

1. 9:30 A.M. Agenda

Documents:

[2021-05-20 Budget Committee Meeting.pdf](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[2020-05-21 Urban Renewal Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)

[2020-05-21 Budget Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)

[2020-05-28 Budget Hearing Minutes.pdf](#)

*Our village is a place where natural resources are valued and protected, where diversity is celebrated, and where a vibrant economy and sense of community pride create and recreate a living spirit. Yachats cares not just for its citizens' basic needs but also supports them in their efforts to excel mentally, physically, artistically, and spiritually. It is a community with an enduring sense of itself.*



**CITY OF YACHATS  
BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING  
Thursday, May 20, 2021 at 9:30 AM**

***Possible City Council Quorum***

**AGENDA**

A public meeting of the Yachats Urban Renewal District Agency, Lincoln County, State of Oregon, and the City of Yachats to discuss the budgets for the fiscal year July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 will be held virtually via zoom. Any person may attend the meeting and hear the discussion and deliberations of the Budget Committee. Please visit the City of Yachats website at <http://yachatsoregon.org> to view ways to submit public comment and access the budget meeting. Notice of these meetings and agenda items can also be viewed on the City's website. The meetings will take place on the May 20, 2021, from 9:30 a.m. and May 27, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of the first meeting is to receive the Budget Message and to receive comment from the public on the budgets. A copy of the budget documents may be inspected or obtained electronically on the City's website, or by appointment at City Hall, 501 Hwy 101 N., between the hours of 9:00 am and 4:00 pm, on or after May 6, 2021. If you need accommodation, please contact the City Hall at 541-547-3565 before the meeting. The City of Yachats is an equal opportunity employer and service provider.

**URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY (URA) BUDGET – 9:30 AM**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Election of URA Chair
- III. Approval of URA 2020-21 Budget Committee Minutes
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Budget for the Urban Renewal Agency for 2021-22 Fiscal Year
- VI. Adjournment

**CITY BUDGET – IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Election of City Budget Chair
- III. Approval of 2020-21 City Budget Committee Minutes
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Public Hearing – Possible Uses for State Revenue Sharing
- VI. City Budget for FY21-22 Fiscal Year
  - i. Debt Service
  - ii. Public Works Operating & Capital Funds
- VII. Adjournment

## Yachats City Council Vision

*Our village is a place where natural resources are valued and protected, where diversity is celebrated, and where a vibrant economy and sense of community pride create and recreate a living spirit. Yachats cares not just for its citizens' basic needs but also supports them in their efforts to excel mentally, physically, artistically, and spiritually. It is a community with an enduring sense of itself.*

A recording will be uploaded to the City website. Meeting Information below.

### How to Provide Public Comment

1. Email [cityhall@yachatsmail.org](mailto:cityhall@yachatsmail.org), or provide written comments in the drop box at the Drive-Up Window at City Hall, up to 2 hours before the meeting.
  - a. Comments will be read during the public comment portion of the meeting
2. If you wish to comment during the meeting, you can join the with the link below. Instructions will be given on how to raise a hand to be recognized and the Moderator will call on participants to talk
  - a. **Comments will be limited to 5 minutes**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87286144059>

Meeting ID: 872 8614 4059

One tap mobile

+12532158782,,87286144059# US (Tacoma)

+13462487799,,87286144059# US (Houston)

Dial by your location

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 872 8614 4059

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kjKLzbW1v>

***The meeting is open to the public and interested citizens are invited to attend. These are open meetings under Oregon law, but a work session is not a community forum; audience participation is at the discretion of the Council. Meetings are audio-recorded. Public meeting minutes are available for review at City Hall. The meeting place is accessible to persons with disabilities. For accommodations, please call (541) 547-3565, or Oregon Relay 1-800-735-2900 TDD) two days in advance. City of Yachats does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, creed, gender, national origin, age, disability, marital or veteran status, sexual orientation, or any other legally protected status.***

**Posted May 6, 2021**



**BUDGET HEARING  
YACHATS URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY**

May 21, 2020

**Draft Minutes**

**I. Call to Order**

City Manager Shannon Beaucaire called the May 21, 2020 regular meeting of the Yachats Urban Renewal Agency Budget Committee to order at 9:00 am in through the Zoom meeting platform. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, John Purcell, Lance Bloch, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald, Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 6.

**II. Election of Chair**

Glenn nominated John Moore to be Chair of the Urban Renewal Agency Board: Aye – 10; No – 0.

**III. Approve 2019-2020 Urban Renewal Committee Minutes**

Vaaler indicated she had minor corrections she would send to Helen Anderson.

\_\_ moved to approve the May 15, 2019 Urban Renewal Agency Budget Hearing minutes as corrected: Aye – 10; No – 0.

**IV. Public Comment - none**

**V. Budget for Urban Renewal Agency**

Purcell wanted to apply \$15,000 the unspent Urban Renewal Agency (URA) money for Public Works to cover the UV doors at the Public Works building. Beaucaire listed the approved projects in the URA plan and was not certain the UV door project fell under one of those plans. She clarified with Dave Buckwald that the UV door project was funded in the City budget.

Bloch noted there was a goal for the URD to address parking but there were no parking projects in the URD capital improvement projects. Mayor Moore noted the goal was a Council goal. Beaucaire stated it was a goal in the original URD document but was not listed as a current project.

Vaaler asked about the property tax line item with the possibility of people not paying taxes due to COVID-19 financial strains. Groth explained he, Beaucaire, and Tom Lauritzen got an estimate of \$395,000 and they took 90% of that to reach \$357,000 figure.

Vaaler noted there was \$150,000 capital project moved from a previous year, which would require an audit due to the expenditure level. She recalled the City's Auditor, Theresa Hanford, noted they could transfer more so that an audit would not be required in the following year.

