

**FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**COUNCIL SUBMITTALS**

**MARCH 26, 2009**

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
1	HR	72 hour pay periods (furloughs)	<p><b>Proposed:</b> Non Safety - employee takes off one 8 hour day per pay period. Effect 9/80 and 4/10 schedules? As part of the solution, one way to implement would be to revert back to a 5/8 schedule.</p> <p>Could possibly result in employees who are on modified work schedules to return to a 5/8 schedule. (Would need additional research on how to implement for departments with modified work schedules or minimum staffing requirements.)</p> <p>Additional proposals (from Departments) based on impacts of reduced work schedule:</p> <p>City Mgr: Furlough a Council Meeting every other month, go to strict action minutes, Council give City Manager higher signature authority (to reduce need to bring items to City Council)</p> <p>Pub Svcs: Schedule furloughs in a manner to provide coverage to reduce impact to public.</p> <p>PD - Such a furlough would result in longer wait times for the public at the PD's front counter, longer times to process evidence and property, it would require sworn officers to do some of the duties currently being done by non-sworn personnel, longer times to process request public information, and a possible reduction in crime prevention services. Of course, these would be the same ramifications of layoffs in the same positions.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	<p>Lower staffing levels available to provide service the public.</p> <p>10% reduction in work time would also reduce work product by 10% especially in smaller divisions.</p> <p>Reducing pay would present a recruitment and retention issue and would affect employee morale which may result in reduced productivity.</p>	<p>10% of salary: <i>See attached spreadsheet.</i></p> <p>One 8 hour day per pay period = 10% of salary (8/80).</p> <p>Note: If exempt employees are taking unpaid days off, they lose their exempt status. Need to be careful so that they are not incurring overtime.</p> <p>Requiring employees to take time off in Depts, with minimum staffing requirements, (ex. Telecommunications) will result in additional costs due to overtime.</p>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
2	HR	Salary Reduction for PD & FD (furlough for remainder)	<p><b>Proposal:</b> 10% reduction in base salary.</p> <p>Note: Salary is calculated as part of total compensation, when comparing to the survey agencies.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	Reducing pay would present a recruitment and retention issue and would affect employee morale which may result in reduced productivity.	<p>(See spreadsheet for details by association)</p> <p>Base salary reductions would also reduce many special pays since these pays are based off of a % of salary.</p> <p>Base salary reductions may also reduce overtime costs.</p>
3	HR	Eliminate car allowance	<p><b>Current:</b> \$477/mo for City Mgr, Ast City Mgr, Dev Svcs Dir, Fin Dir, Adm Svcs, Dir. Amount adjusted annually by CPI or to average of survey agencies.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Eliminate car allowance</p> <p>Note: Car allowance is calculated as part of total compensation, when comparing to the survey agencies.</p>	Yes	No	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	<p>\$28,620</p> <p>(Savings would be offset by additional costs to pay mileage reimbursement if employee needed to use personal vehicle for City business.)</p>
4	HR	Eliminate ½ executive leave	<p><b>Current:</b> 80 hours (112 BCs). If regularly assigned to Council, Planning Commission, Parks &amp; Rec, or major projects and assignments can be approved for up to addl 40 hours.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Reduce to 40 hours (56 BC).</p>	Yes	No	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	<p>No immediate cost savings. Could reduce other leave banks. and lower leave payouts upon separation</p> <p>Could result in some cost savings if vacation cap (no excess pay) policy was reversed.</p>
5	HR	Reduce management benefits by 35% or more	<p><b>Flex Bucket</b></p> <p><b>Current:</b> \$1483 (Directors), \$1457 (Division Managers)</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Reduce by 35% = \$964 (Directors), \$947 (Division Managers)</p> <p>Note: Benefits are calculated as part of total compensation, when comparing to the survey agencies.</p>	Yes	No	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	<p>\$176,295</p> <p>Note: Possible compaction issues</p>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
6	HR	No pay for floating holidays	<p><b>Current:</b> Employees who don't use their floating holiday hours will get cashed out at end of year.</p> <p>For employees who must work with without regards to holidays, floating holiday hours are included in holiday bank cashout.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Employees must use holiday hours or lose them.</p> <p>Note: The parties (City and respective Employee Association(s)) to this MOU agreement/article considered a wide variety of issues in the context of good faith negotiations in accordance with Government Code Section 3500 et seq. (Meyers-Millias-Brown Act). This MOU agreement/article represents the successful conclusion of the legal good faith bargaining process.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	<p>Amount budgeted for FY 09-10. See solution # 14.</p> <p>Payout for Floating Holiday in 2008: See solution # 14.</p> <p>Requiring employees to take time off in Depts (with minimum staffing requirements) will result in additional costs due to overtime.</p>
7	HR	No cash payment for holidays (Excluding floating holidays)	<p><b>Current:</b> Employees (who must work without regards to holidays) can cash out hours (96), or take time off (holiday bank).</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Eliminate cash out option, employees must use time off.</p> <p>Note: The parties (City and respective Employee Association(s)) to this MOU agreement/article considered a wide variety of issues in the context of good faith negotiations in accordance with Government Code Section 3500 et seq. (Meyers-Millias-Brown Act). This MOU agreement/article represents the successful conclusion of the legal good faith bargaining process.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	<p>Amount budgeted for FY 09-10 (includes cash out for holiday bank and floating holidays): \$884,690</p> <p>(Pay out for Holiday Bank Pay and Floating Holiday in 2008: \$1,458,732)</p> <p>Requiring employees to take time off in Depts (with minimum staffing requirements) will result in additional costs due to overtime.</p>
8	HR	Reduce pay & benefits across the board – additional 2% for management	<p><b>Proposed:</b> <i>No specific proposal at this time.</i></p> <p>Note: Salary and benefits are calculated as part of total compensation, when comparing to the survey agencies.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	None	See attached spreadsheet for salary and benefit reductions by association.

