



Lexington-Fayette Urban County Council

Budget Committee of the Whole Link Report Outs Summary

May 27, 2014
10:00AM

Vice Mayor Gorton called the meeting to order at 10:00am. Council Members Ellinger, Kay, Ford, Akers, Beard, Farmer, Stinnett, Scutchfield, Clarke, Henson and Lane were present. Council Members Lawless, Myers and Mossotti were absent.

I. General Government – Ellinger

Council Member Ellinger provided a summary of the General Government Link recommendations for the FY2015 budget.

The link did not recommend any changes to the Mayor's Proposed Budget (MPB) for the following areas: the Department of Law, Human Resources, Mayor's Office, Chief Development Officer, Council Clerk, County Clerk/BOE, Council Office, Internal Audit, Judge Executive, Human Rights Commission, Grants and Special Programs, Friends of the Court, Commonwealth Attorney, Computer Services, Enterprise Services and CIO.

The link agrees with the MPB for the CAO's Office but the CAO's Office has asked the Council to re-examine the location of the Office of the Homelessness Coordinator to be outside of the CAO's Office. If adjusted, the funds would be reallocated to the new area.

The link agreed with the MPB for Communications, except that the link would like to include the creation of a Director position in LexCall 311. If the position of Director is created, it will be a total cost of \$93,786. The current customer service manager position has a cost of \$77,178.

CAO Hamilton commented on this item stating that the issue was whether 311 needed to be a division when they moved to the new emergency operations center. Pat Tatum approached CAO Hamilton and felt that they needed to be a division. Hamilton said this was discussed but was not recommended in the budget. There were split opinions on this item. They have asked the consultants to look at this position again and provide an opinion on the position. Ellinger confirmed that we are currently waiting for their review.

The link would like to consider increased funding for Risk Management pending a review by the CAO's Office concerning staffing and liability.

Gorton asked how Risk Management became the one to review for a recommended increase. Hamilton and Ellinger missed this hearing so Connie Underwood added that Patrick is concerned about avoiding safety problems and did not feel that we had adequate staff to go out and review for risks. Gorton feels that we need solid reasons for increasing funding to an area within government.

The link agrees with the MPB for the PVA and County Attorney with the recommendation that additional funds for both should come from the school board or state rather than local government.

The link agreed with the MPB for the Coroner's Office. Jamshid Baradaran stated that the van requested by the Coroner's Office was on the list for purchase.

Gorton asked about the amount for indigent burials. Commissioner O'Mara stated that the Coroner's Office wanted to look into purchasing land for indigent burials. Ellinger added that they said the cost for this continues to increase and is currently approximately \$1,000 per person. Gorton asked that this item go on the non-budgetary item list for discussion in September.

Stinnett asked if the \$100K for the KY Theatre Renovation is part of a bond. O'Mara said it could be cash and they will check. O'Mara said the KY Theatre was a part of the cash list provided previously. Stinnett asked why we would use cash. O'Mara said it was a balancing act and they were trying to keep the bond under a certain amount so they looked for lower dollar amounts to pay cash.

Stinnett asked how much is half of the salary of the local food coordinator and who is paying the other half. The other half is a grant. Stinnett asked how long LFUCG would pay for the other half and added that when this was set up, it was supposed to be a zero cost to the government. Atkins said the grant is for a year from when it is activated, which will be June 2. Atkins said it was set up for one-year to determine if LFUCG wanted to continue. Stinnett asked if it would be a 100% cost to government if it was continued beyond one year. Atkins said that was correct. Stinnett asked when we would receive information on the grocery truck pilot program and details, still waiting

for food deserts around town. Atkins said the food coordinator will look at this issue. Atkins said the bus will be donated and take food to food desert areas to give access to fresh goods. Stinnett asked who will manage this. Atkins said we will. Stinnett asked what the cost will be to the government. Atkins said there will be no cost to the government.

Akers asked Atkins if the food desert areas had been identified. Atkins said a food desert is defined as an area with no grocery located in a two mile radius and added that they had focused on the east end. Akers commented on areas previously identified as food deserts and would like to see that we diversify where this grocery truck will go and not limit all the resources to the east end. She is still unclear on who will be doing this and how it will work. Atkins said it will not be limited to the east end. The person we are bringing in will review. Akers asked who was paying for this person. Atkins said she will be paid by a grant but added that there were some in-kind contributions from LFUCG.