1 Vaaler noted Tom Lauritzen suggested the URD should reimburse street fund and then the street  
2 fund should reimburse the water reserves. Beaucaire indicated that would be fine if the Committee  
3 agreed.

4  
5 The Committee discussed options for additional transfers in this budget year. Groth noted that  
6 they do a base transfer of \$195,000 so the audit would be required each year.

7  
8 Webb stated he believed the audit was extremely high. Manager Beaucaire noted the audit fee  
9 was \$1,700-\$1,800 and there were additional filing fees for the State.

10  
11 Vaaler clarified that she was recommending to transfer more now and allow it to sit for payment in  
12 the following year. Vaaler stated she thought it was important to look at every \$1,700 in savings.

13  
14 Groth moved to approve a capital outlay transfer to the Water Capital fund 660-1705 for the  
15 earthquake valve at the south tank for \$70,000 for FY21 and for the Highway 101 bridge  
16 earthquake valve for \$100,000 for FY22: discussion

17  
18 Webb clarified that this transfer would free up \$70,000 in the SDC fund.

19  
20 Manager Beaucaire explained the City is contractually obligated to transfer \$100,000 for the debt.  
21 Groth clarified he was not suggesting to eliminate that but to transfer \$170,000 in FY21.

22  
23 McClung stated the earthquake valve was part of the south tank project and it was not completed.  
24 This transfer would reduce the reserves from \$404,000 to 334,000

25  
26 Call for vote: Aye – 10; No – 0.

27  
28 Groth clarified that the URD funds must only be spent on projects within the URD boundary or to a  
29 system that supports the URD district.

30  
31 Groth noted he pays the tax and does not see himself in the district Lauritzen explained the county  
32 has a software limitation that indicates a tax for the URD on every tax payer within in the City limits,  
33 but funds from only those within the URD get put into the URD fund. Taxes from those outside of  
34 the URD go to the county.

35  
36 Groth asked if the transfer for I&I would be for a project within the URD. Manager Beaucaire  
37 stated Public Works could definitely find projects that fit that criterion.

38  
39 Webb clarified that it would be in the best interest to fund as much as possible from the URD.  
40 Groth suggested they look at the scheduled projects to determine if there were other projects that  
41 could be added. Vaaler clarified that the URA Board would need to approve any changes.

42  
43 Glenn moved to approve the Urban Renewal Agency Budget for FY20-21 as amended: Aye – 10;  
44 No – 0.

45  
46 Moore adjourned the meeting at 9:58 am.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51 \_\_\_\_\_  
52 W. John Moore, Chair

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shannon Beaucaire, City Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

DRAFT



**BUDGET HEARING  
CITY OF YACHATS  
May 21, 2020**

**Draft Minutes**

**I. Call to Order**

City Beaucaire called the May 21, 2020 regular meetings of the Budget Committee to order at 10:05 am in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O’Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, Lance Bloch, John Purcell, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Absent: none. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald and Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 8.

**II. Election of Chair**

Glenn moved to elect John Moore as Chair of the Budget Committee: Aye – 10; No – 0.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Vaaler indicated she would send minor corrections to Helen Anderson.

Vaaler moved to approve the May 15, 2019 budget hearing minutes as amended: Aye – 10; No – 0.

**IV. Public Comment - none**

**V. Public Hearing – State Revenue Sharing**

Moore opened the public hearing on State Revenue Sharing at 10:07 am.

Moore explained the City is required by law to have a public hearing to be eligible to participate in state revenue sharing.

There was no public testimony.

Glenn moved to accept the state revenue sharing: Aye -10; No – 0.

Moore closed the hearing at 10:10 am.

**VI. Public Hearing – City of Yachats Budget**

Moore opened the City of Yachats Budget Hearing at 10:10 am.

**A. Debt Service**

Webb asked for clarification on the flow numbers. Beaucaire indicated she and the finance people from the Council of Governments (COG) were in the process of consolidating to get the

1 flow numbers to agree. Webb noted the summary description was not equal to details in the  
2 document. Beaucaire explained the numbers in her document.

3  
4 Tom Lauritzen asked that there be some notation of the loan forgiveness amount to increase  
5 transparency (page 25). Groth clarified the original loan was \$1.7 million and with the  
6 forgiveness the actual amount due is \$1.030 million.

7  
8 **Webb moved to approve the debt service section as presented:** discussion

9  
10 Groth suggested that the transfer section be expanded.

11  
12 **Call for vote: Aye – 10: No – 0.**

### 13 14 **B. Public Works Operating and Capital**

#### 15 16 Streets

17 Webb noted fuel prices were significantly down. McClung stated the impact of that decrease  
18 had not yet shown up in material costs, and he expected to see the impact shortly.

19  
20 Vaaler noted \$50,000 was from the state highway tax. She suggested that this tax would likely  
21 decrease this year. Beaucaire stated the state had not yet provided a revised estimate. Vaaler  
22 suggested they take a more conservative estimate at this time. Beaucaire noted any cuts to  
23 revenue must be reflected in a corresponding decrease in expenditures. Webb agreed with  
24 Vaaler that this estimate should be more conservative.

25  
26 The amount of mowing showed an increase of 35%. Beaucaire indicated she got an estimate  
27 from the mower. Buckwald noted this amount also includes tree removal.

28  
29 Vaaler asked about street lighting and whether some of this could be reduced while still  
30 maintaining safety. Beaucaire indicated this would be a discussion for Council. Beaucaire and  
31 Moore discussed conversion to LED lighting.

32  
33 Groth asked what the \$38,000 in labor included. Buckwald indicated that amount included tree  
34 removal, pot hole filling, and any other work on streets.

35  
36 Groth suggested keeping the \$50,000 estimate and having a supplemental budget to make a  
37 transfer in should the revenues be lower.