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
9	HR	Increase employee PERS contribution	<p><b>Current:</b></p> <p>Non-safety employees, in the CalPERS retirement system, contribute 1% of their salary towards the employee contribution and 2.52% of their salary towards the employer contribution for a total of 3.52%.</p> <p>Safety employees – the cost of the CalPERS retirement system is calculated as part of total compensation, when comparing to the survey agencies. (Also applies to Non Safety employees.)</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b></p> <p>Non Safety - Employees to pay entire cost of PERS contribution (8%), Safety – Employees to pay 7% of PERS contribution (reg: 9%).</p> <p>Note: The parties (City and respective Employee Association(s)) to this MOU agreement/article considered a wide variety of issues in the context of good faith negotiations in accordance with Government Code Section 3500 et seq. (Meyers-Milias-Brown Act). This MOU agreement/article represents the successful conclusion of the legal good faith bargaining process.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	Increasing employee benefit contributions would present a recruitment and retention issue and would affect employee morale which may result in reduced productivity.	<p>See attached spreadsheet. (This contribution would not be subject to taxes.)</p> <p>For non-safety – City would no longer be able to report Employer Paid Member Contributions (EPMC) since employee is paying the entire cost. Would result in decreased final compensation figures.</p> <p>For safety – EPMC would decrease by 7%. Would result in decreased final compensation figures.</p>
10	HR	Proportional layoffs	<b>Proposed:</b> <i>No specific proposal at this time.</i>	Yes	Yes (impact only)	No	July 1, 2009	Lower staffing levels	To be determined.
11	CMO	Ask for Corporate Donations of \$20 Million – Naming Rights of City Hall	This suggestion is almost identical to Corporate Sponsorship of Public Facilities. Essentially, it would involve the solicitation of a donor (private or corporate) to purchase the naming rights to City Hall of other public facility.	Yes	No	No	Again, this is very similar to the Corporate Sponsorship of Public Facilities solution with similar factors involving implementation	None	Unless the City actually solicits for the naming rights to City Hall, it is impossible to know whether the \$20 million figure is achievable and if so, under what conditions? Any RFP soliciting proposals must require a minimum donation to be considered.

