Better Budget Models -- webinar

2:00 – 3:30 p.m. PT, Thursday, April 12, 2012

Cosponsored by Cal-ICMA and CSMFO Coaching Programs

*** Advance registration required for this no-charge webinar:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/764022472

Challenging economic conditions and public insistence on greater accountability call for innovative budget solutions. Gain insights into several budget models, how they work, and ways they might be useful for your agency.

Presenters:
* Randall Reid, County Administrator, Sarasota, FL
* Darin Atteberry, City Manager, Fort Collins, CO
* Jay Panzica, CFO, Ventura, CA

Panel topics:

1. Why did your agency adopt the approach that you use and what's an outline of your budget model?
2. What's worked particularly well to help the budget process link community priorities with service levels and performance results? (concrete examples)
3. How did you implement your approach?
4. What have you learned about key factors for success?
5. For what types of situations do you feel the budget model would be appropriate and where wouldn't it be?
6. How can the audience learn more about the approach that you've employed and what other resources would you recommend?

We'll be using webinar tools (including real-time questions and live polling) to make this a great opportunity for audience interaction.

Audience: finance professionals, general managers, budget liaisons

1. Register in advance for the webinar:
There is no charge for participating in the webinars, but each requires advance registration.
*** Advance registration required for this no-charge webinar:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/764022472

2. Connect with the webinar and audio:
Use your logon information from the email confirmation you receive via email from GoToWebinar. We recommend the telephone option dial-in number provided by
GoToWebinar for sound quality. Depending upon your internet connection, VOIP option for audio (computer speakers) can have delays or sound quality issues.

3. Ask questions:
You may submit questions anonymously via email to Cal-Icma@DonMaruska.com or CSMFO@DonMaruska.com in advance or via the webinar during the panel discussion. As moderator for the session, Don Maruska will pose the questions.

4. Presenters’ presentation materials:
We post these with the agenda at “Live Audio & Archives” tab of www.cal-icma.org/coaching or www.csmfo.org/coaching. The PPT will be available about 2 hours before the webinar.

After a webinar occurs, a digital recording along with the PowerPoint materials and results of the polling questions will be available within 24 hours at the "Live Audio & Archives" tab of www.cal-icma.org/coaching and www.csmfo.org/coaching.

Post-Webinar Group Discussions

Many agencies are organizing groups to participate in the webinars (live or recorded) and discuss the topics among themselves after the webinars. Some are summarizing their discussions and distributing them to managers throughout their organizations. Use the Cal-ICMA Coaching Program and CSMFO Coaching Program as effective ways to enhance professional development in your agency. Here are some discussion starters for this session.

1. What are the key ways in which we’d like to enhance our agency’s budgeting efforts?
2. Which budget models or parts of them seem particularly applicable to our agency?
3. What resources would we like to explore further?

MORE RESOURCES--See the "Coaching Corner" at www.cal-icma.org/coaching or www.csmfo.org/coaching for valuable resources to boost your career. Sign up for the complimentary email list to keep informed of future sessions and resources at www.cal-icma.org/coachingList or CSMFO’s member email list.

We appreciate the sponsors for the Cal-ICMA Coaching Program. They include:
Platinum Sponsors: CA Communities Joint Powers Authority, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and Chevron
Gold Sponsor: California City Management Foundation
Silver Sponsors: California Redevelopment Association, Colorado City and County Management Association, County Administrative Officers Association of California, Municipal Management Association of Northern California (MMANC), Public Agency Retirement Services (PARS), and Granicus
Bronze Sponsors: California Special Districts Association, Carl Warren & Company, County Personnel Administrators Association of California (CPAAC), Davenport Institute for Public Engagement at Pepperdine’s School of Public Policy, Liebert Cassidy
Whitmore, Municipal Management Association of Southern California (MMASC), and Stone and Youngberg

Enjoy the resources and support to thrive in local government.

Don Maruska, Master Certified Coach
Director, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program, CSMFO Coaching Program
See "Coaching Corner" at www.cal-icma.org/coaching or www.csmfo.org/coaching

Biographical Sketches provided by presenters:

Randy Reid, County Administrator, Sarasota, FL

Randall H. Reid has over 37 years of experience in city and county management and became County Administrator for Sarasota County in January 2012. Prior to Sarasota County, he served for 12 years as County Manager of Alachua County in Gainesville, FL. Reid earlier served in Martin County, Florida (Stuart) as Deputy County Administrator and for 14 months as Acting County Manager from 1994 to 1999. He served as City Manager of Titusville, Florida, from 1987 to 1994 and was Executive Director of the Titusville Community Redevelopment Agency. Prior to coming to Florida, Reid served as City Administrator of Green River, Wyoming, from 1980 to 1987 and as Assistant City Manager of Vandalia, Ohio, from 1976 to 1980.