38  
39 **The Committee agreed this fund was satisfactory as presented.**

#### 40 41 Storm Drains

42  
43 Vaaler asked why the allocation of labor increased. Beaucaire explained she increased labor  
44 15% across all funds except streets. She noted this increase includes contracted costs, cost of  
45 living increases, step increases, and possible hiring. Vaaler asked that any new hires be  
46 approved by Council. Webb suggested that hiring at this time should absolutely not be done.  
47 Beaucaire noted hiring would only be done as is economically allowed.

48  
49 Webb asked why there was \$30,000 allocated for labor when there were no line items.  
50 Buckwald indicated that the work was maintenance and not part of capital expenses.



1 Groth asked if it was possible to merge streets and drains. Beaucaire indicated this would be a  
2 future discussion. Webb noted that previously there was no budget at all for storm drains and  
3 they decided they needed to have this category so it was part of ongoing planning on  
4 maintenance. McClung added that there were SDC charges specifically for storm drains and he  
5 thought it was good to separate the two.

6  
7 **The Committee agreed this fund was satisfactory as presented.**

8  
9 Water Operating

10 Groth noted there was excess revenues going forward and suggested that excesses be  
11 transferred to capital projects.

12  
13 Webb and Vaaler stated that they did not agree with any increases to water revenues. Vaaler  
14 wanted to be more conservative. McClung stated 67% of revenue comes from water base rates  
15 and that will remain consistent. He predicted they would sell about 25% less water and that is  
16 why he suggested they not transfer the \$100,000 to capital.

17  
18 Anderson reviewed the Public Works and Streets Commission analysis of April 2020 revenues  
19 and where they concluded residential use was up and large user use was down, but this  
20 decrease was not as significant as might be expected.

21  
22 The Committee discussed possible scenarios. Beaucaire suggested they could use the zero-  
23 balance going forward approach next year if there were in a similar situation.

24  
25 Groth explained the auditor conversion to cash/contingency funds line.

26  
27 McClung explained the \$40,000 contract expense was for testing, calibrations, and engineering  
28 not related to a CIP project. Webb asked about main plant outside services. Buckwald  
29 explained this was for lab testing and equipment calibrations which were requirements by OHA.

30  
31 Bloch asked if action was needed to use the \$83,000 going forward to cover lower revenues.  
32 Beaucaire noted they could do a budget transfer resolution to make the adjustment at the end of  
33 the fiscal year.

34  
35 Vaaler clarified there would be no practical difference in reducing revenues to \$550,000 with  
36 \$33,000 in residuals as that would convey a better public image.

37  
38 Moore took a straw poll on reducing the revenues to \$550,000 and the net residual by \$50,000:  
39 No (4): Purcell, Tooke, Moore, Glenn  
40 Yes (6): Keller, Groth, Bloch, O'Shaughnessey, Vaaler, Webb

41  
42 Moore took a straw poll on moving \$33,125 to the contingency fund:

43 No (1): Purcell

44 Yes (9): Keller, Groth, Bloch, O'Shaughnessey, Vaaler, Webb, Tooke, Moore, Glenn

45  
46 **The Committee agreed to change this fund to reflect \$50,000 reduction in revenues to \$550,000**  
47 **and to move \$33,125 to the contingency to make that \$93,125 with a zero balance going**  
48 **forward.**

49  
50 Wastewater

1 Purcell asked for clarification on the \$20,000 for outside services. Buckwald indicated this  
2 money was for rebuilding pumps.  
3  
4 Vaaler asked about the personnel costs, noting the estimated actual was \$255,000 and  
5 \$345,000 was allocated for this year. Webb noted this was \$95,000 increase.  
6  
7 Buckwald noted \$288,000 from FY18-19 went up to \$340,000 to include training of an additional  
8 operator. Webb was ok with that but still does not understand the increase for this budget.  
9 Vaaler noted this reflects a \$95,000 increase due to how it is allocated. She asked where there  
10 was a corresponding decrease in \$95,000 in the budget. Beaucaire noted there were two  
11 factors: allocations and increases. McClung stated its impossible to forecast were extra labor  
12 was needed and the budgeted amounts were based on a work plan.  
13  
14 Groth noted the \$345,000 was assuming a \$300,000 base amount with a 15% increase.  
15  
16 Groth asked to move the \$94,779 going forward to wastewater capital reserves.  
17  
18 Webb was not in favor of a 15% increase of labor. Vaaler agreed that the \$345,000 was  
19 increased too much.  
20  
21 Vaaler clarified that education and training was required for certifications.  
22  
23 A member asked why water has so much more than wastewater in cell phone costs. McClung  
24 reported he had both a cell phone and an iPad that links to the SCADA system. Vaaler asked  
25 Beaucaire if she has looked into reducing this line item cost.  
26  
27 **The Committee agreed to decrease revenues by \$50,000 to \$525,000 and to move the \$94,770**  
28 **going forward balance to capital reserves.**  
29  
30 Streets Capital  
31 Groth asked about the transfers with Visitor Amenities where there was an accumulated  
32 unspent balance of \$331,000. Beaucaire stated that was for the Ocean View Drive and  
33 Driftwood projects.  
34  
35 Groth clarified that the \$200,000 for parking would be discussed with other Commissions and  
36 Council. Webb stated \$200,000 of the \$264,000 transferred in FY17-18 was for purchase of the  
37 501 Building. Lauritzen stated \$200,000 was applied to the 501 for parking portion and  
38 \$200,000 was allocated to streets to purchase additional parking. He added that \$200,000 has  
39 not been spent and should still be in the reserves. Moore indicated some of these reserves  
40 could be added to the Driftwood project.  
41  
42 Webb suggested that in the name of transparency that a portion of the Driftwood project indicate  
43 that some of the funding is coming from this \$200,000 allocation for parking that comes from  
44 Visitor Amenities. Vaaler agreed this issue was important to highlight. The Committee  
45 discussed ways to account for the source for these funds  
46  
47 **The Committee agreed the budget was satisfactory as presented. Vaaler noted that a note**  
48 **would be made for the Visitor Amenity allocation.**  
49

1 Webb asked how much of the Driftwood project would be allocated for parking. Moore stated  
2 33% or \$55,000 of the Driftwood project was allocated for parking to be paid with Visitor  
3 Amenity funds. Webb suggested they have an amount per spot.

