



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Office of the City Clerk

491 East Pioneer Avenue

Homer, Alaska 99603

clerk@cityofhomer-ak.gov

(p) 907-235-3130

(f) 907-235-3143

Memorandum Agenda Changes/Supplemental Packet

TO: MAYOR CASTNER AND HOMER CITY COUNCIL
FROM: MELISSA JACOBSEN, MMC, CITY CLERK
DATE: DECEMBER 10, 2018
SUBJECT: AGENDA CHANGES AND SUPPLEMENTAL PACKET

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

Written Public Comments Page 3

VISITORS

Memorandum from City Clerk Re: HERC Task Force Report Page 7

ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATIONS/BOROUGH REPORT/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS

AML Report from Councilmember Erickson Page 15

PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance 18-44(A), An Ordinance of the City Council of Homer, Alaska, Appropriating Funds for the Calendar Year 2019 for the General Fund, the Water Fund, the Sewer Fund, the Port/Harbor Fund, Capital Projects, and Internal Service Funds. City Manager.

Memorandum 18-141 from Finance Director Re: Additional Budgetary Information Requested
Page 15

From: [Larry Slone](#)
To: [Melissa Jacobsen](#); [Crisi Matthews](#); [Larry Slone](#)
Subject: Kickin" the HERC can
Date: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 7:41:08 PM

Melissa,
Please incorporate in CC Dec 12 packet as commentary to HERC Task Force Report

To: Homer Councilmembers

From: Larry Slone

Ref: KICKIN' THE CAN - the Dec 12th HERC Final Report and Recommendations

Although I generally concur with the report's findings and recommendations, as a member of the Task Force I believe that "I wuz robbed!" at its last meeting, Nov 27th, of a final opportunity to propose amendments to the TF's Final Report. Some of my amendments were wordsmithing, such as completing TF Recommendation #1. (P.25) to read (my changes in CAPITALS): "Keep HERC-1 in warm status for the next 5 years to allow continued public use while pursuing funding mechanisms for ANY FUTURE USE OR DISPOSITION AS DETERMINED BY THE COMMUNITY".

But the main focus of my proposed amendments was to clarify an ambiguous tone within the report implying that the passage of time isn't really a crucial factor in determining the building's fate. Throughout the TF's existence I've strongly disagree with any such intimation, that it's ok to 'kick the can' down the road. All the HERC building condition-reports provided over the years makes it abundantly clear that the buildings simply cannot be expected to remain operationally safe and viable in the long-term, beyond 5 years, without massive infusion of money for maintenance or rehabilitation. Indeed, recommendation #5 (p.25 of the report) states that without substantial repairs the 60 year-old building may not have "safe, ongoing or efficient use beyond 5 years". However, in the next sentence it immediately slits its own throat by stating that beyond 5 years it "could range from planning" a new facility to . . .etc".

Additional examples of, in my opinion, unwarranted time extension:

1. Item #5, at the bottom of page 26 of the report, "How can the City pay for operations, maintenance, and any required capital expenditures?"

The item goes on to state that the answer is in two ways: near- term and long-term. I disagree with that characterization; my answer is to simply rearrange the verbiage to recategorize as "Operations/Maintenance Costs" and "Capital Expenditures", which intermingle regardless of time-frame.

2. Item #6 (p.27) "Is Leasing HERC an Option?"

I believe the first sentence should conclude by substituting "short-term" for "long-term.

Here's my verbiage for the answer to item #6, p.27 of report:

"The building in its current state and the lack of funding for major capital improvements precludes a viable SHORT-term lease arrangement. However, during the TF process substantial interest in a long-term lease was expressed by Fireweed Academy and Bunnell Street Arts. Therefore , the TF recommends the Council direct that any new, or subsequent TF/Committee continue exploring community leasing possibilities."

3. a.) Implications of Renovating the Existing HEC Building, p. 33 of report.

In my opinion the HERC TF was not directed, as the first sentence in this segment states, to "use a 10-year timeframe when considering improvements . . ." it's directive per Resolution 18-036A was primarily to determine costs associated with active use of the facility for up to 10 years, NOT spend 10 years contemplating how best to use the HERC. This is a crucial difference.