Reid's experience in these positions enabled him to improve financial management practices, create team-based management, effectively manage capital projects, advance strategic economic development efforts, and enhance the quality of neighborhoods in the communities he managed. Reid's personal mission is "to create respect for people and place." He believes that the greatest challenge facing local governments is to meaningfully engage citizens in representative democratic government. His professional goal is to enhance the credibility of county government by providing responsive services and assuring fiscal accountability to taxpayers.

He serves on the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Innovation and has spoken nationally about leading organizational change, growth management and sustainability. He is dedicated to building sustainable organizations and communities and believes communities and their leaders must develop a respect for natural systems, strong local economics, and social justice for their citizens. Reid believes that sustainability has as much to do with how we ethically govern and engage our citizens as it does with how we build viable communities by encouraging best development practices.

Reid is active in a number of professional associations including the International City Management Association and the Florida City/County Management Association, where he has served as President and Chairman of the Ethics Committee. In this capacity, he continues to instruct new professionals on ethical responsibilities. He is a member of
both the America. Society of Public Administration and the American Planning Association.

Reid holds a Bachelor's Degree in Public Administration from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, and a Master's Degree in Public Administration from the University of Dayton, Ohio. While an undergraduate at Miami University, he served on the University Disciplinary Board, played for the Miami Rugby Club, was a residential adviser in the athletic dorm and was named to the President's List of Distinguished Undergraduate Scholars. Throughout his career he has taught graduate and undergraduate classes in public administration, public finance, and state and local government operations.

Reid, a native of Ohio, lives in Sarasota County with his wife Connie and has three children. He is an Eagle Scout, a Christian and member of Rotary International.

Darin Atteberry, City Manager, Fort Collins, CO

Darin Atteberry is the City Manager for the City of Fort Collins, CO, a position he has held since December, 2004. Prior to that, Darin served as the Assistant City Manager for more than 8 years.

As City Manager, Darin has led the City government through a time of transformational change, moving the organization from a "trust us" model to one that uses a data-driven, performance based approach. Darin is an advocate for community collaboration and has built strong relationships with both public and private sector partners.

During his tenure with the City of Fort Collins, Darin has had a variety of responsibilities, including serving as the Interim Director for the Fort Collins Housing Authority, Director of Communications and Technology Services (CTS), which includes Information Technology, Geographic Information Systems, and Public Information, and Director of Administrative Services which includes Human Resources, Finance, and Operation Services.

Prior to coming to Fort Collins, Darin worked with cities in California, Washington, and Georgia. He holds a Bachelor of Science Degree in City and Regional Planning from Cal Poly in San Luis Obispo, California, a Master's Degree in City Planning and a Master of Science Degree in Civil Engineering, both from Georgia Tech.

Darin, his wife, Deborah, and their four children enjoy living in Fort Collins and are active in several community and school activities.
Jay Panzica, Chief Financial Officer, Ventura, CA

Jay is currently serving as Chief Financial Officer for the City of Ventura, in Southern California. He has been in this position since 2005 and has been instrumental in successfully guiding the City through the economic downturn that has affected most cities in the US. Starting with an overall budget of $357 mill in FY05/06 and a General Fund budget that grew to $98 mill in FY07/08, the City is now operating its General Fund at a level of $81mill. The transition to this new level of revenue was accomplished through the implementation of innovative concepts from the Budgeting for Outcomes philosophy. This philosophy was combined with the creation of a citywide system of performance measures that were specifically aimed at driving performance to attain the city’s vision goals.

Prior to his assignment in Ventura, Jay was Director of Finance for Pasadena Water and Power, and was acting General Manager during the energy crisis in the early 2000’s. His role was to design and implement procedures and measurements to help Pasadena succeed during the deregulation of the electric energy. Before entering municipal finance, Jay held senior finance positions in a diverse group of industries. As an example, serving as Director of Finance in a division of American Airlines he was responsible for budgeting and bid preparations in a very competitive industry, and the implementation of TQM in order to reduce costs. As Regional Finance Manager for a division of General Foods, he served as financial counsel for corporate operations and franchisees. In each business, he has been recognized as a creative innovator with a keen interest in process improvement.
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Polling Question #1

How many people are participating at your location?
Overview of Session

1. Why did your agency adopt the approach that you use and what's an outline of your budget model?
2. What's worked particularly well to help the budget process link community priorities with service levels and performance results? (concrete examples)
3. How did you implement your approach?
4. What have you learned about key factors for success?
5. For what types of situations do you feel the budget model would be appropriate and where wouldn't it be?
6. How can the audience learn more about the approach that you've employed and what other resources would you recommend?