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
12	Finance	Eliminate one or two ABLE helicopters	ABLE is a joint venture with the City of Newport Beach. Currently, ABLE has three helicopters that are in operation. By eliminating one helicopter, and keeping the staffing level the same, some cost will increase because of increase overhauls and maintenance. Other costs (i.e. hanger fees, utilities costs) that would remain fixed.	Yes	No	No	Possibly six months to one year to sell the aircraft but the economy is soft so finding a buyer may be tough	Significant reduction of patrol time and/or possibly no patrol time when an aircraft is down for maintenance.	The City's 2009 membership share of ABLE's operation is approximately \$857,500 per year which includes the discount of the City of Santa Ana's contract. The City pays for 4 helicopter pilots' salaries and benefits directly at a cost of \$1 million/year. If the operation was reduced because of the reduction of an aircraft, some of the pilots would have to transfer back to the police dept. Therefore, there would not be a savings to the City unless the pilots were laid off. Also, if an aircraft was sold, there may be a return of investment to the City of approx. \$250,000.
13	HR	Close City Hall every other Friday or every Friday – Close between Christmas and New Year	<p><b>Current:</b> City is open every day except holidays.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b></p> <p>a) Close City Hall every other Friday (26 days) – 8 hour work days</p> <p>b) Close City Hall every Friday (52 days) – 9 hour work days</p> <p>b) Close between Christmas and New Years (4 days)</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Once approved by City Council.	City services not available to the public on closed days.	<p>To be determined.</p> <p>Would need to break out salary information for City Hall employees only for salary cost savings.</p> <p>Estimated building cost savings would be \$883 / day.</p>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
14	Fire	Eliminate minimum manning requirements for the Fire Department	<p><b>Current:</b> The current minimum daily staffing level is 32 personnel which ensures 4-person staffing on each of the eight fire suppression and EMS apparatus 365 days per year, 24 hours per day. Fire administration does exercise the contractual agreement of not filling vacancies of 10-hours or less in the interest of fiscal prudence and determined by daily threat levels and operational needs. This level of staffing is consistent with National Fire Protection Administration (NFPA) guidelines, two-in-two-out considerations, and provides excellent levels of public service and firefighter safety. Additionally, the Department deployment model for Advanced Life Support (ALS) is accomplished through the response of five paramedic engines which requires two paramedics per engine along with a captain and an engineer.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Place a timeframe-specific moratorium on minimum staffing requirements allowing fire administration the ability to reduce daily staffing balanced against daily threat levels and operational needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimum staffing 31</li> <li>2. Minimum staffing 30</li> <li>3. Minimum staffing 28</li> </ol>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduces one company efficiency by 25% - If engine company then rescue/fire suppression compromised and paramedic capability eliminated - if quint company then rescue/fire suppression compromised.</li> <li>2. Reduces two companies efficiency by 25% each - if engine companies then rescue/fire suppression compromised and paramedic capability eliminated - if quint companies then rescue/fire suppression compromised.</li> <li>3. Eliminates response capability of one company - personnel and equipment - increases response times city-wide and decreases Department overall response capability and efficiency by 12.5%.</li> </ol>	<p>Savings realized through positions vacated daily, as agreed upon by a timeframe-specific moratorium on minimum staffing, and by not staffing those position(s) with overtime personnel:</p> <p>Approximate annual savings would depend upon the combination of rank positions (firefighter, firefighter paramedic, engineer, captain, battalion chief) not staffed and range as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. \$429,240 to \$488,976</li> <li>2. \$858,480 to \$977,952</li> <li>3. \$1,716,960 to \$1,955,904</li> </ol>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
15	Fire/PD	Reduce existing levels of supervision in the Fire Department (Captains) and Police Department (Lieutenants).	<p><u>Fire Department</u> Supervision by Fire Captains is necessary for both the efficiency and continuity of service provision to the public and the safety of firefighter personnel. <b>This option is <u>not recommended</u> by Fire Administration.</b></p> <p><u>Police Department</u> The Police Department is currently examining its organizational structure to see where supervisory or management positions can be eliminated or consolidated if necessary. The department will have a lieutenant vacancy in May of this year due to a retirement, and the decision has already been made to hold that position vacant. We anticipate one additional retirement in this rank around the end of the year. No decision has been made on filling that position at this time. Any further reductions in positions for this rank would have to be evaluated on final decisions regarding additional vacancy freezes or layoffs and the program reductions/eliminations those cutbacks would produce.</p>	No	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	As noted, this is not recommended by Fire Administration. Police Administration is looking at opportunities for the possible reduction in the number of Lieutenants as vacancies occur	<p><u>Fire Department</u> No fiscal impact identified for the Fire Department.</p> <p><u>Police Department</u> Freezing the Lieutenant vacancy to occur in May will result in a salary savings of \$207,746 per year. (This is the amount if the position was budgeted as vacant - Step 4)</p>
16	Fire	Reduce overtime for Fire Captains	A reduction in overtime for Fire Captains is included in the overall minimum staffing discussion and accomplished via utilization of move-up certified personnel. It is not practical to look at a reduction in overtime from the perspective of a single, specific rank. <b>See line item #14.</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	See line item #14.	See line item #14.