#### 4 5 Storm Drains Capital

6 Groth clarified with Webb that Storm Drains and Streets still need to be separated in the capital  
7 reserves.

8  
9 The Committee discussed the importance of maintaining reserves in Storm Drains.

#### 10 11 Water Capital Reserves

12 Moore noted there were three capital projects:

- 13 1. \$35,000 for Horizon Hill
- 14 2. \$100,000 for Streets
- 15 3. \$50,000 for Ocean View Drive

16  
17 Groth suggested a transfer in from General Fund reserves of \$234,238 to cover the repayment  
18 of the Water reserves, as he recalled money was borrowed from water reserves to pay for the  
19 501 Building. Beaucaire asked that this be considered in FY21-22 due to the issues around  
20 COVID-19 and the need to support the community. Groth asked that this issue be put into the  
21 5-year plan.

22  
23 Tooke Purcell asked members to better identify what pages and tables they are referring to.

24  
25 Webb suggested adding a footnote or table at the bottom for Water Reserves Fund 660-1705  
26 that notates this amount was related to the 501 Building loan from the fund. Webb noted this  
27 means they are understating their reserves by \$234,238. Tooke noted this amount was not  
28 currently reflected in the current budget documents.

29  
30 Vaaler asked if they were going to use a 2-step process to move funds from Urban Renewal.  
31 Beaucaire indicated she has a note to do this. Lauritzen stated this \$150,000 was a loan  
32 repayment and should not be reflected as revenues. Webb clarified they would change the line  
33 for "Revenue in Urban Renewal" to "Loan Repayment."

34  
35 **The Committee agreed to make the following changes:**

- 36 1. **Make the \$70,000 transfer in from the URD fund and not from the SDC fund (earthquake**  
37 **valve)**
- 38 2. **Wait until FY22 to transfer \$234,230 to repay the loan taken from this fund to purchase**  
39 **the 501 Building and to note this on the page for fund 660-1705**
- 40 3. **Change the \$150,000 transfer of "Revenue in Urban Renewal" to indicate "Loan**  
41 **Repayment."**

#### 42 43 Waste Water Capital Reserves

44 Webb asked for clarification on the personnel allocations on page 65. Beaucaire stated that the  
45 labor charged to projects was estimated at 15% of the total projects outlay.

46  
47 The waste water capital projects included:

- 48 • \$30,000 I&I Basin Rehab
- 49 • \$80,000 Pole Building
- 50 • \$10,000 Utility Rate Study
- 51 • \$90,000 Waste Water Master Plan

- 1 • \$30,000 Submersible Pumps
- 2 • \$100,000 Plant VFD
- 3 • \$5,000 Tanks Screen
- 4 • \$20,000 Sampler Test Container
- 5 • \$90,000 Vac Truck

6  
7 Purcell noted for the sliding doors for the UV building the description on Page 64 indicates  
8 \$15,000 and on sheet distributed it was for \$10,000. He asked if this project should be a capital  
9 project. Buckwald estimated the cost would be \$10,000. Beaucaire noted she needed to revise  
10 page in the budget document. Beaucaire noted the project was already in process so it should  
11 not be in FY20-21.

12  
13 Vaaler asked for clarification on the need for a labor charge to purchase a vac truck. Buckwald  
14 indicated the purchase takes staff time.

15  
16 O'Shaughnessey moved to approve the Public Works operating and capital projects as revised:  
17 Aye – 10; No – 0.

18  
19 Moore adjourned the meeting at 3:59 pm.

20  
21 ATTEST:

22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 W. John Moore, Chair

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 Shannon Beaucaire

\_\_\_\_\_ Date



**BUDGET HEARING  
CITY OF YACHATS  
May 28, 2020**

**Draft Minutes**

**I. Call to Order**

City Beaucaire called the May 28, 2020 regular meetings of the Budget Committee to order at 9:00 am in Room 1 of the Yachats Commons. Members present: W. John Moore, Jim Tooke, Max Glenn, Mary Ellen O’Shaughnessey, Leslie Vaaler, Don Groth, Lance Bloch, John Purcell, Dawn Keller, and Brad Webb. Absent: none. Staff present: City Manager Shannon Beaucaire, Deputy Recorder Kimmie Jackson, Wastewater Plant Lead Dave Buckwald and Water Plant Lead Rick McClung. Audience: 8.

**II. Public Comment - none**

**III. Public Hearing – City of Yachats Budget**

Moore opened the City of Yachats Budget Hearing at 9:00 am.

**A. Continuation of FY21 City Budget**

General Construction

Beaucaire explained the General Construction fund was a cleanup from the Highway 101 Project. The proposal is to move to \$2,951.15 of the remaining balance to streets capital and \$210,353.77 to water capital.

All members approved this fund as presented.

SDC Administration

Beaucaire noted that \$70,000 to capital reserves was now from taken from URD as decided in the previous meeting. Groth noted that there was a lot of construction going on and they would likely see continued income for SDCs. Keller hoped they were conservative enough. Beaucaire noted the reserve for future years would be \$570,000.

All members approved of this proposed fund with the noted changes.

City Hall

Beaucaire noted the major contribution to City Hall was transient lodging tax. She explained she calculated an average of last three years of tax income and took 50% of

1 that. Taxes from tobacco state revenue sharing were expected to decrease . Marijuana  
2 and liquor were expected to increase.

