.4%, and 2.2% for 2016 and 1.5% for 2017. Payrolls will grow at about the same rate during the next three years. Real personal income growth is estimated to be 4.2% in 2015 and forecast to be 4.6% and 3.7% in 2016 and 2017, respectively. The unemployment rate will hover around 6.5% through the balance of 2015. Unemployment is projected to fall through 2016 and will average approximately 5.5%, which is a slight decrease from Anderson’s last forecast. In 2017, an unemployment rate of approximately 5.1% is forecast, essentially the same as in the nation. Overall, Nickelsburg estimates that the State’s employment performance will slightly exceed the nation as jobs are expected to be created across all sectors of the economy. Nikesburg indicates that a

possible downturn in housing as a factor affecting employment in this sector as the main reason for the State’s economy to under-perform over the forecast period.

COUNTY




The County’s economic performance appears to be gaining momentum as University of San Diego’s Index of Leading Economic Indicators for San Diego County rose 1.3 percent in March. It was the third straight strong gain for the USD Index and the third month in a row where all six components were positive. As was the case in the two previous months, initial claims for unemployment insurance, help wanted advertising, and building permits led the way with sharp gains, while consumer confidence, local stock prices, and the outlook for the national economy were up more modestly. February’s increase was the tenth advance in a row for the USD Index, and the gains have been large in four of the previous five months. This signals strong growth in the local economy through the rest of the year and possibly into early 2016. San Diego is mirroring what is happening at the state level. The major developments in the March 2015 index were as follows:

- Residential units authorized by building permits were up significantly for the third consecutive month. But because permits were weak at the end of 2014, the year-over-year quarterly comparison was only modest. Residential units authorized were up only 1.5 percent in the first quarter compared to the year before. Single-family permits led the way with a gain of 18.6 percent, while multi-family units were down 7.2 percent. Such was not the case for the labor market variables, both of which have been positive for a significant consecutive measurement periods.
- A total of 42,457 initial claims for unemployment insurance were filed in the first quarter of 2015, which was down 29 percent from the nearly 60,000 initial claims filed in the first quarter of 2014. Online help wanted advertising increased from almost 128,000 for the first quarter of 2014 to more than 150,000 this year, a gain of nearly 18 percent. The net result was that the seasonally adjusted local unemployment rate fell to 5.1

percent in March 2015, which was down from 5.4 percent in February and 7.1 percent in March 2014.

- Consumer confidence was positive in March signaling the 14th monthly increase in a row for this component.
- Local stock prices gained a strong 6.73 percent in the first quarter. By comparison, the Dow Jones Industrial Average fell 0.26 percent, the S&P 500 Index gained 0.44 percent, and the NASDAQ Composite Index increased 3.48 percent in the same period
- The national Index of Leading Economic Indicators was up for the 15th consecutive month, which signals continued growth in the national economy.

San Diego Index of Leading Economic Indicators
San Diego County, 2009 - 2015



CITY



The City of Chula Vista continues on the slight upward trend in terms of regaining its revenue capacity as its major sources of revenues are projected to increase in the fiscal year 2015-16 budget. Sales Tax, Property Tax, Franchise Fees and Motor Vehicle License fees are increasing by a combined \$3.5 million over the estimates for these revenues as reported in the fiscal year 2014-15 Third Quarter Financial Report. Although the increase is modest it may signal that the City’s revenue base is returning to more stable and predictable revenue growth that the City can rely upon to meet its growing needs.

One indicator of this stability is the continuing improvement in the housing market as the year over year median home price within the City increased by 5.8% from March of 2014 to April of 2015. The median home price is projected to further rise by 2.7% in 2016 (based on Zillow estimate), further improving City property tax revenue opportunities.

Another indicator of improved revenue stability can be seen in the overall 4% projected increase in the City’s assessment roll assumed in for the property tax projection.

A 2% growth rate in assessed valuation of taxable property is legally permitted under Proposition 13 law assuming that there is a commensurate increase in the State’s consumer price index (CPI) of 2% or greater. The City is projecting to receive this increase for fiscal year

2015-16 as the state CPI exceeded the 2% level. This 2% valuation increase in the City’s assessment role provides an important yearly boost to property tax revenues as the increase is applied to the entire assessment roll. It is important to note that in recent fiscal years the City has not benefitted from the increase as the CPI has failed to reach the 2% threshold due to the recession. In those years, where the City did not receive the 2% increase in assessment role valuation, property tax growth may have resulted from upward re-assessments of properties that were re-sold at increased price levels or re-assessments of properties that increased values under Proposition 8 law. Under Proposition 8, property owners may apply for an assessment appeal and be granted a lower assessed valuation on their property for property tax purposes when their property values decrease. The lower assessed valuations are granted under the stipulation that their property assessments will be re-assessed in the future when property values recover.

The table below provides a year over year summary of home price sale improvements that have taken place within the City’s zip codes. The improvement in home sales prices will also help to improve the City’s property tax base.

Examination of other key demographic factors indicates that the City’s unemployment situation improved to 6.7% in February 2015 down from 8.1% for the same month of the prior year. Additionally, Chula Vista’s population remains stable as it continues to maintain its place as the 14th largest incorporated city in the state according to the California Department of Finance.

Chula Vista Home Sales
February 2014 Compared to February 2015

Zip Code	Locale	Median Price		Percent Change
		2013	2014	
91910	North	357,900	420,300	17%
91911	South	321,375	372,650	16%
91913	Eastlake	394,500	433,150	10%
91914	NE	344,077	N/A	N/A
91915	SE	386,850	419,250	8%

Source Zillow.com/research



All Funds Summary

The following section provides an overview of the combined all funds budget. Detailed descriptions, funding, and staffing levels are provided for each fund under the corresponding fund section in this document. This section is intended to provide a citywide overview of the proposed budget for fiscal year 2015-16.

ALL FUNDS REVENUE SUMMARY

The combined revenue budget for all City funds totals \$277.5 million; \$35.5 million represents inter-fund transfers. Projected revenues for all funds are anticipated to decrease by \$4.9 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 projected year-end total of \$282.5 million.

The largest change in revenue is occurring in the Revenue from Other Agencies revenue category, which reflects a net decrease of \$3.8 million when compared to the prior fiscal year. This revenue category includes grants from other agencies and can vary significantly from year to year. The largest change in this category is reflected in the Other Transportation Programs Fund, which reflects \$9.0 million in Federal Grant funds. This is a \$3.8 million increase when compared to the prior year. This grant funding will be used for two capital improvement projects - Willow Street Bridge Widening and Heritage Road Bridge Improvements. The increase in the Other Transportation Programs Fund is offset by decreases in various other funds. Most notably, the budget for the Transit CVT fund (\$1.8 million) is being eliminated. During fiscal year 2014-15, the City Council took action to approve the City's divestment of public transportation services and transition the operation of these services to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Other decreases in this category reflect adjustments in grant revenues for fiscal year 2015-16. The Energy Conservation Fund (\$1.8 million), Police Department Grants Fund (\$1.2 million), and Federal Grants Fund (\$1.0 million) all reflected decreased grant revenues.

The next largest change is reflected in the Charges for Services revenue category, which reflects a reduction of \$3.2 million when compared to the prior fiscal year.

The elimination of Transit Funds is also reflected in the Charges for Services category. This category reflects the elimination of \$4.8 million in Bus Fare Fees. Other major changes in this category include projected increases in the Development Services Fund (\$1.2 million in Zoning Fees-Deposit Based and Plan Checking Fees), Traffic Signal Fund (\$0.2 million in Traffic Signal Fees), and General Fund (\$0.3 million in Jail related revenues and Zoning Fees-Deposit Based).

The Other Local Taxes revenue category reflects an increase of \$2.3 million when compared to the prior fiscal year. This increase is largely reflected in the General Fund; changes in this fund include a \$2.3 million increase in Sales and Use Taxes which are somewhat offset by a decrease of \$1.6 million in Sales Tax-in-Lieu revenues. This change reflects the elimination of the "Triple Flip" midyear. Other changes in the General Fund include a \$1.1 million increase in Franchise Fees and a combined increase of \$0.2 million in Transient Occupancy Taxes and Business License Tax revenues. The Transportation Sales Tax Fund also includes a \$0.4 million increase.

The Development Impact Fees revenue category reflects an increase of \$1.0 million when compared to the prior fiscal year. This increase is reflected in the Transportation DIF Fund. This change is intended to bring budgeted revenues in line with actual revenues.


The Other Revenue category reflects increases and decreases in various funds which result in a net decrease of \$1.0 million. Most notably it reflects the elimination of \$1.2 million in the General Fund in Reimbursements from Other City Funds. This is due to the elimination of reimbursements for the Third Avenue Streetscape Improvement Phase II.

The Schedule of Revenues report, included in the Summary Tables section, reflects the projected revenues for fiscal year 2015-16 at the fund and revenue type level. The following table reflects a summary of all City revenues by category.

Sources of Funds (All Funds Combined)
 Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2016 Revenues
 In Thousands (000)

Revenue Category	FY12-13 Actual	FY13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Change (FY15-FY16)
Other Local Taxes	\$ 55,209	\$ 63,036	\$ 59,402	\$ 61,729	\$ 2,327
Property Taxes	\$ 32,333	\$ 28,517	\$ 35,436	\$ 36,305	\$ 869
Revenue from Other Agencies	\$ 44,050	\$ 50,764	\$ 54,381	\$ 50,575	\$ (3,807)
Transfers In	\$ 32,027	\$ 40,487	\$ 36,448	\$ 35,508	\$ (940)
Licenses and Permits	\$ 3,877	\$ 3,102	\$ 3,310	\$ 3,381	\$ 71
Use of Money & Property	\$ 3,261	\$ 6,330	\$ 3,471	\$ 3,443	\$ (28)
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	\$ 1,640	\$ 1,666	\$ 2,046	\$ 1,776	\$ (270)
Other Revenue	\$ 36,660	\$ 81,959	\$ 33,063	\$ 32,095	\$ (968)
Charges for Services	\$ 59,144	\$ 58,400	\$ 50,438	\$ 47,270	\$ (3,169)
Development Impact Fees	\$ 14,667	\$ 9,784	\$ 4,457	\$ 5,467	\$ 1,009
Total Revenues	\$ 282,868	\$ 344,045	\$ 282,453	\$ 277,548	\$ (4,906)

Total Revenues Fiscal Year 2015-2016 (All Funds Combined)



ALL FUNDS EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

The combined expenditure budget for all City funds for fiscal year 2015-16 totals \$294.3 million of which \$35.5 million represents inter-fund transfers. This amount includes a General Fund operating budget of \$139.2 million and a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget of \$27.5 million. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget includes \$92.2 million in operating budgets for the non-General Fund funds including Sewer, Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, Development Services, CV Housing, and Fleet. When compared to the prior year budget, the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget reflects a decrease of \$11.6 million.

The largest change in expenditures is reflected in the Supplies and Services expense category. This category reflects a decrease of \$11.8 million when compared to the prior fiscal year. Half of this reduction (\$5.9 million) reflects the elimination of the Transit Fund budget as a result of the City's divestment of public transportation services and transition to the operation of these services by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). This category also reflects a \$3.2 million decrease in the General Fund. This decrease largely reflects the elimination of prior year encumbrances from the proposed budget and one-time appropriations approved by the City Council mid-year. The Energy Conservation Fund reflects a \$1.1 million decrease in this expenditure category. This decrease is largely reflected in contractual services and reflects anticipated expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16. The TUT Common Fund reflects a decrease of \$0.8 million. The budget for fiscal year 2015-16 reflects planned expenditures. The remaining changes in this category are a combination of increases and decreases across various funds.

The next largest change in expenditures is reflected in the Personnel Services category. This category is projected to grow by \$3.5 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 projected year end total. This increase reflects the following changes:

- The fiscal year 2015-16 budget reflects a net increase of approximately 5.25 positions when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget, this includes positions that were approved during fiscal year 2014-15 or are recommended as part of the development of the fiscal year 2015-16 budget. These position changes are reflected in the General Fund, Federal Grants, Police Grants, Development Services, Transit, and Environmental

Services funds.

- The annualized cost of the salary increases approved for all employee groups during fiscal year 2014-15 and negotiated wage increases for public safety employees in fiscal year 2015-16.
- Increased costs related to retirement and medical (flex) benefits
- An increase in workers comp charges based on higher expenditure trends in the Workers Comp fund

The Capital expenses category reflects a net decrease of \$1.4 million. This decrease is largely reflected in the TUT Common Fund, which is decreasing by \$1.2 million. In fiscal year 2014-15, these one-time funds were used for the purchase of eligible public safety vehicles and communications equipment.

The Transfers Out expenditure category reflects a decrease of \$1.2 million; this decrease is the net impact of increases and decreases in multiple funds. The most significant changes are reflected in the following funds:

- Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF – reflects a decrease of \$2.4 million related to the loan repayment to the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve fund. Fiscal year 2014-15 included an extra payment. The fiscal year 2015-16 reflects the loan repayment amount as identified in the Consolidated Interfund Loan Amortization Schedules.
- Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF – reflects an increase of \$1.1 million. These funds will be transferred to the Trunk Sewer Fund and the Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF will be closed out.

The total number of recommended permanent positions for fiscal year 2015-16 is 966.0, of which 815.5 are included in the General Fund and 150.50 are included in various other funds. The adopted staffing represents a net increase of 5.25 positions when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget. The Authorized Positions by Department report is included in the Summary Tables section of this document; it provides the new staffing by classification and department. A summary of the new staffing changes is also included in the Staffing Changes section.


The following table reflects the expenditures for all

funds by expense category.

Uses of Funds (All Funds Combined)
 Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2016 Expenditures
 In Thousands (000)

Expenditure Category	FY12-13 Actual	FY13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Change (FY15-FY16)
Personnel Services	\$ 115,792	\$ 119,238	\$ 127,576	\$ 131,147	\$ 3,571
Supplies and Services	\$ 54,214	\$ 55,286	\$ 67,265	\$ 55,450	\$ (11,815)
Other Expenses	\$ 41,739	\$ 91,816	\$ 30,829	\$ 30,174	\$ (656)
Capital	\$ 1,724	\$ 1,773	\$ 4,619	\$ 3,206	\$ (1,412)
Transfers Out	\$ 32,027	\$ 40,487	\$ 36,683	\$ 35,508	\$ (1,175)
CIP Project Expenditures	\$ 23,253	\$ 18,229	\$ 26,959	\$ 27,492	\$ 533
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	\$ 5,319	\$ 3,195	\$ 3,161	\$ 2,221	\$ (940)
Utilities	\$ 7,001	\$ 7,977	\$ 8,882	\$ 9,149	\$ 266
Total Expenditures	\$ 281,068	\$ 338,001	\$ 305,975	\$ 294,347	\$ (11,628)

Total Budget Fiscal Year 2015-16 (All Funds Combined)



PROJECTED CHANGES IN UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCES

The following table provides a summary by fund type of the projected revenues and expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16 and the projected impact to their respective undesignated fund balance. Undesignated fund balance represents available, expendable financial

resources in a governmental fund. Undesignated fund balance is sometimes referred to as available reserves.

As noted in the table below, most funds are anticipated to draw down reserve levels in the coming year. The General Fund is balanced; there is no projected change in operating reserves for the General Fund.

Summary of Net Impact to Reserves by Fund

In Thousands (000)

Fund	Proj Reserve Bal 06/30/15	Revenues	Expenditures	Net Impact	Proj Reserve Bal 06/30/16
Capital Projects Funds	\$ 65,058	\$ 15,143	\$ 21,339	\$ (6,196)	\$ 58,861
Sewer Funds	\$ 100,046	\$ 34,897	\$ 38,345	\$ (3,448)	\$ 96,598
Gas Tax	\$ 5,908	\$ 5,514	\$ 8,590	\$ (3,076)	\$ 2,832
Successor Agency and CV Housing Authority	\$ (21,920)	\$ 14,802	\$ 17,031	\$ (2,229)	\$ (24,149)
Other Funds	\$ 6,509	\$ 10,261	\$ 12,386	\$ (2,125)	\$ 4,383
Public Liability Trust	\$ 1,685	\$ 520	\$ 1,653	\$ (1,133)	\$ 552
TUT Common Fund	\$ 624	\$ -	\$ 616	\$ (616)	\$ 8
Environmental Services Fund	\$ 1,118	\$ 1,372	\$ 1,811	\$ (439)	\$ 680
Grant Funds	\$ 485	\$ 13,328	\$ 13,568	\$ (240)	\$ 245
Workers Comp Fund	\$ -	\$ 3,249	\$ 3,403	\$ (153)	\$ (153)
Fleet Management	\$ 209	\$ 3,822	\$ 3,882	\$ (61)	\$ 148
General Fund	\$ 14,555	\$ 139,704	\$ 139,704	\$ -	\$ 14,555
Development Services Fund	\$ (882)	\$ 7,304	\$ 7,304	\$ -	\$ (882)
Transit Funds	\$ 17	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17
Maint Districts & Open Space	\$ 14,869	\$ 12,759	\$ 12,759	\$ -	\$ 14,869
Debt Service Funds	\$ (26,343)	\$ 14,873	\$ 11,954	\$ 2,918	\$ (23,425)
TOTAL ALL FUNDS	\$ 161,938	\$ 277,548	\$ 294,347	\$ (16,799)	\$ 145,139

Note: The Debt Service Funds and Successor Agency and CV Housing Authority carry a deficit that reflects long-term advances/outstanding debt obligations in Fund 451 and Fund 692.

Analysis of Significant Changes in Anticipated Fund Balances

The net impact to reserves for all funds is a net decrease of \$16.8 million; this change includes the following:

Capital Projects Fund (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ 65,058	\$ 58,861	\$ (6,196)	-9.5%

Capital Project funds reflect a net decrease of \$6.2 million in reserves in fiscal year 2015-16. This decrease largely reflects the use of \$4.6 million in reserves in the Public Facility DIF funds. These funds will be used to pay debt service related to the construction of various City facilities and the annual payment to the TDIF for a prior year loan. The Transportation DIF fund will use approximately \$1.5 million in fund balance for various capital improvement projects. Most notably, the budget includes \$2.0 million in funding for the Bike Lane Along East “H” Street CIP.

Sewer Funds (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ 100,046	\$ 96,598	\$ (3,448)	-3.4%

The Sewer Funds reflect a net decrease of \$3.5 million in reserves in fiscal year 2015-16. Major changes are reflected in the following funds:

- Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF - includes a \$2.2 million decrease in reserves. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget includes a loan repayment to the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve fund.
- Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund – includes a \$1.7 million increase in reserves. This change largely reflects the transfer from the Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF.
- Sewer Service Revenue – includes a \$1.4 million decrease in reserves. This largely reflects the use of reserves for the purchase of \$1.7 million in vehicle equipment.
- Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF – reflects a \$1.1 million decrease in reserves. This fund will be closed in fiscal year 2015-16 and funds will be

transferred to the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund.

- Sewer Facility Replacement – reflects a \$0.5 million decrease in reserves. This fund includes various CIP projects including - Sewer Access Rehabilitation Project, Parkside Drive Lift Station Upgrades, Sewer Manhole Rehabilitation Project, Sewer Manhole Inspection Study, and Sewer Rehabilitation Project.

Gas Tax Fund (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ 5,908	\$ 2,832	\$ (3,076)	-52.1%

The Gas Tax fund reflects the use of \$3.1 million in reserves. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget includes funding for the following capital improvement projects:

- \$2.0 million for Pavement Minor Rehabilitation Program
- \$1.6 million for Storm Drain Repairs at various locations Citywide
- \$0.4 million for Replacement of Curb & Gutter Citywide
- \$0.3 million for Cross Gutter Rehabilitation Citywide

Successor Agency (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ (21,920)	\$ (24,149)	\$ (2,229)	10.2%

Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency and CV Housing Funds reflect a net decrease of \$2.2 million. This decrease is largely reflected in the RDA 2008 TARBS Project Funds–SA fund, which reflects the use of \$1.3 million in reserves. The remaining use of reserves are reflected in the following funds:

- Long-term Advances DSF-RDA SA - reflects (\$350,000) related to interest accruals for interfund loans.
- CV Housing Authority (\$0.4 million) and Housing SA (\$0.3 million) - reflects the combined use of \$0.6 million from these funds’ reserves, which will be used to fund a loan for the Millenia affordable housing development.

Other Funds (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ 6,509	\$ 4,383	\$ (2,125)	-32.7%

Other Funds – this category reflects the use of \$2.1 million in reserves in fiscal year 2015-16. Included in this category are the following funds:

- Transportation Sales Tax Fund reflects the use of \$1.2 million in reserves. These funds will be used to fund various capital improvement projects in fiscal year 2015-16, including:
 - \$4.0 million for major pavement rehabilitation
 - \$0.4 million for raised median improvements
 - \$0.4 million for Main Street Fiber Optics installation (SANDAG)
- The Traffic Signal Fund reflects the use of \$0.5 million in reserves. These funds will be used to fund various capital improvement projects in fiscal year 2015-16 including:
 - \$0.3 million for pedestrian improvements at Hazelcook Elementary School
 - \$0.3 million for traffic signal installation at Jacqua Street and Main Street

Public Liability Trust (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ 1,685	\$ 552	\$ (1,133)	-67.3%

Public Liability Trust Fund reflects a budgeted net impact of \$1.1 million. In order to balance the General Fund, the transfer to the Public Liability Trust Fund has been reduced in fiscal year 2015-16. The use of Public Liability Trust Fund reserves will depend on actual expenditures, which can be difficult to predict.

Debt Service Funds (Thousands)

Anticipated FY 16 Beginning Balance	Anticipated FY 16 Ending Balance	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
\$ (26,343)	\$ (23,425)	\$ 2,918	-11.1%

The Debt Services funds reflect a positive impact of \$3.0 million in reserves. This change reflects interfund loan repayments accounted for in the Long-term Advances DSF – City Fund. As noted previously, this fund reflects a negative fund balance because it accounts for long-term advances/outstanding debt obligations.

GENERAL FUND RESERVES

In November 2009, the City Council approved a resolution updating the City’s General Fund Reserve Policy. The updated reserve policy:

- Provides guidelines for the use of reserves
- Sets a new long-term goal for higher General Fund Reserve level, from 8% to 15%
- Includes the establishment of two new reserve funds - Economic Contingency Reserve and Catastrophic Event Reserve


Achieving these reserve levels is a long-term goal; once fully implemented, the new General Fund Reserve policy will require higher reserve levels. This will help mitigate the negative impact on revenues from economic fluctuations, position the City to withstand potential State revenue takeaways, provide debt service coverage, and provide a resource to fund unforeseen expenditure requirements.

The Third Quarter Financial Report for fiscal year 2014-15 projected that the General Fund would end the fiscal year with a modest surplus (\$0.2 million). The projected surplus reflects higher than anticipated salary savings as a result of vacancies. As reflected on the following table, General Fund reserve levels have not only stabilized but have increased slightly since fiscal year 2009. It is important that the City maintain reserves in order to address the following potential issues:

- Dramatic economic fluctuations
- Debt service coverage
- Development impacts – there may be gaps in timing when services will need to be provided to new developments but the development area has not yet generated the revenues needed to fully offset the cost of those services
- Unfunded liabilities – deferred building and equipment repairs, equipment replacement, deteriorating infrastructure.

The following chart depicts the General Fund operating reserves since fiscal year 2008-09. The fiscal year 2015-16 General Fund Proposed Budget is balanced and there is no budgeted impact to the General Fund reserves.

General Fund Operating Reserves
Fiscal Year 2009 to Fiscal Year 2016



Note: The preceding chart reflects only the General Fund Operating Reserves. It does not include the Economic Contingency Reserve, which has a balance of approximately \$3.6 million. Combined with the operating reserve, these two reserve funds total approximately 13% of the fiscal year 2015-16 General Fund budget.

Summary of Staffing Changes

The fiscal year 2015-16 adopted budget includes 966.00 positions for all funds. This is a net increase of 5.25 positions when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget that included 960.75 authorized positions. The summary of staffing changes is divided into two sections – the staffing changes that were approved by Council during fiscal year 2014-15 and changes made as part of the development of the fiscal year 2015-16 budget.

POSITION CHANGES AUTHORIZED DURING FISCAL YEAR 2014-15

During fiscal year 2014-15, Council approved the addition of 2.50 FTE citywide as well as several reclassifications to reflect changes in duties. Changes in the General Fund resulted in a net increase of 0.50 FTE and changes to other funds resulted in a net increase of 2.00 FTE. These changes included the following:

- City Council – 1.00 Chief of Staff and 1.00 Policy Aide were added to address the department's operational needs. 2.0 Constituent Services Manager positions were eliminated to offset the additions.
- Administration – The City Manager recommended changes in the City management structure which resulted in the addition of 1.00 Deputy City Manager position to share in the oversight of City departments. This change was offset with the elimination of the Director of Finance position from the Finance Department.

The Administration Department also requested to reclassify an Assistant to the City Manager/CI Manager to a Performance and Organizational Development Manager to better reflect the duties assigned to this position.

- Human Resources – the department requested to reclassify two positions in order to address operational needs. The Assistant Director of Human Resources was reclassified to Director of Human Resources and a Senior Human Resources Analyst position was reclassified to a Principal Human Resources Analyst.

- Finance – the department was reorganized to ensure continued success in the overall management of the City's finances. This resulted in an addition of 1.00 Senior Accountant, 1.00 Fiscal Office Specialist, and the elimination of 2.00 Associate Accountant positions. The reorganization also resulted in the reclassification of the Assistant Director of Finance position to Finance Director and the Finance Manager was reclassified to a Finance and Purchasing Manager. The approved changes resulted in no net changes to the authorized position count for the department.
- Animal Care Facility – the department requested to reclassify 5.00 Animal Care Assistants to Animal Care Specialists and 2.00 Senior Animal Care Assistants to 2.00 Senior Animal Care Specialists to better reflect assigned duties.
- Police – A net 0.50 FTE was added to the Police Department. 1.00 Automated Fingerprint Technician was approved as part of the County of San Diego Cal-ID Program. The department also requested the addition of 1.00 Senior Police Technology Specialist and the elimination of 1.00 Parking Enforcement Officer and 0.50 Range Master to better reflect department needs. The department also requested a reclassification of an Administrative Services Manager to a Police Administrative Services Administrator.
- Fire – A Secretary was reclassified to a Training Program Specialist as requested by the Fire department. In addition, 4.00 Firefighter positions were reclassified to Firefighter/Paramedic as part of the implementation of the Advanced Life Support Program.
- Public Works – the department received approval for the following reclassifications: (a) 2.00 Administrative Analyst II positions to Management Analysts; (b) an Assistant Surveyor II to an Associate Land Surveyor; (c) a Construction and Repair Manager to Construction and Repair Supervisor; (d) a Custodial and Facilities Manager to Facilities Manager; (e) 1.00 Lead Custodian and 1.00 Custodial Supervisor to 2.00 Custodians. These

reclassifications were approved to better reflect the position responsibilities and to address service needs.

- Recreation – the department requested to reclassify 2.00 Recreation Supervisor II positions to 2.00 Recreation Supervisor III to address operational needs.
- Library – the department requested to reclassify a Library Associate to a Librarian II position in order to address operational needs. The department also reclassified an Administrative Analyst II to a Management Analyst as part of a citywide effort to better reflect the position responsibilities.
- Police Grants Fund – The City serves as the fiscal agent for CBAG and SD LECC. Changes approved

for these programs include the addition of a 1.00 FA (Fiscal Agent) Program Manager, and the reclassification of a FA Public Safety Analyst position to a FA Senior Public Safety Analyst.

- Federal Grants Fund – the addition of a GIS Specialist position was approved in this fund to assist in the UASI preplan project.
- Development Services Fund – 3.00 Plans Examiner Positions were reclassified to 3.00 Associate Plan Check Engineers to better reflect the responsibilities of these positions.

The following table summarizes the position changes Council authorized during fiscal year 2014-15.

Summary of Fiscal Year 2014-15 Staffing Changes

Approved by City Council

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
City Council (0.00)	Mayor	Chief of Staff	1.00
		Policy Aide	1.00
		Constituent Services Manager	(2.00)
Administration (1.00)	Administration	Deputy City Manager	1.00
	Reclassification	Assistant to the City Manager/CI Manager	(1.00)
		Performance & Organizational Development Manager	1.00
Human Resources (0.00)	Reclassifications	Director of Human Resources	1.00
		Assistant Director of Human Resources	(1.00)
		Senior HR Analyst	(1.00)
		Principal HR Analyst	1.00
Finance (-1.00)	Finance Administration	Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00
		Director of Finance (08/12/2014)	(1.00)
	Reclassifications	Treasury Manager	(1.00)
		Treasury and Business Manager	1.00
		Finance Manager	(1.00)
		Finance and Purchasing Manager	1.00
		Assistant Director of Finance	(1.00)
		Director of Finance (03/03/2015)	1.00
	Comptroller	Senior Accountant	1.00
Associate Accountant		(2.00)	

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
Animal Care Facility (0.00)	Reclassifications	Animal Care Assistant	(5.00)
		Animal Care Specialist	5.00
		Senior Animal Care Assistant	(2.00)
		Senior Animal Care Specialist	2.00
Police (0.50)	Reclassification	Administrative Services Manager	(1.00)
		Police Administrative Services Administrator	1.00
		Police Technology	Senior Police Technology Specialist
	Forensic Services	Automated Fingerprint Technician	1.00
	Parking Enforcement	Parking Enforcement Officer	(1.00)
	Force Operations	Range Master	(0.50)
Fire (0.00)	Reclassifications	Firefighter (112 HR)	(4.00)
		Firefighter/Paramedic (112 HR)	4.00
		Secretary	(1.00)
		Training Programs Specialist	1.00
Public Works (0.00)	Reclassifications	Administrative Analyst II	(2.00)
		Management Analyst	2.00
		Assistant Surveyor II	(1.00)
		Associate Land Surveyor	1.00
		Construction and Repair Manager	(1.00)
		Construction and Repair Supervisor	1.00
		Custodial and Facilities Manager	(1.00)
		Facilities Manager	1.00
		Custodian	2.00
		Lead Custodian	(1.00)
		Custodial Supervisor	(1.00)
Recreation (0.00)	Reclassifications	Recreation Supervisor II	(2.00)
		Recreation Supervisor III	2.00
Library (0.00)	Reclassifications	Administrative Analyst II	(1.00)
		Management Analyst	1.00
		Library Associate	(1.00)
		Librarian II	1.00
Police Grants Fund (1.00)	Reclassification	FA Public Safety Analyst	(1.00)
		FA Senior Public Safety Analyst	1.00
	Fiscal Agent (FA) positions - CBAG and SD LECC	FA Program Manager	1.00
Federal Grants Fund (1.00)	UASI	GIS Specialist	1.00
Development Services Fund (0.00)	Reclassifications	Plans Examiner	(3.00)
		Associate Plan Check Engineer	3.00
TOTAL CITYWIDE			2.50

FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 CHANGES

The fiscal year 2015-16 budget largely reflects a carryover of the service levels and programs funded in the current fiscal year with limited service enhancements. In total, the changes result in a net increase of 2.75 FTE when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 amended budget. These changes include the following changes summarized by department:

- City Council – The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget reflects the addition of an Administrative Secretary to address operational needs of City Council Administration.
- City Clerk – An addition of a Deputy City Clerk is being recommended in order to improve efficiency within the Office of the City Clerk.
- City Attorney – The fiscal year 2015-16 budget includes the transfer of a Senior Risk Management Specialist from the Human Resources Department to the Office of the City Attorney.
- Administration – the Performance and Organizational Development Manager is being transferred from Administration to the Human Resources Department to focus on citywide training, Continuous Improvement (CI), succession planning, and employee engagement.
- Administration/Economic Development – In order to better address workload, the budget includes the following recommendations for Economic Development: (a) the transfer of an Environmental Resource Manager and Real Property Manager from Public Works; (b) the elimination of a Senior Administrative Secretary, and (c) the addition of a Project Coordinator I and Cultural Arts Program Manager. The Cultural Arts Manager will take the lead in developing and implementing the City's Cultural Arts Master Plan. The Project Coordinator will assist the small business community as their ombudsman at the development services front counter assist in conducting workshops and trainings for our local business community.
- Information Technology – in reviewing the workload for the Geographic Information Systems unit, it was determined that current staffing levels are sufficient to handle the normal day-to-day workload of the unit. To better address workload, the department recommended the addition of a Senior Information Technology Support Specialist and the elimination of a vacant GIS Specialist.
- Human Resources – The proposed budget includes the transfer of a Senior Risk Management Specialist from Human Resources to the Office of the City Attorney and a transfer of a Performance and Organizational Development Manager from Administration to the Human Resources Department. These transfers will improve operational efficiencies within their respective departments. The proposed budget also includes funding for the addition of a Senior Fiscal Office Specialist to provide clerical support to the Human Resources and Information Technology Services departments.
- Police – During fiscal year 2014-15, the Police Department worked with Human Resources on a number of classification reviews. As a result, Human Resources is recommending the reclassification of several positions. Two Evidence Control Assistants will be reclassified to Senior Property and Evidence Specialists and two Police Records Transcriptionists to a Police Records Specialists. The department is also recommending the addition of a part-time Fiscal Office Specialist to provide additional clerical support in the Fiscal Operations Division.
- Fire – The Fire Department is recommending the addition of a Fire Prevention Aide in order to be more efficient in delivering general use certificate and complaint inspection services. This position was previously filled on a part-time hourly basis. The proposed budget also reflects the staffing changes needed to implement the reorganization of the department. The reorganization results in the elimination of 2.0 Deputy Fire Chief positions, the addition of 1.0 Battalion Chief, and the funding of two previously frozen positions (Fire Engineer and Fire Division Chief.)
- Public Works – During fiscal year 2014-15, the Public Works Department worked with Human Resources on a number of reclassifications. As a result Human Resources is recommending the

reclassification of a Fiscal Office Specialist to Senior Fiscal Office Specialist and a Senior Public Works Specialist to Graffiti Abatement Coordinator. The proposed budget also reflects the following changes: (a) the transfer of the Environmental Resource Manager and Real Property Manager to the Administration Department; (b) the elimination of an Environmental Resource Specialist and the addition of two Conservation Specialist positions; (c) the conversion of a part-time Engineering Technician II position to a full-time position to complete traffic monitoring and data collection; (d) the addition of a Pump Maintenance Technician to support required maintenance and repairs for City facilities; and (e) the addition of a Maintenance Worker I to provide staffing for the operation of the third storm drain vector.

- Library – The proposed budget includes an additional Senior Librarian that will be assigned to the Otay Ranch Library. This position will help ensure stable and enhanced hours of operation at the Otay Ranch Library and the Hub.
- Police Grants Fund – Changes in the CBAG and SD LECC programs include the elimination of five positions and the reclassification of five FA Senior Public Safety Analyst positions to FA Senior Intelligence Analyst positions. The City serves as the Fiscal Agent to CBAG and SD LECC.
- Environmental Services Fund – Human Resources is recommending the reclassification of an Environmental Services Program Manager to an Environmental Services Manager based on the job duties of the position. In addition, the budget

includes the addition of a Recycling Specialist II position which was previously filled on an part-time hourly basis.

- Transit – Due to the transition of Chula Vista Transit to MTS, all Transit Funds and the Transit Manager position have been eliminated from the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget.
- Development Services Fund – As part of a continuing effort to align available development related resources with the demand for development related services, staff has recommended the elimination of vacant Senior Planner and Senior Office Specialist Positions, and the elimination of a Landscape Planner II. The Development Services Department is also recommending the addition of a Building Inspection Manager and Senior Plan Check Technician in order to remain responsive to workload demands. These recommended changes result in a net reduction of 1.0 FTE to the Development Services Fund.

Reclassifications - During the development of the fiscal year 2015-16 budget, departments worked with the Human Resources Department to review positions that are working out of class due to changing job duties. Departments worked with Human Resources to determine the appropriate classification and compensation for these reclassification requests. The recommended staffing changes are based on changes to scope of responsibility.

The following table summarizes the changes reflected in the fiscal year 2015-16 budget.

Summary of Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-16 Staffing Changes

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
City Council (1.00)	City Council Administration	Administrative Secretary	1.00
City Clerk (1.00)	City Clerk Operations	Deputy City Clerk I	1.00
City Attorney (1.00)	Transfer from Human Resources	Senior Risk Management Specialist	1.00

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
Administration (1.75)	Reclassification	Webmaster	(1.00)
		Senior Webmaster	1.00
	Transfer to Human Resources	Performance & Organizational Development Manager	(1.00)
	Economic Development	Senior Administrative Secretary	(1.00)
		Project Coordinator I	1.00
		Cultural Arts Program Manager	0.75
	Transfer from Public Works	Environmental Resource Manager	1.00
		Real Property Manager	1.00
Information Technology Services (0.00)	Micro-Computers	Senior Information Technology Support Specialist	1.00
	Geographic Information Systems	GIS Specialist	(1.00)
Human Resources (1.00)	HR Operations	Senior Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00
	Transfer from Administration	Performance & Organizational Development Manager	1.00
	Transfer to City Attorney	Senior Risk Management Specialist	(1.00)
Police (0.50)	Reclassifications	Police Records Transcriptionist	(2.00)
		Police Records Specialist	2.00
		Evidence Control Assistant	(2.00)
		Senior Property & Evidence Specialist	2.00
	Fiscal Operations	Fiscal Office Specialist	0.50
Fire (0.00)	Fire Administration	Deputy Fire Chief	(2.00)
	Fire Training	Fire Battalion Chief (80 HR)	1.00
	Fire Prevention	Fire Prevention Aide	1.00
Public Works (1.50)	Reclassifications	Fiscal Office Specialist	(1.00)
		Senior Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00
		Senior Public Works Specialist	(1.00)
		Graffiti Abatement Coordinator	1.00
	Transfer to Administration	Environmental Resource Manager	(1.00)
		Real Property Manager	(1.00)
	Conservation and Environmental Services	Environmental Resource Specialist	(1.00)
		Conservation Specialist	2.00
	Traffic Engineering	Engineering Technician II	0.50
	Lift Station/Pool Maintenance	Pump Maintenance Technician	1.00
Storm Drain Maintenance	Maintenance Worker I	1.00	
Library (1.00)	Otay Ranch Library	Senior Librarian	1.00

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
Police Grants Fund (-5.00)	Reclassifications	FA Senior Public Safety Analyst	(5.00)
		FA Senior Intelligence Analyst	5.00
	Fiscal Agent (FA) positions - CBAG and SD LECC	FA Public Safety Analyst	(1.00)
		FA Analyst	(2.00)
		FA Program Manager	(2.00)
Environmental Services Fund (1.00)	Reclassification	Environmental Services Program Manager	(1.00)
		Environmental Services Manager	1.00
	Environmental Services	Recycling Specialist II	1.00
Transit (-1.00)	Transit	Transit Manager	(1.00)
Development Services Fund (-1.00)	Development Planning	Senior Planner	(1.00)
	Building	Senior Office Specialist	(1.00)
		Senior Plan Check Technician	1.00
		Building Inspection Manager	1.00
	Land Development	Landscape Planner II	(1.00)
TOTAL CITYWIDE			2.75

SUMMARY OF FROZEN POSITIONS

In a prior fiscal year there were a number of positions that were frozen (not funded) in order to help balance the budget. Due to the continued fiscal constraints, the majority of these positions remain frozen in fiscal year 2015-16. As funding becomes available the status of these positions will be reevaluated; recommended funding changes will be brought to Council for consideration. During fiscal year 2014-15, the following positions were “unfrozen” -2.0 Police Dispatch positions.

The proposed budget includes funding for the previously frozen Fire Division Chief and Fire Engineer. A Development Services Technician II was frozen as part of the budget development process in order to help balance the Development Services Fund.

The fiscal year 2015-16 budget reflects 16.0 frozen positions; this is a net reduction of 3.0 frozen positions when compared to the prior fiscal year. The frozen positions are summarized by department and fund on the following table.

Summary of Fiscal Year 2015-16 Frozen Positions

Department/Fund	Program	Position	FTE
City Council	Service Grants	Chief Service Officer	1.00
Police	Community Patrol	Peace Officer	11.00
	Street Crime/Gang Suppression	Peace Officer	1.00
	City Jail	Detention Facility Manager	1.00
	Police Dispatch	Police Communications Systems Manager	1.00
Development Services Fund	Development Services Counter	Development Services Technician II	1.00
TOTAL CITYWIDE			16.00

SUMMARY OF STAFFING CHANGES BY DEPARTMENT AND BARGAINING UNIT

The following tables summarize the staffing changes occurring between the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget and the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget, by bargaining unit and by department.

Summary of Staffing Changes by Bargaining Unit

Bargaining Unit	FY 14-15 Adopted Staffing	FY 14-15 Mid Year Changes	FY 15-16 Proposed Changes	FY 15-16 Proposed Staffing	% Change
Unrepresented Professionals and Mid Managers	34.00	2.00	-	36.00	5.9%
Executives	16.00	2.00	-	18.00	12.5%
Chula Vista Mid Managers and Professionals Association	66.50	(1.00)	3.75	69.25	4.1%
Chula Vista Employee's Association	385.75	3.50	5.00	394.25	2.2%
City Council	5.00	-	-	5.00	0.0%
International Association of Firefighters	125.00	-	1.00	126.00	0.8%
Peace Officer's Association	233.00	-	-	233.00	0.0%
Western Council of Engineers	27.00	-	-	27.00	0.0%
Senior Managers	36.50	(1.00)	(4.00)	31.50	-13.7%
Confidential	32.00	(3.00)	(3.00)	26.00	-18.8%
TOTAL	960.75	2.50	2.75	966.00	0.5%

Summary of Staffing Changes by Department

Department/Fund	FY 14-15 Adopted Staffing	FY 14-15 Mid Year Changes	FY 15-16 Proposed Changes	FY 15-16 Proposed Staffing	% Change
Administration	14.00	1.00	1.75	16.75	19.6%
Development Services - GF	20.25	-	-	20.25	0.0%
Animal Care Facility	21.00	-	-	21.00	0.0%
Police	321.50	0.50	0.50	322.50	0.3%
City Attorney	13.00	-	1.00	14.00	7.7%
City Clerk	5.00	-	1.00	6.00	20.0%
City Council	14.00	-	1.00	15.00	7.1%
Finance	28.00	(1.00)	-	27.00	-3.6%
Fire	136.00	-	-	136.00	0.0%
Human Resources	15.00	-	1.00	16.00	6.7%
Information Technology Services	17.00	-	-	17.00	0.0%
Library	21.50	-	1.00	22.50	4.7%
Public Works	163.00	-	1.50	164.50	0.9%
Recreation	17.00	-	-	17.00	0.0%
General Fund Total	806.25	0.50	8.75	815.50	1.1%
Other Funds					
Federal Grants Fund	2.00	1.00	-	3.00	50.0%
Fleet Management	10.00	-	-	10.00	0.0%
Police Grants Fund	40.00	1.00	(5.00)	36.00	-10.0%
Development Services Fund	45.50	-	(1.00)	44.50	-2.2%
Advanced Life Support	1.00	-	-	1.00	0.0%
CV Housing	4.00	-	-	4.00	0.0%
Environmental Services Fund	5.00	-	1.00	6.00	20.0%
Sewer Fund	46.00	-	-	46.00	0.0%
Transit	1.00	-	(1.00)	-	-100.0%
Successor Agency to RDA	-	-	-	-	0.0%
Other Funds Total	154.50	2.00	(6.00)	150.50	-2.6%
CITYWIDE TOTAL	960.75	2.50	2.75	966.00	0.5%

CITY STAFF EMPLOYEES

5-Year Position Summary

DEPARTMENT	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
LEGISLATIVE/ADMINISTRATIVE					
City Council	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	15.00
City Clerk/Elections	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00
City Attorney	12.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	14.00
Administration	9.00	10.00	13.00	14.00	16.75
Information Technology Services	18.00	18.00	17.00	17.00	17.00
Human Resources	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	16.00
Finance	26.00	26.00	28.00	28.00	27.00
TOTAL	99.00	101.00	105.00	106.00	111.75
DEVELOPMENT/MAINTENANCE					
Animal Care Facility	17.75	19.25	20.50	21.00	21.00
Development Services	21.50	20.50	19.50	20.25	20.25
Public Works Operations	160.50	162.00	163.00	163.00	164.50
TOTAL	199.75	201.75	203.00	204.25	205.75
PUBLIC SAFETY					
Police	306.50	313.00	319.00	321.50	322.50
Fire	134.00	135.00	136.00	136.00	136.00
TOTAL	440.50	448.00	455.00	457.50	458.50
COMMUNITY SERVICES					
Recreation	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00
Library	21.00	21.10	21.50	21.50	22.50
TOTAL	38.00	38.10	38.50	38.50	39.50
GENERAL FUND SUBTOTAL	777.25	788.85	801.50	806.25	815.50

CITY STAFF EMPLOYEES

5-Year Position Summary

DEPARTMENT	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
OTHER FUNDS					
Advanced Life Support	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Development Services	39.00	41.50	44.50	45.50	44.50
Police Grant Funds/California Border Alliance Group (CBAG)	34.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	36.00
Federal Grants Fund	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00
American Renewal & Reinvestment Act	4.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Environmental Services	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00
Housing Authority	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Successor Agency	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Fleet Management	8.00	8.00	8.00	10.00	10.00
Transit	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Sewer	46.00	46.00	46.00	46.00	46.00
Redevelopment Agency	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	147.50	143.50	148.50	154.50	150.50
GRAND TOTAL (does not include hourly staffing)	924.75	932.35	950.00	960.75	966.00



GENERAL FUND SUMMARY

General Fund Expenditure Summary

General Fund Revenue Summary

General Fund Net Cost

Department Summary Reports

General Fund Expenditure Summary

Chula Vista General Operating Budget in thousands(000)

FY 13-14 Actual Expenditures	\$138,373
FY 14-15 3 rd Quarter Projected	\$143,048
FY 15-16 Proposed Budget	\$139,704
% Change FY 14-15 to FY15-16	-2.3%

The General Fund Proposed Operating Budget for fiscal year 2015-16 totals \$139.2 million, which reflects an increase of \$1.7 million (1.2%) when compared to the Fiscal Year 2014-15 projected year-end total. The General Fund Proposed CIP Budget for fiscal year 2015-16 is \$0.5 million, bringing the total General Fund Proposed Budget to \$139.7 million.

The General Fund Proposed Budget is balanced. The City defines a budget as balanced when the amount of budgeted expenditures is equal to or less than the amount of budgeted revenues plus other available sources. The General Fund includes funding for programs and services supported by the City Council in previous fiscal years. The fiscal year 2015-16 Proposed Budget reflects a continuation of current service levels with the exception of a small number of service enhancements approved as part of the development of the budget.

The City’s General Fund reflects positive growth in most major revenue sources. This modest growth in projected revenues allowed for a limited number of funding enhancements. Program/Service enhancements include:

- Otay Ranch Library and the Hub – Added 1.0 Senior Librarian to ensure stable and enhanced hours of operation at the Otay Ranch Library and the Hub.
- Civic Center Library/Museum – Added \$75,000 in funding to match the Mayor’s and Department’s

fund raising efforts towards renovations at the Civic Center Library auditorium.

- Cultural Arts Manager – This new position will manage the City’s cultural arts programs and take the lead in developing and implementing the City’s Cultural Arts Master Plan.
- Special Events - Included \$40,000 in funding to support three Citywide special events such as Starlight Parade and Harbor Days
- Economic Development – Converted hourly staffing to a new Project Coordinator position to support Economic Development’s efforts to assist our local business community and to attract investment and jobs.
- Storm Drain Maintenance – Added 1.0 Maintenance Worker to provide staffing for the operation of the third storm drain vector. This will help address new NPDES regulations that increased inspections and cleaning requirements of storm drain pipes and catch basins to reduce pollutants to the bay.
- Equipment Replacement – Added \$330,000 for the replacement of the highest priority vehicles; includes two vehicles for Fire, 1 vehicle for Police, and 1 vehicle for Public Works.
- Computer Replacement - The budget includes a \$60,000 increase for the lease of an additional 200 computers in year 2 of a 4 year plan to modernize and standardize the City’s aging computers.

A comparison of the fiscal year 2015-16 Proposed budget, the fiscal year 2014-15 projected expenditures, and the fiscal year 2013-14 actual expenditures are summarized in the following table.

General Fund Expenditure Summary
In Thousands (000)

Description	FY 2013-14 Actual	FY 2014-15 3rd Qtr Projected	FY 2015-16 Proposed	Change
Personnel Services	\$ 101,760	\$ 107,428	\$ 111,610	\$ 4,182
Supplies and Services	\$ 14,042	\$ 17,455	\$ 14,269	\$ (3,186)
Other Expenses	\$ 506	\$ 929	\$ 551	\$ (378)
Capital	\$ 604	\$ 638	\$ 266	\$ (372)
Transfers Out	\$ 15,522	\$ 5,400	\$ 6,099	\$ 699
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	\$ 133	\$ 256	\$ 509	\$ 253
Utilities	\$ 4,957	\$ 5,423	\$ 5,889	\$ 466
Total Operating Budget	\$ 137,524	\$ 137,529	\$ 139,193	\$ 1,664
CIP Project Expenditures	\$ 849	\$ 5,519	\$ 510	\$ (5,009)
Total General Fund Budget	\$ 138,373	\$ 143,048	\$ 139,703	\$ (3,345)

MAJOR EXPENDITURE CHANGES BY CATEGORY

The fiscal year 2014-15 3rd Quarter Projected column reflects the projected June 30, 2015 costs as reported in the Third Quarter Financial Report. This column includes the Council adopted budget for fiscal year 2014-15, midyear appropriations, and the carryover of prior year encumbrances (mostly reflected in CIP and Supplies and Services).

When compared to the prior fiscal year, the largest change is occurring in CIP Project Expenditures category. This category reflects a decrease of \$5.0 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 projected year-end total. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget only reflects new projects for fiscal year 2015-16 and excludes the budget for projects that were appropriated in prior fiscal years. The fiscal year 2015-16 capital budget includes \$0.5 million for the following projects:

- \$400,000 for Sign Reflectivity Replacement citywide (offset by SAFE revenues)
- \$110,000 for the City's Asset Management Program.

The next largest change is occurring in Personnel Services. This category reflects an increase of \$4.2 million and includes the following major changes:

- \$4.0 million increase in budgeted Salaries - this increase reflects the annualized cost of wage increases approved by the City Council during fiscal year 2014-15 for all employee groups, negotiated wage increases for Public Safety that will occur during fiscal year 2015-16, step increases, and the addition of 5.25 new positions.
- A \$1.2 million increase for retirement costs which reflects the increased contribution rates based on the October 2014 Annual Valuations report from CalPERS and salary savings projected in fiscal year 2014-15 but not budgeted in this object in fiscal year 2015-16.
- \$0.5 million for increased flex/insurance costs to account for anticipated increases in health premiums based on the projected health premium increases.
- \$0.5 million in Worker's Comp charges, based on increased costs in the Workers Compensation Fund.

- The increase in Salaries, retirement costs, and flex costs also reflect projected salary savings in fiscal year 2014-15 that are not budgeted in these objects in fiscal year 2015-16. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget reflects \$1.7 million in budgeted salary savings.


The Supplies and Services expense category reflects a decrease of \$3.2 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 projected year-end total. The majority of this decrease reflects the elimination of midyear (one-time) appropriations and prior year encumbrances. The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget reflects a \$0.1 million increase when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget of \$14.2 million. This increase reflects adjustments to various objects in the category including software maintenance, fleet maintenance, and other agencies permits and fees. One major changer reflected in this category is a decrease in city liability insurance costs as a result of the dissolution of the San Diego Pooled Insurance Authority for Municipal Entities (SANDPIPA). The City has joined CSAC Excess Insurance Authority for pooled liability insurance coverage at a lower cost.

The Transfers-Out expense category reflects an increase of \$0.7 million. This change consists of various budgeted increases from the General Fund to other funds that include:


- \$0.3 million to the Equipment Replacement Fund
- \$0.2 million to the Police Grants Fund
- \$0.1 million to the Public Liability Trust Fund
- \$0.1 million to other City Funds including the Development Services Fund, Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Fund, and various debt service funds.

The Utilities expense category has been increased by \$0.5 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 projected year-end total. Utility budgets have been adjusted to reflect projected expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16 based on actual usage and expected rate increases.


General Fund Expenditures by Category
Fiscal Year 2015-2016



General Fund Expenditures History by Category
Fiscal Year 2012 through 2016




General Fund Expenditure by Department
Fiscal Year 2015-2016



Note: The chart above does not reflect net cost of each department, only their expenditure allocations.

The following chart reflects the “Other” department costs included in the previous chart that includes the \$31.6 million of the General Fund department budget expenditures.

General Fund Expenditure by Department (Other Department Detail – totals \$31.6 million)
Fiscal Year 2015-2016



Note: The chart above does not reflect net cost of each department, only their expenditure allocations.

STAFFING LEVELS

As revenue levels have improved, the City has continued the trend of slowly recovering its staffing levels previously reduced as a result of the Great Recession. Since fiscal year 2011-12 the City has been able to achieve a modest 4.5% increase in staffing managing to keep pace with a population 4.0% increase over the same period of time.

Staffing for Community Services and the Development and Maintenance Services categories have grown modestly 3.9% and 2.4% respectively from 2011-12. Staffing for the Legislative and Administrative service category has increased by 11.2% primarily due to


reorganizations/consolidations that have shifted staff from other service categories. Public Safety staffing levels have increased 4.4% – this increase includes the addition of various grant funded positions.

Budget constraints necessitated the net elimination of 331.4 full time equivalent (FTE) positions from the City’s peak employment of 1,263.75 FTEs during fiscal year 2006-07. The last major reduction occurred in 2011 and is reflected in the fiscal year 2011-12 budget. As shown in the following graph, the number of FTEs per thousand has remained flat since fiscal year 2011-12.

Staffing Level Fiscal Year 2011-2012 to Fiscal Year 2015-2016

Council Adopted Budget	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	% Chg.
Legislative and Administrative	100.50	101.00	105.00	106.00	111.75	11.2%
Development and Maintenance	308.75	311.25	312.50	315.75	316.25	2.4%
Public Safety	477.50	482.00	494.00	500.50	498.50	4.4%
Community Services	38.00	38.10	38.50	38.50	39.50	3.9%
Total City Staff	924.75	932.35	950.00	960.75	966.00	4.5%

**City of Chula Vista Staffing (FTEs)
Compared to FTEs per Thousand Residents**



SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

Over the last several years, the City's bargaining groups worked with City management to reach new agreements that reduced personnel costs in an effort to balance the budget. The adjustments to employee compensation included wage concessions and pension reform. Subsequently, the City finances have stabilized and improved to the point where the City has been able to grant salary increases to its employee bargaining groups.

The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget reflects the annualized cost of salary increases for all employee groups; these salary increases were approved by the City Council during fiscal year 2014-15. The proposed budget also includes the second year of wage increases for the Police Officers' Association and the International Association of Firefighters. The City is currently in negotiations with three of the City's bargaining groups. The actual impact of salary adjustments will depend on the final agreements with the bargaining groups. As these agreements are reached, staff will bring forward for Council approval the memorandums of understanding and include the fiscal impact.

RISING RETIREMENT COSTS

The increase in retirement costs driven by rising CalPERS costs is a significant budgetary challenge facing the City. The payments made to the retirement system equal 15.3% of the City's General Fund in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget.

Increases in CalPERS contributions can be attributed to several factors. In the early 2000's the City approved enhanced formula benefits for all City employees. During the recent economic downturn, the City also approved an early retirement incentive to encourage employees to retire thereby reducing the number of layoffs, but increasing the City's payment to CalPERS. During this same time period, CalPERS experienced significant investment losses.

Over the last several years, CalPERS has made a series of changes that have resulted in higher contribution rates. Prior to fiscal year 2005-06, the CalPERS investment pool assumed a rate of return of 8.25% and any market gains (or losses) less than that amount could significantly affect the City's overall contribution rate. In fiscal year 2005-06, CalPERS adjusted their investment return assumption to 7.75%. In 2012, the

CalPERS Board of Administration approved a recommendation to lower the rate investment return assumption from 7.75% to 7.50%.

Additional changes that have been implemented by CalPERS include a change the CalPERS amortization and smoothing policies. With this change, CalPERS has employed an amortization and smoothing policy that will pay for all gains and losses over a fixed 30-year period with the increases or decreases in the rate spread directly over a 5-year period.

CalPERS has also focused in on current asset allocations in an effort to stem the volatility of investment returns as it implements its investment strategies to achieve the long-term assumed rate of 7.5% for the retirement fund. In addition the CalPERS board also adopted significant changes to actuarial assumptions with respect to mortality rates after evaluation of a demographic study that covered the years 1997-2011. This study yielded the following conclusions that will impact employer contribution rates:

- Men are living two years longer on average
- Women are living one and half years longer on average
- There are higher rates of service retirement for certain groups including firefighters and police officers
- Lower rates of disability retirements for all groups
- Members with longer service received higher salary increases


CalPERS is sensitive to the impact mortality improvements are likely to have on employer retirement contribution rates and has subsequently sought input from employer organizations. As such, CalPERS adopted the recommendation for local public agencies to first reflect the change in assumptions in fiscal year 2016-17 with the cost spread over twenty years with the increases phased in over the first five years and ramped down over the last five years of the twenty year amortization period. The estimated impact of these changes on the City's fiscal year 2016-17 retirement contribution rates is outlined in the CalPERS October 2014 Annual Valuation Report.

The budgetary impacts caused by the increased employer contribution rates for retirement costs have

been significant and will continue to challenge the City in future years. The impact of these cost increases have been partially offset through negotiations with City's bargaining groups that have resulted in the implementation of pension reform. Under the negotiated pension reform, employees have agreed to pay their share of pension costs thereby reducing the impact of pension cost increases to the City's budget. For fiscal year 2015-16, Tier 1 Miscellaneous employees contribute 8% of their salary, Tier 2 employees contribute 7% and Tier 3 employees contribute 6.75%. Tier 1 and Tier 2 public safety employees contribute 9% of their salary towards pension costs; Tier 3 public


safety employees contribute 12.25% of their salary. To follow is a series of charts related to pension costs. The first chart depicts the actual market rates of return for the CalPERS investment portfolio relative to the assumed 7.5% rate of return. The second chart reflects actual CalPERS costs in the General Fund for fiscal years 2009 to 2014, the projected cost for fiscal year 2014-15, and the proposed budget cost for 2015-16. The final chart reflects historical CalPERS contributions illustrating the employer (City) contribution rates from fiscal years 2003-04 to 2015-16 and projected rates for fiscal years 2016-17 through 2020-21.

CalPERS Historical Market Value Rates of Return
Relative to Assumed Investment Return of 7.5%




**Retirement Costs
(General Fund)**

Fiscal Years 2011-12 to 2015-16



CalPERS Employer Contribution Rates

Fiscal Years 2003-04 to 2020-21 Projected



Notes:

1. Reflects Employer Contribution. The actual employer contribution is higher due to Employer Paid Member Contributions (EPMC) ranging from 1.3% to 4.2%, and for applicable years an additional 8% and 9% for the Employer Paid Member Contribution (Employee Contribution).
2. Projected rates (FY 2017 through FY 2021), based on CalPERS Actuarial Valuation Report as of June 30, 2013, reflects assumed ROI of 7.5%.

HEALTH CARE COSTS


Flex/Health insurance represents 8.5% of the total fiscal year 2015-16 General Fund expenditure budget and account for the health care costs for permanent employees.

To follow are charts and tables reflecting the increased expenditures related to flex/health insurance. The first chart illustrates the actual Flex/Health insurance costs in the General Fund for fiscal years 2010 to 2014, the projected expenditures for fiscal year 2014-15 and the proposed budget for fiscal year 2015-16. It is important to note that the decrease in actuals in fiscal year 2010-11 and fiscal year 2011-12 was due to the reduction in staffing levels over the same period of time and not caused by a decrease in flex/health insurance costs. In

actuality, Flex/Health insurance costs have increased annually. The annually increasing flex/health insurance cost is a challenge that the City will continue to address in future budgets.

The subsequent table displays Flex Allotments by bargaining group from calendar year 2010 to calendar year 2015. Flex Allotments are the amounts provided by the City for employees to use towards the purchase of their health benefits. This allotment is negotiated between the City and each bargaining group. As illustrated by the table, costs to the City in the area of flex/health insurance have increased significantly since calendar year 2010.

**Flex/Health Insurance Costs
(General Fund)**
Fiscal Years 2011-12 to 2015-16



Flex Allotment Increases by Bargaining Group
Calendar Year 2011 to Calendar Year 2015

FLEX Allotment Increases by Bargaining Unit						
Bargaining Group	2011	2012	2013	2014⁽¹⁾	2015	2011-2015 % Change
Confidential	\$ 11,348	\$ 11,936	\$ 12,386	\$ 13,074	\$ 13,524	19.2%
Chula Vista Employees Association	\$ 10,848	\$ 11,436	\$ 11,886	\$ 12,574	\$ 13,024	20.1%
Executive	\$ 14,248	\$ 14,836	\$ 15,162	\$ 15,850	\$ 16,300	14.4%
Mid Managers and Professionals	\$ 11,848	\$ 12,436	\$ 12,762	\$ 13,450	\$ 13,900	17.3%
Senior Managers	\$ 12,848	\$ 13,436	\$ 13,762	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,900	16.0%
Western Council of Engineers	\$ 11,848	\$ 12,436	\$ 12,762	\$ 13,450	\$ 13,900	17.3%
Mayor & Council	\$ 14,248	\$ 14,836	\$ 15,162	\$ 15,850	\$ 16,300	14.4%

⁽¹⁾ Flex allotments remain at the 2013 amounts for all Employee Only members within the following employee groups: Confidential, Executive, Mid Managers and Professionals, Senior Managers, Western Council of Engineers, and Mayor & Council.

The public safety bargaining group is not included in the preceding table as their negotiated benefits differ from the other bargaining groups.

For the public safety bargaining group the City pays the full premium for Kaiser HMO Health Plan and Cigna DHMO pre-paid dental plan for the employee and any eligible dependents. Employees who choose a non-Kaiser HMO coverage pay a flat annual amount regardless of the number of dependents covered. Employees choosing the Cigna DPPO preferred provider plan are responsible for any additional costs over and above the Cigna DHMO pre-paid plan.

Due to the annual increase of flex/health insurance costs the amount the City has paid in insurance premiums have risen. As illustrated in the table below, medical premiums the City pays on behalf of public safety employees have increased by between 21% and 34% (depending on medical group elections) since calendar year 2011. Due to a switch in dental care providers, the City has seen a decrease of 3% in dental premiums over the same period of time.

The following table presents the range of benefits the City provides in medical and dental insurance to public safety employees and their dependents.