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
17	Fire	Close 1 Fire Station	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elimination of 6-firefighter/firefighter paramedic, 3-engineer, and 3-captain positions, and rank reduction for 3-captains to engineer and 6-engineers to firefighter</li> <li>2. Surplus sale of one engine or quint and reduction in spending for fuel and maintenance/internal rent for that apparatus</li> <li>3. Reduction in uniform and personal protective equipment costs for 12 personnel and 4 post positions</li> <li>4. Sale of fire station property</li> </ol>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement to realize savings of less than 32 staffing.	Eliminates response capability of one company (personnel and equipment), increases response times city-wide and decreases Department overall response capability and efficiency by 12.5%. If a paramedic engine is placed out-of-service then loss of ALS capability is reduced 20% city-wide.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. \$1,601,899.00</li> <li>2. \$266,371.00 to \$466,371 includes vehicle, equipment, fuel, maintenance, internal rent (variance based upon approximate surplus value of decommissioned apparatus and equipment)</li> <li>3. \$59,592.00</li> <li>4. Value of property</li> </ol>
18	Fire	Implement Volunteer Firefighter program	Costa Mesa is a diverse and complex urban community. The knowledge, training, education, and experience of professional firefighters is vital to the fulfillment of the Costa Mesa Fire Department mission, and to the ultimate safety of all who reside, visit and conduct business in the City. While Volunteers are a very useful and essential component of many rural fire agencies, the demands and requirements are completely different from what exists in urban areas such as Costa Mesa.	Yes	Yes	No	If direction were given to establish a volunteer component of the Fire Department, a significant amount of research will be needed to establish how that might be done, liabilities and worker's comp considerations, Meet & Confer issues and related matters. This would likely be a lengthy (12 to 18 months) to establish, if possible.	As noted, Fire Administration does not recommend the use of Volunteer Firefighters in an urban environment. If directed to institute a program, it would most likely involve Volunteers as support as opposed to in lieu of regular Fire Fighters.	Absent extensive research, it is impossible to provide a fiscal impact at this time. On the supposition that Volunteers would serve as support to Fire Fighters, the anticipated cost would be expected to increase for training, equipment, liability, workers comp and related expenses.