3  
4 Groth suggested dropping the interest earned line to \$5,000 per month or \$60,000 for  
5 the year (down from \$78,000). Webb asked for information on income for the most  
6 recent months in these categories. Bloch clarified that the proposal meant that the  
7 reserve for future years would drop by \$18,000.

8  
9 Purcell asked for clarification on professional, IGA, services line. Beaucaire explained  
10 this line included the costs for all service contracts.

11  
12 She stated the budgeted amount was currently at \$173,000 and the proposed at  
13 \$190,000. Beaucaire stated the increase includes increases in cleaning costs due to  
14 COVID. Purcell clarified that no one contract was increased by more than 10%.

15  
16 Webb wanted to separate out the joint fund for this as it was such a large amount  
17 compared to other items. He believed that some of the components should be  
18 separated out. He noted the significant increases over the past few years. He also  
19 noted a 25% in auditor expenses, a 33% increase legal expenses, additional software,  
20 the need for a maintenance plan to justify the \$18,000, and the additional monies for  
21 advertising.

22  
23 Beaucaire noted that advertising has gone up because of additional mailings and legal  
24 advertising and postings. She explained the building and land maintenance cost was  
25 based on a standard per square foot. She suggested legal costs were rising due to  
26 more review of vacation rental restrictions and RFP reviews. Auditor costs were  
27 consistent and split among three funds. Beaucaire added that the software costs were  
28 based on three years so the next year should decrease.

29  
30 Webb asked suggested that the maintenance costs should be in the building and land  
31 maintenance lines and not under contracted services. Beaucaire stated there was a  
32 decision put contract costs together. Webb noted they created this 3.5% maintenance  
33 cost based on national group, but they were not allocating expenses to that to specific  
34 items or areas based on that. He asked if there was a plan in place. Beaucaire stated  
35 the Facilities Manager was developing a plan.

36  
37 Vaaler asked about the increase in property tax revenues as some people might not  
38 meet their tax payments in this economic downturn. Beaucaire explained they used  
39 data from Lincoln County which had not yet shown a decrease. Vaaler asked if the  
40 estimated actual was a best estimate of what they will have at the end of the fiscal year.  
41 Beaucaire explained the process of generating the estimated actuals as a way to  
42 estimate how much they would have at the end of the year.

43  
44 Vaaler asked way the franchise income for electricity increased. Beaucaire stated she  
45 probably underestimated the estimated actual of the \$37,000 rather than overestimated  
46 the proposed \$40,000.

1  
2 Vaaler had a tremendous concern about increase in labor beyond what is mandated by  
3 union contracts. She noted increases both in labor and allocated labor throughout the  
4 budget. Beaucaire noted allocated labor was estimated at a 15% increase. She also  
5 noted she was proposing adding a few position if economy allowed. Beaucaire noted  
6 many of these costs were for required services.  
7  
8 Vaaler stated the allocated labor increased from \$656,200 to \$897,500, an increase of  
9 \$241,300 above the estimated actual. She noted the considerable increase for contract  
10 labor.  
11  
12 O'Shaughnessey asked what the criteria were for, "if the economy allows" for hiring.  
13 Beaucaire stated the Plan Ahead team was using a metric of watching water production,  
14 and quarterly taxes of food and beverage and transient lodging taxes. O'Shaughnessey  
15 asked if they had established a percent increase target number. Beaucaire stated they  
16 would be looking at the three trend lines of increase.  
17  
18 O'Shaughnessey noted that Hoen's contract for facilities manager would be going away  
19 as she was converting to an employee position. Beaucaire stated the money might still  
20 be needed if something went awry with the Community Services new position.  
21  
22 O'Shaughnessey suggested it would be helpful to see the allocation to each service  
23 area under contract labor. She also wanted to see the overall salaries to get big picture  
24 of personnel costs. Beaucaire indicated that was her goal. O'Shaughnessey also  
25 wanted to see total cost of legal expense.  
26  
27 Keller had concern about paying for a lot of things that they are not using, such as the  
28 Commons. She noted the Commons was not currently being used and may not be for a  
29 long time. She noted all they needed was a basic empty building maintenance plan.  
30 She wanted to see a worst-case scenario plan. She wanted to remove these types of  
31 expenses. She suggested it appeared that the city is plowing ahead like nothing was  
32 happening with the pandemic. Beaucaire noted that costs could be higher when  
33 classes and other uses resume because of COVID. She stressed the need for investing  
34 in their buildings.  
35  
36 Moore stated they budget for what they might need, but they do not need to spend  
37 everything that is budgeted.  
38  
39 Webb noted investing in buildings was a capital issue, not an operating expense. He  
40 suggested now was a good time to invest in the building as it is not being used.  
41  
42 Webb asked if they had information about people who pay on the three-tiered tax  
43 payment system from the county. Groth did not see that information in the data.  
44  
45 Webb asked about insurance costs, noting Beaucaire said last year that she was  
46 looking to save on insurance.

1 Beaucaire noted they changed to a square foot based insurance cost. She was told to  
2 estimate a 12% increase in insurance. They are looking at options other than CIS as an  
3 insurance provider. Webb asked that they need an executive summary on insurance,  
4 especially when changing the costing method. He did not think a square footage basis  
5 for insurance was the best method where there were plants with high risks and small  
6 buildings with lower risk, such as the Log Church. Webb noted the over 100% increase  
7 since 2017.

8  
9 Vaaler suggested that they could add an extra line to allocated labor that indicated what  
10 was needed now and what would be allocated if certain thresholds are met.

11  
12 Moore noted the only change agreed upon was change in interest earned from \$78,000  
13 to \$60,000.

14  
15 Groth asked if the Council was going to look at the community support contributions.  
16 Beaucaire reviewed the organizations requesting funding.

