

Public Testimony #1

Unfinished Business:

Recommendation from the Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee

Two issues here:

1) The Resolution passed by Council forming the committee is substantively different than the one actually signed by the Mayor on the night passed, (as well as signatures from The City Recorder and City Attorney.) Please explain the discrepancy

08-06 Minutes:

1. Resolution No. 2019-24; a Resolution Approving the Scope of Work and the Timeline for the Cost Review Ad hoc Committee

Madding gave a brief Staff report. She explained that she will bring this back to Council no later than February 4th.

Slattery explained that the Committee will be looking at the General Fund 90% and 10% looking at other issues specifically.

Jensen/Graham moved to approve Resolution No. 2019-24 setting the work program and timeline for the Cost Review Ad Hoc Committee. Discussion: Graham spoke to the importance of getting this done. **Roll Call Vote: Jensen, Seffinger, Akins, Graham and Slattery: YES. Motion passed unanimously.**

Council Communication and Resolution in your 08-06 packet

https://www.ashland.or.us/SIB/files/06182019_Expenditure_Ad_Hoc_CCFinal.pdf

Scope of Work

The purpose of the Cost Review Ad Hoc Committee is to create expenditure recommendations to the City Council that lead to the City's long-term financial sustainability and enhance the City's overall financial resilience.

The Cost Review Ad Hoc Committee will analyze a variety of programs and current operational approaches/systems to determine the long-term financial sustainability of each. These programs may include assessing PERS and Healthcare strategies that would be used in labor negotiations, and conducting cost-benefit analysis of programs such as the City's ambulance service.

Timeline

The Cost Review Ad Hoc Committee will present their findings to-date and the continuation of the Ad

Hoc Committee will be reevaluated by the City Council no later than the February 4, 2020 City Council Business meeting.

THE CITY OF ASHLAND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The scope of work and associated timeline will be adhered to by the Cost Review Ad Hoc Committee.

Signed Resolution in current packet:

https://www.ashland.or.us/SIB/files/050520_Cost_Ad_Hoc_Update_CCFinal.pdf

Scope of Work

The purpose of the Cost Reduction/Efficiency/Alternative Funding/PERS & Healthcare Strategies Ad Hoc Committee is to create expenditure recommendations to the City Council that lead to the City's long-term financial sustainability and enhance the City's overall financial resilience.

The Cost Reduction/Efficiency/Alternative Funding/PERS & Healthcare Strategies Ad Hoc Committee will analyze a variety of programs and current operational approaches/ systems to determine the long-term financial sustainability of each.

Timeline

The Cost Reduction/Efficiency/Alternative Funding/ PERS & Healthcare Strategies Ad Hoc Committee will present their findings to-date and the continuation of the Ad Hoc Committee will be reevaluated by the City Council no later than the January 7, 2021 City Council Business meeting.

THE CITY OF ASHLAND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The scope of work and associated timeline will be adhered to by the Cost Reduction/Efficiency/Alternative Funding/PERS & Healthcare Ad Hoc Committee.

These are not 'scrivener's errors, and the Feb 4th date is clearly mentioned in the minutes, while the Altered Resolution date is different and not in the minutes

Does Council not have a problem with having what they voted on altered?

2) According to "the minutes" a meeting of the committee was held on July 29. One week before the resolution AND the membership of the committee were approved by Council

This seems to be a addition to the web page, and the meeting was never referenced or approved in subsequent meetings. Beyond the obvious, was this properly noticed?

<https://www.ashland.or.us/agendas.asp?sectionID=-1&ccbid=266>

December 4 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
November 20 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
November 6 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
October 16 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
October 2 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
September 18 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
September 4 2019	Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting
July 29 2019	Cost Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting

Russ Silbiger

Public Testimony #2

NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Recommendation from the Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee

Let's cut to the chase here: The Cost Cutting Committee failed to recommend a single thing to cut. Not one penny.

Instead, they were led through 6 months of basically Budget Committee presentations, going over the same issues and questions that have all been discussed before over the years.

And the report? Let's look at the stuff we actually should be doing regularly, and /or ones already we have or should have looked at. Without a result.

What you have is a small piece of what direction the Committee should have given staff at the first meeting. **"Bring us the answers to these questions"**

Instead, 11 months after the first 'cost cutting' idea was approved, we are no closer to dealing with the problem, and we are now in the middle of a fiscal crisis which is likely to be more damaging to us than the last recession.

And we have an interim Administrator and Finance Director. And it doesn't appear to be any hurry to deal with that either.

In the end, three Councilors could come up with nothing actionable. And the other three are far more interested in dealing with it by raising taxes.

So, what's the point? Maybe the Budget Committee can fix it. Next year.....

June 4 2019

Slattery/Jensen Moved that we ask the Mayor with the help of the Administrator to form an ad-hoc committee looking at the cost side of things to help the City be financially sustainable and to help the Community be resilient. Discussion: Slattery spoke to the importance of working on this. Jensen spoke that he hopes this can begin soon. Rosenthal spoke that he will vote against this motion and explained that the City does not need another ad-hoc committee and is not efficient. Seffinger agreed with Rosenthal. Graham spoke in support of the motion **Roll Call Vote: Graham, Slattery, Akins and Jensen: YES. Rosenthal and Seffinger: NO. Motion passed 4-2**

Russ Silbiger

Public Testimony #3

Public Forum

According to the Agenda " **Written testimonies submitted by the deadline will be available to the City Council before the meeting and will be included in the meetings minutes.**"

Yet no such testimonies are included in meeting minutes.

Russ Silbiger

Public Testimony #4

NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Recommendation from the Cost Review Ad-Hoc Committee

There are issues with the spreadsheet in your packet. If you notice, in the Parks Line, General Fund revenue is included. In the rest of it, not so much. That makes it even harder to figure out what's going on. GIGO.

Also, it seems there is a little more than hand waving into the minimal look at value services are presented, though the blind eye to anything not General Fund doesn't help.

In addition, putting Cemetery as a Charter requirement isn't accurate. The Charter enables us to have a Cemetery, and enables us to have a Cemetery Trust Fund, which was designed to pay for operations when the City too them over.

Perhaps a look at how we are spending a million dollars a year on our Cemetery Dept. is in order

Russ Silbiger