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
19	Fire	Contract fire inspections (e.g. fire companies would no longer conduct inspections)	Fire companies are not compensated additionally for conducting fire and life safety business inspection. Inspections are a collateral responsibility of fire companies and overall staffing would not be decreased if inspections were contracted out. This proposal offers no opportunity for cost reduction.	No	Possibly	No	If direction is given to contract Fire Inspections, the Department would first consult with HR to determine if this is subject to the Meet & Confer process? If the concept moved forward, an RFP would be developed to solicit proposals for a private firm to conduct inspections. Because this approach is not used by most if any cities, it is impossible to fairly estimate a timeframe for implementation.	Loss of familiarity by Fire personnel with structures and operations within their service area.	Because this would not result in a reduction in personnel or equipment costs, it is estimated that there would be a cost increase by contracting out this function. No accurate estimates are available at this time.
20		Reduce OT Use by Department by 50% with all OT approved in advance by management level personnel	<u>Fire Department</u> See line item #14 proposed scenario #2  <u>Police Department</u> (Not available at this time)	Yes	Fire Department – Yes  Police Department - Possibly	No	<u>Fire Department</u> See line item #14 proposed scenario #2  <u>Police Department</u> (Not available at this time)	<u>Fire Department</u> See line item #14 proposed scenario #2  <u>Police Department</u> (Not available at this time)	<u>Fire Department</u> See line item #14 proposed scenario #2  <u>Police Department</u> (Not available at this time)

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
21	Fire/PD	Suspend/eliminate all specialty pays, assignment pays & certifications for Police & Fire personnel	<p><u>Fire Department</u> Total includes all bonus and certification pay within the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bilingual</li> <li>• USAR certifications</li> <li>• CSFM certifications</li> <li>• Education 60-180 units, AA/AS, BA/BS, MA/MS</li> <li>• Paramedic recertification</li> <li>• Move-up and administrative assignment</li> <li>• CICCIS certifications</li> <li>• Longevity for pre-certification program employees</li> <li>• Executive professional development</li> </ul> <p><u>Police Department</u> In the case of the Police Department, specialty and assignment pay are given to positions that require either significantly more specialized training (pilots, K-9 handlers), are exposed to more hazardous duties (pilots, motor officers, patrol), or their work hours require shift work, holiday work, weekend work (patrol). Assignment pay for patrol also serves as an incentive for more senior personnel to work in patrol. Other pay, such as language or POST certification pay, serves as an incentive for employees to complete specialized training or higher education, resulting in a well rounded employee with enhanced skill levels.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement for both Departments.	<p><u>Fire Department</u> Incentives create expertise and produce service excellence through continual training and education.</p> <p><u>Police Department</u> These types of pay are standard in the industry and elimination would limit recruiting efforts and may cause officers to seek opportunities in other agencies (lateral movement). It would also impact motivation for officers to improve their skills or finish higher education (most costs are out of pocket to the employee), resulting in a less educated staff.</p>	<p><u>Fire Department</u> Total all categories: \$535,342.20</p> <p><u>Police Department</u> POST: \$1,140,434 Uniform: \$ 254,424 Bilingual: \$ 134,923 Motorcycle: \$ 96,647 Canine: \$ 16,657 Total: \$1,643,085</p>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
22	HR	Suspend/eliminate all City paid training, memberships and conferences	Based upon the adopted FY 08-09 budget, a total of \$679,246 was budgeted for Professional Development, meetings & conferences. This includes both mandatory training & membership (as set by State & Federal law) and discretionary training and conference attendance. The largest percentage of this expense is attributable to dues (such as the League of California Cities, LAFCO) and required certifications (such as P.O.S.T., engineering and inspections licenses).	Yes	Yes	No	Suspension/elimination of discretionary training, memberships and conferences can be accomplished through the normal budget adoption. Suspension/elimination of non-discretionary training and certification that would disqualify personnel from carrying out their assigned duties is not recommended.	Varies. While optional attendance at conferences and training have been cut substantially in recent years, it could be eliminated completely. The expected shortfall would be a work force not current with technologies, professional standards, new State & federal policy directives	Absent adequate time to review the budget detail for every submitted request to ascertain whether requested training is mandatory or discretionary, it is not possible to provide an accurate estimate at this time. A rough estimate would be that approximately \$75,000 could be eliminated by prohibiting all non-mandatory training, conference and membership expenses.
23	CMO	Suspend/eliminate all City Council Advisory Committees	A total of \$30,335 was approved in FY 2008-09 for activities conducted by various City Council Advisory Committees. No additional costs are incurred for staff time do to flex scheduling or staffing by management.	Yes	No	No	Suspension or elimination of Advisory Committees can be done by action of the City Council.	This action would reduce community participation and advisement of the City Council on a variety subjects. Given the nature and variety of activities undertaken by the various committees, it is exceedingly difficult to "quantify" their loss.	Varies depending on Committee requested activities – see <u>Overview</u> for FY 08-09 funding level.
24	HR	Require employees to fully fund their contribution to PERS retirement	The City contributes a 7% contribution for non-sworn employees and a 9% contribution for safety employees towards the required employee contribution. This employer contribution is calculated as part of total compensation when comparing to survey agencies. Current salary levels reflect this contribution.	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	N/A	\$4,080,000