(My response immediately above also applies to the statement in "Rationale for A 5-year vs. a 10-year Plan" on p. 35 of the report. I do not read Resolution 18-036A as suggesting that a 10-year period was available to make a decision about renovating/remodeling HERC-1. Again, the 10-year reference was directed to determining cost for active use, not planning for use.

Thus the subsequent statement about a 10-year plan being primarily a "do-nothing strategy" is not relevant.)

b.) Same thing with the initial phrase of the next (2nd) paragraph on page 33. It's not about the city "waiting 10 years" to renovate/remodel; I believe the correct phrase should be "If the City waits BEYOND 5 YEARS to renovate/remodel . . . "

4. Finally, I just can't part without commenting on the incomplete meaning of the final two paragraphs of p.37, under the heading "Building a New Facility vs Remodeling the Existing HERC-1".

a.) Paragraph one ends with a statement about providing sufficient time for further input and analyses. I would restate the sentence to clarify its purpose, as in: "This option will provide sufficient time for further input and analyses FOR PURSING A FUNDING PLAN TO MEET SPECIFIC HERC USE AS DETERMINED BY THE COMMUNITY."

b.) Finally, near the last sentence of the following, or last, paragraph on that page (p.37) begins with a statement that "constraints exist". What kind of constraints? My proposed verbiage: "BECAUSE CURRENT FUNDING CONSTRAINTS REQUIRE FULL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN DETERMINING HERC USE, no recommendation is tendered by the Task Force . . ."

the End



December 10, 2018

Homer City Council
491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

Re: HERC Building

Dear Mayor & City Council Members:

The Academic Policy Committee (APC) is the governing body for Fireweed Academy (FWA), a public charter school within the Kenai Peninsula School District. The APC recently convened a meeting of its One Campus Committee, which was established to unify the two FWA campuses.

Currently, FWA students are split between two facilities, with younger students (K-2) housed on East End Road, and older students (3-6) sharing space at West Homer Elementary. The purposes of FWA's unification process are to create cost and administrative efficiencies, to enhance safety and to improve educational opportunities.

The APC strongly supports additional opportunities to explore HERC building options. As a public school, FWA has the financial capacity to engage a long-term arrangement that can benefit both the City of Homer and FWA, and as a charter school, we have the flexibility to collaborate with and support other community uses of the facility.

We truly appreciate the excellent work of the HERC Committee, and we're writing now to strongly encourage the City Council to adopt the HERC Committee's recommendations. Specifically, we support the formation of a new HERC Committee (or continue the existing one), and the work needed to identify a long-term solution that benefits the City of Homer and its residents.

Thank you for considering these issues, and please do not hesitate to contact me at 907.235.9728 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Todd Hindman".

Todd Hindman, Principal
Fireweed Academy



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Office of the City Clerk

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

clerk@cityofhomer-ak.gov

(p) 907-235-3130

(f) 907-235-3143

Memorandum

TO: MAYOR CASTNER AND HOMER CITY COUNCIL
FROM: MELISSA JACOBSEN, MMC, CITY CLERK
DATE: DECEMBER 7, 2018
SUBJECT: HERC TASK FORCE REPORT

At the November 27th meeting of the HERC Task Force I miscalculated a 2/3 vote on the motion to call for the question and end debate on the motion to forward the final Task Force Report to council. The vote was 5 yes and 3 no but should have been 6 yes and 2 no. As a result of my miscalculation, the information provided by Task Force Member Slone was not considered by the group. Mr. Slone's information was provided to the Task Force in their meeting packet and the final vote on the motion to forward the final Task Force Report to Council was 7 yes and 1 no.

Mr. Slone's comments are attached to this memorandum so Council is aware of the modifications he intended to propose at the meeting. I have included the original emailed copy and the reformatted copy that was included in the packet to ensure no details are omitted.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only

1 **Larry Slone email 11/16/18**

2 Julie/Crisi and TF Members

3 Most of the proposed changes are wordsmithing, rearranging existing paragraphs which - to my mind -
4 help provide written clarity, continuity and flow to our report, making it a presentation in which I can
5 take pride . If the other members have the opportunity to read this proposal, then discussion shouldn't
6 be required; either they agree that those segments are beneficial to clarity, or not.

