RESOLUTION NO. R-74-2000

RESOLUTION TO AUGMENT AND AMEND THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 GENERAL FUND BUDGET OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS

WHEREAS, the resources of the General Fund are now determined to be $353,490,921 as itemized in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, the increase in available resources results from an increase in the revenue in excess of the amount included in the Fiscal Year 2000 Final Budget for the General Fund of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NRS 354.615, the City of Las Vegas is desirous of augmenting and amending the Fiscal Year 2000 Budget for the purpose of effecting an increase in appropriations to provide for expenditures unplanned in original budget, transfers out to other funds for planned projects and debt service;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 21st day of June, 2000, that the Fiscal Year 2000 Budget for the General Fund be increased from $345,018,535 to $353,490,921; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that expenditures totaling $8,472,386, as itemized in Exhibit B, which is attached hereto, be approved and authorized; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said augmentation and amendment as described above shall be effective upon delivery of a certified copy of the Resolution to the Nevada State Department of Taxation.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was approved this 21st day of June, 2000.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS

By: Oscar B. Goodman

OSCAR B. GOODMAN, Mayor

ATTEST:

Barbara Jo Ronemus

BARBARA JO RONEMUS, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

V. Pontiallo 6/7/00

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
FISCAL YEAR 2000
BUDGET AUGMENTATION - REVENUES
GENERAL FUND

	Current Budget	Adjustment	Augmented Budget
TAXES			
Ad Valorem Property Tax	$ 56,179,945	$	$ 56,179,945
Room Tax	1,425,000		1,425,000
Subtotal	$ 57,604,945	$	$ 57,604,945
LICENSES AND PERMITS			
Business Licenses And Permits:			
Business Licenses	$ 9,497,289	$ 1,000,000	$ 10,497,289
Liquor Licenses	1,471,227	100,000	1,571,227
City Gaming Licenses	4,040,000		4,040,000
			-
Franchise Fees:			-
Gas Utility	3,330,000		3,330,000
Electric Utility	12,500,000	100,000	12,600,000
Telephone Utility	4,528,446	750,000	5,278,446
Garbage Collection	1,900,000		1,900,000
Cable Television	1,575,000	100,000	1,675,000
Concessions/Taxi Stands	3,948		3,948
Ambulance	400,000		400,000
			-
Nonbusiness Licenses And Permits:			-
Building Permits	9,500,000	500,000	10,000,000
Offsite Permits	510,000		510,000
Administrative Fees	375,000		375,000
Miscellaneous Permits	35,000		35,000
Subtotal	$ 49,665,910	$ 2,550,000	$ 52,215,910
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES			
State Shared Revenues:			
Consolidated Tax	$ 151,500,000	$ 5,500,000	$ 157,000,000
Interlocal Cooperative Agreements:			
Reimbursed From Other Governments	975,000		975,000
Other Local Govt. Shared Revenues:			
County Gaming Licenses (City Share)	4,200,000		4,200,000
Other Local Units PILOT	70,400		70,400
Subtotal	$ 156,745,400	$ 5,500,000	$ 162,245,400

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
FISCAL YEAR 2000
BUDGET AUGMENTATION - REVENUES
GENERAL FUND

	Current Budget	Adjustment	Augmented Budget
CHARGES FOR SERVICES			
General Government:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	$ 2,997,604	$	$ 2,997,604
Planning And Development Fees	485,000		485,000
Data Processing Fees	280,740		280,740
Business License Application Fee	237,654		237,654
Other	365,053		365,053
Judicial:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	1,515		1,515
Financial Counseling Fees	174,000		174,000
Court Counseling Fees	867,000		867,000
Traffic School Fees	1,071,000		1,071,000
Assessment School Fees	65,000		65,000
Collection Fees	1,527,000		1,527,000
Public Safety:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	89,890		89,890
Construction & Subdivision Inspections	493,000		493,000
EMS Transport	800,000		800,000
Other	297,729		297,729
Public Works:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	1,024,004		1,024,004
Other	286,272		286,272
Culture And Recreation:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	9,988		9,988
Recreation Fees	1,565,000		1,565,000
Theater Admissions	152,900		152,900
Swimming Pool Fees	210,000		210,000
Softball Fees	500,000		500,000
Other	455		455
Economic Development And Assistance:			
Intracity Reimbursable Fees	92,960		92,960
Transit Systems:			
Advertising	17,000		17,000
Subtotal	$ 13,610,764	$	$ 13,610,764