- **Randall Reid**, County Administrator, Sarasota, FL
- **Darin Atteberry**, City Manager, Fort Collins, CO
- **Jay Panzica**, CFO, Ventura, CA
- **Don Maruska**, Director, Cal-ICMA and CSMFO Coaching Programs

...and polls and questions along the way.
Polling Question #2

In which of the following areas would you most like to explore improvements in your budget process?
Better Budget Models

Randall H. Reid, County Administrator
Sarasota County Government
Quick Background of Sarasota County

Location: Southwest FL  
(South of Tampa, North of Ft. Myers)

Population: 379,448

Municipalities:
- City of Sarasota
- City of North Port
- City of Venice
- Town of Longboat Key
Budget Overview
FY13 Budget Timeline

- Budget Workshop – February 23rd (General Fund and Major CIP projects)
- Budget Workshop - March 14th (Annual Surtax Update)
- Budget Workshop – May 7th (Facilities Needs / Condition Assessment)
- Preliminary Property Values - June 1st
- Budget Workshops - June 12th, 13th, 15th (Operating and Capital)
- Final Property Values - July 1st
- Set “Not to Exceed” Millage Rates - July 11th
- Final Budget Workshops - August 20th (Operating and Capital)
- Budget Adoption (Public Hearings) - September 10th (South County) & September 24th (North County)
FY12 Adopted = $869,929,961

**FY12 Budget Includes:**
- 3,257 FTE’s (employees)
- 230 funds
- Nearly 40,000 line items
- 242 Active Capital Improvement projects
- 43 Ad Valorem Districts
- 39 Non-Ad Valorem Assessment Districts

Transfers & Reserves
$142,202,967

Debt
$69,228,291

Capital
$50,471,844

Operating
$608,026,859
## Major Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>Difference (FY08 - FY12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes (county-wide)</td>
<td>$202,043,054</td>
<td>$161,513,330</td>
<td>$139,746,210</td>
<td>$133,537,656</td>
<td>$125,514,647</td>
<td>($76,528,407) -37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sales Surtax</td>
<td>$28,068,112</td>
<td>$25,147,991</td>
<td>$25,006,507</td>
<td>$26,992,370</td>
<td>$26,223,926</td>
<td>($1,844,186) -6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>$24,445,088</td>
<td>$21,026,465</td>
<td>$21,258,282</td>
<td>$21,381,517</td>
<td>$21,343,830</td>
<td>($3,101,258) -12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Taxes</td>
<td>$16,861,035</td>
<td>$16,291,854</td>
<td>$16,197,021</td>
<td>$16,206,604</td>
<td>$16,302,414</td>
<td>($558,621) -3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP&amp;L Franchise Fee</td>
<td>$18,273,961</td>
<td>$18,629,619</td>
<td>$16,941,463</td>
<td>$18,509,223</td>
<td>$16,109,505</td>
<td>($2,164,456) -11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Development Tax</td>
<td>$10,500,787</td>
<td>$9,574,948</td>
<td>$9,777,447</td>
<td>$10,557,702</td>
<td>$11,642,760</td>
<td>$1,141,973 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Services Tax</td>
<td>$11,144,933</td>
<td>$11,160,766</td>
<td>$10,590,006</td>
<td>$10,876,705</td>
<td>$10,446,246</td>
<td>($698,678) -6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>$8,457,560</td>
<td>$7,453,687</td>
<td>$7,425,253</td>
<td>$6,856,885</td>
<td>$7,382,076</td>
<td>($1,075,484) -12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>$18,338,554</td>
<td>$12,882,132</td>
<td>$13,222,292</td>
<td>$9,308,389</td>
<td>$6,550,880</td>
<td>($11,787,674) -64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$338,133,084</td>
<td>$283,680,792</td>
<td>$260,164,661</td>
<td>$254,227,051</td>
<td>$241,516,284</td>
<td>($96,616,800) -28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Fund Ad Valorem Revenue
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Adopted General Fund (FY12)  
($225,549,150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>88,927,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Constitutional Officials</td>
<td>34,833,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAT</td>
<td>16,026,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>15,524,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>12,335,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>12,143,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>11,943,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>9,624,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Svc's</td>
<td>5,682,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguards, Emergency Mgt, etc.</td>
<td>4,145,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sarasota CRA</td>
<td>3,615,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>3,537,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>3,223,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Center &amp; Coop Ext</td>
<td>2,030,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise GIS</td>
<td>1,710,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>244,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>244,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Modeling

GovMax
(contact: Judy Kenton at jkenton@scgov.net)

General Fund Model
(contact: Karen Fratangelo at kfratang@scgov.net)

IMPLAN

Impact DataSource
(website: http://www.impactdatasource.com/)
Develop strategic plans, business plans, initiatives, goals, objectives, measures
Relate resources, plans and budget dollars
Provide a system to collect, organize and analyze the data
Evaluate services and spending decisions
Software is shared among 16 government agencies
General Fund Model Overview