Gorton asked how much is allocated in the budget for this program. Atkins said that there is \$30K in the budget. Gorton asked specifically about the food truck. Atkins said there was nothing budgeted for this other than the time of the food coordinator.

Akers asked about the County Clerk/BOE budget, do we pay for the elections. Gorton said yes. Akers thought they would have their own budgets for that.

Henson asked about the mobile grocery truck, she feels it is a good concept, but who will pay for the gas and maintenance, is this also grant funded. Atkins said LexTran is going to help with those costs for the first year. Henson asked if the items would be for sale. Atkins said yes, it will be like a Farmer's Market. Henson added that Faith Feeds takes fresh produce out to communities and it is free but they do not have a mobile unit. She feels we could partner with other people doing this already. If this is costing the city money, she feels this will duplicate what Faith Feeds is already doing.

Lane added that this is seasonal and he concurs with Henson that it would be better to give the money to a nonprofit organization rather than hire someone on LFUCG staff to coordinate this. Atkins said they are just looking for someone to coordinate and not to take over. Lane is concerned that every time we add a position, we are layering on extra expenses, gas, maintenance, etc. He thinks it would be better to put the money toward the people who need it rather than another administrative staff.

Kay added that these areas change over time so there will have to be an assessment made. This is not giving food away but providing it at a reasonable cost to people who don't have access to it.

Gorton suggested that we have a workshop on this issue to allow Council Members to ask questions and get a feel for how this will go forward once the food coordinator is here. This will be scheduled in the fall.

Akers asked what will be looked at to determine if this is a successful position and should be continued. Atkins said that was still being derived.

Gorton stated that the General Government link was not making recommendations for additional money but did have several non-budgetary items to discuss. Ellinger agreed.

Gorton asked the links to put the non-budgetary items into a list.

II. Finance & Social Services – Beard

Council Member Ford provided the summary of the Finance & Social Services Link recommendations for the FY2015 budget.

The link recommended the following non-budgetary changes: change the name “partner agency”, reallocate Home Care Services Agent funds from BGADD to Department of Social Services, consider changes to the partner agency funding process, have the Social Services Commissioner report back to the Social Services Committee in October 2014 and consider ways to reduce prescription costs for partner agencies.

Gorton asked about the issue of partnering with partner agencies for prescriptions. There was a time in the past when they could get insurance benefits from the government and asked if this was the issue. Akers stated that this was not to benefit the agency staff but some of the agencies use the funds from LFUCG to purchase medications for their clients. The recommendation is to explore whether the agency can get a discounted rate through the LFUCG On-Site Rx contract (ex. Baby Health Service).

The link recommended an increase in funding for the following 12 partner agencies:

- Children’s Advocacy Center - \$70,000
- Kentucky Refugee Ministries - \$35,810
- New Life Day Center - \$15,300
- Moveable Feast - \$24,000
- Baby Health Services - \$27,630
- Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center - \$85,505
- Bluegrass Technology Center - \$25,370
- The Nest - \$57,810
- Repairers of the Breach - \$15,920
- Iglesia Nueva Vida - \$7,450
- Community Action Council – from \$114,660 in MPB to \$179,940

- God's Pantry – from \$137,190 in MPB to \$167,295

The budgetary impact of these changes is \$460,180, which the link recommends to be covered by a larger than projected FY2014 fund balance.

The link did not recommend any changes to the MPB for the Department of Social Services or the Department of Finance and Administration or the any of the divisions within these two areas.

Stinnett asked how these recommendations related to the list, do these go down the list in order or is it random. Ford stated that it did not go down the list as some of the agencies did not wish to come meet with the link adding that there place on the list varied. Stinnett suggested that it would do down the list and fund as many as possible. Stinnett is also concerned that the recommended funding source is fund balance. Many of these costs are recurring costs that do not go away and we cannot depend on a fund balance to cover the expenses. Stinnett asked if there was an update fund balance number. O'Mara said no and the he would be sending out April numbers later this week and they are planning to close May in three days to have a proposal on June 5th.