City Provided Public Safety Flex Benefit Ranges
Calendar Year 2011 to Calendar Year 2015

Public Safety FLEX Benefit Ranges						
Benefit	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2011-2015 % Change
Medical	\$4,776 - \$14,772	\$5,352 - \$15,852	\$5,436 - \$16,752	\$5,988 - \$18,180	\$5,784 - \$19,848	21% - 34%
Dental ⁽¹⁾	\$180 - \$444	\$204 - \$492	\$168 - \$396	\$168 - \$396	\$180 - \$432	0% - (3%)

⁽¹⁾Dental insurance for public safety employees is fully compensated for at the DHMO level. Employees may choose PPO and pay the variance between DHMO and PPO.

Insurance Premiums

Kaiser and AETNA insurance premiums have increased an average of 6.4% per year since the beginning of calendar year 2011. As noted in the table below, Kaiser premiums have increased a total of 21.1% during this time while AETNA premiums have increased 33.0% over the same period. The annual budget for flexible spending accounts/medical premiums has increased from \$9.1 million in fiscal year 2010-11 to \$12.0 million in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget. Recent discussions with health care professionals indicate these high trends in health care costs are likely to

continue for the foreseeable future. For fiscal year 2015-16, the proposed budget reflects an anticipated premium increase of 5% based on the preliminary information provided by the health care providers.

The following table reflects the changes in health care rate premiums the City has experienced from January 2011 to January 2015. The final rate premium that will be in effect for January 2016 will not be known until late summer or early fall.

Premium Increases by Health Care Provider
Calendar Year 2011 to 2015

Date of Increase	Kaiser	AETNA
January 2011	5.1%	8.0%
January 2012	12.2%	7.0%
January 2013	1.5%	5.5%
January 2014	10.2%	8.2%
January 2015	-3.4%	8.9%
Annual Average Premium Increase	4.9%	7.4%
Total Increase (January 2011 – January 2015)	21.1%	33.0%

General Fund Revenue Summary

Chula Vista General Operating Budget in thousands(000)

FY 13-14 Actual Revenues	\$142,061
FY 14-15 3 rd Quarter Projected	\$135,993
FY 15-16 Proposed Budget	\$139,304

% Change FY 14-15 to FY15-16 **2.4%**

*Excludes CIP Revenues

The estimated General Fund revenues for fiscal year 2015-16 General Fund total \$139.3 million excluding CIP related revenues. This reflects an increase of \$3.3 million (2.4%) when compared to the FY 2014-15 third quarter projected revenues. The increase is largely due to increases in Franchise Fee, Property Tax, and Sales Tax revenue estimates.

The following table compares the fiscal year 2015-16 estimated revenues to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. CIP related revenues can vary significantly from year and are reported separately on the table below.

General Fund Revenues

In Thousands (000)

Category	FY 2013-14 Actual	FY 2014-15 3 rd Qtr Projected	FY 2015-16 Proposed	Change
Sales Tax	\$ 29,171	\$ 30,320	\$ 31,015	\$ 695
Property Taxes	\$ 27,451	\$ 28,930	\$ 29,897	\$ 967
Motor Vehicle License Fees	\$ 16,774	\$ 17,884	\$ 18,597	\$ 713
Franchise Fees	\$ 8,845	\$ 10,342	\$ 11,426	\$ 1,085
Transfers From Other Funds	\$ 10,097	\$ 10,584	\$ 9,988	\$ (596)
Interfund Reimbursements	\$ 9,901	\$ 9,753	\$ 9,360	\$ (393)
Utility Users Tax	\$ 17,525	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	\$ -
Charges for Services	\$ 6,476	\$ 6,281	\$ 6,476	\$ 195
Transient Occupancy Taxes	\$ 2,633	\$ 2,807	\$ 2,891	\$ 84
Use of Money and Property	\$ 2,523	\$ 2,583	\$ 2,677	\$ 94
Other Agency Revenue	\$ 2,711	\$ 2,511	\$ 2,327	\$ (184)
Other Local Taxes	\$ 2,278	\$ 2,130	\$ 2,262	\$ 133
Development Revenue	\$ 1,619	\$ 1,223	\$ 1,399	\$ 177
Police Grants	\$ 807	\$ 771	\$ 1,279	\$ 508
Licenses and Permits	\$ 1,162	\$ 1,090	\$ 1,135	\$ 45
Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties	\$ 1,010	\$ 1,403	\$ 1,134	\$ (270)
Other Revenues	\$ 1,077	\$ 881	\$ 941	\$ 60
Total Operating Budget	\$ 142,061	\$ 135,993	\$ 139,304	\$ 3,311
Capital Projects	\$ 298	\$ 1,809	\$ 400	\$ (1,409)
Total General Fund	\$ 142,359	\$ 137,802	\$ 139,704	\$ 1,902

MAJOR REVENUE INCREASES BY CATEGORY


- Franchise Fees – Franchise fee revenues are estimated to increase by \$1.1 million in comparison to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projection. This increase is a result of the annualizing revenues from new franchise agreements negotiated by the City.
 - Property Taxes – This category reflects an increase of \$1.0 million. Based on the most recent fiscal year 2014-15 quarterly projections, property taxes are trending slightly higher than anticipated, mainly in secured property tax revenue. This trend is anticipated to be continued into the coming fiscal year. The projection for fiscal year 2015-16 reflects a 4% increase in assessed valuation.
 - Motor Vehicle License Fees – This category reflects an increase of \$0.7 million, primarily in Motor Vehicle License In-Lieu revenue. These revenues also reflect a 4% increase in assessed valuation.
 - Sales Tax – This category reflects an increase of \$0.7 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. Projections show sales tax revenues improving, and continuing with this trend, sales taxes are estimated to grow 2% from the current projections.
 - Police Grants – Police Grants revenue are anticipated to be \$0.5 million better than the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections due to anticipated federal grant revenue.
 - Charges for Services – Revenues within this category are anticipated to increase by \$0.2 million when compared to fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This can be attributed to an anticipated increase in activity in recreation programs and reimbursements associated with the Jail facility.
 - Development Revenue – This category reflects an increase of \$0.2 million when compared to the most recent quarterly projections. This can be attributed to an anticipated increase in workload for reimbursable projects.
 - Other Local Taxes – When compared to the most recent fiscal year 2014-15 quarterly projections, this category is anticipated to increase \$0.1 million. This is due to higher than expected revenues from Business License Tax and Real property Transfer Taxes.
 - Use of Money and Property – Revenues are projected to increase by \$0.1 million based on fees derived from the rental of City facilities.
 - Transient Occupancy Taxes – Transient occupancy tax revenues are projected to increase by \$0.1 million from the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projection. This increase reflects the continued upward trend for this revenue source.
 - Other Revenues – This category reflects an increase of \$0.1 million reflecting an anticipated increase in contributions from entertainment facilities within the City, such as Sleep Train Amphitheater and Aquatica SeaWorld's Waterpark.
- These revenue increases are partially offset by the decreases in the following revenue categories:
- Capital Projects – This category reflects a decrease of \$1.4 million when compared to fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This is largely due to reimbursements for the Third Avenue Streetscape Improvement Phase II project which is accounted for in the prior year.
 - Transfers from Other Funds – This category reflects a decrease of \$0.6 million when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This decrease can be attributed to a one-time transfer to the General Fund to offset fleet maintenance for the Fire and Police Departments from the TUT Common Fund approved as part of the fiscal year 2014-15 adopted budget.
 - Inter-fund Reimbursements – This category reflects a decrease of \$0.4 million when compared to fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This decrease can be attributed to one-time reimbursements for prior year activities and the closure of the Transit Fund.

- Fines, Forfeitures and Penalties – Revenue in this category reflects a decrease of \$0.3 million from the most recent quarterly projection. This is due to lower anticipated Code Enforcement Violations and False alarm Penalties revenue in fiscal year 2015-16.
- Other Agency Revenue – This category is anticipated to decrease from the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections due to the elimination of one-time contributions from various agencies.

The following charts provide a summary view of the major General Fund revenue sources.

General Fund Revenues by Category


Fiscal Year 2015-2016



Note: Other Revenues include the following categories: Development Revenue, Other Agency Revenue, Other Local Taxes, Other Revenues, Use of Money & Property, Licenses and Permits, Police Grants, and Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties, CIP, and Other Revenue.

Historical and Estimated General Fund Revenue Sources

Fiscal Year 2009-2010 through 2015-2016



MAJOR REVENUE SOURCES

The following is a description of the City’s major revenue sources along with a brief discussion of the trends impacting these revenues for the fiscal year 2015-16.

Sales Tax

Prior to fiscal year 2004-05, the City received 1% of sales tax revenue applied to all taxable retail sales occurring within the City limits. Beginning in fiscal year 2004-05, the State reduced the local allocation by 0.25% and applied these funds as security for the State’s Economic Recovery Bonds. The State committed to replacing the 0.25% sales tax revenues dollar for dollar in local property taxes from the County Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF). Fiscal year 2015-16 is the final year that the City will receive a Triple Flip allocation. For forecasting and comparison purposes, sales tax revenues are projected at the full 1% rate.

Sales tax revenues are collected by the State at a rate of 8.00% for the City of Chula Vista. The sales tax revenues are then allocated based on the following rates:

State General Fund (includes K-12/Community Colleges)	4.1875%
State Fiscal Recovery Fund (Triple Flip) (City Share)	0.2500%
Local Jurisdiction (City or County of place sale/use) (City Share)	0.7500%
Public Safety (Prop 172)	0.5000%
County Realignment (Mental Health/Welfare/Public Safety)	1.5625%
Countywide Transportation Fund	0.2500%
San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (TransNet)	0.5000%
Total Sales Tax Rate – Chula Vista ¹	8.0000%


¹ Total sales tax rates will vary by City due to local sales tax initiatives. For example, National City’s sales tax rate is 9.00% due to voter approved increase of 1% funding public services.

Sales tax revenue is highly sensitive to economic conditions, and reflects the factors that drive taxable sales, including the levels of unemployment,

consumer confidence, per-capita income, and business investment. Sales tax revenue is the City’s largest discretionary revenue source, accounting for 22.6% of total revenue for the General Fund in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget. Consumer spending decreased significantly nationwide due to the economic recession. However, recent trends show that sales tax revenues are beginning to increase due to improvement in local economic indicators. The positive trend is expected to continue in fiscal year 2015-16 and is reflected in the projections with an increase of 2.3% or approximately \$0.7 million from the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. The graph below illustrates the decrease in Sales tax revenue, due to the economic recession, and the slow ascent to pre-recession levels.


City of Chula Vista Sales Tax Revenues

Fiscal Year 2008 – Fiscal Year 2016



Chula Vista continues to be challenged in the generation of taxable sales per capita when compared to other County cities. As noted on the following chart, taxable sales per capita for the City is only \$2,916 while Del Mar has the highest taxable sales per capita at a rate of \$8,360. This comparison indicates that the City’s residents spend a high percentage of their retail dollars elsewhere.

Taxable Sales Per Capita



Notes:

1. Based on 4th Quarter 2014 Taxable Sales
2. Chula Vista Ranks 16th out of 18 cities in San Diego County.
3. Prior budget documents reflected Sales Tax Per Capita information, which changes the scale of the presentation presented above but does not change the City's standing when compared to other cities.

The City of Chula Vista continues to pursue development opportunities that have the potential to positively impact sales tax revenue for the City. The City is working on policies and programs that would increase the residential densities and office development in the Western area of the City. The City is also in discussions with developers on the possibility of locating additional automobile dealerships within the Chula Vista AutoPark. In Eastern Chula Vista the development of the Eastern Urban Center (Millenia) is moving forward and there are discussions about the development of new office space which would increase employment opportunities in the City. While all of these opportunities could provide more employees and residents to the City that would shop and dine in these areas, the projects are several years away from actually being built and occupied. In the short term, the City is reaching out to various retail tenants to showcase areas where they could locate new retail establishments within existing vacant retail space.

In an effort to boost sales tax receipts, the City of Chula Vista launched the “Shop Chula Vista Now” campaign. The Shop Chula Vista Now campaign promotes purchases by Chula Vista residents, visitors, and employees at Chula Vista businesses. The program seeks to educate residents, public officials, businesses

and community leaders about how buying goods and services locally translates into more money for Chula Vista



services, improves the success of local businesses, creates employment, and benefits the local economy and future of the City.

The City is collaborating to promote the program at member businesses, on ShopChulaVistaNow.com, Facebook and Twitter, as well as other communications vehicles. The website has been updated, a mobile/smartphone feature has been added, and a targeted advertising campaign generated a boost in awareness


In fiscal year 2015-16, staff will focus on additional cross-promotional efforts with local businesses as well as partner with Third Avenue Village Association and the Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce to secure participation from their members.

Property Tax

Property tax revenues represent a major funding source for the City of Chula Vista as well as other local jurisdictions. The distribution of property tax funding has changed over time as the State legislature and voter approved initiatives have altered property tax allocations among local jurisdictions. As a result, the City currently receives property tax in-lieu revenues and property tax in-lieu of vehicle license fee revenues. These revenues were meant to replace the


state-wide reallocation of sales tax and vehicle license fee revenues but do not increase the City’s revenue base.

Currently, the City of Chula Vista and other cities receive approximately 12.7% of each property tax dollar. The distribution of the property tax dollar among the other local jurisdictions is depicted in the graph below.



- ¹ Represents the exchange of Property Tax for Cities and County Sales and Use Tax as authorized under Assembly Bill 1766, chaptered August 2, 2003.
- ² Represents the exchange of Property Tax for Cities and County Vehicle License Fees as authorized under Senate Bill 1096, chaptered August 5, 2004.
- ³ Revenue for Schools has been reduced by the ERAF deficit as authorized under Senate Bill 1096, chaptered August 5, 2004.
- ⁴ Effective February 1, 2012 Redevelopment Agencies were dissolved and related revenue is allocated as provided by Health & Safety Code, Division 24, Part 1.85.

Historical Change in Assessed Value
City of Chula Vista and Countywide Comparison



Source: County of San Diego Assessors Office.


Property tax revenues fell throughout the economic recession with Chula Vista being one of the hardest hit areas. From 2005 through 2008 Chula Vista kept pace or exceeded the County average assessed valuation growth as result of new development and increasing property values. During the economic recession the City's assessed valuation dropped significantly, and up until recently the change was negative. This history is depicted in the preceding graph. Over the last two fiscal years, the City's assessed value has increased and this positive trend is anticipated to continue into fiscal year 2015-16 and is reflected in the estimated property tax revenues.

Property tax revenues comprise the City's second largest discretionary revenue source and accounts for 21.4% of the total revenue for the General Fund. This revenue source is estimated at \$29.9 million in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget and represents a \$1.0 million (3.4%) increase from the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections.

Property Tax revenues are based on a 1.0% levy on the assessed value of all real property. Under the terms of Proposition 13, which was approved in California in 1978, annual increases in the assessed value are capped at a maximum of 2% per year unless there is a change in ownership or new construction. Annual increases in assessed value are limited by either the California Consumer Price Index (CPI) or the 2% cap, whichever is less.

The recent recession resulted in decreases in assessed valuations due to lower prices from home re-sales. Also, some years experienced little inflation or negative


inflation (deflation) that precluded the County Assessor from applying the normal increase of up to 2% to the assessment roll as permitted under the terms of Proposition 13. As recently as fiscal year 2012-13, assessed values decreased by 0.7% based on data from the County of San Diego Assessor's Office. The reductions in assessed valuations and the less than full application of the 2% growth factor to the assessment roll resulted in several years of negative or no growth in property tax revenues for the City during the recession, as illustrated in the chart below.



*FY13 Property Tax includes a one-time payment related to the elimination of the City's Redevelopment Agency.

The most recent change in the October to October CPI was 2.1%, which will allow the full 2% growth rate to be applied to the assessment roll. The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget has been increased to reflect this projected rate, as well as another estimated 2% growth in reassessed properties, for a total increase of 4% in assessed valuation.

Historical Change in Assessed Value vs Changes in the California CPI




Franchise Fees

Franchise fee revenues are generated from public utility sources such as San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) (2% on gas and 1.25% on electricity), trash collection franchises (20% fee), and cable franchises (5% fee) conducting business within City limits. SDG&E collects the franchise fee from Chula Vista customers which can vary due to usage trends. Trash franchise fees and cable fees are more predictable due to the fixed rates charged and the monthly and quarterly receipt of the revenues respectively. Revenue growth is projected based on population and inflation factors.

The following chart illustrates the historic and projected revenue trends for the City’s Franchise Fee revenue. Overall, fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget franchise fee revenues are increasing by \$1.1 million or 10.5% over the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This increase is attributable to the annualizing of revenues of the waste management franchise renewal negotiated by the City in fiscal year 2014-15.


Franchise Fee Revenues by Utility



Motor Vehicle License Fees

With the State Budget Act of 2004, the allocation of VLF revenues to cities and counties was substantially changed. Since 2005-06 the majority of VLF revenues for each city grew essentially in proportion to the growth in the change in gross assessed valuation. Due to the new formula by the State, 96% of the City’s VLF revenues fluctuated with changes in assessed values within the City.

The other 4% of VLF revenues received by the City were based on a per capita formula but has since been shifted per SB89. Provisions in SB89 shifted hundreds of millions of Vehicle License Fee revenues to fund the state law enforcement grants. Statewide, SB89 took \$130 million of city general revenue and shifted it to save state law enforcement grant programs. This change applied to the 4% of VLF revenues that were based on a per capita formula. The City of Chula Vista lost approximately \$700,000 annually due to the State take away. Only \$100,000 is reflected in the City’s fiscal year 2015-16 estimated VLF revenues.



The chart above represents actual VLF revenues since fiscal year 2007-08, the projection for fiscal year 2014-15, and the fiscal year 2015-16 estimates. In total the proposed fiscal year 2015-16 VLF revenues are projected to increase by 4% when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This revenue is estimated to increase in accordance with projected increases in assessed values at 4%.

Utility Users Tax

The City adopted its Utility Users Tax (UUT) in 1970. The City of Chula Vista imposes a UUT on the use of

telecom at a rate of 4.75% of gross receipts. For natural gas services UUT is applied at a rate of \$0.00919 per therm and \$0.00250 per kilowatt on electricity services, which equates to a tax of approximately a 1% of utility charges. Fiscal year 2015-16 energy related UUT is budgeted at \$2.5 million.


On April 12, 2013 the City approved a settlement agreement that resolved a class action lawsuit challenging the City’s collection of the wireless telecom portion of the UUT from customers. The settlement received final approval of the court and became fully effective as of February 11, 2014. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the City brought forward an action and approved Ordinance No. 3318, reducing the Telephone Users’ Tax rate from 5% to 4.75%. The reduction of the rate, and the possible impact of users transitioning to prepaid cards, has decreased the amount of anticipated wireless telephone users’ tax funds.

Telephone users’ tax funds are budgeted at \$4.0 million in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget, which includes wireless and landline revenues.

Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT)

The City of Chula Vista imposes a Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) upon all hotel stays within the City boundaries. The TOT tax rate in the City is 10%. The potential for significant revenue growth is feasible provided additional hotels are built capturing the market created by the growth in the eastern section of the City. Several potential new hotel developments are being proposed in the City primarily in the Millenia project and the Bayfront.

As illustrated in the following graph, during the economic recession, TOT revenue dropped due to the lack of discretionary spending by consumers. However, the trend for city TOT revenues has been improving since 2010 as actual TOT revenue has increased on a yearly basis. Fiscal year 2014-15 TOT revenues are projected to exceed the budget by \$0.3 million. Continuing with this improving trend, fiscal year 2015-16 TOT revenues have been increased by 3.0% over the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter TOT projections.



Other Revenue

Revenue projections are continually reviewed and updated by City staff. As described above, major general revenues, such as property taxes, sales taxes, franchise fees, utility users tax, transient occupancy tax and motor vehicle license fees, are projected by the Finance Department based on prior history, growth and inflation projections, and economic climate. Additional assistance in the projection of revenues is provided by subject-matter experts such as the City’s sales and property tax consultants, the County Assessor and by reviewing regional and local economic forecasts provided by the UCLA Anderson Forecast and the University of San Diego’s Index of Leading Economic Indicators for San Diego County, respectively.

General Fund Net Cost


The fiscal year 2015-16 General Fund budget of \$139.7 million is based on funding from estimated program revenues totaling \$30.6 million and discretionary revenues totaling \$109.1 million. Program revenues are broadly defined as those revenues generated by a given activity (e.g. grant revenues, charges for services, licenses, permits). General revenues, or “discretionary revenues,” are broadly defined as those revenues that are generated not by any given activity, but by general or specific taxing authority such as property taxes and sales tax.

Departments that generate small amounts of revenue relative to their size generally have higher net costs. Departments that generate large amounts of revenue relative to their size generally have lower net costs. The majority of discretionary revenue is allocated to public safety services, with Police at 41% followed by Fire at 22%. The next highest portion was allocated to Public Works at 13%.

The following chart depicts the net cost of each department, excluding Non-Departmental, based on the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Proposed Budget.

General Fund Net Cost by Department

Fiscal Year 2015-2016





General Fund Department Summary



The General Fund budget funds the day-to-day operations of most City services. For fiscal year 2015-2016 the proposed General Fund operating budget totals \$139.7 million. This funds the following departments:

- Mayor and City Council
- Boards and Commissions
- City Clerk
- City Attorney
- Administration
- Information and Technology Services
- Human Resources
- Finance
- Non-Departmental
- Animal Care Facility
- Development Services
- Police
- Fire
- Public Works
- Recreation
- Library

To follow is a series of summary reports that reflect the anticipated revenues, expenditures, and staffing information for each of the General Fund departments.



CITY COUNCIL

MISSION STATEMENT

The City Council is comprised of a fulltime Mayor and four part-time Councilmembers. The Mayor and City Council are elected at-large, and each holds office for a four-year term. The City Council reviews and approves the budget, enacts ordinances, authorizes public improvements, adopts traffic regulations, approves contracts, sits as the Housing Authority, and oversees the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	600,298	554,996	637,749	819,432
Hourly Wages	157,428	147,795	125,323	6,022
Health Benefits	141,499	133,609	163,117	211,923
Retirement Benefits	191,621	196,816	212,406	263,168
Other Personnel Expense	59,290	44,886	52,988	74,908
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	1,150,136	1,078,102	1,191,583	1,375,453
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	46,641	53,276	113,033	108,479
Capital	0	2,789	3,190	3,190
Utilities	1,614	1,114	1,520	1,520
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	48,255	57,179	117,743	113,189
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,198,391	\$1,135,281	\$1,309,326	\$1,488,642
REVENUES				
Revenue from Other Agencies	39,144	0	0	0
Charges for Services	39,118	4,254	0	0
Other Revenue	4,525	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$82,787	\$4,254	\$0	\$0
REVENUE RECOVERY %	7%	0%	N/A	N/A
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	14.00	14.00	14.00	15.00

BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

MISSION STATEMENT

The process of establishing boards and commissions is one that began with the City Charter as a method to give citizens a greater voice in the determination of policies at all levels of government. Four commissions were established by the Charter- the Planning Commission, the Board of Library Trustees, Civil Service Commission, and the Parks & Recreation Commission. All other boards and commissions have been established through an ordinance or resolution since that time in order to meet a specific need of the City Council. The members for Chartered commissions are appointed by a majority vote of the City Council, with applications for these appointments accepted throughout the year from all interested residents.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Overtime	0	0	1,985	0
Retirement Benefits	0	0	15	0
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	0	0	2,000	0
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	7,210	5,443	138,576	11,476
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	7,210	5,443	138,576	11,476
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$7,210	\$5,443	\$140,576	\$11,476
REVENUES				
Other Revenue	260	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$260	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVENUE RECOVERY %	4%	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

CITY CLERK/ELECTIONS

MISSION STATEMENT

The City Clerk's Office is committed to accurately recording and preserving the actions of the City Council; safeguarding all vital, historic and permanent records of the City; providing information and support to the City Council, City staff, and the public in a timely, courteous and fiscally responsible manner; and administering open and free elections in accordance with statutory requirements.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	381,069	403,209	429,854	486,084
Hourly Wages	0	0	16,560	19,000
Overtime	133	0	0	0
Health Benefits	66,087	68,736	73,576	91,849
Retirement Benefits	111,005	125,383	138,019	163,787
Other Personnel Expense	23,642	21,624	17,675	30,599
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	581,936	618,952	675,684	791,319
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	192,759	166,029	305,160	140,766
Other Expenses	0	1,200	0	0
Capital	0	6,954	2,254	8,950
Utilities	454	678	521	750
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	193,213	174,861	307,935	150,466
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$775,149	\$793,813	\$983,619	\$941,785
REVENUES				
Revenue from Other Agencies	0	2,345	0	0
Charges for Services	21,122	10,477	9,510	11,600
Other Revenue	18,231	16,730	36,430	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$39,353	\$29,552	\$45,940	\$11,600
REVENUE RECOVERY %	5%	4%	5%	1%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00

CITY ATTORNEY

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the City Attorney's Office is to provide high quality legal services to the City in order for the City to operate in a lawful and effective manner, safeguard taxpayer resources and to improve quality of life for City residents.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,389,582	1,446,103	1,530,410	1,662,578
Hourly Wages	0	0	0	1,816
Health Benefits	162,199	173,109	171,901	220,755
Retirement Benefits	381,220	425,709	464,178	531,572
Other Personnel Expense	47,983	36,342	59,937	53,569
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	1,980,984	2,081,263	2,226,426	2,470,290
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	492,282	415,724	409,645	431,857
Capital	0	2,891	4,948	4,948
Utilities	1,974	1,732	2,200	1,850
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	494,256	420,347	416,793	438,655
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,475,240	\$2,501,610	\$2,643,219	\$2,908,945
REVENUES				
Charges for Services	45,599	65,916	73,694	73,694
Other Revenue	110,110	66,668	99,215	95,126
Transfers In	8,163	9,453	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$163,872	\$142,037	\$172,909	\$168,820
REVENUE RECOVERY %	7%	6%	7%	6%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	13.00	13.00	13.00	14.00

ADMINISTRATION

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Administration Department is to provide the leadership necessary for the implementation of City Council policies, administration of the organization and delivery of services to our community.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,176,180	1,529,195	1,744,671	2,059,482
Hourly Wages	122,006	41,690	16,938	0
Overtime	0	0	216	0
Health Benefits	133,607	179,955	202,920	259,160
Retirement Benefits	355,523	486,292	568,236	690,507
Other Personnel Expense	53,380	71,397	106,801	(28,895)
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	1,840,696	2,308,529	2,639,781	2,980,254
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	131,249	212,732	349,269	248,159
Capital	0	3,423	4,936	4,936
Utilities	1,205	1,193	1,412	1,520
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	132,454	217,348	355,617	254,615
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,973,150	\$2,525,877	\$2,995,398	\$3,234,869
REVENUES				
Charges for Services	5,411	7,545	4,250	57,050
Other Revenue	136,260	103,454	62,500	260,405
Transfers In	0	77,210	77,210	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$141,671	\$188,209	\$143,960	\$317,455
REVENUE RECOVERY %	7%	7%	5%	10%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	10.00	13.00	14.00	16.75

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Information Technology Services Department is to provide technology, planning, development support and management to City employees and departments so they can perform their jobs effectively and meet their strategic goals for the City.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,482,928	1,407,617	1,500,259	1,561,141
Hourly Wages	0	18,780	13,290	0
Health Benefits	230,732	223,496	219,338	255,352
Retirement Benefits	408,137	413,476	457,130	504,718
Other Personnel Expense	84,317	66,476	84,263	95,485
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	2,206,114	2,129,845	2,274,279	2,416,696
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	583,841	533,144	705,190	865,157
Capital	63,901	81,018	89,099	148,500
Utilities	43,649	34,303	34,180	47,045
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	691,391	648,465	828,469	1,060,702
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,897,505	\$2,778,310	\$3,102,748	\$3,477,398
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	13	70	0	0
Charges for Services	4,742	7,128	10,025	10,000
Other Revenue	5,488	837	6,699	20,000
Transfers In	11,680	35,348	10,000	8,900
TOTAL REVENUES	\$21,923	\$43,383	\$26,724	\$38,900
REVENUE RECOVERY %	1%	2%	1%	1%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	18.00	17.00	17.00	17.00

HUMAN RESOURCES

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Human Resources Department is to provide superior services to employees, departments, and the public to ensure an informed, quality work force and community, while treating everyone with fairness, dignity, and respect.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,202,205	1,160,951	1,264,800	1,355,354
Hourly Wages	25,138	23,572	29,956	16,708
Overtime	0	40	0	204
Health Benefits	172,884	197,041	195,213	239,982
Retirement Benefits	331,863	341,690	386,360	428,242
Professional Enrichment	0	(1,025)	0	0
Other Personnel Expense	68,607	56,648	62,468	77,419
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	1,800,697	1,778,917	1,938,797	2,117,909
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	250,617	299,310	332,112	422,305
Other Expenses	7,609	234	2,299	0
Capital	0	9,307	9,264	8,920
Utilities	1,613	1,364	1,289	1,530
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	259,839	310,215	344,964	432,755
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,060,536	\$2,089,132	\$2,283,761	\$2,550,664
REVENUES				
Charges for Services	82,285	90,196	65,200	67,000
Other Revenue	156,735	97,823	80,175	70,000
Transfers In	40,653	42,221	35,000	35,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$279,673	\$230,240	\$180,375	\$172,000
REVENUE RECOVERY %	14%	11%	8%	7%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	15.00	15.00	15.00	16.00

FINANCE

MISSION STATEMENT

The Chula Vista Finance Department is dedicated to supporting the long-term financial stability of the City and enhancing public and organizational trust through integrity of financial reporting and sound financial practices.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,994,549	2,130,946	2,088,119	2,172,086
Hourly Wages	101,994	108,037	40,024	55,325
Health Benefits	314,933	351,061	358,300	394,253
Retirement Benefits	559,652	626,263	628,983	700,642
Other Personnel Expense	118,569	110,679	117,802	135,968
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	3,089,697	3,326,986	3,233,228	3,458,274
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	160,623	150,177	220,300	185,530
Other Expenses	34	0	0	0
Capital	0	12,408	15,499	15,499
Utilities	2,334	2,164	1,762	2,500
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	162,991	164,749	237,561	203,529
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,252,688	\$3,491,735	\$3,470,789	\$3,661,803
REVENUES				
Other Local Taxes	61,038	66,445	38,675	60,000
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	25,054	30,844	31,266	30,000
Use of Money & Property	106,284	109,722	103,994	108,364
Charges for Services	66,798	47,972	30,007	57,750
Other Revenue	688,288	321,122	359,253	466,400
Transfers In	326,744	317,274	348,500	348,500
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,274,206	\$893,379	\$911,695	\$1,071,014
REVENUE RECOVERY %	39%	26%	26%	29%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	26.00	28.00	28.00	27.00

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

MISSION STATEMENT

The Non-Departmental budget reflects expenditures and expenditure savings that are not directly related to any single department. The budget includes such items as insurance, interest expense, transfers out to the Public Liability fund, and transfers out to various Debt Service Funds for the General Fund's debt service obligations. This budget also includes all General Fund discretionary revenues.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	0	0	513,611	331,387
Hourly Wages	6,850	0	0	0
Health Benefits	(6,014)	448	7,581	8,427
Retirement Benefits	143	44,309	98,590	(232,064)
Professional Enrichment	85,624	105,263	121,250	209,800
Other Personnel Expense	0	2,046	2,635	(1,818,574)
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	86,603	152,066	743,667	(1,501,024)
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	2,530,471	1,935,027	2,872,571	1,596,447
Other Expenses	211,459	223,477	476,867	167,500
Capital	1,430,222	0	270,000	0
Utilities	778	18,887	52,466	61,327
Transfers Out	5,499,121	14,493,456	4,948,916	5,483,642
CIP Project Expenditures	1,172,734	849,234	5,518,759	510,000
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	0	19,500	38,100	490,316
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	10,844,785	17,539,581	14,177,679	8,309,232
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$10,931,388	\$17,691,647	\$14,921,346	\$6,808,208
REVENUES				
Property Taxes	27,876,534	27,451,232	28,930,278	29,896,924
Other Local Taxes	47,119,435	61,200,066	52,859,490	54,850,192
Use of Money & Property	1,107,626	1,412,411	1,507,963	1,586,709
Revenue from Other Agencies	18,009,284	17,631,740	18,503,595	19,135,591
Charges for Services	24,379	0	65	0
Other Revenue	2,465,916	1,456,167	2,737,360	1,794,339
Transfers In	1,901,130	2,292,658	2,511,130	1,869,717
TOTAL REVENUES	\$98,504,304	\$111,444,274	\$107,049,881	\$109,133,473
REVENUE RECOVERY %	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

ANIMAL CARE FACILITY

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Chula Vista Animal Care Facility is to ensure the health and safety of animals and citizens in Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, National City and Lemon Grove.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	968,728	1,033,350	1,077,411	1,168,141
Hourly Wages	183,534	199,798	198,592	205,930
Overtime	54,154	54,914	60,713	53,168
Health Benefits	227,328	244,571	251,595	290,404
Retirement Benefits	295,664	324,638	335,346	384,156
Other Personnel Expense	85,461	75,979	92,593	104,002
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	1,814,869	1,933,250	2,016,249	2,205,801
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	519,357	555,060	600,055	569,555
Other Expenses	2,962	3,503	4,133	4,500
Capital	0	16,948	77,282	6,282
Utilities	42,548	43,224	39,984	41,495
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	564,867	618,735	721,454	621,832
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,379,736	\$2,551,985	\$2,737,704	\$2,827,633
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	143,871	150,879	135,145	132,600
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	300	21,533	34,252	20,000
Use of Money & Property	112	83	41	0
Charges for Services	305,916	260,337	225,008	252,600
Other Revenue	763,949	953,207	1,068,208	947,785
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,214,148	\$1,386,039	\$1,462,653	\$1,352,985
REVENUE RECOVERY %	51%	54%	53%	48%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	19.25	20.50	21.00	21.00

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Development Services Department is to guide the physical development of the City through the implementation of the General Plan and building Codes. We are committed to enhancing the quality of life in our community by planning for sound infrastructure and public services, protection of the environment, and promotion of high quality social and economic growth.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,515,396	1,363,715	1,527,052	1,476,258
Hourly Wages	96,491	41,124	32,247	0
Overtime	0	0	36	1,530
Health Benefits	247,156	241,475	260,713	273,244
Retirement Benefits	435,017	416,462	462,864	479,368
Other Personnel Expense	79,187	59,767	70,149	85,478
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	2,373,247	2,122,543	2,353,061	2,315,878
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	138,831	133,863	136,287	146,322
Other Expenses	10,915	10,950	10,950	12,000
Utilities	1,840	2,033	2,113	2,200
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	151,586	146,846	149,350	160,522
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,524,833	\$2,269,389	\$2,502,411	\$2,476,400
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	388,123	438,010	402,937	339,328
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	322,563	345,541	508,008	387,100
Charges for Services	400,466	401,479	176,614	275,370
Other Revenue	443,801	427,561	325,964	326,661
Transfers In	332,061	204,408	348,738	333,777
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,887,014	\$1,816,999	\$1,762,261	\$1,662,236
REVENUE RECOVERY %	75%	80%	70%	67%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	20.50	19.50	20.25	20.25

POLICE

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Chula Vista Police Department is to enhance the quality of life in the City of Chula Vista by:

- Providing a proactive and professional level of police service ensuring safety through commitment, integrity and trust
- Managing resources effectively
- Treating all persons with fairness, respect and dignity
- Maintaining a partnership with the community to meet contemporary and future challenges

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	22,593,757	22,463,339	23,541,480	25,480,762
Hourly Wages	404,362	408,678	438,840	229,931
Overtime	2,606,094	3,011,310	3,359,567	2,494,418
Health Benefits	3,595,903	3,801,570	3,865,104	4,599,403
Retirement Benefits	7,439,191	7,562,935	8,240,012	9,191,352
Other Personnel Expense	2,586,528	2,484,890	2,544,768	2,777,850
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	39,225,835	39,732,722	41,989,771	44,773,716
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	2,798,583	3,251,758	4,321,845	3,141,063
Other Expenses	83,300	105,003	89,290	123,243
Capital	0	188,934	91,686	0
Utilities	373,144	404,786	507,889	570,942
Transfers Out	175,000	600,000	0	162,989
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	3,430,027	4,550,481	5,010,710	3,998,237
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$42,655,862	\$44,283,203	\$47,000,481	\$48,771,953
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	256,465	151,341	181,664	250,000
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	479,410	473,750	721,286	533,700
Use of Money & Property	0	9,666	4,203	8,000
Revenue from Other Agencies	1,360,671	1,127,508	1,156,054	1,579,824
Charges for Services	4,413,008	4,247,798	4,095,126	4,129,158
Other Revenue	32,065	36,214	42,492	37,453
Transfers In	617,974	491,630	556,927	404,445
TOTAL REVENUES	\$7,159,593	\$6,537,907	\$6,757,752	\$6,942,580
REVENUE RECOVERY %	17%	15%	14%	14%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	313.00	319.00	321.50	322.50

FIRE

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Fire Department is to protect life, environment and property

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	10,390,812	10,818,654	10,912,213	11,614,479
Hourly Wages	47,529	69,217	105,923	1,336
Overtime	4,701,459	4,057,858	4,360,577	3,417,445
Health Benefits	1,708,694	1,909,031	2,015,015	2,246,002
Retirement Benefits	3,559,767	3,916,950	4,148,735	4,650,816
Other Personnel Expense	1,007,694	1,273,822	1,355,319	1,445,724
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	21,415,955	22,045,532	22,897,782	23,375,802
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	2,259,085	2,029,541	2,127,870	1,911,336
Other Expenses	450	0	0	0
Capital	33,215	103,242	0	0
Utilities	169,843	183,389	189,533	226,715
Transfers Out	152,226	43,060	60,230	62,326
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	2,614,819	2,359,232	2,377,633	2,200,377
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$24,030,774	\$24,404,764	\$25,275,416	\$25,576,179
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	530,069	460,319	464,743	552,519
Use of Money & Property	7,800	14,300	15,600	15,600
Revenue from Other Agencies	664,407	719,695	666,907	664,000
Charges for Services	584,631	563,717	568,468	469,157
Other Revenue	514,475	450,574	553,453	92,157
Transfers In	50,000	559,846	634,333	833,510
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,351,382	\$2,768,451	\$2,903,503	\$2,626,943
REVENUE RECOVERY %	10%	11%	11%	10%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	135.00	136.00	136.00	136.00

PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Public Works Department is to provide and manage the City's infrastructure, parks and open space through high quality operations, maintenance and construction in order to optimize mobility, public and environmental health and safety.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	10,393,670	10,579,045	10,817,300	11,169,396
Hourly Wages	336,803	304,046	371,171	367,927
Overtime	166,741	201,817	198,048	207,545
Health Benefits	1,916,863	2,061,900	2,054,847	2,302,340
Retirement Benefits	2,915,293	3,173,538	3,336,129	3,643,005
Other Personnel Expense	791,324	681,145	786,087	874,237
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	16,520,694	17,001,491	17,563,582	18,564,450
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	3,391,045	3,559,967	3,933,675	3,665,992
Other Expenses	118,063	117,387	139,966	128,000
Capital	41,784	115,635	66,921	61,921
Utilities	3,463,601	3,632,468	3,902,766	4,156,884
Transfers Out	184,936	385,321	390,802	390,290
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	99,525	113,674	217,901	18,700
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	7,298,954	7,924,452	8,652,031	8,421,787
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$23,819,648	\$24,925,943	\$26,215,613	\$26,986,237
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	76,991	114,896	47,488	35,000
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	0	900	0	0
Use of Money & Property	241,084	264,252	207,856	247,700
Revenue from Other Agencies	32,344	(10,597)	27,407	0
Charges for Services	911,050	878,137	886,091	828,440
Other Revenue	7,530,368	7,177,535	6,881,661	6,530,998
Transfers In	6,373,042	6,065,093	6,062,637	6,154,472
TOTAL REVENUES	\$15,164,879	\$14,490,216	\$14,113,140	\$13,796,610
REVENUE RECOVERY %	64%	58%	54%	51%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	162.00	163.00	163.00	164.50

RECREATION

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Recreation Department is to enrich our community through recreational opportunities and services.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,038,618	1,122,152	1,139,707	1,226,239
Hourly Wages	825,536	907,257	938,183	1,014,577
Overtime	4,253	1,487	449	5,100
Health Benefits	183,892	213,558	214,253	241,333
Retirement Benefits	349,075	395,755	412,263	475,696
Other Personnel Expense	81,770	61,605	68,189	80,583
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	2,483,144	2,701,814	2,773,044	3,043,528
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	549,502	474,854	583,396	621,146
Other Expenses	16,055	43,603	205,451	115,657
Capital	0	22,414	2,523	2,523
Utilities	313,857	346,008	384,923	420,057
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	879,414	886,879	1,176,293	1,159,383
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,362,558	\$3,588,693	\$3,949,337	\$4,202,911
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	698,906	674,453	687,144	652,883
Revenue from Other Agencies	4,331	5,418	6,683	5,330
Charges for Services	1,372,499	1,280,852	1,141,526	1,354,344
Other Revenue	72,457	115,745	86,509	50,773
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,148,193	\$2,076,468	\$1,921,862	\$2,063,330
REVENUE RECOVERY %	64%	58%	49%	49%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00

LIBRARY

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Chula Vista Public Library is to increase knowledge and enrich lives within the community. We accomplish this by connecting people equitably to responsive programs, services and resources in a manner that reflect the ideals of a democratic society.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Expenses				
Salaries	1,336,308	1,400,375	1,417,854	1,529,015
Hourly Wages	533,010	498,601	620,796	665,707
Overtime	0	49	0	0
Health Benefits	250,375	277,300	261,321	318,698
Retirement Benefits	440,987	481,552	503,778	587,364
Other Personnel Expense	102,460	90,203	105,766	121,296
Personnel Expenses Subtotal	2,663,140	2,748,080	2,909,515	3,222,080
Non-Personnel Expenses				
Supplies and Services	256,597	266,062	306,177	203,852
Other Expenses	360	360	400	400
Capital	0	38,257	0	0
Utilities	262,386	283,617	299,991	352,925
Non-Personnel Expenses Subtotal	519,343	588,296	606,568	557,177
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,182,483	\$3,336,376	\$3,516,083	\$3,779,257
REVENUES				
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	175,620	137,168	108,500	163,000
Use of Money & Property	39,665	37,958	55,900	57,550
Revenue from Other Agencies	2,000	2,000	5,000	2,000
Charges for Services	80,484	75,956	77,000	115,013
Other Revenue	80,751	52,097	102,800	8,850
Transfers In	0	2,352	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$378,520	\$307,531	\$349,200	\$346,413
REVENUE RECOVERY %	12%	9%	10%	9%
AUTHORIZED FULL TIME POSITIONS	21.10	21.50	21.50	22.50

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND

Development Services Fund

The Development Services fund accounts for revenues and expenditures related to the processing of development plans and permits. The fund is comprised of three divisions, Planning, Building, and Engineering, which provide direct services to property owners, developers, and the City as required for the entitlement and/or improvement of property. The services provided encompass most development activities, including land use entitlements; public infrastructure, open space, and landscape planning; public infrastructure construction, grading and building permits.

Historically, the staff involved in the processing of development plans and permits were reflected in the City's General Fund. Beginning in fiscal year 2008-09, all the staff involved in the processing of development plans and permits were budgeted directly in the Development Services Fund. Consolidating all development service cost centers in a single fund clearly delineates development related costs and revenues from General Fund supported services; thereby making the nexus between development related activities, costs, fees, and revenues more transparent. This also allows operating expenses to be adjusted to coincide with changes in demand for development services. This adjustment of operating expenses aids in avoiding impacts to the General Fund when revenue fluctuations occur as result of changes in development activity.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011-12, the Development Services fund was accounted for as an enterprise fund.

REVENUES

In fiscal year 2015-16 revenues are projected to be sufficient to support projected expenditures - the proposed budget for the Development Service Fund is balanced. The fiscal year 2015-16 Development Services budget reflects an overall increase of 16% in projected revenues when compared to the most recent quarterly projections.

However, it is important to note that the most current fiscal year 2014-15 projections estimate that revenues will be short of budget. It is anticipated that this fund will end the current fiscal year (FY2015) with an \$882,000 deficit. Staff will continue to monitor revenue trends and may need to make adjustments accordingly. Staff recognizes it may require modification to its existing composition of staff to remain responsive to the type of work being received.

The proposed fiscal year 2015-16 budget reflects the continued effort of balancing development related resources with the demand for development related services.

Development related revenues consist of two categories: development processing fee revenues and deposit based revenues. Development processing fee revenues include building permits, planning fees, other building department fees, and engineering fees. Deposit based revenues are generated through staff time reimbursements related to specific projects. The table below provides a comparison of the projected revenue for fiscal year 2014-15 compared to the estimated fiscal year 2015-16 revenues. The City is anticipating that the following major projects will continue to move forward in fiscal year 2015-16:

- Bayfront Redevelopment Project
- Millenia Project
- Otay Ranch Villages
- University Land Entitlement Projects

Development Services Fund Revenues
Fiscal Years 2014 to 2016

Category	FY 2013-14 Actual	FY 2014-15 Projected	FY2015-16 Proposed	Change	%Change
Other Local Taxes	\$ 7,845	\$ 7,072	\$ 7,000	\$ (72)	-1%
Licenses and Permits	\$ 1,735,402	\$ 1,979,717	\$ 1,973,215	\$ (6,502)	0%
Charges for Services	\$ 3,776,359	\$ 3,187,658	\$ 4,337,865	\$ 1,150,207	36%
Other Revenue	\$ 819,006	\$ 671,684	\$ 459,000	\$ (212,684)	-32%
Transfers In	\$ 628,181	\$ 448,137	\$ 526,614	\$ 78,477	18%
Total Revenues	\$ 6,966,793	\$ 6,294,268	\$ 7,303,694	\$ 1,009,426	16%

Projections for fiscal year 2015-16 revenues were based on a trend analysis of fiscal year 2013-14 actual revenues and fiscal year 2014-15 projections. A summary of the notable changes by category are listed below:

- Licenses and Permits – The decrease in this category of \$6,502 reflects the projected decrease in development activity.
- Charges for Service – The increase in this category of \$1.2 million reflects the change in nature or composition of development activity moving from processing of large master planned communities to processing of improvement and development plans. The largest increase in this category is in Plan Checking Fees.
- Other Revenue – The proposed fiscal year 2015-16 budget reflects a decrease of \$212,684 from the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This decrease is due to the anticipated decrease in CIP related staff time reimbursements.
- Transfers In – The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget reflects a change of \$78,477 in projected transfers from the General Fund. The increase is due to a reimbursement for the General Fund’s portion of the Accela software upgrade. This reimbursement is to be paid by the General Fund in five (5) equal payments for five (5) years.

EXPENDITURES

The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget includes funding for 44.5 positions in the Development Services Fund. This reflects a net decrease of 1.0 position when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 Council adopted budget. These changes are a result of the following personnel changes:

- The addition of 1.0 Building Inspection Manager and 1.0 Senior Plan Check Technician
- The elimination of 1.0 Senior Planner, 1.0 Senior Office Specialist, and 1.0 Landscape Planner II positions

As illustrated in the following table, Personnel Services expenditures in the Development Services fund are the largest component of the Fund’s expenditures, much the same as the City’s General Fund budget. The Transfers Out expenditure category reimburses the General Fund for citywide and departmental overhead. Reimbursed citywide overhead includes support costs associated with Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology Services, Custodial Services, and City Attorney.

Development Services Fund Expenditures
Fiscal Year 2014 to 2016

Category	FY 2013-14 Actual	FY 2014-15 Projected	FY 2015-16 Proposed	Change	%Change
Personnel Services	\$ 5,367,696	\$ 5,434,240	\$ 5,734,293	\$ 300,053	6%
Supplies and Services	\$ 664,015	\$ 304,015	\$ 268,532	\$ (35,483)	-12%
Other Expenses	\$ 68,663	\$ 93,807	\$ 98,812	\$ 5,005	5%
Capital	\$ 8,316	\$ 11,340	\$ 9,500	\$ (1,840)	-16%
Transfers Out	\$ 1,143,810	\$ 1,328,299	\$ 1,187,557	\$ (140,742)	-11%
Utilities	\$ 4,441	\$ 4,828	\$ 5,000	\$ 172	4%
Total Expenditures	\$ 7,256,941	\$ 7,176,529	\$ 7,303,694	\$ 127,165	2%

A summary of the notable changes between the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections to the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget by category are listed as follows:

- Personnel Services – This category reflects a net increase of \$300,053 when compared to the most recent fiscal year 2014-15 projections. The increase can be attributed to the annualized costs of salary increases approved by Council in fiscal year 2014-15, the addition of 1.0 Building Inspection Manager and 1.0 Senior Plan Check Technician, and increases to various personnel costs including overtime, PERS, flex/insurance, Worker’s Comp charges, and vacation in-lieu expenses.

These increases were partially offset by a reduction of 1.0 Senior Planner, 1.0 Senior Office Specialist, 1.0 Landscape Planner II, and freezing the funding for a Development Services Technician II.

- Supplies and Services – The proposed budget reflects a net decrease of \$35,483 in this category. This decrease is due to the shift of a portion of software maintenance fees to the General Fund for its share of Accela. The decrease was partially offset by an increase in contractual services that will be used in the plan check process.
- Other Expenses – The Other Expenses category reflects an increase of \$5,005 in comparison to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This is due to an increased volume of credit card transaction fees charged to the City for customers who choose to pay fees using a credit card.

- Capital – The Capital category reflects a net decrease of \$1,840 when compared to the most recent fiscal year 2014-15 projections. This decrease is due lower anticipated copier lease payments.
- Transfers Out – The transfers out expenditure category reflects a decrease of \$140,742 when compared to the fiscal year 2014-15 third quarter projections. This transfer reflects the reimbursement amount from the Development Services Fund to the General Fund for department and citywide overhead costs. The decrease is due a reduction in citywide and department overhead allocated to this fund.
- Utilities – The utilities category reflects the projected amounts necessary for fiscal year 2015-16 projected utility expenses. This change is consistent with the projected costs for fiscal year 2014-15.



FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	5,214,558	5,367,696	5,434,240	5,734,293
Supplies and Services	405,599	664,015	304,015	268,532
Other Expenses	92,205	68,663	93,807	98,812
Capital	0	8,316	11,340	9,500
Utilities	4,951	4,441	4,828	5,000
Transfers Out	1,175,724	1,143,810	1,328,299	1,187,557
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$6,893,037	\$7,256,941	\$7,176,529	\$7,303,694
REVENUES				
Other Local Taxes	6,796	7,845	7,072	7,000
Licenses and Permits	2,399,259	1,735,402	1,979,717	1,973,215
Charges for Services	3,502,059	3,776,359	3,187,658	4,337,865
Other Revenue	746,222	819,006	671,684	459,000
Transfers In	439,238	628,181	448,137	526,614
TOTAL REVENUES	\$7,093,574	\$6,966,793	\$6,294,268	\$7,303,694
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$200,537	(\$290,148)	(\$882,261)	\$0

STAFFING SUMMARY - 408

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Assoc Engineer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Assoc Plan Check Engineer	-	3.00	-	3.00
Assoc Planner	4.00	-	-	4.00
Building Inspection Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Building Inspector II	4.00	-	-	4.00
Building Inspector III	1.00	-	-	1.00
Building Off/Code Enf Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Development Services Tech I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Development Svcs Tech Iii	6.00	-	-	6.00
Devlpmt Svcs Counter Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Engineering Tech II	1.00	-	-	1.00
Landscape Architect	2.50	-	-	2.50
Landscape Planner II	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Plan Check Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Planning Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Plans Examiner	3.00	(3.00)	-	-
Principal Civil Engineer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Principal Planner	2.00	-	-	2.00
Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Building Inspector	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Engineering Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Office Specialist	2.00	-	(1.00)	1.00
Sr Plan Check Tech	-	-	1.00	1.00
Sr Planner	4.00	-	(1.00)	3.00
Sr Project Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Transportation Engineer W/Cert	1.00	-	-	1.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	45.50	-	(1.00)	44.50

SUCCESSOR AGENCY AND HOUSING FUNDS

Successor Agency Funds

Housing Authority Funds

Successor Agency Funds

On December 29, 2011, the California Supreme Court upheld AB x1 26 dissolving California redevelopment agencies. Effective February 1, 2012, all redevelopment agencies were dissolved and the City of Chula Vista assumed the role of Successor Agency (resolution 2011-164).

The Successor Agency is responsible for the wind down of the former Redevelopment Agency activities and obligations. The act of winding down the former Redevelopment Agency is significant. The Successor Agency will continue to oversee and implement all legally obligated contracted work, projects and programs as well as dispose of the former Redevelopment Agency assets. Since approximately 68% of the former Redevelopment Agency-owned land (24 acres of 35.24 acres) is contaminated there are clean up requirements as well as remediation that will be necessary to dispose of these properties. Significant administrative obligations will continue to exist in the preparation of budgets and documentation to be submitted to and reviewed by the Successor Agency, Oversight Board, County of San Diego and the State Department of Finance.

As required by AB x1 26, an Oversight Board, composed of affected taxing entities within the City, was created. The primary responsibility of the Oversight Board is reviewing and approving the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule and serving in a fiduciary role to the taxing entities that the Oversight Board represents. Some historical information follows regarding the former Redevelopment Agency.

The Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency was created on October 24, 1972 by City Council Ordinance. The goals of the former Redevelopment Agency were to reduce blight and to encourage new development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of residential, commercial, industrial, and retail uses. Since the Agency's creation, the City adopted and amended six project areas to encompass a total of approximately 3,563 acres of City territory. Land uses within these areas are mostly commercial and industrial, but also includes some residential and public uses (e.g., governmental administrative centers, corporation yards, streets, etc.).

FUND DESCRIPTIONS

The Successor Agency budget is organized into Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund (RORF) and debt service funds. The RORF accounts for the staffing and other expenditures required in winding down activities of the former Redevelopment Agency. The Debt Service funds are used to pay for the former Redevelopment Agency's debt service on its outstanding Tax Allocation Bonds, loans and other debt of the former Redevelopment Agency.

Several funds were eliminated as a result of the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency. The eliminated funds are former operating funds 317, 611, 651 and pass-through funds 671-675. In addition the debt service funds listed below replace funds 691 and 693-697.

Operating Funds

- Fund 318: Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund (RORF)
The RORF will serve as the primary operating funds in the winding down of the former Redevelopment Agency. This fund will be used to pay the documented enforceable obligations of the former redevelopment agency that have been approved by the Successor Agency Oversight Board and the State Department of Finance.
- Fund 319: Successor Agency Housing Fund
The City's Housing Authority became the Successor Housing Agency. This fund accounts for all assets (everything but fund balance) originally held by the Low and Moderate Income Housing fund and will account for activities similar to the Low and Moderate Income Housing program. The fund revenues are not discretionary and must be used for the production of affordable housing.

Debt Service Funds

The Debt Service funds are used to pay for former Redevelopment Agency debt service on its outstanding Tax Allocation Bonds, loans and other

debt of the former Redevelopment Agency.

- Fund 692: Long Term Advances Debt Service Fund – Redevelopment Agency

This fund was established to account for Redevelopment Agency interfund loans.

- Fund 661: 2005 Taxable Revenue Bonds Series A – CRA/ERAF Loan Program

In April 2005, the Agency entered into a Loan Agreement with the California Statewide Communities Development Authority to borrow the amount of \$765,000. This amount was used to pay the Agency's portion of the 2005 Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) to the County of San Diego pursuant to Section 33681.12 of the California Health and Safety Code. This loan was paid off in fiscal year 2014-15.

- Fund 662: 2006 Taxable Revenue Bonds Series A – CRA/ERAF Loan Program

In April 2006, the Agency entered into a Loan Agreement with the California Statewide Communities Development Authority to borrow the amount of \$930,000. This amount was used to pay the Agency's portion of the 2006 Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) to the County of San Diego pursuant to Section 33681.12 of the California Health and Safety Code.

- Fund 663: 2006 Senior Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds, Series A

In July 2006, the Redevelopment Agency issued the 2006 Senior Tax Allocation Bonds, Series A in the amount of \$13,435,000 to refinance the Agency's outstanding Bayfront/Town Centre Redevelopment Project 1994 Senior Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds Series A (the "1994 A Bonds"). The original bonds were issued to finance improvements in the Bayfront/Town Centre Project Areas. The Annual Debt Service is paid from property tax increment generated in the project areas. The term of the bonds runs through 2027.

- Fund 664: 2006 Subordinate Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds, Series B

In July 2006, the Redevelopment Agency issued the 2006 Subordinate Tax Allocation Bonds, Series B in the amount of \$12,325,000 to refinance the Agency's outstanding Bayfront/Town Centre Redevelopment Project 1994 Senior Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds Series D (the "1994 D Bonds") and the 1994 Subordinate Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds, Series C (the 1994 C Bonds) The original bonds were issued to finance improvements in the Bayfront/Town Centre Project Areas. The Annual Debt Service is paid from property tax increment generated in the project areas. The term of the bonds runs through 2021.

- Fund 665: RDA 2008 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds (TARBs)

This fund was established to account for the debt service payments for the refunding of the Redevelopment Agency 2000 Tax Allocation Bonds (Merged Redevelopment Project) in the amount of \$21,625,000. The Merged Redevelopment Project was created on August 22, 2000, pursuant to an amendment to the redevelopment plans for three of the Agency's four existing redevelopment projects, the Town Centre II Project Area, the Otay Valley Project Area and the Southwest Project Area. The Merged Project Area was amended in 2004 adding 494 acres. The Bonds were issued to provide funds for the repayment of certain obligations of the Merged Redevelopment Project and other interfund loans, and for general redevelopment purposes. The term of the bonds is through the year 2036.

REVENUES

A summary of the notable changes by category are listed below:

- Property Taxes – The increase in this category is due to the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency. Property tax increment revenues are now received by the County of San Diego and will be distributed to the Successor Agency based on documented enforceable obligations that have been approved by both the Successor Agency Oversight Board and the State Department of

Finance. Enforceable obligations are projected to be \$97,507 less than the previous fiscal year therefore property taxes have been adjusted accordingly.

- Transfers In – Transfer-In amount is the same as for the prior fiscal year. The Successor Agency has received permission to repay the Successor Agency Housing Fund for a loan previously received to pay the State of California required SERAF payment in 2010 and 2011.

The table below provides a comparison of the projected revenues for fiscal year 2014-15 to the estimated fiscal year 2015-16 revenues. The table does not reflect the revenue budget of the debt service funds which are reflected in the debt service section of the budget document.

Redevelopment/Successor Agency Operating Fund Revenues
Fiscal Years 2014 to 2016

Category	Funds 318/319 FY 2013-14 Actual	Funds 318/319 FY 2014-15 Projected	Funds 318/319 FY 2015-16 Proposed	Change
Property Taxes	\$ 6,639,329	\$ 6,505,446	\$ 6,407,939	\$ (97,507)
Use of Money & Property	\$ 10,640	\$ 17,885	\$ 15,000	\$ (2,885)
Charges for Services	\$ 20,979	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Revenue from Other Agencies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other Revenue	\$ 106,064	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfers In	\$ -	\$ 1,927,748	\$ 1,927,748	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 6,777,012	\$ 8,451,079	\$ 8,350,687	\$ (100,392)

EXPENDITURES

Expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16 are for winding down the former Redevelopment Agency and Low and Moderate Income Housing activities and documented enforceable obligations.

- Services and Supplies – The budget has been decreased due to project related consultant services.
- Other Expenses – The increase in this category reflects a \$2.0 million loan to be made to subsidize affordable housing in the anticipated development of the Millennia project.
- Capital – The capital category reflects the projected amounts necessary for fiscal year 2015-16.
- Transfers Out – The transfers out expenditure

category accounts for the required debt service for the Successor Agency. Bonded debt service for the 2006 and 2008 TABS and the 2006 ERAF loan is approximately \$3.7 million. The Agency is also repaying a loan from the Successor Agency Housing Fund of \$1.9 million. The Transfers Out category has decreased due to the payoff of the 2005 ERAF loan.

- Utilities – The utilities category reflects the projected amounts necessary for fiscal year 2015-16 projected utility expenses.

The table below provides a comparison of the proposed budgeted expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16 to the adopted fiscal year 2014-15 expenditures. The table does not reflect the debt service expenditure budget which is discussed in the debt service section of this document.

Redevelopment/Successor Agency Operating Fund Expenditures

Fiscal Year 2014 to 2016

Category	Funds 318/319 FY 2013-14 Actual	Funds 318/319 FY 2014-15 Projected	Funds 318/319 FY 2015-16 Proposed	Change
Personnel Services	\$ 84,065	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Supplies and Services	\$ 62,859	\$ 147,993	\$ 143,770	\$ (4,223)
Other Expenses	\$ 911,862	\$ 897,972	\$ 2,846,109	\$ 1,948,137
Capital	\$ 7,978	\$ 12,040	\$ 12,040	\$ -
Transfers Out	\$ 3,122,997	\$ 5,698,895	\$ 5,601,309	\$ (97,586)
CIP Project Expenditures	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 484	\$ -	\$ (484)
Utilities	\$ 1,594	\$ 1,700	\$ 1,780	\$ 80
Total Expenditures	\$ 4,191,355	\$ 6,759,084	\$ 8,605,008	\$ 1,845,924

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	92,044	84,065	0	0
Supplies and Services	79,810	59,965	80,270	80,270
Other Expenses	2,296,468	759,626	718,540	718,540
Capital	0	4,940	6,040	6,040
Utilities	382	1,594	1,700	1,780
Transfers Out	9,156,742	3,122,997	5,698,895	5,601,309
CIP Project Expenditures	641,835	0	0	0
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	4,000,000	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$16,267,281	\$4,033,187	\$6,505,445	\$6,407,939
REVENUES				
Property Taxes	4,456,770	1,065,528	6,505,446	6,407,939
Use of Money & Property	(23,899)	10,640	0	0
Other Revenue	322	0	0	0
Transfers In	641,835	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$5,075,028	\$1,076,168	\$6,505,446	\$6,407,939
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$11,192,253)	(\$2,957,019)	\$1	\$0

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	30,943	2,894	63,500	63,500
Other Expenses	76,561	152,236	179,432	2,127,569
Capital	4,241	3,038	6,000	6,000
Transfers Out	29,000	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$140,745	\$158,168	\$248,932	\$2,197,069
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	670,962	495,183	17,885	15,000
Charges for Services	0	20,979	0	0
Other Revenue	90,452	106,064	0	0
Transfers In	237,450	0	1,927,748	1,927,748
TOTAL REVENUES	\$998,864	\$622,226	\$1,945,633	\$1,942,748
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$858,119	\$464,058	\$1,696,701	(\$254,321)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Other Expenses	0	158,165	1,274,067	1,274,067
Transfers Out	641,835	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$641,835	\$158,165	\$1,274,067	\$1,274,067
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(147)	578	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	(\$147)	\$578	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$641,982)	(\$157,587)	(\$1,274,067)	(\$1,274,067)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	8,192	8,502	10,600	15,000
Other Expenses	3,515,315	3,513,384	4,110,547	4,008,561
Transfers Out	0	0	1,927,748	1,927,748
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,523,507	\$3,521,886	\$6,048,895	\$5,951,309
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	101,938	102,377	0	0
Other Revenue	22	541	0	0
Transfers In	8,917,421	3,122,996	5,698,895	5,601,309
TOTAL REVENUES	\$9,019,381	\$3,225,914	\$5,698,895	\$5,601,309
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$5,495,874	(\$295,972)	(\$350,000)	(\$350,000)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
661 05 ERAF - SA	99,528	100,356	100,883	0
662 06 ERAF - SA	125,784	125,187	129,285	127,795
663 06 TABs Series A - SA	1,017,893	1,018,180	1,017,345	1,018,570
664 06 TABs Series B - SA	993,006	990,981	992,297	993,559
665 08 TABs - SA	966,158	966,044	1,531,337	1,533,637
692 Successor Agency Long-term Deb	321,138	321,138	2,277,748	2,277,748
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,523,507	\$3,521,886	\$6,048,895	\$5,951,309
REVENUES				
661 05 ERAF - SA	99,463	100,305	100,883	0
662 06 ERAF - SA	125,696	125,110	129,285	127,795
663 06 TABs Series A - SA	1,017,861	1,018,221	1,017,345	1,018,570
664 06 TABs Series B - SA	992,637	1,016,121	992,297	993,559
665 08 TABs - SA	966,122	966,157	1,531,337	1,533,637
692 Successor Agency Long-term Deb	5,817,602	0	1,927,748	1,927,748
TOTAL REVENUES	\$9,019,381	\$3,225,914	\$5,698,895	\$5,601,309
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$5,495,874	(\$295,972)	(\$350,000)	(\$350,000)

Housing Authority Funds

The Housing Authority was formed in 1993. A Housing Authority can provide tax-exempt bond financing, own and operate housing, and operate various housing programs. The Chula Vista Housing Authority does not own or operate housing, and the Section 8 rental assistance programs including Public Housing are operated in Chula Vista by the County of San Diego Housing Authority. The staff of the Housing Authority provides comprehensive housing services for the City. In addition, with the elimination of the City's redevelopment agency, the Housing Authority will assume the housing functions of the former Redevelopment Agency, becoming a "Successor Housing Agency".