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
FISCAL YEAR 2000
BUDGET AUGMENTATION - REVENUES
GENERAL FUND

	Current Budget	Adjustment	Augmented Budget
FINES AND FORFEITS			
Court Fines	$ 7,983,102	$ 250,000	$ 8,233,102
Forfeited Bail	277,000	-	277,000
Subtotal	$ 8,260,102	$ 250,000	$ 8,510,102
MISCELLANEOUS			
Interest Earnings	$ 2,000,000	$ -	$ 2,000,000
Rents And Royalties	4,050,000	172,386	4,222,386
Other	950,000	-	950,000
Subtotal	$ 7,000,000	$ 172,386	$ 7,172,386
SUBTOTAL REVENUES	$ 292,887,121	$ 8,472,386	$ 301,359,507
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES			
Transfers In:			
Special Revenue Funds	$ 443,000	$	$ 443,000
Enterprise Funds	5,372,800		5,372,800
Internal Service Funds	131,700		131,700
Subtotal	$ 5,947,500	$	$ 5,947,500
SUBTOTAL REVENUES AND OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	$ 298,834,621	$ 8,472,386	$ 307,307,007
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	$ 46,183,914	$	$ 46,183,914
TOTAL RESOURCES	$ 345,018,535	$ 8,472,386	$ 353,490,921

EXHIBIT B

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
FISCAL YEAR 2000
BUDGET AUGMENTATION - EXPENDITURES
GENERAL FUND

	Current Budget	Adjustment	Augmented Budget
GENERAL GOVERNMENT			
City Council	$ 1,344,073	$ 10,000	$ 1,354,073
City Clerk	941,885		941,885
City Manager	3,349,080		3,349,080
City Attorney	4,962,425	(100,000)	4,862,425
Human Resources	3,366,574	(39,318)	3,327,256
Finance and Business Services	5,934,132	(50,000)	5,884,132
Internal Audit	528,814		528,814
Architectural Services	1,110,284		1,110,284
Planning And Development	4,774,763		4,774,763
Information Technologies	9,270,944	50,062	9,321,006
Purchasing & Contracts	1,572,757		1,572,757
Real Estate & Asset Management	435,081		435,081
Building Services	8,132,765		8,132,765
Utilities	7,237,271	175,000	7,412,271
Non-Departmental	3,420,216	(500,000)	2,920,216
Subtotal	$ 56,381,064	$ (454,256)	$ 55,926,808
JUDICIAL			
Municipal Courts	$ 10,321,237	$	$ 10,321,237
Public Defender	769,591		769,591
Alternative Sentencing & Education	2,925,611		2,925,611
Subtotal	$ 14,016,439	$	$ 14,016,439
PUBLIC SAFETY			
Metropolitan Police	$ 75,172,389	$ (750,000)	$ 74,422,389
City Marshals	4,170,504	165,000	4,335,504
Fire Services	46,476,468	(250,000)	46,226,468
Detention And Correctional Services	16,965,322	(250,000)	16,715,322
Building And Safety	9,634,686	39,318	9,674,004
Neighborhood Response	1,300,433	151,000	1,451,433
Traffic Engineering	9,180,517	100,000	9,280,517
Subtotal	$ 162,900,319	$ (794,682)	$ 162,105,637
PUBLIC WORKS			
Administration	$ 1,235,606	$ (50,062)	$ 1,185,544
Engineering And Planning	11,370,042		11,370,042
Street Maintenance	720,260		720,260
Subtotal	$ 13,325,908	$ (50,062)	$ 13,275,846