7 FINAL SLONE PROPOSAL FOR FINAL HERC TF REPORT

8 _____

9 My recollection of Nov 13 changes (changes I had made are in CAPITALS)

10 Task Force Recommendations: Near & Long Term

11 Near Term: 1 to 5 years

12 1. Keep HERC-1 in warm status for the next 5 years TO ALLOW CONTINUED PUBLIC USE WHILE
13 PURSUING FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR ANY SPECIFIC FUTURE USE AS DETERMINED BY THE
14 COMMUNITY.

15 2. WITHIN THE FIRST YEAR, MAKE THE NECESSARY repairs needed to maintain HERC-1 in warm status
16 and prevent further deterioration. (Estimated CUMULATIVE Expenditure \$60,000-\$100,000, see Chapter
17 3).

18 3. City Council form a NEW HERC committee or a task force this winter to investigate COMMUNITY
19 CAPACITY TO SPEARHEAD funding methods to address community recreational and educational needs.
20 Preferred funding is, but not limited to, a public-private partnership for occupancy options (to include
21 the upstairs) and funding of HERC-1.

22 4. No change

23 5. Long Term: 5 years+

24 I recommend Barry's substitution (from the top para, p 2 of his Nov 13 laydown) for our
25 Recommendation #5, LongTerm: 5 years+, on page 25 of Nov 13 packet.

26 _____

27 Below are the remaining items, from the Nov 13 HERC meeting, I had hoped to propose. At this point,
28 now that our 1 thru 3 "Near-Term" recommendations, above, (p.25 of Nov 13 packet) have been
29 adopted, thereby securely linking the 5 yr HERC-use plan with the time requirement necessary to
30 arrange funding for whatever use the community ultimately decides, I can live with the substance of the
31 Report.

32 Herewith my proposed changes:

33 1.) Reference #3, top of page 26 - "Desirable improvement to entire HERC to allow full use for next 10
34 years".

35 {Slone Note: By motion the TF on Nov 13 approved placing the next two paragraphs under that section.
36 The motion consisted primarily of retaining the verbiage but moving the paragraphs around. }

37 " If a full potential occupancy, Educational (E) occupancy or K-12 school is desirable, then the cost rises
38 from \$900,000 to \$1.3 million dollars, mainly for sprinklers and basic safety upgrades. These
39 improvements would extend the life of the building approximately 10 years, but does not result in a
40 modern, energy efficient building.

41 ADDITIONALLY, a remodel of \$2.5 to \$3 million dollars would extend the life of the building
42 approximately 20 years. A full renovation of \$4.5 M to \$5 M would extend the building 30 years or more.
43 Seismic upgrades would likely be required but neither the extend nor costs are currently determined.
44 Chapter 3 provides more detail on these cost estimates. [Note: The above rough order of magnitude
45 costs reflect 2018 dollars and are subject to possible 15%-20% inflation corrections.]"

46 A.) Someplace in here, perhaps as another note, retain the qualifying sentence "Building use in this
47 scenario is limited to IBC A-2 thru A-4, B & E (including day care) Classifications".

48 B.) Lastly - but a minor issue - the third paragraph to be placed in sequence, after the two stated above,
49 would presumably be the one listed in the Nov 13th packet, beginning with "The only way a ten-year
50 timeframe would be . . . " I recommend removing the sentence beginning with "A partnership could be a
51 school, non-profits, or a for-profit start-up, etc . . . " and placing it in section 5, "How to Pay, etc. ".

52 2.) Item # 5, bottom of p.26, How to pay for O&M/Maintenance?Capital Expenditures

53 My proposal is essentially what I stated on p.14/15 of the Nov 6th packet. It' s entitled The ENTIRE
54 SEGMENT ANSWERING ITEM 5:

55 {Primarily my proposal would substitute O&M and Capital Expenditures as the two categories, displacing
56 the terms "near term and long term". This is precisely the category of input that -036A asks of us. And,
57 as Crisi noted at the last work session, O&M/Capital Expenditures by their very nature shift across time-
58 barriers.

59 Other than that, I propose simply to adjust the existing paragraphs to fit within the O&M/Capital
60 Expenditures categories.