The Chula Vista Housing Authority fund is the clearinghouse for all housing related staff activity. Included in this fund are personnel expenses which are reimbursed by various funding sources such as Federal Housing and Urban Development Grant Funds. The Housing Fund will receive \$0.8 million in staff time reimbursements for administering the City's Housing, CDBG, HOME and other grants and for monitoring of bond covenants for affordable housing bonds issued by the City's Housing Authority. The Housing Authority focuses on the development of sustainable neighborhoods through a variety of investments such as:

- Production of affordable housing
- Expand home ownership
- Oversee social service contracts for low income households
- Oversee policies and programs related to affordable housing

FUND DESCRIPTIONS

- Fund 313: Chula Vista Housing Authority
The Chula Vista Housing Authority Fund accounts for all housing related activities not considered eligible for reimbursement by other sources.



The Landings Project, pictured above, is an example of the type of project developed with Housing Funds. The Landings consists of 92 three-bedroom townhome units. Each unit includes an enclosed 2-car garage, in-unit washer and dryer, balcony, and full sized appliances. Project amenities include a pool, spa, clubhouse, and a tot lot.



FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	767,659	537,460	571,868	583,385
Supplies and Services	5,649	16,942	37,800	87,800
Other Expenses	0	0	0	372,660
Utilities	184	406	1,000	1,100
Transfers Out	166,085	147,555	177,145	155,968
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$939,577	\$702,363	\$787,813	\$1,200,913
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(5,868)	5,355	0	0
Charges for Services	230,513	622,790	71,000	100,000
Other Revenue	456,505	721,727	706,871	749,889
Transfers In	97,000	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$778,150	\$1,349,872	\$777,871	\$849,889
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$161,427)	\$647,509	(\$9,942)	(\$351,024)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 313


BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Housing Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Project Coordinator II	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Project Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	4.00	-	-	4.00

SEWER FUNDS

Sewer Funds

The Sewer enterprise funds account for revenues and expenditures related to the City’s Sewer programs, including maintenance and expansion of the City’s conveyance system and payment of San Diego Metro wastewater treatment costs.

The City of Chula Vista provides wastewater conveyance and treatment services to approximately 49,000 billing accounts, including residential and non-residential uses. The wastewater generated by Chula Vista customers is collected and sent to treatment facilities in the South Bay and Point Loma through the City’s extensive sewer collection system, which consists of 14 pump stations and over 500 miles of sewer pipe. The San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater System provides wastewater treatment services to the City of Chula Vista on a contract basis (\$20 million in fiscal year 2014-15). The City is currently analyzing options to secure sufficient treatment capacity to see the City through build out. Per the 2014 Wastewater Master Plan, the City will need approximately 29.89 MGD at build out. This treatment capacity may be provided by either purchasing additional treatment capacity in the San Diego Metro Wastewater System or construction of a wastewater reclamation plant in Chula Vista. The following figure illustrates the City’s current trunk sewer network, which conveys flows to the San Diego Metro trunk sewer (shown in red).



REVENUES

The Sewer Fund derives the majority of its revenue from various service charges that are collected from system users. This fund also derives revenues from other sources such as permit fees for new connections to the sewer system, interest earnings from investments, development impact fees, transfers from other funds designated to support Sewer fund operations. Other revenues include revenue reimbursements from other city funds and various service charges. Sewer revenues are projected to increase by \$1.1 million in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget. This mostly reflects a \$1.1 million Transfer-In from the Telegraph Canyon Sewer DIF fund. In fiscal year 2015-16, the Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF will be closed and remaining funds will be transferred to the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund.

Sewer Fund revenues are summarized in the table on the following page.

Sewer Fund Revenues

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Change	% Change
Licenses and Permits	11,120	40,000	40,000	\$ -	0.0%
Use of Money & Property	1,373,068	301,726	301,726	\$ -	0.0%
Charges for Services	33,114,340	32,881,199	32,881,199	\$ -	0.0%
Other Revenue	714,030	325,000	325,000	\$ -	0.0%
Transfers In	565,495	3,400,000	1,279,047	\$ (2,120,953)	-62.4%
Total	\$ 35,778,053	\$ 36,947,925	\$ 34,826,972	\$ (2,120,953)	-5.7%

Note: Revenue amounts include Sewer Operating Funds: 411, 412, 413, 414, and 428.

EXPENDITURES

Sewer fund operations and capital programming contains no General Fund contribution. Sewer fund operations and capital programming costs are offset by fees paid by residential and non-residential users. In addition, other revenue sources generated within the Sewer fund through normal operations that fund 46.0 permanent positions that are contained in the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget. Changes to the Sewer Fund budget for fiscal year 2015-16 are as follows:

- Personnel Services – Personnel services in the fiscal year 2015-16 are increasing by \$67,913. This increase represents the annualized wage increases approved by the City Council during fiscal year 2014-15. Personnel Services also reflects cost increases in Workers Compensation Charges, Flex (medical insurance), and PERS (retirement benefits).
- Supplies and Services – Supplies and services costs are increasing by \$39,350. This change is primarily due to increased contracted services for wastewater treatment (\$20,000), equipment rental charges (\$10,000), and \$9,350 for increased fleet maintenance charges and necessary travel expenses for the certification of personnel assigned to this fund.
- Capital – Capital expenses are increasing by \$766,180 due vehicle replacement expenditures.
- CIP Project Expenditures – CIP Projected Expenditures are decreasing by \$931,000. This proposed budget reflects the normal funding levels for the rehabilitation effort on pipes, manholes, access roads and pump stations. Several studies are under way to define the scope

of future CIP projects that will be funded by the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund to upsize sewer pipe capacity within the City.

The City continues to focus on its Annual Sewer Rehabilitation Program, which expends approximately \$1.0 million to \$2.0 million annually for the replacement and rehabilitation of sewer pipes,



Pictured above: Point Loma Treatment Facility

connections between sewer mains and laterals, access roads, and access covers. The City also utilizes standardized evaluation and ranking criteria in televising and evaluating the condition of sewers in order to ensure that the most critically impacted sewer infrastructure is replaced or rehabilitated first. To date, the funds collected from City’s rate payers have been sufficient to maintain and operate the City’s wastewater collection system as well as to pay for the treatment of the wastewater.

In order to ensure the future adequacy of the sewer funds, City Council has adopted an updated sewer rate case study that set the sewer rates for the next five years that went into effect July 2014. One of the issues considered of significantly impact to the sewer rates for the City is the Point Loma Treatment Plant

(PLTP) Secondary Treatment Waiver. In 2010, the City of San Diego was successful in obtaining a five-year waiver that allowed the continued operation of the PLTP at an advance primary level of sewer treatment before discharging into the ocean. A regional effort, led by the City of San Diego is in progress to prepare the application for the next waiver. The application for the next waiver will be submitted in 2015. Expensive infrastructure investments are expected as a condition of the next waiver. The 2014 City of Chula Vista sewer rate adjustment will help pay for said infrastructure investments or the upgrade of the PLTP to secondary.

In fiscal year 2007-08 the City transitioned its Sewer funds from 'special revenue' funds to 'enterprise' funds. Enterprise funds may be used to report any activity for which a fee is charged to external users for goods or services, and are appropriate in situations wherein there is either a legal requirement or policy decision to recover costs of providing services for an activity. This change complies with the GFOA recommended accounting structure, should the City decide to issue bonds for capital improvements solely guaranteed by sewer fees and charges in the future.

City staff expenditures incurred supporting wastewater system maintenance and operations are funded by the Sewer Service fund through a combination of direct expenditures and inter-fund transfers. Positions 100% funded by Sewer funds (wastewater maintenance and wastewater engineering) are budgeted directly in the Sewer fund (\$4.5 million in fiscal year 2015-16). The remaining support staff is budgeted in either the General or Development Services funds. These positions are partially offset via inter-fund transfers (\$3.3 million in fiscal year 2015-16). All supplies and services, capital, and utilities budgets associated with supporting the

wastewater system are also budgeted in the Sewer Service fund in fiscal year 2015-16.

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

The second highest commitment of CIP funding is for the Wastewater Management System (WMS). The appropriation for Wastewater projects is \$2.2 million which represents 8% of the proposed CIP budget. The single project type within the WMS is Sewer. However, the discussion below is divided into the following two categories: Sewer Rehabilitation and Specific Sewer Improvements, and Sewer Pump Stations and Access Roads.

Sewer Rehabilitation and Specific Sewer Improvements

The following projects are included in fiscal year 2015-16 budget:

- \$406,000 to complete sewer improvements at Industrial Boulevard & Main Street
- \$300,000 to complete sewer rehabilitation projects for citywide work
- \$250,000 for the manhole rehabilitation citywide
- \$200,000 for a sewer manhole inspection and evaluation study

Sewer Pump Stations and Access Roads

The lift station at Parkside Drive will be rehabilitated, at an estimated cost of \$450,000. Sewer access roads at various locations will be rehabilitated, at a cost of \$600,000.

Sewer Fund expenditures are summarized in the table on the following page.

Sewer Fund Expenditures

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Change	% Change
Personnel Services	\$ 4,253,032	\$ 4,469,564	\$ 4,537,477	\$ 67,913	1.5%
Supplies and Services	\$ 20,852,964	\$ 22,821,121	\$ 22,860,471	\$ 39,350	0.2%
Other Expenses	\$ 5,384,245	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ -	0.0%
Capital	\$ 30,152	\$ 1,047,500	\$ 1,813,680	\$ 766,180	73.1%
Transfers Out	\$ 3,339,821	\$ 3,196,098	\$ 3,291,270	\$ 95,172	3.0%
CIP Project Expenditures	\$ 2,881,110	\$ 3,150,000	\$ 2,219,000	\$ (931,000)	-29.6%
Utilities	\$ 172	\$ 315	\$ 315	\$ -	0.0%
Total	\$ 36,741,496	\$ 34,929,598	\$ 34,967,213	\$ 37,615	0.1%

Note: Expenditure amounts include Sewer Operating Funds: 411, 412, 413, 414, and 428.

FUND DESCRIPTIONS

• Fund 411: Sewer Income Fund

This fund is used to account for all revenues collected to recover the City’s costs incurred constructing the public wastewater system. The funds are collected from new properties receiving a permit to connect to the City’s wastewater collection system. The owner or person making the application for connection pays fees to the City as designated in the master fee schedule. All funds received may be used only for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, maintenance and operation of sanitation or sewerage facilities, or to reimburse a subdivider or any person who has constructed sewer facilities benefiting other properties. The fund may also be used to reimburse the City for any expense incurred in connection with the construction and installation of any sewer facility including engineering work and acquisition of rights-of-way.

• Fund 412: Special Sewer Fund

The Special Sewer Fund is used to account for the sale of the City’s excess Metropolitan Sewerage capacity. On December 17, 2013 Council approved closing this fund and transferring the available fund balance to the Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund (Fund 413).

• Fund 413: Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund

The Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund is used to account for sewerage facility participation fees received from the owner or person applying for a permit to develop or modify the use of any residential, commercial, industrial or other property, which is projected to increase the

volume of flow in the City’s sewer system, as determined by the City Engineer. All revenue derived from the sewerage facility participation fee shall be used solely for:

1. Paying the cost and expense to repair, replace or enlarge trunk sewer facilities of the City so as to enhance efficiency of utilization and/or adequacy of capacity to serve the needs of the City, or;
2. Paying the cost and expense to plan and/or evaluate any future proposals for area-wide sewage treatment and/or water reclamation systems or facilities.

The City Council can appropriate the funds for another purpose, provided such purpose shall be for the planning, design, construction, maintenance or operations of sewage collection or treatment or water reclamation purposes.

• Fund 414: Sewer Service Revenue Fund

The Sewer Service Revenue Fund is used to account for all monies collected from the monthly sewer service charge. Monies in this fund may be used for any and all sewer related activities. The primary use of these funds is the payment of the City’s annual San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Capacity and Maintenance fees and to pay the operational costs of the ‘in-city’ sewer collection system.

• Fund 428: Sewer Facility Replacement Fund

A portion of the revenues derived from the monthly sewer service charge is deposited into the Sewerage Facilities Replacement Fund. Monies in this fund are used solely for the purpose of paying the cost of refurbishment

and/or replacement of structurally deficient sewerage facilities including related evaluation, engineering, and utility modification costs.

The City Council can appropriate the funds for another purpose provided such purpose is for the construction, maintenance, or operation of sewers or incidental thereto, including any charge for its collection.

- Funds 431, 432, 433: Sewer Development Impact Fee Funds

These fees are levied against new development in specific areas of the City, based upon the sewer facility their project will impact. The monies collected are used to fund construction of public improvements designed to increase the capacity of the subject facilities, allowing the City to maintain service levels with increased demand. Included DIF programs are the Telegraph Canyon Sewer Basin DIF, the Poggi Canyon Sewer Basin DIF, and the Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF.



FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	4,058,923	4,253,032	4,469,564	4,537,477
Supplies and Services	19,689,382	20,852,964	22,821,121	22,860,471
Other Expenses	5,515,363	5,384,245	245,000	245,000
Capital	42,926	30,152	1,047,500	1,813,680
Utilities	172	172	315	315
Transfers Out	2,843,760	3,339,821	3,196,098	3,291,270
CIP Project Expenditures	1,466,947	2,881,110	3,150,000	2,219,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$33,617,473	\$36,741,496	\$34,929,598	\$34,967,213
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	40,500	11,120	40,000	40,000
Use of Money & Property	314,191	1,373,068	301,726	301,726
Charges for Services	34,382,920	33,114,340	32,881,199	32,881,199
Other Revenue	592,175	714,030	325,000	325,000
Transfers In	3,578	565,495	3,400,000	1,279,047
TOTAL REVENUES	\$35,333,364	\$35,778,053	\$36,947,925	\$34,826,972
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$1,715,891	(\$963,443)	\$2,018,327	(\$140,241)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
412 Special Sewer	0	449,972	0	0
413 Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve	5,398,948	5,742,045	1,250,000	606,000
414 Sewer Service Revenue	27,036,771	28,185,121	31,429,598	32,411,213
428 Sewer Facility Replacement	1,181,754	2,364,358	2,250,000	1,950,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$33,617,473	\$36,741,496	\$34,929,598	\$34,967,213
REVENUES				
411 Sewer Income	(10,033)	22,561	0	0
412 Special Sewer	(2,431)	3,157	0	0
413 Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve	3,879,455	3,821,010	4,500,000	2,379,047
414 Sewer Service Revenue	29,653,340	29,874,434	30,991,199	30,991,199
428 Sewer Facility Replacement	1,813,033	2,056,891	1,456,726	1,456,726
TOTAL REVENUES	\$35,333,364	\$35,778,053	\$36,947,925	\$34,826,972
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$1,715,891	(\$963,443)	\$2,018,327	(\$140,241)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 414

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Assoc Engineer	2.00	-	-	2.00
Engineering Tech II	2.00	-	-	2.00
Equipment Operator	3.00	-	-	3.00
Maintenance Worker II	18.00	-	-	18.00
Pub Works Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Works Supervisor	4.00	-	-	4.00
Sr Civil Engineer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Maintenance Worker	14.00	-	-	14.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	46.00	-	-	46.00

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	3,724	0	0
Other Expenses	122,927	125,555	164,091	37,500
Transfers Out	250,000	250,000	3,500,000	2,249,047
CIP Project Expenditures	0	726	0	0
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	0	0	100,000	1,091,264
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$372,927	\$380,005	\$3,764,091	\$3,377,811
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(48,615)	102,104	0	0
Development Impact Fees	645,015	268,092	120,000	70,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$596,400	\$370,196	\$120,000	\$70,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$223,473	(\$9,809)	(\$3,644,091)	(\$3,307,811)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
431 Tel Cyn Sewer Basin Plan DIF	60,000	60,000	35,000	1,129,047
432 Poggi Cyn Sewer Basin DIF	0	726	10,000	10,000
433 Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF	312,927	319,279	3,719,091	2,238,764
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$372,927	\$380,005	\$3,764,091	\$3,377,811
REVENUES				
431 Tel Cyn Sewer Basin Plan DIF	(5,932)	12,118	0	0
432 Poggi Cyn Sewer Basin DIF	45,755	141,452	20,000	20,000
433 Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF	556,577	216,626	100,000	50,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$596,400	\$370,196	\$120,000	\$70,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$223,473	(\$9,809)	(\$3,644,091)	(\$3,307,811)



TRANSIT FUNDS

Transit Fund

The MTS - Chula Vista Transit (CVT) was an independent municipal transit system with the Chula Vista City Council as its governing board. CVT formed part of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), which is a network of local and regional transit operators. MTS provides a seamless transit system composed of local, regional, and ADA paratransit services. MTS coordinates fares, transfers, routes and information services to the region.

Over the last few years, MTS has been expanding its transit (South Bay) facility located at 3650 Main Street in Chula Vista. The expansion includes additional bus parking and new administrative and maintenance buildings. With this expansion, MTS acquired the necessary capacity to consolidate the Chula Vista Transit operations into their South Bay operations yard and vacate the City's Public Works Corp (PWC) yard. Accordingly, on January 13, 2015, the Chula Vista City Council voted to divest the City's responsibility for

providing public transit services redirecting this responsibility back to MTS. Through this process, MTS had agreed to continue to fund the Transit Manager position for an unspecified amount of time to aide in the transition to MTS. MTS has notified the City that it will no longer fund this position. All Transit Funds and the Transit Manager position have been eliminated from the City's proposed budget. For comparison purposes the following tables reflect revenues and expenditures for Transit Funds.

Chula Vista Transit Revenues

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Inc/Dec	%Inc/Dec
Use of Money & Property	\$ 7,903	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Revenue From Other Agencies	\$ 3,800,358	\$ 2,200,372	\$ -	\$ (2,200,372)	-100.0%
Charges for Services	\$ 2,672,230	\$ 4,853,816	\$ -	\$ (4,853,816)	-100.0%
Other Revenue	\$ 212,196	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Transfers In	\$ 23,701	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Total	\$ 6,716,388	\$ 7,054,188	\$ -	\$ (7,054,188)	-100.0%


Chula Vista Transit Expenditures

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Inc/Dec	% Inc/Dec
Personnel Services	\$ 156,895	\$ 166,164	\$ -	\$ (166,164)	-100.0%
Supplies and Services	\$ 6,039,420	\$ 5,954,031	\$ -	\$ (5,954,031)	-100.0%
Other Expenses	\$ 587,088	\$ 463,496	\$ -	\$ (463,496)	-100.0%
Transfers Out	\$ 34,750	\$ 34,750	\$ -	\$ (34,750)	-100.0%
Capital	\$ -	\$ 177,800	\$ -	\$ (177,800)	-100.0%
CIP Project Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 261,556	\$ -	\$ (261,556)	0.0%
Utilities	\$ 152,196	\$ 174,177	\$ -	\$ (174,177)	-100.0%
Total	\$ 6,970,349	\$ 7,231,974	\$ -	\$ (7,231,974)	-100.0%

STATISTICS

Routes	7
Service	Six local routes most within Chula Vista city limits, with some service in unincorporated areas of the County (Bonita). One Sunday route operated by MTS from their South Bay Division
Square Miles Served	48
Fiscal Year 2015 Total Passengers	1,742,744 thru January 23 rd , 2015
Fleet Size	38 Buses (32) 40-foot, CNG New Flyers (6) 30-foot CNG El Dorado Nationals

CHULA VISTA TRANSIT SYSTEM MAP





FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	154,480	156,895	166,164	0
Supplies and Services	5,632,377	6,039,420	5,954,031	0
Other Expenses	1,159,823	587,088	463,496	0
Capital	0	0	177,800	0
Utilities	143,652	152,196	174,177	0
Transfers Out	34,750	34,750	34,750	0
CIP Project Expenditures	0	0	261,556	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$7,125,082	\$6,970,349	\$7,231,974	\$0
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(4,223)	7,903	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	3,095,626	3,800,358	2,200,372	0
Charges for Services	2,841,619	2,672,230	4,853,816	0
Other Revenue	303,968	212,196	0	0
Transfers In	0	23,701	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,236,990	\$6,716,388	\$7,054,188	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$888,092)	(\$253,961)	(\$177,786)	\$0

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
401 Bayfront Trolley Station TDA	92,843	61,823	109,553	0
402 Transit CVT	6,775,587	6,908,526	6,683,065	0
403 Transit Capital Projects	256,652	0	439,356	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$7,125,082	\$6,970,349	\$7,231,974	\$0
REVENUES				
401 Bayfront Trolley Station TDA	92,843	143,504	109,553	0
402 Transit CVT	6,143,717	6,523,389	6,683,079	0
403 Transit Capital Projects	430	49,495	261,556	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,236,990	\$6,716,388	\$7,054,188	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$888,092)	(\$253,961)	(\$177,786)	\$0

STAFFING SUMMARY - 402

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Transit Manager	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	1.00	-	(1.00)	-

FLEET FUND

Fleet Fund

The Fleet Fund is an internal service fund which like other internal service funds is used to finance and account for goods, special activities, and services performed by one City department for other City departments on a cost reimbursement basis. The Fleet Management fund consists of two functions, Central Garage Operations and Equipment Replacement. Funds are collected on an annual basis through each affected department’s operating budget and deposited in the Fleet Management Fund.

The Central Garage Operations function maintains the City’s fleet of vehicles, both through City equipment mechanics and through contracts with local vendors for more specialized maintenance work, such as major transmission and air conditioning repairs. All City vehicles are maintained by the Central Garage, these vehicles include those associated with safety services, streets and sewers, parks and open space, building and housing and the library. Services provided include maintenance of the vehicles, vehicle fuel, and other specialized services not directly related to any single vehicle.

REVENUES

Revenues in the Fleet Fund come directly from affected departments within the City through vehicle maintenance charges. These charges are based on the actual vehicles that reside within a department and include costs ranging from routine (oil changes, preventive maintenance) to major (transmission repair)

as well as fuel costs. Vehicle replacement costs also used to be charged in a similar manner. However, due to continuing economic constraints, the City has discontinued this practice and has transitioned to pay as you go for the replacement of vehicles depending on the availability of funds.

For fiscal year 2015-16, the proposed revenue budget for the Fleet Fund is \$3.8 million. This represents a net increase of \$167,920 over the fiscal year 2014-15 year-adopted budget. The major revenue changes are as follows:

- The \$330,000 increase in the Transfers In Revenue category is due to an increase of the transfer from the General Fund. These funds will be used for vehicle replacement.
- A \$172,159 decrease in Other Revenue category is the net difference between the reduction in transit reimbursements from the Transit Fund and a increase in fleet maintenance charges. Transit Fund activities are scheduled to cease at the end of the 2014-15 fiscal year and are therefore eliminated from the budget.
- A \$15,000 increase in Charges for Services reflects a projected increase in revenues recovered for cost recovery.

Fleet Fund Revenues

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 15-16 Proposed	Inc/Dec
Use of Money & Property	\$ 15,189	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Charges for Services	\$ 55,542	\$ 20,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 15,000
Other Revenue	\$ 3,593,021	\$ 3,628,744	\$ 3,456,585	\$ (172,159)
Transfers In	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 330,000	\$ 330,000
Total	\$ 3,663,752	\$ 3,648,744	\$ 3,821,585	\$ 172,841

EXPENDITURES

The Fleet fund’s expenditures include costs to repair and replace equipment (motor vehicles, mowers, generators, equipment trailers, etc.) throughout the City. As discussed in the revenue summary above, these costs are then allocated back to the affected departments based on several factors such as the number of vehicles/equipment, repair history, and fuel usage.

The proposed budget for fiscal year 2015-16 for Fleet Management is \$3.9 million. This amount includes funding for the necessary resources that will be required to sustain operations for service, repairs, and to fuel the City’s fleet in fiscal year 2015-16.

- The Personnel Services category is increasing by \$22,836 over the fiscal year 2014-15 budgeted personnel services costs. This change is reflects the anticipated personnel cost increases due salary increases approved in fiscal year 2014-15, scheduled step increases, and associated benefit costs (retirement and health).
- The Supplies and Services category is increasing by \$96,070 over the adopted fiscal year 2014-15 supplies and services costs. This change is due to increased costs for maintenance and equipment repair and automotive maintenance costs.
- Capital expenditures are increasing by \$141,194 in order to fund vehicle replacement costs. The fiscal year 2015-16 budget includes \$330,000 for the purchase of the following vehicles:
 - 2004 Chevrolet Tahoe, Fire Department
 - 2005 Chevrolet Suburban, Fire Department
 - 2004 Nissan Titan, Police Department
 - 2006 Ford F450 Aerial Truck, Public Works
- The Utilities expense category is decreasing by \$212,176 reflecting the elimination of Transit Fund activities that will result in lower gas and electric costs.

Fleet Fund Expenditures

Category	FY 13-14 Actual	FY 14-15 Projected	FY 16-16 Proposed	Inc/Dec
Personnel Services	\$ 848,459	\$ 1,022,503	\$ 1,045,339	\$ 22,836
Supplies and Services	\$ 2,308,518	\$ 2,237,885	\$ 2,333,955	\$ 96,070
Other Expenses	\$ 254,424	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -
Capital	\$ 23,757	\$ 188,806	\$ 330,000	\$ 141,194
Utilities	\$ 438,864	\$ 384,748	\$ 172,572	\$ (212,176)
Transfers out	\$ 23,701	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 3,897,723	\$ 3,834,342	\$ 3,882,266	\$ 47,924

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	797,796	848,459	1,022,503	1,045,349
Supplies and Services	2,775,188	2,308,518	2,237,885	2,333,955
Other Expenses	384,629	254,424	400	400
Capital	85,358	23,757	188,806	330,000
Utilities	598	438,864	384,748	172,572
Transfers Out	104,000	23,701	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,147,569	\$3,897,723	\$3,834,342	\$3,882,276
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(7,250)	15,189	0	0
Charges for Services	26,203	55,542	20,000	35,000
Other Revenue	3,508,232	3,593,021	3,628,744	3,456,585
Transfers In	404,000	0	0	330,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,931,185	\$3,663,752	\$3,648,744	\$3,821,585
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$216,384)	(\$233,971)	(\$185,598)	(\$60,691)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
391 Central Garage	3,573,582	3,595,841	3,645,536	3,552,276
392 Equipment Replacement	573,987	301,882	188,806	330,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,147,569	\$3,897,723	\$3,834,342	\$3,882,276
REVENUES				
391 Central Garage	3,873,425	3,592,186	3,611,665	3,491,585
392 Equipment Replacement	57,760	71,566	37,079	330,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,931,185	\$3,663,752	\$3,648,744	\$3,821,585
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$216,384)	(\$233,971)	(\$185,598)	(\$60,691)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 391

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Equipment Mechanic	4.00	-	-	4.00
Fire Apparatus Mech	2.00	-	-	2.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fleet Inventory Control Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fleet Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Equipment Mechanic	1.00	-	-	1.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	10.00	-	-	10.00

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Purchase Type

FUND	DEPT	EQUIPMENT DESCRIPTION	PROJECTED MILEAGE ¹	FY 2015-16 ADOPTED
Vehicle Replacement Fund	Fire	2004 Chevrolet Tahoe	189,375	\$60,000
Vehicle Replacement Fund	Fire	2005 Chevrolet Suburban	130,105	\$125,000
Vehicle Replacement Fund	Police	2004 Nissan Titan	178,057	\$40,000
Public Safety Realignment ²	Police	Crown Victoria	130,875	\$23,173
Public Safety Realignment ²	Police	Ford 500	86,291	\$23,173
TUT Common Fund	Police	Toyota Camry	169,636	\$40,000
TUT Common Fund	Police	Vehicle Outfitting		\$46,158
Public Safety Realignment ²	Police	Xterra	91,254	\$23,173
Vehicle Replacement Fund	Public Works	2006 Ford F450 Aerial Truck	10,295 hours	\$105,000
Sewer	Sewer	19990Caterpillar M318 Excavator	2,433 hours	\$325,000
Sewer	Sewer	2001 International 4700 Dump Truck	68,466	\$92,000
Sewer	Sewer	2002 Ford F450 Service Body Truck	4,943 hours	\$84,000
Sewer	Sewer	2004 GMC P3100 W/TV	51,515	\$275,000
Sewer	Sewer	2008 IHC 7400 Vactor	5,228 hours	\$475,000
Sewer	Sewer	2008 IHC 7400 Vactor	6,073 hours	\$410,000
Sewer	Sewer	Vehicle Outfitting		\$55,000
TOTAL				\$2,201,677
GRAND TOTAL - ALL EQUIPMENT				\$2,201,677

1 Projected Mileage for June 2016.

2 Does not reflect total cost of vehicles for those funded through Public Safety Realignment.



CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS

Capital Project Funds

Capital Projects Funds account for resources used for the acquisition and construction of capital facilities by the City, with the exception of those assets financed by proprietary funds.

ASSESSMENT DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

These funds were established as depositories for monies received from issuance of bonds for various assessment districts. The monies are used to finance the construction of public works improvements in the related districts. Included in this group are funds 501 through 518.

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES (DIF)

These funds were established as depositories for various development impact fees. The fees are levied against all new development in the City in order to pay for the construction or improvement of public facilities as a result of City growth. Included in this group are the following funds:

- Fund 542: Telegraph Canyon Drainage Development Impact Fee
This fee is levied against new development in specific areas of the City, based upon the drainage facility their project will generate an impact on. The monies collected are used to fund construction of public improvements designed to increase the capacity of the subject facilities, allowing the City to maintain service levels with increased demand.
- Funds 567-582: Public Facilities Development Impact Fees
The Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) is levied against new development throughout the City to mitigate the impacts of growth on the City's public services. The monies collected are used in the construction of new, and renovation of existing, public facilities.
- Fund 587: Otay Ranch Pedestrian Bridge DIF
The Otay Ranch Pedestrian Bridge DIF is levied against all new development in Otay Ranch Villages 1, 2, 5, and 6 to fund the construction of pedestrian bridge improvements, as necessitated by growth in these villages.

- Fund 588: Otay Ranch Village 11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF
The Otay Ranch Village 11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF is levied against all new development in Otay Ranch Village 11 to fund the construction of pedestrian bridge improvements, as necessitated by growth in this village.
- Fund 591: Transportation Development Impact Fee
The Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF) is levied against all new development in the City east of I-805 to fund the construction of transportation improvements, as necessitated by growth in the eastern portion of the City.
- Fund 593: Western Transportation Development Impact Fee
The Western Transportation Development Impact Fee (W-TDIF) is levied against all new development in the City between Interstate 5 and Interstate 805, to fund the construction of transportation improvements, as necessitated by growth in the western portion of the City.
- Fund 594: Bayfront Development Impact Fee
The Bayfront Development Impact Fee (BFDIF) is levied against all new development within the Bayfront Area of the City, to fund construction of transportation improvements, as necessitated by growth in the Bayfront Area of the City.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

Included as a part of this group are the following:

- Fund 723: Bicycle Facilities
This fund is a depository for local Transportation Development Act funds, Article 3.0, received from the County for the purpose of bicycle related programs.
- Fund 735: Transportation Partnership
This fund is a depository for the revenues received from the State and Local Transportation Partnership Program. Funds must be spent on street purposes.

- Fund 736: Other Transportation Programs
This fund accounts for other miscellaneous Federal and State transportation grants received by the City.
 - Fund 737: Transportation Equity Act 21
This fund is a depository for revenues received from the federal government under the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century. Funds must be spent on street purposes.
 - Fund 739: Traffic Congestion Relief
This fund is a depository for revenues allocated to the City under Streets and Highways Code Section 2182 and Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7104. Funds must be expended for maintenance or reconstruction of public streets and roads no later than the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the allocation is received. Any funds not expended within that period must be returned to the State Controller.
 - Fund 741: Proposition 1B Highway Safety
This fund is a depository for revenues received from the State government under Proposition 1B (The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Act), as approved by voters in the November 2006 general election. Funds must be spent on street purposes.
- Chapter 17.10 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code, in accordance with authority granted by Section 66477 of the California Government Code.
- Fund 717: Residential Construction Tax
This fund is a depository for fees levied for the construction, replacement, or conversion of all dwelling units within the City including hotels and motels, collected pursuant to Chapter 3.32 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code.
 - Fund 725: Industrial Development Authority
The Industrial Development Authority (IDA) is a conduit-issuer of bonds, formed in February 1982 (Ordinance 1970) by the City of Chula Vista City Council. The IDA enables bonds to be issued with a tax-exempt status, but does not pledge City funds to repay the bond issues. The City is able to issue and sell bonds to provide financial assistance that has a public benefit for the acquisition, construction and installation of facilities for industrial, commercial, business or public utility purposes.

MISCELLANEOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS

Included as part of this group are the following:

- Fund 715: Park Acquisition and Development (East)
This fund is a depository for fees collected from subdividers for the purpose of providing park and recreational facilities directly benefiting and serving the residents of the regulated subdivision east of the 805. These funds are collected pursuant to Chapter 17.10 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code, in accordance with authority granted by Section 66477 of the California Government Code.
- Fund 716: Park Acquisition and Development (West)
This fund is a depository for fees collected from subdividers for the purpose of providing park and recreational facilities directly benefiting and serving the residents of the regulated subdivision west of the 805. These funds are collected pursuant to

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	7,765	1,248	0	0
Transfers Out	27,538	8,900	54,760	100,195
CIP Project Expenditures	0	161	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$35,303	\$10,309	\$54,760	\$100,195
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(12,228)	24,792	0	0
Other Revenue	18,836	18,784	19,045	19,285
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,608	\$43,576	\$19,045	\$19,285
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$28,695)	\$33,267	(\$35,715)	(\$80,910)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
507 Otay Valley Rd AD 90-2 Improv	7,765	1,248	0	0
508 AD97-2	0	161	0	0
517 AD2004-1 Dixon Drive	27,538	0	30,981	9,598
518 AD2005-1 Tobias Drive	0	8,900	23,779	90,597
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$35,303	\$10,309	\$54,760	\$100,195
REVENUES				
507 Otay Valley Rd AD 90-2 Improv	(498)	903	0	0
511 Otay Vly Rd Fee Recovery Dist	(4,916)	10,013	0	0
512 EL Greens II AD 94-1 Improv	(6,062)	12,371	0	0
515 Twin Oaks Ave AD 96-1 Improv	(117)	233	0	0
516 Oxford St AD 97-1 Improv	(24)	49	0	0
517 AD2004-1 Dixon Drive	9,253	9,509	9,358	9,598
518 AD2005-1 Tobias Drive	8,972	10,498	9,687	9,687
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,608	\$43,576	\$19,045	\$19,285
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$28,695)	\$33,267	(\$35,715)	(\$80,910)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
CIP Project Expenditures	14,045	4,252	0	200,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$14,045	\$4,252	\$0	\$200,000
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(32,730)	66,577	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	(\$32,730)	\$66,577	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$46,775)	\$62,325	\$0	(\$200,000)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	490	2,521	55,300	55,300
Other Expenses	232,517	289,212	300,000	300,000
Transfers Out	4,221,342	6,111,579	7,050,654	7,114,789
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,454,349	\$6,403,312	\$7,405,954	\$7,470,089
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(220,306)	260,009	0	0
Development Impact Fees	6,808,865	4,554,723	2,850,000	2,850,000
Other Revenue	0	146,608	0	0
Transfers In	0	0	140,338	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,588,559	\$4,961,340	\$2,990,338	\$2,850,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$2,134,210	(\$1,441,972)	(\$4,415,616)	(\$4,620,089)

FUND DETAIL

DEPT # DEPT DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
567 DIF-Adamo Property Acquisition	52,575	35,743	0	0
571 General Administration	233,007	294,448	495,638	355,300
572 Civic Center Expansion	2,385,939	3,076,482	3,323,662	3,625,369
573 Police Facilities Remodel	1,723,283	1,720,438	1,601,035	1,600,000
574 Corporation Yard Relocation	0	845,273	844,795	844,420
575 Library for Eastern Territory	59,545	0	0	0
576 Fire Suppression Sys Expansion	0	430,928	1,140,824	1,045,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,454,349	\$6,403,312	\$7,405,954	\$7,470,089
REVENUES				
567 DIF-Adamo Property Acquisition	(1,420)	2,113	0	0
571 General Administration	548,557	576,962	300,000	300,000
572 Civic Center Expansion	1,137,555	1,216,883	600,000	600,000
573 Police Facilities Remodel	1,242,685	766,447	400,000	400,000
574 Corporation Yard Relocation	317,502	215,957	100,000	100,000
575 Library for Eastern Territory	1,294,730	956,237	500,000	500,000
576 Fire Suppression Sys Expansion	1,006,193	591,461	640,338	500,000
582 Recreation Facilities	1,042,757	635,280	450,000	450,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$6,588,559	\$4,961,340	\$2,990,338	\$2,850,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$2,134,210	(\$1,441,972)	(\$4,415,616)	(\$4,620,089)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Other Expenses	0	0	6,200	6,200
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$0	\$0	\$6,200	\$6,200
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(18,213)	40,741	0	0
Development Impact Fees	251,872	345,770	90,000	90,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$233,659	\$386,511	\$90,000	\$90,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$233,659	\$386,511	\$83,800	\$83,800

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
587 DIF-OR Village Pedestrian Ramp	0	0	3,000	3,000
588 OR Vlg11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF	0	0	3,200	3,200
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$0	\$0	\$6,200	\$6,200
REVENUES				
587 DIF-OR Village Pedestrian Ramp	194,064	303,130	40,000	40,000
588 OR Vlg11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF	39,595	83,381	50,000	50,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$233,659	\$386,511	\$90,000	\$90,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$233,659	\$386,511	\$83,800	\$83,800

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	0	211,000	0
Other Expenses	182,819	172,098	580,916	265,000
Transfers Out	0	36,851	6,444	0
CIP Project Expenditures	2,635,057	3,337,454	573,686	2,955,845
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,817,876	\$3,546,403	\$1,372,046	\$3,220,845
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(79,286)	138,990	119,290	0
Development Impact Fees	2,527,830	2,001,362	772,477	1,831,600
Other Revenue	71,902	0	0	0
Transfers In	0	36,851	6,444	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,520,446	\$2,177,203	\$898,211	\$1,831,600
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$297,430)	(\$1,369,200)	(\$473,835)	(\$1,389,245)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
591 Transportation DIF	2,817,876	3,509,552	1,277,321	3,220,845
593 Western Transportation DIF Fund	0	36,851	94,725	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,817,876	\$3,546,403	\$1,372,046	\$3,220,845
REVENUES				
591 Transportation DIF	2,453,265	2,123,447	869,290	1,750,000
593 Western Transportation DIF Fund	67,181	53,756	28,921	81,600
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,520,446	\$2,177,203	\$898,211	\$1,831,600
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$297,430)	(\$1,369,200)	(\$473,835)	(\$1,389,245)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	0	50,000	50,000
Other Expenses	0	0	50,000	50,000
Transfers Out	687,941	606,675	677,336	1,193,205
CIP Project Expenditures	3,616	29,522	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$691,557	\$636,197	\$777,336	\$1,293,205
REVENUES				
Other Local Taxes	413,552	209,075	374,557	325,505
Use of Money & Property	(130,310)	310,082	0	0
Development Impact Fees	4,433,468	2,614,066	625,000	625,000
Transfers In	100,001	383,900	302,779	352,700
TOTAL REVENUES	\$4,816,711	\$3,517,123	\$1,302,336	\$1,303,205
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$4,125,154	\$2,880,926	\$525,000	\$10,000

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
715 PAD Fund - Eastern	3,616	29,522	75,000	75,000
716 PAD Fund - Western	0	0	25,000	540,000
717 Resid. Construction/Conversion	677,319	606,675	677,336	678,205
725 Indust. Development Authority	10,622	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$691,557	\$636,197	\$777,336	\$1,293,205
REVENUES				
715 PAD Fund - Eastern	4,217,838	2,630,550	600,000	600,000
716 PAD Fund - Western	87,645	292,895	25,000	25,000
717 Resid. Construction/Conversion	511,274	593,686	677,336	678,205
725 Indust. Development Authority	(46)	(8)	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$4,816,711	\$3,517,123	\$1,302,336	\$1,303,205
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$4,125,154	\$2,880,926	\$525,000	\$10,000

OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS FUND 730

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	50,406	0	0
Other Expenses	7,607	0	0	0
Transfers Out	0	19,999	32,192	0
CIP Project Expenditures	2,292,368	2,153,803	5,261,877	9,048,589
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,299,975	\$2,224,208	\$5,294,069	\$9,048,589
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(4,664)	5,085	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	2,224,650	1,594,834	5,261,877	9,048,589
Other Revenue	0	300,000	0	0
Transfers In	79,838	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,299,824	\$1,899,919	\$5,261,877	\$9,048,589
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$151)	(\$324,289)	(\$32,192)	\$0

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
723 Bicycle Facilities	7,607	0	0	0
736 Other Transportation Program	2,166,128	1,552,057	5,294,069	9,048,589
741 Prop 1B Hwy Safety	126,240	672,151	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,299,975	\$2,224,208	\$5,294,069	\$9,048,589
REVENUES				
723 Bicycle Facilities	7,607	0	0	0
735 Transportation Partnership	(151)	309	0	0
736 Other Transportation Program	2,166,128	1,552,058	5,261,877	9,048,589
741 Prop 1B Hwy Safety	126,240	347,552	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,299,824	\$1,899,919	\$5,261,877	\$9,048,589
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$151)	(\$324,289)	(\$32,192)	\$0



DEBT SERVICE FUNDS

Debt Service Funds

The debt service requirement for the City and Public Financing Authority is \$11.6 million for fiscal year 2015-16. Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency debt is reported in the "Debt Administration" section of the budget. The \$11.6 million are the required payments for the debt per the amortization schedules however, the amounts budgeted or actually paid are usually less due to funds available with the trustee as a result of interest earnings or excess cash in the various debt service funds that reduce the required cash outlay budgeted for the annual payment of the debt.

Debt service payments are made from various City and Funds in accordance with the legal documents governing each borrowing. Present debt is in the form of Certificates of Participation, Long Term Notes and Lease-Purchase Obligations. Debt has been issued by the City to finance a wide variety of projects, including the construction of the new Public Works Center and the new Police Facility, parking facilities, refurbishment of the Chula Vista Shopping Mall, property acquisitions, building remodeling, and equipment and software acquisition.

Annual debt service costs are funded by the General Fund and Public Facilities Development Impact Fee Fund.

DEBT SERVICE – CITY FUND

Debt Service for City Fund accounts for the activities of the City's bonds (not issued by the CV Public Financing Authority), notes and capital leases. Debt service expenditures for the City Fund are approximately \$2.6 million offset by revenues of \$3.8 million. To follow is a brief description of the City Fund - debt service funds.

- Fund 442: CDBG Section 108 Loan

In June of 2008, the City received a loan of \$9.5 million from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), under the Section 108 program. These funds will be repaid with a portion of the City's annual CDBG allocation, over the next 20 years. The funds will be used for the 'Castle Park Infrastructure Project'. The Section 108 loan is an 'advance' of future CDBG entitlement funds, and, as such, is repaid with a portion of the City's annual entitlement.

- Fund 451: Long Term Advances DSF – City

This fund was established to account for inter-fund loans.

- Fund 452: Capital Leases

This fund was established to account for the lease/purchase of the Fire Department's defibrillator equipment, the Police Department's Mobile Data Computers, and Energy Conservation equipment.

In December 2012, the City entered into a lease purchase agreement with Bank of America to purchase certain energy conservation equipment. The agreement would bridge the financial gap between the Municipal Streetlight Retrofit Project capital costs and the available rebates for energy conservation equipment.

In March 2015, the City entered into lease purchase agreement with PCS Mobile to purchase mobile data computers and associated software.

- Fund 453: Energy Loan Repayment

This fund accumulates payment of principal and interest on a loan obtained through the California Energy Commission to fund various energy conservation capital projects.

On July 23, 2013, the City Council authorized a 16 year lease purchase agreement with Banc of America to fund various solar energy projects for City facilities. The original amount of the loan was \$2,121,500 and will be repaid through future energy savings.

DEBT SERVICE – CHULA VISTA PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY

The Chula Vista Public Financing Authority (PFA) formed in April 1995 to provide for financing of acquisition, construction and improvement of public capital improvements. The PFA has been used to issue Certificates of Participation on behalf of the City.

Debt service expenditures for the PFA are approximately \$9.8 million with offsetting revenues of \$9.8 million. To follow is a brief description of the Chula Vista PFA - debt service funds.

- Fund 472: 2004 Certificates of Participation – Civic Center Project – Phase I
In August 2004, the Public Financing Authority issued the 2004 COP in the amount of \$37,240,000 to finance the construction and equipping of certain improvements to the Civic Center complex and to provide funds for infrastructure improvements in western Chula Vista. The source of repayment of the certificates is the lease payments to be made by the General Fund and PFDIF to the Public Financing Authority. The term of the certificates is through the year 2034.
- Fund 473: 2006 Certificates of Participation – Civic Center Project – Phase II
In March 2006, the Public Financing Authority issued the 2006 COP in the amount of \$20,325,000 to finance the construction and equipping of additional improvements to the Civic Center complex and for the renovation of the City's Nature Center.
- Fund 474: 2010 COP Refinance – Corporation Yard and Civic Center Phase III)
In February 2010, the Public Financing Authority issued the 2010 COP in the amount of \$29,355,000 to refinance the outstanding \$15,640,000 principal balance of the 2000 Certificate of Participation and to finance certain capital improvement projects. The source of repayment of the certificates is the lease payments to be made by the General Fund and PFDIF to the Public Financing Authority. The term of the certificates is through the year 2033.
- Fund 475: 2014 Refunding Certificates of Participation
In March 2014, the Public Financing Authority issued the 2014 COP in the amount of \$45,920,000 to refinance the outstanding principal balance of the 2002 Certificates of Participation. The source of repayment of the certificates is the lease payments to be made by the General Fund and PFDIF to the Public Financing Authority. The term of the certificates is through calendar year 2032.

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Other Expenses	1,817,640	2,735,944	2,704,272	2,173,048
Transfers Out	0	36,851	100,482	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,817,640	\$2,772,795	\$2,804,754	\$2,173,048
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(679)	1,055	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	1,149	0	0	0
Other Revenue	0	145,494	183,262	183,262
Transfers In	2,164,114	2,741,033	3,613,757	4,928,498
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,164,584	\$2,887,582	\$3,797,019	\$5,111,760
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$346,944	\$114,787	\$992,265	\$2,938,712

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
442 CDBG Section 108 Loan	749,073	752,752	756,715	758,243
446 Notes Payable Adamo Property	52,575	35,744	0	0
449 SD Co Regional Comm Systems	295,734	295,729	0	0
451 Long-term Advances DSF - City	0	696,971	750,000	150,000
452 KS Fire Equipment Capital Lease	143,513	298,741	488,114	452,952
453 CES Loan Repayment	576,745	692,858	809,925	811,853
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,817,640	\$2,772,795	\$2,804,754	\$2,173,048
REVENUES				
442 CDBG Section 108 Loan	749,073	752,752	756,715	758,243
446 Notes Payable Adamo Property	52,575	35,743	0	0
449 SD Co Regional Comm Systems	295,643	295,706	0	0
451 Long-term Advances DSF - City	350,000	817,779	1,878,202	3,190,000
452 KS Fire Equipment Capital Lease	418,516	294,301	352,177	351,664
453 CES Loan Repayment	298,777	691,301	809,925	811,853
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,164,584	\$2,887,582	\$3,797,019	\$5,111,760
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$346,944	\$114,787	\$992,265	\$2,938,712

DS - CV PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY FUND 470

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	15,056	12,885	18,500	21,000
Other Expenses	10,114,463	59,155,359	9,764,365	9,760,349
Transfers Out	0	3,455,008	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$10,129,519	\$62,623,252	\$9,782,865	\$9,781,349
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	276,668	111,629	0	0
Other Revenue	0	49,457,111	0	0
Transfers In	7,769,142	12,842,973	9,764,400	9,760,794
TOTAL REVENUES	\$8,045,810	\$62,411,713	\$9,764,400	\$9,760,794
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$2,083,709)	(\$211,539)	(\$18,465)	(\$20,555)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
450 2002 COP Police Facility Proj	3,919,532	7,103,845	0	0
471 2003 Refunding Cert of Part	1,065,416	495,852	0	0
472 2004 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase I	2,394,846	2,395,317	2,396,449	2,399,514
473 2006 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase 2	1,271,308	1,273,239	1,277,309	1,276,960
474 2010 Refunding COP	1,478,417	2,494,705	2,494,107	2,492,319
475 2014 Refunding COP	0	48,860,294	3,615,000	3,612,556
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$10,129,519	\$62,623,252	\$9,782,865	\$9,781,349
REVENUES				
450 2002 COP Police Facility Proj	3,953,149	3,792,276	0	0
471 2003 Refunding Cert of Part	29,311	11,687	0	0
472 2004 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase I	2,516,041	2,266,820	2,391,449	2,394,514
473 2006 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase 2	1,331,717	1,207,036	1,271,309	1,270,960
474 2010 Refunding COP	215,592	2,492,651	2,491,607	2,487,320
475 2014 Refunding COP	0	52,641,243	3,610,035	3,608,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$8,045,810	\$62,411,713	\$9,764,400	\$9,760,794
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$2,083,709)	(\$211,539)	(\$18,465)	(\$20,555)

OTHER FUNDS

Other Funds

The funds included in this section include miscellaneous Special Revenue and Internal Service funds. Special Revenue Funds are used to account for proceeds derived from specific revenue sources, which are legally restricted to expenditures for special purposes. Internal Service Funds are used to finance and account for goods, special activities, and services performed by one City department for other City departments on a cost reimbursement basis. Internal Service Funds account for the activities of worker's compensation, insurance, and technology replacement.

To follow is a brief description of special revenue funds.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

Included in this group are the following funds:

- Fund 221: Gas Tax
This fund accounts for the receipt and expenditure of all monies received from the State under Street and Highway Code Sections 2106, 2107, 2107.5. The allocations must be spent for street maintenance or construction and a limited amount for engineering. Historically, these monies were deemed highly restrictive insofar as expenditure, but with adoption of AB1502 effective January 1, 1978 most of the money can be used for any street purpose.
- Fund 225: Traffic Signal Fee
This fund accounts for the receipt and expenditure of fees collected from private developers for financing and / or installation of new traffic signals, as required by City of Chula Vista Council Policy 478-01.
- Fund 227: Transportation Sales Tax
This fund was established to account for the receipt and disbursement of all transportation sales tax (TransNet) revenues for the City. In November 1987, San Diego County voters first approved the Transportation Program (TransNet). In November of 2004, voters approved a 40-year extension of the program, which funds transportation improvements throughout the region via a half-cent local sales tax. The City's allocation of regional funds is based upon population and the number of local street and road miles maintained by the City.

PARKING FUNDS

Included as part of this group are the following funds:

- Fund 241: Parking Meter
Parking Meter Fund revenues are generated through two sources: coin deposits from parking meters located in the downtown area, and parking citation payments for expired meter violations. These funds pay for the coin collection and maintenance of the meters, the parking enforcement staff that monitors the downtown area, and general upkeep and signage of the downtown parking lots.
- Fund 243: Town Center I Parking
This fund is used to account for revenues from an in-lieu parking fee. This in-lieu parking fee applies to any developer of a new commercial building or addition to an existing commercial building within the Downtown Parking District. Use of monies in this fund is restricted to the purchase or development of parking sites.

PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDS

Included in this group are the following funds:

- Fund 245: Traffic Safety
This fund is a depository for all monies derived from vehicle code fines, excluding parking violations. The fines are collected through the County court system and remitted to the City monthly. These monies may be expended only for traffic control devices and equipment and maintenance thereof or for the maintenance, improvement or construction of public streets.
- Fund 251: Supplemental Law Enforcement Services
This fund accounts for the Supplemental Law Enforcement grant funds awarded to the Police Department; these funds can be used to supplement general fund appropriations for Police related personnel, overtime, and equipment expenditures.

- Fund 252: Police Department Grants
This fund includes the California Border Alliance Group (CBAG) and miscellaneous police grants. CBAG is funded with federal funds. While CBAG employees are technically City of Chula Vista employees they do not work in the City of Chula Vista nor do they provide direct services for the City of Chula Vista; the City serves only as a fiscal agent for CBAG.
- Fund 253: Inmate Welfare Fund
This fund is a depository for monies collected from pay phones commissions and operation of a commissary, in accordance with the Sheriff's Penal Code section 4025. Monies in this fund shall be expended for the benefit, education, and welfare of the inmates.
- Fund 254: Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Funds
This fund accounts for federal Justice Assistance Grant funds awarded to the Police Department; these funds can be used to supplement general fund appropriations for Police related personnel, overtime, and equipment expenditures.
- Fund 256: Asset Seizure
This fund is a depository for assets seized under Federal statutes through the process of "equitable sharing" of drug money and real property. By law these funds may only be used for law enforcement purposes and are intended to supplement, not supplant, existing funds.

LIBRARY/CULTURAL ARTS FUNDS

Included in this group are the following funds:

- Fund 261: California Library Service Act
The California Library Services Act (CLSA) helps public libraries provide coordinated reference services and provides reimbursement for interlibrary loans of materials and loans to nonresident borrowers through the Transaction Based Reimbursement program, also known as the Direct Loan program. The Chula Vista Public Library participates in the Universal Borrowing provision of CLSA that reimburses the City for any over-the-counter loan service to the residents of all other California public library jurisdictions (Direct Loan). The Interlibrary Loan program reimburses the City for handling costs when books are lent to other
- California libraries.
- Fund 262: Public Library Foundation Fund
The Public Library Foundation Act (PLF) is a funding formula under which the State contributes funding for basic local library services, under specified conditions, to assure the availability to every resident of the state an adequate level of public library service regardless of the taxable wealth of the local jurisdiction providing the service. The legislation provides that to every library jurisdiction which allocates to its public library at least as much local funding as it had the previous year, the state will award a dollar amount equal to the proportional share of the total amount allocated for the Public Library Foundation program based on the population of the library's service area as certified by the State Librarian for that fiscal year. The annual funding is dependent upon appropriations made by the legislature and the Governor.
- Fund 267: McCandliss Awards
The Gayle McCandliss Fund was established in 1991 shortly after she passed away. Consistent with her wishes, it was established as a perpetual fund to recognize and provide monetary support or recognition to individuals or groups who make substantial contribution to the arts in the City of Chula Vista.

SUNDRY GRANT FUNDS

Included as part of this group are the following funds:

- Fund 268: State Recreation Grants
This fund was established to account for the receipt and disbursement of all State Recreation Grants received by the City.
- Fund 269: Other Grant Fund
The Other Grants Fund was established to account for all grants other than Federal and State grants such as: San Diego Neighborhood Reinvestment Program and Be the Change grants.
- Fund 272: Federal Grants Fund
This fund was established to account for the receipt and disbursement of all Federal Grants received by the City.

- Fund 273: State Grants Fund
This fund was established to account for the receipt and disbursement of all State Grants received by the City (excluding Recreation related grants).
- Fund 274: ARRA Fund
This fund was established to account for the receipt and disbursement of federal grant funds received by the City, authorized by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AND CONSERVATION FUNDS

Included as part of this group are the following funds:

- Fund 281: Waste Management and Recycling
Revenue for the Waste Management fund is generated by a variety of grants which are used to implement, operate and educate the public on waste diversion, recycling, environmental actions and impacts. Current grant programs include litter reduction and bottle and can recycling programs; a regional used motor oil and oil filter recycling program; regional household hazardous waste program, regional universal waste program, and a regional needles and sharps disposal program.
- Fund 282: Environmental Services
The Environmental Services fund is a depository for revenue that is generated primarily by a 5% surcharge (AB 939 fees) applied to the refuse rates for residential and commercial customers. The surcharge is authorized by the State to recover the costs of developing and implementing source reduction, recycling, and composting programs that are implemented to meet the State mandate to divert 50% of all waste generated annually in the City from landfills. The fund also includes two annual flat fees paid by the franchise hauler under the franchise agreement to cover litter container costs and to support the programs public education and enforcement service costs.
- Fund 285: Energy Conservation Fund
Revenue for the Energy Conservation fund is generated by grants and inter-agency agreements for specific energy conservation projects. The energy conservation fund reflects the budget for the SDG&E energy conservation grant. This grant funds energy conservation programs for local residents, businesses, and City operations that

reduce the amount of natural gas and electricity consumed.

STORM DRAIN FUND

Storm Drain Revenue (Fund 301) – In accordance with Chapter 14.16 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code all proceeds of the storm drain fee are deposited into the Storm Drain Revenue Fund. Monies in this fund may only be used for storm drain purposes. The monthly storm drain service charge is included on the sewer bill.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

These funds are depositories of grant entitlement monies received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development including funds 311, 314, 321, 325, and 333. The purpose of these monies is for community development projects; eligible activities include those that:

- Benefit low and moderate income people.
- Eliminate slums and blight.
- Alleviate conditions posing a serious health and/or safety hazard.

OPEN SPACE DISTRICT FUNDS

These funds are a depository for all monies received for all flat rate property tax assessments levied against benefiting property owners for all maintenance of open space areas. Included in this group are funds 342 through 389.

The total assessment amount for each Open Space District is calculated each year based upon the cost of providing services within the district. This assessment rate is limited to the prior year's amount, increased by the lesser of two local indexes. In recent years the indexed increases were not effectively keeping pace with the actual costs of providing these services to the property owners. In fiscal year 2007-08 staff went through the Proposition 218 process on seven districts/zones, in order to bring revenues in line with actual maintenance costs. Only one of the seven districts was approved for an increase in assessment. As a result a concentrated effort has been made to reduce expenditures to within available resources.

MISCELLANEOUS SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

Included in this grouping are the following funds:

- Fund 223: Telephone Users Tax (TUT) Common Fund
This fund is used to account for funds in accordance with a 2014 settlement agreement that resolved a class action lawsuit challenging the City's collection of Telephone Users' Taxes from wireless customers.
- Fund 270: Mobile Home Rent Review Program Fund
This fund is a depository for monies collected for the Mobile Home Administrative Fee. This fee was established in July 2011 to ensure a consistent funding source for administration and implementation of Chula Vista Municipal Code 9.50 – Mobile Home Park Space Rent Review.
- Fund 316: Public Educational & Government Fee Fund
This fund accounts for funds received through State Video Franchise Fees to support Public, Education, and Governmental (PEG) access channel facilities. These funds are restricted. In fiscal year 2013-14 they will be used to replace presentation and broadcasting equipment for Council Chambers and the Police Department Community Room.

INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS

Included as part of this group are the following funds:

- Fund 232: Flexible Spending Account
This fund is used to account for employee health, medical and dependent care benefits. In fiscal year 2011-12 this fund was transitioned to a trust and agency type fund.
- Fund 234: Advanced Life Support (ALS) Fund
This fund accounts for the receipt of pass-through revenue from ambulance services to fund First Responder Advanced Life Support program.
- Fund 235: Legislative Counsel Fund
This fund accounts for the expenditures and revenues used to fund outside legal counsel services as necessary to implement Proposition C.

- Fund 341: Public Liability Trust Fund
This fund is a depository for contributions made from the General Fund to provide an appropriate reserve level to pay for uninsured and deductibles for public liability losses. The City is self-insured for amounts up to \$250,000 per claim.
- Fund 393: Technology Replacement Fund
The Technology Replacement Fund is an internal service function that provides for the replacement of computers and related technology equipment. Funds from departments' operating budgets are transferred to the Technology Replacement Fund for future replacement of equipment included in the program. Due to economic reasons, the program has not been funded for several years. Computer replacement has been included in various funds based on available resources.
- Fund 398: Workers Compensation
This fund is a depository for contributions made from all funds, which have personnel allocated to them, to pay for annual costs related to workers' compensation liabilities including the provision of an appropriate reserve to pay uninsured claims costs. The City is self-insured for amounts up to \$1.0 million per claim. The amount of the reserve and the required annual transfer is determined by the Director of Finance, based on experience and consultation with the Risk Manager. In fiscal year 2010-11 the Workers Compensation Fund was moved from Fund 231 to Fund 398, this change is necessary to change the fund type from General Fund to internal service.