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
25	HR	Eliminate the 2 floating holidays per year	<p>Holiday hours are addressed in the MOU's with the employee groups. All employees receive the equivalent of twelve (12) days per year. (134.4 hours for Fire and 96 hours for all other employees) Sixteen (16) of these hours are considered "floating holiday" hours for non-sworn employees. These "floating holiday" hours are provided in lieu of Lincoln's Birthday and Admissions' Day.</p> <p>Employees may cash out the "floating holiday" hours or take these hours as leave. In calendar/payroll year 2008, 170 employees (out of 261) chose to receive a cash payment for some or all of their Floating Holiday for a total of \$89,000. This amount does not include floating holiday hours that are cashed out as part of a holiday bank (i.e. employee who work without regard to holidays).</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	N/A	Based upon calendar/payroll year 2008, non-safety employees cashed out \$89,000 for Floating Holidays not used during the year.
26	HR	Adopt new marketplace for all employee compensation as the average for all cities in OC	<p>Per the current MOU's the identified marketplace for salary surveys consists of Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Newport Beach, Santa Ana as well as the County of Orange for certain benchmarks including Police and the Orange County fire Authority for Fire positions.</p> <p>The impact of changing the surveyed marketplace to the 32 agencies in Orange County will vary from position to position.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement.	N/A	<p>Based on a very preliminary survey of only a few positions, when all 32 Orange County cities/agencies were surveyed, the surveyed Costa Mesa positions were found to be 0.39% to 10.80% above the County-wide average.</p> <p>This is preliminary information and more extensive surveying would be required to generate more complete data.</p>

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
27		Eliminate positions from the Operating budget when vacated – must be justified anew through the budget adoption process	At present, Department Managers with City Manager approval determine whether there is a need to fill positions that becomes vacant. For the past 12 months, virtually all vacancies have remained unfilled except for some Public Safety positions. This proposed solution would require that all vacated positions be eliminated. Filling vacancies would be justified through the annual budget adoption process.	No	No	No	This is a personnel/budget management issue and as such, no formal policy or agreement would be required. Implementation could begin immediately.	Varies. Dept. management carefully evaluates each vacancy to ascertain if there are alternative, more cost effective means to deliver services without filling vacancies. Establishing a directive that precludes filling vacancies when they occur and requiring re-justification through the budget process will most likely result in a reduction of services. Depending on when a vacancy occurs, this could result in a manpower shortage of as little as a matter of weeks to over 12 months. Additionally, such a policy would encourage managers to retain substandard personnel rather than create a vacancy and lose the position completely until the following year.	Varies depending on the number of vacancies that may occur. This has generally not been an issue given that current staffing levels are below those of 20 years ago and positions are being held vacant depending on service demands and fiscal constraints. Management presently has the authority to delete positions from the budget that are vacant and not required and has done so in year's past.