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

MAYOR GOODMAN	All right, Item 105. This is going to be a public hearing on R-74-2000. Discussion and possible action of a resolution to augment and amend the fiscal year 2000 General Fund budget $8,472,386. The staff recommends approval of the augmentation and amendment to the General Fund budget. This is a public hearing, I now declare it open. Mr. Vincent.
MARK VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES	Thank you again, Mayor. Mark Vincent, Finance and Business Services. If I could have the overhead, please. This item is a public hearing because one of the revenue sources in the General Fund is ad valorum taxes, property taxes, so NRS requires us to have given proper notice and hold the public hearing. This first slide just indicates the sources of revenue that we are augmenting with. About 2 ½ million from licenses and permits, including some franchise fee revenue in excess of what we had planned. Consolidate tax, which is primarily sales tax, sales and use tax is a major component. Fines and forfeitures and there's some miscellaneous revenue. In addition to that 8.4 million, 8.5 million additional revenue, we have about 1.6 million in cost reductions for this year's operating budget to bring a total of about 10.1 million that we are either augmenting or transferring for other uses. Our recommended uses about 5.4 million, we recommend putting in our Capital Projects Funds. About 2.2 million go into our Building Reserve. The City just recently had a bond rating increase. One of the reasons why we got that increase is because of our strong reserve balances, both in the General Fund and in our Building Reserve Fund. It's important to note that our committed Building Reserve balances have been dropping significantly. It's about half of what it was a couple years ago. It's imperative in my opinion that we begin to replenish some of those Building Reserves. There's an item this morning for an ERP, an Enterprise Resource Planning project relative to five business systems that we are moving forward that's consistent with our Strategic Plan. So this technology funding that we're putting there is to help us towards that three-year plan for that Hansen project. Fire Services is a minor item that we need to fund with respect to some modifications of existing fire stations. Our traffic and our nominal drainage funds, those fund balances have been depleted and we, this – would put a half a million dollars in fund balance to both of those funds.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

Debt service 3 million, $3.1 million in debt service, that is related to the park bonds that we sold last summer. Not only do we have to make this year's debt service, but it's been our policy to also fund one year debt service in advance. And we don't typically take that out of the bond proceeds. And so, in order to keep consistent with our policy, we need to fund that in the Debt Service Fund.

Council's made the decision I – believe months ago, to extend the VSP program. There's some additional costs this year for the vested benefits for those payouts. There's savings next year for those, but none the less I have to fund about 1.5 million of – the VSP related, Voluntary Separation Program related costs this year. And then there's some other funds that also need to be – funded. So that's the planned uses of the $10.1 million.

Be happy to answer any questions you may have.

COUNCILMAN BROWN — Public hearing.

MAYOR GOODMAN — Any members of the public wish to be heard? All right. I'll close the public hearing. Councilman Brown?

COUNCILMAN BROWN — Your Honor, I've – had a discussion with Mr. Vincent on this item and I certainly, in light of our recent bond rating, I certainly don't want to jeopardize the policies that are in place. I did talk to him about, though, on this particular augmentation and in the light of the presentation we received earlier from Mr. McNellis on the parks, he had indicated that there's 20 million that were under construction or finished this past year, fiscal year 30 million anticipated with an additional 10 million on the table. My concern is that that overall program may come in under funded. Especially as we get into actually going out, buying some land, etc.

So I'd talked to Mr. Vincent about the possibility of including in the Capital Project Fund augmentation monies set aside to supplement that parks priority list. Anticipating that things will continue on their upward trend and we will be back in December with an additional augmentation, I've asked that if – we could take a percentage of that 5.35 million and dedicate it to the Parks Fund. And --

MAYOR GOODMAN — Is that a question?