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	0	1,265,500	490,000
Other Expenses	1,960	3,774,828	90,000	45,000
Capital	0	0	1,465,000	125,902
Transfers Out	4,518,652	4,342,351	4,869,428	4,259,428
CIP Project Expenditures	9,319,294	5,704,542	11,529,119	12,090,343
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	0	0	637,500	100,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$13,839,906	\$13,821,721	\$19,856,547	\$17,110,673
REVENUES				
Other Local Taxes	6,196,036	898,172	5,522,000	5,886,000
Use of Money & Property	(36,887)	95,894	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	7,249,106	12,504,188	6,249,431	5,642,500
Charges for Services	240,397	207,016	0	200,000
Other Revenue	30,692	355,944	288,900	0
Transfers In	0	8,037,452	32,192	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$13,679,344	\$22,098,666	\$12,092,523	\$11,728,500
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$160,562)	\$8,276,945	(\$7,764,024)	(\$5,382,173)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
221 Gas Tax	6,266,602	5,358,418	6,839,428	8,590,428
223 TUT Common Fund	0	3,790,423	4,228,219	615,902
225 Traffic Signal	948,417	352,060	965,000	659,000
227 Transportation Sales Tax	6,624,887	4,320,820	7,823,900	7,245,343
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$13,839,906	\$13,821,721	\$19,856,547	\$17,110,673
REVENUES				
221 Gas Tax	5,651,471	12,262,328	6,159,431	5,514,157
223 TUT Common Fund	0	8,037,009	0	0
225 Traffic Signal	251,405	251,244	25,738	200,000
227 Transportation Sales Tax	7,776,468	1,548,085	5,907,354	6,014,343
TOTAL REVENUES	\$13,679,344	\$22,098,666	\$12,092,523	\$11,728,500
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$160,562)	\$8,276,945	(\$7,764,024)	(\$5,382,173)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	40,000	0	0	0
Supplies and Services	175,157	210,705	220,300	220,300
Other Expenses	135,684	154,537	166,400	166,400
Utilities	10,715	11,323	11,855	12,448
CIP Project Expenditures	2,125	273,882	100,000	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$363,681	\$650,447	\$498,555	\$399,148
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	42,489	39,897	35,000	35,000
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	209,862	232,857	200,000	200,000
Use of Money & Property	349,463	392,208	350,000	350,000
Other Revenue	0	2,001	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$601,814	\$666,963	\$585,000	\$585,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$238,133	\$16,516	\$86,445	\$185,852

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
241 Parking Meter	363,681	650,447	498,555	399,148
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$363,681	\$650,447	\$498,555	\$399,148
REVENUES				
241 Parking Meter	602,080	666,405	585,000	585,000
243 Town Centre I-Parking District	(266)	558	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$601,814	\$666,963	\$585,000	\$585,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$238,133	\$16,516	\$86,445	\$185,852

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	4,333,413	4,616,850	6,214,773	5,479,457
Supplies and Services	971,226	903,145	1,453,615	1,387,216
Other Expenses	0	0	0	8,999
Capital	16,839	224,681	225,000	269,519
Transfers Out	623,876	486,325	531,364	418,678
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$5,945,354	\$6,231,001	\$8,424,752	\$7,563,869
REVENUES				
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	426,373	427,460	437,640	437,640
Use of Money & Property	5,951	22,525	20,000	20,000
Revenue from Other Agencies	5,004,264	5,725,752	7,257,863	6,023,705
Charges for Services	52,975	144,800	122,445	123,046
Other Revenue	15,946	38,089	60,000	60,000
Transfers In	115,522	42,753	36,786	220,824
TOTAL REVENUES	\$5,621,031	\$6,401,379	\$7,934,734	\$6,885,215
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$324,323)	\$170,378	(\$490,018)	(\$678,654)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
245 Traffic Safety	529,896	394,316	437,640	437,640
251 Suppl Law Enforcement Services	213,022	325,920	504,657	543,384
252 Police Department Grants	4,516,887	5,122,623	6,815,112	5,726,767
253 Inmate Welfare Fund	50,364	50,245	45,000	60,000
254 Local Law Enf Block Grant	188,497	85,126	77,343	91,078
256 Asset Seizure	446,688	252,771	545,000	705,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$5,945,354	\$6,231,001	\$8,424,752	\$7,563,869
REVENUES				
245 Traffic Safety	425,760	427,702	437,640	437,640
251 Suppl Law Enforcement Services	228,244	388,412	401,014	401,014
252 Police Department Grants	4,520,563	5,125,949	6,728,737	5,665,483
253 Inmate Welfare Fund	13,610	16,043	30,000	30,000
254 Local Law Enf Block Grant	174,966	95,989	77,343	91,078
256 Asset Seizure	257,888	347,284	260,000	260,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$5,621,031	\$6,401,379	\$7,934,734	\$6,885,215
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$324,323)	\$170,378	(\$490,018)	(\$678,654)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 252

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
CBAG Deputy Director	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Deputy Exec Dir	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Director Of IV-LECC	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Executive Director	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Admin Analyst II	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Analyst	4.00	-	(2.00)	2.00
FA Director Of SD LECC	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Geospatial Intel Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Graphic Designer/Wbmstr	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Info Security Program Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA LECC IT Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Ntwrk Administrator II	4.00	-	-	4.00
FA Program Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Program Assistant	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Program Manager	2.00	1.00	(2.00)	1.00
FA Public Safety Analyst	2.00	(1.00)	(1.00)	-
FA RCFL Ntwk Engineer	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Sr Intelligence Analyst	-	-	5.00	5.00
FA Sr Public Safety Analyst	4.00	1.00	(5.00)	-
FA Sr Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Peace Officer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Police Agent	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Comm Relations Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Sergeant	2.00	-	-	2.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	40.00	1.00	(5.00)	36.00

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	59,175	97,409	2,281	400
Other Expenses	1,400	500	1,200	1,200
Transfers Out	0	2,352	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$60,575	\$100,261	\$3,481	\$1,600
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(1,254)	1,820	0	0
Transfers In	59,545	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$58,291	\$1,820	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$2,284)	(\$98,441)	(\$3,481)	(\$1,600)

FUND DETAIL

FUND #	FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES					
261	California Library Service Act	24,867	88,920	0	0
262	Public Library Act	34,308	8,489	1,881	0
265	CA Dept of Education Sect. 321	0	2,352	0	0
267	McCandliss Cultural Arts	1,400	500	1,600	1,600
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$60,575	\$100,261	\$3,481	\$1,600
REVENUES					
261	California Library Service Act	58,540	1,637	0	0
262	Public Library Act	(168)	32	0	0
267	McCandliss Cultural Arts	(81)	151	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES		\$58,291	\$1,820	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY		(\$2,284)	(\$98,441)	(\$3,481)	(\$1,600)

SUNDRY GRANTS & MISC FUND

270

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	412,662	595,186	772,804	827,244
Supplies and Services	682,825	842,356	745,076	573,409
Other Expenses	415,515	278,622	365,484	107,333
Capital	5,173	413,519	309,173	0
Transfers Out	112,736	9,889	0	0
CIP Project Expenditures	2,509,427	514,060	386,310	0
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	19,642	306,267	940,500	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,157,980	\$2,959,899	\$3,519,347	\$1,507,986
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(187)	1,521	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	2,274,972	1,703,950	3,312,325	1,314,484
Charges for Services	129,650	117,055	120,000	73,500
Other Revenue	2,236,671	25,067	22,333	22,333
Transfers In	52,226	43,060	64,689	62,326
TOTAL REVENUES	\$4,693,332	\$1,890,653	\$3,519,347	\$1,472,643
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$535,352	(\$1,069,246)	\$0	(\$35,343)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
268 State Recreation Grants	62,736	0	0	0
269 Other Grant Fund	67,562	243,315	0	0
270 Mobile Home Rent Review Progra	99,824	67,025	120,000	93,000
272 Federal Grants Fund	1,178,156	1,556,035	2,347,398	1,316,810
273 State Grants Fund	551,407	673,358	1,029,616	75,843
274 ARRA Fund	2,198,295	420,166	22,333	22,333
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$4,157,980	\$2,959,899	\$3,519,347	\$1,507,986
REVENUES				
269 Other Grant Fund	298,000	16,737	0	0
270 Mobile Home Rent Review Progra	129,459	118,495	120,000	73,500
272 Federal Grants Fund	1,085,599	1,575,961	2,347,398	1,316,810
273 State Grants Fund	529,930	158,867	1,029,616	60,000
274 ARRA Fund	2,650,344	20,593	22,333	22,333
TOTAL REVENUES	\$4,693,332	\$1,890,653	\$3,519,347	\$1,472,643
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$535,352	(\$1,069,246)	\$0	(\$35,343)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 272

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Emergency Svcs Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
GIS Specialist	1.00	1.00	-	2.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	2.00	1.00	-	3.00

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	686,793	782,723	990,910	1,035,473
Supplies and Services	1,056,540	903,015	3,768,394	2,307,229
Other Expenses	913,224	689,476	1,658,450	1,014,079
Capital	0	52,659	8,250	4,600
Utilities	30	56	5,100	5,100
Transfers Out	120,959	132,585	107,585	107,585
CIP Project Expenditures	105,000	2,098,662	(21,881)	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,882,546	\$4,659,176	\$6,516,808	\$4,474,066
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(7,528)	16,680	0	0
Revenue from Other Agencies	1,602,544	1,225,335	4,792,489	2,663,079
Charges for Services	1,071,724	1,104,573	1,264,279	1,262,279
Other Revenue	306,839	2,353,731	200,000	110,000
Transfers In	13,374	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,986,953	\$4,700,319	\$6,256,768	\$4,035,358
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$104,407	\$41,143	(\$260,040)	(\$438,708)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
281 Waste Management & Recycling	249,306	174,825	1,311,697	987,385
282 Environmental Services Fund	1,252,440	1,335,673	1,699,564	1,810,987
285 Energy Conservation	1,380,800	3,148,678	3,505,547	1,675,694
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2,882,546	\$4,659,176	\$6,516,808	\$4,474,066
REVENUES				
281 Waste Management & Recycling	248,119	177,760	1,289,744	987,385
282 Environmental Services Fund	1,377,252	1,350,567	1,464,279	1,372,279
285 Energy Conservation	1,361,582	3,171,992	3,502,745	1,675,694
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,986,953	\$4,700,319	\$6,256,768	\$4,035,358
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$104,407	\$41,143	(\$260,040)	(\$438,708)

STAFFING SUMMARY - 282

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Environ Svcs Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Environ Svcs Prog Mgr	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Recycl Spec I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Recycling Specialist II	3.00	-	1.00	4.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	5.00	-	1.00	6.00

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	222,722	296,107	348,100	348,100
Other Expenses	24,361	0	0	0
Utilities	754	776	800	800
Transfers Out	340,463	340,463	487,378	210,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$588,300	\$637,346	\$836,278	\$558,900
REVENUES				
Licenses and Permits	(1,180)	0	23,750	23,750
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	600	(4,341)	5,000	5,000
Use of Money & Property	(961)	1,850	0	0
Charges for Services	587,887	600,025	555,500	555,500
TOTAL REVENUES	\$586,346	\$597,534	\$584,250	\$584,250
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$1,954)	(\$39,812)	(\$252,028)	\$25,350

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	48,032	13,303	43,427	16,527
Other Expenses	332,381	381,381	1,467,566	1,289,420
Capital	0	1,161	75,419	75,419
Transfers Out	817,073	752,752	756,715	758,243
CIP Project Expenditures	3,090,468	381,766	0	468,292
Non-CIP Project Expenditures	1,199,362	2,755,132	1,226,612	520,592
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$5,487,316	\$4,285,495	\$3,569,739	\$3,128,493
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	40,950	12,067	79,000	79,000
Revenue from Other Agencies	3,055,233	3,415,216	3,406,739	3,019,493
Charges for Services	132	140	0	0
Other Revenue	205,184	55,710	0	0
Transfers In	27,538	0	30,981	9,598
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,329,037	\$3,483,133	\$3,516,720	\$3,108,091
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$2,158,279)	(\$802,362)	(\$53,019)	(\$20,402)

FUND DETAIL

FUND # FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
311 CDBG Housing Program	25,432	16,685	451,500	46,100
314 Emergency Shelter Grant Prog	86,380	162,060	151,402	153,270
321 Home Program	520,697	1,808,221	949,902	922,183
333 FY2000 Comm Dev Block Grant	4,854,807	2,298,529	2,016,935	2,006,940
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$5,487,316	\$4,285,495	\$3,569,739	\$3,128,493
REVENUES				
311 CDBG Housing Program	51,346	21,643	451,500	46,100
314 Emergency Shelter Grant Prog	86,380	162,060	151,402	153,270
321 Home Program	488,847	1,756,996	949,902	922,183
325 CDBG Program - Income Projects	(340)	688	0	0
333 FY2000 Comm Dev Block Grant	2,702,804	1,541,746	1,963,916	1,986,538
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,329,037	\$3,483,133	\$3,516,720	\$3,108,091
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$2,158,279)	(\$802,362)	(\$53,019)	(\$20,402)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	7,326,683	6,272,554	7,406,837	7,629,005
Supplies and Services	0	0	0	126,905
Other Expenses	0	0	0	1,000
Other Expenses	1,869,929	1,777,609	1,886,707	1,942,358
Utilities	0	0	0	10,500
Utilities	2,158,934	2,409,959	2,875,327	3,049,715
CIP Project Expenditures	0	0	200,000	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$11,355,546	\$10,460,122	\$12,368,871	\$12,759,483
REVENUES				
Use of Money & Property	(82,226)	169,146	0	0
Other Revenue	12,142,259	9,204,603	11,862,234	12,621,078
Other Revenue	0	0	0	138,405
TOTAL REVENUES	\$12,060,033	\$9,373,749	\$11,862,234	\$12,759,483
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$704,487	(\$1,086,373)	(\$506,637)	\$0

FUND DETAIL

FUND #	FUND DESCRIPTION	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES					
342	CFD 11-M RHR McMillin	53,047	77,712	136,650	152,521
343	CFD 12-M Vlg7	465,789	372,688	472,569	469,962
344	CFD 13-M Vlg2	125,762	111,442	171,155	222,930
345	CFD 12M - OR Village 7	498,215	416,130	457,600	463,261
346	Not in Use	0	0	0	138,405
352	Bay Blvd Landscaping Dist	7,140	6,618	10,661	12,294
353	Eastlake Maintenance Dist #1	278,009	274,687	364,524	408,743
354	Open Space District #1	83,358	74,347	106,506	112,134
355	Open Space District #2	19,480	17,600	24,649	35,602
356	Open Space District #3	50,549	52,544	59,512	74,769
357	Open Space District #4	100,501	89,245	97,844	116,984
358	Open Space District #5	56,233	47,562	53,288	64,629
359	Open Space District #6	32,994	30,823	35,818	44,049
361	Open Space District #7	15,679	5,941	19,725	11,451
362	Open Space District #8	84,753	76,322	87,957	104,949
363	Open Space District #9	86,429	79,471	90,655	107,252
364	Open Space District #10	88,641	77,286	91,925	107,776
365	Open Space District #11	172,000	152,951	180,550	214,242

OPEN SPACE DISTRICT FUND

350

367	Open Space District #14	411,196	431,230	462,170	471,556
368	Open Space District #15	28,518	24,745	39,277	50,112
369	Open Space District #17	9,971	10,125	11,680	26,891
371	Open Space District #18	160,393	138,268	166,215	171,516
372	Open Space District #20	1,294,705	1,310,310	1,546,914	1,664,218
373	Open Space District #23	51,803	42,706	47,156	51,430
374	Open Space District #24	35,492	34,290	53,087	66,643
375	Open Space District #26	14,387	14,443	17,583	20,654
376	Open Space District #31	160,359	128,413	202,047	160,172
378	CFD 07M-Eastlk II Woods, Vista	621,887	525,515	591,945	661,776
379	CFD 08M-Vlg 6 McM & Oty Ranch	907,143	807,745	940,601	994,455
380	CFD 09M OR Vlg II	1,021,932	891,083	995,457	1,025,267
382	CFD 99-2 Otay Ranch Vlg 1 We	780,462	710,433	829,887	825,691
386	Otay Ranch Acquisition Dist	428,742	445,890	719,000	505,000
387	CFD 98-3 Sunbow 2	1,003,410	870,360	916,105	884,381
388	Comm Facility 97-1 (Otay Rnch)	2,203,641	2,109,216	2,356,639	2,303,677
389	Otay Ranch Village 1,2,6,7,12	2,926	1,981	11,520	14,091
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$11,355,546	\$10,460,122	\$12,368,871	\$12,759,483
REVENUES					
342	CFD 11-M RHR McMillin	94,557	32,240	136,650	152,521
343	CFD 12-M Vlg7	594,145	12,873	462,569	469,962
344	CFD 13-M Vlg2	213,130	125,532	171,155	222,930
345	CFD 12M - OR Village 7	389,060	357,560	442,600	463,261
346	Not in Use	0	0	0	138,405
351	Town Centre Landscaping Dist I	(125)	278	0	0
352	Bay Blvd Landscaping Dist	(306)	527	10,661	12,294
353	Eastlake Maintenance Dist #1	308,895	229,564	319,524	408,743
354	Open Space District #1	78,997	65,422	81,506	112,134
355	Open Space District #2	13,972	14,659	24,649	35,602
356	Open Space District #3	49,992	49,183	54,512	74,769
357	Open Space District #4	85,103	85,940	97,844	116,984
358	Open Space District #5	50,571	49,007	53,288	64,629
359	Open Space District #6	31,521	32,038	35,818	44,049
361	Open Space District #7	13,655	11,293	11,725	11,451
362	Open Space District #8	69,378	70,109	82,957	104,949
363	Open Space District #9	68,408	69,707	80,655	107,252
364	Open Space District #10	78,221	80,304	84,925	107,776
365	Open Space District #11	162,122	133,224	170,550	214,242
366	Open Space District #13	2	3	0	0
367	Open Space District #14	335,839	345,081	442,170	471,556
368	Open Space District #15	20,948	21,806	29,277	50,112
369	Open Space District #17	8,168	8,327	11,680	26,891
371	Open Space District #18	148,619	151,737	160,215	171,516
372	Open Space District #20	1,379,378	548,803	1,455,914	1,664,218
373	Open Space District #23	29,820	21,314	47,156	51,430

OPEN SPACE DISTRICT FUND**350**

374	Open Space District #24	29,205	29,866	38,087	66,643
375	Open Space District #26	10,750	11,049	17,583	20,654
376	Open Space District #31	127,309	131,024	157,410	160,172
378	CFD 07M-Eastlk II Woods, Vista	895,048	566,564	571,945	661,776
379	CFD 08M-Vlg 6 McM & Oty Ranch	1,241,913	1,218,945	925,601	994,455
380	CFD 09M OR Vlg II	925,298	931,909	995,457	1,025,267
382	CFD 99-2 Otay Ranch Vlg 1 We	802,407	692,729	784,887	825,691
383	Town Ctr Business Imprv Distr	(3,210)	194	0	0
386	Otay Ranch Acquisition Dist	100,216	122,817	719,000	505,000
387	CFD 98-3 Sunbow 2	871,933	679,592	886,105	884,381
388	Comm Facility 97-1 (Otay Rnch)	2,825,849	2,468,370	2,286,639	2,303,677
389	Otay Ranch Village 1,2,6,7,12	9,245	4,159	11,520	14,091
TOTAL REVENUES		\$12,060,033	\$9,373,749	\$11,862,234	\$12,759,483
NET FUND ACTIVITY		\$704,487	(\$1,086,373)	(\$506,637)	\$0

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	576,747	300,000	300,000
Capital	0	131,062	300,000	300,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$0	\$707,809	\$600,000	\$600,000
REVENUES				
Other Local Taxes	627,766	654,842	600,000	600,000
Use of Money & Property	(675)	4,924	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$627,091	\$659,766	\$600,000	\$600,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$627,091	(\$48,043)	\$0	\$0

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services	0	235,080	505,041	294,242
Supplies and Services	0	220,673	307,203	134,039
Capital	0	275,764	160,701	0
Transfers Out	143,513	559,846	746,051	833,510
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$143,513	\$1,291,363	\$1,718,996	\$1,261,791
REVENUES				
Revenue from Other Agencies	214,000	1,316,182	1,534,429	1,475,907
TOTAL REVENUES	\$214,000	\$1,316,182	\$1,534,429	\$1,475,907
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$70,487	\$24,819	(\$184,567)	\$214,116

STAFFING SUMMARY - 234

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR	FY 2015-16 CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EMS Nurse Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	1.00	-	-	1.00

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	0	80,000	80,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$0	\$0	\$80,000	\$80,000
REVENUES				
Transfers In	80,000	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	\$80,000	\$0	(\$80,000)	(\$80,000)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	117,131	261,530	713,439	713,439
Other Expenses	1,200,913	385,083	940,000	940,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,318,044	\$646,613	\$1,653,439	\$1,653,439
REVENUES				
Other Revenue	0	304,810	0	0
Transfers In	1,164,000	1,321,009	429,000	520,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$1,164,000	\$1,625,819	\$429,000	\$520,000
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$154,044)	\$979,206	(\$1,224,439)	(\$1,133,439)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	0	0	600,000	284,576
Capital	362	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$362	\$0	\$600,000	\$284,576
REVENUES				
Transfers In	0	600,000	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$362)	\$600,000	(\$600,000)	(\$284,576)

FUND SUMMARY

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
EXPENDITURES				
Supplies and Services	594,867	622,965	711,610	733,610
Other Expenses	3,135,192	2,472,973	2,669,000	2,669,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$3,730,059	\$3,095,938	\$3,380,610	\$3,402,610
REVENUES				
Other Revenue	2,909,831	2,109,108	2,652,549	3,249,426
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,909,831	\$2,109,108	\$2,652,549	\$3,249,426
NET FUND ACTIVITY	(\$820,228)	(\$986,830)	(\$728,061)	(\$153,184)



NON-CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Project Type

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Housing Services	\$50,000
At-Risk and Homeless Youth Svcs.	\$39,550
F.R.C. Emergency and Basic Services	\$39,312
Family Violence Treatment Program	\$39,000
Fair Housing Services	\$35,000
C.V. Solar Affordable Homes Pgm.	\$30,000
Norman Park Senior Center Services	\$30,000
KidCare Express Mobile Medical Unit	\$27,000
Rice Elementary Fire Hydrant Project	\$20,855
Therapeutic Program	\$20,100
Food 4 Kids Backpack Program	\$15,000
Home Delivered Meals for Seniors	\$12,000
Rotational Shelter Network	\$11,000
South Bay Food Program	\$10,000
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT TOTAL	\$378,817

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT

	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Rapid ReHousing Program and HMIS	\$78,998
Casa Nueva Vida I	\$62,777
EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT TOTAL	\$141,775

GAS TAX

	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Tree Trimming - Citywide	\$100,000
GAS TAX TOTAL	\$100,000

NON-CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Project Type

GENERAL FUND

	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
PW Mobile Radio Replacement	\$256,000
IFAS Upgrade	\$159,316
Civic Center Library Auditorium Remodel	\$75,000
Eucalyptus Park Improvements	\$18,700
GENERAL FUND TOTAL	\$509,016

SALT CREEK SEWER BASIN DIF

	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
Preserve Maintenance Enhancement	\$1,091,264
SALT CREEK SEWER BASIN DIF TOTAL	\$1,091,264

GRAND TOTAL - ALL PROJECTS

\$2,220,872

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Summary

In January 2012, the City Manager presented to the City Council the Fiscal Recovery and Progress Plan (Fiscal Years 2013 to 2017). This plan is an expansion to the Fiscal Health Plan and is intended to identify major challenges the City faces in moving from financial stability to financial sustainability and eventually to financial resiliency. The Plan identifies the major components of City finances such as General Fund revenues, Pension Liability, Debt Service and Infrastructure, provides an assessment of the status or level of risk for each component and identifies next steps to address the issues identified. The Plan uses the Continuous Improvement Visual Controls (Green, Yellow and Red) to indicate the status of each particular component.

Over the past several years of a declining economy, City revenues have been reduced dramatically. As a result, the number of City staff as well as City supplies and services budgets has been decreased significantly. With the City’s efforts to improve efficiencies through the Continuous Improvement Program, consolidate departments and reduce overhead, and moderately improving revenues the level of service in many key City functions have slightly improved.

This report is intended to identify key functions in each department and provide a management assessment of the current level of service, including the above Continuous Improvement Visual Controls for ease of reference. The following visual categories assist the reader in determining the status of the current level of service for each function:

Green – Objective achieved. Level of service standards are being met.

Yellow – Caution. Not fully achieving level of service goals.

Red – High risk area. Additional funding or operational efficiencies needed.

FUNCTION OVERVIEW

The following section summarizes each department’s key functions and their changes from January 2014 to January 2015.

Animal Care Facility

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Animal Control	■	■
Animal Care Services	■	■
Animal Placement	■	■

City Attorney

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Department Support Services	■	■
City Council, Boards and Commissions	■	■
Public Outreach	■	■
Claims and Insurance	N/A	■
Proactive Risk Management	N/A	■
“Offensive” Litigation	■	■
Defense of the City – Standard Litigation	■	■
Defense of the City – Specialty Litigation	■	■
Code Enforcement	■	■

City Clerk

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Manage Records of Legislative Actions (City Council, Housing Authority, and Public Finance Authority)	■	■
Prepare and Distribute Agenda Packets	■	■
Customer Service	■	■
Boards & Commissions	■	■
Elections	■	■
Carry Out Legally Required Duties as Filing Officer	■	■
Post/Publish Legally Required Notices	■	■
Maintain/Update Municipal Code and Council Policy Manual	■	■
Public Records Act Requests	■	■
Citywide Records Management Program	■	■

Development Services Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Project Reviews	■	■
Building Plan Review	■	■
Building Inspection	■	■
General Code Enforcement	■	■
Affordable Housing/Grant Administration	■	■
General Plan Implementation & Maintenance	■	■
Long Range Planning Reviews	N/A	■

Economic Development Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Business Support	N/A	■
Regional and Bi-National Collaboration	N/A	■

Finance Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Financial Compliance Reporting	■	■
Payroll Services	■	■
Accounts Payable	■	■
Debt Service Management	■	■
Banking and Investment Services	■	■
Fixed Asset Management	■	■
Deferred Compensation	■	■
Tax Administration Program	■	■
Accounts Receivable	■	■
Collections	■	■
Revenue Generation/Fee Management	■	■
Acquisitions	■	■
Budget Development	■	■
Financial Management Information Analysis	■	■
Long-Term Financial Planning	■	■

Fire Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Dispatch	■	■
Turnout	■	■
Response/Travel Time	■	■
100% of Mandatory Training Completed Annually	■	■

General Use Certificate Inspections	■	■
Fire Company Inspection Program	■	■
Fire Safety Engineering Plan Reviews	■	■
Origin and Cause of Fire Investigations	■	■
Purchasing	■	■
Contracts	■	■
Payroll	■	■
Records Management/Reports	■	■
Data Research	■	■

Human Resources Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Recruitment & Selection	■	■
Classification/Compensation	■	■
Training	■	■
Offer Comprehensive Benefits	■	■
Employee Wellness Initiative	■	■
Administration of Retiree Health Insurance and COBRA	■	■
Ensure Compliance with Employee Benefit Laws and Regulations	■	■
Data Processing and Maintenance	■	■
Employee Online Enrollment	■	■
Management of Tort Claims	■	N/A
Administration of Insurances	■	N/A
Insurance in Contracts	■	N/A
Disability Management	■	■
Occupational Health and Safety	■	■
Recovery on Damages to City Property	■	■

Information Technology Services

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Operations & Telecommunications	■	■
Programming and Application Support – Custom Applications	■	■
Programming and Application Support – Support of 3 rd Party Software	■	■
Help Desk Response	■	■
Server Environment	N/A	■
Network Uptime	■	■
Geographic Information Systems (GIS)	■	■

Library

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Open Hours		
Civic Center Branch	■	■
South Chula Vista Branch	■	■
Otay Ranch Branch	■	■
Space	■	■
Staff Assistance	■	■
Collection	■	■
Information Technology	■	■

Marketing and Communications

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Marketing and Communications Program	■	■
Community Engagement	■	■
City of Chula Vista Programs and Services	■	■
Big Picture Projects	■	■
City Website	■	■

Police Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Community Patrol	■	■
Community Engagement	■	■
Criminal Investigations	■	■
Support Operations	■	■
Employee Services	■	■
Police Dispatch	■	■
Police Technology	N/A	■
Administrative Services	■	■

Public Works

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Roadway Maintenance	■	■
Pothole Repair	■	■
Litter and Weed Abatement	■	■
Graffiti Abatement	■	■
Traffic Striping and Signing	■	■
Street Sweeping	■	■
Traffic Signal and Street Light Maintenance	■	■
Vehicle Service and Repairs	■	■
Preventative Maintenance	■	■

Monitor MTS Services for Chula Vista Community	■	N/A
Asset Management Program (AMP)	■	■
Maintenance of Districts	■	■
Urban Forestry	■	■
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	■	■
Construction	■	■
Drainage Management System	■	■
Wastewater Management System	■	■
Maintain City Parks	■	■
Safety and Security of Parks	■	■
Design	■	■
Surveys	■	■
Building and Park Construction	■	■
Compliance with Waste Management Act (AB939) and Waste Diversion Act (AB341)	■	■
Citywide Solid Waste Collection Services	■	■
Household Hazardous Waste Disposal Services	■	■
Municipal Energy & Water Conservation Upgrades	■	■
Community Energy & Water Conservation Services	■	■
Resource Conservation Commission Climate Change Working Group & City Operations Green Team	■	■
City Building Facilities Service Requests	■	■
Perform Routine Preventative Maintenance on City Building Facilities	■	■
Minor CIP Projects	■	■
Basic Cleaning Services	■	■
Detailed Cleaning Events	■	■
Special Event Set-Ups and Break-Downs	■	■
Traffic Engineering	■	■
Wastewater Engineering	■	■
Advanced Planning	■	■

Recreation Department

Function	Jan 2014	Jan 2015
Provision of Recreational Swim	■	■
Operation of Recreation Hours	■	■
Operation of Norman Park Center	■	■
Provision of After-School “Critical Hours” Programming	■	■
Provision of City-Sponsored Youth Leagues, Programs, and Camps	■	■
Provision of City-Sponsored Adult Leagues and Programs	■	■
Therapeutics Programming	■	■
Aquatic Facilities Community Use	■	■
Arena Soccer Facilities for Community Use	■	■
Provision of Instructional Swimming Programs	■	■
Provision of Adult Lap Swim	■	■
Provision of Contractual Classes	■	■
Provision of Elementary Learn-to-Swim Programs	■	■
Facility Lease Agreements at Norman Park Center	■	■
Facility Lease Agreements at Parkway Community Center	N/A	■
Provision of Community Capacity-Building Programs	■	■
Fiscal Management	■	■
Policies and Procedures	■	■
Information/Technology	■	■
Marketing and Communications	■	■
Provision of Safe, Adequate, and Appropriate Recreational Equipment	■	■
Community Access to Ball Fields	■	■
Ball Field Rentals	■	■
Mt. San Miguel Park Tournaments	■	■
Provision of Water Safety Programs	■	■

ANIMAL CARE FACILITY

ANIMAL CONTROL (Yellow)

The ACF currently provides Animal Control services for Chula Vista as well as Lemon Grove and Imperial Beach under contract. There are two Animal Control Officers (ACO) funded for Chula Vista. The Animal Control Officers are generally able to adequately respond to calls for service (reactive) from Chula Vista residents and can be backed up as need by the ACO's assigned to Lemon Grove and Imperial Beach. Priority calls address public safety issues. This function would be considered (Green) if the ACF was able to provide "proactive" Animal Control services. This would require one additional ACO.


ANIMAL CARE SERVICES (Green)

The ACF currently provides Animal Care kenneling services for Chula Vista as well as Lemon Grove, Imperial Beach, and National City under contract. This service level is considered (Green). The ACF consistently meets the standards for kenneling in municipal shelters. The expansion of the cattery has significantly reduced overcrowding and improved the health and behavior of cats.

ANIMAL PLACEMENT (Yellow)

The ACF currently places 85% of dogs (goal area is 89%) and 40% of cats (goal to reach 50%) through adoptions and rescue organizations and currently does not euthanize any cats or dogs which are healthy and without behavioral issues. In addition to trying to increase the percentage of placements, another significant goal of the ACF is to reduce the number of intakes of animals in Chula Vista. Since acquiring the spay/neuter vehicle back in December 2011, the ACF has performed over 2,500 surgeries at no cost to low income families in Chula Vista and its contract cities. This function would move to Green if we could decrease intakes into the shelter.

Staff has implemented new initiatives to try and reduce the number of animal intakes in Chula Vista. In 2013, City Council approved changes to City Ordinances regarding animals. Since implementing these initiatives there has been a reduction in intakes of cats; however, the intake of dogs continues to increase, which appears to be related to the depressed economy.



CITY ATTORNEY

The City Attorney's Office serves as legal counsel to the City Council, all City Boards and Commissions, City Manager, City Clerk and all City Departments. The Office's primary responsibility is to provide these clients with the legal services they need to develop and implement City policy and to deliver City services in a lawful and efficient manner. The Office also defends the City against claims and lawsuits, files claims on behalf of the City when necessary, advocates for City's interests in administrative proceedings and enforces the City's municipal code.

The City Attorney's Office is staffed with nine full-attorneys, one manager, one risk management specialist, and three administrative assistants. From time to time the City Attorney also engages outside counsel to assist with major litigation or specialty law issues. Volunteer legal interns also provide valuable support.

ADVISORY SERVICES (Yellow)

The City Attorney's Office "Advisory Group" provides legal advice and services that involves legal research, analysis, and/or document production across a broad spectrum of legal disciplines including federal, state and local government law, corporate law, elections law, public and private contracts, land use, regulations of businesses and personal conduct, finance, economic development, labor and employment, environmental, and real estate law. The types of Advisory Group work is driven largely by the legal needs and demands of its various departments. The City Council and Boards and Commissions present additional needs and demands.

The primary challenges to achieving optimum service levels for the Advisory Group are: (1) very-high work volumes, (2) work flow volatility, (3) competing demands for services within and across departments; and, (4) the complexity of many work assignments. Combined, these challenges can result in below optimum service levels including: (a) slower than optimum response times, (b) oral versus written advice (when written advice is more desirable for clarity and consistency) and (c) inadequate time and opportunities for the delivery of proactive services (e.g., training, form standardization, opinion banks, code review and updates, and "standard work" capture).

With the addition of the office manager, there is now a person dedicated to developing and managing processes to improve efficiency and more effectively manage the City Attorney's Office resources.

- **Department Support Services (Yellow)**

The Advisory Group provides legal service to every City department. To provide this service effectively requires a broad spectrum of legal knowledge, training and experience, along with a working understanding of each "client" department's own workings and challenges. The type of legal work required by each department varies, of course, but typically falls within one of the following categories:

Contracts: Negotiate, draft, review, interpret, and help enforce every conceivable type of contract or agreement, including: service and infrastructure agreements with other governmental agencies, franchises for the provision of utilities, solid waste disposal, telecommunications, and ambulance transport, development agreements, sales and acquisitions of real property, leases, licenses, subdivision improvement agreements, financings, public works contracts, consulting agreements, labor group MOUs and side letter agreements, waivers, indemnities and releases, affordable housing, and public private partnerships. Also draft and interpret procurement policies.

Contract Standardization: The City Attorney works with staff from all departments to evaluate, update, revise and/or draft contracts to ensure that the contracts comply with current law and City policies, and that they contain adequate provisions to protect the interests of City and its residents in the event of any adverse incident or dispute.

State and Local Regulations: Provide on-going legal advice regarding City (1) fees, assessments and taxes; (2) land use regulations, including general and specific plans, zoning, special use permits, development impact fees, tentative and final maps, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and related environmental and resource requirements; and (3) code provisions regulating business and individual conduct. Advice includes assistance with the preparation of any proposed

revisions to the Municipal Code, and with interpretations of and responses to federal and state legislation.


Open and Ethical Government Compliance: Provide on-going counsel on numerous legal matters relating to elections law, the Brown Act, the Public Records Act, the Political Reform Act, conflicts of interest, the noticing and conduct of City Council meetings, budget approval, the City’s Ethics Code, and related City ordinances and policies.

Risk Management and Public Safety: Advise on personnel and disciplinary matters; coordinate with risk management staff to manage claims and assure adequate insurance coverage. Provide on-going counsel regarding police response and enforcement activities and protocols including constitutional law updates and recommendations on policy/training modifications; assist with community outreach and proactive policing policies and programs designed to reduce crime and disorder; prepare, review, and revise ordinances and agreements for police, fire and public works regulations and services.

Agenda Review: Review and advise on every agenda item for legal compliance, including conflicts of interest, CEQA and identification of special risks; prepare ordinances, resolutions and agreements, and approve all such items as to form and legality.

The current overall department support service level is (Yellow). It should be noted, however, that service levels to individual departments can—and do—vary, both throughout the year (depending largely on work volumes), and from department to department (depending both upon work volumes and the availability of in-house expertise). Achieving a high level of service with greater consistency, both in times of higher and lower volume work flows, and achieving this high level of service throughout the organization, is what the Department is striving to achieve. This greater consistency is also what will be necessary in order to warrant a service level rating of (Green) for departmental support services.

- City Council, Boards and Commissions (Yellow)
The City Attorney attends all City Council meetings and workshops and advises the City Council on all legal matters. Staff attorneys also regularly attend meetings of the Ethics Commission, Planning Commission, Rent Review Commission, Civil Service Commission, Charter Review Commission and the Districting Commission. Advisory Group attorneys review all agendas and documents for these meetings, and are the primary staff for the Ethics, Charter Review and Districting commissions. The Advisory Group also provides legal counsel on an “as-needed” basis to all other City Boards and Commissions. This service level is (Yellow). More frequent and tailored training for these groups on Brown Act and Ethics laws, along with more formal written advice, provided in advance, on key legal issues, is necessary in order to move this service level to (Green).
- Public Outreach (Yellow)
The office frequently works with City departments to conduct community outreach programs to identify and respond to community issues and concerns. Direct public inquiries are also responded to by telephone and email. The City Attorney website is frequently updated to provide referrals to legal resources and information. This service level is (Yellow). City Attorney website enhancements to add content and explanations of the legal parameters that regulate City and individual conduct, and additional open government practices and policies will be necessary to move this service level to (Green).



LITIGATION AND CODE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES**(Yellow)**

The City Attorney's Office responsibilities include representation of the City in litigation at all levels of state and federal courts and administrative agencies, and enforcement of the City's Municipal Code. The overall service level for the Litigation Group in meeting litigation and code enforcement needs and demands is (Yellow). Administrative improvements in document and case management (including document management software), more strategic use of outside attorneys, and other resource management enhancements and/or additions that create more proactive "risk management" time, will be necessary before this service level can be increased to (Green). Recent incorporation of Claims and Insurance management from Human Resources to the City Attorney's Office affords enhanced ability to achieve category (Green) in Proactive Risk Management.

- Claims and Insurance **(Green)**

Tort Claims: Litigation Group works with Risk Management daily providing legal advice and settlement authority consensus articulated in Municipal Code on "tort claims", where negligence or misconduct is alleged against the City. Collaborative actions include evaluation of potential liability and damages exposure, including case facts as impacted by government, and municipal code, case law; consideration of risk transfer including but not limited to contract indemnity and insurance clauses favoring city; reporting periodically to excess insurers in compliance with city's coverage rights and obligations; determination of whether best interests of city call for efforts to settle, mediate, or litigate to facilitate best practices claim resolution on a case by case basis. When unresolved claims proceed to litigation, Risk and Litigation Group continue to coordinate case management through final resolution whether by final judgement, settlement, or dismissal.

Insurance Oversight to Protect City Assets

This includes maintenance of property insurance policy schedules applicable to City's real property, business property including vehicles, crime, boiler and machinery; collection of information from departments citywide to facilitate insurance policy

renewal applications including liability (municipal, cyber and pollution) and property insurance including crime coverages; and assisting in recovery from third parties and their insurers responsible for damage to City property and personnel. T

Contract Risk Transfer

Risk Management reviews and negotiates the insurance provisions in City contracts to ensure that the requirements transfer risk in the way that most protects the City and reviews and verifies, as needed, to ensure insurance compliance.

- Proactive Risk Management **(Yellow)**

Training: The City Attorney provides periodic training to individual departments, and elected and appointed officials regarding municipal law to ensure the City's activities remain lawful and efficient, and respectful of individual rights. This also minimizes exposure to costly and time-consuming lawsuits. A more robust program in this area is under development to more proactively mitigate or eliminate City's liability exposure.

- "Offensive" Litigation **(Yellow)**


With City Council approval, the City Attorney initiates litigation against outside entities or individuals who cause harm to the City in some manner (i.e., breach of contract or failing to provide indemnity owed to City on a matter). This typically occurs only when reasonable resolution attempts by staff and the City Attorney fail to yield a satisfactory remedy, and the City Attorney has determined it is entitled to a legal remedy. The City Attorney handles standard offensive litigation in-house in order to maximize cost recovery to the City. Although funding is limited, the City Attorney utilizes outside counsel for offensive litigation when the matter involves specialized legal issues.

- Defense of the City – Standard Litigation **(Yellow)**

The City Attorney defends the City in personal injury, property damage, dangerous condition of public property, and civil rights cases using in-house "Litigation Group" staff whenever possible. The addition of a litigation Deputy in FY 2011/2012 has substantially increased the capacity of the office to handle matters in-house and to be more assertive with "terminating motions" at early

stages of litigation. The City Attorney’s goals in defensive litigation are to mitigate or eliminate risk to the City through streamlined discovery, preparing and filing terminating motions, and settling matters when it is in the City’s best interest to do so.

- Defense of the City– Specialty Litigation (Yellow)
The City Attorney utilizes outside counsel to defend the City in litigation involving specialized legal issues. Recent reductions in funding for outside counsel results in service close to (Red). The office is working on systems to better manage these reduced resources.
- Code Enforcement (Yellow)
The City Attorney assists with the enforcement of City Code provisions related to building standards, zoning requirements, neighborhood preservation, and other conditions or conduct affecting public health, safety or welfare. Violations are addressed by employing the various legal enforcement tools available to the City: administrative actions, civil actions and/or criminal prosecution.



CITY CLERK**CITY CLERK OPERATIONS**

- Manage records of legislative actions taken by the City Council, Housing Authority, and Public Financing Authority (Green)

The City Clerk's office prepares minutes and finalizes agreements, resolutions and ordinances for the City Council, Housing Authority and Public Financing Authority. The City Clerk's goal is to provide minutes to the City Council for approval within two weeks of a meeting. Within the last three years, the delay in preparation has been reduced from five months to two weeks. An upgraded software program was implemented in January 2014 to further enhance minutes preparation and publication, as well as other City Council agenda-related functions. The program also allows minutes to be posted alongside the meeting video with hyperlinks to the relevant sections of the recorded meeting, making public access more user-friendly.

- Prepare and Distribute Agenda Packets (Green)

Agenda packets are compiled the week prior to Council Meetings. To meet state and local requirements, the City makes agenda packets available to the Mayor, Council, and public on Thursdays prior to Council Meetings. Upgraded software to process City Council agendas was implemented in January 2014. The software implementation has also allowed for posting the agenda packet alongside the meeting video with hyperlinks to backup materials for the agenda, as well as relevant sections of the recorded meeting, improving accessibility and transparency. Significant progress has been made in preparing and distributing Council agenda packets, and efforts continue to further enhance the process; greater efficiency is expected as a result of additional staff training and acclimation to the improved system, as well as efforts to continually review the process for potential improvements.

- Customer Service (Green)

The City Clerk's office is the primary public counter for City Hall and is often the first stop for residents and other customers in need of assistance. As such, one of the primary goals of the department is to provide quality, accurate customer care. Most of

the remaining duties of the department are mandated by state or local law, requiring strict deadlines to be met by specifically trained, professional staff. Staff is often pulled away from state-mandated duties to answer phones and assist customers. The department was able to hire a qualified, part-time, hourly employee to provide phone, counter, and administrative services in January 2015, which allowed this function to advance from (Yellow) to (Green) in fiscal year 2015.

- Boards & Commissions (Yellow)

The City Clerk's office provides support to board and commission secretaries and staff, maintains original resolutions and meeting minutes for every board and commission, assists with the appointment and onboarding of board and commission members, and oversees mandated ethics training. In fiscal year 2014, a handbook was developed and training provided by the City Clerk's office to staff who support boards and commissions. Training is expected to be provided on an annual basis in the future. Additionally, templates were made available to staff in order to standardize agendas, minutes and commonly used documents. Although great strides have been achieved in this area, City Clerk staff remains unable to provide the degree of support and process oversight needed city-wide to assist board and commission staff. The function will advance to (Green) with continuous improvement efforts to streamline processes, as well as additional staff support to free up those with subject-matter expertise to provide process oversight.

Elections (Green)


The City Clerk serves as the local Elections Official. The City Clerk plans and conducts local elections, and works with the Registrar of Voters to ensure compliance with local, state, and federal laws. Additionally, the City Clerk provides relative information and assistance to all candidates and to the public. Great strides have been made to increase available election information for the public via the City's website.

- Carry out legally required duties as filing officer for FPPC-regulated documents (Yellow)

The Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) requires the filing officer (City Clerk) to notify filers of their mandated duty to file, review filed campaign statements and Statements of Economic Interest (Form 700), as well as other duties, including updating the City’s Conflict of Interest Code. The City Clerk has used existing resources to streamline this process as much as possible. The process of notifying designated filers of their filing requirements was improved by implementing new software designed for the management of Form 700s in February 2015. The City also received approval from the Fair Political Practices Commission to allow for online filing of Form 700s through this software system. However, funds have not yet been appropriated to allow for online filing and management of campaign statements. With certain fields being required, the software reduces the likelihood of errors and missing information on the statements and thus reduces the amount of time required to review the statements and request amendments. It also would allow statements to be made available online immediately upon filing, in a searchable, easy-to-use format for public viewing. The program would reduce staff resources currently used to manage the campaign statement notification and receipt process, as well as allow the potential for future e-filing, better facilitating the City’s open and ethical governance. As ready access to information continues to grow in importance to the public, the comprehensive implementation of this software remains a high priority for the City Clerk’s office. Public complaints have received related to lack of online access to campaign statements. Online statements are quickly becoming the industry standard and are now available in many jurisdictions. Therefore, this category is classified as (Yellow) and will become (Green) upon the online availability of all FPPC-regulated documents.

- Post and/or publish legally required notices (Green)
There are a variety of notices that are required to be posted and/or published, such as notices of hearings, ordinance adoption, meeting cancellations, and board and commission term expirations. All notices are published on time and in accordance with legal mandates.
- Maintain and update Municipal Code and Council Policy Manual (Yellow)


As changes are made to the Municipal Code or Council Policies, the City Clerk’s office makes the required changes. Most Municipal Code updates are available online within two weeks of the effective date of ordinances. This has been classified as (Yellow) due to the need to evaluate the policies contained in the Council Policy Manual as well as the need to provide a more user-friendly manual. In order to update the Council Policy Manual, a committee consisting of managers from each department would need to determine which policies are outdated. Once other functions are (Green), staff can focus on this project and develop a maintenance plan. Once complete this function will advance to (Green).



RECORDS MANAGEMENT

- Public Records Act Requests (Yellow)
The City Clerk’s Office processes, tracks, and coordinates requests made under the California Public Records Act (CPRA). As of mid-April 2015, 484 requests were processed in fiscal year 2015; 86% of the requests for records were fulfilled within 10 days, 11% required an extension, and 3% of the requests are currently open and in process. This has been classified as (Yellow) because the records management program has not been updated, and city-wide records management training has not yet been provided. An updated records management program as well as training events are currently in process and will help City staff locate and provide records in a timely manner. The function will advance to (Green) if 95% of the records requested are provided within the 10-day period; unnecessary paper copies and manual processes minimized, which may be possible through the use of workflow software; and city-wide records management standards used.

- Citywide Records Management Program (Yellow)**
 The Citywide Records Management program requires managing City records in accordance with state and federal laws, as well as best practices. This includes establishing and managing standard procedures related to records, training staff, regularly updating and revising the retention schedule as regulations and needs change, and purging files. This function is considered (yellow) as the existing program is extremely outdated. During fiscal year 2015, with the assistance of a records management consultant, the City Clerk’s office began the process of reviewing and updating the records program to include electronic records and newer document types, as well as account for business changes since the implementation of the previous version. The update to the program is currently underway and is anticipated to be brought before the City Council for approval in the first quarter of fiscal year 2016. Additionally, city-wide training will be provided to ensure consistent application of the new procedures. An updated records management program, record-keeping training events, and adequate staff to assist with the continuous maintenance of active files and off-site records are necessary to consider this function (Green).




DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The Development Services Department is comprised of five divisions, Planning, Building/Code Enforcement, Housing, Successor Agency and Engineering/Land Development, which provide direct services to property owners, developers, and the City as required for the entitlement and/or improvement of property. The services provided encompass most development related activities, including but not limited to, land use entitlements, public infrastructure, production of affordable housing, code enforcement, historic preservation, growth management, grant administration, open space, landscape planning, grading and building permits.

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING, LAND DEVELOPMENT

The Development Planning and Land Development Divisions are responsible for administering the City's Zoning Ordinance and processing all applications for planning entitlements and for all Engineering / Land Development Permits within the City. Performance metrics have been established to measure the level of service to the public in the following areas:


- o Complete Project Reviews within established review cycles (typically 2-3 weeks) depending on the application type. The Development Services Department (DSD) is the central department to receive projects for review, but relies on multiple departments to review projects. The performance metric for project reviews is to complete 85% of all project plan reviews within the established due dates. Currently 54% of all project reviews are completed within the established due dates. Primary factors include inconsistent adherence to Permits Plus data entry protocols, and turnaround times not being met by all members of the multi-disciplinary team. Increased attention and improvement is needed, and will become a focus as DSD shifts to the Acella Automation software system beginning in May 2015. **(Yellow)**



BUILDING DIVISION

- Building Plan Review **(Yellow)**
 This Section protects the health and safety of Chula Vista residents and visitors by ensuring all building plans conform to minimum requirements of adopted Federal, State and local building codes. The primary functions of the Building Plan Review Section are: 1) to conduct plan review of each building project to confirm design conforms to minimum requirements of adopted codes, and 2) to provide applicants with clear and comprehensive direction on modifying plans to meet code requirements, and do this in the most efficient and timely manner possible.
 - o The performance metric is to complete 85 % of project reviews within established review cycles. On average 60% of building plan reviews are completed within established timelines which is lower than the target of 85%. During FY2014, the section performed 2,951 initial reviews and rechecks of building permit plans, and in FY2015, as of March 24, 2015 has performed 2984 reviews.
- Building Inspection **(Green)**
 This Section conducts several specific inspections of each permitted building project to confirm that construction is in accordance with permitted plans and construction documents. The primary functions of our Building Inspection Section include: 1) conducting periodic inspections of each building project to confirm that construction is in accordance with approved plans and 2) preparing accurate records of inspection activities and archiving permit records.

- The performance metric is to perform 90% of building inspections within 24 hours of request. On average, 98% of the building inspections are performed the next business day which exceeds the target of 90%. During FY2014, the section performed close to 21,500 building inspections, and in FY2015, as of March 24, 2015 has performed close to 15,000 inspections.



CODE ENFORCEMENT DIVISION


Code Enforcement serves to protect the health and safety of Chula Vista’s citizens by identifying and addressing violations of the Chula Vista Municipal Code. Our Housing, Hotel/Motel and Mobile Home Inspection programs upgrade and make safe the City’s inventory of affordable housing by requiring private reinvestment in properties that are unsafe and substandard. Our Abandoned Residential Properties program protects residential neighborhoods from becoming blighted though the lack of adequate maintenance and security of abandoned properties.

General Code Enforcement (Green)

Officers respond to and investigate code violation complaints. Complaints are made on a range of enforcement matters including building without a permit, illegal dwelling units, garage conversions, accumulation of refuse and garbage, substandard single-family housing conditions, abandoned construction, illegal businesses, abandon vehicle illegal signs and other code violations and blight. Notices are issued to property owners and follow-up enforcement commences if voluntary compliance is not achieved.

- The performance metric is to perform 85% of reported code enforcement inspections within 48 hours of complaint. In the current fiscal year


eighty-six percent (86%) of initial code enforcement inspections were performed within 48 hours of receiving complaint which exceeds the target of 85%. During FY2014, around 670 cases were opened, and in FY2015, as of March 24, 2015, 436 cases were opened.



AFFORDABLE HOUSING/GRANT ADMINISTRATION (Green)

The Chula Vista Housing Authority coordinates and administers the City’s programs for promoting balanced housing for families of all income levels. The Housing Division staff is responsible for management of Housing programs and policies as well as grant administration of several Federal grants.

The performance metrics for the Housing Division are set by State and Federal Law and are tracked through various reporting requirements on a quarterly and annual basis. Currently all grants, projects and programs are meeting or exceeding the metrics as required by either State or Federal law.



LONG RANGE PLANNING

The Advance Planning Section is responsible for the City’s long-range planning activities involving the following major areas of emphasis: Growth Management, Historic Preservation, Multiple Species

Conservation Program, regional planning and General Planning Maintenance and implementation.


- General Plan Implementation & Maintenance **(Green)**

Advance Planning is responsible for the periodic update, and ongoing implementation/maintenance of the City’s General Plan (GP), as well as the review of projects for GP conformance and any related General Plan amendments. The GP is a state-mandated document which serves as the land use and policy guide for City decision making across a broad set of subjects including land use, environmental protection, economic development, and public facilities and services among others. Comprehensive GP updates are conducted approximately every 15 years, with our last comprehensive update approved in December 2005.

Current work is focused on completing GP amendments in support of the Healthy Communities/Complete Streets initiative; supporting preparation of the University SPA Plan; wrapping up GP amendments for the Freeway Commercial area of Otay Ranch; coordinating with the County on the Village 13 project; providing support to the Arts Master Plan update; and preparing framework provisions for a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

- Project Reviews **(Yellow)**

Advance Planning Staff also conducts planning project reviews. The performance metric for advance planning project reviews is to complete 85% of all project plan reviews within the established due dates. Currently 78% of all project reviews are completed within the established due dates.



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Economic Development is a collaborative effort between the community, businesses and government to grow the local economic base through actions that support the expansion and creation of businesses, develop new markets for goods and services and attract top talent into the workforce. The following program summary is a proactive approach to address the increased demands and challenges facing our local businesses by allocating resources and time to enhance our outreach efforts and provide excellent customer service to new and existing businesses. In addition to the below mentioned efforts, economic development, staff actively participates on the City team involved in the Chula Vista Bayfront Project, efforts to revitalize western Chula Vista, implementation of the Eastern Urban Center, the University and Innovation District, as well as, discussions concerning the acquisition of the Olympic Training Center.


BUSINESS SUPPORT (Yellow)

Assisting new and established businesses to start, grow and succeed is the mission of any Economic Development Department. Our primary focus is to help our business community thrive. The most important business is the one that has already invested in the City and so a number of our programs (workshops, training, financial aid, tax rebates, employee recruitment and training) and the programs of our local partners (Chamber of Commerce, Third Avenue Village Association, South County Economic Development Council) are focused on helping Chula Vista businesses succeed, grow, expand and start new businesses. This year we are proposing new personalized services (economic development ombudsman at the front counter, staff to assist in understanding codes and procedures) for the small business community to help them get through the regulatory process, find financing and apply for tax credits. Our programs are focused on assisting new businesses to ensure they get through the regulatory process, locate strategically, find financing and are successful in their business venture. The metric of these programs is to have a 90% satisfaction rate for customers going through these processes. In order to ensure this sense of satisfaction we will be surveying our customers after service has been complete. The FREBE program, is one of our most successful programs, and averages fifteen site visits with businesses per week.

REGIONAL AND BI-NATIONAL COLLABORATION

(Yellow)

To strengthen regional accountability and sustainable development within the region, collaboration with regional partners is essential. Businesses are more willing to invest in a region whose communities work together and understand its neighboring jurisdictions as well as its own unique assets. Chula Vista can boost its economy in both the short and long term by implementing a coordinated and collaborative approach with a specific focus on engaging neighboring communities, trade associations, regional economic development organizations and the private sector. The 2013 Business Cluster Study identified a number of organizations the City could partner with to pro-actively market the opportunities available in Chula Vista. A coordinated sustainable economic strategy can guide Chula Vista in creating a culture of stewardship, innovation and action that can lead to prosperity and future economic gains. The goal is to educate every Chula Vista resident, business, business association and all our regional partners on the opportunities available so that everyone can help market our City as the best opportunity for investment. The metric is to attend 70% to 90% of all our partners’ board meetings, conferences and trade shows. Our coordinated sustainable economic strategy guides Chula Vista in creating a culture of stewardship, innovation and action that can lead to prosperity and future economic gains.




**FINANCE DEPARTMENT
COMPTROLLER**

The Comptroller Division is responsible for the day to day accounting transactions of the City, preparation of the annual financial statements, debt management, annual disclosure requirements, IRS payroll tax compliance, coordination of the annual independent audit, issuing accounts payable checks and processing bi-weekly payroll. The information provided by the Comptroller Division assists City Council, City Management, and the public and other agencies so they can be informed of the City’s financial standing.

- Financial Compliance Reporting Function (Green): provides financial reports to the public, City Departments, and other agencies so they can be in compliance with Federal, State, and Local legal requirements.
- Payroll Services Function (Yellow): processes biweekly paychecks and prepares various compensation related reports for employees and governmental agencies as required by law. While we are currently meeting deadlines this function is (Yellow) because are at risk of not meeting deadlines due to inadequate staffing coverage and continuing technical problems with the financial system. In order to shift this category into (Green), funding for a business system analyst is needed in order to optimize the use of the City’s existing financial system. This will lead to significant process improvements and reliability of our systems benefitting all departments.
- Accounts Payable Function (Green): processes approximately 14,000 payment requests for all City Departments. The division is responsible for reviewing each payment request for proper authorization, documentation and available budget in accordance with City Charter Section 504. While there is room for efficiency and improvement, we are meeting all deadlines without risk.
- Debt Service Management Function (Green): provides debt management services for the City which involves processing debt payments, annual disclosure reporting and information to creditors and the public on the status of City bonded indebtedness.

- Banking and Investment Services Function (Green): provides cash and portfolio management services to the City in order to meet daily cash obligations and optimize return on investments. We are meeting all deadlines without risk.
- Fixed Asset Management (Yellow) provide Capital Asset inventory and reporting services to City Departments so they can safeguard City Property and to accurately reflect the asset value in the financial statements. Even though the Finance Department made major strides towards accomplishing its goal of taking a full Citywide inventory of all its assets, this function is (Yellow) for this Fiscal Year. Due to budget constraints the Finance Department could only hire an hourly employee to assist in the process of taking a full Citywide inventory. Due to the restricted time allocated to the hourly employee, the Finance Department accomplished taking a full inventory of the City’s Equipment Assets, but still leaving the inventory audit on Buildings, Land & Improvements pending. The duties have been transitioned to a fulltime staff on a permanent basis.
- Deferred Compensation Function (Green): provides administration and educational services to City employees informing them of tax-deferred savings programs.




REVENUE & RECOVERY

The Revenue & Recovery Division administers the City’s revenue programs including utility taxes, sales taxes, transient occupancy taxes and business licenses taxes; directs and controls the accounting and revenue functions of the City that include bank to book

reconciliations and assists in the preparation and monitoring of the City operating budget.

- Tax Administration Program **(Green)**: implements and enforces the tax provisions of the Chula Vista municipal code which includes Sales Tax, Business License Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax, Utility Users Tax, Real Property Transfer Tax and Residential Construction Tax. We are meeting all deadlines without risk.
- Accounts Receivable Function **(Red)**: generates invoices, revenue reports and collection services for the City. The Accounts Receivable (A/R) function is (Red) due to continued financial system challenges. In order to move this function to (Green), the Finance Department recently hired a consultant to assess the overall financial system (accounting software) which includes A/R. An implementation plan for some of the consultant's recommendations is currently under development. As previously discussed, in order to implement all of the recommendations, the department will request funding for business system analyst services in a subsequent fiscal year.
- Collections Function **(Green)**: Previous reductions in staffing levels limited the Revenue & Recovery Division's ability to actively pursue city wide collections and led to a rating of (Yellow) in the past. In order to move this function into the (Green) category, the Department contracted with a full service collection agency to pursue delinquent accounts that are over 60 days delinquent. Delinquent accounts in several program areas are being regularly turned over to the collection agency, resulting in increased collection rates. Full implementation is projected by the end of calendar year 2015.
- Revenue Generation/Fee Management Function **(Green)**: is the lead in updating the City's Master Fee Schedule. The Master Fee Schedule provides details for the various fees charged by the City for services provided to residents and customers. The function recently improved from (Yellow) as a result of shifting an analyst position from the Budget & Analysis Division to Revenue & Recovery


who supports the coordination and analysis required to update City fees in a timely manner.



PURCHASING

The purpose of the Purchasing Division is to provide acquisition services to City staff so they can obtain products and services at best value.

- Acquisitions Function **(Yellow)**: provides procurement and related services to City Departments so they can obtain required products and services for the best value in a timely manner. This function is (Yellow) because of lengthy processes to get products/services to departments as well as limitations in ensuring the best prices for the City due to limitations in the accounting software and 50% reductions in staff over the past five years. In order to move this function into (Green), the department is including this process in the systems review project and looking at implementing Workflow, another feature of the accounting software. In addition, the purchasing process is being reviewed through the continuous improvement program. A new Finance and Purchasing Manager position was added to help address these issues.




BUDGET AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Budget and Analysis Division is to provide budget development, strategic planning, and analysis services to the City Council, City Manager, and departments so they can make informed decisions that: better align resources with citizen needs, improve operational efficiency and contribute to the overall financial health of the City.

- Budget Development Function (Green): is to provide budget development, reporting, and support services to the City Council, City Manager, and departments so they can make timely and accurate performance-based budgetary decisions that are aligned with Council priorities, demonstrate sound financial planning, and strengthen public accountability and trust.
- Financial Management Information Function (Green): provides financial reports to the City Council, the City Manager, and Department Heads so they can be informed as to the current and projected financial status of the City. (i.e. quarterly fiscal status reports and monthly fiscal status reports)
- Analysis Function (Yellow): is to provide fiscal and operational analysis services to the City Council, City Manager and departments so they can make informed decisions that improve operational efficiency and contribute to the overall financial health of the City. This function is (Yellow) due to the operating departments limited ability to provide analytical support as a result of the elimination of analyst positions in those departments over the past few years. This has impacted the Budget & Analysis division due to the significant increase in analysis and departmental support required over the past few years. The division worked continuously through the fiscal crisis to identify budget balancing strategies in order to keep the City budget balanced and avoid impacting the City’s reserves. In addition, the division was involved in costing analysis for ongoing labor negotiations and analysis of continued high profile projects. We anticipate that this function may move into (Green) as the City’s financial condition improves and the need to provide ongoing budget balancing strategies is reduced.