61 This proposal was discussed briefly at the Nov 6 work session. I was left with the impression that it was
62 then viewed favorably by several other TF members, and that Julie was going to incorporate my
63 suggestions in a rewrite of that segment to be presented in our Nov 13 packet. For whatever reason, it
64 didn't occur.}

65 In any case, here's my proposal ref how to pay (my word changes in CAPITALS):

66 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

67 Existing operations and utility expenses are \$23,000 (2017). See Chapter 4 for a detailed analysis. City
68 finances do not allow for increased HERC building operating/maintenance expenses unless offsetting
69 additional revenue is generated. Additionally, using the building for longer hours, OR THE UPSTAIRS ON
70 a regular basis will also increase operational costs. Allowing FOR community organizations/user group
71 rentals may generate this additional revenue. Also, higher fees may cover more of the current operating
72 costs, therefore the TF recommends analyzing and potentially increasing HERC user/RENTAL FEES FOR
73 THE GYM AND ZUMBA ROOM. FOR ANY LEASE ARRANGEMENT, THE LESSEE TYPICALLY PAYS
74 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS (or similar words).

75 A key component for usccessful short-term revenue and more intensive use is active building
76 management by a designated building manager.

77 Note: See item #6 below, Is leasing HERC an option?

78 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

79 Capital expenditures could be funded from the existing HERC building depecciation reserve fund,
80 potential operating surplus, or other sources as Council deems appropriate.

81 Although conventional means of funding exist, such as state grant funding, a new-tax ballot measure, or
82 a service area, currently there does not appear to be broad community support for increased taxes to
83 pay for changing building uses (i.e. building code classification changes for the upstairs) or a significant
84 renovation.

85 ULTIMATELY, a partner will be needed that would have access to private foundation grants or other
86 private funding sources, not readily available to the city. Considering this the TF recommends that the
87 city DIRECT ANY NEW TF/COMMITTEE to actively promote a public-private partnership OR OTHER SUCH
88 ARRANGEMENT TO FUND ANY RECREATIONAL OR EDUCATIONAL USE OF THE HERC-1 PROPERTY.

89 3.) Item # 6: Is leasing HERC an option?

90 Here's my version:

91 "The building in its current state and the lack of funding for major capital improvments precludes a
92 viable short-term lease arrangement. However, during the TF process substantial interest in a long-term
93 lease was expressed by Fireweed Academy and Bunnell Street Arts. Therefore, the TF recommends the
94 Council direct that any new, or subsequent, TF/Committee continue exploring community leasing
95 possibilities. (See recommendation #3, and Chp 5).

96 Note: A long-term lease may allow for financing options such as a commercial loan that could be repaid
97 through rental income."

98 - On to more wordsmithing -

99 4.) P.33, para 3, "Implications of Renovating the Existing HERC Building"

100 Starting with the first paragraph, I'd change it to: "The original Task Force directive from the City Council
101 was to APPLY A "10-YEAR" TIME-FRAME FOR USE WHEN MAKING improvements that need . . . "

102 {note: This clarifies that the intent is to make TIMELY repairs in order to have the building functional
103 over MOST of that 10 years, NOT take 10 years to decide whether or not to make improvements. Big
104 difference!!}

105

106 5.) First sentence of next (2nd) paragraph of same segment (4th para from top of page 33), "Implication
107 of Renovating the Existing HERC Building"

108 Change initial phrase to read "IF THE CITY WAITS BEYOND 5 YEARS to renovate/remodel the HERC-1, the
109 cost . . . "

110 {Again, this keeps everything referenced to the time of our justified standard, the good old " 5-year
111 plan". Beyond 5 years is adequately addressed in the last sentence of that paragraph.

112 6.)

113 A.) Lower portion of p.33, the paragraph under A 5-YEAR PLAN, third sentence, beginning with "As
114 stated previously . . ." where it talks about developing strategies and funding to enable a "final decision",
115 I'd change to read " . . .develop strategies and funding to enable a 'final decision' ON HERC USE OR
116 DISPOSITION."

117 B.) Next sentence in that paragraph (A 5-year Plan), that begins with "Thus, at the end of the 5-year
118 period, the City will have two paths . . ." That seems indefinite. I'd suggest "AT THE END OF THE 5-YEAR
119 PERIOD, THE CITY SHOULD BE PREPARED TO SELECT ONE OF TWO PATHS; EITHER THIS OR THAT"

120 {Again, my suggested wording strongly implies that community uncertainty about building use cannot
121 extend out forever because deteriorating HERC building conditions five years hence will require the city,
122 by then, to have made plans for a definite decision, one way or the other.}

123 - Nearing the end -

124 7.)