- Inter-active Excel model with projections of revenues, expenses & fund balances through FY17
- Some projections cannot be adjusted (ex. debt payments)
- Some projections can be adjusted (change in property values, sales taxes, expenditures)
- The “shortfall” line is the amount that cannot be funded using the assumed revenues & expenditures. The shortfall is only created after the Economic Uncertainty Fund in depleted, but the Hurricane/Disaster Reserve always remains fully funded.
### General Fund Model - Projected Revenues & Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$107,834,777</td>
<td>$103,435,505</td>
<td>$102,390,753</td>
<td>$102,390,753</td>
<td>$103,425,058</td>
<td>$105,514,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/FPL/CST</td>
<td>$53,388,906</td>
<td>$53,922,795</td>
<td>$55,001,251</td>
<td>$56,651,288</td>
<td>$58,350,827</td>
<td>$60,101,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$50,568,279</td>
<td>$49,124,400</td>
<td>$49,124,400</td>
<td>$49,124,400</td>
<td>$49,124,400</td>
<td>$49,124,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$33,845,967</td>
<td>$38,776,704</td>
<td>$44,439,543</td>
<td>$35,023,615</td>
<td>$17,043,344</td>
<td>$18,206,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$245,637,929</td>
<td>$245,259,404</td>
<td>$250,955,947</td>
<td>$243,190,056</td>
<td>$227,943,629</td>
<td>$232,946,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$245,637,929</td>
<td>$245,259,404</td>
<td>$250,955,947</td>
<td>$257,426,414</td>
<td>$263,355,924</td>
<td>$266,562,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($14,236,358)</td>
<td>($35,412,295)</td>
<td>($33,615,979)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/FPL/CST</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The model assumes that gaps between revenues & expenses are filled with available fund balance. When fund balance runs out, a shortfall is created.*

*$14m shortfall begins in FY15 under this scenario*
Property tax assumptions are changed to be more optimistic, shortfall in this scenario is lowered $3.7m in FY15
Property tax assumptions remain the same but an additional expense which will cost $3m per year is approved, shortfall in this scenario is increased to $26m in FY15.
Fiscal Year Beginning Fund Balances

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 Day Disaster Reserve   30-60 Day Econ Fund   Add'l Available Funds

An output of the model is shown above, graph changes based on assumptions.
Economic Incentives & Analysis
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES EVALUATION TOOLS

IMPLAN

Econometric Impact (Community)

Direct Impact
- Output
- Jobs
- Comp.

Indirect Impact
- Output
- Jobs
- Comp.

Impact DataSource

Fiscal Impact (County)

Net Effect to Revenue
- Breakeven
- R.O.I.
- NPV
### Project Full Spectrum
NAICS # 424490
Implan sector 319 - Wholesale Trade

**OPERATING IMPACTS (1):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Output</th>
<th>Indirect Output</th>
<th>Total Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,265,099</td>
<td>2,300,642</td>
<td>5,565,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,850,198</td>
<td>2,973,235</td>
<td>7,823,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,435,298</td>
<td>3,645,815</td>
<td>10,081,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,020,397</td>
<td>4,318,429</td>
<td>12,338,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,605,496</td>
<td>4,991,098</td>
<td>14,596,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Employees</th>
<th>Indirect Employees</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>117.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Wages</th>
<th>Indirect Wages</th>
<th>Total Wages</th>
<th>Average Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>669,816</td>
<td>751,654</td>
<td>1,421,470</td>
<td>33,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,339,632</td>
<td>960,481</td>
<td>2,300,113</td>
<td>33,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,009,448</td>
<td>1,169,315</td>
<td>3,178,763</td>
<td>33,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,679,264</td>
<td>1,378,149</td>
<td>4,057,413</td>
<td>33,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,349,080</td>
<td>1,586,997</td>
<td>4,936,077</td>
<td>33,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Impacts of the Miracle League Project
$707,655

- The estimated economic impact within the local area *
  - Jobs Created: 11
  - Jobs created would have a total compensation of: $453,953
  - Total expenditures within the local area: $1,239,796

* Sarasota, Charlotte, Manatee & Desoto Counties
# Impact Data Source

**Uses Economic Impact to Derive Local Fiscal Impact (Direct & Indirect)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New Economic Output</td>
<td>+ Sales Tax Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Jobs Created</td>
<td>+ Property Tax Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earnings of New Workers</td>
<td>+ Utility Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Residential and Commercial Property added to Tax Rolls</td>
<td>+ Hotel Occupancy Tax Rev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Taxable Sales</td>
<td>+ Building Permit Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of Additional Visitors to Area</td>
<td>+ Impact Fee Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Taxable Lodging Sales</td>
<td>- Costs of Providing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Costs of Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Costs of Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Return on Investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sarasota County: Benefits, Costs and Net Benefits Over the First 10 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Additional Benefits</th>
<th>Additional Costs</th>
<th>Net Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Taxes*</td>
<td>$1,293,854</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,293,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes, after tax abatement</td>
<td>$71,934</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Development Taxes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits and Fees</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>$19,626</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes &amp; User Fees - New Residents</td>
<td>$104,714</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes &amp; User Fees - New Business</td>
<td>$33,483</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services - New Residents</td>
<td>($70,792)</td>
<td>($22,636)</td>
<td>($22,636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services - New Business</td>
<td>($22,636)</td>
<td>($22,636)</td>
<td>($22,636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,547,611</td>
<td>($93,428)</td>
<td>$1,454,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The analysis identifies the net effect on local government revenues from additional taxable sales in the area.
Levels of Service
Description of Current Services:

- Maintain property safety and values through ordinance enforcement
- Conduct Community Clean-ups
- Engage Homeowner Associations on various issues
- Collect Liens
- Respond proactively and reactively to complaints

Future Operational Changes / Opportunities:

- Continue cross-training to develop talent network
- Streamline the enforcement and compliance processes
- Continued public engagement and education efforts to encourage voluntary compliance
In this example, the Board can chose to reduce Code Enforcement by $49,558. The Level of Service (LOS) impact is detailed along with the “Community Outcome Area” impact…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Scenario # 1</th>
<th>GF Reduction Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$49,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOS Implications:**
- Increased response time to community complaints from within 2 working day to 6+ working days
- Reduced capacity to provide weekend coverage, community clean-ups, and weekend inspections on Siesta Key

**Policy Implications:**
- None

**Community Outcome Area(s) Affected:**
- *Preserve & Enhance Neighborhoods:* Enhance Neighborhood Character and Value
Community Engagement
Community originates in conversations between people. Budget discussions can be community building events. Community begins one conversation or one room at a time.
As citizens, we should not shy away from having serious conversations about the challenges we face as a community, our priorities, and how we should address them through public policies. These courageous conversations should be about what we want to achieve as a community and how to pay for those achievements. This should be a civil dialogue between those who recognize their individual differences but who are committed to the best interests of our community and achieving the delicate balance of what is enough.
How your property taxes are allocated

Sarasota County (Unincorporated)

Sarasota County School Board
- $0.334 School (State)
- $0.247 School (Local)
- $0.58 School Total
- $0.234 Sarasota County
- $0.018 Sarasota County Debt
- $0.002 Mosquito Control
- $0.050 Sarasota County EMS
- $0.30 County Total

Districts
- $0.030 Southwest Florida Water Management
- $0.003 West Coast Inland Navigation
- $0.083 Sarasota Memorial Hospital
- $0.12 District Total

For illustrative purposes only. Does not include Non-Ad Valorem Assessments. Totals include rounding.
“In this fiscal environment every governmental operation must consider alternative futures of providing services and in many cases employees must even discuss alternative futures for themselves and their careers”

This may be the new “empowerment”
For more information regarding Sarasota County’s budget process, please contact Steven Botelho at sbotelho@scgov.net
Polling Question #3

Which of the following offer opportunity for improvement in your agency’s budgeting?
Better Budget Models
~Budgeting For Outcomes~

Darin Atteberry
City Manager
City of Fort Collins
• Population: 144,000
• 2,200 individual employees
• $447.6 million total budget
• 26,000 CSU students
What is Budgeting For Outcomes (BFO)?

- A budget process focused on community priorities
- A shift from paying for departments to buying services and programs
- A method to put citizens and their priorities, not status quo, first
What is BFO?

Based on four key questions:

• What results matter most to our citizens?
• How much revenue is available?
• How much should we spend to achieve each result?
• How can we BEST deliver the results that citizens expect?
Why Change to BFO?

- Change in revenue growth
- Change in citizen expectations
- Change in leadership
A Closer Look at BFO

Budget is a collection of purchasing decisions

- Set the price that community members are willing to pay for local government services
- Determine desired community outcomes
- Allocate dollars to each outcome
A Closer Look at BFO

- Results Teams develop purchasing plans

- Service providers make offers

- Results Teams rank offers

- Starting with the highest priority, Results Teams “buy” offers until funding runs out

- Offers that rank within available resources are used to prepare budget.
A Closer Look at BFO

Two key points of differentiation:

  – Overview
  – Indicators
  – Purchasing Strategies

• Results Teams
  – Hand-picked staff
  – Citizen representation

Factors for Success

- Commitment from organizational leadership
  - Change is hard
  - Difficult decisions
- Engaged employees
- Organization needs to bring necessary resources (staff time)
- Open and honest communication – internally and to the public
- Deep, genuine commitment to continuous improvement
Benefits

• Created greater understanding of City finances for citizens, Council, and City staff

• Strengthened partnership with City Council
  – Council plays a more active role
  – Greater transparency of services and costs

• Strengthened partnerships between departments
  – Eliminated some duplication of efforts
  – No one “owned” their own bucket of money; greater collaboration
Benefits

- Established clear connection between community priorities, resources and levels of service
  - Stop doing lists
  - “Drilling Platforms”
  - Clear choices and trade-offs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Fees</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRMPO Contribution</td>
<td>$49,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Engineering</td>
<td>$1,023,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping</td>
<td>$430,632.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets Supporting Operations</td>
<td>$1,572,711.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Expenses</td>
<td>$62,531.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossing Replacement</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Bridge Program</td>
<td>$700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Management</td>
<td>$3,800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Technician</td>
<td>$65,465.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets Capital Equipment</td>
<td>$934,508.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits

• Increased transparency and accountability
  – Community Scorecard example: http://bit.ly/Hs119s

• Prompted other data driven initiatives
Benefits

- Increased credibility between City and the community

“Installing Budgeting for Outcomes, which was only proposed early this year, in such a swift manner came with its share of difficulties, but the City Council, City Manager Darin Atteberry and particularly city staff deserve credit for getting this much-needed process under way. Not everybody, including the Fort Collins Coloradoan editorial board and two City Council members, agree with the specifics of what was funded in the end. But the advantage of Budgeting for Outcomes is that it makes city government more transparent in its budgeting decisions.”