- Long-Term Financial Planning Function (Green): involves the development of the City’s Five Year Financial Forecast as well as the City’s Fiscal Recovery & Progress Plan. The Division has embarked on the development of the City’s Long-Term Financial Plan. In 2014, the data collection and analysis is taking place in order to create the Long-Term Financial Plan.



**FIRE DEPARTMENT
OPERATIONS DIVISION**


Emergency response can be broken down into three areas: Dispatch, Turn-out, and Response Time. Each of these areas depends on different indicators and is budgeted for separately.

- Dispatch: Less than 1 minute (Yellow)
This is done through a contract with San Diego Dispatch. This is the time from the 911 call received to station alerting for response. The current dispatch time averages 1 minute 14 seconds. The goal is to dispatch in less than 1 minute. During future contract negotiations with San Diego, efforts will be made to enhance service performance.
- Turnout: Less than 1 minute (Red)
This is the time it takes for crews to don their protective gear and respond out of the station to a call. The current turnout remains over 2 minutes according to FirstWatch and as a result we are not meeting our GROC response standards. In FY16, Fire will continue to use FirstWatch software, as a tool, to monitor and develop recommendations to improve performance.
- Response/Travel Time: Less than 5 minutes (Red)
The new threshold adopted through the Fire Facility Master Plan is 5 minutes. Since then we met the 5 minute response time standard approximately 60% of the time. Implementation of the new Fire Facility Master Plan anticipates enhancing these levels to the 90th percentile. In FY16, Fire will continue to use FirstWatch software, as a tool, to monitor and develop recommendations to improve performance.



TRAINING DIVISION

- 100% of mandatory training completed annually (Yellow)
The Department is in the process of updating Training's organizational chart by adding a Battalion Chief and a Fire Engineer at the Training Division. This additional staff and new rank structure will create efficiency and capability to allow the Training Division to facilitate compliance for mandatory training. The Battalion Chief will focus on managing the division to include the budget and planning, while the existing Captain and new Engineer will focus on implementing the training plan. Additionally, in FY16 the Training Division will be developing a Training Program Administration manual which identifies mandatory and other required training.



PREVENTION DIVISION

- General Use Certificate Inspections: Complete new business license inspections within one month of application receipt (Yellow)
The Fire Department General Use Certificates (GUC) are provided to each new business applying for a business license. As a result of a current vacancy and other capacity issues, improvements in this category have been delayed. For FY16, Fire requested consolidating hourly Fire Prevention Aides to a new full-time position. This new position along with dedicating other staff time should help improve this function.
- Fire Company Inspection Program: Percent of FCIP inspections completed annually (Green)
The Fire Company Inspection Program (FCIP) inspection assignments are divided amongst geographical districts and shifts. Further, the


assignments are provided on a quarterly basis. At this time, all FCIP inspections are tracking to be completed before the end of the calendar year. Additionally, inspections are now completed on Department iPad minis. This has helped improve efficiency in data entry. The department will seek purchasing more iPad minis in order to improve efficiency in the field to allow crews to complete inspections more efficiently.

- Fire Safety Engineering Plan Reviews: Conduct plan reviews within established time frames 90% of the time (Green)

The established time frames vary based upon the permit types (i.e. tenant improvement, residential, commercial, etc.). At this time, the reviews are being completed higher than the 90th percentile.

- Prevention to perform origin and cause fire investigations for 100% of fires as defined under the policy (Green)

This performance measure includes all fires being investigated by a trained Fire Investigator from the Fire Prevention Division. At this time, Prevention Fire Investigators only investigate origin and cause fire investigations as defined under the policy. The current policy limits the fires that Investigators respond to. This policy was set in place to create a manageable workload and help limit overtime. The department's goal is to have all fires be investigated by a trained Investigator. This would require additional resources.



ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

- Purchasing (Yellow)

Provides procurement and related services to all Divisions of the Department, processes payments and obtains required insurance documents for all

vendors as specified by the Department of Finance's insurance requirements, works with Department of Finance to ensure lowest cost while meeting all safety requirements. The Department has a Principal Management Analyst, who oversees the purchasing unit and ensures funds are spent according to budget, as well as, review and approve purchase requisitions and backup documentation. The Department also has two hourly Sr. Office Specialists who process and track all purchase order requisitions, and serve as the liaison for the department with vendors and the Finance Department. The goal of the department is to hire a full-time Sr. Fiscal Office Specialist to create more efficiencies and consistency in the process.

- Contracts (Yellow)

The Department is responsible for several contracts with various vendors. These include purchasing, shared services, mutual aid, automatic aid, and fees for service contracts. Contracts are now managed by the Principal Management Analyst, which means all contracts are centralized. Oversight has improved during the last year and this function should move to green in the near future.

- Payroll (Green)

This function processes biweekly payroll for all Divisions of the Department. A recent change which eliminated the paper system and moved us to using the fully automated "Telestaff" system has greatly improved the efficiency of the process. Additionally, the Principal Management Analyst reviews the biweekly payroll processed and any corrections are done prior to payroll being finalized. This change adds a layer of control to payroll processing to eliminate errors.


- Records Management/Reports (Yellow)

Management of the RMS reports to both State and Federal authorities. This function manages our day to day incident reports. This function also facilitates our regulatory and legal compliance with HIPPA and other mandates. Monthly reports are generated for compliance to GMOC and NFPA Standards relating to Operational Responses. This function also responds to public requests under the Public Information Act. Due to other responsibilities

this function has been delayed in meeting goals and needs for the Department.

- **Data Research (Yellow)**

This function collects and analyzes department-wide data related to all lines of business. Software is used to determine the best suitable locations for future Fire Stations (Fire Facility Master Plan) and project unit placement. This function also develops best suitable locations for the phased in implementation of the new Advanced Life Support Program. Due to other responsibilities this function has been delayed in meeting goals and needs for the Department.




HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

HUMAN RESOURCES OPERATIONS

- Recruitment & Selection **(Green)**
Recruitments are monitored from when the recruitment is assigned to the establishment of the eligibility list. The department is meeting the goal to complete recruitments in less than 60 days from assignment to analyst to establishment of an eligibility list. The service level is considered (Green) if the recruitment is completed in less than 60 days, (Yellow) if the recruitment falls between 60 to 90 days to complete, (Red) if the recruitment is over 90 days.
- Classification /Compensation **(Red)**
Classification reviews from departments are analyzed and a recommendation is completed within 60 days of receipt. This service level is considered (Red) because it is currently taking the department approximately over 90 days to complete the assignment. The service level is considered (Green) if the classification review is completed in less than 60 days, (Yellow) if the review completion falls between 60 to 90 days to complete, and (Red) if the classification review is over 90 days. Historically, classification reviews were only conducted if initiated by a Department Head. In late 2013, the City allowed for employee-initiated position classification reviews which have substantially increased the number of reviews conducted by the Human Resources Department. The number of requests increased from an average of three per year to an average of 29 in each of the last two years. The department is modifying this measurement in future years to completion within 60 days of being assigned to an analyst in order to be reflective of the increased number of requests based on procedure changes.
- Training **(Yellow)**
While we are currently providing all mandated training programs training is an area the City has fallen short due to reductions in staff and budget to support training activities. With the analysts' current workload, in-house training will continue at service level (Yellow). This function would be considered (Green) if we were able to provide staff training in the areas of supervisory training, leadership development, individual development

and advanced software training. In absence of being able to provide this proactive training directly, we pass on information on free trainings offered by partner agencies.



BENEFITS

- Offer Comprehensive Benefits **(Green)**
Maintaining a comprehensive benefit program is essential to attracting and retaining well-qualified employees. The City has continually offered benefits that are at the same level, if not better, when compared to other public sectors. The City's benefit program includes: a Cafeteria Plan (medical, dental, vision, Flexible Spending Accounts), life insurance, disability insurance, Employee Assistance Program (EAP), Professional Enrichment Program, Wellness Program, CalPERS/PARS and Unemployment (EDD).
- Employee Wellness Initiative **(Green)**
Studies have shown that a strong and healthy workforce results in greater productivity, lower health costs and increased employee satisfaction. Our employees play a role in the health of our community. By supporting wellness and healthy outcomes for our City employees we can set an example and support a healthy community. We are in our second year of our in-house initiative, "Wellness Works." Over the past year we have been able to offer a number of opportunities aimed at raising employee awareness of health concerns that they have the power to control through lifestyle changes. Initiatives this year included a Lazyman Triathlon, blood pressure and skin cancer screenings, on site flu shots, and a Weight Loss Challenge. We continue to make improvements to our fitness centers to improve employee usage of

those facilities. The Committee continues work on their goals for the year with monthly wellness topics. The Committee will continue to develop innovative ways to get employees involved. Some of these may involve incentives that will most likely require additional resources to achieve.

- Administration of Retiree Health Plan for retirees and their dependents, and COBRA continuation plan (health, dental, vision, Flexible Spending Accounts (FSA) and Employee Assistance Program (EAP)) (Green)

Retired employees are eligible to continue to participate in the City's medical insurance plans at their own cost. Retirees and other former employees and qualified dependents are also allowed to participate in certain benefit plans (health, dental, vision, flexible spending accounts and our Employee Assistance Program) again at their own cost for a period of time prescribed by law. The administration of the Retiree Health Plan was brought back in-house effective January 1, 2013. After reviewing the processes using the tools of continuous improvement it was determined that efficiencies and service levels improvements would be achieved by doing so. It was also determined that the administration of the COBRA plans is still better served by contracting with a third party administrator.

- Ensure compliance with employee benefit laws and regulations (Green)

To date, the City's benefit program is in compliance with federal and state laws. This includes newly approved and revised legislations affecting employee benefits such as Paid Sick Leave, Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and the California Family Rights Act (CFRA).

- Data processing and maintenance (Yellow)

This includes employee payroll set-up, differential pay, benefit coverage updates, retirement set-up (PARS and CalPERS) and fiscal/calendar year-end updates. Although payroll transactions are processed in a timely manner, we do not have resources to carry out periodic audit functions.

Service level would be (Green) if we can fund IFAS programming modifications and devote staff to implement changes.


- Employee Online Enrollment (Yellow)

The City currently maintains a web-based system where employees are able to make their benefit elections, access and make changes to their personal information. The system currently used, "Employee Online (EO)" is a product of SunGard. In 2006 when the system was implemented EO was chosen because of its relation to IFAS, our payroll and accounting system, and initially it served our purposes.

It has become increasingly more challenging to customize the system to accommodate the complexity of the unique and multiple benefit plan designs of each employee group. Every change, no matter how minor, requires hours of HR and IT staff time in addition to the amount charged by SunGard to make the changes. Additionally the time and resources spent have not always produced solutions.

Three months after the close of 2015 Open Enrollment, Human Resources Technicians were still manually processing enrollments. The current system has made it extremely difficult to keep up with the increasing complexity and ever changing federal and state requirements of benefits administration.

Service level will be (Green) if we can replace or upgrade online employee benefit system in order to achieve full operational excellence and to be able to provide quality customer service to our employees and our partners in benefits administration, such as the Finance and IT Departments.



RISK MANAGEMENT

- Disability Management (Green)
 This function serves as a liaison between injured employees, their departments, medical providers and our third party administrators for workers compensation (Tristar Risk Management), short- and long-term benefit providers to ensure that injuries are reported in compliance with applicable laws, that claims are investigated to determine whether they are work related, that communication between the department, the injured employee and the treating physician are maintained in order to identify ways of returning the employee to some type of work within their limitations so that they may remain a productive part of our workforce. In addition the Disability Management function ensures that the City follows all applicable leave laws: Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), California Family Rights Act (CFRA), and Pregnancy Disability Leave which due to their nature are complex and convoluted. The department is meeting all requirements in this function. However, staff is aware that there are many manual processes in this area that should be reviewed for improvement. Greater efficiencies could free up staff time more aggressively carry out the recently promulgated Return to Work/Transitional Duty program.

- Occupational Health and Safety (Yellow)
 This program ensures that the City is compliant with all CalOSHA requirements and identifies and provides education, corrective measures, personal protective equipment to prevent injuries to employees and the public. For the most part Safety staff has been able to keep up with the requirements. The area of this program that brings

it to a yellow status is that the City is behind in two of the major components of OSHA compliance: record keeping, and follow-up and documentation of corrective actions. Additionally, the City’s Injury Illness and Prevention Plan (IIPP) that was drafted in the 1990’s is in need of updating and dissemination amongst the workforce.

- Recovery on Damages to City Property (Green)
 This function pursues restitution either from the perpetrator or their insurance when the City has suffered damages to its property or staffing resources impacts have resulted from the third party’s action. Staff works with other City departments to obtain reports and estimates of the damages incurred. This program recovers approximately \$200,000 per fiscal year. The funds collected reimburse DUI response staff costs and provide revenue to pay for repairs incurred. These recoveries benefit many City funds including the General Fund, the Central Garage Fund, and Open Space funds.



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

The Information and Technology Services Department is currently undergoing a thorough top-to-bottom review at the time of this report (April 2015). Data from this review will most likely change the outcomes of many of these categories reported below.

OPERATIONS & TELECOMMUNICATIONS (Yellow)

Operations & Telecommunications provides planning, support and maintenance of the City’s voice communication systems. This service level is considered (Yellow) based on the need to do a full scale replacement of the City’s phone system. Currently the City deploys an analogue phone system with limited functionality in terms of advanced communication capabilities. Modern phone systems are digital and utilize Voice Over IP (VOIP) protocols which result in advanced communications capabilities which will be fully integrated into the City’s office productivity applications (i.e Outlook) and be able to provide seamless communications connectivity for the employees whether it be by phone, video conferencing, instant messaging or other forms of communications. Staff anticipates development of a Request for Proposal in the 2nd quarter of Fiscal Year 2016 for a new system.

Operations and Telecommunications also provides support to the City’s main computer data back-up system. As the current system is comprised of older technology, staff has begun work on identifying a replacement system which will provide a much more robust disaster recovery capability as well as much quicker recovery speeds. By utilizing cloud technologies, should a disaster occur in Chula Vista, the City will be able to maintain continuity of operations through a virtualized computing environment which can be activated in near minutes for all critical systems.

PROGRAMMING AND APPLICATION SUPPORT – CUSTOM APPLICATIONS (Red)

Programming and Application Support provides design, management, and support for custom and 3rd Party (“off the shelf”) software applications.

The service level for programming and support of custom applications is considered (Red) based on the current workload levels for the two Sr. Programmer Analysts. As the City moves forwards on various major software purchases/upgrades, the Sr. Programmer

Analysts are normally dedicated almost 100% to these major projects which means a significant number of other important projects are often not able to be completed in a timely manner. With upcoming upgrades to the City’s financial system (IFAS), and other projects which require programming (open enrollment, MOU implementations, various data warehousing projects, etc), the need for skilled application support for custom applications are at an all-time high. Without this much needed support, access to valuable data in our various data management systems is not available to City staff.

PROGRAMMING AND APPLICATION SUPPORT – SUPPORT OF 3RD PARTY SOFTWARE (Yellow)

Programming and Application Support provides design, management, and support for 3rd party software.

The service level for support of 3rd party software is considered (Yellow). It would be considered (Green) if we were able to be proactive and implement additional software features that allow users to take full advantage of the software being used. This would require additional dedication application support staff.

HELP DESK RESPONSE (Yellow)

Since the beginning of Fiscal Year 2015, the Department has responded to 6,588 Web Help Desk tickets. This will result in approximately 8,000 tickets for the entire fiscal year. Although great effort has been made over the last 6 months to incorporate all calls for service into the Web Help Desk, staff estimates that approximately 10% of calls to ITS don’t get logged into the Web Help Desk. Conservative estimates of the total number of calls into ITS for service is probably closer to 9,000 per year.

There are 4 different types of Priority calls and the overall response time for all calls. Staff strives to handle Priority 1 emergency calls within 4 hours, Priority 2 high priority calls within 1 business day, and Priority 3 medium priority within 2 days and priority 4 low priority calls within one week.

The chart below details the percentage of calls handled within the allotted time period:

PRIORITY	1	2	3	4
% on Time	87%	72%	71%	64%

Staff is doing an extraordinary job keeping up with the number of Web Help Desk tickets, although not at the desired level of 90% on-time threshold. There are a wide variety of reasons as to why staff is unable to meet the 90% threshold. The three primary reasons are:

- 1) Staffing Levels – with well over 1,000 PC’s, 160 servers, numerous printers, copiers and other devices which are connected to the City’s network infrastructure, staff is literally jumping from one ticket to the next with little time available for proactive work.
- 2) Desktop Environment Out of Date – well over half of the desktops in the City need to be replaced with updated hardware and software.
- 3) Server Environment – Nearly 60% of the server fleet is on aging hardware well beyond the typical lifespan of a server, as well as operating on operating systems that are no longer supported by Microsoft.

Staff is currently working with various vendors to try to remediate the issues stated above.

SERVER ENVIRONMENT (Red)

This category is (Red) as over one half of the servers which support the various software applications are Windows 2003 or older servers. This has become problematic for two reasons: 1) Microsoft will end all support for Windows Server 2003 servers in July 2015. This will mean no important security updates will be pushed out, and no bug fixes will be issued. 2) Applying new Windows Server 2012 servers into the fleet of older servers has resulted in a variety of failures due to conflicts between the versions of server software. This has significantly impacted email services to the Police Department, as well as a host of other issues throughout the City which have required significant amount of IT staff time creating work-arounds to get the software working correctly. And oftentimes, these work-arounds require constant tweaking as new issues arise. Staff is currently working with various vendors to seek solutions to these issues.

DESKTOP ENVIRONMENT (Red)

Nearly 60% of the 1097 desktop computers in the City still run the Windows XP operating system. Microsoft ended support for Windows XP in April of 2014. That means the majority of the City’s desktop computers haven’t had a security or software update to their


operating systems in a year. This presents a significant security concern as any new security exploits discovered will go untreated in Windows XP. With the large amounts of confidential information that the City has, this presents a significant liability, especially if there is a data breach which is a result of a Windows XP system being compromised. The other issue that we are starting to see is that Windows XP can only run Internet Explorer 8.0. This has become problematic as many of the newer software solutions utilize Internet Explorer 10 and above as the “front end” of their software solution (what you see when you’re using the program). The Finance Department is a perfect example of where we needed to do upgrades to all the computers in order to be able to run the latest versions of Springbrook. The Police Department was also forced to upgrade several computers throughout the Department as their backgrounding software would only work on the latest versions of Internet Explorer. This is a trend that will be accelerating as we upgrade software throughout the City.

NETWORK UPTIME (Unknown)

The City does not currently have adequate network monitoring software to make a proper determination of the network uptime.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS) (Green)

The GIS Section provides GIS data and mapping support to all Departments. We currently have 2 full time GIS Specialists who assist in maintaining our GIS databases. GIS also houses numerous interns throughout the year which contribute to a wide variety of GIS Although GIS meets or exceeds current staff expectations, we are collaborating with agencies in the South Bay to possibly provide GIS support and find more efficient ways to exchange and maintain our GIS database. Sharing GIS data and resources between agencies will result in a better product for staff and the general public.



LIBRARY ACCESS

● Open Hours

The Library needs to be open in order to provide books and materials, trained and friendly assistance, and a safe community gathering place for study, meeting and community outreach.

Service level goals are based on national norms, patterns of local public use, and input from residents and elected officials.

(Green) = 7 days a week, 4 evenings a week, with at least 52 hours of service per week per branch

(Yellow) = 6 days, 2 or 3 evenings, with between 52 and 40 hours of service per week per branch

(Red) = 5 days, 40 hours or less per outlet

Civic Center Branch open hours **(Green)**

South Chula Vista Branch open hours **(Green)**

Otay Ranch Branch open hours **(Yellow)**

● Space **(Red)**

Adequate space per person is needed to allow access to the basics of tables and chairs for study, shelving to house and manage an adequate collection of materials, space for necessary computers, opportunities for study, meetings and gathering places, community information display and distribution, children’s story times, activities and early learning support.

Square foot per person threshold is based on Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) standards and library best practices.

(Green) = 0.5 to 0.7 square foot per capita

(Yellow) = 0.4 to 0.5 per capita

(Red) = below 0.4 per capita

Chula Vista Public Library System = 0.38 **(Red)**

There is also a County Library Branch (Bonita) on City owned land that services the residents in the area. If the square footage (10,400) and population of the service area (13,882) of the Bonita Branch of San Diego County Library were included the result would still be below the standard at 0.402 **(Yellow)**.

● Staff Assistance **(Red)**

The Library is not a self-service institution. Trained staff is needed to assist, guide, direct, interface with computers, present literacy and early learning experiences, train and evaluate volunteers, provide class visits, and perform outreach and represent the City to community groups and organizations. Population served per FTE staff:

Statewide mean = 4,121 population served per FTE staff

(Source: California State Library 2012-13 data, CaliforniaLibraryStatistics.com)


(Green) = 4,121 (statewide mean)

(Yellow) = 5,151 (exceeds mean by 25%)

(Red) = 6,182 (exceeds mean by 50%)

Chula Vista Public Library System= 6,363

FTE @ Chula Vista Public Library = 40.35



COLLECTION **(Red)**

● Materials spending per capita

Statewide mean = \$4.02

(Source: California State Library 2012-13 data, CaliforniaLibraryStatistics.com)

(Green) = \$4.02 (statewide mean)

(Yellow) = \$3.02 (75% of mean)

(Red) = \$2.01 (50% of mean)

Chula Vista Public Library System= \$0.78 **(Red)**




INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (Yellow)

The Library’s goal is to provide up-to-date technology that responds to the needs of the residents.

- Computers per 1,000 population
 Statewide mean = 0.81
 (Source: California State Library 2012-13 data, CaliforniaLibraryStatistics.com)

(Green) = 0.81 (statewide mean)
 (Yellow) = 0.47 (40th percentile)
 (Red) = 0.36 (25th percentile)

Chula Vista Public Library System= 0.47 (Yellow)



MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS

MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM

(Yellow)

The City of Chula Vista implements a proactive, informative, creative, and innovative marketing and communications program. The Office of Communications coordinates this program which supports the wide-ranging initiatives and activities for the City of Chula Vista. A Marketing and Communications Plan guides these efforts, and elements of the plan also are included and tracked as part of the City’s Strategic Plan. Key elements of this plan include implementation of a branding/marketing program, community engagement efforts, strategic alliances, Web and social media programs, media relations, and process improvements for internal and external customers. Progress has been made in the last three years, so this is at (Yellow) status. As more elements are implemented, this will move to (Green) status.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (Yellow)

The City of Chula Vista implements a proactive community engagement, outreach, and participation program. These efforts include involving residents in the decision-making process, providing information to the public, holding public meetings, updating and enhancing our Web site, expanding our social media program, and implementing innovative solutions to communicating with and getting information from residents and stakeholders. This effort involves enhancing strategic alliances with South Bay and regional community stakeholders, representatives of agencies and organizations, marketing, and communications, print and broadcast media representatives, and business leaders. Progress has been made in the last three years, but remains (Yellow) as elements continue to be developed.

CITY OF CHULA VISTA PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

(Yellow)

The Office of Communications provides strategic and creative communications, marketing, graphic design, and web services for numerous programs and services. The team assists staff in their efforts to promote City services, provide public education, engage communities, build media awareness, and enhance economic development in Chula Vista. Marketing, communications, and graphics support will be provided to:

- Provide communications, marketing, branding, and graphic design support for Economic Development work plan
- Develop and implement Explore Chula Vista program to promote existing City assets and attractions.
- Retain quality local special events and pursue larger-scale public events to attract local and regional audiences
- Collaborate with other stakeholders to enhance tourism in the City of Chula Vista
- Further streamline and enhance special events and film production process to attract more events to the City
- Continue to promote the Library, Parks and Recreation, CLEAN program, Public Safety, and other City programs
- Expand involvement with communications professionals through the South County Alliance of Marketing Professionals (SCAMP)
- Continue expanding social media efforts to benefit all City programs


There have been a number of successes to report in the last three years. A new city website was developed and launched. Programs have been developed, social media has greatly expanded and collaborations have increased. This will move from (Yellow) to (Green) as more elements are implemented.

MARKETING BIG PICTURE PROJECTS (Green)

The City of Chula Vista is developing a number of projects that will transform the City. Each of these projects requires communications and marketing efforts to be implemented in collaboration with other agencies, business and community leaders, organizations, residents, and other stakeholders. The Office of Communications provides strategic and creative communications and graphic design support for the Chula Vista Bayfront, University and Innovation Center, Millenia Project, Third Avenue revitalization, and other projects. A strong collaboration has been established with the Port of San Diego and other entities to advance the Bayfront Master Plan.

CITY WEBSITE *(Green)*

The new City website was launched in February 2015. The website promotes and markets City services, programs, and events as well as Chula Vista’s assets and attractions. City staff has been trained on the new content management system to update web pages so the most current information is available to the public. The new website promotes access to public broadcast of council meetings, social media, community engagement, public participation, and two-way communication. The new website is accessible with mobile devices, provides easy access to translation function and it is ADA compliant. The new website also serves as a tool to market the City.



POLICE DEPARTMENT**COMMUNITY PATROL (Yellow)**

Responding to citizen's calls for service in a timely manner and providing quality police service are primary functions of the Community Patrol Division. In February 2015, Growth Management Oversight Committee (GMO) response time thresholds were amended to be consistent with industry standards for the Police Department to 1) Respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls within 7 minutes 30 seconds and maintain average response time of 6 minutes; and 2) Respond to all Priority II urgency calls within 12 minutes.

In 2012, the Department commissioned a staffing study from Matrix Consulting Group which recommended that the department should maintain approximately 40% average proactive patrol time. Through various changes to the Patrol Division via scheduling and various management changes, the Community Patrol Division has been able to increase the availability of proactive time from a low of 21% to nearly 34%. Although this is an overall increase in proactive time, the availability of proactive time during the peak patrol hours (8AM – 8PM) remains low. With five Community Service Officer (CSO) positions restored in the Patrol Division, the Department was able to redirect low priority calls for service to these civilian positions and free up officers to focus on high priority calls for service. Additionally, the Department implemented a new Security Alarm Ordinance effective July 1, 2014, which reduced the number of false security alarms throughout the City, thereby freeing up officers to respond to higher priority calls for service. Based on the first nine months of the Ordinance in place, the number of false alarms calls has decreased by 9%, when compared to the prior nine months.

With 13 total sworn vacancies, the Department has placed a high priority on hiring new officers. Beyond the current vacancies, the Department is expecting a sizeable number of retirements throughout 2015. The Department also expects a number of vacancies in the sworn classifications due to employees accepting positions in various law enforcement agencies in San Diego County. This could further exacerbate the staffing issues if the Department is unable to recruit and hire officers in a timely manner (A discussion regarding hiring is mentioned in "Employee Services"). The overall function is (Yellow) considering the operational


changes that are being implemented and resources are already budgeted for this function.

The overall function for this division is (Yellow) mainly due to anticipated revenue decreases in Police grants that fund personnel. Funding for one sergeant and one agent assigned to the Southwest Border Ant-Money Laundering Alliance will end in December 2015, and funding for one officer assigned to the Promise Neighborhood program will end in December 2017. Additionally, one Police Community Relations Specialist is partially funded by the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG), and one sergeant and two officers are funded by the State Law Enforcement Supplemental Fund (SLESF). Because JAG funds have been decreasing each year and SLESF is not guaranteed funding, the Police Department is recommending to restore these positions in the General Fund and utilize grant funding for one-time equipment expenditures rather than ongoing personnel costs.

While sworn officer vacancies and a high volume of employee retirements continue as challenges, Chula Vista remains among the safest cities in the country with populations over 200,000. According to FBI Uniform Crime Statistics, the total overall crime rate in Chula Vista decreased by 13% in 2014 when compared to 2013.

- Community Engagement (Green)

The Police Department conducts a variety of community outreach functions in order to ensure that the Police Department is responsive to the needs of our diverse community, and that important information is relayed to residents regarding crime and disorder issues throughout the community. This function is (Green), although it should be noted that the Department does not currently conduct any formalized community-wide survey to ascertain what the citizens feel are important issues in terms of crime and disorder in their neighborhoods. This type of survey would help the Department set overarching goals to address these issues.




CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS (Yellow)

The Criminal Investigations Division is comprised of General and Special Operations detectives charged with investigating various felony and misdemeanor crime cases and providing detailed crime reports to the San Diego District Attorney’s Office (or other judicial authority) for prosecution. The overall function is (Yellow) due to high caseloads, increased expectations from stakeholders (Community members and prosecutors), as well as position reductions in detective staffing over the last eight years. In 2007, five of the ten property crimes detectives were eliminated and one family protection unit detective was frozen. The reductions have negatively impacted the division’s ability to investigate both lower level felony and misdemeanor cases. A majority of property crimes are only proactively investigated if they become series related and evidence of suspect identity is discovered. Furthermore, the implementation of the body worn camera program will require additional time for investigations to review standard arrest cases.

Staff reductions in the Investigations Division in 2010 eliminated a Special Operations Lieutenant, and two Narcotics Enforcement Team positions thus reducing the Department’s effectiveness in dealing with narcotic related complaints received by the community. In 2013, the Special Operations Division eliminated another five detectives in regional task forces thereby reducing our presence and influence to investigate organized and cross border related crimes. The reductions in the Special Operations task force positions have reduced the Department’s ability to work large-scale conspiracy cases, thus reducing asset forfeiture funding. Recent changes in the Attorney General’s asset forfeiture guidelines will continue to have a negative impact on the department’s forfeiture funds.

The second phase of the Matrix study was completed in 2013, and there were various recommendations for staffing changes in the Criminal Investigations Division. These changes have not been implemented yet, but will be considered in the Department’s strategic plan.



SUPPORT OPERATIONS (Yellow)

The Support Operations Division provides operational support to both the Patrol Operations and Criminal Investigations divisions. The Support Operations Division consists of the Professional Standards Unit, City Jail, Forensic and Property/Evidence Units, Police Technology and Police Dispatch. These units all provide direct support to the field officers and detectives. The overall function is (Yellow) due to the ongoing recruitment challenges in Employee Services and the critical staffing and equipment needs in Police Dispatch; both of which are high priority functions in the Police Department.

- **Employee Services (Yellow)**

The Professional Standards Unit is responsible for personnel recruiting, background investigations and hiring for the Police Department. The Unit is also responsible for training and internal affairs investigations. This function is currently (Yellow). Currently there are 13 vacancies (as of April 7, 2015) in sworn staff which has a significant effect on the Department’s ability to achieve proactive patrol time targets. Although the Department has taken steps to increase the number of staff in Professional Standards, the workload involved in successfully recruiting qualified candidates, and conduct thorough and detailed background investigations, impact the unit’s ability to meet hiring goals. The unit plans to implement a new internal affairs/professional standards software system which will significantly improve operational efficiencies.

Additionally, the Professional Standards Unit is responsible for coordinating mandatory qualifications and training for the Department. Funding for training remains an issue for the Department, especially in light of reduced funding from the State of California. Since police work is a high liability function, training is a critical component to the overall risk reduction for the City. Further erosion of training funds will mean reduced training, and potentially more liability claims against the City. This function will positively impact Community Patrol if addressed with adequate resources.

- **Police Dispatch (Red)**


The Police Dispatch unit provides critical communication between officers in the field, and citizens reporting emergencies to the Department. The unit is currently facing some of the same staffing issues that Community Patrol does. There are several retirements anticipated within the next year and the hiring process for Dispatchers is much like a Police Recruit, with long training cycles after hire. Therefore, when a vacancy occurs, it could take up to one year before a new hire is capable to work as a Dispatcher. Current staffing levels also offer no flexibility in terms of being able to absorb leave use by dispatchers. Each time leave is used, the vacancy must be filled by overtime. This is putting additional stress on dispatchers as they work longer hours, and have less down time from an already stressful job. There are also several information technology related issues related to the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system that continues to cause operational issues for the dispatchers. The Department considers these IT issues as critical as they affect the ability of dispatchers to operate the CAD system which is used to track each incident that is called into the Police Department. Much of this information is critical to officer safety.

- **Police Technology (Red)**

The Department remains resolute for the need a manager level position to oversee the department's security and technology needs. The Department is facing multiple high-level technology projects that will require the skill and experience of a manager who thoroughly understands law

enforcement technology needs. These projects include replacement of the aging Mobile Data Computer fleet, implementation of the new federally mandated Advanced Authentication protocol, replacement and upgrades of various police related software programs, as well as future replacements of the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system and new radio system.

As a result of budget reductions from prior years, the Department has not been able to replace its aging desktop computers. The Department has over 100 computers running on Microsoft XP, which is obsolete and no longer supported or updated by Microsoft. This represents a tremendous security risk to the Department's secure network which cannot be remedied without upgrading these computers to a modern operating system. Currently the Department's network is extremely vulnerable to attack by hackers.




- **ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (Yellow)**

The Administrative Services Division provides workload support to all three divisions in the Police Department. This includes Fiscal Operations, Police Support Services and Research and Analysis.

The Administrative Services Division is working with Public Works to address concerns over its aging fleet. With the elimination of the vehicle replacement fund from prior year budget cuts, the Department increased the replacement mileage of its fleet from 80,000 miles to 100,000+ miles. The Department has replaced over 40 vehicles using non-General Fund monies but struggles to identify funding to replace its aging vehicle fleet.

The Police Department is currently implementing its strategic plan (also known as SP14), which aligns with

the City's Strategic Plan and gives the Police Department a solid resource to make quality informed decisions about deployment and implementation of three focused initiatives: People, Partnership & Processes. SP14 will identify action plans of opportunities and challenges that the Department will face in the next five years, including recruiting, succession planning, personnel deployment, community partnerships and technology/equipment needs.



PUBLIC WORKS**STREETS SECTION (Red)**

City crews provide routine maintenance within the roadway and respond to service requests related to failures including pavement, curbs & gutters, sidewalks, traffic signs, fences and railings. They also respond to requests for removal of graffiti, litter, and other debris in the Public Right of Way. These requests are prioritized by considering health, safety, and protection of property. In addition, an emphasis is being placed on the aesthetics on major thoroughfares at the City entry ways. Current staffing generally provides for adequate response to high priority requests such as health and safety issues. Tasks are almost exclusively in reaction to complaints, as opposed to being proactive. Thereby leaving City crews limited time to proactively perform preventative maintenance or preservation strategies. We currently utilize the Roadway Management System (RMS) to spread the limited funding in the most effective way so as to minimize overall deterioration of the roadway assets.

To determine the level of service of the various section responsibilities, staff is tracking the following performance measures:

Goal: 95% of priority 1 “work orders” are completed within two working days. Currently we are achieving that turn around target 88% of the time;

Goal: 95% of priority 2 “work orders” are completed 10 working days of notification.

- **Roadway Maintenance (Red)**

In fiscal years prior to the economic slowdown of the 2000’s, the City used General Fund dollars to support its in-house roadway maintenance crews. The City currently relies on Gas Tax Funds to pay for its’ in-house crews. The Federal and State Gas tax rates have not kept pace with rising costs for roadway preservation and restoration needs. In fact, the rates have remained unchanged for over 22 years. In this same period, more vehicle miles are being travelled while revenues decrease due to alternate fuels and improved vehicle gas mileage. If the City were to invest the necessary funds, it would position itself to avoid more expensive street repairs in future years, minimizing the need to

undertake costly reconstruction projects for streets that had not been properly maintained.

In the February 2013 Council Workshop, City staff recommended a target Level of Service in terms of the Pavement Condition Index (PCI). Specifically, the recommendation embraced by Council, directs staff to target average PCI’s of 80 for Arterials, 75 for collectors and 70 for residential streets. It is estimated that an annual investment of \$11 to \$12M dollars (not including inflation) would achieve and sustain these targets over the next 30 years. Considering the current annual investment, we see a \$5 to \$6 million dollar gap in order to bring this function to a Green level of service.

Roadway preservation and restoration efforts are almost exclusively performed by outside contractors through our competitive bidding procurement processes. City crews spend most of their time responding to work requests such as the following:

- **Pothole Repair (Yellow)**
Routine pavement preservation and repairs made by our in-house Street Maintenance Crews include pothole repairs, asphalt crack filling and minor street reconstruction to help to prevent further damage to street surfaces. Currently, the City has met 75% of the pothole backlog.
- **Litter and Weed Abatement (Red)**
City crews are no longer scheduled to perform these services on a routine basis. Constituent requests for litter and/or weed abatement are completed within 2 weeks of receiving the request as this activity is the lowest priority. We currently promote volunteerism through the Buff-a-Block program. Currently, volunteers assist with small portions of our street system and have minimal impact on the needs. Providing additional resources would bring this service level up.
- **Grffiti Abatement (Red)**
The City currently employs one fulltime employee and two hourly employees who responds to service requests related to public infrastructure only. Increasing the graffiti budget by \$85,000 will allow

staff to utilize dedicated fulltime staff to assist with graffiti removal efforts on public infrastructure and resume with the eradication of graffiti from private property as well. Increased funding will support and achieve a (Yellow) level within this function. This program currently promotes the Buff-a-Block program which uses volunteers to abate and reduce graffiti in the community. A total of eight individual community groups have entered the program. These groups have taken responsibility for approximately 10% of the City’s neighborhoods.

Goal: 95% of graffiti would be removed within 48 hours of notification on **public** property. Currently 85% of reported graffiti is removed within 48 hours of notification (the average is 3 work days). Rapid removal of graffiti is one of the best deterrents to repeat offenses and not removing graffiti within 24 hours is inconsistent with the City’s graffiti removal ordinance. Providing additional resources would bring this service level up.

- **Traffic Striping and Signing (Yellow)**

City crews maintain street markings and traffic control signs for motorists, pedestrians, and residents so they can travel on clearly marked streets. Crews are assigned to assist with repainting stop legends, limit lines, school crosswalks, curbs, etc. but are only able to repaint 75% of the inventory on a bi-annual basis with on a goal of repainting 100% bi-annually.

Street Sign work requests are prioritized by risk assessment. Regulatory and Warning signs are priority 1 and Informational signs are ranked as 2 or 3 as appropriate.


Goal: 100% of legends would be repainted bi-annually.

Adding a 2 person crew to this Section, with an annual cost of \$200,000, would bring this area to a (Green) Service Level.

- **Street Sweeping (Yellow)**

The City is required by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations to implement a program to sweep improved (possessing a curb and gutter) municipal roads, streets, highways, and parking facilities. The

current degree of street sweeping is the bare minimum to keep the City in compliance. Anything less than the current frequency could move the category to (Red.) Increasing the street sweeping contract from \$150,000 to \$300,000 would allow the sweeping frequency to increase from once every two months to once a month for residential streets that generate moderate volumes of trash and/or debris, to achieve greater compliance with NPDES standards. .



TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND STREET LIGHTS SECTION (Green)

- **Traffic Signal and Street Light Maintenance (Green)**

City crews respond to service requests related to failures in the signals and lights. These requests are prioritized by considering health, safety, and protection of property.

Traffic Device Technicians are responsible for the following related to the City’s traffic control devices: Emergency Calls, Service Requests, Preventive Maintenance, Dig Alert and Inspections. Technicians assist the City’s Construction Inspections Section by doing electrical inspections on streetlights and traffic signals located in the public right-of-way (ROW). Dig Alert mark-outs are necessary for any excavation in the ROW which requires Technicians to mark all underground conduits related to the City’s extensive streetlight and traffic signal system. Dig Alert notifications occur daily by email.

Traffic Devices Maintained:

Traffic Signals

Nearly 300 signalized intersections are dutifully maintained by three City technicians, many more than the FHWA recommendation of 40-60

intersections per technician. Key components that make the job challenging are:


- Communications (essential for timing, coordination and monitoring) include; twisted-pair copper (leased AT&T lines), fiber optic lines and wireless radios.
- Controllers (essentially microprocessors), Detection; inductive loops and video detection systems, replacement of LED modules for vehicle and pedestrian signal and Accessible Pedestrian Systems.
- Preventive Maintenance includes annual testing of the conflict monitor (210 module), verifying planned operation of timing parameters and all controller modules, cleaning inside controller cabinets and identifying long term maintenance concerns. Maintenance repairs that can not be made on the spot are typically contracted out using operating budget or by CIP

Roadway Lighting

The City has approximately 9,000 roadway lights nearly all which have been converted to energy efficient LEDs. Although this has eliminated the need for frequent lamp replacement, there is still the burden of repairing and replacing failures, photo electric controls, maintaining miles of underground conduit and cables and knock downs. Since 2002, the average number of Citywide knock downs is 15 caused mainly by vehicle accident. Know down replacements are typically contracted out and are completed within 30-60 days from date of incident.

Other devices maintained include: Advanced Crosswalk Warning; In-pavement and Mast Arm Mounted Flashers and Hard-wired and Solar Powered Flashing Beacons. The number of these devices increase as requested by Traffic Engineering for pedestrian safety.

In addition, Condition Assessments are current and Preventative Maintenance Schedules on track. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.



FLEET MANAGEMENT SECTION (Yellow)

● **Vehicle Service and Repairs (Yellow)**


Current funding for service and repair of City vehicles and equipment is not keeping pace with the demand. Mechanic productivity is above industry standards and fleet availability is close to the goal of 95%. However, vehicles are not being replaced on the recommended schedule due to limited funds. As vehicles and equipment age beyond their recommended replacement date, the service and repair needs increase significantly in order to keep them in service. The service requests are prioritized considering health and safety first. Other City services are often impacted due to delays in completing needed service. The section reviewed its operation and determined that discontinuing a contract with NAPA for parts procurement and bringing inventory control in house would be more efficient for mechanics and represent cost savings. An in-house fleet inventory control specialist position was approved by council in the previous fiscal year. Staff has been added now, so improvement will be seen in FY16. Adding an additional Equipment Mechanic would bring this service to a (Green) level.

● **Preventative Maintenance (Yellow)**


Preventative Maintenance (PM) Programs utilize a systematic approach of scheduling fleet maintenance to ensure that manufacturers' recommended service intervals are met and repairs are made before "major" mechanical failures occur. Prior to staff reductions, PM's were performed on sedans and light-duty trucks every 3,000 miles and 85% were performed on schedule, which is an Industry Standard. PM's are now completed every 5,000 miles and only 72% are completed on schedule. Proactive PM Programs result in a more dependable fleet with extended equipment life,

lower repair costs (by avoiding costly repairs), less vehicle downtime, warranty tracking, and helps ensure operators' safety. The section implemented continuous improvement tools to increase the percentage of scheduled vehicle PM inspections that are completed each month. Staff identified a number of countermeasures to reduce or remove non-value added steps, reducing the PM process from 32 to 15 steps and saving an estimated 8.4 mechanic hours per day. Additionally, an equipment mechanic position was approved by council in the previous fiscal year. Combined the improvements bring this service to a (Yellow) level.

Goal: 85% of PM's was anticipated to be completed on schedule with the addition of staff. We did get up to 80% on schedule. Unfortunately a mechanic is out with a Workers' Comp injury, which makes it difficult to achieve this goal.



Drainage Management System	Red	\$450,000
Fleet Management System	Green	\$0
Buildings Management System	Red	\$150,000
General Government Management System	Yellow	\$0
Open Space Management System (District Funds)/Urban Forestry Management System	Green/Red	\$100,000



OPEN SPACE AND URBAN FORESTRY SECTION

- Maintain the Open Space Districts (OSDs) and Community Facilities Districts(CFDs) **(Green)**

This section provides stewardship over the OSDs and the CFDs. City staff administers contracts with private companies to perform this work. The City has also contracted with CEO, a non-profit organization to augment these services at well below market rates. This section is adequately staffed to perform these services at the appropriate level.

- Urban Forestry **(Red)**

This section is responsible for monitoring the overall health of street trees. Industry standard sets the ideal schedule for periodic tree trimming as follows: Palms need to be trimmed every 1 or 2 years. Pine trees and broad-leaved trees are recommended to be trimmed every 3- years. Based on an inventory of about 27,500 trees and using 3 years as the trimming cycle, the annual goal is 200 trees. Due to multi-year budget constraints, we are currently backlogged by over 13,000 trees. A one-time expenditure of \$1,600,000 would bring this area to a (Green) level. An additional \$350,000 over the current budget allocation of \$150,000 would stop the current backlog from increasing this year. A one-time cost of \$100,000 will be spent in FY16 as part of a


OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION **(Red)**

- Asset Management Program (AMP) **(Red)**

The Operations Administration Section is responsible for developing and administering the Citywide AMP. Additional resources are being used through a consultant contract to inventory the assets, evaluate their condition, and prioritize and determine the investment needs required to sustain their use. The City worked with a citizen advisory committee last year to better vet gaps and priorities. The next fiscal year the City will conduct additional outreach and education.


Asset Management Program		\$1,100,00
		0
Wastewater Management System (Sewer Funds)	Green	\$0
Roadway Management Systems	Red	\$250,000
Parks Management System	Red	\$150,000

Capital Improvement Project to remove approximately 250 dead and/or dying trees.




INSPECTIONS SERVICES (Green)

- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) (Green)
This section manages the City’s participation in the NPDES, which includes program planning, enforcement, education, and compliance. This section is adequately staffed to perform these services at the appropriate level.
- Construction (Green)
This section provides inspection, contract and permit administration services to private developments as well as City projects to enforce compliance with City standards and requirements. This section’s activities are vital to insure public infrastructure is constructed as designed and to the expected level of quality. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this section.



STORM WATER AND WASTEWATER COLLECTIONS

- Drainage Management System (Red)
The current Drainage Management System (DMS) is currently unsustainable. Inventories and Condition Assessments are incomplete and outdated (Corrugated Metal Pipe Assessment-10 years old). Preventative Maintenance is very limited as funding falls well short of the needs. Current activities have primarily been limited to a reactive approach when failure occurs. Corrugated Metal Pipe and Reinforced Concrete Pipe Replacement and Rehab efforts are unfunded and Drainage Basins are deteriorating due to excess vegetation and erosion of channels. Funds (\$60,000) are also needed to increase contractual services for channel cleaning, NPDES inspections, etc. in non-CFD (funded) areas. The NPDES Permit requires regular inspection and cleaning of trash and debris from the City’s storm drainage systems, including open channels, culverts, detention basins, etc.
- Wastewater Management System (Green)
This function is appropriately staffed and funding is sustainable. The Inventory and Condition Assessments are current on all facilities. Preventative Maintenance is being completed as scheduled. A study for potential adjustment to Sewer Fees is underway. Current system capacity meets or exceeds demand.



PARKS SECTION (Yellow)


- Maintain City Parks (Yellow)
City crews provide grounds keeping and maintenance services Monday through Friday each week for the 56 neighborhood and community parks including contracted out areas such as Connoley, Sherwood, and the Holiday Estates Parks and the medians along Main Street, Broadway, J Street and Orange Avenue.. A total of \$150,000 is

needed in park materials to purchase fertilizer (533 acres), plant material and also to complete repairs associated with playground equipment in order to maintain a (Yellow) level. As additional new park acreage is added such as the Orange Park and Stylus and Montecito Parks in new development; additional staff, and supplies and services will need to be allocated to prevent park maintenance from deteriorating to a (Red) condition.

- **Safety and Security of Parks (Yellow)**

The Park Ranger program was dismantled in the early days of the fiscal crisis, but in the current fiscal year, a Park Ranger Supervisor position was approved by council in the previous fiscal year. The services provided by the Ranger Program are accomplished by part-time hourly employees focusing on very limited weekend services only. Services include: opening and closing of the parks, posting rented gazebos, cleaning and restocking restrooms, and trash receptacle management. The Park Ranger program also monitors all City sports fields for non-permitted sport activity that may cause damage to City fields. In addition, City Council adopted an Ordinance authorizing the Park Rangers to issue infraction citations.

A new approach is envisioned to bring this area to a (Green) service level. The Public Works department is working with the Police Department to develop a Park Volunteer Program to assist with park monitoring services, picnic shelter and reservation systems, and park security duties. A full time Park Ranger Supervisor has been hired to oversee this volunteer program and to provide enforcement. In addition, this position oversees the weekend hourly Ranger staff and provides enforcement in the parks for 3 weekdays.




PROJECT DELIVERY (Green)

- **Design (Green)**

The Design Section is responsible for the preparation and development of construction documents, specifications, and right-of-way acquisition necessary to successfully build the various infrastructure rehabilitation projects within the City of Chula Vista. The section provides the City with invaluable in-house expertise with respect to its ability to design and manage both large and small Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). This section is adequately staffed at the appropriate level to provide these services and would be adjusted to meet program needs if necessary.

- **Surveys (Green)**


The Survey Section is responsible for providing professional in-house expertise in construction staking, engineering design surveys for Capital Improvement Projects, and design related survey information for roadways, sewer lines or other public improvements. The section also provides property surveys for City-related projects. This section is adequately staffed at the appropriate level to provide these services and would be adjusted to meet program needs if necessary.



REAL PROPERTY SECTION (Green)

Real Property provides comprehensive real property services to the City, development community, and general public. The Real Property Management program provides professional right-of-way and real property services including right-of-way acquisition and relocation; property management and disposition; and property document research, interpretation, and creation. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.

- Building and Park Construction (B & PC) **(Green)**
 The Building and Park Construction Section manages, monitors, and completes all new facility and park construction projects for the City, and ensures that all programming issues are addressed during the design/development and construction drawing phases of these projects. In addition, the Inspectors of the B & PC section ensure quality control and contract compliance in the areas of facilities and landscape construction. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.



ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SECTION **(Green)**


- Compliance with AB 939 Waste Management Act and AB 341 Waste Diversion **(Green)**
 Environmental Services currently provides solid waste management program planning, development, implementation and ongoing operations designed to meet the waste reduction and recycling goals of keeping the City of Chula Vista in compliance with AB 939, the California Waste Management Act. (5.3 lbs per person, per day or less disposed – Chula Vista is at 3.5 lbs per person, per day).

Chula Vista is also in compliance with AB 341. The Clean Business program is continuing to grow with continued collaboration with the Storm Water and Conservation Sections.

- Citywide Solid Waste Collection Services **(Green)**
 This section has oversight of the City’s franchise agreement with Republic Services, who provides some of the services and program enhancements that assist the City with compliance with AB 939. There are service standards and performance indicators built into the contract, which Allied Waste has met and continues to meet. Current

staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.

- Household Hazardous Waste Disposal Services **(Green)**
 Environmental Services also has oversight of the South Bay Regional Household Hazardous Waste Drop-off Facility at the Public Works Facility. The contract for service includes turnkey operation of the drop-off facility for residential and commercial small quantity generators hazardous waste, and door-to-door pickup for select individuals. These services are provided for National City, Imperial Beach, the County of San Diego, and Chula Vista. The current contract has been in place for two years and Clean Harbors, Inc. has met all the performance indicators. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.



CONSERVATION SECTION **(Green)**


- Municipal Energy & Water Conservation Upgrades **(Yellow)**
 The Public Work’s Conservation Section assists various departments in identifying, financing, and implementing capital projects to lower energy and water use and to reduce related municipal utility costs. Over the last year, the Conservation Section facilitated an indoor LED lighting pilot project, an adaptive street light control test bed, and the transition to a web-based utility management system to better track and analyze the 600+ municipal energy accounts. However, the City continues to struggle with securing funds for indoor and outdoor water use efficiency upgrades. This problem will become more urgent over the next 6 months as new statewide emergency drought orders become mandatory.

- Community Energy & Water Conservation Services **(Green)**

Through its two core community programs – *Free Resource & Energy Business Evaluations (FREBE)* and *Home Upgrade, Carbon Downgrade*, the Conservation Section provides no-cost energy and water conservation services to businesses and residents. Over the last year, over 600 community members have benefited from these services and received incentives, loans, or audits to help lower their monthly utility costs. In addition, the Conservation Section supports local Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) programs in providing new financing for residents and businesses interested in energy and water upgrades. In collaboration with Environmental Services and Storm Water, Conservation staff continues to administer the Chula Vista CLEAN Business Program, which recruited 50 additional businesses into the program over the last year. Finally, the Conservation Section continued to manage the City’s Local Government Partnership with San Diego Gas & Electric and the California Public Utilities Commission, which supports additional community energy efficiency programs via numerous City departments. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.

- Resource Conservation Commission Climate Change Working Group & City Operations Green Team **(Green)**

The Conservation Section administers the Resource Conservation Commission to help guide and to provide an additional public forum for the City’s environmental programs and policies. Over the last year, staff has supported monthly meetings for the Resource Conservation Commission. In addition, the Conservation Section reconvened a Climate Change Working Group to help develop recommendations for updating the City’s Climate Action Plan. Finally, the Conservation Section, in coordination with Environmental Services and Storm Water, coordinates the implementation of the newly-adopted City Operations Sustainability Plan with the assistance of the multi-departmental Green Team. Current staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient service in this function.



CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR SECTION **(Red)**

- City Building Facilities Service Requests **(Yellow)**



City crews respond to service requests related to City facility repairs. These requests are prioritized by considering health, safety, and protection of property. Current staffing generally provides for adequate response to health and safety issues. Tasks are almost exclusively in reaction to complaints. A Construction & Repair Supervisor position was added in the previous year to move this function towards (Green).

- Perform Routine Preventative Maintenance on City Building Facilities **(Red)**

City crews have minimal available time to proactively perform preventative maintenance or preservation strategies. We are developing the Buildings Management System (BMS) to enable us to assess the condition of our building assets, establish preventative maintenance schedules and determine appropriate sinking fund investments for future repairs/replacement. Additional resources are needed to move towards (Yellow) in this function in order to maintain the reliability and viability of all electrical, HVAC, plumbing systems, etc.

- Minor CIP Projects **(Red)**

This program has not been funded over the last few years, which continues to create a backlog associated with painting, stucco and drywall, electrical, plumbing, HVAC, and roofing repairs. A list of the Minor CIP Projects is developed each year by coordination with City departments. \$200,000 annually is needed to address a \$3.4 million citywide Priority 1 critical construction and repair needs. A project of a minor nature is generally approximately \$7,000-\$10,000 per improvement.



CUSTODIAL SERVICES SECTION (Yellow)

● **Basic Cleaning Services (Yellow)**

The Custodial staff is responsible to ensure that the City facilities are clean and ready for public use each day. This generally includes the routine cleaning and sanitizing of restrooms, vacuuming and sweeping floors, and emptying trash receptacles. A checklist of basic cleaning tasks is logged daily at each facility.

Goal: 95% of basic cleaning services would be completed daily. The Recreation Centers hours of operation were increased within the last fiscal year. The custodial forces are not able to provide the basic cleaning services for these additional hours without an additional \$75,000 to augment the baseline budget. This increase would return the basic cleaning service level to (Green).

● **Detailed Cleaning Events (Yellow)**

Buffing floors, washing windows, dusting blinds and fixtures, and washing walls are examples of this service. City staff is not resourced to provide adequate service levels for this function.

● **Special Event set-ups and break-downs (Yellow)**

Custodial staff is often called upon to assist in setting up and breaking down for special events. This can involve transporting and setting up audio/visual equipment, chairs and tables, etc. The section is not staffed to provide this service and when called upon, must forgo performing basic cleaning in another facility in order to provide for the special event. An annual investment of \$73,000 would be needed to move this service area to (Green) including the Basic Cleaning Services function.

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (Yellow)

● **Traffic Engineering (Yellow)**


The Traffic Engineering Section endeavors to establish a public traffic safety service by providing a communication link between the citizens of Chula Vista and City staff, along with the City Council via the Safety Commission. Through this dialogue inquiries regarding traffic safety and other related issues are addressed. In addition, the section works to develop a safe and efficient transportation network, and for compliance to the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) threshold standards, and monitors the functioning of that network on a daily basis. Traffic Engineering also performs design services for the City with respect to transportation improvements such as traffic signals, improved signing, arterial monitoring services, and other important traffic related projects. The Traffic Engineering section performs field surveys of high accident locations and locations which experience congestion and initiates remedial traffic improvements, investigates all requests for traffic improvements, and takes any necessary corrective actions. Additionally, the Traffic Section is responsible for grant application preparation and submittals.

Stretch goals for this year are:

- Complete more traffic counts citywide
- Complete more speed limit studies
- Complete more traffic operation investigations
- Expand Adaptive Traffic Signal System
- Prepare an Annual Traffic Safety Report
- Pursue transportation program grant funds
- Synchronize signal timing on key arterials
- Update Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan

It is anticipated that all of the goals may not be met due to staffing levels and funding.

- Wastewater Engineering (Green)**
 The Wastewater Engineering section manages the City's sewer system so that Chula Vista residents receive dependable and affordable wastewater treatment and disposal services. This section is adequately staffed at the appropriate level to provide these services and would be adjusted to meet program needs if necessary.
- Advanced Planning (Green)**
 Advanced Planning manages asset inventories, flood plain inquiries, master plans, pavement management system and special studies to identify current and future deficiencies in the City's sewer, pavement, storm drain, wastewater disposal, and street systems to ensure that the City's infrastructure will adequately serve the community now and in the future. This section also prepares most of the Engineering grant submittal applications throughout the year and is adequately staffed at the appropriate level to provide these services and would be adjusted to meet program needs if necessary.



RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Four key functions in the Recreation Department that provide a management assessment of the current levels of service are Recreation Programs and Services, Operations, Customer Service, and Resource Management. These key functions establish what constitutes a quality experience, operational and cost recovery goals, marketing and communications standards for users to access programs and services.

RECREATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Recreation programs and services provided by the City shall be based on the conceptual foundations of play, recreation, and leisure; essential interests and needs; community opportunities; City's mission and goals; and experiences desirable for participants. Recreation programs and services can be self-directed, leader-directed, facilitated, fee-based or cooperative in nature.

SELF-DIRECTED PROGRAMS AND SERVICES provide for recreation opportunities where there is only general supervision, including outdoor basketball courts, trails, tennis courts, and open multipurpose ball fields, game rooms and playgrounds as well as some pool and center based activities. These self-directed areas, facilities, and equipment should be provided to give an opportunity for individuals and groups to participate without leadership, under only general supervision.

- Provision of Recreational Swim (Yellow)
Recreational swimming provides time when the pools are open to the general public for fee-based and General Fund supported, unstructured, leisure swimming. Target participants are families, elementary school aged youth and teens. The status of Recreational Swim is (Yellow) as a result of outside funding received and additional funding allocations for the budget this FY 2014-2015 to provide part-time Lifeguards. Recreational swimming is offered during the six weeks of summer, two weeks of spring, and two weeks of fall for 2.5 hours/day, 3 days/week. The status could move to (Green) with increasing total hours of operation and secured outside funding. The status could move to (Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed and pool operational hours are affected.
- Operation of Recreation Centers (Green)
Facility operations at City Recreation Centers


(Parkway Center/Gym, Loma Verde Center, Otay Center, Veterans Center, Heritage Center, Salt Creek Center, and Monteville Center) include provision of structured and drop-in activities and programs, provision of meeting space for community groups and organizations, oversight of adjoining outdoor amenities, and fitness centers at several locations, including the provision of associated custodial and building maintenance services and utilities funding. Status is (Green), as center operations have expanded back to five to seven days per week. It has been noted by both Recreation and Public Works Departments that custodial and building maintenance services were not increased commensurate with the hours of operation. This is addressed in the Public Works Department under custodial services section.

- Operation of Norman Park Senior Center (Yellow)
Facility operations at Norman Park Senior Center (NPSC) encompass a variety of services including: the provision of meeting rooms to clubs primarily serving seniors; drop-in as well as organized and structured classes, programs, special events and activities; a place for leisurely socializing; and a membership based fitness center. Norman Park is open five days per week during hours desired by the senior community. The center offers more than 60 programs, classes and activities each month geared toward serving the older adult and senior population. In addition, NPSC leases space upstairs to several nonprofit community service providers including Meals-on-Wheels, Home Start Inc., the Parkinson's Foundation, Southern Caregivers Resource Center. The Department also partners with ElderLaw to provide meeting space for seniors to receive free legal advice and AARP for meeting or event space to offer Drivers Safety Classes and Car-Fit events. In addition to recreation programs and classes, Norman Park Center also offers services such as information and referral, assistance completing low income housing paperwork, the Commission on Aging, bereavement support groups, income tax assistance, the RUOK program, volunteer opportunities, partnerships with a number of senior focused organizations such as Scripps, So-CAN, AIS and HHSA to provide health talks, fraud/scam awareness prevention healthier living

workshops as well as partner events such as Dance for Your Health. The Community Development Block Grant program funds 29 of the center’s 53 hours of operation per week (Monday-Thursday, 12-5pm and Friday 8am-5pm). However CDBG funds continue to decrease while the demands of the center continue to be a high priority. This center site is staff intensive, yet there is no full time Recreation Supervisor, thus the status has moved from Green to Yellow. As the aging population grows, the need for GF and full time staff support for this site are a priority to the department and commissions. If CDBG or GF funding is not continued this could move back to (Red).

- Provision of After-School “Critical Hours” Programming (Green)

Generally, fee-free, after- school programming is offered at all recreation centers and through the mobile recreation program at park location sites in underserved areas without a recreation center. The program is designed to provide a “safe haven” for youth ages 5-16 during the two to three hours immediately following the close of the school day until parental supervision resumes later in the afternoon/early evening. Activities may be formal (organized) or informal (drop-in) and hours vary by center and school schedules. Currently serving over 350 youth per day at our various program sites. Critical hours for an older age group (16-25) typically take place later in the evening and on weekends at Parkway Gymnasium and Loma Verde Center and serve 30-40 teens and young adults daily. Status is (Green) based on recreation centers now being open at least five days per week with extended hours.



LEADER-DIRECTED PROGRAMS AND SERVICES provide recreation opportunities where participant involvement is directed by a leader, including instructional skills classes, such as sports, camps, art, dance and creative and performing arts for children.

- Provision of City-Sponsored Youth Leagues, Programs, and Camps (Yellow)

Organized, fee-based, coed recreational leagues for all skill levels for ages 6-16. Basketball and soccer sports leagues are coached by volunteers from the community. Practices are generally held during the week with games scheduled on Saturdays according to geographic considerations at two City facilities, Parkway Gym (West) and Salt Creek (East). A variety of specialty sport camps are offered on a fee-basis at a variety of recreation centers throughout the year as well. Five centers offered at least one week of camp during the winter quarter and many offered a variety of camps throughout the various intersession breaks. The status could change to (Green) through additional funding resources to provide at least one camp at each center/gym site location.


- Provision of City Sponsored Adult Leagues and Programs (Yellow)

Organized, fee-based, coed and men’s recreational leagues for all skill levels for adults. Softball and basketball leagues are held four times per year, and are facilitated by part-time staff and officiated by contract officials. Softball leagues play at Mt San Miguel Park, Monteville Park, and Veteran’s Park. Basketball leagues play at Parkway Gym, Salt Creek Gym, and Monteville Gym. The Golf league is held one season per year during the spring/summer and is held at Chula Vista Municipal Golf Course, Bonita Golf Club, Eastlake Country Club, and Salt Creek Golf Club. The status could change to (Green) through additional resources to provide a full time Recreation Supervisor to increase and develop additional programs and services.