COUNCILMAN BROWN — It's kind of a question leading up to a statement. And – we've had some debate on this one. But I – feel very strongly that if we – let an opportunity like this go by on an augmentation -- We certainly have our priorities, but this Council has decided the parks priority list is and remains a

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

	top one. I'd like to see a certain percentage of that project fund be dedicated back into the parks priority list. We – can't seem to agree on a number. What I'd like to put forward, I'll – have Mr. Vincent respond to it before I make any kind of motion, but I'd like to see at least 10% of the overall augmentation be dedicated to support that parks priority list. And either look at other ways we can link some of this existing funding into the December augmentation, find other ways to support some of these listed expenditures or transfers or simply find other ways to cut back on money. I just – feel very strongly we can't let an augmentation go by without supporting the parks priority program.
COUNCILMAN REESE	I can certainly second that.
MAYOR GOODMAN	Anybody else like to be heard?
COUNCILMAN WEEKLY	Yes, Your Honor.
MAYOR GOODMAN	Yes, Councilman Weekly.
COUNCILMAN WEEKLY	Just like to ask, in reference to Councilman Brown's question that he's asking here, would this have anything to do with when, I guess, the City Managers came around and ask us about proposed parks that we'd like to see happen in our Wards? Is that what we're relating this to?
COUNCILMAN BROWN	It's, we – have the priority parks list that Mr. McNellis, I think those were the top eleven.
COUNCILMAN WEEKLY	Yes.
COUNCILMAN BROWN	Those look like they're fully funded. We never know. Some are coming in under, some are coming in over. But on the tail of that, we have an additional five or six projects that are critically important. I just feel that we have to start building a reserve fund for our capital program for parks. These dollars are not allocated to anything but in support of the approved projects, including some of the equipment that we go in and retrofit these parks. I just feel the worst – case scenario would be is we move forward into the major park projectS, we come in underfunded, some of these projects have to be done in phases or are half complete or 90% complete and delays it. I think this would add, just like we do with all these other building reserves, technology, fire services, it gives our parks a little bit of a cushion, which – is the driving impetus behind the – motion.
COUNCILMAN WEEKLY	Okay. I guess one of the concerns that I have is I know we came in at a really odd time here in the budget. And when we were, when I was specifically asked about any proposed parks or any idea for future parks, I guess my question

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

	would be where would that fall into this proposed budget. I know Mr. McNellis just kind of give, gave, had given us a presentation on the eleven parks that we're, the proposed parks that we're looking at now, but I – remember submitting three – possible or proposed future parks and I don't recall seeing them anywhere on that list.
MARK VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES	Those items, I believe, have not been prioritized because they could not be fully funded. And so, I, Councilman, if I understand your question, I think you asked me a question, is that there may be – some needs that haven't been prioritized and what you're suggesting is we're missing an opportunity here to set aside some – of the funding that we can build a reserve for the ability to prioritize those other projects. I think that's what you're --
COUNCILMAN BROWN	Yes and no. If these – priority projects list, the eleven that are on the top list, if they all came in under budget, it'd be wonderful. We'd have excess money to immediately roll over to the next list, including any kind of reserve that we start to build up for that. My concern would be of the eleven projects that have been deemed priority, including some of these retrofits and upgrades and things we do on a normal basis, my concern would be that we – hit a streak of overbudget, high bids and are – forced back into a situation.
MARK VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES	Well, if, the process, as I understand it, is if we, if our – bids came in high, or if there was a request to -- for some reason add scope, modify the project to add amenities or whatever to an existing project that's already been prioritized, that that would come back to Council any way. Council would have to decide do we want to add that scope, do we want to descope, what do we do? We, part of the answer I wanted to give you to the earlier question is we – track revenue on a – monthly basis and we produce a quarterly revenue report that you all have an opportunity to look at. We use that as a – benchmark when we go through all of our planning, which is, seems to be constant. We're always looking for where do we anticipate we're going to have excess revenue and what are the needs that we think, some of which you've notified us or you've already taken action on, or ones that we anticipate. We – do anticipate, we're always looking at the possibility that that, the bid on a park project for example would come in high or that at the last minute there'd be some kind of a Council directive to make some kind of a change in that park project. So we try to anticipate those. I, I'm confident that – whether we do it here or whether we do it as a result of closing the fiscal year with our excess General Fund balance, that – we're going to be able to accommodate at least the items that I've been hearing about and what I

**CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

heard Mr. McNellis talk about. But that means that somewhere down the road, that's got to be Council's priority. That we're going to put that money towards those types of projects. And if that's what the Council wants to direct us to do, that's what we'll do.