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
28	PD	Consolidate Traffic Bureau and Field Operations/Patrol and reduce staffing by 15%	<p>The Police Department is not sure of the intent of this suggestion. If it is to eliminate supervisory or management positions, this would be part of the larger discussion regarding the department's organizational structure (see explanation for item #15 above). If the intent is to eliminate the Traffic Bureau function and absorb those duties in Field Operations, the explanation for item #15 would also apply here since no decisions have been made as to what services would best be cut due to the current economic conditions.</p> <p>Service Impacts: The elimination of the Traffic Bureau (if that is the intent of this suggestion) would have a severe impact on the Police Department's operations. The city is the recipient of numerous grants regarding Highway and Traffic Safety and we would likely lose those grants if we had no Traffic Bureau. These grants fund DUI/Drivers License checkpoints and some equipment purchases. See "Service Impact" box for additional information.</p>	Yes	Yes	No	Upon meet and confer agreement and City Council approval	<p>Service Impacts continued:</p> <p>Elimination of Motor Officers would dramatically reduce our ability to enforce DUI laws, making our streets less safe, likely resulting in an increase in DUI related fatal traffic collisions. It would also require patrol officers to handle all traffic collision reports, making them unavailable to respond to other calls for service. The city also would be unable to handle special events such as the OC Fair and Cattle Drive and the OC Marathon without Motor Officers and the Special Events Unit.</p>	(Unknown)

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
29	Develop. Svcs.	Reduce Code Enforcement staffing by 50%	At present, the City has 9 Code Enforcement personnel including a Code Enforcement Supervisor. Two of these positions are funded through CDBG for Housing Code enforcement in target neighborhoods. The remaining 6 Code Enforcement Officers and part-time weekend Code Enforcement complete staffing in this area.	Yes	Yes- Layoffs likely required	No	Assuming the proposed reduction would be accomplished by layoffs as opposed to attrition, the City would need to Meet & Confer regarding the impacts of the layoffs and go through the required, adopted process. This could be as short as 30 days (required notice) or up to possibly 3 months.	A 50% reduction in Code Enforcement staffing would significantly reduce pro-active enforcement efforts and result in a substantial increase in citizen complaints. Overall appearance of properties within the community may be expected to deteriorate. Complaint driven code enforcement actions would most certainly take longer to respond to.	The reduction of 3 Code Enforcement Officers (9 positions less 1 Supervisor, less 2 CDBG funded Code Enforcement personnel and 50% of the remaining 6 officers) would result in an annual savings of \$298,212 (\$99,404 x 3)

#	DEPT/ DIV	PROPOSED FINANCIAL SOLUTION	OVERVIEW	COUNCIL APPROVAL REQUIRED?	MEET AND CONSULT / CONFER?	VOTE BY PUBLIC REQUIRED?	EARLIEST IMPLEMENTATION DATE	SERVICE IMPACT	ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT
30	CMO	Eliminate Inter-Governmental Relations program by dropping State League of Cities membership; non-State mandated dues & registrations and staff support	The City's Intergovernmental Relations program is supported by membership in both the OC Div. of the League of Cal Cities as well as the State League of Cities. It also involves participation in the Legislation Committee of the Chamber of Commerce and other regional groups focused on legislation and actions of the County, State & Federal governments. Staff resources for meeting attendance, preparation of correspondence, positions on legislative matters and related duties. This also includes City Council participation in regional agencies and lobbying efforts.	Yes	No	No	Elimination of the City's Intergovernmental Relations effort could be implemented by action of the City Council and put into effect through the budget process.	On the basis that this effort would be eliminated as opposed to scaled back, the City would rely solely on local representation with the Board of Supervisors, State Assembly and Senate reps. and our Congress member to represent City interests. Due to the number of competing interests at each level of government, the City would simply have to rely on the best judgment of its elected representatives to know how various measures would impact Costa Mesa or cities generally. It may also result in elected officials from the City being ineligible to participate on various regional agencies.	Elimination of the City's annual dues to the State League of Cities, OC Div of the League of Cities, various regional organizations, elimination of all travel to the State Capital and all related direct costs would result in a savings of approximately \$54,000/year. It would also remove the time required by the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, Legislative & Public Affairs Manager, Management Analyst and management/staff in all departments to review & comment on legislative issues impacting the City. Because this is largely an ancillary responsibility for many positions with the City, no analysis has been prepared to determine whether or not staffing could be reduced if the Intergovernmental Relations program was eliminated. It may also limit the opportunity for City council members to participate in regional governance.