Coloradoan Editorial – Nov. 18, 2005
Keep Fort Collins Great

- .85% sales tax increase approved in 2010
- Approximately $19M per year
- 60+% voted yes
- Accountability included in ballot language
Resources


• [http://fcgov.com/budget](http://fcgov.com/budget)
  – 2011-2012 Budget
  – “Stop doing” lists

• *The Price of Government: Getting the Results We Need in an Age of Permanent Fiscal Crisis* by David Osborne and Peter Hutchinson
Polling Question #4

What’s your view about the desirability of Budgeting for Outcomes in your agency?
Ventura’s Version of BFO

Jay Panzica
Chief Financial Officer
City of Ventura
The City of Ventura

- A beach community ½ way between Malibu and Santa Barbara
- 120 years old, full service community
- 109,000 residents
- City Council/City Manager Government

- General Fund
  - Revenues down from $96M to $81M
  - FTE’s down from 675 to 580
Why a Change?

- Significant Drop In Revenue
- Too many Vision Goals
- “Nip and Tuck” wasn’t going to work
- Significant public “wants” with no decrease in their expectations
- Two failed tax increase attempts
General Fund Spending Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Exp</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>$94.1</td>
<td>$85.1</td>
<td>$11.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>$96.5</td>
<td>$80.4</td>
<td>$7.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>$88.1</td>
<td>$81.0</td>
<td>$7.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>$81.5</td>
<td>$82.4</td>
<td>$0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$84.4</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>$0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>$0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Millions

- FY 2008-09: $11.4 M
- FY 2009-10: $7.7 M
- FY 2010-11: $7.1 M
- FY 2011-12: $0 M
- FY 2012-13: $0 M
- FY 2013-14: $0 M
Vision Goals

- Healthy & Safe
- Prosperous
- Natural
- Well Planned
- Accessible
- Sustainable
- Active
- Educated
- Creative
- Involved
- Accountable
What is important about this list of goals?

– It was developed with significant community input

– *All* of our performance measures *Are* tied to it

– *All* of our budget decisions

– It is referred to in every document, report and measurement
Why BFO for Ventura?
Reduce, Restructure and Eliminate

1. Getting the results that matter most from your taxpayer $$
2. Living Within Our Means
3. Do It Well or Don’t Do It
Five Main Components of the Price of Government - BFO

- **Get a grip on the problem**
- Set the Price of Government
- Set the Priorities of Government
- Allocate available resources across the priorities
- Develop a purchasing plan
Get a Grip on the Problem

• Define and understand the situation or problem at hand

• *In our case*, this was declining tax levels along with increasing costs and increasing salary expectations, resulting in a structural imbalance
Five Main Components of the Price of Government

- Get a grip on the problem
- Set the Price of Government
- Set the Priorities of Government
- Allocate available resources across the priorities
- Develop a purchasing plan
Set the Price of Government

• How much the citizens are willing to pay
• Amount available for purchasing outcomes

• *In our case*, this was $85M
Five Main Components of the Price of Government

• Get a grip on the problem
• Set the Price of Government
• **Set the Priorities of Government**
• Allocate available resources across the priorities
• Develop a purchasing plan
Set the Priorities of Government

• Define the **key results** that the citizens most want from government

• *In our case*, these were our 11 Vision Goals as defined in the General Plan
Set the Priorities of Government

• Determine the **indicators** that measure progress towards achieving those outcomes

• *In our case*, these are our performance measures
Respond to In Progress Crimes & Emergencies in 5 Minutes or Less, 90% of the Time:
Percentage of Time Response to Emergency Events is 5 Minutes or Less

Why This Is Important
Providing for the protection of life and property is a core function of local government. The timely arrival of police officer to a reported crime in-progress or other serious emergencies is vital to prevent injury or death, apprehend suspected criminals, identify witnesses and evidence, and enhance the solvability of the crime.

What Is Being Done
The Ventura Police Department prioritizes all calls for service. Emergency and in-progress crimes are given the highest priority. Response times to these calls are reviewed on a monthly basis and compared to our goal of responding to emergency and in-progress crimes in 5 minutes or less 90 percent of the time. In order to ensure response time goals, we have reduced or eliminated response to lower priority calls for service such as burglary alarms, non-injury traffic accidents, and civil disputes. We have also instituted an online reporting system for identified low-level crimes where no means exists for identifying the suspect(s).