But we – do anticipate those sorts of things ourselves. We – try to – make sure that we, that we've identified where those potential revenue sources could be so that when those issues do come up that we're able to accommodate those requests, if that's what the Council directs us to do. And I'm pretty confident we'll be able to do that. I don't particularly have a – as I look at the – spending plan for next year's projects, we have a significant amount of money. I've forgotten the number now, but it's, I believe it's now over $40 million of the $70 million that we just added to our plan. That money's not going to be spent next year. I mean it's just not physically feasible. Those projects are going to take some time. And so there's always an opportunity for us to – work within those times frames and also for subsequent augmentations.

So I don't have a problem with your suggestion about earmarking a part of this as a reserve. That doesn't bother me. I think that's okay. My only caution in my mind is whatever those projects are that we identify, that we come back to the Council as a whole and they get reprioritized.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD — Your Honor?

MAYOR GOODMAN — Yes.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD — On that issue, of what, Councilman Brown was still looking at having a chance to talk to you, also City Managers and Dr. Jackson and Public Works, we sat down with. The concern, and I follow Councilman Brown with this, is that we've set a priority, we've followed the priority and we've done everything we can to be fiscally responsible. But also in the same respect, we have to have the fulfillment as a commitment back to the constituents.

We've made a promise to – this community that we're going to build these parks and the, I have the same concern. Because looking at some of the accounting and the bids that have gone out for numerous parks as well as upgrades, we, I don't think we – we might be close to the ceiling. And to have that at least earmarked as a – precedent, we need to have that type of – cushion because there's no use building a park if you're only going to do it half way. I don't believe in building a park and then going back and finishing it. If you're not going to do it all at once, that's what the constituents want, they don't want to have a park half built

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2000

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

and then while they're playing, we're trying to do ball fields, you know, they're out playing baseball and the next acre's being reprogrammed, or processed. So I do support the motion. The only caution I give is to, and concerns talking to Dr. Jackson, that we – need to also maintain that we have the faculty and – with that in mind, our programming people, to have that – very responsible. Exactly. And that, that's the only concern I have.

I support the Councilman's proposal 100%, because I don't think we can half build parks. But in the same respect in talking with Mr. Goecke and Mr. McNellis, we need to program those two people, so we get the parks in line. And then talking to Dr. Jackson, in the same respect, we need to be able to have the staff that fulfills that. And that goes out to the entire Council and the Mayor, Your Honor, just that we have, there's no use having the facilities if we can't staff them.

MAYOR GOODMAN

Councilman Brown?

COUNCILMAN BROWN

Your Honor, I'll raise two final points for the Council's consideration. One is the whole approach to our augmentation. And I'll try to make it simplistic, because that's the only finance I understand. We – do well with revenues, the economic's good, drives the General Budget. We also do, on the flip side of the coin, ways to become more efficient, so that creates this surplus fund twice a year. We have perhaps not as much as other agencies, but we have become somewhat reliant upon this augmentation to do one-time expenditures, one-time projects. That needs to be addressed from a policy standpoint. How much reliance we put on anticipating augmentation to either pay for things we've already approved or kind of a wish list, slush fund at the end of the year. I – would raise that in some kind of workshop or policy debate or discussion with the Manager's office. Very important.