17  
18 Bloch did not have recommended changes but had concerns. He asked what the  
19 purpose of budgeting was. He asked if the process was to precisely identify what  
20 revenues would be and limit spending accordingly or whether these were rough  
21 estimates so that they would not need a supplemental budget later. He noted the  
22 expenditures going up in a year when revenues are going down. He believed it looked  
23 bad for the City to be spending more when people's personal budgets were going down.

24  
25 Beaucaire stated she tried to be conservative but not cut to the bare bones.

26  
27 Moore asked for a straw poll on this fund:

28 Bloch – yes

29 Groth – yes

30 Keller – no

31 Keller had an issue with the whole thinking behind the budget process.

32 She believed they should be doing everything in a tight and transparent  
33 way. She also believed they should do things in the proper order, such as  
34 take public input before they pursue any grants. She noted they get the  
35 finished product first, and then they have to justify any changes. She feels  
36 like this is "Shannon's budget," not the city's budget. She does not think it  
37 has passed the test to have the public give their feedback.

38 Purcell – yes

39 Webb – yes

40 Webb noted they have to pass a budget and agreed they need to be  
41 better in getting input from public. He noted things like the extra \$13,000  
42 in community support should be restricted. Beaucaire asked for  
43 clarification on what Webb was uncomfortable with. Webb indicated he  
44 was uncomfortable with having an open wallet.

45 Glenn – yes

46 Tooke – yes



1 Vaaler – no

2 Vaaler had concern about transparency on many levels, such as  
3 preparation of this document, decisions that come before Council, and not  
4 having enough time to evaluate and discuss decisions. She believed it  
5 was most important to get this budget correct, even if it took additional  
6 time. Moore noted the plan was to start the budget process early with  
7 Finance Committee but COVID changed the ability to start the process.

8 O'Shaughnessey – no

9 O'Shaughnessey asked how long it would take to do a supplemental  
10 budget. Beaucaire indicated that could take three to four weeks.

11 O'Shaughnessey noted she heard comments about the process that was  
12 use to get here. She noted they do get items late. She was torn because  
13 she cannot get all of her questions answered.

14 Moore – yes

15  
16 Moore summarized this fund was accepted with the \$18,000 change in interest earned  
17 by a 7-3 vote.

18  
19 Beaucaire asked to speak about the transparency process. She noted Oregon's budget  
20 process was one of the most transparent in the nation. Beaucaire noted that grants  
21 often have quick timelines so the City needed to act quickly. Beaucaire noted she and  
22 the team tries to be transparent. She added they were always looking for ways to get  
23 better. She added her descriptions in the document helped with transparency.

#### 24 25 Visitor Amenities

##### 26 Points of discussion:

- 27 • Beaucaire stated the transient lodging tax (TLT) reflected the 50% of the 3-year  
28 average.
- 29 • Beaucaire noted she does have an in-house marketing position in the allocated  
30 labor.
- 31 • Bloch noted the extreme jump in marketing costs and assumed it was due to  
32 COVID.
- 33 • Beaucaire noted that fireworks were typically spent on July 1 and may not be  
34 spent this year.
- 35 • Groth clarified that the Chamber of Commerce did not have input on the  
36 marketing issue.
- 37 • Keller asked what the community support item was. Beaucaire stated it included  
38 banners, Cape Perpetua, landscaping, and other beautification projects.
- 39 • Purcell asked if the visitor center line item funds the Chamber. Beaucaire  
40 explained that the contract has gone to the Chamber and it was out to bid at  
41 present.
- 42 • Webb stated they should eliminate fireworks for FY21 and bring it back in FY22.
- 43 • Webb thought the city was trying to do marketing when that should be done by  
44 someone who better knows how to market.
- 45 • Beaucaire stated the \$50,000 for allocated labor for marketing was specifically  
46 for in-house marketing and she vetted through attorney that it was proper to fund  
47

1 this position under restricted portion of TLT. She indicated this would be a new  
2 position.

3  
4 Webb moved to eliminate allocated labor for \$50,000 for a marketing position: Aye 5;

5 No – 5. Motion does not carry

6 Bloch: yes

7 Groth: no

8 Keller: yes

9 Purcell: no

10 Webb: yes

11 Glenn: no

12 Tooke: no

13 Vaaler: yes

14 O'Shaughnessey: yes

15 Moore: no

16  
17 Webb moved to eliminate the fireworks funding of 2,000: Aye – 3; No – 7. Motion does  
18 not carry

19 Bloch: yes

20 Groth: no

21 Keller: no

22 Purcell: no

23 Webb: yes

24 Glenn: no

25 Tooke: no

26 Vaaler: yes

27 O'Shaughnessey: no

28 Moore: no

29  
30 Webb wanted to keep the community support amount to what it was the previous year.

31  
32 Beaucaire noted the plan ahead team has talked about creating signage to increase  
33 safety awareness. She noted they were creating banners reminding people to practice  
34 safe habits. Vaaler clarified that Beaucaire did not have an estimate of what the banner  
35 project would cost. Webb asked if that could be expensed under COVID funds.  
36 Beaucaire indicated they would be related to COVID.

37  
38 Webb moved to reduce community support from \$25,000 to \$17,850, the amount in last  
39 year's budget: Aye -5; No – 5. Motion does not carry.

40 Webb: yes

41 Purcell: no

42 Keller: yes

43 Groth: no

44 Bloch: yes

45 Glenn: no

46 Tooke: no

1 Vaaler: yes  
2 O'Shaughnessey: yes  
3 Moore: no  
4

5 Moore noted there was no concurrence on any adjustment to this fund. Moore asked  
6 for a vote on approving the visitor amenities fund as presented. (No stated motion)

7 Webb: no  
8 Purcell: yes  
9 Keller: no  
10 Groth: yes  
11 Bloch: no  
12 Glenn: yes  
13 Tooke: yes  
14 Vaaler: no  
15 O'Shaughnessey: no  
16 Moore: yes

17 Vote was 5 ayes and 5 nays so there was not majority support.

18  
19 Purcell moved to reconsider the motion to reduce community support from \$25,000 to  
20 \$17,850, the amount in last year's budget: Aye – 8; No – 2.