Gorton added that we can adjust the revenue number as well if necessary. O'Mara said that we could but reminded Council that we just did that in March.

Kay stated that it would be helpful to see the full list of agencies and how they originally scored along with the rationale for the proposed increases. He is supportive of higher funding for partner agencies but it would be helpful to see this information laid out with the original recommendation. He would also like to see that agencies that did not attend and where they were in the list.

Gorton asked Connie to compile this information for the Council and send it out.

Kay added that his underlying concern is that we not continue every year to have a process that we set up and redo every year because it is not adequate.

Lane stated that many of the agencies listed have received awards of excellence in the past and he was disappointed to see that they were not recommended for funding originally. He does not think that coming back after the process is complete and adding funds is not really fair to the other organizations. He does agree that we need to provide additional funds because this is a safety net for some people and the economy is still not that good.

Scutchfield added that she served on the ranking committee and feels we are sending the wrong message by adding funds to organizations that are farther down the list. She realizes they were invited to attend the link but the grant process had closed. Many of these organizations may have only one person to represent them. It is not a fair process

to decide after the fact who gets more. We don't want to provide funds to those who complain the most.

Clarke stated that he feels limiting this fund to \$2.3 million was too small in the first place and leads to this problem. He feels the total funding for the future needs to be the focus of the discussions.

Akers agreed that the problem is that we need more funding for partner agencies. She added that all agencies who applied for funding were invited. Twenty signed up and of those 19 showed up for their meeting. Some wanted to just say "thanks." Akers said several of the agencies on the list are partners with the city for services and the link felt it was part of the responsibility of government to provide support. Akers said the link recommendation on the right hand side of the list should be equal to the amount of funding received in FY2014.

Ford stated that this was not a perfect process and at no point did the link criticize the Department of Social Services and added that they work very hard year round to make the process more fair and even the playing field. The link had a lot of conversations as to how to make the process more fair. Ford stated that maybe the Council's role should be to help identify going in how much funding will be available and identify areas where it is more critical. Ford added that Mr. Larson was very supportive of the Children's Advocacy Center. They work very closely with our Police Department and has not needed to request funding in the past. Ford walked the Council through the list of recommendations and where the agencies ranked in the original application process.

- Children's Advocacy Center - \$70,000 – Rank 52
- Kentucky Refugee Ministries - \$35,810 – Rank 64
- New Life Day Center - \$15,300 – Rank 50
- Moveable Feast - \$24,000 – Rank 35
- Baby Health Services - \$27,630 – Rank 47
- Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center - \$85,505 – Rank 42
- Bluegrass Technology Center - \$25,370 – Rank 36
- The Nest - \$57,810 – Rank 32
- Repairers of the Breach - \$15,920 – Rank 44 and 55
- Iglesia Nueva Vida - \$7,450 – Rank 67
- Community Action Council – from \$114,660 in MPB to \$179,940
- God's Pantry – from \$137,190 in MPB to \$167,295

This is a total of \$364,795 for programs that were not recommended for funding in the MPB and a total increase to the budget of \$460,180.

Stinnett stated that we had a process that had been changed in the past few years. The old process was this method, if you weren't happy with the MPB, then you just came to Council link to get more. He feels this is very close to going back to the old method. If

Council is going to do anything to change the amount, then they need to allocate an amount, 1% of the total budget or \$3.1 million. Once that amount is set, they can go down the list and pick up the next agencies in order. To do it this way goes back to the old method and circumvents the ratings that were done. All of these issues were addressed during the ranking process. He is of the opinion that Council needs to set a rate and vote on it rather than do it this way.

Scutchfield added that if she were any of the agencies not funded that scored higher than the ones proposed for additional funding, she would be contacting Council very upset. She feels we are setting a bad precedent by going against the process. How can you have trust in government, if we change the rules after the fact. She does not think this is a good idea.

Henson stated that we have a process now where there was not one before. We need to adjust the process and make it better. She thinks Council needs to set the percentage that each agency receives and not let the funding committee set this rate. She gave the example of the top rated agencies will receive 85% of their request and this percentage cannot be changed without the Council approval. She feels it is important that the funding is diverse and not let all of it go to homeless or feeding the hungry. There are many important issues and all agencies are important but we need to establish priorities as a community. Going forward, she has trust in Commissioner Mills to bring us a better plan.