- Therapeutics Programming (Yellow)

This status has shifted from Red to Yellow through Community Development Block Grant funding the entire Therapeutic Recreation Program in FY 2014-15. This program features classes, events, activities and services specifically designed for individuals with physical and/or developmental disabilities.

Activities offered include parent’s night out, dance, fitness, enrichment, and sport classes as well as social events. This year’s goal is to serve 100 individuals with physical or developmental disabilities. The department also continues to provide inclusion services, ADA mandated accommodations for requesting individuals, via an assessment and support provided through a Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist (CTRS). Expansion of Therapeutics Programming would move this to (Green). If neither CDBG funding nor GF funding is secured for FY16, this would move back to (Red).



spring for practices and games for the Eastern Division. The soccer arena was closed in August 2014. The site is in need of having the turf and scoreboard replaced to continue its future use. This project was placed on the unfunded proposals Capital Improvement list (item 102150, Speed Soccer Arena \$145,000), but has since been approved to utilize TUT funds for replacement costs. An Adult Arena Soccer league will once again be introduced and will generate an additional \$30,000 in revenue annually with the turf and scoreboard replacement.




FACILITATED PROGRAMS AND SERVICES provide recreation opportunities where individuals and groups of individuals are encouraged and assisted to operate independently of the agency, including rental opportunities.

- Aquatic Facilities for Community Use **(Green)**
Both City pools are revenue-producing facilities through use by private local swim clubs, SUHSD for swimming and water polo teams, and individuals or groups for private functions. This was changed from a (Yellow) status to (Green) due to cost changes to make rentals more desirable to users and individuals. The demand for pool space, at least times and seasons, outweighs availability. The status could move to (Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed and pool operational hours are affected.
- Arena Soccer Facilities for Community Use **(Red)**
The soccer arena is a high demand, high use sports facility by the community for rentals and parties. The soccer arena historically realizes more than 130 rentals per year, and has also been utilized by the City-sponsored Youth Indoor Soccer League in the

FEE BASED PROGRAMS AND SERVICES provide recreational opportunities for a fee, as not all programs and services can be offered without charge. To offer some programs and services for a fee can greatly augment the recreational opportunities. Services for a fee may include the rental of aquatic facilities, outdoor soccer arena, and recreation centers. Programs for a fee also include instruction, lap swim and contractual classes

- Provision of Instructional Swimming Programs **(Green)**
Instructional swimming programs currently include the following: Parent & Tot (parent and child age 6 months-3 years), Toddler Aquatics (children ages 2-3), Tiny Tot (children ages 4-5), Learn-to-Swim (children age 6-17), Swim Clinic (children age 6-17), Adult Swimming Lessons (ages 18+), and Private Lessons (ages 4+). Being able to provide instructional swimming programs nine months per year to all ages on a fee basis keeps this at a (Green) status. The status could move to (Yellow or Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed and pool operational hours are affected.

- Provision of Adult Lap Swim (Yellow)
 Adult Lap Swimming provides time when the pools are open to adult's age 18+, primarily serving lap swimmers, water-walkers and other water-based aerobic activities, paid for by fees and the General Fund. The status of Adult Lap Swimming is (Yellow) as a result of budget reductions that reduced the program by 50%, to Monday through Friday hours during the morning and noon time at one pool, instead of both pools. Fees do not cover the full cost. This year we were able to continue to provide an additional two days/week at Parkway Pool from March-June as a result of a generous donation. As this was funded by a donation and could potentially not be funded in the future, we cannot consider the status as Green. Status could move to (Green) with the addition of outside funding for part-time resources (Lifeguards) to provide activities at both pools on a year-round basis. The status could move to (Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed and pool operational hours are affected.
- Provision of Contractual Classes (Green)
 The Recreation Department utilizes 60-80 independent contractors yearly as contractual instructors of a wide variety of 1,200 recreational classes, including, but not limited to: preschool activities, dance, creative and performing arts, martial arts, fitness, sports, personal enrichment and others. These contractual programs are offered at all recreation facilities as well as at various "satellite" parks and locations throughout the city and involve 10,000 participants annually. Although (Green), opportunities remain for further expansion of these programs, particularly in "satellite" locations.



COOPERATIVE PROGRAMMING provides recreational opportunities through coordination with other organizations in the community to provide maximum coverage with a minimum of duplication, as well as to reduce interagency competition for the time of an individual. The desirability of total community programming is in order to avoid unnecessary waste of effort and finances and to match the type and level of programming to community needs. Cooperative programming includes use of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), Memoranda of Agreement (MOA), partnering, or leasing space available at facility sites (ie Norman Park Senior Center upstairs office spaces).

- Provision of Elementary Learn-to-Swim Programs (Green)
 These are group swimming lessons provided primarily to 4th grade classes from schools in the Chula Vista Elementary School District. They are currently funded through a grant from the Kaiser Foundation. The status of this program could switch to (Yellow) or (Red) if grant funding and/or donations are reduced or eliminated. The status could also move to (Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List and pool operational hours are affected.
- Facility Lease Agreements at Norman Park Center (Green)
 In an effort to assist seniors in accessing needed programs and services, Norman Park Center leases the offices located on its 2nd floor to several non-profit agencies that provide additional services to seniors such as Parkinson's Foundation, Southern Caregivers, HomeStart Inc. and Meals on Wheels.
- Facility Lease Agreements at Parkway Community Center (Green)
 With the expansion of the Chula Vista Learning Community Charter School to include a separate middle school in facilities on Park Way, we have leased out recreation facilities at the Parkway Community Center and Gymnasium for the school to operate physical education, dance, and health classes throughout the week. Howard Gardener Charter School also utilizes Parkway Gym for physical education programs facilitated by Recreation staff.

- Provision of Community Capacity-Building Programs (Yellow)

The Recreation Department has been providing programming space at Loma Verde and Norman Park Centers to HHS/AIS for Healthier Living with Chronic Conditions classes geared toward older adults and seniors. This is a peer lead program administered and funded by HHS/AIS. The program involves peer led classes encouraging and discussing goal setting for increased health of those with chronic conditions such as arthritis, diabetes, obesity, depression, health disease and much more.

Additionally, Norman Park Senior Center partners with Southwestern College’s Continuing Education Department to offer a Senior Strength and Exercise class and So-CAN to offer the yearly “Dance For Your Health” event.

These free programs provide added visibility and enhanced services to our scope of programming as well as help to further promote our centers to the public.



OPERATIONS

- Fiscal Management (Yellow)

Recreation use fees and charges as a revenue source to supplement General Fund appropriations. The department does not currently have a specific mandated cost recovery or specific percentages per recreation programs and services, other than a guidance of a 30% to 70% cost recovery. Fees and charges involve updating the City’s Master Fee Schedule as well as policies currently in place. The Department is currently well under way with a cost recovery resource allocation, pricing strategy and revenue enhancement study which is anticipated to


be completed by June 2015. This category could move to **Green** once the study is implemented.

The study will provide following components:

1. Create a cost recovery resource allocation, pricing strategy and revenue enhancement study In order for the department to maintain cost recovery/subsidy levels that are appropriate based on our community’s characteristics, values, and available funding.
2. Develop a pricing methodology policy so that staff is trained and understands the philosophy behind it and how to communicate the price to the users.

- Policies and Procedures (Yellow)

The department has begun to update forms, applications and operational procedures to help facilitate the implementation of policies, how tasks are to be completed, when, and by whom. In coordination with the City Attorney’s Office, the department has reviewed cooperative programming Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), Memoranda of Agreement (MOA), leases, permits and partnership opportunities. Public Works staff and Recreation staff reviewed and revised Chapter 2.66 of the Municipal Code (Park and Facilities Rules) updating language to be consistent with current operations and department structures. For the department to be united and to communicate the same message to the community, it needs to have policies and procedures in place that are consistent, which will ultimately move this to a (Green) status.




CUSTOMER SERVICE

- Information/Technology (Green)

The Recreation Department offered all full- time staff an additional day of training on the reporting and marketing features offered through ActiveNet.

This tool continues to help provide consistent communication and increased customer service to our patrons. The status has changed to (Green) based on the improvements made. However, the status can revert to (yellow) without resources to continue training staff and customers on the features of ActiveNet as well as upgrades to technology when needed to ensure good communication to both internal and external customers. The department continues to evaluate computers and software programs needed to be updated at center sites.

- Marketing and Communications (Yellow)
Continue to work on developing a marketing plan to promote our services. The Recreation Department worked with the Office of Communications to develop a logo for the department to brand the programs and services. Peach Jar (a fee based paperless system) is an electronic marketing tool that the local elementary school system is utilizing. Twenty-six schools in the Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) district are enrolled in this marketing program and 20 schools are not. The department is able to market programs and services to the public through press releases, Nixle, Website and Facebook. The Department continues to seek out additional marketing opportunities that are not fee based and can further reach our community who may not have easy access to computers. All full time staff received one day training on the reporting and marketing features of ActiveNet. Creating a marketing plan within the department should help move this towards a (Green) status.



RESOURCE MANAGEMENT/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/PARTNERSHIPS/SPONSORS

- Provision of Safe, Adequate, and Appropriate Recreational Equipment and Facilities (Yellow)
Due to no replacement funds being budgeted, durable recreational equipment and supplies used by the public have not been replaced for a number of years. This equipment is showing predictable signs of wear and tear; some items are able to be repaired, rather than being replaced. Equipment that is failing and is non-repairable is being removed from service, having a negative impact on programs with an end result of less revenue. A list of items that includes costs for replacement should be made for future long term planning. Some examples of durable equipment include tables and chairs, fitness center equipment, pool covers, and adjustable/retractable basketball goals. The establishment of a regularly scheduled, preventative maintenance program as well as the addition of an equipment replacement fee component to current and future fees and charges will enable the status to remain (Green) once implemented. Although the status of this broad-scope category would not likely be downgraded to (Red) as a whole, if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed, individual programs in specialty categories within this report certainly would be downgraded either from (Green) to (Yellow) or from (Yellow) to (Red).
- Community Access to Ball Fields (Yellow)
The Youth Sports Council (YSC), a group of 22 separate, youth-serving, non-profit organizations that provide organized sports activities in the community, provides coordination among, and support for, organized youth sports activities in the City. YSC organizations utilize 62 designated athletic fields in 32 City parks for 750 teams serving 9,800 youngsters annually. Fields are also utilized to conduct City-sponsored programs and activities, and are rented by private individuals and organizations for athletic activities.

The combination of total number of fields, reduced maintenance on fields, and high demand/use has resulted in a shortage of fields available for use; select fields are pulled from available inventory and

are now closed to recover from overuse. A regular field maintenance schedule needs to be developed for all fields to rest at some point. Closing more fields due to overuse, the lack of funding to maintain them, ultimately could shift this to (Red). We need to continue to collaborate with the YSC and Public Works Department on an operational plan to put in place for routine and continuous maintenance needs and funding renovations to continue to sustain the City’s facilities and amenities.

- Ball Field Rentals (Yellow)


The YSC is currently allocated a majority of the City’s fields for organized sport use. This does not leave a lot of options for additional ball fields’ access for rent. When available, fields are utilized to conduct City-sponsored programs and activities, and are rented by private individuals and organizations for athletic activities. Veteran’s Softball field, Veteran’s Multi-purpose field, and Salt Creek North Multi-purpose field were removed from the Youth Sports Council inventory of allocated fields to provide fields for the community use and/or City programming to increase field rentals. The combination of total number of fields, reduced maintenance on fields, and high demand/use has resulted in a shortage of fields available for use; fields are pulled from available inventory and are now closed to recover from overuse. Closing more fields due to overuse, and lack of funding to maintain them, ultimately could shift this to (Red).

- Mt. San Miguel Park Tournaments (Green)

Mt. San Miguel Park is a tournament destination site for the City. In 2014, the department secured thirteen multi-day tournaments for both softball and baseball requests. In addition, there were twenty-three single-day tournaments held for both youth and adults. Lutheran High School and High Tech High Chula Vista rent Mt San Miguel softball fields each spring season for their CIF practices and games. These multi-day sports tournaments have provided direct revenue to the department as well as indirect benefit through TOT, sales tax, etc.

- Provision of Water Safety Programs (Yellow)

This encompasses a variety of programs and activities including Safety Certification Classes (Lifeguarding, Water Safety Instructor, Instructor Training Classes), outreach efforts such as the Aquatic Safety Awareness Program (ASAP) and the Water Awareness in Residential Neighborhoods (WARN) program, and community-based water safety campaigns and events such as April Pools Day, Water Safety Festival, World’s Largest Swim Lessons and National Water Safety Month. Staff has been partnering with the Fire Department to increase the awareness to the public. This continues to be (Yellow) as what is currently offered is delivered by full-time staff with no funding to train and implement using part-time staff hours. Due to budgetary constraints, full-time aquatic staff has been doing ASAP and WARN presentations as time has allowed. Status could change to (Green) if qualified volunteers are recruited and trained to become presenters. These volunteers could do the WARN outreach program to homeowner associations, mobile home parks, and community groups, and ASAP outreach program to schools. The status could move to (Red) if significant maintenance items listed on the Citywide Critical Needs List are not addressed and pool operational hours are affected.



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Capital Improvement Program Summary

CIP Revenue Summary

CIP Expenditure Summary

Capital Improvement Projects Summary

Capital Improvement Program Summary

The following is an overview of the Capital Improvement Budget Program. The goal of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is to provide for the sustainable preservation of City-owned assets at the lowest cost and to leverage financial strategies to address infrastructure needs within a prioritized framework, which includes an assessment of the asset's condition, capacity to meet service demands, probability of failure, maintenance and preservation strategies, and funding availability. The CIP is a living document used to identify current and future requirements and the basis for determining annual capital budget expenditures. The CIP document can be found in its entirety on the City's website. To follow is a summary of the document.

Capital Improvement Projects are defined as capital investments with a value of \$50,000 or more and a minimum useful life of 5 years at a fixed location. Equipment, operating and maintenance costs are budgeted in the City's operating budget. New maintenance costs are included in the CIP budget and appropriated in future operating budget cycles.

The CIP document provides the capital project budget detail and reporting by asset management category, funding, and location. This format better aids the decision-making process as it allows the City Council to review projects recommended in each asset management system, gain an understanding of the condition of the asset in relation to the overall system and the basis for the recommendation, as well as the availability of funding sources. The proposed projects' detail sheets within each asset management system provides a description, location, project intent, type of project, link to the strategic goals, and funding requirements over the life of the project.



CIP PROCESS

The Department of Public Works annually prepares a Capital Improvement Budget for the City Council's approval. The CIP budget includes an estimated five-year Capital Improvement Program. The City is faced with the challenge of managing a range of aging infrastructure assets that are critical to maintaining an aging City and serving new development. Making sound decisions about asset maintenance and replacement requires information about the asset's probability of failure and capacity to meet the requirements of the system.

On a continuous basis, project proposals are added to the City's capital improvement budget and project management database (CIPACE) following recommendations from guiding documents (see list below) adopted by the City Council and condition assessments performed by Public Works staff. This year's CIP process includes the process of ranking projects and setting funding priorities. Funding recommendations are based on the evaluation of the

proposed asset's probability of failure, capacity, and level of service requirements including efficiency improvements gained.

Another tool used in ranking and formulating the CIP recommendations are Guiding Documents approved by the City Council. The City utilizes "guiding documents" to ensure proposed CIP projects are consistent with established program priorities. The following is a partial list of guiding documents, which have included public input from multiple stakeholders in the community. For example the Five-year Pedestrian Master Plan and Bike Master Plan were recently adopted by the City Council. They identify missing infrastructure needs within those program categories. Additionally, proposed CIP projects are reviewed for consistency with the City's General Plan and specific plan and City policies.

- General Plan
- Regional Transportation Program
- Bikeway Master Plan
- Street Saver Condition Index Database
- Drainage Master Plan
- Wastewater Master Plan
- Fire Master Plan
- Asset Management Plan
- Parks Master Plan
- Pedestrian Master Plan/Safe Routes to School
- Redevelopment Implementation Plan
- Southwest United in Action Survey Results
- Third Avenue Streetscape Master Plan
- Environmental Mitigation Program
- Western TDIF Program
- TDIF Program
- Redevelopment Implementation Plan
- Traffic Monitoring Program
- Growth Management Oversight Committee Annual Report
- Other Specific Plans (e.g. Urban Core Specific Plan, Palomar, Bayfront and Main Street Specific Plans)

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

Although a component of the City Manager's overall budget, the CIP budget is developed separately by Public Works staff on an annual basis. The CIP budget process runs parallel to the development process for the City's operating budget, and they are subsequently presented together for City Council approval.

On March 3, 2015 a public hearing was held for City Council to consider and adopt the TransNet Local Street Improvement Program of projects for fiscal years 2015-16 through 2019-20. Then, on April 2, 2015 Public Works held their annual Infrastructure Workshop.

Public comment is a vital component of the CIP process. The public had the opportunity to comment on the proposed CIP. The initial proposed capital improvement project detail sheets are posted annually in April of each year on the Public Works website for public comment and review.

<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/engineering>

Additionally, the Public Works Department publishes an annual proposed CIP budget. The document will be made available at the City Clerk's Office, the Civic Center Library, Otay Ranch Mall Library, and the South Chula Vista Library.

The proposed program reaffirms the City's commitment to identify resources to move us toward long-term sustainability of our City's current assets as well as new improvements that accommodate growth.


The City will continue to collaborate with regional agencies, such as the Port, SANDAG, and Caltrans, to ensure that the needs of our City residents are met, taking into account the unique characteristics of our City and recognizing our role as the County's second largest city and a leader in the South Bay.

CIP Revenue Summary

The Capital Improvement Program is supported by a number of funding sources. City staff continuously explores opportunities to diversify revenue and leverage funding for infrastructure improvements. The

following chart and table summarizes the funding sources for the FY 2015-2016 CIP budget.

Fiscal Year 2015-16 CIP by Funding Source



Funding Source	Amount
Sewer Service Revenue	\$ 13,000
Telegraph Canyon DIF	\$ 200,000
Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve	\$ 406,000
CDBG	\$ 468,292
General Fund	\$ 510,000
Traffic Signal	\$ 644,000
Sewer Facility Replacement	\$ 1,800,000
Transportation Development	\$ 2,955,845
Gas Tax	\$ 4,231,000
TransNet	\$ 7,215,343
Highway Bridge Program	\$ 9,048,589
Total FY16 Proposed Budget	\$ 27,492,069

The Capital Improvement Budget is primarily supported by Transportation Sales Tax (TransNet), Gas Tax, and revenues from the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) for Willow Street and Heritage Bridges. TransNet is the largest stable source of revenues for Capital Improvement projects. Along with TransNet, Gas Tax funds continue to provide a stable source of revenue for street related projects. The HBP is a safety program that provides federal-aid to local agencies to replace and rehabilitate deficient locally owned public highway bridges. Other major revenues in this year's budget include Transportation Development Impact Fees for street related projects and Sewer Facility Replacement funds for ongoing sewer rehabilitation projects. Competitive grant revenue sources remain steady with grant revenue growth opportunities in the imminent future. Transportation grants include the Active Transportation Program and Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program. Revenue decreases include the end of funds available from Proposition 1B and a reduction in Community Block Grant funding traditionally used for ADA pedestrian improvements.

The following is a brief description of key funding sources which support the FY 2015-16 Capital Improvement Budget:

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Traffic Signal Fee

The Traffic Signal Fee is a trip-based development impact fee that is charged with the issuance of building permits for new construction. The fee can be utilized for the installation and upgrade of traffic signals throughout the City. \$644,000 is programmed in FY 2015-16 for traffic signal modifications and pedestrian improvements.

Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF)

The City's TDIF Program was established on January 12, 1988, by Ordinance 2251 for the collection of development impact fees to be used to construct transportation facilities to accommodate increased traffic generated by new development within the City's eastern territories.

Telegraph Canyon Development Impact Fee

The City's Telegraph Canyon DIF was established on August 7, 1990, by Ordinance 2384 for collection of development impact fees to be used to construct drainage and channel improvements for the Telegraph

Canyon Basin. Due to outstanding DIF obligations and changing NPDES regulations, an overall study at a cost of \$200,000 is programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP to identify the improvement required to preserve and protect the infrastructure within the Telegraph Canyon Channel basin.

GRANTS

Active Transportation Grant Program

On September 26, 2013, the Governor signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (Senate Bill 99 Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354), a new statewide grant program to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The Active Transportation Program (ATP) consolidated the Bicycle Transportation Account BTA along with Safe Routes to School Program, the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program and two other programs into one program. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted the ATP guidelines on March 26, 2015. Caltrans announced a call for ATP projects and is accepting application from March 21, 2015 to June 1, 2015. Staff is currently evaluating potential projects to apply for grant funding under this program. Award notifications are expected in November 2015.

Bicycle Transportation Account

The Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) is an annual program providing state funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. Projects must be designed and developed to achieve the functional commuting needs and physical safety of all bicyclists. No BTA Program Call for Projects has been announced for FY 2015-16. Therefore, no BTA funds are programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP.

Community Development Block Grant Funds

Each year, the City receives approximately \$1.7 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Of this amount approximately \$1.3 million is available for community development activities, which include capital improvement projects. In 2006, the City of Chula Vista received a CDBG Section 108 loan in the amount of \$9.5 million for the completion of the Castle Park Infrastructure Projects. The debt service payment is paid back from the City's annual allotment of CDBG funds (approximately \$750,000 annually). This reduces the amount of CDBG funds available for other capital

projects to approximately \$0.3-0.5 million annually for the next 14 years. A total of \$468,292 in CDBG funds are programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP Program.

Highway Bridge Program

Included in the FY 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program are two major bridge replacement projects: STL-261, "Willow Street Bridge Widening," at the Sweetwater River and STM-386, "Heritage Road Bridge Replacement," at the Otay River. Both projects will be designed and constructed primarily using Federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds totaling approximately \$43.3 million, leveraged with a relatively small local TDIF contribution of about \$6.7 million. The environmental documentation and engineering design for STM-364 is also being partially funded by a \$2.5 million SAFETEA-LU grant.

The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) provides funding to enable states to improve the condition of their highway bridges through replacement, rehabilitation, and systematic preventive maintenance of deficient bridges. The existing bridge at Willow Street was constructed in 1940 and, through a series of studies, was determined that it was not practical to rehabilitate the bridge and funding for full replacement was subsequently approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans, which administers the HBP Grant Program in California. The existing bridge at Heritage Road was built as an interim facility in 1993 when heavy flood waters destroyed the river crossing; this interim bridge was recently approved by FHWA and Caltrans for replacement because it is inadequate for peak traffic volumes, does not accommodate pedestrians, and is unable to convey the 50-year storm without being overtopped.

Highway Safety Improvement Program

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) was established to attain a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads through the implementation of infrastructure-related highway safety improvements. The HSIP Cycle 7 call for projects announcement was made by Caltrans on February 3, 2015, with a beginning schedule on April 2015 and the applications due late July 2015. No HSIP funding has been programmed as part of the FY 2015-16 CIP.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Program

The Neighborhood Reinvestment Program (NEP) provides grant funds to County departments, public agencies, and to non-profit community organizations for one-time community, social, environmental, educational, cultural or recreational needs. No NEP funds are programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP.

Safe Routes to School

The State Safe Routes to School (SR2s) program goal is to reduce injuries and fatalities to schoolchildren and to encourage increased walking and bicycling among students. Competitive grants are available to local government agencies for construction of facilities that enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, primarily students in grades K-12 who walk or bicycle to school. No Safe Routes to School funds are programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP. The Active Transportation Program (ATP) consolidated the Safe Routes to School Program along with a number of other programs into one program.

Smart Growth Incentive Grant

The TransNet Smart Growth Initiative Program (SGIP) funds transportation related infrastructure improvements and planning efforts that support smart growth development. The SGIP will award two percent of the annual TransNet revenues for the next 40 years to local governments through a competitive grant program to support projects that will help better coordinate transportation and land use in the San Diego region. Staff will be submitting for an Active SGIP grant for the Third Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project Phase III from 200 feet north of "F" Street to "E" Street. No SGIP funds are programmed as part of the FY 2015-16 CIP.

MISCELLANEOUS FUNDS

General Fund

The General Fund is the City's main operating fund used to pay for City services. The FY 2015-16 CIP includes \$400,000 for Sign Reflectivity Replacement citywide, a revenue offset project (funded by SAFE funds), and \$110,000 for the City's Asset Management Program.

Residential Construction Tax (RCT)

The Residential Construction Tax (RCT) was established by the City Council in October 1971 to provide a more equitable distribution of the burden of financing parks, open spaces, public facilities, and other capital

improvements, the need for which is created by the increasing population of the City. The RCT is applicable to all new residential units and paid by the person constructing the units. RCT funds are used to pay for debt service obligations resulting from the issuance of Certificates of Participation (COP's) for western Chula Vista failing CMP repairs. No RCT funds are programmed as part of the FY 2015-16 CIP.

VOTER APPROVED FUNDS

Proposition 1B Highway Funds

In 2006-07, the voters of the State of California approved Proposition 1B. This proposition included funds to be provided to cities within the State for local roadway improvements. The initial allocation of \$3.6 million was spent on pavement rehabilitation projects in FY 2010-11. The second allocation of \$3.3 million was frozen by the State of California due to the State's financial crisis and released in late April 2010 in monthly installments. As a result, the State provided an additional year of expenditure for Prop 1B funds received in 2009-10. The City spent the second allocation of Prop 1B funds prior to June 2014.

Gas Tax

Several years ago the voters approved Proposition 42, which provided funding for cities to improve streets from the sales tax on fuel. The funds can only be utilized for street improvements and the City has utilized these funds to augment its annual pavement rehabilitation efforts. In FY 2015-16 the proposed CIP budget is \$4,231,000 million for minor pavement rehabilitation including street overlays and some street reconstruction based on the City's Pavement Management System, and CMP rehabilitation.

Transportation Sales Tax

Transportation Sales Tax (TransNet) funds are derived from sales tax revenues levied in San Diego County that are collected by the State specifically for use on transportation related projects in San Diego County. The regional metropolitan planning agency, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), programs these funds to municipalities within San Diego County. Revenues vary from year-to-year, depending on the amount of sales tax available to the region and the number and costs of projects for which municipalities, local transit, and Caltrans request funding. The revenue approved for municipalities is based on the specific cost estimates that are required to be submitted as part of

the annual request for funding. The TransNet Extension Ordinance states that at least 70 percent of the funds allocated to local agencies for local road projects should be used to fund Congestion Relief (CR) projects. CR projects include the construction of new or expanded facilities, major rehabilitation and reconstruction of roadways, traffic signalization, transportation infrastructure to support smart growth, capital improvements for transit facilities, and operating support for local shuttle and circulator transit routes. No more than 30 percent of TransNet funds allocated to local agencies are expected to be used for local street and road maintenance. In the FY 2015-16 CIP, the TransNet budget is nearly \$7.2 million.

SEWER FUNDS

Sewer Service Revenue

The Special Sewer fund is used to account for the sale of the City's excess Metropolitan Sewerage Capacity. A total of \$13,000 in Special Service funds are programmed in the FY 2015-16 CIP.

Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve

The Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve Fund is a permit fee based revenue source received from the owner or person applying for a permit to develop or modify the use of any residential, commercial, industrial or other property, that may increase the volume of flow in the City's sewer system. The funds may be used for: (1) to repair, replace or enlarge trunk sewer facilities to enhance efficiency of utilization and/or adequacy of capacity to serve the needs of the City, or (2) to plan and/or evaluate any future proposals for area-wide sewage treatment and/or water reclamations systems and facilities. In the FY 2015-16 CIP, \$406,000 is programmed to upsize an existing sewer pipe between Industrial Blvd and Main Street to meet operational standards for existing flow.

Sewer Facility Replacement Fund

The Sewer Facility Replacement Fund is a fee based revenue source that all properties pay each month as part of their sewer bills. The funds can be utilized to replace, rehabilitate or upgrade existing sewer facilities. In the FY 2015-16 CIP, a total of \$1.8 million is proposed for sewer rehabilitation projects.

CIP Expenditure Summary

The 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a five-year expenditure plan that provides the City with a financial strategy for infrastructure improvements. The CIP includes funding for projects and programs in various geographic areas of the City. The Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-16 capital expenditure budget is approximately \$27.5 million. The forecasted five-year program is estimated at \$96.1 million. The 2016-2020 CIP program reflects the actions taken by Council and developed in accordance with Council adopted policies and guiding documents (such as and not limited to the City's General Plan, Master Plans, Specific Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan) as well as generally accepted accounting principles. Overall, the 5-year program continues to trend favorably despite the economy and the fiscal constraints facing the City.

Projects in this year's Capital Improvement Budget have been sorted by the nine-asset management systems identified in the City's Fiscal Recovery Plan and the Infrastructure Workshop with the City Council. This provides a mechanism to track CIP allocations by Asset Management System (AMS). The nine AMS's include the following:


- The Roadway Management System (RMS) is comprised of all City-owned assets in the Public Right-of-Way. These assets include: Major and Local Streets, Sidewalks, Traffic Signals & Striping, Bicycle and Pedestrian paths, ADA Ramps and Curbs and Gutters. A majority of the CIP funding is focused on the RMS.
- The Wastewater Management System (WMS) is comprised of Sewer Pump Stations, Rehabilitation

and related projects.

- The Drainage Management System (DMS) is comprised of citywide storm drain facilities.
- The Building Management System (BMS) is comprised of City-owned facilities including the Civic Center, Fire Stations, Libraries, Police Station, Recreation Centers, and community facilities such as Rohr Manor and the Woman's Club.
- The Parks Management System (PMS) is comprised of the citywide park system.
- The Open Space Management System (OMS) is comprised of the Open Space Districts and Community Facility Districts (CFDs).
- The Fleet Management System (FMS) is comprised of City-owned vehicles.
- The General Government Management System (GGMS) includes general-purpose items such as Automation, Utility Undergrounding and Parking Meters.
- The Urban Forestry Management System (UMFS) is comprised of City-owned street trees, and trees within Public Right-of-Way and parks.

The following chart provides an expenditure breakdown, by Asset Management System, totaling \$27.5 million of recommended appropriations:

Fiscal Year 2015-16 Proposed CIP by Asset Management System



ROADWAY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RMS)

A majority of the CIP funding is focused on the Roadway Management System (RMS). The total amount programmed for Roadway projects is \$22.8 million, which represents 82.6% of the proposed CIP budget. Project types within the RMS are Major Streets, Local Streets, and Traffic. The following chart and table summarizes the funding by these project types.

Project Type	Total Cost
Local Streets	\$10,342,459
Major Streets	\$9,295,267
Traffic	\$3,159,000
Total Roadway Projects	\$22,796,726

RMS Projects

- Major Streets*

The \$9.3 million in funding includes the Pavement Major Rehabilitation Project (citywide), Heritage Road Bridge Replacement project, Bike Lane along East H Street, and studies for the Bikeway Facility Gap Project and the widening of Main Street and Heritage Road. The Pavement Major Rehabilitation Project includes resurfacing and pavement overlays, which may extend street life by up to 15 years. Failure to complete proactive street maintenance will lead to the accelerated deterioration of City streets, thereby, costing more to repair in the long-term.
- Local Streets*

The \$10.3 million in funding includes the Pavement Minor Rehabilitation Project, Willow Street Bridge

Road widening, sidewalk installation along portions of Moss Street, and the replacement of curb and cutter (citywide), and Kellog Elementary School pedestrian improvements.

Funding of \$50,000 is included for a Pavement Management Study which will further the development of the Roadway Management System, by addressing other roadway elements, besides pavement, on eligible roads. These elements include curbs, gutters, sidewalks, medians, parkways, traffic signals and street lighting.

- Traffic*

The \$3.2 million in funding includes the Traffic Calming Program, Traffic Signal System Optimization, Traffic Signal and Streetlight Systems Upgrade and Modification Program, Neighborhood Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Program, and traffic signal modifications at various locations.

Funding of \$608,000 is included to complete pedestrian improvements at Hazel Cook Elementary School and at various uncontrolled intersections throughout the City.

Funding of \$400,000 is included to replace city street signs that do not meet State reflectivity standards. In addition, funding of \$250,000 is included for the Traffic Signal installation at Main Street and Jacqua Street.

WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (WMS)

The second highest commitment of CIP funding is for the Wastewater Management System (WMS). The appropriation for Wastewater Management System (WMS) is \$2.2 million which represents 8% of the proposed CIP budget. The single project type within the WMS is Sewer. However, the discussion below is divided into the following two categories: Sewer Rehabilitation and Specific Sewer Improvements, and Sewer Pump Stations and Access Roads.

WMS Projects

- *Sewer Rehabilitation and Specific Sewer Improvements*

The annual Sewer and Manhole Rehabilitation project for fiscal year 2015-16 commits \$1.1 million for citywide work. A total of \$406,000 is included to complete sewer improvements at Industrial Boulevard and Main Street. In addition, \$200,000 is included to complete manhole inspections to establish a baseline condition in order to preserve and extend service life and avoid failures of existing structures.

- *Sewer Pump Stations and Access Roads*

The pump station at Parkside Drive will be rehabilitated, at a cost of \$450,000. Sewer access roads at various locations will be rehabilitated, at a cost of \$900,000.

DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (DMS)

The appropriation for Drainage Management System (DMS) projects is \$2.1 million which represents 7.7% of the proposed CIP budget. The single project type within the DMS is Drainage.

DMS Projects

- *Drainage*

A total of \$1.6 million in Gas Tax funds has been committed for CMP rehabilitation. This project is to address rehabilitation of CMP at specific locations, as well as for emergency repairs.

Funding of \$200,000 is included to complete a compliance feasibility study of the Telegraph Canyon Channel. In addition, \$280,000 is included to complete a storm drain rehabilitation project at a specific location.

BUILDING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (BMS)

Due to budget constrictions, staff has had to identify alternatives to fund building maintenance. Although funding is needed for maintenance on City facilities, the fiscal year 2015-16 proposed CIP budget does not include appropriations for Building Management System (BMS) projects. The goal is to better manage City assets with dedicated funding for replacement of components or entire facilities when they reach the end of their useful life.

FLEET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (FMS)

The City owns and operates over 540 vehicles, from police cars to fire trucks to dump trucks. Maintenance of these vehicles is funded via the individual City department's budgets that operate vehicles. Replacement of the vehicles is funded by the Equipment Replacement Fund, which the City Council established in 1985. However, due to budget constraints, staff has continued to extend the replacement of vehicles over the past several years. However, failure to replace vehicles when needed will result in higher maintenance costs to keep those vehicles running and impact productivity of crews.

PARKS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (PMS)

The City owns and operates 54 Parks covering more than 500 acres of land including amenities such as sports fields, lighting, play equipment, basketball and tennis courts, skate features, restrooms, parking lots landscaping, picnic areas and shelters. The preservation and rehabilitation funding for these assets predominantly is from the General Fund. Over the years, the City has also successfully competed for State Grants used for park improvements and received philanthropic donations. Unfortunately, all of these funding sources have been stressed with the economy and the actual maintenance investment has decreased in each of the last four budget cycles. As a result, the condition of the parks and amenities, throughout the system, is suffering visible deterioration.

A study was presented to the City Council in 2000, which recommended appropriate staffing levels for adequately maintaining the parks system. Current staffing levels are down by 16 positions from the recommended levels. Additionally, critical needs are estimated to cost \$405,000 and include tot lot replacements at Valle Lindo and Los Ninos Parks, tot lot soft fall replacements at various parks, repairs to steps

that join Loma Verde Recreation Center to Rienstra fields, sidewalk repairs at Rohr and Tiffany Parks, jogging trail, restroom and a pump replacement at Rohr Park.

PMS Projects

- *Parks*
The City has received \$2.8 million in Proposition 84 State Parks Grant funds to design and construct Orange Park, south of the South Chula Vista Library, within an SDGE easement. The construction of Orange Park is scheduled to be completed in the summer of 2015.

OPEN SPACE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (OSMS)

A total of \$98,343 is being appropriated for Open Space Management System (OSMS).

OSMS Projects

- *Open Space*
A total of \$98,343 is being appropriated to restore and enhance approximately 10 acres of degraded habitat for the coastal cactus wren within the Otay Ranch Preserve (Salt Creek/Otay River Valley). Management activities will include invasives species control, habitat restoration (including vegetation planting), and biological monitoring.

URBAN FORESTRY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (UFMS)

The Urban Forestry Management System is responsible for monitoring the overall health of trees throughout the City, including street trees, park trees, and trees located on City property. The City continues to maintain City street trees in order to:

- Ensure ongoing traffic safety along City streets;
- Enhance the appearance and image of the City;
- Improve the air quality and the environment for City residents; and
- Clear right-of-way obstructions.

Industry standard sets the ideal schedule for periodic tree trimming as follows: Palms need to be trimmed every 1 or 2 years. Non-palms are recommended to be trimmed every 3-5 years (eucalyptus and pine every 2-3 and broadleaf every 5-6). Based on an inventory of about 27,500 trees and using 5 years, the annual goal is 5,500 trees. Due to multi-year budget constraints, we are currently backlogged by over 13,000 trees.

Maintenance of City trees is primarily funded via Gas Tax Funds.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (GGMS)

The appropriation for General Government System (GGS) projects is \$170,000, which represents 1% of the proposed CIP budget. The single project type within the GGS is General Government.

GGMS Projects

- *General Government*
Funding of \$110,000 from the General Fund will be used for the Asset Management Program. Consultants will be hired to identify all city-owned assets, performing condition assessments, and preparing a Preservation & Rehabilitation Plan to assist the City in prioritizing limited resources.

A total of \$170,000 in TransNet funds will be used to perform various studies and projects by City staff, including the Bikeway Pedestrian Master Plan, Sweetwater River Pathway Study and infrastructure planning and engineering work related to the application for funds.

There is no CIP funding for Utility Undergrounding Districts in the coming year. The City has approximately 164 Miles of aboveground electric distribution wires with an estimated cost to underground of \$275 million. The Franchise Agreement with SDGE Allocation is \$2 million per year from 20A Funds. Almost \$40 million has been expended in undergrounding projects since the 1990's. The most recent completed projects are the Phase I Bayfront project at \$20 million, and Fourth Avenue from L Street to Orange Avenue and L Street from Monserate Avenue to Nacion Avenue, at \$9.3 million. The City's 20A fund allocation has a negative balance of (\$9,629,977). According to Rule 20A, municipalities are allowed to incur debt up to five times the annual allocation. Since the City's annual allocation is \$2.0 million, this is within the five-year limit (\$10.0 million) allowed by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). However, it means that, until at least next year, the City cannot currently borrow ahead any additional funds to construct additional undergrounding facilities unless allowed by a revised agreement with SDG&E.

In an effort to contain undergrounding construction costs, the City of Chula Vista as well as several other local agencies formed a Utility Undergrounding District subcommittee to meet and discuss policies and various other methods for controlling underground utility district costs so that additional conversion districts can be funded in the future. Future conversion districts may be established and constructed differently than how we have done previous districts. A letter to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) was sent on May 17, 2011, for CPUC clarification of additional local agency eligible reimbursable expenses.

REGIONAL PROJECTS

The City of Chula Vista CIP includes funding for several studies related to regional projects. It does not include total costs of regional projects funded or led by other agencies such as Caltrans or SANDAG. However, City staff often partners or gets involved in the delivery of these projects since they provide a direct benefit to the community and sustainable infrastructure. The following is a summary of various projects:

- *Interstate-5 Multi-modal Corridor Study*
In an effort to identify all transportation related improvements needed along, across and within the four-mile long Interstate-5 and rail corridor in Chula Vista, the City has combined efforts with Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and SANDAG to undertake this planning level study. Funding is provided by a combination of TransNet and two Federal grants. The study has several phases of work and the first two phases have been completed. Phase III commenced in FY13/14 and is for the environmental work and preliminary engineering of grade-separating the Palomar Street light rail crossing near the intersection with Industrial Blvd.

Phase I identified and prioritized needed transportation improvements to improve mobility and goods movement within the study area bounded by SR-54 and Main Street. The results of the first phase study completed in December 2010 have already been included in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan adopted by SANDAG in October 2011. This report is used as a technical

appendix to the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Rail improvements were identified as the highest near term need.

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=387&useaction=projects.detail>

Phase II, the Chula Vista Light Rail Corridor Improvements Project Study Report, is a grade separation study for each of the three light rail trolley stations at E Street, H Street and Palomar Street. This document, completed in August 2012, has planning level work for the ultimate rail corridor improvements in Chula Vista. Final recommendations from the LRT Improvement study are being incorporated into the Phase III environmental work for the Palomar Street location as well as future regional plans and as individual projects into the Bayfront Development Impact Fee Program, the Western Transportation Development Impact Fee (WTDIF) Program and the CIP program.

<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/public-works/engineering/chula-vista-light-rail-corridor-improvements-project-study-report>

The completed Phase I and Phase II studies serve to identify an accurate project description for Phase III, a future LRT grade-separation Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that commenced in FY 2013-14 and completed in FY 2015-16. This environmental and preliminary design work is the last phase of the I-5 Multi-modal Corridor Study. The Palomar Street crossing is the highest priority LRT grade-separation project out of 27 study locations within San Diego County. The H Street and the E street locations rank fourth and sixth, respectively.

Furthermore, the Blue Line Improvement Corridor has seen many upgrades and continues with several improvements regionally and state funded. SANDAG has current freight rail improvements throughout the Blue Line corridor that are in various stages of design and/or construction.

In addition to the roadway and freeway network, Light Rail Trolley (LRT) maintenance upgrades at all Chula Vista at-grade rail crossings began by MTS/SANDAG in FY 2012-13 and is still on-going. The remaining work includes the following

locations and scope and is wrapping up in late 2015:

- Anita Street
- Main Street Freight Rail Bridge

- *Interstate-805/East Palomar Street Direct Access Ramp (DAR) Project*

The Caltrans work on Interstate-805 will provide a new access point to/from the East Palomar Street Bridge to and from the north freeway via Direct Access Ramps which are ramps that lead to/from the center median area of the freeway instead of from the right side of the freeway. The project started construction in April 2013 and construction will be completed by late summer 2015. When completed, the freeway DAR project will connect to the recently completed High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes that extend from East Naples Street to State Route-94.

- *The South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (SBBRT) Project*

The SBBRT project, coordinated by SANDAG, is expected to follow the Caltrans I-805 Direct Access Ramp project. SANDAG, as the project manager, will design and build a 21-mile BRT line between the Otay Mesa Port of Entry and downtown San Diego via eastern Chula Vista, I-805 and SR-94. The eastern Chula Vista section extends from the intersection of East Palomar Street and Oleander Avenue through Otay Ranch Town Center and the Millennium Project to SR-125. The project will include arterial "transit only" lanes, transit signal priority, special shoulder lanes for busses-only on the freeway, and enhanced customer amenities.

City staff is providing design and surveying for the portion of the project within the Otay Ranch Shopping Center and Birch Road. Design is complete and the project will be advertised for construction in mid-2015 by SANDAG. Construction is expected to begin in the fall of 2015 and be in operation by summer 2017.

- *State Route – 125 (SR-125)*

In December 2011, SANDAG purchased the lease to operate the SR-125 toll road (South Bay Expressway). Soon thereafter, the SANDAG Board of Directors did approve the lowering of tolls effective June 30, 2012. Traffic volumes since the

new toll schedule went into effect show that traffic volumes have increased from approximately 25,000 vehicles per day to over 40,000 vehicles per day. More recent counts show that traffic volumes are still increasing on this facility.

As SANDAG completes its transition with South Bay Expressway, city staff will work with Caltrans and SANDAG to pursue construction of the northbound off-ramp and the southbound on-ramp at the San Miguel Ranch subdivision. City staff will be providing cost estimates for completing these ramps and work with Caltrans and SANDAG to agree on financing and expediting completion of this work. For more information, including a list of frequently asked questions, visit:

www.sandag.org/southbayexpressway

At the south end of the toll road, City staff has continued to work with Caltrans and the development community to determine the ultimate on-ramp and off-ramp needs and geometric configurations where the future Main Street (Rock Mountain Road/Hunte Parkway) and Otay Valley Road local streets eventually will cross the SR-125 corridor. On November 18, 2014, these on-ramps and off-ramps were added into the Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF) Program.

- *Bayshore Bikeway Project*

The City completed a preliminary engineering study for the segment between E and H Streets, working with SANDAG and a consultant. The study was presented to the SANDAG Bayshore Bikeway Working Group in FY13/14 and was accepted. Staff is looking at grants to fund the preliminary engineering and environmental phase. The multi-purpose bike path segment between H Street and Palomar Street was completed by SANDAG in March 2012 and has high usage rates, especially on the weekends. The City of San Diego is responsible for working with SANDAG on the segment south of Palomar Street to Main Street, which is currently in the environmental and design phases.

In 2014, the San Diego Unified Port District completed the bike path on the H Street segment between Bay Blvd to the intersection of Marina Parkway. Future segments of the Bayshore

Bikeway along the Chula Vista Bayfront waterfront will be part of the development of that area and a general alignment of that facility can be seen on the City's 2011 Bikeway Master Plan map.

CIP DOCUMENT

The initial proposed capital improvement project detail sheets are posted annually in April of each year on the Public Works website for public comment and review.

<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/engineering>

Additionally, the Public Works Department publishes an annual proposed CIP budget. The document is made available at the City Clerk's Office, the Civic Center Library, Otay Ranch Mall Library, and the South Chula Vista Library. The proposed CIP is presented at a Council Budget Workshop in May and adopted in June of every year.





CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Project Type

DRAINAGE

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
DR202	Storm Drain Rehabilitation Project FY2015/16	\$280,000
DR203	Telegraph Canyon Channel Compliance Feasibility Study	\$200,000
DR204	Storm Drain Repairs At Various Locations	\$1,631,000
DRAINAGE TOTAL		\$2,111,000

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
GG222	Asset Management	\$110,000
OP202	CIP Advanced Planning	\$45,000
OP225	Sweetwater River Pathway Study	\$75,000
STL404	Bikeway Pedestrian Master Plan 2016 Update	\$50,000
GENERAL GOVERNMENT TOTAL		\$280,000

LOCAL STREETS

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
OP219	Pavement Management System	\$50,000
STL261	Willow Street Bridge (Widening)- Phase II	\$6,959,167
STL366	Moss Street Sidewalk Installation	\$468,292
STL406	Third Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project - Phase III FY 2015/2016	\$150,000
STL407	Replacement of Curb & Gutter Program Citywide FY2015/16	\$350,000
STL408	Cross Gutter Rehabilitation Program Citywide FY 2015/16	\$250,000
STL409	Pavement Minor Rehabilitation Program FY2015/16	\$2,000,000
STL410	Kellog Elem. School Pedestrian Improvements	\$115,000
LOCAL STREETS TOTAL		\$10,342,459

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Project Type

MAJOR STREETS

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
STM369	Bikeway Facilities Gap Project (Study)	\$50,000
STM381	South Broadway Improvements Main Street to Southern Limits, Phase II	\$50,000
STM382	Bike Lane along East H Street	\$2,000,000
STM385	Bridge Maintenance Program (BMP)	\$150,000
STM386	Heritage Road Bridge Improvement (HBP)	\$2,345,267
STM387	Pavement Major Rehabilitation Program FY2015/16	\$4,000,000
STM388	Main Street Widening FY2015/16	\$300,000
STM389	Heritage Road Widening FY2015/16	\$400,000
MAJOR STREETS TOTAL		\$9,295,267

OPEN SPACE

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
OP227	Coastal Cactus Wren Habitat-Salt Creek/Otay River Valley	\$98,343
OPEN SPACE TOTAL		\$98,343

SEWER

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
SW292	Industrial Blvd. & Main St. Sewer Improvements	\$406,000
SW293	Parkside Drive Lift Station Upgrades	\$450,000
SW294	Sewer Access Rehabilitation Program FY2015/16	\$600,000
SW295	Sewer Rehabilitation Program FY2015/16	\$300,000
SW296	Manhole Inspections Program FY 2015/16 (Study Analysis)	\$200,000
SW297	Manhole Rehabilitation Program FY 2015/16	\$250,000
SEWER TOTAL		\$2,206,000

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Funding Summary by Project Type

TRAFFIC

		FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
TF321	Citywide Traffic Count Program	\$50,000
TF327	Neighborhood Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Program	\$150,000
TF332	Signing and Striping Program	\$25,000
TF345	Traffic Calming Program	\$25,000
TF350	Traffic Signal System Optimization Program	\$75,000
TF366	Traffic Signal and Streetlight Systems Upgrade and Modification Program	\$200,000
TF374	Modification of existing traffic signal and equipment at Orange Ave. and Palomar	\$50,000
TF384	Hazel G Cook Elementary School Pedestrian Improvements	\$358,000
TF391	Sign Reflectivity Replacement FY 2015/16	\$400,000
TF392	Palomar Street Traffic Data Collection	\$136,000
TF393	Internally Illuminated SNS Conversion Program FY 2015/16	\$100,000
TF394	Pedestrian Crosswalk Enhancement at Uncontrolled Intersections	\$250,000
TF395	SANDAG Main St Fiber Optic - Additional Work	\$400,000
TF396	Traffic Signal System Communication Network Master Plan	\$250,000
TF397	Raised Median Improvements	\$440,000
TF398	Traffic Signal Installation at Main Street and Jacqua Street	\$250,000
TRAFFIC TOTAL		\$3,159,000
GRAND TOTAL - ALL PROJECTS		\$27,492,069



SUMMARY TABLES

Fund Appropriations by Department and
Expenditure Category

Schedule of Revenues

Fund Balance Projections

Schedule of Interfund Transfers

Authorized Positions by Department

**FUND APPROPRIATIONS BY
DEPARTMENT AND EXPENDITURE
CATEGORY**

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES BY DEPARTMENT / CATEGORY

Fiscal Year 2015-16

DEPT / FUND	PERSONNEL SERVICES	SUPPLIES & SERVICES	UTILITIES	OTHER EXPENSES	OPERATING CAPITAL	TRANSFERS OUT	CIP PROJECTS	NON-CIP PROJECTS	TOTAL FY 2015-16
01100 City Council	1,375,453	108,479	1,520		3,190				1,488,642
02000 Boards and Commissions		11,476							11,476
03000 City Clerk	791,319	140,766	750		8,950				941,785
04000 City Attorney	2,470,290	431,857	1,850		4,948				2,908,945
05000 Administration	2,980,254	248,159	1,520		4,936				3,234,869
06000 Information Technology Svcs	2,416,696	865,157	47,045		148,500				3,477,398
07000 Human Resources	2,117,909	422,305	1,530		8,920				2,550,664
08000 Finance	3,458,274	185,530	2,500		15,499				3,661,803
09000 Non-Departmental	(1,501,024)	1,596,447	61,327	167,500		5,483,642	510,000	490,316	6,808,208
10000 Animal Care Facility	2,205,801	569,555	41,495	4,500	6,282				2,827,633
12000 Planning and Building Services	2,315,878	146,322	2,200	12,000					2,476,400
14000 Police	44,773,716	3,141,063	570,942	123,243		162,989			48,771,953
15000 Fire	23,375,802	1,911,336	226,715			62,326			25,576,179
16000 Public Works	18,564,450	3,665,992	4,156,884	128,000	61,921	390,290		18,700	26,986,237
17000 Recreation	3,043,528	621,146	420,057	115,657	2,523				4,202,911
18000 Library	3,222,080	203,852	352,925	400					3,779,257
100 GENERAL FUND TOTAL	111,610,426	14,269,442	5,889,260	551,300	265,669	6,099,247	510,000	509,016	139,704,359
221 Gas Tax						4,259,428	4,231,000	100,000	8,590,428
223 TUT Common Fund		490,000			125,902				615,902
225 Traffic Signal				15,000			644,000		659,000
227 Transp Sales Tax Fund				30,000			7,215,343		7,245,343
234 Advanced Life Support Program	294,242	134,039				833,510			1,261,791
235 Legislative Counsel Fund		80,000							80,000
241 Parking Meter		220,300							399,148
245 Traffic Safety		38,500				399,140			437,640
251 Supp Law Enforcement Serv Fund	448,846	75,000				19,538			543,384
252 Police Dept Grants Fund	4,939,533	708,716		8,999	69,519				5,726,767
253 Inmate Welfare Fund		60,000							60,000
254 Local Law Enforc blk Grant Pro	91,078								91,078
256 Asset Seizure		505,000			200,000				705,000
267 McCandliss memorial Cult Arts		400		1,200					1,600
270 Mobilehome Admin fee fund		28,000		65,000					93,000
272 Federal Grants Fund	811,401	505,409							1,316,810

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES BY DEPARTMENT / CATEGORY

Fiscal Year 2015-16

DEPT / FUND	PERSONNEL SERVICES	SUPPLIES & SERVICES	UTILITIES	OTHER EXPENSES	OPERATING CAPITAL	TRANSFERS OUT	CIP PROJECTS	NON-CIP PROJECTS	TOTAL FY 2015-16
273	State Grants Fund	15,843	40,000	20,000					75,843
274	Amer. Recovery & Reinvest. Act			22,333					22,333
281	Waste Mgmt & Recycling	67,518	908,867	11,000					987,385
282	Environmental Services	704,386	899,316	5,100	4,600	107,585			1,810,987
285	Energy Conserv Fund	263,569	499,046	913,079					1,675,694
301	Storm Drain Revenue		348,100	800		210,000			558,900
313	CV Housing Authority Fund	583,385	87,800	1,100	300,000	155,968			1,200,913
316	Public Educational & Govt. Fee		300,000						600,000
318	Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd		80,270	1,780	6,040	5,601,309			6,407,939
319	Housing - SA		63,500	2,127,569	6,000				2,197,069
311	CDBG Housing Program Fund		100	46,000					46,100
314	Emergency Shelter Grnt Prog			11,495				141,775	153,270
321	Home Program Fund		5,000	854,710	62,473				922,183
333	Comm Dev Block Grant Fund		11,427	377,215	12,946	758,243	468,292		2,006,940
341	Public Liability Trust		713,439	940,000					1,653,439
342	CFD 11-M RHR McMillin		108,246	23,174					152,521
343	CFD 12-M Village 7 MM		263,891	138,120	67,951				469,962
344	CFD 13-M Otay Ranch Village 2		125,345	69,800	27,785				222,930
345	CFD 12M Village 7 Otay Ranch		234,492	165,500	63,269				463,261
346	CFD 14M- A - EUC Millenia		126,905	10,500	1,000				138,405
352	Bay Blvd Ldscpg Dist Fund		2,848	7,666	1,780				12,294
353	Eastlake Maintenance District		227,623	116,616	64,504				408,743
354	Open Space District #1		54,787	39,670	17,677				112,134
355	Open Space District #2		21,534	6,925	7,143				35,602
356	Open Space District #3		34,759	28,041	11,969				74,769
357	Open Space District #4		70,431	26,550	20,003				116,984
358	Open Space District #5		34,618	17,905	12,106				64,629
359	Open Space District #6		20,647	13,000	10,402				44,049
361	Open Space District #7		4,974	2,240	4,237				11,451
362	Open Space District #8		60,455	27,060	17,434				104,949
363	Open Space District #9		59,150	31,802	16,300				107,252
364	Open Space District #10		57,852	33,034	16,890				107,776
365	Open Space District #11		117,524	67,675	29,043				214,242
367	Open Space District #14		217,536	185,260	68,760				471,556

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES BY DEPARTMENT / CATEGORY

Fiscal Year 2015-16

DEPT / FUND	PERSONNEL SERVICES	SUPPLIES & SERVICES	UTILITIES	OTHER EXPENSES	OPERATING CAPITAL	TRANSFERS OUT	CIP PROJECTS	NON-CIP PROJECTS	TOTAL FY 2015-16
368	Open Space District #15	30,240	10,375	9,497					50,112
369	Open Space District #17 Fund	21,032		5,859					26,891
371	Open Space District #18 Fund	77,928	66,485	27,103					171,516
372	Open Space District #20 Fund	1,035,393	397,904	230,921					1,664,218
373	Open Space District #23 Fund	33,096	9,815	8,519					51,430
374	Open Space District #24 Fund	38,885	20,115	7,643					66,643
375	Open Space District #26	12,683	4,125	3,846					20,654
376	Open Space District #31 Fund	74,398	50,708	35,066					160,172
378	CFD 07M Improvement Areas	375,798	128,346	157,632					661,776
379	CFD 08M Village 6	507,062	288,490	198,903					994,455
380	CFD 09M OR Vlg II Brookfld She	648,455	216,193	160,619					1,025,267
382	CFD 99-2 Olay Ranch Vlg 1 West	516,528	198,575	110,588					825,691
386	Olay Ranch Preserve	451,000		54,000					505,000
387	CFD 98-3 Sunbow 2	558,143	200,924	125,314					884,381
388	Community Facility Dst 97-1 OR	1,525,124	454,475	324,078					2,303,677
389	Olay Ranch Village 1,2,6,7,12	6,528	5,220	2,343					14,091
391	Central Garage Fund	1,045,349	172,572	400	330,000				3,552,276
392	Equip Replacement Fund								330,000
393	Technology Replacement	284,576							284,576
398	Workers Compensation	733,610		2,669,000					3,402,610
408	Development Services Fund	5,734,293	5,000	98,812	9,500	1,187,557			7,303,694
413	Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve			200,000			406,000		606,000
414	Sewer Service Revenue	4,537,477	315	45,000	1,813,680	3,141,270	13,000		32,411,213
428	Sewer Facility Replacement					150,000	1,800,000		1,950,000
431	Tele Cyn Sewer Basin Plan Dif			10,000					10,000
432	Poggt Cyn Sewer Basin DIF			27,500		1,120,000		1,091,264	2,238,764
433	Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF			758,243					758,243
442	CDBG Section 108 Loan			150,000					150,000
451	Long-term Advances DSF - City			452,952					452,952
452	Equipment Lease			811,853					811,853
453	Energy Conservation Loans			2,394,514					2,399,514
472	2004 COP Civ Ctr Proj Ph I	5,000							5,000
473	2006 COP Civ Ctr Proj Ph 2	6,000							6,000
474	2010 COP Refinance	5,000							5,000

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES BY DEPARTMENT / CATEGORY

Fiscal Year 2015-16

DEPT / FUND	PERSONNEL SERVICES	SUPPLIES & SERVICES	UTILITIES	OTHER EXPENSES	OPERATING CAPITAL	TRANSFERS OUT	CIP PROJECTS	NON-CIP PROJECTS	TOTAL FY 2015-16
475 2014 Refunding COP		5,000		3,607,556					3,612,556
517 AD2004-1 Dixon Drive					9,598				9,598
518 AD2005-1 Tobias Drive					90,597				90,597
542 Tele Cyn Drainage Plan Dif Fun							200,000		200,000
571 PFDIF General Administration		55,300		300,000					355,300
572 PFDIF - Civic Center Expansion					3,625,369				3,625,369
573 Police Facilities Remodel					1,600,000				1,600,000
574 Corporation Yard Relocation					844,420				844,420
576 Fire Suppression Sys Expansion				3,000	1,045,000				1,045,000
587 Olay Ranch VLG Ped Ramp DIF				3,200					3,200
588 OR Vlg11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF				265,000			2,955,845		3,220,845
591 Transportation DIF				1,274,067					1,274,067
654 RDA 2008 TARBS ProjFund - SA									127,795
662 06 ERAF - SA									1,018,570
663 06 TABs Series A - SA		5,000		1,013,570					993,559
664 06 TABs Series B - SA		5,000		988,559					1,533,637
665 08 TABs - SA		5,000		1,528,637					2,277,748
692 Long-term Advances DSF-RDA S				350,000		1,927,748			75,000
715 Park Land Acquisition Fund		50,000		25,000					540,000
716 Western-Park Acquisition & Dev				25,000		515,000			678,205
717 Resident. Construct/Conver Fnd						678,205			9,048,589
736 Other Transportation Programs							9,048,589		
GRAND TOTAL ALL FUNDS	131,147,346	55,450,025	9,148,589	30,173,795	3,206,329	35,507,779	27,492,069	2,220,872	294,346,804

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
100 GENERAL FUND					
<u>Property Taxes</u>					
3000	24,518,260	27,876,534	27,451,232	28,930,278	29,896,924
	\$24,518,260	\$27,876,534	\$27,451,232	\$28,930,278	\$29,896,924
<u>Other Local Taxes</u>					
3010	27,275,753	28,627,785	29,985,219	31,120,026	31,830,591
3020	8,400,178	9,266,768	8,845,067	10,341,588	11,426,283
3030	3,465,136	4,428,794	17,525,294	6,500,000	6,500,000
3040	1,169,307	1,260,622	1,328,554	1,313,405	1,429,643
3050	2,295,675	2,471,252	2,632,774	2,806,654	2,890,853
3070	779,981	1,125,252	949,603	816,492	832,822
	\$43,386,030	\$47,180,473	\$61,266,511	\$52,898,165	\$54,910,192
<u>Licenses and Permits</u>					
3100	138,036	143,871	150,879	135,145	132,600
3120	268,412	275,133	267,938	189,210	209,317
3140	816,321	976,515	896,628	907,622	967,530
	\$1,222,769	\$1,395,519	\$1,315,445	\$1,231,977	\$1,309,447
<u>Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties</u>					
3200	675,789	368,357	494,211	688,116	420,700
3210	288,439	245,808	99,627	351,191	300,100
3240	263,007	213,162	279,084	255,505	250,000
3250	128,534	175,620	136,814	108,500	163,000
	\$1,355,769	\$1,002,947	\$1,009,736	\$1,403,312	\$1,133,800
<u>Use of Money & Property</u>					
3300	633,057	143,601	356,840	300,520	300,364
3310	356,912	0	0	45,869	0
3320	33,486	26,866	58,043	36,354	17,509
3330	46,728	49,262	52,449	59,505	63,347
3350	976,237	957,564	963,843	996,823	1,071,291
3370	870,214	1,024,197	1,091,740	1,143,630	1,224,295
	\$2,916,634	\$2,201,490	\$2,522,915	\$2,582,701	\$2,676,806