125 a.) P.37, Nov 13 packet. "Building a New Facility vs Remodeling the Existing HRC-1"

126 1st para, 2nd sentence, beginning with "This option will provide sufficient time for further input and
127 analysis." I suggest changing to " This option will provide sufficient time for PURSUING A FUNDING PLAN
128 TO MEET SPECIFIC HERC USE AS DETERMINED BY THE COMMUNITY."

129 {Otherwise, we're recommending Input and analysis of what, exactly? Would it be researching anew
130 everything that this TF has already explored, other than keeping the HERC in warm status?}

131 7.)
132 b.) Last sentence of last paragraph p.37, "Since constraints exist . . . "
133 {what kind of constraints?}
134 I'd change to read something similar to "BECAUSE CURRENT FUNDING CONSTRAINTS REQUIRE FULL
135 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN DETERMINING HERC USE, no recommendation is tendered by the TF on
136 whether to remodel the existing HERC or demolish and build a new facility."
137 - the End -



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Homer City Council

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

(p) 907-235-3130

(f) 907-235-3143

Memorandum

TO: Mayor Castner & Homer City Council

FROM: Councilmember Erickson

DATE: December 6, 2018

SUBJECT: Alaska Municipal League Conference, Nov. 14-16, 2018

I had the pleasure of taking our new Representative, Sarah Vance to AML. It was good to be able for all of us to watch a changing of administrations. Change can be difficult, and changing the direction from one administration to another brings about either a sense of dread or anticipation.

I appreciated touching bases with the City of Juneau about their cold weather emergency shelters and how they have been dealing with the homeless issue. I also found it beneficial talking with other ports of call for cruise ship docking. Each city has their issues to deal with that industry. Because we are out of the cruise ship lanes, we are in a unique situation. There appears to be more cruise lines that are looking outside the inside passage lane. Infrastructure improvements and the cost of hosting ships versus the revenue it brings to the cities are topics of discussion for the cities.



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Finance Department

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

finance@cityofhomer-ak.gov

(p) 907-235-8121

(f) 907-235-3140

Memorandum 18-141

TO: Mayor Castner and Homer City Council
THROUGH: Katie Koester, City Manager
FROM: Elizabeth Walton, Finance Director
DATE: December 7, 2018
SUBJECT: Additional Budgetary Information Requested

The purpose of this memo is to discuss the additional budgetary information that has been requested from council members.

Personnel Costs as a % of Total Fund Expenditures:

The first included chart illustrates the relationship between personnel costs and total expenditures for each of the funds for the City of Homer over the last ten years. For example, in 2017 personnel costs accounted for 58.83% of the General Fund total expenditures.

The representation of personnel costs in this exercise is consistent with those costs we define as “Total Salaries and Benefits” in the budget document, with the exception of PERS Relief expense. This was backed out due to the mechanics of how this “expense” works (PERS Relief expense is offset by the PERS Revenue). As an additional clarification, the 22% PERS Contribution has been included in this chart.

Depreciation Reserves Analysis:

The second chart included with this memo provides a top level analysis on the City of Homer’s various depreciation reserve accounts. The reserve accounts that are specifically evaluated consist of the General Fund Fleet Reserve (152), the General Fund Reserves (156), the Water and Sewer Reserves (256), the Port and Harbor Fleet Reserve (452), and the Port and Harbor Reserves (456).

The analysis was done for a period of ten years and it details the following activity for each of the funds: transfers in, total net expenditures, revenue received, and the ending fund balance.

- **Transfers in** includes annual budgetary transfers to reserves and any subsequent transfers throughout the fiscal year.
- **Total net expenditures** represents the amount spent out of each fund. This also takes into account any credits received or reversing audit entries to correct coding.

- **Revenue received** represents interest income earned, donations received, grant funding, and revenue classified as other.
- The **ending fund balance** is derived by applying all activity throughout a given year to the prior years ending balance.

There were a couple discrepancies between the fund balance reported in this chart and the balances reported in the 2019 Draft Budget (which has also been included for reference). They are as follows:

- The balance for the General Fund Fleet Reserve at the end of 2017 was underreported in the budget by \$95,500.
- The balance for the General Fund Reserves at the end of 2017 was overstated in the budget by \$20,181.
- The balance for the Port and Harbor Reserves at of the end of 2017 was overstated in the budget by \$603,306.