Akers added that it was not easy to do. There were many personal examples and emotional stories which at times made link members and agency directors cry. She added that the percentage of funding was changed from last year resulting in fewer agencies being funded. The decision to fund the ones on the list were prioritized and used agencies that focused on critical needs and basic human services. She gave an example of an agency that scored number 2 on the list last year and scored below 30 this year so did not receive funding. She feels there is a problem with the scoring. She also mentioned larger organizations requesting millions and a small organization asking for a few thousand. The larger agencies have grant writers that can focus on writing the requests and small ones do not. It is not fair to put an agency with a \$15,000 budget up against one with a million dollar budget.

Gorton added that the partner agency focus changes depending on who is sitting on Council. She mentioned a few years ago when there was a committee trying to work with partner agencies to help them not have to depend on government support.

III. Environmental Quality & Public Works - Farmer

Council Member Farmer provided a summary of the Environmental Quality & Public Works link committee recommendations for the FY2015 budget.

The link recommended adding an additional \$85,000 to the Environmental Policy to cover distressed trees. This addition will allow the opportunity to take care of 200 trees opposed to the 55 trees in the MPB.

Farmer summarized the changes recommended in the MPB. The link is in agreement with the budget in other areas.

Gorton stated that she did not see a source for funding. Farmer said that while they were not tasked with providing a funding source, the link would recommend that if Council approves, the funds would not be added until a funding source is identified. Gorton asked if this would be a one-time addition. Farmer stated that the issue will be ongoing but for the purpose of the budget, this would be a one-time addition for the upcoming year.

Lane added that his neighborhood inoculated all of the Ash trees and they are doing well. The next neighborhood over did not and has had to cut down a lot of trees. He would encourage Council to provide some funding for inoculation of Ash trees that have not been completely destroyed as this is cheaper than removing or replacing the trees.

Henson agrees that our tree canopy is extremely important and in addition to the ash bore, there are also problems with trees planted improperly and harmed by mowers, etc. If we put additional money into replacing and planting trees, then we need an assurance that they will be planted properly and given the extra attention needed, especially for young trees. Susan Plueger said they have guidelines and qualifications for the contractors planting trees. They plan to bring a revision to Council later for the street tree program guidelines. Henson feels that most trees at risk are in the right-of-way and not on private property and asked if these were covered in the guidelines. Plueger stated that the street tree cost share program addresses trees in the right-of-way, if they are directly abutting private property, then the owner is responsible for them. Henson asked about Richmond Road trees, Tates Creek Road, etc. some of those trees already have problems. Plueger said there are a couple of issues at play in these areas to ensure that trees are planted properly and maintained through oversight and inspection.

Clarke says this is a significant problem and is not a one-time thing, the problem will continue but feels this is a good first step to address it.

Stinnett commented on the \$3 million budgeted for resurfacing, \$1.2 million of this is for Man O' War, leaving only \$1.8 million for the districts. After the winter we had, this will not be enough to address this paving issues. He just wanted to get it out there so that it can be considered as we go through the budgeting process.

Gorton asked if the link discussed this. Farmer commented. This was discussed in the link but there was not consensus on the best way to proceed. He is in agreement that it needs to be addressed and added that there will be other opportunities to discuss.

Henson asked if we could determine how we get to where we need to be and maintain that. She realizes weather plays a role but was curious if anyone was looking at that. Farmer said that was a part of the discussion that was in the Planning & Public Works committee. We need to explore how to add funds to the different line items.

IV. Public Safety - Henson

Council Member Henson provided a summary of the Public Safety link committee recommendations for the FY2015 budget.

The link agrees with the MPB for Animal Care and Control.

The link recommended that 15 corrections officers be hired at the beginning of the fiscal year, rather than in two recruit classes as proposed in the MPB. The link also recommends that the employee turnover rate at Community Corrections and that the Division of Human Resources conduct exit interviews with Corrections Officers leaving to determine why.

The link recommends an additional \$8,350 for a total of \$10,000 to provide 287 emergency weather radios to all of the targeted population (mobile home parks, etc.) to the MPB for Emergency Management. They would like to refer the issue of merging the Division of Emergency Management into the Division of Police or the Division of Fire and Emergency Services to the Public Safety Committee for review.