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
<u>Revenue from Other Agencies</u>					
3010	724,185	784,116	0	0	0
3400	537,892	667,263	567,615	647,331	652,000
3440	236,354	231,546	226,938	226,938	243,309
3460	16,288,377	16,253,826	16,773,957	17,883,946	18,597,204
3480	2,765	4,331	51,284	6,683	300,408
3500	844,496	641,161	486,626	441,183	885,824
3580	25,415	66,936	16,804	42,540	42,000
3600	120,655	793,595	6,845	7,500	2,000
3690	498,305	669,407	1,348,040	1,109,525	664,000
	\$19,278,444	\$20,112,181	\$19,478,109	\$20,365,646	\$21,386,745
<u>Charges for Services</u>					
3700	995,614	1,080,516	1,449,571	1,075,655	1,213,064
3720	115,910	111,791	87,522	88,474	133,337
3730	46,311	10,973	6,790	4,899	12,000
3740	454,026	594,411	366,158	482,775	322,580
3770	3,902	205	9,886	600	0
3800	1,578,374	1,716,857	1,667,067	1,549,692	1,686,600
3830	789,223	943,530	957,682	973,965	986,625
3900	791,257	922,828	868,164	777,657	938,940
3950	304,773	424,640	403,218	362,445	407,780
3970	278,588	311,153	164,768	246,068	188,000
4200	1,971,852	1,896,995	1,684,748	1,571,081	1,491,750
4300	251,152	343,609	276,190	229,273	320,500
	\$7,580,982	\$8,357,508	\$7,941,764	\$7,362,584	\$7,701,176
<u>Other Revenue</u>					
4410	124,544	361,512	426,705	173,996	269,808
4420	272,739	283,196	292,419	202,451	0
4430	239,209	630	4,468	3,082	0
4440	2,057,317	2,095,461	1,884,161	1,966,316	2,049,410
4450	3,337,138	3,921,563	4,273,692	4,416,511	4,097,905
4460	741,110	709,814	443,524	60,524	68,100

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	3,078,903	3,360,321	2,874,051	4,738,970	3,274,754
4600 Assessments	359	0	0	0	0
4700 Collection Charges	343,568	368,520	61,864	47,278	80,000
4800 Sale of Goods	0	1,718	4,643	4,250	250
4900 Other Revenue	1,392,583	1,920,944	1,010,207	829,341	860,720
TOTAL	\$11,587,470	\$13,023,679	\$11,275,734	\$12,442,719	\$10,700,947
Transfers In					
5221 Tfr In from Gas Tax Fund	3,561,417	4,439,428	4,259,428	4,259,428	4,259,428
5223 Tfr In from TUT Common	0	0	82,923	610,000	0
5234 Tfr In Fire Equip Lease Fund	0	0	559,846	634,333	833,510
5245 Tfr In from Traffic Safety	534,140	492,669	366,325	399,140	399,140
5256 Tfr In from Asset Seizure Fund	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	0
5261 Tfr In from CA Library Service	25,000	0	0	0	0
5265 Tfr In CA Dept of Educ Sec 321	0	0	2,352	0	0
5272 Tfr In from Federal Grants	0	50,000	0	0	0
5274 Tfr in - ARRA	0	0	9,889	0	0
5282 Tfr In from Environmental Serv	107,781	107,585	107,585	107,585	107,585
5285 Tfr In from Energy Cons	0	0	25,000	0	0
5301 Tfr In from Storm Drain Rev	240,463	240,463	240,463	0	0
5313 Tfr in from CV Hsng Authority	210,227	166,085	147,555	165,926	155,968
5402 Tfr In from Transit/CVT Fund	37,849	34,750	34,750	34,750	0
5408 Tfr In from Dev Svcs Fund	1,224,416	1,175,724	1,143,810	1,269,770	1,187,557
5414 Tfr In from Sewer Service Rsrv	3,142,406	2,824,121	2,723,850	2,951,061	3,045,133
5452 Tfr In fr Equipment Cap Lease	0	0	0	32,482	0
5471 Tfr In from 03 Ref COP Fund	0	0	271,002	0	0
5571 Tfr In from PFDIF-Gen Admin	0	0	2,715	0	0
5651 Tfr In from SW/TIC/IOV Proj	79,486	0	0	0	0
5725 Tfr In from IDA Fund	0	10,622	0	0	0
5736 Tfr in from Other Trans Progra	67,158	0	0	0	0
5739 Tfr In from Prop 42	500,000	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	\$9,850,343	\$9,661,447	\$10,097,493	\$10,584,475	\$9,988,321
TOTAL - 100 GENERAL FUND	\$121,696,701	\$130,811,778	\$142,358,939	\$137,801,856	\$139,704,359

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
220 TRANSPORTATION FUNDS					
3010 Sales Tax	3,485,185	6,196,036	898,172	5,522,000	5,886,000
3300 Investment Earnings	34,166	(36,887)	95,894	0	0
3400 State Grants	0	0	4,319,400	0	0
3440 State Tax Sharing	3,567,956	5,666,602	7,890,623	6,159,431	5,514,157
3600 Other Agency Grants	989,803	1,582,504	294,165	90,000	128,343
3770 Other Dev Fees	145,470	240,397	207,016	0	200,000
4440 Open Space/Assess Dist Reimb	1,781	3,679	1,778	0	0
4450 CIP Reimbursements	25,806	24,945	24,085	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	91,027	2,068	330,081	288,900	0
5000 Transfers In	27,543	0	8,037,452	32,192	0
TOTAL - 220 TRANSPORTATION FUNDS	\$8,368,737	\$13,679,344	\$22,098,666	\$12,092,523	\$11,728,500
230 DEVELOPER DEPOSITS					
3300 Investment Earnings	39,754	17,745	16,914	0	0
3760 Other Dev Fees	8,522,655	7,720,822	8,022,857	0	0
TOTAL - 230 DEVELOPER DEPOSITS	\$8,562,409	\$7,738,567	\$8,039,771	\$0	\$0
232 FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT					
4900 Other Revenue	14,015	0	0	0	0
TOTAL - 232 FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT	\$14,015	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
234 ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT FUND					
3690 Other Agency Revenue	214,000	214,000	1,316,182	1,534,429	1,475,907
TOTAL - 234 ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT FUND	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$1,316,182	\$1,534,429	\$1,475,907
235 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FUND					
5000 Transfers In	0	80,000	0	0	0
TOTAL - 235 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FUND	\$0	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
240 PARKING					
3160 Other Permits	21,582	42,489	39,897	35,000	35,000
3240 Parking Penalties	238,925	209,862	232,857	200,000	200,000
3300 Investment Earnings	6,711	(4,433)	12,518	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	316,269	353,896	379,690	350,000	350,000
4900 Other Revenue	0	0	2,001	0	0
TOTAL - 240 PARKING	\$583,487	\$601,814	\$666,963	\$585,000	\$585,000
250 PUBLIC SAFETY					
3210 Law Enforcement Penalties	423,487	426,373	427,460	437,640	437,640
3300 Investment Earnings	17,429	(5,281)	10,352	0	0
3320 Sale of Personal Property	5,980	0	0	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	9,073	11,232	12,173	20,000	20,000
3400 State Grants	709,365	353,753	383,103	470,588	401,014
3500 Federal Grants	5,009,067	3,900,989	4,302,468	5,534,587	5,003,387
3600 Other Agency Grants	0	741,765	869,705	997,052	425,032
3690 Other Agency Revenue	5,769	7,757	170,476	255,636	194,272
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	0	52,975	144,800	122,445	123,046
4800 Sale of Goods	10,626	2,920	1,868	10,000	10,000
4900 Other Revenue	212,804	13,026	36,221	50,000	50,000
5000 Transfers In	105,104	115,522	42,753	36,786	220,824
TOTAL - 250 PUBLIC SAFETY	\$6,508,704	\$5,621,031	\$6,401,379	\$7,934,734	\$6,885,215
260 LIBRARY/CULTURAL ARTS					
3300 Investment Earnings	3,431	(1,254)	1,820	0	0
3440 State Tax Sharing	938	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	0	59,545	0	0	0
TOTAL - 260 LIBRARY/CULTURAL ARTS	\$4,369	\$58,291	\$1,820	\$0	\$0
270 SUNDRY GRANTS & MISC					
3300 Investment Earnings	0	(187)	1,521	0	0
3400 State Grants	0	514,588	157,945	29,116	60,000

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
3500 Federal Grants	3,065,521	1,446,120	1,531,268	3,283,209	1,254,484
3600 Other Agency Grants	0	314,264	14,737	0	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	0	129,650	117,055	120,000	73,500
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	15,854	17,200	1,633	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	1,665,221	2,219,471	23,434	22,333	22,333
5000 Transfers In	52,226	52,226	43,060	64,689	62,326
TOTAL - 270 SUNDRY GRANTS & MISC	\$4,798,822	\$4,693,332	\$1,890,653	\$3,519,347	\$1,472,643

280 CONSERVATION

3300 Investment Earnings	13,929	(7,528)	16,680	0	0
3400 State Grants	(165,161)	240,962	174,843	1,289,744	987,385
3500 Federal Grants	1,669	20,539	0	0	0
3600 Other Agency Grants	797,107	1,341,043	1,050,492	3,502,745	1,675,694
3700 Zoning Fees	0	0	128	2,000	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	1,645	3,290	1,830	0	0
4300 Fees for Other Services	1,031,634	1,068,434	1,102,615	1,262,279	1,262,279
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	331,243	306,839	232,231	200,000	110,000
4900 Other Revenue	899,552	0	2,121,500	0	0
5000 Transfers In	0	13,374	0	0	0
TOTAL - 280 CONSERVATION	\$2,911,618	\$2,986,953	\$4,700,319	\$6,256,768	\$4,035,358

301 STORM DRAIN REVENUE

3120 Dev / Improvement Permits	9,455	(1,180)	0	23,750	23,750
3230 Environmental Fines Penalties	47,065	600	(4,341)	5,000	5,000
3300 Investment Earnings	1,428	(961)	1,850	0	0
4020 Storm Drain Fees	555,497	587,887	600,025	555,500	555,500
TOTAL - 301 STORM DRAIN REVENUE	\$613,445	\$586,346	\$597,534	\$584,250	\$584,250

310 HOUSING PROGRAM

3300 Investment Earnings	30,003	(5,868)	5,355	0	0
3700 Zoning Fees	0	25,215	18,349	0	0
3760 Other Dev Fees	0	0	372,660	0	0

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	0	93,568	1,000	0	0
4300 Fees for Other Services	71,092	111,730	230,781	71,000	100,000
4430 Redev Agency Reimbursements	260,920	83,238	160,044	178,532	161,669
4460 CDBG/Home Reimbursements	361,138	281,346	405,254	441,339	513,220
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	46,365	56,421	87,000	75,000
4900 Other Revenue	0	45,556	100,008	0	0
5000 Transfers In	143,882	97,000	0	0	0
TOTAL - 310 HOUSING PROGRAM	\$867,035	\$778,150	\$1,349,872	\$777,871	\$849,889

316 PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL & GOVT. FEE

3020 Franchise Fees	0	627,766	654,842	600,000	600,000
3300 Investment Earnings	0	(675)	4,924	0	0
TOTAL - 316 PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL & GOVT. FEE	\$0	\$627,091	\$659,766	\$600,000	\$600,000

318 REDV OBLIGATION RETIREMENT

3000 Property Tax	3,233,347	4,456,770	1,065,528	6,505,446	6,407,939
3300 Investment Earnings	80,514	(23,899)	10,640	0	0
4450 CIP Reimbursements	504	0	0	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	742,116	322	0	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	1,865,730	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	11,030,351	641,835	0	0	0
TOTAL - 318 REDV OBLIGATION RETIREMENT	\$16,952,562	\$5,075,028	\$1,076,168	\$6,505,446	\$6,407,939

319 HOUSING - SA

3300 Investment Earnings	(2,451)	653,730	423,627	0	0
3310 Sale of Real Property	0	0	56,612	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	7,484	17,232	14,944	17,885	15,000
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	25	0	20,979	0	0
4420 Transit Reimbursements	0	0	2,192	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	400	0	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	0	90,052	103,872	0	0
5000 Transfers In	0	237,450	0	1,927,748	1,927,748

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
TOTAL - 319 HOUSING - SA	\$5,058	\$998,864	\$622,226	\$1,945,633	\$1,942,748
320 COMM DEV BLOCK GRANTS					
3300 Investment Earnings	10,200	40,950	12,067	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	0	0	0	79,000	79,000
3500 Federal Grants	3,168,968	3,055,233	3,415,216	3,406,739	3,019,493
3720 Document Fees	0	30	0	0	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	250	102	140	0	0
4460 CDBG/Home Reimbursements	0	14,114	0	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	6,302	7,227	441	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	111,030	183,843	55,269	0	0
5000 Transfers In	0	27,538	0	30,981	9,598
TOTAL - 320 COMM DEV BLOCK GRANTS	\$3,296,750	\$3,329,037	\$3,483,133	\$3,516,720	\$3,108,091
341 PUBLIC LIABILITY TRUST					
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	0	304,810	0	0
5000 Transfers In	1,653,439	1,164,000	1,321,009	429,000	520,000
TOTAL - 341 PUBLIC LIABILITY TRUST	\$1,653,439	\$1,164,000	\$1,625,819	\$429,000	\$520,000
350 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT					
3300 Investment Earnings	139,889	(82,226)	169,089	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	0	0	57	0	0
4600 Assessments	11,306,684	12,142,259	9,203,769	11,862,234	12,759,483
4900 Other Revenue	0	0	834	0	0
TOTAL - 350 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT	\$11,446,573	\$12,060,033	\$9,373,749	\$11,862,234	\$12,759,483
390 FLEET MANAGEMENT					
3300 Investment Earnings	17,756	(8,832)	13,613	0	0
3320 Sale of Personal Property	23,705	1,582	1,576	0	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	17,810	26,203	55,542	20,000	35,000
4420 Transit Reimbursements	259,563	274,715	368,561	173,480	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	0	175	0	0

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
4900 Other Revenue	3,232,772	3,233,517	3,224,285	3,455,264	3,456,585
5000 Transfers In	0	404,000	0	0	330,000
TOTAL - 390 FLEET MANAGEMENT	\$3,551,606	\$3,931,185	\$3,663,752	\$3,648,744	\$3,821,585
393 TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENT					
5000 Transfers In	0	0	600,000	0	0
TOTAL - 393 TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENT	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0
398 WORKERS COMPENSATION					
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	6,968	6,757	2,318	25,000	25,000
4900 Other Revenue	2,855,153	2,903,074	2,106,790	2,627,549	3,224,426
5000 Transfers In	2,990,161	0	0	0	0
TOTAL - 398 WORKERS COMPENSATION	\$5,852,282	\$2,909,831	\$2,109,108	\$2,652,549	\$3,249,426
400 TRANSIT					
3300 Investment Earnings	6,543	(4,223)	7,903	0	0
3400 State Grants	3,524,426	3,095,626	3,800,358	2,200,372	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	1,061	0	4,654	0	0
4300 Fees for Other Services	2,670,477	2,841,619	2,667,576	4,853,816	0
4900 Other Revenue	124,554	303,968	212,196	0	0
5000 Transfers In	57,147	0	23,701	0	0
TOTAL - 400 TRANSIT	\$6,384,208	\$6,236,990	\$6,716,388	\$7,054,188	\$0
408 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES					
3780 Other State Revenue	0	6,796	7,845	7,072	7,000
3120 Dev / Improvement Permits	1,710,314	2,399,259	1,735,402	1,979,717	1,973,215
3700 Zoning Fees	2,440,674	2,477,356	2,312,855	2,024,033	2,581,288
3720 Document Fees	(500)	208	154	175	500
3730 Plan Checking Fees	846,298	939,330	1,360,370	1,106,916	1,711,077
3740 Inspection Fees	73,514	71,213	69,449	56,237	43,000
3770 Other Dev Fees	1,186	890	1,038	297	2,000
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	5,991	13,062	32,493	0	0

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
4410 DIF Reimbursements	47,938	53,360	50,065	49,112	35,000
4430 Redev Agency Reimbursements	44,927	0	0	0	0
4440 Open Space/Assess Dist Reimb	20,210	19,066	2,170	7,850	0
4450 CIP Reimbursements	424,870	229,741	271,980	142,265	85,000
4460 CDBG/Home Reimbursements	19,235	15,818	1,123	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	250,313	428,167	493,551	460,553	339,000
4900 Other Revenue	30,930	70	117	11,904	0
5000 Transfers In	485,989	439,238	628,181	448,137	526,614
TOTAL - 408 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	\$6,401,889	\$7,093,574	\$6,966,793	\$6,294,268	\$7,303,694

410 SEWER

3120 Dev / Improvement Permits	9,160	40,500	11,120	40,000	40,000
3300 Investment Earnings	1,182,093	314,191	1,373,068	301,726	301,726
3700 Zoning Fees	8,197	4,811	21,976	18,500	18,500
4000 Sewer Fees	32,504,389	34,319,945	33,039,714	32,862,699	32,862,699
4040 Industrial Waste Fees	500	6,100	(2,525)	0	0
4100 Pump Station Fees	36,206	48,616	50,625	0	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	33,579	3,448	4,550	0	0
4410 DIF Reimbursements	1,537	2,425	7,200	0	0
4440 Open Space/Assess Dist Reimb	1,878	25,962	58,818	0	0
4450 CIP Reimbursements	19,945	51,602	20,717	15,000	15,000
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	42,434	0	0	0
4600 Assessments	1,610	700	441	0	0
4700 Collection Charges	414,778	464,725	626,854	310,000	310,000
4900 Other Revenue	10,905	4,327	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	122,824	3,578	565,495	3,400,000	1,279,047
TOTAL - 410 SEWER	\$34,347,601	\$35,333,364	\$35,778,053	\$36,947,925	\$34,826,972

430 SEWER DIF

3300 Investment Earnings	85,053	(48,615)	102,104	0	0
4350 Sewer / Drainage DIF	174,667	645,015	268,092	120,000	70,000
TOTAL - 430 SEWER DIF	\$259,720	\$596,400	\$370,196	\$120,000	\$70,000

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
440 DEBT SERVICE - CITY					
3300 Investment Earnings	80	(679)	1,055	0	0
3600 Other Agency Grants	0	1,149	0	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	0	145,494	183,262	183,262
5000 Transfers In	4,928,153	2,164,114	2,741,033	3,613,757	4,928,498
TOTAL - 440 DEBT SERVICE - CITY	\$4,928,233	\$2,164,584	\$2,887,582	\$3,797,019	\$5,111,760
470 DS - CV PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY					
3300 Investment Earnings	286,417	276,668	111,629	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	0	0	49,457,111	0	0
5000 Transfers In	8,244,395	7,769,142	12,842,973	9,764,400	9,760,794
TOTAL - 470 DS - CV PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY	\$8,530,812	\$8,045,810	\$62,411,713	\$9,764,400	\$9,760,794
500 ASSESS DIST IMPROVEMENTS					
3300 Investment Earnings	21,290	(12,228)	24,792	0	0
4600 Assessments	19,646	18,836	18,784	19,045	19,285
TOTAL - 500 ASSESS DIST IMPROVEMENTS	\$40,936	\$6,608	\$43,576	\$19,045	\$19,285
542 TELEGRAPH CANYON DRAINAGE DIF					
3300 Investment Earnings	57,952	(32,730)	66,577	0	0
TOTAL - 542 TELEGRAPH CANYON DRAINAGE DIF	\$57,952	\$(32,730)	\$66,577	\$0	\$0
560 PUBLIC FACILITIES DIF					
3300 Investment Earnings	130,523	(220,306)	256,279	0	0
3320 Sale of Personal Property	0	0	3,730	0	0
4330 Public Facilities DIF	3,122,331	6,808,865	4,554,723	2,850,000	2,850,000
4900 Other Revenue	238,238	0	146,608	0	0
5000 Transfers In	0	0	0	140,338	0
TOTAL - 560 PUBLIC FACILITIES DIF	\$3,491,092	\$6,588,559	\$4,961,340	\$2,990,338	\$2,850,000

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
580 PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE DIF					
3300 Investment Earnings	31,790	(18,213)	40,741	0	0
4380 OR Pedestrian Bridge DIF	267,302	251,872	345,770	90,000	90,000
TOTAL - 580 PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE DIF	\$299,092	\$233,659	\$386,511	\$90,000	\$90,000
590 TRANSPORTATION DIF					
3300 Investment Earnings	143,385	(79,286)	138,990	119,290	0
4340 Transportation DIF	1,348,766	2,527,830	2,001,362	772,477	1,831,600
4900 Other Revenue	3,286	71,902	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	241,006	0	36,851	6,444	0
TOTAL - 590 TRANSPORTATION DIF	\$1,736,443	\$2,520,446	\$2,177,203	\$898,211	\$1,831,600
600 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
3000 Property Tax	7,954,428	0	0	0	0
3300 Investment Earnings	532,421	(147)	578	0	0
3350 Rental/Lease of Land and Space	10,433	0	0	0	0
4200 Staff Services Reimbursements	50	0	0	0	0
4450 CIP Reimbursements	30,000	0	0	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	23,383	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	10,992,285	0	0	0	0
TOTAL - 600 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	\$19,543,000	\$(147)	\$578	\$0	\$0
660 DEBT SERVICE - SUCCESSOR AGENCY					
3300 Investment Earnings	51,801	101,938	102,377	0	0
4480 Other City Funds Reimbursement	0	22	541	0	0
5000 Transfers In	4,630,791	8,917,421	3,122,996	5,698,895	5,601,309
TOTAL - 660 DEBT SERVICE - SUCCESSOR AGENCY	\$4,682,592	\$9,019,381	\$3,225,914	\$5,698,895	\$5,601,309
670 SW TAX AGREEMENT					
3300 Investment Earnings	9,234	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	744,919	0	0	0	0

SCHEDULE OF REVENUES

FUND/ACCOUNT	FY 2011-12 ACTUAL	FY 2012-13 ACTUAL	FY 2013-14 ACTUAL	FY 2014-15 PROJECTED	FY 2015-16 ESTIMATED
TOTAL - 670 SW TAX AGREEMENT	\$754,153	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
680 DEBT SERV - REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
3300 Investment Earnings	47,471	0	0	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	20	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	24,751,523	0	0	0	0
TOTAL - 680 DEBT SERV - REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	\$24,799,014	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
700 MISC CAPITAL PROJECTS					
3060 Residential Construction Tax	261,252	413,552	209,075	374,557	325,505
3300 Investment Earnings	219,787	(130,310)	310,082	0	0
4370 Park Acquisition & Develop Fee	705,759	4,433,468	2,614,066	625,000	625,000
4900 Other Revenue	60,000	0	0	0	0
5000 Transfers In	1,125,985	100,001	383,900	302,779	352,700
TOTAL - 700 MISC CAPITAL PROJECTS	\$2,372,783	\$4,816,711	\$3,517,123	\$1,302,336	\$1,303,205
730 OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS					
3300 Investment Earnings	37,415	(4,664)	5,085	0	0
3400 State Grants	2,939,684	324,684	362,284	0	0
3500 Federal Grants	1,105,162	1,972,197	1,232,550	5,261,877	9,048,589
3600 Other Agency Grants	30,208	(72,231)	0	0	0
4900 Other Revenue	0	0	300,000	0	0
5000 Transfers In	69,639	79,838	0	0	0
TOTAL - 730 OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS	\$4,182,108	\$2,299,824	\$1,899,919	\$5,261,877	\$9,048,589
GRAND TOTAL ALL FUNDS	\$320,713,240	\$282,867,708	\$344,045,285	\$282,485,606	\$277,547,600



FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFERS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFERS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
GENERAL FUND							
100	General Fund	14,554,698	139,704,359	154,259,057	(138,685,343)	(1,019,016)	14,554,698
TOTAL - GENERAL FUND		14,554,698	139,704,359	154,259,057	(138,685,343)	(1,019,016)	14,554,698
HOUSING							
<u>Housing Funds</u>							
313	CV Housing Authority	984,246	849,889	1,834,135	(1,200,913)		633,222
TOTAL		984,246	849,889	1,834,135	(1,200,913)		633,222
TOTAL - HOUSING		984,246	849,889	1,834,135	(1,200,913)		633,222
SUCCESSOR AGENCY							
<u>Successor Agency</u>							
318	Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	2,001,459	6,407,939	8,409,398	(6,407,939)		2,001,459
319	Housing - SA	4,472,224	1,942,748	6,414,972	(2,197,069)		4,217,903
654	RDA 2008 TARBS ProjFund - SA	1,329,985	1,329,985	1,329,985	(1,274,067)		55,918
661	05 ERAF - SA	1,017		1,017			1,017
662	06 ERAF - SA	1,244	127,795	129,039	(127,795)		1,244
663	06 TABs Series A - SA	1,027,955	1,018,570	2,046,525	(1,018,570)		1,027,955
664	06 TABs Series B - SA	1,029,620	993,559	2,023,179	(993,559)		1,029,620
665	08 TABs - SA	1,545,679	1,533,637	3,079,316	(1,533,637)		1,545,679
692	Successor Agency Long-term Debt	(34,313,246)	1,927,748	(32,385,498)	(2,277,748)		(34,663,246)
TOTAL		(22,904,063)	13,951,996	(8,952,067)	(15,830,384)		(24,782,451)
TOTAL - SUCCESSOR AGENCY		(22,904,063)	13,951,996	(8,952,067)	(15,830,384)		(24,782,451)

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFRS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFRS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
ENTERPRISE FUNDS							
<u>Transit Funds</u>							
402	Transit CVT	14		14			14
403	Transit Capital Projects	17,006		17,006			17,006
	TOTAL	17,020		17,020			17,020
<u>Sewer Funds</u>							
411	Sewer Income	2,005,115		2,005,115			2,005,115
413	Trunk Sewer Capital Reserve	55,662,354	2,379,047	58,041,401	(200,000)	(406,000)	57,435,401
414	Sewer Service Revenue	26,679,097	30,991,199	57,670,296	(32,398,213)	(13,000)	25,259,083
428	Sewer Facility Replacement	9,906,618	1,456,726	11,363,344	(150,000)	(1,800,000)	9,413,344
431	Tel Cyn Sewer Basin Plan DIF	1,129,047		1,129,047	(1,129,047)		0
432	Poggi Cyn Sewer Basin DIF	2,454,200	20,000	2,474,200	(10,000)		2,464,200
433	Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF	2,209,444	50,000	2,259,444	(1,147,500)	(1,091,264)	20,680
	TOTAL	100,045,875	34,896,972	134,942,847	(35,034,760)	(3,310,264)	96,597,823
408	Development Services Fund	(882,261)	7,303,694	6,421,433	(7,303,694)		(882,261)
	TOTAL - ENTERPRISE FUNDS	99,180,634	42,200,666	141,381,300	(42,338,454)	(3,310,264)	95,732,582
SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS							
<u>Transportation Funds</u>							
221	Gas Tax	5,908,137	5,514,157	11,422,294	(4,259,428)	(4,331,000)	2,831,866
223	TUT Common Fund	624,268		624,268	(615,902)		8,366
225	Traffic Signal	1,255,371	200,000	1,455,371	(15,000)	(644,000)	796,371
227	Transportation Sales Tax	2,123,663	6,014,343	8,138,006	(30,000)	(7,215,343)	892,663
	TOTAL	9,911,439	11,728,500	21,639,939	(4,920,330)	(12,190,343)	4,529,266
<u>Parking Funds</u>							
241	Parking Meter	938,145	585,000	1,523,145	(399,148)		1,123,997
243	Town Centre I-Parking District	40,815		40,815			40,815
	TOTAL	978,960	585,000	1,563,960	(399,148)		1,164,812

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFERS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFERS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
<u>Public Safety Funds</u>							
245	Traffic Safety	32,343	437,640	469,983	(437,640)		32,343
251	Suppl Law Enforcement Services	142,458	401,014	543,472	(543,384)		88
252	Police Department Grants	65,209	5,665,483	5,730,692	(5,726,767)		3,925
253	Inmate Welfare Fund	35,000	30,000	65,000	(60,000)		5,000
254	Local Law Enf Block Grant	0	91,078	91,078	(91,078)		0
256	Asset Seizure	500,000	260,000	760,000	(705,000)		55,000
	TOTAL	775,010	6,885,215	7,660,225	(7,563,869)		96,356
<u>Library and Cultural Arts Funds</u>							
261	California Library Service Act	19,090		19,090			19,090
262	Public Library Act	16		16			16
267	McCandliss Cultural Arts	12,074		12,074	(1,600)		10,474
	TOTAL	31,180		31,180	(1,600)		29,580
<u>Sundry Grant Funds</u>							
269	Other Grant Fund	216		216			216
272	Federal Grants Fund	0	1,316,810	1,316,810	(1,316,810)		0
273	State Grants Fund	15,843	60,000	75,843	(75,843)		0
274	ARRA Fund	229	22,333	22,562	(22,333)		229
	TOTAL	16,288	1,399,143	1,415,431	(1,414,986)		445
<u>Conservation Funds</u>							
281	Waste Management & Recycling	0	987,385	987,385	(987,385)		0
282	Environmental Services Fund	1,118,449	1,372,279	2,490,728	(1,810,987)		679,741
285	Energy Conservation	23,693	1,675,694	1,699,387	(1,675,694)		23,693
	TOTAL	1,142,142	4,035,358	5,177,500	(4,474,066)		703,434

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFRS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFRS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
<u>Community Development Block Grant</u>							
311	CDBG Housing Program	204,927	46,100	251,027	(46,100)		204,927
314	Emergency Shelter Grant Prog	2,995	153,270	156,265	(11,495)	(141,775)	2,995
321	Home Program	0	922,183	922,183	(922,183)		0
325	CDBG Program - Income Projects	63,826		63,826			63,826
333	FY2000 Comm Dev Block Grant	30,000	1,986,538	2,016,538	(1,159,831)	(847,109)	9,598
	TOTAL	301,748	3,108,091	3,409,839	(2,139,609)	(988,884)	281,346
<u>Open Space District Funds</u>							
342	CFD 11-M RHR McMillin	277,307	152,521	429,828	(152,521)		277,308
343	CFD 12-M Vlg7	746,632	469,962	1,216,594	(469,962)		746,632
344	CFD 13-M Vlg2	336,089	222,930	559,019	(222,930)		336,089
345	CFD 12M - OR Village 7	531,381	463,261	994,642	(463,261)		531,381
346	CFD 12M - OR Village 7	0	138,405	138,405	(138,405)		0
351	Town Centre Landscaping Dist I	25,126		25,126			25,126
352	Bay Blvd Landscaping Dist	45,259	12,294	57,553	(12,294)		45,259
353	Eastlake Maintenance Dist #1	365,473	408,743	774,216	(408,743)		365,473
354-376	Open Space District #1 - #31	2,633,411	3,677,029	6,310,440	(3,677,030)		2,633,410
378	CFD 07M-Eastlk II Woods, Vista	1,147,748	661,776	1,809,524	(661,776)		1,147,748
379	CFD 08M-Vlg 6 McM & Oty Ranch	2,203,217	994,455	3,197,672	(994,455)		2,203,218
380	CFD 09M OR Vlg II	859,734	1,025,267	1,885,001	(1,025,267)		859,734
382	CFD 99-2 Otay Ranch Vlg 1 We	945,238	825,691	1,770,929	(825,691)		945,238
383	Town Ctr Business Imprv Distr	9,563		9,563			9,563
386	Otay Ranch Acquisition Dist	426,776	505,000	931,776	(505,000)		426,776
387	CFD 98-3 Sunbow 2	910,719	884,381	1,795,100	(884,381)		910,719
388	Comm Facility 97-1 (Otay Rnch)	3,294,249	2,303,677	5,597,926	(2,303,677)		3,294,249
389	Otay Ranch Village 1,2,6,7,12	111,564	14,091	125,655	(14,091)		111,564
	TOTAL	14,869,486	12,759,483	27,628,969	(12,759,483)		14,869,487

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFRS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFRS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
	Miscellaneous						
270	Mobile Home Rent Review Program	201,104	73,500	274,604	(93,000)		181,604
316	Public Educational & Govt. Fee	579,048	600,000	1,179,048	(600,000)		579,048
	TOTAL	780,152	673,500	1,453,652	(693,000)		760,652
301	Storm Drain Revenue	8,667	584,250	592,917	(558,900)		34,017
	TOTAL - SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS	28,815,072	41,758,540	70,573,612	(34,924,991)	(13,179,227)	22,469,395

INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS

234	Advance Life Support Fund	332,054	1,475,907	1,807,961	(1,261,791)		546,170
235	Legislative Council Fund	80,000		80,000	(80,000)		0
341	Public Liability Trust	1,685,200	520,000	2,205,200	(1,653,439)		551,761
391	Central Garage	154,186	3,491,585	3,645,771	(3,552,276)		93,495
392	Equipment Replacement	54,606	330,000	384,606	(330,000)		54,606
393	Technology Replacement	287,226		287,226	(284,576)		2,650
398	Workers Compensation	0	3,249,426	3,249,426	(3,402,610)		(153,184)
	TOTAL - INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS	2,593,272	9,066,918	11,660,190	(10,564,692)		1,095,498

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFERS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFERS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
------	-------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------

CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS

<u>Assessment District Funds</u>							
501	Otay Lakes Rd AD 88-2 Improv	95,924		95,924			95,924
503	East H St AD 87-1 Improv	126,839		126,839			126,839
507	Otay Valley Rd AD 90-2 Improv	83,212		83,212			83,212
508	AD97-2	555,633		555,633			555,633
511	Otay Vly Rd Fee Recovery Dist	921,786		921,786			921,786
512	EL Greens II AD 94-1 Improv	1,138,590		1,138,590			1,138,590
515	Twin Oaks Ave AD 96-1 Improv	22,019		22,019			22,019
516	Oxford St AD 97-1 Improv	4,373		4,373			4,373
517	AD2004-1 Dixon Drive	151	9,598	9,749	(9,598)		151
518	AD2005-1 Tobias Drive	80,910	9,687	90,597	(90,597)		0
	TOTAL	3,029,437	19,285	3,048,722	(100,195)		2,948,527
<u>Development Impact Fee Funds</u>							
542	Tel Cyn Drainage Plan DIF	9,081,672		9,081,672		(200,000)	8,881,672
567-582	DIF - Public Facilities	6,629,495	2,850,000	9,479,495	(7,470,089)		2,009,406
587	DIF-OR Village Pedestrian Ramp	1,028,860	40,000	1,068,860	(3,000)		1,065,860
588	OR Vlg11 Pedestrian Bridge DIF	3,074,435	50,000	3,124,435	(3,200)		3,121,235
591	Transportation DIF	11,874,551	1,750,000	13,624,551	(265,000)	(2,955,845)	10,403,706
593	Western Transportation DIF Fund	145,443	81,600	227,043			227,043
	TOTAL	31,834,456	4,771,600	36,606,056	(7,741,289)	(3,155,845)	25,708,922
<u>Misc Capital Project Funds</u>							
715	PAD Fund - Eastern	28,866,015	600,000	29,466,015	(75,000)		29,391,015
716	PAD Fund - Western	782,786	25,000	807,786	(540,000)		267,786
717	Resid. Construction/Conversion	10,611	678,205	688,816	(678,205)		10,611
718	Library Construction	124,515		124,515			124,515
725	Indust. Development Authority	51		51			51
	TOTAL	29,783,978	1,303,205	31,087,183	(1,293,205)		29,793,978

FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS

FUND	DESCRIPTION	EST AVAIL 06/30/2015 FUND BAL	ESTIMATED REVENUES/ TFERS IN	ESTIMATED TOTAL RESOURCES	ESTIMATED OP EXP/ TFERS OUT	ADOPTED CIP/NON- CIP	EST AVAIL 06/30/2016 FUND BAL
<u>Other Transportation Funds</u>							
735	Transportation Partnership	29,074		29,074			29,074
736	Other Transportation Program	335,040	9,048,589	9,383,629		(9,048,589)	335,040
741	Prop 1B Hwy Safety	45,736		45,736			45,736
	TOTAL	409,850	9,048,589	9,458,439		(9,048,589)	409,850
TOTAL - CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS		65,057,721	15,142,679	80,200,400	(9,134,689)	(12,204,434)	58,861,277

DEBT SERVICE FUNDS

<u>Debt Service - City Funds</u>							
442	CDBG Section 108 Loan	540	758,243	758,783	(758,243)		540
449	SD Co Regional Comm Systems	288		288			288
451	Long-term Advances DSF - City	(36,852,341)	3,190,000	(33,662,341)	(150,000)		(33,812,341)
452	KS Fire Equipment Capital Lease	134,627	351,664	486,291	(452,952)		33,339
453	CES Loan Repayment	4,189	811,853	816,042	(811,853)		4,189
	TOTAL	(36,712,697)	5,111,760	(31,600,937)	(2,173,048)		(33,773,985)
<u>Debt Service - CV Financing Authority</u>							
472	2004 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase 1	2,464,548	2,394,514	4,859,062	(2,399,514)		2,459,548
473	2006 COP Civ Ctr Proj Phase 2	1,319,953	1,270,960	2,590,913	(1,276,960)		1,313,953
474	2010 Refunding COP	2,551,251	2,487,320	5,038,571	(2,492,319)		2,546,252
474	2014 Refunding COP	4,033,600	3,608,000	7,641,600	(3,612,556)		4,029,044
	TOTAL	10,369,352	9,760,794	20,130,146	(9,781,349)		10,348,797
TOTAL - DEBT SERVICE FUNDS		(26,343,345)	14,872,554	(11,470,791)	(11,954,397)		(23,425,188)

GRAND TOTAL ALL FUNDS 161,938,235 277,547,600 439,485,836 (264,633,863) (29,712,941) 145,139,033



SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS

SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN

FY 2015-16
PROPOSED

FUND/ACCOUNT

DESCRIPTION

100 GENERAL FUND

221 Gas Tax	Reimbursement for street related staff time, materials, and utilities	4,259,428
234 Advanced Life Support Program	Staff time reimbursement	833,510
245 Traffic Safety	Reimbursement for Police fleet maintenance costs	399,140
282 Environmental Services	Reimbursement for allocated overhead costs	107,585
313 CV Housing Authority	Reimbursement for allocated overhead costs	155,968
408 Development Services Fund	Reimbursement for allocated overhead costs	1,187,557
414 Sewer Service Revenue	Reimbursement for Sewer related staff time and materials	3,045,133
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 100 GENERAL FUND		\$9,988,321

252 POLICE DEPARTMENT GRANTS

100 General Fund	Funding for personnel costs	162,989
251 Suppl Law Enforcement Services	Funding for personnel costs	19,538
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 252 POLICE DEPARTMENT GRANTS		\$182,527

254 LOCAL LAW ENF BLOCK GRANT

100 General Fund	General Fund support of grant funded positions	38,297
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 254 LOCAL LAW ENF BLOCK GRANT		\$38,297

272 FEDERAL GRANTS FUND

100 General Fund	General Fund match for grant	62,326
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 272 FEDERAL GRANTS FUND		\$62,326

319 HOUSING - SA

Pooled Cash	Repayment of SERAF Loan from Low and Mod Income Housing fund to former Redevelopment Agency	1,927,748
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 319 HOUSING - SA		\$1,927,748

333 COMM DEV BLOCK GRANT FUND

517 AD2004-1 Dixon Drive	Project cost reimbursement from AD	9,598
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 333 COMM DEV BLOCK GRANT FUND		\$9,598

SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN

FUND/ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
--------------	-------------	------------------------

341 PUBLIC LIABILITY TRUST		
100 General Fund	General Fund transfer for public liability expenses	440,000
414 Sewer Service Revenue	Sewer Fund transfer for public liability expenses	80,000
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 341 PUBLIC LIABILITY TRUST		\$520,000

392 EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT		
100 General Fund	Funding for vehicle replacement	330,000
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 392 EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT		\$330,000

408 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND		
100 General Fund	Staff time reimbursement	110,477
110	Permit subsidy	400,000
414 Sewer Service Revenue	Staff time reimbursement	16,137
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 408 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND		\$526,614

413 TRUNK SEWER CAPITAL RESERVE		
431 Tele Cyn Sewer Basin DIF	Return SW224 project funds transferred in excess	1,129,047
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 413 TRUNK SEWER CAPITAL RESERVE		\$1,129,047

414 SEWER SERVICE REVENUE		
428 Sewer Facility Replacement	Staff time reimbursement	150,000
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 414 SEWER SERVICE REVENUE		\$150,000

442 CDBG SEC108 LOAN		
333 Comm Dev Block Grant Fund	Debt service payment - Section 108 loan	758,243
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 442 CDBG SEC108 LOAN		\$758,243

SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN

FY 2015-16
PROPOSED

FUND/ACCOUNT

DESCRIPTION

451 LONG-TERM ADVANCES DSF - CITY

301 Storm Drain Revenue	Interfund loan payment - Trunk Sewer Capl Res-Reso 18996	210,000
433 Salt Creek Sewer Basin DIF	Interfund loan payment - Trunk Sewer Capl Res-FY00-01 Budget Reso	1,120,000
572 Civic Center Expansion	Interfund loan payment	300,000
576 Fire Suppression Sys Expansion	Interfund loan payment	1,045,000
716 Western-Park Acquisition & Dev	Interfund loan payment	515,000
	TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 451 LONG-TERM ADVANCES DSF - CITY	\$3,190,000

452 EQUIPMENT LEASE FUND

100 General Fund	Debt Serv Pymt - Fire Equipment	297,403
	TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 452 EQUIPMENT LEASE FUND	\$297,403

453 ENERGY LOAN REPAYMENTS

100 General Fund	Debt service payment - California Energy Commission loan	682,852
	TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 453 ENERGY LOAN REPAYMENTS	\$682,852

472 2004 COP CIV CTR PROJ PHASE I

100 General Fund	Debt service payment - Civic Center Phase 1	314,771
572 Civic Center Expansion	Debt service payment - Civic Center Phase 1	1,401,538
717 Resid. Construction/Conversion	Debt service payment - Western Chula Vista Infrastructure	678,205
	TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 472 2004 COP CIV CTR PROJ PHASE I	\$2,394,514

473 2006 COP CIV CTR PROJ PHASE 2

100 General Fund	Debt service payment - Civic Center Phase 2	281,575
572 Civic Center Expansion	Debt service payment - Civic Center Phase 2	989,385
	TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 473 2006 COP CIV CTR PROJ PHASE 2	\$1,270,960

SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN

FUND/ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
474 2010 COP REFINANCE		
100 General Fund	Debt Service Payment - Civic Center Phase 3/2000 COP Refunding Corp Yard	708,454
572 Civic Center Expansion	Debt Service Payment - Civic Center Phase 3/2000 COP Refunding Corp Yard	934,446
574 Corporation Yard Relocation	Debt Service Payment - Civic Center Phase 3/2000 COP Refunding Corp Yard	844,420
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 474 2010 COP REFINANCE		\$2,487,320
475 2014 REFUNDING COP		
100 General Fund	Debt Service Payment - 2002 COP Refunding - Police Facility	2,008,000
573 Police Facilities Remodel	Debt Service Payment - 2002 COP Refunding - Police Facility	1,600,000
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 475 2014 REFUNDING COP		\$3,608,000
662 06 ERAF - SA		
318 Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	Debt service payment	127,795
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 662 06 ERAF - SA		\$127,795
663 06 TABS SERIES A - SA		
318 Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	Debt service payment	1,018,570
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 663 06 TABS SERIES A - SA		\$1,018,570
664 06 TABS SERIES B - SA		
318 Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	Debt service payment	993,559
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 664 06 TABS SERIES B - SA		\$993,559
665 08 TABS - SA		
318 Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	Debt service payment	1,533,637
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 665 08 TABS - SA		\$1,533,637

SCHEDULE OF INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN

FUND/ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED
692 LONG-TERM ADVANCES DSF-RDA SA		
318 Redv Obligation Retirement Fnd	Repayment of SERAF Loan from Low and Mod Income Housing fund to former Redevelopment Agency	1,927,748
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 692 LONG-TERM ADVANCES DSF-RDA SA		\$1,927,748
717 RESID. CONSTRUCTION/CONVERSION		
100 General Fund	General Fund transfer for debt service expense	262,103
518 AD2005-1 Tobias Drive	Project cost reimbursement from the assessment district	90,597
TOTAL TRANSFERS IN - 717 RESID. CONSTRUCTION/CONVERSION		\$352,700
GRAND TOTAL ALL FUNDS		\$35,507,779



**AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY
DEPARTMENT**

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
CITY COUNCIL				
Administrative Secretary	-	-	1.00	1.00
Chief Of Staff	-	1.00	-	1.00
Chief Service Officer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Constituent Services Manager	2.00	(2.00)	-	-
Councilperson	4.00	-	-	4.00
Executive Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Mayor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Office Specialist (Myr/@Will)	1.00	-	-	1.00
Policy Aide	-	1.00	-	1.00
Sr Council Asst	4.00	-	-	4.00
CITY COUNCIL TOTAL	14.00	-	1.00	15.00
CITY CLERK				
Assistant City Clerk	1.00	-	-	1.00
City Clerk	1.00	-	-	1.00
Deputy City Clerk I	1.00	-	1.00	2.00
Records Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Records Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
CITY CLERK TOTAL	5.00	-	1.00	6.00
CITY ATTORNEY				
Asst City Attorney	1.00	-	-	1.00
City Attorney (Elected)	1.00	-	-	1.00
Deputy City Attorney II	3.00	-	-	3.00
Deputy City Attorney III	3.00	-	-	3.00
Law Office Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Legal Assistant	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Asst City Attorney	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Legal Assistant	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Risk Management Specialist	-	-	1.00	1.00
CITY ATTORNEY TOTAL	13.00	-	1.00	14.00
ADMINISTRATION				
Asst City Manager (C)	1.00	-	-	1.00
Asst To City Mgr/CI Manager	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
City Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Cultural Arts Prog Mgr	-	-	0.75	0.75
Dep City Manager	1.00	1.00	-	2.00
Dir Of Econ Development	1.00	-	-	1.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
Environmntl Resource Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Executive Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Marketing & Communications Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Performance & Org Dev Mgr	-	1.00	(1.00)	-
Principal Economic Dev Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Project Coordinator I	-	-	1.00	1.00
Public Information Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Real Property Manager	-	-	1.00	1.00
Special Events Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Sr Economic Dev Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Graphic Designer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Webmaster	-	-	1.00	1.00
Webmaster	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	14.00	1.00	1.75	16.75

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SRVCS

Dir Of Info Tech Svcs	1.00	-	-	1.00
GIS Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
GIS Specialist	3.00	-	(1.00)	2.00
Info Tech Support Specialist	3.00	-	-	3.00
Information Technology Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Ops&Telecom Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Application Support Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Info Tech Support Spec	3.00	-	1.00	4.00
Sr Programmer Analyst	2.00	-	-	2.00
Telecommunications Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SRVCS TOTAL	17.00	-	-	17.00

HUMAN RESOURCES

Asst Dir Human Resources	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Benefits Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Dir Of Human Resources	-	1.00	-	1.00
HR Analyst	2.00	-	-	2.00
HR Technician	2.00	-	-	2.00
Performance & Org Dev Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Principal HR Analyst	-	1.00	-	1.00
Risk Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Senior HR Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	1.00	2.00
Sr HR Analyst	3.00	(1.00)	-	2.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
Sr Risk Management Specialist	3.00	-	(1.00)	2.00
HUMAN RESOURCES TOTAL	15.00	-	1.00	16.00
FINANCE				
Accountant	1.00	-	-	1.00
Accounting Assistant	6.00	-	-	6.00
Accounting Technician	5.00	-	-	5.00
Assoc Accountant	2.00	(2.00)	-	-
Asst Dir Of Finance	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Budget & Analysis Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Business License Rep	1.00	-	-	1.00
Collections Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Dir Of Finance	1.00	-	-	1.00
Finance & Purchasing Mgr	-	1.00	-	1.00
Finance Manager	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Fiscal & Management Analyst	4.00	-	-	4.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	-	1.00	-	1.00
Procurement Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Accountant	1.00	1.00	-	2.00
Sr Procurement Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Treasury And Business Manager	-	1.00	-	1.00
Treasury Manager	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
FINANCE TOTAL	28.00	(1.00)	-	27.00
ANIMAL CARE FACILITY				
Animal Adoption Counselor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Animal Care Assistant	5.00	(5.00)	-	-
Animal Care Fac Administrator	1.00	-	-	1.00
Animal Care Specialist	-	5.00	-	5.00
Animal Care Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Animal Control Officer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Animal Control Officer Supvsr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Office Specialist	0.50	-	-	0.50
Registered Veterinary Tech	3.50	-	-	3.50
Sr Animal Care Assistant	2.00	(2.00)	-	-
Sr Animal Care Specialist	-	2.00	-	2.00
Sr Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Veterinarian (Permitted)	1.00	-	-	1.00
ANIMAL CARE FACILITY TOTAL	21.00	-	-	21.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES				
Administrative Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Assistant Dir Development Svcs	1.00	-	-	1.00
Assoc Planner	1.75	-	-	1.75
Code Enf Offcr II	6.00	-	-	6.00
Development Svcs Dept Director	1.00	-	-	1.00
Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Planning Manager	0.50	-	-	0.50
Planning Technician	2.00	-	-	2.00
Principal Planner	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Code Enforcement Off	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Planner	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Planning Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES TOTAL	20.25	-	-	20.25
POLICE				
Administrative Services Managr	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Automated Fingerprint Tech	1.00	1.00	-	2.00
Chief Of Police	1.00	-	-	1.00
Civilian Background Investigtr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Community Serv Officer	8.00	-	-	8.00
Crime Laboratory Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Detention Facility Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Evidence Control Asst	2.00	-	(2.00)	-
Facility & Supply Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	0.50	-	0.50	1.00
Forensics Specialist	2.00	-	-	2.00
Latent Print Examiner	2.00	-	-	2.00
Parking Enforcement Officer	2.00	(1.00)	-	1.00
Peace Officer	146.00	-	-	146.00
Police Admin Svcs Administrato	-	1.00	-	1.00
Police Agent	49.00	-	-	49.00
Police Captain	3.00	-	-	3.00
Police Comm Systems Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Data Specialist	2.00	-	-	2.00
Police Dispatcher	20.00	-	-	20.00
Police Dispatcher Supervisor	6.00	-	-	6.00
Police Lieutenant	9.00	-	-	9.00
Police Records Specialist	6.50	-	2.00	8.50
Police Records Transcriptionis	2.00	-	(2.00)	-
Police Sergeant	23.00	-	-	23.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
Police Services Officer	10.00	-	-	10.00
Police Support Services Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Svcs Officer Supervisor	2.00	-	-	2.00
Police Technology Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Principal Management Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Safety Analyst	3.00	-	-	3.00
Range Master	0.50	(0.50)	-	-
Secretary	3.00	-	-	3.00
Sr Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Office Specialist	4.00	-	-	4.00
Sr Police Data Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Police Technology Spec	-	1.00	-	1.00
Sr Property & Evidence Spec	-	-	2.00	2.00
Sr Public Safety Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
Training Programs Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
POLICE TOTAL	321.50	0.50	0.50	322.50

FIRE

Deputy Fire Chief	3.00	-	(2.00)	1.00
Facility & Supply Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Battalion Chief (112 Hr)	6.00	-	-	6.00
Fire Battalion Chief (80 Hr)	-	-	1.00	1.00
Fire Captain (112 Hr)	33.00	-	-	33.00
Fire Captain (80 Hr)	2.00	-	-	2.00
Fire Chief	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Division Chief	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Eng (112 Hr)	33.00	-	-	33.00
Fire Engineer (80 Hr)	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Insp/Invest I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Insp/Invest II	5.00	-	-	5.00
Fire Prev Eng/Invest	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fire Prevention Aide	-	-	1.00	1.00
Firefighter (112 Hr)	38.00	(4.00)	-	34.00
Firefighter/Paramedic (112 Hr)	4.00	4.00	-	8.00
Principal Management Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Safety Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
Secretary	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Sr Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Fire Insp/Invest	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Training Programs Spec	-	1.00	-	1.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
FIRE TOTAL	136.00	-	-	136.00
PUBLIC WORKS				
Admin Analyst II	2.00	(2.00)	-	-
Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Administrative Services Managr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Assistant Surveyor II	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Assoc Engineer	10.00	-	-	10.00
Assoc Land Surveyor	-	1.00	-	1.00
Asst Dir Of Public Works	1.00	-	-	1.00
Asst Director Of Engineering	1.00	-	-	1.00
Asst Engineer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Bldg Project Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Conservation Specialist I	1.00	-	2.00	3.00
Construction & Repair Mgr	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Construction & Repair Supvsr	-	1.00	-	1.00
Custodial & Facilities Manager	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Custodial Supervisor	3.00	(1.00)	-	2.00
Custodian	9.50	2.00	-	11.50
Dir Of Public Works	1.00	-	-	1.00
Electrician	2.00	-	-	2.00
Electronics Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Engineering Tech II	1.50	-	0.50	2.00
Environmental Hlth Specialist	2.00	-	-	2.00
Environmental Resource Spec	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Environmntl Resource Mgr	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Equipment Operator	2.00	-	-	2.00
Facilities Manager	-	1.00	-	1.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Gardener II	22.00	-	-	22.00
Graffiti Abatement Coord	-	-	1.00	1.00
HVAC Techncian	2.00	-	-	2.00
Lead Custodian	5.00	(1.00)	-	4.00
Locksmith	2.00	-	-	2.00
Maintenance Worker I	-	-	1.00	1.00
Maintenance Worker II	9.00	-	-	9.00
Management Analyst	1.00	2.00	-	3.00
Open Space Inspector	5.00	-	-	5.00
Open Space Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Park Ranger Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Parks Operations Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Parks Supervisor	4.00	-	-	4.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
Plumber	1.00	-	-	1.00
Principal Civil Engineer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Pub Works Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Works Insp II	6.00	-	-	6.00
Public Works Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Works Supervisor	2.00	-	-	2.00
Pump Maint Technician	4.00	-	1.00	5.00
Pump Maintenance Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Real Property Manager	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Signing&Striping Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Civil Engineer	5.00	-	-	5.00
Sr Engineering Technician	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	1.00	2.00
Sr Gardener	9.00	-	-	9.00
Sr HVAC Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Landscape Inspector	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Maintenance Worker	8.00	-	-	8.00
Sr Management Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Open Space Inspector	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Pub Works Specialist	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Sr Public Works Insp	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Survey Technician II	1.00	-	-	1.00
Traffic Devices Tech	3.00	-	-	3.00
Traffic Devices Tech Supv	1.00	-	-	1.00
Tree Trimmer Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Wastewater Collections Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
PUBLIC WORKS TOTAL	163.00	-	1.50	164.50
RECREATION				
Administrative Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Aquatic Supv I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Aquatic Supv II	2.00	-	-	2.00
Aquatic Supv III	1.00	-	-	1.00
Director Of Recreation	1.00	-	-	1.00
Principal Recreation Manager	2.00	-	-	2.00
Recreation Supervisor II	2.00	(2.00)	-	-
Recreation Supervisor III	5.00	2.00	-	7.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Recreation Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
RECREATION TOTAL	17.00	-	-	17.00
LIBRARY				
Admin Analyst II	1.00	(1.00)	-	-
Dir Of Library	1.00	-	-	1.00
Librarian I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Librarian II	4.00	1.00	-	5.00
Librarian III	2.00	-	-	2.00
Library Associate	8.50	(1.00)	-	7.50
Library Digital Services Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Management Analyst	-	1.00	-	1.00
Principal Librarian	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Librarian	2.00	-	1.00	3.00
LIBRARY TOTAL	21.50	-	1.00	22.50
GENERAL FUND SUBTOTAL	806.25	0.50	8.75	815.50
ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT PROGRAM				
EMS Nurse Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT PROGRAM TOTA	1.00	-	-	1.00
POLICE DEPT GRANTS FUND				
CBAG Deputy Director	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Deputy Exec Dir	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Director Of IV-LECC	1.00	-	-	1.00
CBAG Executive Director	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Admin Analyst II	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Analyst	4.00	-	(2.00)	2.00
FA Director Of SD LECC	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Geospatial Intel Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Graphic Designer/Wbmstr	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Info Security Program Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA LECC IT Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Ntwrk Administrator II	4.00	-	-	4.00
FA Program Analyst	1.00	-	-	1.00
FA Program Assistant	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Program Manager	2.00	1.00	(2.00)	1.00
FA Public Safety Analyst	2.00	(1.00)	(1.00)	-
FA RCFL Ntwk Engineer	2.00	-	-	2.00
FA Sr Intelligence Analyst	-	-	5.00	5.00
FA Sr Public Safety Analyst	4.00	1.00	(5.00)	-

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
FA Sr Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Peace Officer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Police Agent	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Comm Relations Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Police Sergeant	2.00	-	-	2.00
POLICE DEPT GRANTS FUND TOTAL	40.00	1.00	(5.00)	36.00
FEDERAL GRANTS FUND				
Emergency Svcs Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
GIS Specialist	1.00	1.00	-	2.00
FEDERAL GRANTS FUND TOTAL	2.00	1.00	-	3.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES				
Environ Svcs Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Environ Svcs Prog Mgr	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Recycl Spec I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Recycling Specialist II	3.00	-	1.00	4.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES TOTAL	5.00	-	1.00	6.00
CV HOUSING AUTHORITY FUND				
Housing Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Project Coordinator II	2.00	-	-	2.00
Sr Project Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
CV HOUSING AUTHORITY FUND TOTAL	4.00	-	-	4.00
FLEET MANAGEMENT				
Equipment Mechanic	4.00	-	-	4.00
Fire Apparatus Mech	2.00	-	-	2.00
Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fleet Inventory Control Spec	1.00	-	-	1.00
Fleet Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Equipment Mechanic	1.00	-	-	1.00
FLEET MANAGEMENT TOTAL	10.00	-	-	10.00
TRANSIT CVT				
Transit Manager	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
TRANSIT CVT TOTAL	1.00	-	(1.00)	-

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND				
Assoc Engineer	3.00	-	-	3.00
Assoc Plan Check Engineer	-	3.00	-	3.00
Assoc Planner	4.00	-	-	4.00
Building Inspection Mgr	-	-	1.00	1.00
Building Inspector II	4.00	-	-	4.00
Building Inspector III	1.00	-	-	1.00
Building Off/Code Enf Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Development Services Tech I	1.00	-	-	1.00
Development Svcs Tech Iii	6.00	-	-	6.00
Devlpmt Svcs Counter Mgr	1.00	-	-	1.00
Engineering Tech II	1.00	-	-	1.00
Landscape Architect	2.50	-	-	2.50
Landscape Planner II	1.00	-	(1.00)	-
Plan Check Supervisor	1.00	-	-	1.00
Planning Manager	1.00	-	-	1.00
Plans Examiner	3.00	(3.00)	-	-
Principal Civil Engineer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Principal Planner	2.00	-	-	2.00
Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Building Inspector	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Engineering Technician	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Office Specialist	2.00	-	(1.00)	1.00
Sr Plan Check Tech	-	-	1.00	1.00
Sr Planner	4.00	-	(1.00)	3.00
Sr Project Coordinator	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Secretary	1.00	-	-	1.00
Transportation Engineer W/Cert	1.00	-	-	1.00
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FUND TOTAL	45.50	-	(1.00)	44.50
SEWER				
Assoc Engineer	2.00	-	-	2.00
Engineering Tech II	2.00	-	-	2.00
Equipment Operator	3.00	-	-	3.00
Maintenance Worker II	18.00	-	-	18.00
Pub Works Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Public Works Supervisor	4.00	-	-	4.00
Sr Civil Engineer	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Fiscal Office Specialist	1.00	-	-	1.00
Sr Maintenance Worker	14.00	-	-	14.00

AUTHORIZED POSITIONS BY DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION	FY 2014-15 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2014-15 MIDYEAR CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED CHANGES	FY 2015-16 PROPOSED BUDGET
SEWER TOTAL	46.00	-	-	46.00
NON-GENERAL FUND SUBTOTAL	154.50	2.00	(6.00)	150.50
TOTAL AUTHORIZED POSITIONS	960.75	2.50	2.75	966.00



APPENDIX

Fiscal Policies

Investment Policies

Debt Administration

GANN Appropriations Limit

Legal Debt Margin

Accounting Systems and Budgetary Control

List of Acronyms

Glossary

Chula Vista at a Glance

Fiscal Policies

This section of the budget document reiterates the fiscal policies that were reviewed, acknowledged, or approved/adopted by the City Council. These policies form the overall framework within which the operating budget was formulated. The fiscal policies, most of which are already codified in one form or another, are not considered new or controversial, but are summarized here to assist you to better understand the basis for the resource allocation decisions that were made.

General

1. The City's financial assets will be managed in a sound and prudent manner in order to ensure the continued viability of the organization.
2. A comprehensive operating and capital budget for all City funds will be developed annually and presented to the City Council for approval. The purpose of the annual budget will be to:
 - a. Identify community needs for essential services.
 - b. Identify the programs and specific activities required to provide these essential services.
 - c. Establish program policies and goals that define the nature and level of program services required.
 - d. Identify alternatives for improving the delivery of program services.
 - e. Identify the resources required to fund identified programs and activities, and enable accomplishment of program objectives.
 - f. Set standards to facilitate the measurement and evaluation of program performance.
3. The City's annual operating budget will be balanced whereby planned expenditures do not exceed anticipated revenues.
4. Recurring revenues will fund recurring expenditures. One-time revenues will be used for capital, reserve augmentation, or other non-recurring expenditures.
5. Accounting systems will be maintained in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.
6. Investment policy and practice will be in accordance with State statutes that emphasize safety and liquidity over yield, including quarterly status reports to the City Council. (*Council Policy*)
7. City operations will be managed and budgets prepared with the goal of maintaining an available fund balance in the General Fund of no less than fifteen percent of the General Fund operating budget. (*Council Policy*)
8. General Fund fiscal status reports reflecting comparisons of actual and projected performance with budget allocations for both revenue and expenditures will be presented to the City Council on a quarterly basis. (*City Charter*)

Revenue

1. The City will endeavor to maintain a diversified and stable revenue base in order to minimize the impact to programs from short-term economic fluctuations.
2. Revenue projections will be maintained for the current year and four future fiscal years, and estimates will be based on a conservative, analytical, and objective process.
3. In order to maintain flexibility, except as required by law or funding source, the City will avoid earmarking any restricted revenues for specific purpose or program.
4. The City has established user fees to best ensure that those who use a proprietary service pay for that service in proportion to the benefits received. With few exceptions, such as those services provided for low-income residents, fees have been set to enable the City to recover the full cost of providing those services. (*Citywide*)

Cost Recovery Policy, Council Policy Number 159-03)

5. User fees will be reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis to ensure that program costs continue to be recovered and that the fees reflect changes in levels of service delivery. *(Master Fee Schedule)*
6. The City will recover the cost of new facilities and infrastructure necessitated by new development consistent with State law and the City's Growth Management Program. Development Impact Fees will be closely monitored and updated to ensure that they are maintained at a level adequate to recover costs. *(GMOC Ordinance)*
7. When considering new development alternatives, the City will attempt to determine the fiscal impact of proposed projects, annexations, etc. and ensure that mechanisms are put in place to provide funding for any projected negative impacts on City operations. *(GMOC Ordinance)*

Expenditures

1. Budgetary control will be exercised at the Department/category level, meaning that each department is authorized to spend up to the total amount appropriated for that department within the expenditure categories of Personnel Costs, Supplies & Services, Other Charges, Utilities, and Capital. Transfers of appropriations between expenditure categories of up to \$15,000 may be approved by the City Manager. Transfers of appropriations between expenditure categories in excess of \$15,000, between departments, and transfers from CIP projects require City Council approval. *(City Charter & Council Policy)*
2. Appropriations, other than for capital projects, remaining unspent at the end of any fiscal year will be cancelled and returned to Available Fund Balance with the exception of any appropriations encumbered as the result of a valid purchase order or as approved for a specific project or purpose by the City Council or the City Manager.