Personnel Costs as a % of Total Expenditures	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014	12/31/2015	12/31/2016	12/31/2017
	General Fund	71.10%	69.99%	62.21%	63.23%	66.11%	64.46%	58.18%
Water/Sewer Fund	47.68%	44.64%	49.29%	47.56%	45.78%	44.41%	42.67%	41.85%
Port and Harbor Fund	48.91%	46.31%	46.08%	38.28%	32.31%	36.91%	38.42%	37.47%
Government Wide	61.67%	59.68%	56.66%	54.47%	53.08%	54.24%	50.94%	50.81%

Notes:

- PERS Relief has been backed out from these numbers, but the 22% PERS Contribution has been included.

City of Homer
2019 Operating Budget

Depreciation Reserve

General Fund

<u>Fund & Account #</u>	<u>A/C Name</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2014</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2015</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2016</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2017</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>8/31/2018</u>
156-0367	PUBLIC ART RESERVES	171	171	171	171	171
156-0369	SEAWALL RESERVES	50,640	57,513	37,185	45,396	53,354
156-0370	Animal Shelter	(25,895)	(29,158)	0	20,000	20,000
156-0372	Parks Needs Assessments	15,208	680	680	680	680
156-0375	General Fund Reserves	232,397	91,470	117,114	131,632	119,011
156-0384	CITY HALL DEPRECIATION	(88,533)	(91,796)	78,204	174,542	307,150
156-0385	PARKS & REC DEPRECIATION	88,707	79,381	74,381	47,702	31,602
156-0387	PLANNING DEPRECIATION	36,075	36,076	46,076	38,166	38,166
156-0388	Airport Reserve	27,607	27,608	27,608	27,608	27,608
156-0390	LIBRARY DEPRECIATION	32,589	14,703	14,703	67,323	157,323
156-0393	FIRE DEPRECIATION	76,583	45,302	44,175	94,961	94,961
156-0394	POLICE DEPRECIATION	144,806	101,078	84,296	269,103	269,103
156-0395	PUBLIC WORKS DEPR.	364,464	235,013	299,815	299,815	299,815
156-0396	OLD MIDDLE SCHOOL DEPR.	188,281	188,131	188,131	188,131	188,131
156-0397	Fishing Hole Depr Res	110,316	113,546	113,546	113,546	113,546
156-0398	Information Systems Res.	6,264	(24,658)	7,746	67,746	267,746
156-0399	SISTER CITIES	18,196	18,197	18,197	18,197	18,197
156-0400	ADA Reserve	0	0	0	0	100,000
<u>Fund Balance</u>		<u>1,277,875</u>	<u>863,257</u>	<u>1,152,028</u>	<u>1,604,719</u>	<u>2,106,564</u>

General Fund - Fleet

<u>Fund & Account #</u>	<u>A/C Name</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>End of 2014</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2015</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2016</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2017</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>8/31/2018</u>
152-0375	ADMIN FLEET RESERVES	63,391	66,383	68,918	71,419	68,973
152-0380	Administrative	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929
152-0381	FIRE FLEET RESERVES	124,417	116,998	(7,187)	88,313	284,211
152-0382	POLICE FLEET	9,612	17,032	33,822	35,007	196,853
152-0383	PUBLIC WORKS FLEET	169,996	116,112	128,708	63,414	41,959
152-0391	FLEET INSURANCE RESERVES	139,819	139,819	139,818	139,818	139,818
<u>Fund Balance</u>		<u>549,163</u>	<u>498,272</u>	<u>406,008</u>	<u>439,900</u>	<u>773,743</u>

Water & Sewer Depreciation Res.

<u>Fund & Account #</u>	<u>A/C Name</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>End of 2014</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2015</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2016</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2017</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>8/31/2018</u>
256-0378	Water	2,217,062	2,224,878	2,490,079	2,593,246	2,662,537
256-0379	Sewer	1,837,713	1,861,716	1,930,940	2,153,985	2,261,353
256-0932	Ocean Dr Sewer - Ord 08-38	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
256-0934	Hillside, Ocean Dr Lp Ord 08-38	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
<u>Fund Balance</u>		<u>4,184,775</u>	<u>4,216,594</u>	<u>4,551,019</u>	<u>4,877,231</u>	<u>5,053,891</u>

Port & Harbor Depreciation Res.