The link recommended moving the Fire vehicle accounting string from Facilities & Fleet Management to Fire & EMS to allow the entire budget to be in one place. The link also recommended funding an independent third party study for strategic fire station location analysis not to exceed \$100,000. Council Member Lane walked the Council through an addendum related to this item.

Gorton asked what the \$100,000 would purchase. Henson said it would be an analysis of where our fire stations should be located or relocated. Gorton asked if it would start with a look at the internal study completed a few years ago. Henson said that at this point they haven't gotten a good picture of where we should be down the road. Scutchfield added that the study will look at where we are now, cost savings in older buildings, should we move stations and where we need to locate new ones. She feels a third party will be impartial and not have strong ties to any of these areas. This is not an attempt in any way to close stations. Gorton was curious to see if we are using the study that was completed previously.

Akers asked about the internal study, who did it, can they get a copy for the CMs who were not here. Chief Hoskins said there was a GIS study in 2003 and an ISO Study in 2012, which provided station locations. Akers asked if fire felt this was sufficient. Hoskins said they were open to any study but they all seem to say the same thing, you have growth and response times to deal with. There isn't much variation in how you deal with them.

Gorton asked if the link had reviewed the previous studies. Henson stated that they were presented in the Public Safety Committee. She feels like they need more information, where are most of the calls, how many trucks are in each station, etc. This would be a very broad study and would provide a lot of information.

Beard asked what we could get for \$100,000. He can't see spending this money to replicate previous surveys that have been done. If we are going to do it, we need to do it right and he doesn't feel that \$100,000 will get much.

The link agreed with the MPB for the Division of Police and Public Safety Administration.

Kay also would like to know what we will get in this study that we do not already have. He does not oppose a comprehensive study but would like to ensure that we will get new information.

Lane walked the Council through the addendum and rationale for the fire station location analysis.

Stinnett feels we have the information and can do this in house so he is not sure why we would hire an outside party. The analysis just presented was pretty good. Lane still feels that we need an independent outside entity to review and make recommendations without prejudice.

Stinnett asked for a copy of the detailed staffing plan for the Division of Police requested at the Public Safety committee, which was supposed to be presented in the budget. We have a detailed analysis of Fire but not Police. Henson said they would get it.

Clarke is curious why there are 5 fire stations within a mile of each other downtown. Clarke asked Lane to explain how the budget was doubled in one year (page 17 of addendum). Lane explained that the operating expenses were estimated to increase at 3% per year. Alan Waddell stated that page 17 is a cumulative budget for operating, the annual amount is on page 15. He explained that the number CM Clarke was looking at was the starting point.

Gorton stated that this was a complicated issue and response time is everything. She did not see anything in the presentation about response time, which is the driver for

where we place fire stations. There is a lot of discussion that needs to go into this. We cannot just close stations or combine them to save money and have our response times suffer.

Henson added that our public safety areas are top notch but thinks the analysis would provide information that could be followed going forward.

Ford asked what FY2015 called for in regards to building the new station. Chief Hoskins stated that the station will not open in 2015 but probably 2016 due to construction time. Hoskins said the property was purchased several years ago. They have done some preliminary design on the property but due to the level of funding in the MPB being lower than the request, they will have to adjust the building.

Stinnett added that there is \$2.5 million in the MPB and asked how much we needed to do it right. Hoskins said that with that level of funding, they will only be able to move what is currently at Eastland to the new location. Stinnett commented on the critical needs identified in 2007 and asked for the cost of that and why it would be better to do it today. Hoskins said that the architect stated that they can build with an intent to go back later and add on but it will cost more to do it this way. Stinnett asked what it would cost today. Hoskins said they requested \$6 million. Stinnett said there is an opportunity here to do it once and not have to go back later and do it again. Stinnett asked Lane if capital expenses were included in his presentation. Lane said that number is included but only for \$2.5 million for the station. Alan Waddell said the number included is \$4 million. Stinnett asked if staff was also included (new hires, training, etc.). Lane said it was included.

Scutchfield commented on the map and the fact that there has not been a station closed since 1974. In looking at the map, it appears that 75% of stations are located within New Circle Road. We need to look into the possibility of consolidating services and making them more efficient.