About This Measure
The Ventura Police Department Command Center records response times from the time the call is received until the first police officer arrives on scene using a state of the art Computer Aided-Dispatch system. Emergency response times include in-progress crimes and other serious emergencies such as injury traffic accidents.
## Beachfront Capital Projects: Award Contract for Promenade Phase II by July 2012 and Identify Grant Opportunities for Surfers Point Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date AssIGNED:</th>
<th>Lead:</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-11</td>
<td>Rick Raives</td>
<td>McDermott, Ivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current 30-day Action Plan

- **Finalize Plans in April,** advertise Promenade on May 7.
- **$3 million TE grant application submitted for Surfers Point.**

### Major Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promenade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Plans and Specs for Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise and Receive Bids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surfers Point</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Grant Opportunities Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Development Planning

#### Number of Days to Process Hearing Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average days to hearing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Cases Filed

- **JUL:** 8
- **AUG:** 9
- **SEP:** 4
- **OCT:** 13
- **NOV:** 4
- **DEC:** 10
- **JAN:** 21
- **FEB:** 15
- **MAR:** 14
- **APR:** 16

---

*Graph showing Number of Cases Filed from July to June.*
Five Main Components of the Price of Government

• Get a grip on the problem
• Set the Price of Government
• Set the Priorities of Government
• Allocate available resources across the priorities
• Develop a purchasing plan
Allocate Available Resources Across the Priorities

- The Price of Government - *revenue* - is now allocated across the outcomes
- Decide the price for each priority or outcome
- No concept of base budget
- No looking back at last ten years worth of history
Allocate available resources across the priorities

• Do not ask “How much did we spend on this last year?”

• Do ask: “What is it worth to our citizens for us to achieve this result?”
Allocate available resources across the priorities

• Results in meaningful and significant changes from the past

• *In our case,* the City Manager and the Leadership Team developed a decision process
Allocate available resources across the priorities

FY 2008-09 General Fund

- Our Natural Community - $3.4 M
- Our Prosperous Community - $.4 M
- Our Well-Planned & Designed Community - $2.9 M
- Our Accessible Community - $2.0 M
- Our Sustainable Infrastructure - $2.2 M
- Our Active Community - $8.2 M
- Our Healthy & Safe Community - $53 M
- Our Educated Community - $.5 M
- Our Creative Community - $1.8 M
- Our Involved Community - $1.1 M
- Our Accountable Government - $17.3 M
Five Main Components of the Price of Government

- Get a grip on the problem
- Set the Price of Government
- Set the Priorities of Government
- Allocate available resources across the priorities
- **Develop a purchasing plan**
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- BFO Teams were created for each goal
- Their input is the core of BFO
- Made up of knowledgeable people from all departments, the public and the Chamber of Commerce
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- They act as purchasing agents for the citizens
- Ask them to tell you where to put the money to get the best results
- Provide them with detailed data of City processes, goals and expected outcomes that add to total budget $
# Our Creative Community
## Owner: Community Services

## Citywide Outcome Rating Work Sheet

### Outcomes Activities Driving Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Activity Details</th>
<th>07-08 Adopted Budget $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Personnel Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTE's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citizen Satisfaction: Heritage and the Built Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prog #</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Direct Personnel Costs</th>
<th>In-Direct Personnel Costs-Overhead</th>
<th>Serv &amp; Supp</th>
<th>ISFs</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Historic Programs and Sites (includes Music Under the Stars, Tours)</td>
<td>CS Fees</td>
<td>75200, 75510, 75110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>$86,123</td>
<td>$91,376</td>
<td>$64,008</td>
<td>$90,403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$331,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albingen Museum</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>75705</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$17,694</td>
<td>$2,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$20,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perception of Ventura as a Thriving Cultural Scene: Cultural Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prog #</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Direct Personnel Costs</th>
<th>In-Direct Personnel Costs-Overhead</th>
<th>Serv &amp; Supp</th>
<th>ISFs</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grants and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>75700, 75710, 75715, 75800, 75110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$4,914</td>
<td>$43,464</td>
<td>$225,224</td>
<td>$3,649</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$277,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ventura as a Cultural Destination: Public Awareness & Cultural Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prog #</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Direct Personnel Costs</th>
<th>In-Direct Personnel Costs-Overhead</th>
<th>Serv &amp; Supp</th>
<th>ISFs</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>CS Fees</td>
<td>10371, 10372, 10373, 10376, 75720, 75110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$98,396</td>
<td>$43,464</td>
<td>$86,320</td>
<td>$10,690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$238,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ArtWalks</td>
<td>CS Fees</td>
<td>75750</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$81,318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21,625</td>
<td>$3,963</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$106,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sister Cities Internation Program</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>75110-54399</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access and Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prog #</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Direct Personnel Costs</th>
<th>In-Direct Personnel Costs-Overhead</th>
<th>Serv &amp; Supp</th>
<th>ISFs</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural Affairs &amp; Commission Support</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>75110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$43,464</td>
<td>$4,779</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$49,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Creative Community**

$270,751 | $221,768 | $419,650 | $112,260 | 0 | $15,000 | $1,039,430
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- This development work was a **hugely** difficult process
- Staff invested over six months in the process
Develop a Purchasing Plan