21 Webb: yes  
22 Purcell: yes  
23 Keller: yes  
24 Groth: no  
25 Bloch: yes  
26 Glenn: yes  
27 Tooke: yes  
28 Vaaler: yes  
29 O'Shaughnessey: yes  
30 Moore: no  
31

32 O'Shaughnessey asked for clarification on whether additional marketing could be done  
33 by the person who runs the visitor center. Beaucaire stated that the Chamber had  
34 historically been given an additional budget which was \$25,250 for the past year.  
35 O'Shaughnessey clarified this additional money was not for a job position. Beaucaire  
36 stated both the Budget Committee and Council had concern about getting statistics on  
37 how well the marketing was working. Beaucaire added that the proposals received thus  
38 far were emphasizing the marketing rather than the operations side of the visitor center.  
39 She speculated they might have to divide the tasks and rebid. O'Shaughnessey did not  
40 think this time was appropriate to create an additional position.

41  
42 Glenn moved to pass the visitor amenities fund with a reduction in community support to  
43 \$17,850: Aye – 6; No – 0.

44 Webb: no  
45 Purcell: yes  
46 Keller: no

1 Groth: yes  
2 Bloch: yes  
3 Glenn: yes  
4 Tooke: yes  
5 Vaaler: no  
6 O'Shaughnessey: no  
7 Moore: yes

8

9 Library Operations

10 Nikki Carlson, Library Chair, clarified that the \$8,000 contract would include the needs  
11 assessment and repairs. Vaaler asked where the Petersen gift money was located.  
12 Carlson stated that was under capital. Vaaler asked about the increase of \$3,000 for  
13 books and periodicals. Carlson said it was based on increases over the past few years.

14

15 **Glenn moved to adopt the Library fund as proposed:** discussion

16

17 Webb asked what happened if they did not reopen the library. Carlson indicated the  
18 Library funds were currently frozen.

19

20 **Vote: Aye – 10; No – 0.**

21

22 Commons

23 Groth asked what the allocated labor for Commons included. Beaucaire stated that it  
24 included repairs made by Public Works, cleaning contracting and time for community  
25 services, the City Manager, and the Deputy Recorder. She noted the current Facilities  
26 Manager position would go away if they successfully hire the new position. She noted  
27 contract labor was at same level as last year.

28

29 Vaaler noted that the interview process for Community Support was not completed. She  
30 believed leaving the Facilities Manager position in contract labor seemed like double  
31 counting. Beaucaire stated she wanted to hire a professional company, noting she got  
32 an initial quote of \$50,000 just to clean the Commons. O'Shaughnessey asked if there  
33 were any local firms that do the cleaning work. Beaucaire noted it would have to be  
34 Newport or Florence

35

36 Webb asked about rents and fees. Beaucaire noted the \$13,000 reduction was for  
37 classes. The \$17,800 was rent the City paid for rent of the City Hall space.

38

39 **Glenn moved to approve the budget for the Commons fund: Aye – 8; No – 0.**

40

41 Webb: no

42 Purcell: yes

43 Keller: no

44 Groth: yes

45 Bloch: yes

46 Glenn: yes

46 Tooke: yes

1 Vaaler: yes  
2 O'Shaughnessey: yes  
3 Moore: yes  
4

5 Little Log Church and Museum

6 Webb asked for clarification on the building and maintenance line. Beaucaire stated  
7 this budget was identical to the 2019 budget and was in accord with national standards.  
8

9 Moore noted that the City had been grossly underbudgeting for maintenance, so the  
10 City has been gradually increasing that amount. Moore noted they used maintenance  
11 money to replace the heater in the Little Log Church and Museum. Webb emphasized  
12 the need for doing the maintenance now that it was budgeted.  
13

14 Bloch asked why there was a drop in visitor amenities transferring in. Beaucaire they  
15 only transferred in what they needed to. Groth reiterated that they were trying to fund at  
16 their needed levels only.  
17

18 Glenn moved to approve the Little Log Church and Museum fund as presented: Aye –  
19 8; No – 2.

20 Webb: no  
21 Purcell: yes  
22 Keller: no  
23 Groth: yes  
24 Bloch: yes  
25 Glenn: yes  
26 Tooke: yes  
27 Vaaler: no  
28 O'Shaughnessey: yes  
29 Moore: yes  
30

31 Parks and Trails

32 Groth noted the expenditures exceeded income for last year. The Committee discussed  
33 what was contained in the line items.  
34

35 Vaaler had concern about funding conference and travel expenses for trails volunteers  
36 during this time of COVID. Purcell thought Vaaler's question was valid.  
37

38 Vaaler moved to reduce the travel budget from \$2,050 to \$1,000: Aye 10 – 0; No – 0.  
39

40 Beaucaire indicated this decrease in an expense line would result in a decrease the  
41 amount of transfer in from the general fund.  
42

43 Webb moved to approve the parks and trails fund with the reduction in the travel budget  
44 to \$1,000: Aye 10 – 0; No – 0.  
45  
46

1 Library Capital Reserves

2 Carlson noted the beginning balance included the Petersen donation. Beaucaire  
3 clarified that the Friends of the Library had the Petersen money. Beaucaire clarified that  
4 the needs assessment would be paid from the Hall Bequest. Webb noted that  
5 Beaucaire has previously stated the needs assessment was part of labor.

6  
7 Groth clarified that the first two lines under revenues was the \$306,000 ending balance  
8 from the current year. Vaaler clarified this budget does not include any Petersen funds.