Akers asked Alan Waddell to send the 5 year numbers used in the statistics presented. Alan said those were provided by the Fire Department and he will send it out.

V. General Services – Clarke

Council Member Clarke walked the Council through the General Services link recommendations for the FY2015 budget.

The link recommends reducing the professional services account in the Commissioner Of Planning's office by \$20,000 due to an accounting error. They also recommend that Council consider funding the Infill & redevelopment Coordinator position as well as the Greenway Coordinator position once the Design Excellence Plan has been approved.

They also request clarification on whether or not the \$3 million passed for Affordable Housing included funding for the Affordable Housing Coordinator and operations.

The link agrees with the MPB for Historic Preservation, Engineering, Downtown Lexington Corporation, Commerce Lexington, World Trade Center and SCORE.

The link recommends increased bond funds for PDR from \$1 million to \$2 million if federal match is available. They also recommend increasing professional services by a total of \$30,750 to cover legal and appraisal services for the additional \$1 million.

The link recommends funding one of the three proposed small area plans at \$100,000 and asks Council to consider funding an Administrative Officer once the Design Excellence Plan has been approved.

The link recommends removing \$1,000 from Code Enforcement equipment for purchase of cameras, as photos can be taken by iPads. They also recommend moving the \$200,00 for nuisance abatement to the Commissioner of Planning.

The link recommends funding a Building Inspection Supervisor position and \$25,000 for a part time (or contractual) Landscape Examiner.

Stinnett asked if Building Inspection is at full staff or if they have vacancies. There seems to be delays out there with inspections. Commissioner Paulsen said there is a vacancy that they were just approved to fill. They will be advertising for it and two others soon. Stinnett asked if there was a need to increase staffing in the upcoming budget. Paulsen said it was premature to do that at this time.

Kay asked how nuisance abatement will work if the \$200,000 is moved. Paulsen said this would allow use of some of these funds for zoning enforcement as well instead of just using them for code enforcement. He feels this will be sufficient for all abatement. The funding stream will just be moved but it will be handled in the same way. We have not used the entire amount in any one year since it was increased to \$200,000. Kay asked how much has been used so far in the fiscal year because there have been times when people were told that there were no funds for abatement. Paulsen said we have used approximately \$75,000 so far. They are working on operating procedures too.

Lane asked when the \$3 million plan for affordable housing will come forward. Paulsen said they will present on July 1. Lane asked about the Greenway Coordinator. Paulsen said they will help coordinate between the different divisions the plan of bringing in greenways and how to maintain them. There is currently a backlog in the acceptance of greenways right now. Lane asked if the Design Excellence only focused on downtown. Paulsen said they can also work on small items that are not small area plans.

Henson stated that we used to run out of nuisance abatement funds so it was increased. She asked for examples of how it will be used if it is moved. Paulsen said that zoning enforcement issues were very similar to nuisance abatement issues but on a larger scale. Henson is concerned that we will run out of funds and code enforcement will be delayed on their side. Paulsen said this would not change how it works and in his opinion, there are plenty of funds to cover both. It was increased before he was here and he cannot speak to why. If something needs to be abated, they will take care of it. It seemed better to pull from these funds rather than create a new funding stream. Henson asked what a landscape examiner will do. Paulsen said they will review the landscape plans that come in for development.

Akers asked about zoning abatement. How are these handled. Paulsen said we would send a notification and give them an opportunity to abate themselves before we go out and take care of it. They are particularly looking at signs now. Akers asked about the positions proposed. Paulsen commented that his position would not be in this budget year. Akers asked what the estimate is for the Design Excellence Plan being approved. Paulsen said if the positions are approved, he would not anticipate them to take effect until next year.

The link agrees with the MPB for General Services. They recommend a one year pilot program for the Downtown Arts Center and request the Commissioner to report on the project to the General Government Committee by September 30. They request that the Commissioner's office report on updates regarding proposed changes to the Administrative Office of the Courts reimbursement policy.

The link agrees with the MPB for Facilities and Fleet Management. They request a quarterly update to Council on vacancy status. They also request a report to the General Government Committee on the 26% increase to professional and contract services from FY2014 by November 15th.