• The committees analyzed the activities currently being performed by the City staff

• Identified and ranked those outcomes that are necessary for attaining the Vision Goals
### Our Active Community

**Owner: Community Services**

#### Citywide Outcome Reduction Restructure Elimination Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Details</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Changes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Changes</td>
<td>Total Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents who rate CS programs as excellent or good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Administration/Resource Development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Class Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF/CT - Registration and Finance/Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation classes and camps</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Healthy and Fit Residency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sports and Corporate Games Flag Football, Tournaments, Sea to Shore Adventure Race</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth access to recreation programs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpark Community Center and PAL: field trips, family events and activities, ceramics program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- BFO Committee recommendations were reviewed and analyzed by department heads:

  “Will they actually have the impact they are supposed to?”

  “Can we actually implement them?”
Develop a Purchasing Plan

• The BFO recommendations were:
  1. refined/adjusted if necessary
  2. discussed/negotiated with the CM

• Within each Vision Goal the ranked proposals were approved by moving down the ranking list until the allowable funding was exhausted
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- This plan was presented to City Council over a span of two months and four Admin Reports

- This “buying” plan became the budget
Develop a Purchasing Plan

- NOTE: In the Final Step, “Pure” BFO utilizes the Requests for Results (RFR’s) that we discussed earlier.

- With few exceptions we didn’t go outside the city for bids.
Practical Comments

- The process is:
  - Nimble and adaptable
  - More transparent
  - Aligns resources with results produced

- Employees and citizens are involved
Practical Comments

- Brings a methodology to:
  - allocate your resources
  - make reductions
- Has significant employee participation in the creation of ideas
Practical Comments

- Traditional budget approaches work well in a revenue rich arena, but not in tight times
- This approach works well in tight times
- Good governments will do this in good times
Practical Comments

- Department heads became much more aware of their departments and programs performance
- Resulted in major changes
- “Be Prepared” for change
Links & References

Performance Measures on the web
- www.cityofventura.net/performance measur es

BFO Reference
- The Price of Government
- David Osborne and Peter Hutchinson, 2004

Questions
- jpanzica@cityofventura.net
Polling Question #5

Which of the following elements of Budgeting for Outcomes seem like they’d be particularly valuable for your agency?
Contacts for Today’s Session

- **Randall Reid**, County Administrator, Sarasota, FL; rreid@scgov.net

- **Darin Atteberry**, City Manager, Fort Collins, CO; datteberry@fcgov.com

- **Jay Panzica**, CFO, Ventura, CA; jpanzica@ci.ventura.ca.us

- **Don Maruska**, Director, Cal-ICMA and CSMFO Coaching Programs; don@donmaruska.com
Resources and Feedback

Go to “Live Audio & Archives” tab at web sites for recordings of this webinar and other professional development resources.

www.cal-icma.org/coaching
www.csmfo.org/coaching

Please complete the follow up survey.
Polling Question #6

How was the webinar of value to you?
Upcoming session

Productive Labor Relations & Negotiations
Cal-ICMA and CSMFO Coaching Programs
2:00 – 3:30 p.m., PT, Wednesday, May 9

Registration is now open:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/169899128
“Better Budget Models” webinar Polling Results
Cal-ICMA and CSMFO Coaching Programs, April 12, 2012

236 locations participating, estimated 392 total live audience

[CLOSED] How many people are listening on your line?
- 81% 1 – just myself
- 13% 2-5
- 5% 6-10
- 3% 11-20
- 0% 21 or more

[CLOSED] Which of the following areas are of interest to you?
- 53% How to build a budget through sequential decisions
- 63% Tools for "what if" modeling
- 44% How to evaluate economic initiatives
- 64% Ways to address levels of service
- 52% Budgeting for outcomes approach — purchasing results

[CLOSED] Which of the following offer opportunity for your agency?
- 40% Ways to build a budget through sequential decisions
- 67% Tools for dynamic "what if" modeling
- 36% Tools to evaluate economic initiatives
- 60% Ways to address levels of service issues
- 2% Others [please send in your comments]

[CLOSED] What’s the applicability of Budgeting for Outcomes in your agency?
- 4% We’re doing it, and it’s worth the effort
- 1% We’ve tried it, and we wish we hadn’t [send comments]
- 75% Sounds promising, and we need to know more to evaluate it
- 19% Doesn’t sound applicable to our agency
- 1% We’ve got a better way to budget [please send your way]

[CLOSED] Which of the following elements of Budgeting for Outcomes would be particularly valuable for your budget efforts?
- 27% Get a grip on the problem
- 44% Set the price of government
- 76% Set the priorities of government
- 71% Allocate available resources across the priorities
- 19% Develop a purchasing plan

How was the webinar of value to you?
- 74% stimulated idea for new approaches to budgeting
- 51% provided examples of concrete tools that we can pursue
- 45% identified potential issues and key factors for success
- 42% offered additional resources that we’d like to pursue
- 2% other [send comments via Question on webinar]