9  
10 Beaucaire stated the allocated labor includes 15% of the cost of capital projects.

11  
12 Vaaler moved to approve the Library capital reserve budget as presented: Aye 10; No –  
13 0.

14  
15 City Hall Reserves

16 Groth moved that capital outlay equipment be increased by \$20,000 for FY21 for  
17 emergency supply containers at south and north locations, including installation, to  
18 make a total of \$45,000 for equipment and that capital outlay buildings be increased to  
19 \$211,300: discussion

20  
21 Moore clarified that the equipment outlay increased from \$25,000 to \$45,000; the capital  
22 outlay for buildings to increase by \$166,300 from the General Fund for a total of  
23 \$211,300; and to transfer in from reserves \$95,000.

24  
25 Groth explained the emergency supply containers are paid for through the City Hall  
26 budget and the Emergency Preparedness Committee was asking to replace rusting  
27 containers. City Hall already has a line item for paying for supplies for the emergency  
28 containers. Beaucaire noted this action had been done in the past.

29  
30 Groth stated the \$166,300 was to come from general fund to include \$75,000 that was  
31 there plus additional items. Beaucaire stated that of the \$166,300, \$91,000 was from  
32 the grant and \$75,000 was from the City.

33  
34 Summarized the changes for this fund to be:

- 35 • Beginning balance of \$64,065
- 36 • Income from grant of \$91,300
- 37 • Transfer from general fund of \$95,000
- 38 • No change in allocated labor
- 39 • Capital outlay equipment of \$45,000
- 40 • Capital outlay to buildings of \$166,300

41  
42 Vaaler asked about allocated labor at 15% and noted they were not changing the  
43 allocated labor accordingly. Webb recommended that they have a separate fund for  
44 emergency preparedness. Groth clarified that should include both an operations and a  
45 capital fund. Beaucaire stated it would be a good idea to identify this cost in the budget  
46 but not necessarily to create new funds.

1  
2 Glenn moved to approve the City Hall reserves with the above changes: Aye 10 – 0; No  
3 – 0.

4  
5 Commons Capital Reserves

6 Vaaler moved to approve the Commons Capital Reserve fund as presented: Aye 10; No  
7 – 0.

8  
9 Parks & Trails Capital Reserve

10 Beaucaire noted that the county might not be as generous as they have been for Ocean  
11 View Drive. She stated that the \$50,000 would be applied to the boardwalk near the  
12 Underground Pub.

13  
14 Groth noted beginning balance was from visitor amenities and urban renewal so there  
15 would be restrictions on expenditures.

16  
17 Purcell moved to approve the Parks & Trails capital reserves fund as presented: Aye -  
18 9; No – 1 (Webb).

19  
20 Webb noted the boardwalk project would be enormously expensive. Keller had concern  
21 about the insurance cost of a boardwalk.

22  
23 Little Log Church Capital Reserves

24 Beaucaire noted this allocation was made in previous years. She stated the City would  
25 be applying for a Ford Family Foundation grant and that would require City matching  
26 funds.

27  
28 Beaucaire clarified that the labor was 15% of \$150,000 capital project.

- 29  
30
- 31 • Vaaler recalled a long discussion last year. She remained opposed to moving  
32 this issue forward. She did not feel that the community was on board with this  
33 project and she wanted to find out what the community truly wanted. She did not  
34 think this was a year to be spending on this project.
  - 35 • Tooke agreed with Vaaler.
  - 36 • Glenn stated the project had been before the community for several years and he  
37 had heard nothing negative from the community. He noted the Log Church  
38 Board had been fundraising. He noted they were not spending this allocation  
39 unless they have to, and he wanted the money to leverage for grants.
  - 40 • O’Shaughnessey acknowledged the emotional element but did not think this was  
41 the time to be spending this money
  - 42 • Bloch indicated he saw the Little Log Church as a museum and wanted to  
43 support that, but with the current virus situation, this would not be the best year to  
44 do this project.
  - 45 • Groth had concern that if they do not proceed, the building might deteriorate so it  
would not be usable.

- 1 • Keller noted they have been fundraising for two years and only have \$10,000.  
2 She was not hearing community support for this project. She had concern that  
3 moving forward with a \$300,000 project would anger citizens. She noted that  
4 nobody will be using the building for potentially several years.
- 5 • Beaucaire explained the history of why the project has been on the books for this  
6 long.
- 7 • Purcell reviewed some history and indicated he believed it was a community  
8 decision as to whether they want to rebuild. He suggested they create a timeline  
9 for fundraising so the community can show their support.
- 10 • Purcell noted there were people using the church prior to COVID.
- 11 • Webb stated his daughter was married in the Little Log Church so he had a bias.  
12 He believed the bottom-line problem was a lack of inertia. He believed the cost  
13 was excessive. He noted this money was already set aside in the reserves. He  
14 had an issue with the allocated labor. He would do it personally for half that  
15 amount.
- 16 • Moore noted the building foundation has no crawl space and there was wood  
17 sitting on the ground. He favored on leaving this item as a placeholder and  
18 getting additional community input.

19  
20 Beaucaire stated they were expecting the Ford Family Foundation to give over  
21 \$100,000.

22  
23 Glenn moved to approve the Little Log Church and Museum capital reserves budget  
24 and to have Parks and Commons work with the Board to establish a timeline for  
25 fundraising: Aye – 9; No – 1 (Vaaler).

26  
27 **Budget Approval**

28 Glenn moved to adopt the 2020-2021 City of Yachats budget as revised: Aye – 7; No –  
29 3 (Vaaler, Keller, and Webb).

30  
31  
32 Moore adjourned the budget hearing at 12:55 pm.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 \_\_\_\_\_  
39 W. John Moore, Chair

40 ATTEST:

41  
42  
43 \_\_\_\_\_  
44 Shannon Beaucaire

\_\_\_\_\_ Date