Secondly, and – I say this with the utmost respect, most of the time if it comes down to buying five less computers or putting in, delaying a drainage program or a street for a couple months, everything has to be placed on this priority list. I want parks on that list with traffic and drainage, fire services, technology, building reserve almost as an automatic. Because parks has been and traditional is the first one to get bumped off any kind of funding list. Either the general budget or augmentation and that's, I think that's part of the problem that we're in today. Because years ago, it was the easiest thing to cut. This Council has flipped it all the way around and put parks, open space, recreational opportunities as a priority. And in a situation like this, with the budget, I think that priority has to be reflected, even if it is 5,000 or 50,000 or 500,000, whatever the case may be, parks cannot be any less important than any – other issue that we do as far as a Council.

Those two issues I bring up because I think I certainly have a lot to learn about how Mark goes through the reserves, the pay backs, the debt repayment, but with – that stated, I'd be ready to make a motion, Your Honor.

MAYOR GOODMAN — Okay. I appreciate that. I would just like to add that as part of your concept, Councilman Brown, on the – issue of parks, I think we have to start thinking in terms of the park that we're going to have downtown as well. Where the Federal Post Office is located. Hopefully we're going to get that building within the very foreseeable future and we're going to need to start thinking in terms of how we're going to refurbish it and also refurbish the parking area around it and make that into the park that I think the entire Council believes is necessary in order to have it as the frontist piece for downtown. So, just wanted to, I – concur with the Councilman's philosophy.

COUNCILMAN REESE — You mean you're putting another park on the list?

MAYOR GOODMAN — This is at the top of the list.

COUNCILMAN BROWN — Your Honor, I would **move that we add 10% of the $8.4 million to be dedicated to the parks priority list and also indicate that in the anticipated December augmentation, if things need to be made up that are in front of us today, they would be included in that augmentation and also that all future augmentations reflect some component of our parks and leisure activities.**

MAYOR GOODMAN — All right. There's a motion.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD — Your Honor, I'd support that motion. The only thing I'd ask to that is, Dr. Jackson, can you also give us a proposal of what it will take once we make, once we have these facilities up, the personnel, so we can also look at that. Because I follow Councilman Brown's proposal that we need to have parks as a priority. We, this Council's gone far beyond steps to make sure that we have the open spaces, programmable spaces to look out for tomorrow's future, to look out for our children. But in that same respect, I, if you could give us, the Mayor and Council, kind of what you're looking for in the programmable in that same augmentation. That way we know that we build it and we have the – staff to accommodate it.

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT: ITEM 105 – R-74-2000

DR. BARBARA JACKSON, DIRECTOR OF LEISURE SERVICES	Certainly, I'd be glad to do that. And once I have the list in hand, we'll look it over and see what in fact is programmable from our aspect and what – we would intend to do.
COUNCILMAN McDONALD	Also staff, cost levels and such, that you'd need.
DR. BARBARA JACKSON, DIRECTOR OF LEISURE SERVICES	All of that. I will.
COUNCILMAN McDONALD	Please.
MAYOR GOODMAN	Thank you.
MARK VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES	And, Councilman, also with all due respect, maintenance costs from Mr. Haugness' organization needs to be considered as well.
COUNCILMAN McDONALD	Exactly. I'm sorry. Yeah, Mr. Goecke was, I spoke with him just before he left. He's back now, but that was also. Mr. Goecke, if you could also give us the costs.
MAYOR GOODMAN	All right. There's been a motion. Vote on the motion, please. Post, please. Motion carries. **(Motion carried unanimously with L.B. McDonald not voting.)** Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Vincent.
	END RELATED DISCUSSION – RESUMED RELATED DISCUSSION UNDER ITEM 106
MARK VINCENT, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES	Thank you, Your Honor. This item is required for a public hearing, again, because of the ad valorum tax, the property tax is a revenue component here. This is tandem to the augmentation that we just did in the General Fund. Just for purpose of clarification, there is 3.1 million in the augmentation of the General Fund that did relate to parks. If we didn't augment that for the parks debt service, it would have had to have come out of the parks project scope. This component is the first year debt service on those park bonds and it's in order. Recommend approval.
	END OF DISCUSSION

/vwd