Appropriations for capital projects will necessarily be carried over from year to year until the project is deemed to be complete. *(Council Policy)*

3. The City will establish and maintain equipment replacement and facility maintenance funds as deemed necessary to ensure that monies are set aside and available to fund ongoing replacement needs.
4. The City will attempt to compensate non-safety employees at rates above the middle of the labor market as measured by the median rate for similar jurisdictions. *(Council Policy)*

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

1. Major capital projects will be included in a CIP Budget reflecting a five-year period. The CIP budget will be updated annually and presented to City Council for approval. Resources will be formally appropriated (budgeted) for the various projects on an annual basis in accordance with the five-year plan.

City Debt Policy & Debt Management

1. The City will consider the use of debt financing primarily for capital improvement projects (CIP) when the project's useful life will exceed the term of the financing and when resources are identified sufficient to fund the debt service requirements. Some exceptions to this CIP driven focus are the issuance of debt such as Pension Obligation Bonds, where the financial benefits are significantly greater than the costs and where the benefits are determined to be a financially prudent option; and short-term instruments such as tax and revenue anticipation notes, which are to be used for prudent cash management purposes. Bonded debt should not be issued for projects with minimal public benefit or support, or to finance normal operating expenses. *(Council Policy)*

If a department has any project which is expected to use debt financing, the department director is responsible for expeditiously providing the Finance Department with reasonable cost

estimates, including specific revenue accounts that will provide payment for the debt service. This will allow the Finance Department to do an analysis of the project's potential impact on the City's debt capacity and limitations. *(Council Policy)*

2. Debt capacity and affordability will be determined by conducting various analyses prior to the issuance of bonds. The analysis of debt capacity should cover a broad range of factors including but limited to the following:
 - Statutory or constitutional limitations affecting the amount that can be issued, such as legally authorized debt limits and tax or expenditure ceilings
 - Other legal limitations, such as coverage requirements or additional bonds tests imposed by bond covenants
 - Evaluation of trends relating to the government's financial performance, such as revenues and expenditures, net revenues available after meeting operating requirements, reliability of revenues expected to pay debt service and unreserved fund balance levels
 - Debt service as a percentage of total General Fund Revenues

The City will attempt to limit the total amount of annual debt service payments payable by the General Fund to no more than 10% of estimated total General Fund revenues. Under State Law, general obligation bonds shall not exceed 15% of total assessed valuation within the City.

An analysis using current market rates and conservative projections showing compliance with the debt affordability limitations included in this Debt Policy shall be conducted before the issuance of any debt with a maturity longer than two years from date of issue.

Data showing direct and overlapping debt levels for the City of Chula Vista and surrounding agencies that affect the residents of the City shall be compiled for inclusion in the Comprehensive

Annual Financial Report (CAFR) of the City. *(Council Policy)*

3. In order to maximize the financial options available to benefit the public, it is the policy of the City of Chula Vista to allow for the consideration of issuing all generally accepted types of debt, including, but not exclusive to the following:
 - General Obligation (GO) Bonds: General Obligation Bonds are suitable for use in the construction or acquisition of improvements to real property that benefit the public at large. Examples of projects include libraries, parks, and public safety facilities. All GO bonds require a 2/3 vote in order to pass.
 - Revenue Bonds: Revenue Bonds are limited-liability obligations tied to a specific enterprise revenue stream where the projects financed clearly benefit or relate to the enterprise. An example of projects that would be financed by a Revenue Bond would be improvements to the sewer system, which would be paid back with money raised from the property owner's sewer bills. Generally, no voter approval is required to issue this type of obligation but must comply with proposition 218 regarding rate adjustments.
 - Lease-Backed Debt/Certificates of Participation (COP): Issuance of COP debt is a commonly used form of debt that allows a City to finance projects where the debt service is secured via a lease or installment agreement and where the payments are budgeted in the annual budget appropriation by the City from the general fund. Lease-Backed debt does not constitute indebtedness under the state or the City's constitutional debt limit and does not require voter approval.
 - Special Assessment/Special District Debt: the City will consider requests from developers for the use of debt financing secured by property based assessments or special taxes in order to provide for necessary infrastructure for new development only under strict guidelines adopted by City Council, which may include minimum value-

to-lien ratios and maximum tax burdens. Examples of this type of debt are Assessment Districts (AD) and Community Facilities Districts (CFD) or more commonly known as Mello-Roos Districts. In order to protect bondholders as well as the City's credit rating, all Rate and Method of Apportionment (RMA) documents must include the provision that the maximum projected annual special tax revenues must equal 110% of the projected annual gross debt service on any bonds of the community facilities district. The City will also comply with all State guidelines regarding the issuance of special district or special assessment debt. For further information, refer to the City of Chula Vista Statement of Goals and Policies Regarding the Establishment of Community Facility Districts.

- Industrial Development Bonds – Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs) are tax-exempt securities which can fund manufacturing businesses or energy development projects which provides a public benefit. While the authorization to issue IDBs is provided by a state statute, the tax-exempt status of these bonds is derived from federal law (IRS Code Section 103(b) (2).
 - Tax Allocation Bonds – Tax Allocation Bonds are special obligations that are secured by the allocation of tax increment revenues that were generated by increased property taxes in the designated redevelopment area. Tax Allocation Bonds are not debt of the City. Due to changes in the law affecting California Redevelopment agencies with the passage of ABX1 26 as codified in the California Health and Safety Code, the City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency (RDA) was dissolved as of February 1, 2012, and its operations substantially eliminated but for the continuation of certain enforceable RDA obligations to be administered by the City of Chula Vista Successor Agency. The terms of ABX 1 26 requires successor agencies perform all obligations with respect to enforceable debt obligations, which include
 - Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue Bonds – The City Housing Authority is authorized to issue mortgage revenue bonds to finance the development, acquisition and rehabilitation of multi-family rental projects. The interest on the bonds can be exempt from Federal and State taxation. As a result, bonds provide below market financing for qualified rental projects. In addition, the bonds issued can qualify projects for allocations of Federal low-income housing tax credits, which can provide a significant portion of the funding necessary to develop affordable housing. For further information, refer to the Chula Vista Housing Authority – Multi-Family Administrative Bond Policies.
 - HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program – The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program allows cities to use their annual Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement grants to obtain federally guaranteed funds large enough to stimulate or pay for major community development and economic development projects. The program does not require a pledge of the City's General Fund, only of future CDBG entitlements. By pledging future CDBG entitlement grants as security, the City can borrow at favorable interest rates because of HUD's guarantee of repayment to investors. *(Council Policy)*
4. The City will strive to minimize borrowing costs by:
 - Seeking the highest credit rating possible;
 - Maintaining transparency and excellent communications with credit rating agencies regarding the City's fiscal condition;
 - Purchasing bond insurance or taking action to upgrade the City's current credit rating *(Council Policy)*
 5. The City will comply with Rule 15(c) 2-12 of the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and provide timely disclosure of relevant information on an annual basis as well as any material event

notices as required. *(Council Policy)*

6. In addition to externally financed debt, the City utilizes inter-fund loans whenever possible to reduce borrowing costs or provide for shorter term loans. When interest is charged on internal loans, it is done at the same rate the City earns from its pooled investments.

Sewer Service Revenue Fund Reserve Policy

1. Working Capital and Rate Stabilization Reserve
Working Capital and Rate Stabilization reserves in the Sewer Service Revenue Fund will be restricted to maintaining operating the wastewater collection system and paying treatment charges to City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater (“Metro”). The reserve will be funded from revenues accumulated in the Sewer Service Revenue Fund. IT is intended to accommodate any natural variability in revenues and expenditures, including potential disruptions of cash flows due to varied billing methodology, short term fluctuations and annual cycles. The reserve will also assist in addressing shortfalls which may occur due to unanticipated cost increases in labor or energy and other consumption based goods and services, such as wastewater treatment services provided by Metro. The reserves represent unrestricted resources available for appropriation by the City Council addressing unforeseen needs for sewer services.

The Working Capital and Rate Stabilization Reserves will assist the City in addressing the following items:

- Rate Stabilization – the reserves will allow the City the flexibility to “smooth” rates and phase increases in over multiple years, which is prudent given the potential variability in the City’s payments to Metro.
- Revenue Collection Fluctuations – the reserves will be used to protect the City from natural fluctuations in revenue and expenditure cycles which is prudent given that the City bills customers at different points in time but incurs expenses continuously throughout the year.

- Rates of delinquencies – delays in collection of outstanding revenues.
- Payroll cycles – the timing of fixed cash requirement for payroll, as related to the timing of revenue cycles.
- Unanticipated expenses – expenses whose characteristics make accurate estimation difficult, such as increases in wastewater treatment services provided by the City of San Diego, energy costs, labor benefits and other consumption based goods and services.

The City shall maintain a Sewer Revenue reserve equivalent to 90 days of operating expenditures and a Rate Stabilization reserve equivalent to 90 days of operating expenditures for a minimum combined total of 180 days and a maximum reserve balance of 125% of the minimum balance.

If funds are appropriated from the Sewer Revenue Working Capital and Rate Stabilization Reserves, the funds should be replenished in the budget process during subsequent fiscal years to the minimum reserve balance. If the magnitude of the event caused the Sewer Revenue Working Capital and a Stabilization Reserves to be less than 30 days of operating and maintenance budget, the Finance Director shall provide the City Council with a plan to incrementally replenish the reserves to the 180 days minimum reserve balance. *(Council Policy)*

2. Emergency Reserve
The Sewer Service Revenue Fund Emergency Reserve is necessary to secure funding for insurance deductibles, unforeseen liabilities/litigation and settlement costs related to the City’s wastewater system.

The City shall maintain a minimum Sewer Service Revenue Fund Emergency Reserve target level of 5% of the operating and maintenance budget and a maximum reserve balance of 125% of the minimum balance. If the funds are appropriated from the Sewer Revenue Emergency Reserves due to unanticipated needs, the Finance Director

shall provide the City Council with a plan to incrementally replenish the reserves to the minimum reserve balance. *(Council Policy)*

3. Vehicle Replacement Reserve

The Sewer Service Revenue Fund Vehicle Replacement Reserves represents monies set aside to fund the replacement of aging vehicles. The allocation is funded from revenues accumulated in the Sewer Service Revenue Fund.

The City shall maintain a minimum Sewer Services Fund Vehicle Replacement Reserve target of 2% of the operating and maintenance budget. This reserve will ensure that vehicles utilized for sewer operations are replaced as scheduled and available to deploy as needed.

To achieve a minimum impact to cost of services and rates, funds will be included in the proposed budget on an annual basis as identified in the City's Vehicle Replacement schedule. The cost of replacing all vehicles will be averaged over the lifespan of the existing fleet. This will generate a more normalized cost of services by evenly distributing revenue requirements on a year-to-year-basis offsetting temporary cash flow deficiencies and avoid significant increases in rate charges to customers in the years the replacement cost are incurred. *(Council Policy)*

4. USEPA Permit Renewal Liability Reserve

The Sewer Service Revenue Fund USEPA Permit Renewal Liability Reserve will account for monies set aside to fund the City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater costs related to the potential upgrade of the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant (PLWTP) or other alternative for secondary treatment. The reserve will be funded from revenues accumulated in the Sewer Service Revenue Fund.

Metro's USEPA waiver expires in FY 2015 and may not be renewed. If denied, Metro would need to develop and implement improvements to achieve secondary treatment level at PLWTP. Current cost estimates to establish full secondary treatment at PLWTP as well as possible

alternatives are all significant (>\$1 Billion). As a contributing member to the regional treatment plant, the City of Chula Vista's share in the cost of any upgrade would be approximately 10 percent for the capital improvements and any increase in the overall treatment cost. It is expected that Metro will have 10 years after the expiration of the USEPA waiver to institute secondary treatment or alternative. This reserve establishes a dedicated fund that will offset a portion of the City's share of any obligation related to the PLWTP USEPA waiver. By actively planning for the PLWTP upgrade or alternative the City will be in a stronger financial position to afford such costs while mitigating impacts to ratepayers.

The Permit Renewal Liability Reserve will be funded through annual contributions with the intent to reach a target balance of 20% of Chula Vista's share of the upgrade cost by FY 2024/25 (10 years after the expiration of the waiver). If substantial increases in Metro-related costs occur sooner than expected, the City may draw down reserve levels prior to FY 2024/25 to manage impacts to ratepayers. To be consistent with the City's policy for managing balances for its other utility reserves, if funds are appropriated from the reserve before its intended use, the funds should be replenished in subsequent fiscal years. If the magnitude of withdrawal is material, the Finance Director shall provide the City Council with a plan to incrementally replenish the reserves.

If the actual costs for the PLWTP upgrade or alternative are less than anticipated, any unspent reserves will be rolled into the Working Capital and Rate Stabilization Reserve and utilized to fund City sewer programs, including maintenance and expansion of the City's conveyance system and payment of San Diego Metro wastewater treatment costs. *(Council Policy)*

Investment Policies

1.0 Purpose

This “Investment Policy and Guidelines” (the “Investment Policy”) Policy is intended to provide guidelines for the prudent investment of the City of Chula Vista’s (the “City”) cash balances, and outline policies to assist in maximizing the efficiency of the City’s cash management system, while meeting the daily cash flow demands of the City.

2.0 Policy

The investment practices and policies of the City of Chula Vista are based upon state law and prudent money management.

3.0 Scope

This Investment Policy applies to all financial assets of the City of Chula Vista, as indicated in 3.1 below. These funds are accounted for in the City’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

3.1 Funds

The Director of Finance/Treasurer is responsible for investing the unexpended cash in the City Treasury for all funds, except for the employee’s retirement funds, which are administered separately, and those funds which are managed separately by trustees appointed under indenture agreements. The Director of Finance/Treasurer will strive to maintain the level of investment of this cash as close as possible to 100%. These funds are described in the City’s annual financial report and include:

- General Fund
- Special Revenue Funds
- Capital Project Funds
- Enterprise Funds
- Trust and Agency Funds
- Any new fund created by the legislative body, unless specifically exempted

This Investment Policy applies to all transactions involving the financial assets and related activity of the foregoing funds.

4.0 Prudence

The standard of prudence to be used by the Director of Finance/Treasurer shall be the “**prudent investor standard**”. This shall be applied in the context of managing an overall portfolio. The “**prudent investor standard**” is applied to local agencies, pursuant to California Government Code Section 53600.3 which provides, in pertinent part:

“ ... all governing bodies of local agencies or persons authorized to make investment decisions on behalf of those local agencies investing public funds pursuant to this chapter are trustees and therefore fiduciaries subject to the prudent investor standard. When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling, or managing public funds, a trustee shall act with care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, including, but not limited to, the general economic conditions and the anticipated needs of the agency, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity with those matters would use in the conduct of funds of a like character and with like aims, to safeguard the principal and maintain the liquidity needs of the agency...”

4.1 Personal Responsibility

The Director of Finance/Treasurer, Assistant Director of Finance, Treasury Manager and Finance Manager as investment officers acting in accordance with written procedures and the Investment Policy and exercising due diligence, shall be relieved of personal responsibility for an individual security’s credit risk or market price changes, provided deviations from expectations are reported to the City Council in a timely fashion and appropriate action is taken to control adverse developments.

5.0 Objective

Consistent with this aim, investments are made under the terms and conditions of California Government Code Section 53600, et seq. Criteria for selecting investments and the absolute order of priority are:

5.1 Safety

Safety of principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments of the City of Chula Vista shall be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure the preservation of capital in the overall portfolio. To attain this objective, diversification is required in order that potential losses on individual securities do not exceed the income generated from the remainder of the portfolio.

5.2 Liquidity

The City of Chula Vista's investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable the City to meet all operating requirements which might be reasonably anticipated and to maintain compliance with any indenture agreement, as applicable. Liquidity is essential to the safety of principal.

5.3 Return on Investments

The City of Chula Vista's investment portfolio shall be designed with the objective of attaining a market-average rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles (market interest rates), within the City's Investment Policy's risk parameters and the City's cash flow needs. See also Section 16.0.

6.0 Delegation of Authority

The Director of Finance/Treasurer shall be responsible for all transactions undertaken and shall establish a system of controls and written procedures to regulate the activities of subordinate officials. The responsibility for the day-to-day investment of City funds will be delegated to the Assistant Director of Finance or their designee. The Director of Finance/Treasurer may delegate day-to-day investment decision making and execution authority to an investment advisor. The advisor shall follow the Investment Policy and such other written instructions as are provided.

7.0 Ethics and Conflicts of Interest

In addition to state and local statutes relating to conflicts of interest, all persons involved in the investment process shall refrain from personal business activity that could conflict with proper execution of the investment program, or which could

impair their ability to make impartial investment decisions. Employees and investment officers, including investment advisors, are required to file annual disclosure statements as required for "public officials who manage public investments" [as defined and required by the Political Reform Act and related regulations, including Government Code Sections 81000, et seq., and the rules, regulations and guidelines promulgated by California's Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC)].

8.0 Authorized Financial Dealers and Institutions

The City's Director of Finance/Treasurer will maintain a list of the financial institutions and brokers/dealers authorized to provide investment and depository services and will perform an annual review of the financial condition and registrations of qualified bidders and require annual audited financial statements to be on file for each company. The City will utilize Moody's Securities or other such services to determine financially sound institutions with which to do business. The City shall annually send a copy of the current Investment Policy to all financial institutions and brokers/dealers approved to do business with the City.

As far as possible, all money belonging to, or in the custody of, a local agency, including money paid to the City's Director of Finance/Treasurer or other official to pay the principal, interest, or penalties of bonds, shall be deposited for safekeeping in state or national banks, savings associations, federal associations, credit unions, or federally insured industrial loan companies in this state selected by the City's Director of Finance/Treasurer; or may be invested in the investments set forth in Section 9.0. To be eligible to receive local agency money, a bank, savings association, federal association, or federally insured industrial loan company shall have received an overall rating of not less than "satisfactory" in its most recent evaluation by the appropriate federal financial supervisory agency of its record of meeting the credit needs of California's communities, including low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

To provide for the optimum yield in the investment of City funds, the City's investment procedures shall encourage competitive bidding on transactions from

approved brokers/dealers. In order to be approved by the City, the dealer must meet the following criteria: (i) the dealer must be a “primary” dealer or regional dealer that qualifies under Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15C3-1 (Uniform Net Capital Rule); (ii) the dealer’s institution must have an office in California; (iii) the dealer must be experienced in institutional trading practices and familiar with the California Government Code as related to investments appropriate for the City; and (iv) all other applicable criteria, as may be established in the investment procedures. All brokers/dealers and financial institutions who desire to become qualified bidders for investment transactions must submit a “Broker/Dealer Application” and related documents relative to eligibility including a current audited annual financial statement, U4 form for the broker, proof of state registration, proof of Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) certification and a certification of having read and understood the City’s Investment Policy and agreeing to comply with the Investment Policy. The City’s Director of Finance/Treasurer shall determine if they are adequately capitalized (i.e. minimum capital requirements of \$10,000,000 and five years of operation).

If the City has an investment advisor, the investment advisor may use its own list of authorized broker/dealers to conduct transactions on behalf of the City.

9.0 Authorized & Suitable Investments

The City is authorized by California Government Code Section 53600, et. seq., to invest in specific types of securities. Where this section specifies a percentage limitation for a particular security type, that percentage is applicable only on the date of purchase. Credit criteria listed in this section refers to the credit rating at the time the security is purchased. If an investment’s credit rating falls below the minimum rating required at the time of purchase, the Director of Finance/Treasurer will perform a timely review and decide whether to sell or hold the investment.

Investments not specifically listed below are deemed inappropriate and prohibited:

- A. **BANKERS’ ACCEPTANCES** A maximum of 40% of the portfolio may be invested in bankers’ acceptances. The maximum maturity is 180 days. Eligible bankers’ acceptances shall have the highest ranking or the highest letter and number rating as provided by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization (NRSRO).
- B. **NEGOTIABLE CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT.** A maximum of 30% of the portfolio may be invested in negotiable certificates of deposit (NCD’s). The maximum maturity of a NCD issue shall be 5 years. These are issued by commercial banks and thrift institutions against funds deposited for specified periods of time and earn specified or variable rates of interest. Negotiable certificates of deposit (NCD) differ from other certificates of deposit by their liquidity. NCD’s are traded actively in secondary markets. NCD’s with maturities under one year must be rated at least “A-1,” its equivalent, or better by a NRSRO. NCD’s with maturities in excess of one year must be rated “A,” its equivalent or better by a NRSRO. In compliance with California Code 53601.8, all FDIC insured CD’s, when placed through a deposit placement service, will be measured for compliance with NCD’s.
- C. **COMMERCIAL PAPER** A maximum of 25% of the portfolio may be invested in commercial paper. The maximum maturity is 270 days. Commercial paper of prime quality of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and number rating as provided for by a NRSRO. The entity that issues the commercial paper shall meet all of the following conditions in either paragraph (1) or paragraph (2):
 - 1) The entity meets the following criteria:
 - a. Is organized and operating in the United States as a general corporation.
 - b. Has total assets in excess of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000).
 - c. Has debt other than commercial paper, if any, that is rated “A” or higher, or the equivalent, by a NRSRO.

- 2) The entity meets the following criteria:
- a. Is organized within the United States as a special purpose corporation, trust, or limited liability company.
 - b. Has program wide credit enhancements including, but not limited to, over collateralization, letters of credit, or surety bond.
 - c. Has commercial paper that is rated "A-1" or higher, or equivalent, by a NRSRO.
- D. BONDS ISSUED BY THE CITY OR ANY LOCAL AGENCY WITHIN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. Bonds must have an "A" rating or better from a NRSRO. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.
- E. OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY. United States Treasury Notes, bonds, bills or certificates of indebtedness, or those for which the faith and credit of the United States are pledged for the payment of principal and interest. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.
- F. FEDERAL AGENCIES. Federal agency or United States government-sponsored enterprise obligations, participations, or other instruments, including those issued by or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by federal agencies or United States government-sponsored enterprises. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.
- G. REPURCHASE AGREEMENT, maximum term 3 months. Investments in repurchase agreements may be made, on any investment authorized in this section, when the term of the agreement does not exceed 3 months. A Master Repurchase Agreement must be signed with the bank or broker/dealer who is selling the securities to the City. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.
- H. REVERSE-REPURCHASE AGREEMENTS (Requires Council approval for each transaction). Reverse repurchase agreements or securities lending agreements may be utilized only when all of the following conditions are met:
- a) The security to be sold on reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement has been owned and fully paid for by the local agency for a minimum of 30 days prior to sale.
 - b) The total of all reverse repurchase agreements and securities lending agreements on investments owned by the local agency does not exceed 20% of the base value of the portfolio.
 - c) The agreement does not exceed a term of 92 days, unless the agreement includes a written codicil guaranteeing a minimum earning or spread for the entire period between the sale of a security using a reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement and the final maturity date of the same security.
 - d) Funds obtained or funds within the pool of an equivalent amount to that obtained from selling a security to a counter party by way of a reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement, shall not be used to purchase another security with a maturity longer than 92 days from the initial settlement date of the reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement, unless the reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement includes a written codicil guaranteeing a minimum earning or spread for the entire period between the sale of a security using a reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement and the final maturity date of the same security. Investments in reverse repurchase agreements, securities lending agreements, or similar investments in which the local agency sells securities prior to purchase with a simultaneous agreement to repurchase the security shall only be made with primary dealers of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or with a nationally or

state-chartered bank that has or has had a significant banking relationship with a local agency.

- e) For purposes of this policy, “significant banking relationship” means any of the following activities of a bank:
 - i. Involvement in the creation, sale, purchase, or retirement of a local agency’s bonds, warrants, notes, or other evidence of indebtedness.
 - ii. Financing of a local agency’s activities.
 - iii. Acceptance of a local agency’s securities or funds as deposits.

- I. MEDIUM-TERM CORPORATE NOTES. A maximum of 30% of the portfolio may be invested in medium-term corporate notes, with a maximum remaining maturity of five years or less. Notes eligible for investment shall be rated “A,” its equivalent or better by a NRSRO

- J. TIME DEPOSITS-CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT (non-negotiable certificates of deposit). The maximum maturity is 3 years. Certificates of deposit are required to be collateralized as specified under Government Code Section 53630 et seq. The City, at its discretion, may waive the collateralization requirements for any portion that is covered by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insurance. The City shall have a signed agreement with any depository accepting City funds per Government Code Section 53649. No deposits shall be made at any time in certificates of deposit issued by a state or federal credit union if a member of the City Council or the Chief Financial Officer serves on the board of directors or any committee appointed by the board of directors of the credit union. In accordance with Government Code Section 53638, any deposit shall not exceed that total shareholder’s equity of any depository bank, nor shall the deposit exceed the total net worth of any institution. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category

- K. OBLIGATIONS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. Including bonds payable solely out of revenues from a revenue producing property owned, controlled or operated by the state, or by a department, board, agency or authority of the state. Obligations must be “A” rated or better by a NRSRO. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.

- L. OBLIGATIONS OF THE OTHER 49 STATES Including bonds payable solely out of revenues from a revenue producing property owned, controlled or operated by any of these states, or by a department, board, agency or authority of the state. Obligations must be “A” rated or better by a NRSRO. There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category.

- M. MONEY MARKET FUNDS. A maximum of 20% of the portfolio may be invested in money market funds. No more than 10% of the City’s portfolio may be invested in shares of beneficial interest of any one Money Market fund. Local agencies may invest in “shares of beneficial interest” issued by diversified management companies which invest only in direct obligations in U.S. Treasury bills, notes and bonds, and repurchase agreements collateralized with U.S. Treasuries with a weighted average of 60 days or less. They must have the highest rating from two NRSRO’s or have retained an investment advisor registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission with not less than five years of experience managing money market mutual funds and with assets under management in excess of \$500,000,000. The purchase price of the shares may not include commission.

- N. SAN DIEGO COUNTY TREASURER’S POOLED MONEY FUND. Also known as the San Diego County Investment Pool, the pool is a local government money fund created to invest the assets of the County of San Diego and other public agencies located within the County. The three primary objectives of the County Pool are to safeguard principal; to meet liquidity needs of Pool participants; and to achieve an investment

return on the funds within the guidelines of prudent risk management. Investment in the County Pool is highly liquid and the City may invest with no portfolio percentage limit.

- O. **THE LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND (LAIF).** LAIF is a special fund of the California State Treasury through which any local government may pool investments. The City may invest up to \$50 million in this fund. Investments in LAIF are highly liquid and may be converted to cash within 24 hours.
- P. **SHARES OF BENEFICIAL INTEREST ISSUED BY A JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (Local Government Investment Pools [LGIP]).** There is no limit on the percentage of the portfolio that can be invested in this category. LGIP's organized pursuant to Government Code Section 6509.7 that invests in the securities and obligations authorized in subdivisions (a) to (o) of California Government Code Section 53601, inclusive. Each share will represent an equal proportional interest in the underlying pool of securities owned by the joint powers authority. To be eligible under this section the joint powers authority issuing the shares will have retained an investment adviser that meets all of the following criteria:
- The adviser is registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission.
 - The adviser has not less than five years of experience investing in the securities and obligations authorized in subdivisions (a) to (o) Government Code Section 53601, inclusive.
 - The adviser has assets under management in excess of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000).
- Q. **ASSET BACKED SECURITIES (ABS).** A maximum of 20% of the portfolio may be invested in ABS. The maximum maturity is five years. Securities eligible for investment under this subdivision shall be issued by an issuer having an "A" or higher rating for the issuer's debt as provided by an NRSRO and rated in a rating category of "AA" or its equivalent or better by an NRSRO. ABS

constitutes a mortgage pass-through security, collateralized mortgage obligation, mortgage-backed or other pay-through bond, equipment lease-backed certificate, consumer receivable pass-through certificate, or consumer receivable-backed bond.

9.1 Investment Pools

The City's Director of Finance/Treasurer or designee shall be required to investigate all local government investment pools and money market mutual funds prior to investing and performing at least a quarterly review thereafter while the City is invested in the pool or the money market fund. LAIF is authorized under provisions in Section 16429.1 of the California Government Code as an allowable investment for local agencies even though some of the individual investments of the pool are not allowed as a direct investment by a local agency.

10.0 Portfolio Adjustments

Should any investment listed in section 9.0 exceed a percentage-of-portfolio limitation due to an incident such as fluctuation in portfolio size, the affected securities may be held to maturity to avoid losses. When no loss is indicated, the Director of Finance/Treasurer shall consider reconstructing the portfolio basing his or her decision on the expected length of time the portfolio will be unbalanced. If this occurs, the City Council shall be notified.

11.0 Collateralization

Under provisions of the California Government Code, California banks, and savings and loan associations are required to secure the City's deposits by pledging government securities with a value of 110 % of principal and accrued interest. California law also allows financial institutions to secure City deposits by pledging first trust deed mortgage notes having a value of 150% of the City's total deposits. Collateral will always be held by an independent third party. A clearly marked evidence of ownership (safekeeping receipt) must be supplied to the City and retained. The market value of securities that underlay a repurchase agreement shall be valued at 102% or greater of the funds borrowed against those securities and the value shall be adjusted no less than quarterly. Since the market value of the

underlying securities is subject to daily market fluctuations, the investments in repurchase agreements shall be in compliance if the value of the underlying securities is brought back up to 102% no later than the next business day. The Director of Finance/Treasurer, at his or her discretion, may waive the collateral requirement for deposits that are fully insured up to \$250,000 by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The right of collateral substitution is granted.

12.0 Safekeeping and Custody

All City investments shall identify the City of Chula Vista as the registered owner, and all interest and principal payments and withdrawals shall indicate the City of Chula Vista as the payee. All securities shall be safe kept with the City itself or with a qualified financial institution, contracted by the City as a third party. All agreements and statements will be subject to review annually by external auditors in conjunction with their audit. In the event that the City has a financial institution hold the securities, a separate custodial agreement shall be required. All securities shall be acquired by the safekeeping institution on a "Delivery-Vs-Payment" (DVP) basis. For Repurchase Agreements, the purchase may be delivered by book entry, physical delivery or by third-party custodial agreement consistent with the Government Code. The transfer of securities to the counter party bank's customer book entry account may be used for book entry delivery.

13.0 Diversification

The City's investment portfolio will be diversified to avoid incurring unreasonable and avoidable risks associated with concentrating investments in specific security types, maturity segment, or in individual financial institutions. No more than 5% of the investment portfolio shall be in securities of any one issuer except for U.S. Treasuries, U.S. Government Agency issues, and investment pools such as LAIF, the San Diego County Pool, money market funds, and local government investment pools (LGIP's).

- A. Credit risk, defined as the risk of loss due to failure of the insurer of a security, shall be mitigated by investing in those securities with an "A" or above rating and approved in the

Investment Policy and by diversifying the investment portfolio so that the failure of any one issuer would not unduly harm the City's cash flow.

- B. Market risk, defined as the risk of market value fluctuations due to overall changes in the general level of interest rates, shall be mitigated by implementing a long-term investment strategy. It is explicitly recognized herein, however, that in a diversified portfolio, occasional measured losses are inevitable and must be considered within the context of overall investment return. The City's investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable the City to meet all operating requirements which might be reasonably anticipated.

14.0 Maximum Maturities

To the extent possible, the City will attempt to match its investments with anticipated cash flow requirements. Unless matched to a specific cash flow, the City will not directly invest in securities maturing more than five (5) years from the date of purchase, unless, the legislative body has granted express authority to make that investment either specifically, or as a part of an investment program approved by the City Council at least three (3) months prior to the investment.

15.0 Internal Control

The Director of Finance/Treasurer shall establish a system of internal controls designed to prevent loss of public funds due to fraud, employee error, or misrepresentation by third parties. No investment personnel, including an investment advisor, may engage in an investment transaction except as provided for under the terms of this Investment Policy and the procedure established by the Director of Finance/Treasurer.

The external auditors shall annually review the investments with respect to the Investment Policy. This review will provide internal control by assuring compliance with policies and procedures for the investments that are selected for testing. Additionally, account reconciliation and verification of general ledger balances relating to the purchasing

or maturing of investments and allocation of investments to fund balances shall be performed by the Finance Department and approved by the Director of Finance/Treasurer. To provide further protection of City funds, written procedures prohibit the wiring of any City funds without the authorization of at least two of the following four designated City staff:

1. Director of Finance/Treasurer
2. Assistant Director of Finance
3. Treasury Manager
4. Finance Manager

16.0 Performance Standards

The investment portfolio shall be managed to attain a market-average rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles, taking into account the City's investment risk constraints and cash flow. Investment return becomes a consideration only after the basic requirements of investment safety and liquidity have been met. In evaluating the performance of the City's portfolio in complying with this policy, the City shall establish an appropriate performance benchmark and compare the return of its portfolio to the return of the benchmark.

17.0 Reporting

The Director of Finance/Treasurer shall submit a quarterly investment report to the City Council and City Manager following the end of each quarter. This report will include the following elements:

- Type of investment
- Institutional issuer
- Purchase date
- Date of maturity
- Amount of deposit or cost of the investment
- Face value of the investment
- Current market value of securities and source of valuation
- Rate of interest
- Interest earnings
- Statement relating the report to its compliance with the Statement of Investment Policy or the manner in which the portfolio is not in compliance
- Statement on availability of funds to meet the next six month's obligations

- Monthly and year-to-date budget amounts for interest income
- Percentage of portfolio by investment type
- Days to maturity for all investments
- Comparative report on monthly investment balances & interest yields
- Monthly transactions
- Compare portfolio yield to the yield attained by the County of San Diego and the five largest cities in the county for the same period.

In addition, a commentary on capital markets and economic conditions may be included with the report.

18.0 Investment Policy Review and Adoption

This Investment Policy shall be reviewed at least annually by the Director of Finance/Treasurer to ensure its consistency with the overall objective of preservation of principal, liquidity, and return, and its relevance to current law and financial and economic trends. Each fiscal year, the Finance Director shall provide a copy of the City's current Investment Policy and Guidelines to the City Council. By virtue of a resolution of the City Council of the City of Chula Vista, the Council shall acknowledge the receipt of the Policy for the respective fiscal year.

Debt Administration

Based on the most recent audited financial statements, which were for the year ended June 30, 2014, the City and the former Redevelopment Agency (Agency) borrowed funds through several long-term debt issues

and held other obligations which are to be funded over a period of time longer than one year, are categorized as follows:

Description	Principal Outstanding	Interest Outstanding	Total Debt Outstanding
Tax Allocation Bonds	\$ 40,920,000	\$ 19,971,231	\$ 60,891,231
Certificates of Participation	\$ 121,650,000	\$ 65,702,960	\$ 187,352,960
Bond Premium	\$ 3,442,833	\$ -	\$ 3,442,833
Bond Discount	\$ (751,434)	\$ -	\$ (751,434)
Capital Leases	\$ 2,047,313	\$ 684,639	\$ 2,731,952
Notes/Loans Payable	\$ 6,044,912	\$ 470,796	\$ 6,515,708
CDBG Section 108 Loan	\$ 7,913,000	\$ 3,457,425	\$ 11,370,425
Miscellaneous Claims Payable	\$ 22,361,236	\$ -	\$ 22,361,236
Compensated Absences (Employee Leave)	\$ 6,625,460	\$ -	\$ 6,625,460
Subtotal	\$ 210,253,320	\$ 90,287,051	\$ 300,540,371
Advances from Other Funds	\$ 50,513,914	\$ -	\$ 50,513,914
TOTAL LONG TERM DEBT	\$ 260,767,234	\$ 90,287,051	\$ 351,054,285

This section discusses the various types of long-term debt that the City has incurred. Bond financings, notes payable, capital leases and advances from other funds are the traditional forms of long-term debt that the City has incurred. However, also captured in this section are professional estimates derived from actuarial studies for workers compensation and general liability claims. In addition, the Finance Department provides an estimate of the City's liability for compensated absences as of the end of each fiscal year. The following sections discuss the details of the City's long-term debt.

Tax Allocation Bonds (\$40.9 million)

Tax Allocation Bonds (TABs) are issued by the Agency and utilize tax increment revenue for debt service. The 2006 Senior TABs, Series A and 2006 Subordinate TABs, Series B were issued to refund the 1994 TABs Series A, C and D that were issued to refund prior obligations of the Bayfront and Town Center 1 project areas. In July 2008 the Agency issued the 2008 Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds to refund the 2000 TABs that were issued by the Southwest, Otay Valley and Town Center 2 project areas to finance certain redevelopment activities in those areas.

Certificates of Participation (\$121.7 million)

As of June 30, 2014, the City currently has four outstanding Certificates of Participation. The Chula Vista Public Financing Authority (Authority) issued the 2004 COP to finance the Phase 1 reconstruction, renovation and equipping of the City's Civic Center Complex. In March 2006, the Authority issued the 2006 COP to finance the Phase 2 construction and equipping of certain improvements to the Civic Center Complex of the City and other existing City Facilities. In February 2010, the Authority issued the 2010 COP to refund the 2000 COP and to provide funds for the construction, reconstruction, modernization and equipping of Phase 3 of the Civic Center Complex, reimburse the PFDIF funds, fund capitalized interest, fund a reserve fund, and pay the costs incurred in connection with the execution and delivery of the Certificates. In February 2014, the authority issued the 2014 COP to refund the 2002 COP (Police Facility Project), fund a reserve fund, and pay the costs incurred in connection with the execution and delivery of the Certificates.

Bond Premium (\$3.4 million)

The premium is composed of two bond issuances. One is for the premium on the issuance of the 2004 COP Civic Center Phase 1. Original amount was \$35,324. This amount is amortized over 30 years. The other premium is in connection with the 2014 COP refunding bonds. The original amount of the premium is \$3,537,111 and will be amortized over the life of the bonds.

Bond Discount (-\$0.8 million)

This is the discount on the issuance of the 2006 Refunding TABs and the 2008 Refunding TABs. The original amounts were \$505,884 and \$579,161 respectively. These amounts are amortized over 20 years.

Capital Leases (\$2.0 million)

In December 2012, the City entered into a lease purchase agreement with Bank of America to purchase certain energy conservation equipment. The agreement would bridge the financial gap between the Municipal Streetlight Retrofit Project capital costs and the available rebates for energy conservation equipment. As of June 30, 2014 the outstanding balance is \$2,003,017.

Notes/Loans Payable (\$5.7 million)

The Redevelopment Agency participated in a Loan Agreement with the California Statewide Communities Development Authority to finance the 2006 share of the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) payments to the County Auditor (\$930,000).

In September 2007, the City Council authorized the City's participation in the California Energy Commission and San Diego Gas and Electric On-Bill Financing program. The loans were to bridge the financial gap between energy conservation project capital costs and available rebates for energy conservation equipment. The original loan amount was \$665,884 for the On-Bill Financing program. In fiscal year 2011-12 additional loans were entered into with the California Energy Commission (\$3.7 million) and San Diego Gas & Electric On-Bill Financing Program (\$256,302).

On July 23, 2013, the City Council authorized a 16 year lease purchase agreement with Banc of America to fund various solar energy projects for City facilities. The

original amount of the loan was \$2,121,500 and will be repaid through future energy savings.

CDBG Section 108 Loan (\$7.9 million)

The City entered into a contract for Loan Guarantee Assistance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as part of the Section 108 Loan Program in the amount of \$9,500,000 in June 2008. The Section 108 Loan is an “advance” of future CDBG entitlement funds and as such is repaid with a portion of the City’s annual entitlement. Proceeds of the loan will be used to fund multiple capital improvement projects. Debt service payments will be made with future CDBG entitlements for the next 20 years.

Miscellaneous Claims Payable (\$22.4 million)

The Miscellaneous Claims Payable represents the probable amount of loss as estimated by legal counsel and risk management staff due to worker’s compensation and general liability claims filed against the City.

Compensated Absences (\$6.6 million)

The obligation for Compensated Absences represents the current dollar value of accumulated leave balances, primarily vacation leave, for employees that would have to be paid off if all permanent employees were terminated as of June 30, 2014.

Advances From Other Funds (\$50.5 million)

The Agency has entered into reimbursement agreements with the City to reimburse the City for certain lease payments made by the City under various lease agreements. The balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$9.0 million

The City Council authorized loans to Public Facilities DIF for \$12,950,160 and Western TDIF for \$36,094. The

Public Facilities DIF loan for \$5,200,000 is due and payable in 13 years, at an interest rate of 3.8% based on the pooled investment rate. The Public Facilities DIF loan for \$5,300,000 is due and payable in 13 years, at an interest rate of 0.56% based on the pooled investment rate.


The City Council authorized a loan from Eastern PAD to Western PAD in the amount of \$9,630,000 to acquire a 14.41 acre site located in the lower Sweetwater Valley owned by the redevelopment agency and \$310,000 to acquire the 1.89 acre site located at the Auto Park Place, Chula Vista. The loan will be repaid as funds become available through the payment of PAD fees by developers in western Chula Vista. The balance was \$10,095,262 at June 30, 2014.

The City Council authorized long-term loans from the Trunk Sewer fund to Salt Creek DIF for \$16,848,381, to the Storm Drain fund for \$744,612 and \$803,331 from the Sewer Facility fund for capital improvement projects.

General Fund Long-Term Debt for Fiscal Year 2015-16

The General Fund’s annual debt service “commitment” for the Certificates of Participation in fiscal year 2015-16 is approximately \$9.8 million, or 7.3% of the General Fund operating budget. However, it must be noted that although this amount is truly a General Fund commitment, only \$3.3 million will actually be paid from General Fund resources, with the remaining amount paid from available development impact fees and residential construction tax. The \$3.3 million represents approximately 2.4% of the General Fund operating budget. The \$9.8 million represents ongoing level debt service payments as depicted in the chart on the next page.

Annual Debt Service Obligation of the General Fund
Fiscal Years 2005-06 through 2035-36



Note:

- 1) Actual payments are funded by the General Fund and Development Impact Fee Funds, however all debt service obligations are backed by the General Fund.
- 2) The 1994 Pension Obligation Bonds and 2003 COP were paid off in FY2012 and FY2014 respectively. The 2002 COP was refunded in FY2013 and became the 2014 Refunding COP.

GANN Appropriations Limit

Article XIII B of the California Constitution, approved by the voters in 1979, imposed the concept of spending limits on local governments. This Constitutional provision and related implementing legislation specifies that annual increases in appropriations financed from "Proceeds of Taxes" are limited to a base year (1978-79) amount increased annually by an inflation factor comprised of the change in population of the City combined with the greater of the change in new non-residential construction or the change in the California per capita personal income. By definition, "Proceeds of Taxes" includes such revenues as property taxes, sales and use taxes, utility users taxes, transient occupancy taxes, and state subventions. Revenues from other sources like fees/charges and federal grants are considered "Non-Proceeds of Taxes" and are not subject to the annual spending limit. This calculation has always been perfunctory for the City of Chula Vista,

since the proceeds of taxes for the City are far less than the statutory appropriations limit.

The State Department of Finance and the San Diego County Assessor's Office are charged with providing the data necessary for local jurisdictions to establish their appropriations limit. According to these sources, for purposes of the fiscal year 2014-2015 calculation, the population increased 1.66% and new non-residential construction increased by 1.0103%. California per capita personal income decreased by 0.23%; consequently, new non-residential construction was used in the formula to compute the limit since this increase is the greater of the two amounts.

Fiscal Year 2014-15 Appropriations Limit

The fiscal year 2014-15 Appropriations Limit has been calculated as follows:


Fiscal Year 2014-15 Appropriation Limit	
Fiscal Year 2013-14 Appropriations Limit	\$ 710,187,628
Increased by an inflation factor composed of the increases in population and New non-residential construction	x 1.027199
FISCAL YEAR 2014-15 APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT	\$ 729,447,134

Proceeds of Taxes

The "Proceeds of Taxes" as included in the fiscal year 2014-15 Proposed Budget that are subject to the appropriations limit are estimated to be \$88,000,256. Therefore the City has what is referred to as an appropriation "gap" of \$641,446,878

(\$729,447,134 - \$88,000,256). Simply stated, this means that the City could collect and spend up to \$641,446,878 more in taxes during Fiscal Year 2014-2015 without exceeding the Constitutional limit.

Proceeds of Taxes Compared to Legal Spending Limit



Legal Debt Margin

Under State law, the City has a legal debt limitation not to exceed 15% of the total assessed valuation of taxable property within City boundaries. As of June 30, 2014 the City's legal debt limit is \$811,735,084. In accordance with California Government Code Section

43605, only the City's general obligation bonds are subject to this limit. The City of Chula Vista has no outstanding General Obligation Bonds. The table below summarizes the City's debt limit margin.

Computation of Debt Limit Margin

Fiscal Years Ended 2012 through 2014

	June 30, 2012	June 30, 2013	June 30, 2014
Total Assessed Valuation	\$ 21,153,963,435	\$ 20,942,796,908	\$ 21,646,268,909
Conversion Percentage	25%	25%	25%
Adjusted Assessed Valuation	\$ 5,288,490,859	\$ 5,235,699,227	\$ 5,411,567,227
Debt Limitation Percentage	15%	15%	15%
<i>Debt Limit</i>	\$ 793,273,629	\$ 785,354,884	\$ 811,735,084
Total Debt Applicable to Limit:			
Pension Obligation Bonds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Legal Debt Margin	\$ 793,273,629	\$ 785,354,884	\$ 811,735,084

The Government Code of the State of California provides for a legal debt limit of 15% of gross assessed valuation. However, this provision was enacted when assessed valuation was based upon 25% of market value. Effective with the 1981-82 fiscal year, each parcel is now assessed at 100% of market value (as of the most recent change in ownership for that parcel). The computations shown above reflect a conversion of assessed valuation data for each fiscal year from the current full valuation perspective to the 25% level that was in effect at the time that the legal debt margin was enacted by the State of California for local governments located within the State.



Accounting Systems and Budgetary Control

The City of Chula Vista’s budget provides an overview of the fiscal and operational status of the City; highlighting policy issues, decisions, and proposed changes in service levels. The budget is comprised of a series of funds used to account for revenues and expenditures. These funds are generally classified as governmental or proprietary funds.


Governmental funds include activities associated with the operations of the City such as the provision of library, recreation, and public safety services. Special revenue funds, capital project funds, debt service funds, and the City’s general fund are different categories of governmental funds.

Proprietary funds are used to account for activities often found in the private sector including enterprise funds and internal service funds. Operations of the

development service and sewer systems are accounted for as enterprise funds. In prior years, the City’s transit system was also included as an enterprise fund; however the fund was closed during fiscal year 2014-2015. Examples of functions accounted for by internal service funds include fleet management and worker’s compensation.

The budget document is organized around the following major funds – General Fund, Redevelopment Retirement Obligation Fund and Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency Funds, Sewer Funds, Fleet Service Funds, Capital Projects Funds, Debt Service Funds, and Other Funds. Details about each of these funds can be found in the corresponding sections of the document.

City of Chula Vista Fund Structure



Each fund is considered an autonomous accounting entity. Funds are used to separate the various financial activities of the City and to demonstrate compliance with specific regulations, restrictions, or limitations. This may include demonstrating that restricted revenues are spent only for allowed purposes.

The City's accounting records and budget are prepared and maintained using a modified accrual basis of accounting, which follows the accounting practices for governmental units as recommended by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. Basic City operations are accounted for in the City's General Fund, with other activities accounted for in separate funds as required by law or determined by management discretion. Generally, revenues are recorded when measurable and available, and liabilities are recorded when incurred.

In administering the City's accounting systems, primary consideration is given to the adequacy of internal accounting controls, which include an array of administrative procedures. These controls are designed to provide reasonable, but not absolute, assurance regarding the safeguarding of assets against loss from unauthorized use or disposition, as well as the reliability of financial records for accurate and fair presentation of financial reports. The concept of reasonable assurance recognizes that the cost of specific controls should not exceed the benefits likely to be derived from exercising the controls, and that this evaluation necessarily involves estimates and judgments by management. It is believed that the City's internal accounting controls adequately safeguard City assets and provide reasonable assurance of proper recording of financial transactions.

The City Charter charges the Director of Finance with the responsibility to supervise and be responsible for the disbursement of all monies and have control over all expenditures to ensure that budget appropriations are not exceeded. The level of budgetary control, that is the level at which expenditures are not to exceed Council approved appropriations, is established at the department and expenditure category level (e.g., personnel services, supplies and services, capital).

Any budget modification that would result in an appropriation increase requires City Council approval. The City Manager and Finance Director are jointly

authorized to transfer up to \$15,000 of appropriations between expenditure categories within a departmental budget. Any appropriations transfers between departments, in excess of \$15,000, and transfers from CIP projects, require City Council approval.

An encumbrance (commitment) accounting system is utilized as a technique to enhance budgetary control during the year. Appropriations encumbered (committed) at year-end may be carried forward with City Manager approval and are available to be used for those commitments during the subsequent year. Unspent and unencumbered appropriations lapse at year-end and become generally available for re-appropriation the following year.

List of Acronyms

A

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act
 ALS: Advanced Life Support
 AMP: Asset Management Plan
 AMS: Asset Management System
 ARRA: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
 ATP: Active Transportation Program

B

BIG: Business Improvement Grant
 BFDIF: Bayfront Development Impact Fee
 BMS: Building Management System
 BRT: Bus Rapid Transit
 BTA: Bicycle Transportation Account

C

CAD: Computer Aided Dispatch
 CalPERS: California Public Employees Retirement System
 CALTRUST: Investment Trust of California
 CAPPO: California Association of Public Purchasing Officers
 CBAG: California Border Alliance Group
 CDBG: Community Development Block Grant
 CEC: California Energy Commission
 CES: Conservation Environmental Services
 CFD: Community Facility District

CIP: Capital Improvement Plan/Project/Program
 CLSA: California Library Services Act
 CMP: Corrugated Metal Pipe
 CMT: Constant Maturity Treasury
 CONF: Confidential
 COP: Certificate of Participation
 CPI: Consumer Price Index
 CTC: California Transportation Commission
 CVBMP: Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan
 CVACF: Chula Vista Animal Care Facility
 CVEA: Chula Vista Employee's Association
 CVPD: Chula Vista Police Department
 CVT: Chula Vista Transit

D

DASH: Dynamic After School Hours
 DIF: Development Impact Fee
 DMS: Drainage Management System
 DVP: Delivery Versus Payment

E

EEBG: Energy Efficiency Block Grant
 EOC: Emergency Operation Center
 ERAF: Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund
 EUC: Eastern Urban Center

F

FCIP: Fire Company Inspection Program
 FDIC: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

 FF: Firefighters

 FHLB: Federal Home Loan Bank

 FHLMC: Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation

 FHWA: Federal Highway Administration

 FICB: Federal Intermediate Credit Bank

 FLB: Federal Land Bank

 FLSA: Fair Labor Standards Act

 FMS: Fleet Management System

 FNMA: Federal National Mortgage Association

 FPPC: Fair Political Practices Commission

 FREBE: Free Resource Energy Business Evaluation

 FSE: Fire Safety Engineering

 FTA: Federal Transit Administration

 FTE: Full-Time Equivalent

 FY: Fiscal Year

G

GAAP: Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

 GDP: Gross Domestic Product

 GFOA: Government Finance Officers of America

 GGMS: General Government Management System

 GIS: Geographic Information System

 GMOC: Growth Management Oversight Committee

 GNMA: Government National Mortgage Association

GUC: General Use Certificates

H

HBP: Highway Bridge Program

 HOV: High Occupancy Vehicle

 HR: Human Resources

 HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program

 HUD: Housing and Urban Development

 HVAC: Heating\Ventilation\Air Conditioning

I

IAFF: International Association of Firefighters

 ITS: Information and Technology Services

L

LAIF: Local Agency Investment Fund

 LAN: Local Area Network

 LRT: Light Rail Trolley

M

MGD: Million Gallons per Day

 MHZ: Megahertz

 MIS: Management and Information Systems\Services

 MLA: Master Lease Agreement

 MOU: Memorandum of Understanding

 MSCP: Multiple Species Conservation Plan

 MTDB: Metropolitan Transit Development Board

 MTS: Metropolitan Transit System

N

NCD: Negotiable Certificate of Deposit

NEP: Neighborhood Reinvestment Program

NFPA: National Fire Protection Association

O

OSMS: Open Space Management System

P

PACE: Parcel Assessed Clean Energy

PAD: Park Acquisition and Development

PCI: Pavement Condition Index

PFDIF: Public Facilities Development Impact Fees

PLF: Public Library Foundation Act

PLTP: Point Loma Treatment Plant

PMS: Parks Management System

POA: Police Officer's Association

PUC: Public Utilities Commission

R

RCS: Regional Communications System

RCT: Residential Construction Tax

RDA: Redevelopment Agency

RFP: Request for Proposals

RMS: Roadway Management System

RTIP: Regional Transportation Improvement Program

S

SANDAG: San Diego Association of Governments

SANDPIPA: San Diego Pooled Insurance Policy Association

SBA: Small Business Association

SBBRT: South Bay Bus Rapid Transit

SGIP: Smart Growth Initiative Program

SHOPP: State Highway Operations and Protection Program

SLMA: Student Loan Marketing Association

SR2s: Safe Routes to School

SRO: School Resource Officer

STRETCH: Safe Time For Recreation, Enrichment And Tutoring

T

TABS: Tax Allocation Bonds

TARBS: Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds

TDA: Transportation Development Act

TDIF: Transportation Development Impact Fee

TOT: Transient Occupancy Tax

TUT: Telephone Users' Tax

TVA: Tennessee Valley Authorities

U

UUT: Utility Users Tax

V

VLF: Vehicle License Fee

W

WCE: Western Council of Engineers

WMS: Wastewater Management System

W-TDIF: Western Transportation Development Impact
Fee

Glossary

A

Accrual Basis of Accounting – The accounting basis used by the City by which transactions are recognized when they occur, regardless of the timing of cash receipts and disbursements.

Accounting System – The collective set of records and procedures used to record, classify, and report information on the financial status and operations of the City.

Accounts Payable – Amounts owed by the City to external entities for goods and services received.

Accounts Receivable – Amounts due to the City from external entities for goods and services furnished.

Adopted Budget – The title of the budget following its formal adoption by resolution of the City Council.

Ad Valorem – In proportion to value, a basis for levy of taxes on property.

Amended Budget – The title of the budget version that includes all amendments to the Adopted Budget approved by Council throughout the fiscal year.

Appropriation – A legislative act by the City Council authorizing the expenditure of a designated amount of public funds for a specific purpose.

Audit – An examination of City records and accounts by an external source to check their validity and accuracy.

B

Balanced Budget – The amount of budgeted expenditures is equal to or less than the amount of budgeted revenues plus other available sources. For budgeting purposes, the use of contingency reserves or use of fund balance will be considered revenue in defining a balanced budget.

Bond – A certificate of debt issued by a government or corporation guaranteeing payment of the original investment plus interest by a specified future date.

Budget – A spending plan and policy guide comprised of an itemized summary of the City's probable expenditures and revenues for a given fiscal year.

C

Calendar Year (CY) – The 12-month period from January through December.

Capital Expenditures – A specific undertaking involving procurement, construction or installation of facilities or related equipment which improves, preserves, enhances or modernizes the City's provision of municipal services, has a useful life of at least five years, and costs in excess of \$10,000.

Capital Improvement Program – An ongoing five-year plan of single and multiple-year capital expenditures which is updated annually.

Capital Improvement Project (CIP) – Any major capital investment with a value of \$50,000 or more and a minimum useful life of five years at a fixed location. CIPs may include construction or major repair of City buildings and facilities such as streets, roads, storm drains, traffic signals, parks, community centers, etc.

Capital Project Funds – Funds that are utilized to account for resources used for the acquisition and construction of capital facilities by the City, with the exception of those assets financed by proprietary funds.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds – Funds received from the federal government and expenditures as prescribed under the Community Development Grant Program.

D

Debt Service Funds – Funds used for payment of interest and principal to holders of the City's various debt instruments.

Deferred Maintenance – A backlog of needed repairs to City facilities including facility maintenance, painting and structural repairs.

Depreciation – The expense incurred with the expiration of a capital asset.

Direct Costs – Operational expenditures exclusive to a specific service or program.

Discretionary Revenue – Revenues that are generated by general or specific taxing authority such as Property or Sales Taxes.

E

Encumbrance – The designation or reserving of funds to buy an item or service.

Enterprise Funds – Funds established to account for specific services funded directly by fees and charges to users such as sewer services. These funds are intended to be self-supporting.

Expenditure – The actual outlay of monies set aside by appropriation for identified goods and services.

F

Fiscal Year (FY) – The twelve-month period beginning July 1st and ending June 30th of the subsequent calendar year.

Fixed Assets – An asset with a useful life greater than three years.

Fringe Benefits – This consists of the costs to provide employee benefits that include the flexible benefit program, insurance, and retirement.

Full-time Equivalent Positions (FTE) – The conversion of part-time, temporary, or volunteer positions to a decimal equivalent of a full-time position based on an annual amount of 2,080 hours worked.

Fund – A set of interrelated accounts to record revenues and expenditures.

Fund Balance – The excess of an entity's assets over its liabilities. A negative fund balance is sometimes referred to as a deficit.

G

Generally Accepted Accounting Principles – A uniform set of minimum standards for external financial accounting and reporting.

Gann Appropriation Limit – A State of California mandated appropriation limit imposed on local jurisdictions.

General Fund – The City's main operating fund that is used to pay for City services.

General Plan – The fundamental policy document that guides the City's future growth and development.

General Revenue – See Discretionary Revenues.

Governmental Funds – Funds that are typically used to account for tax-supported activities. These include the general fund, special revenue funds, debt service funds, and capital project funds.

Grants – A contribution by a government or other organization to provide funding for a specific project. Grants can either be classified as capital projects or programmatic, depending on the grant.

I

Indirect Cost – Costs that are essential to the operation of the City but not exclusive to any specific service or program. Indirect costs are primarily associated with support departments such as City Clerk, City Attorney, Administration, Management Information Systems (MIS), Human Resources, and Finance.

Infrastructure – Basic physical assets such as buildings, streets, sewers, and parks.

Interest Expense – Interest costs paid by Chula Vista on loans and bonds.

Internal Service Funds – Funds that are used to finance and account for goods, special activities, and services performed by one City department for other City departments on a cost reimbursement basis.

L

Levy – To impose or collect a tax, special assessments, or charges for the support of City services.

Liability – Debt or other legal obligations arising out of past transactions that will be liquidated, renewed, or refunded at some future date.

M

Memorandum of Understanding – A document detailing the outcomes of labor negotiations between the City and its various bargaining units.

Modified Accrual Basis of Accounting – A method of accounting in which revenues are recognized in the period they become available and measurable, and expenditures are recognized in the period the associated liability is incurred.

Municipal Code – A collection of ordinances approved by City Council.

N

Non-Capital Improvement Project Expenditures – Expenditures in this category are for large maintenance costs, studies and various community outreach programs. By their nature these maintenance upkeeps and programs are expended beyond a one year period. Recording these types of expenditures in an operating type budget would skew the comparison of budgets from year to year, because of this, the City finds it more efficient to record these types of expenditures in the Non-Capital Improvement Project category.

O

Operating Budget – Costs associated with the on-going municipal services.

Ordinance – A formal legislative enactment by the City Council.

Other Expenditures – All budgeted expenditures that do not fall into one of the following primary expenditure categories: Personnel, Supplies and Services, Utilities, Transfers Out, CIP and Non-CIP Projects, and Capital.

P

Personnel Services Expenditures – Expenses related to employee compensation including salaries, wages, and benefits.

Program Revenue – Revenues generated by a given activity.

Proposed Budget – The title of the budget prior to its formal adoption by resolution of the City Council.

Proprietary Funds – Funds used to account for a government's business-type activities, which are supported, at least in part, by fees or charges.

R

Reserves – The portion of the General Fund balance set aside for contingencies.

Resolution – A special order of the City Council that requires less legal formality than an Ordinance.

Revenue – Funds received from various sources to finance expenditures.

S

Sewer Funds – Funds that account for revenues and expenditures related to the City's sewer programs, including maintenance and expansion of the City's conveyance system and payment of Metro Sewer treatment costs.

Special Revenue Funds – Funds that are used to account for proceeds derived from specific revenues sources, which are legally restricted to expenditures for special purposes. (e.g. Transportation Funds, parking Funds, Public Safety Funds)

Spending Plan – A preliminary budget approved by Council contingent upon subsequent adoption of appropriations.

Supplies and Services Expenditures – Expenditures for supplies required for the daily operation of the City and for contractual and professional services.

T

Transfers Out Expenditures – Expenditures in this category are the authorized exchanges of cash, positions, or other resources between organizational units.

U

Utilities Expenditures – Expenses related to the consumption of services including electricity, natural gas, water, and telephone services.

Y

Yield – The rate of return earned on an investment based on the price paid.

Chula Vista at a Glance


General Information

Incorporated.....1911
 Government.....Council/Manager
 Bond Rating.....AA-

Population


Population.....257,989
 Median Age.....34
 Source: Population data, California Department of Finance.
 Median Age, San Diego Association of Governments estimates.

Population by Ethnic Group




Source: San Diego Association of Governments, Current Estimates

Chula Vista Population Growth



Note: This data represents calendar year population numbers.
 *2015 – 2016 population numbers are projections.
 Source: California Department of Finance and City of Chula Vista staff

Educational Attainment ¹



¹Based on population 25 years and over.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey

Elementary Schools

Chula Vista Elementary School District
 FY2013-14 Data
www.cvesd.org
 (619) 425-9600
 Number of Schools ¹.....47
 Projected Enrollment.....29,472
¹Includes 5 dependent and 2 independent charter schools.

Secondary Schools

Sweetwater Union High School District
 FY2013-14 Data
www.sweetwaterschools.org
 (619) 691-5500
 Number of Schools¹.....31
 Projected Enrollment.....40,901
¹Includes middle schools, high schools, adult schools, and alternative education sites.

Housing

Housing Units.....	82,499
Persons per Household.....	3.26
Vacancy Rate.....	4.8%


Source: California Department of Finance

Housing Type

Single Family.....	53,405
Multiple Family.....	25,029
Mobile Homes.....	4,065

Source: California Department of Finance

Household Income



Source: San Diego Association of Governments, Current Estimates

Public Safety

Fire Uniform Strength.....	108
Fire Stations.....	9
Emergency Calls to Fire Department ¹	16,901
Police Uniform Strength ²	225
Citizen Initiated Calls for Service ¹	66,120


¹Calls for service data is for calendar year 2014.
²Police uniform strength does not include 12 frozen positions.
 Source: City of Chula Vista Staff

Community Facilities

Acres of Developed Parks ¹	532.69
Total Number of Parks.....	60
Libraries.....	3
Recreation Facilities.....	11

¹ Actual City Ownership Park Acreage
 Source: City of Chula Vista staff

Construction Permits



*Fiscal Year 2015 data as of April 30, 2015.
 Source: City of Chula Vista staff