<u>Fund & Account #</u>	<u>A/C Name</u>	<u>Actual**</u> <u>End of 2014</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2015</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2016</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>12/31/2017</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>8/31/2018</u>
456-0380	P & H Reserve	3,354,254	3,237,893	3,663,476	4,197,406	4,605,569
456-0382	P & H Bond Reserve	267,045	280,995	292,595	302,645	316,895
452-0374	P & H Fleet Reserve	102,892	130,735	121,214	151,214	162,713
<u>Fund Balance</u>		<u>3,724,191</u>	<u>3,649,623</u>	<u>4,077,285</u>	<u>4,651,265</u>	<u>5,085,177</u>

Depreciation Reserves Analysis

PH - Fleet (452)	Transfers in	Expenditures	Revenue	Balance
12/31/2006				-
12/31/2007				-
12/31/2008				-
12/31/2009				-
12/31/2010	103,545	34,749	-	68,796
12/31/2011	30,000	30,163	-	68,634
12/31/2012	30,000	11,440	-	87,194
12/31/2013	30,000	26,999	-	90,195
12/31/2014	30,000	17,303	-	102,892
12/31/2015	30,000	2,157	-	130,735
12/31/2016	30,000	39,521	-	121,214
12/31/2017	30,000	-	-	151,214

PH Reserves (456)	Transfers in	Expenditures	Revenue	Balance
12/31/2006				-
12/31/2007	1,296,772	220,380	32,317	1,108,709
12/31/2008	384,530	294,515	20,541	1,219,264
12/31/2009	324,530	171,008	11,050	1,383,836
12/31/2010	324,530	91,302	35,752	1,652,816
12/31/2011	500,000	360,757	-	1,792,059
12/31/2012	954,252	662,787	-	2,083,525
12/31/2013	1,156,593	651,344	-	2,588,774
12/31/2014	2,295,938	3,600,411	-	1,284,301
12/31/2015	3,551,500	1,916,913	-	2,918,888
12/31/2016	870,188	147,911	-	3,352,765
12/31/2017	852,763	22,834	4,000	3,896,745

GF - Fleet (152)	Transfers in	Expenditures	Revenue	Balance
12/31/2006				813,619
12/31/2007	426,680	549,456	20,477	711,320
12/31/2008	556,221	515,123	14,163	766,582
12/31/2009	80,000	95,594	5,780	756,768
12/31/2010	30,000	103,545	941	684,164
12/31/2011	30,000	194,797	4,877	524,244
12/31/2012	246,420	-	2,599	773,263
12/31/2013	82,140	285,459	7,537	577,481
12/31/2014	-	46,661	18,343	549,163
12/31/2015	-	53,884	2,992	498,272
12/31/2016	307,000	310,028	6,264	501,508
12/31/2017	305,500	274,109	2,501	535,400

GF - Reserves (156)	Transfers in	Expenditures	Revenue	Balance
12/31/2006				610,600
12/31/2007	1,181,313	982,635	32,644	841,922
12/31/2008	1,237,134	234,262	119,310	1,964,105
12/31/2009	179,425	406,184	16,253	1,753,598
12/31/2010	31,015	397,434	3,553	1,390,733
12/31/2011	303,004	329,318	10,568	1,374,987
12/31/2012	740,713	438,174	6,817	1,684,343
12/31/2013	20,000	442,962	118,394	1,379,775
12/31/2014	45,000	156,877	9,977	1,277,875
12/31/2015	28,051	451,628	8,960	863,258
12/31/2016	436,731	155,835	7,874	1,152,028
12/31/2017	590,243	172,252	14,518	1,584,538

W/S Reserves (256)	Transfers in	Expenditures	Revenue	Balance
12/31/2006				-
12/31/2007	4,249,069	101,324	82,161	4,229,906
12/31/2008	230,000	446,297	73,023	4,086,632
12/31/2009	224,115	270,266	29,271	4,069,753
12/31/2010	500,000	324,245	4,035	4,249,543
12/31/2011	500,000	411,905	-	4,337,639
12/31/2012	213,181	255,372	10,900	4,306,348
12/31/2013	300,000	623,850	-	3,982,499
12/31/2014	213,184	115,352	-	4,080,331
12/31/2015	233,484	201,665	-	4,112,150
12/31/2016	452,114	117,689	-	4,446,576
12/31/2017	599,966	169,310	-	4,877,232