The link recommends \$105,000 for Parks and Recreation for connectivity at pools (\$85,000) and a study for location and design of a splash park in the East End (\$20,000). They request the Division to provide a quarterly update to Council on vacancy status. They would like a report to the General Government Committee on the design plan for an Aquatics Program and a S.A.F.E. Parks position by reorganizing current personnel. They also request the Mayor's Office to prioritize finding grants via a selected lobbying firm for the Division of Parks and Recreation.

The link agrees with the MPB for the Downtown Development Authority. They request a substantive and current performance report at regular intervals and completion of the proposed 10 year development program plan for presentation to Council.

The link recommends separating the PSA into 2 agreements for the Bluegrass Area Development District (BGADD), one for dues and one for Homecare match. They also

recommend bringing the issue of continued BGADD membership to the Committee of the Whole for discussion including their audit response.

The link agrees with the MPB for the Lyric Theatre. They request a strategic plan from the administration to be presented to Council prior to December 31st. They request the administration to conduct a financial audit and report results to Council by November 1st and ask the Commissioner of Finance to assist them with obtaining an audit.

The link feels the Economic Development Agencies should continue to present to Council at the Quarterly Economic Development Committee. The link would like to refer a strategy for collaboration among these agencies to the Economic Development Committee.

Akers asked about the Downtown Arts Center plan. How many of the current staff will stay and when will they know. Commissioner Reed says he is not comfortable telling them one way or another until the Council decides how to move forward. They know there is a change coming. The decision on the number staying or going will be a decision left up to Amber Luallen. There are currently too many people and not enough activity. We will have to do more with less during the pilot program but he cannot say how many people will be retained or lost. Akers asked how much was allocated for Amber's salary. Reed said none. He does not want a permanent position at this time until they know how it will go to allow flexibility. Akers asked about the lobbying firm for grants. Reed said that was not his idea. This idea generated from the links committee. He has heard that the firm the Mayor is contracting has skill in grant writing so they could look for opportunities for us. Reed feels that there is still a need to a full time grant writer in parks. This was requested in the budget but not funded. He and the new Director will look in the budget and with Council permission, abolish something to create this one. The position will pay for itself.

Farmer asked Clarke how the link intended to pay for the additional PDR funds. Clarke said this was discussed but they don't have a firm answer. Gorton said the plan was to bond it.

Ford asked where the small area plan would be located. Clarke said they did not decide that and were leaving it up to Planning. Ford asked if Planning had decided. Gorton said they have list of needed plans. Ford asked if it would be Cardinal Valley. Henson said the Cardinal Valley plan was funded in 2014. Ford is also supportive of the study for the splash park and feels this will help get the project going.

Lane asked if Reed saw a benefit to having one person handle leasing of various buildings. Reed says this is worth discussing but he does not know if it is feasible or not.

Beard asked if we could get rid of the art on the roof now that we are cutting ties with the arts. Reed said he will explore options but pointed out that we are not cutting our ties with the arts.

Gorton added that we are not cutting our ties with the arts. LFUCG owns the Downtown Arts Center and will continue to do so.

Akers asked about the splash park proposal. Reed said it was generated in Parks last year. It would make sense to have a water feature to prevent people from using court house fountains and others in the downtown area. Akers stated that there are other areas that could benefit from a splash park. She asks that when this study takes place, she would like to see it look at other areas and not just focus on the downtown.

Gorton suggested that Clarke adjust the slide for the link financial recommendations to show that the PDR funds are to be bonded.

Gorton stated that the financial recommendations would come back in a list for discussion in a few weeks and the non-financial recommendations will be discussed in September.

Farmer suggested that Council Members think about where the funds for the recommendations will come from before going to far ahead. He doesn't want to get too far down the road and realize there is no money.

Gorton agreed and added that we will be looking at the revenue number at the June 5th meeting.

Gorton asked if Council would like to rank individual recommendations for discussion purposes so that they don't go by district.

Kay asked about timing for individual requests. Gorton said they are due by close of business on Friday, May 30th. Kay asked if she were suggesting putting link and council member recommendations in one list. Gorton said there would be two different lists.

Ford suggested that the council member recommendations be considered by seniority of council members.

Motion by Kay to adjourn. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

Submitted by Stacey Maynard, Council Administrator