

TENTATIVE AGENDA

COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MEETING  
SIKESTON CITY HALL

Tuesday, May 12, 2015  
7:00 A.M.

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE
- III. OPENING PRAYER
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING

Proposed FY-16 Budget Providing for the Appropriation of Monies and Administration of Expenditures of Monies Received During Fiscal Year 2016

- V. ITEMS OF BUSINESS

A. Other Items As May Be Determined During the Course of the Meeting

- VI. STUDY SESSION

Flood Plain Discussions

Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of May 2015

---

Carroll Couch, City Clerk

The City of Sikeston complies with ADA guidelines. Notify Linda Lowes at 471-2512 (TDD Available) to notify the City of any reasonable accommodation needed to participate in the City Council's Meeting.

# **Council Letter**

---

Date of Meeting: May 12, 2015

Originating Department: City Manager

To the Mayor and City Council:

Subject: FY2016 Budget

Attachment(s):

1. Revised budget summary
2. Memo re: DPS vehicles

Action Options:

1. Briefing Only
2. Other Action Council May Deem Necessary

## **Background**

The City Council received the first draft of the Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) budget at the April 27 Council Meeting. On May 12, the Council will hold a public hearing regarding the budget, as required by State statute.

Since April 27, city staff have revised and refined various spending and revenue projections for both FY15 and FY16. The City Council may amend any of the budget projections until the budget is formally approved in June.

## **Refined Projections**

Since the April 27 draft of the budget was presented, staff have made several amendments to the FY15 and FY16 projections:

- \$5,000 was added to the general government building maintenance line item in FY16 for repairs to the HVAC system at City Hall, based on some issues that have come to light in the past few weeks.

- \$29,000 was removed from the Capital Improvement Fund budget for FY16 for an outdoor warning siren at the industrial park. Staff intended to, but did not, remove that item before the April 27 draft of the budget was released.
- Various liability insurance projections for FY16 were amended based on the insurance rates approved by the City Council at the May 4 Council meeting.
- Various FY15 year-end estimates were refined based on information from the departments.
- A \$3,000 wage adjustment was included for each sworn DPS position (not including the Director, Communications Officers, and clerical positions).
- Sales tax revenue estimates for FY15 were adjusted upward based on two more months of returns that have been received since the estimates were first prepared. FY15 is still running about 10% higher than FY14.
- Sales tax revenue estimates for FY16 were adjusted upward based on FY15 year-end estimates, and with a cautiously optimistic 2% increase budgeted for FY16 over FY15.

With all of the changes above incorporated, the budget for all funds combined shows us spending down the fund balance by about \$79,000. As discussed previously, we have healthy reserves (about six months worth, and well above the amount required by our city policies), but I would only recommend spending down reserves for one-time expenditures (such as new equipment or to catch up on deferred maintenance) and not for on-going expenditures such as salaries.

### **Answer to Budget Questions**

City staff have received a few questions regarding the budget from various Councilmen. Here are answers to some of those questions, which may be of interest to the rest of the Council:

#### **DPS Building Maintenance, \$27,000 (p.15) - What is included in this line item?**

Routine building maintenance includes HVAC repairs and maintenance for all DPS buildings (Headquarters, Fire Stations #1, #2, and #3), elevator inspection and maintenance, garage door maintenance, light bulbs, etc. DPS has budgeted \$20,000 for routine maintenance and an additional \$7,000 to paint the first floor at headquarters.

#### **Transportation Sales Tax, Minor Equipment and Apparatus, \$35,000 (p.35) – What is included in this line item?**

Routine expenditures include replacement of various power and hand tools, sprayers and occasional rentals of specialty tools. Public Works has budgeted \$13,000 for such routine expenditures, \$7,000 for purchase of a hydraulic jackhammer attachment for bobcat, \$15,000 for a batwing mower attachment for use at the airport and other large mowing projects.

Who leases the Essex Building?

The Essex building is leased by Trans Texas Tire and Faurecia Emission.

Municipal Court Fund, Other Contractual Services, \$35,490 (p.46) – What is included in this line item?

This line item is for temp services from Manpower for a Municipal Court Clerk, and various software support items.

Municipal Court, Fingerprinting, \$3,791 (p.46) - What are the expenses associated with fingerprinting?

This pays the firm that provides equipment that electronically captures fingerprints. The “inmate security surcharge” offsets the expense of the fingerprint machine.

DPS Vehicles – Chevy Tahoe vs Various Sedans

The attached memo from Chief Juden provides more information about the department’s preference for the Chevy Tahoe.

Budget Amendment near end of May

State statutes require all appropriations to be approved by the City Council via the budget ordinance. Throughout the year fiscal year, some individual line items are underspent while others are overspent, and occasionally an unbudgeted item is brought to Council for approval (such as higher than anticipated salt prices last year, or the emergency repairs to the Public Works building roof). Near the end of the fiscal year, Carroll prepares an amendment to the current fiscal year (FY15) budget to account for these items. We will have that ready for Council’s approval in late May.

**Action Requested**

Staff requests Council direction regarding any changes the Council would like to see made before a final budget is prepared for Council adoption.

**CITY OF SIKESTON  
FY-16 BUDGET SUMMARY**

	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Sales Tax Fund</b>	<b>Trans. Tax Fund</b>	<b>Park Fund</b>	<b>Mun Ct. Fund</b>	<b>Tourism Fund</b>	<b>E-911 Fund</b>	<b>Cap Impr Fund</b>	<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>
<b>REVENUES</b>									
Taxes	1,850,592	3,118,886	1,511,733	378,443		106,392		25,230	6,991,276
Licenses & Permits	226,450								226,450
Intergovernmental	3,737,159		2,600			20,000			3,759,759
Charges for Services	1,366,618		20	0			277,890		1,644,528
Rents & Leases	176,292			27,084					203,376
Miscellaneous Revenues	279,256	3,400	6,500	1,000	12,311	294	2,986	159,000	464,747
Fines & Forfeits					304,950				304,950
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>7,636,367</b>	<b>3,122,286</b>	<b>1,520,853</b>	<b>406,527</b>	<b>317,261</b>	<b>126,686</b>	<b>280,876</b>	<b>184,230</b>	<b>13,595,086</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>									
General Government	2,751,593					108,844		80,000	2,940,437
Administrative Services	463,428							0	463,428
Public Safety	6,027,362						930,392	1,165,345	8,123,099
Public Works	623,020		1,676,035					25,000	2,324,055
Parks				538,770				71,850	610,620
Municipal Court					317,184			0	317,184
Airport Improvements								0	0
<b>TOTAL EXPEND.</b>	<b>9,865,403</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,676,035</b>	<b>538,770</b>	<b>317,184</b>	<b>108,844</b>	<b>930,392</b>	<b>1,342,195</b>	<b>14,778,823</b>
EXCESS (DEFICIENCY OF) REVENUE OVER EXPEND.	(2,229,036)	3,122,286	(155,182)	(132,243)	77	17,842	(649,516)	(1,157,965)	(1,183,737)
OTHER SOURCES	3,089,086			140,000		0	730,392	1,200,345	5,159,823
OTHER USES	933,392	3,122,286	0		0			0	4,055,678
<b>BEG. FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>5,000,885</b>	<b>919,471</b>	<b>791,219</b>	<b>108,115</b>	<b>87,551</b>	<b>72,315</b>	<b>394,979</b>	<b>36,972</b>	<b>7,411,507</b>
<b>END. FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>4,927,543</b>	<b>919,471</b>	<b>636,037</b>	<b>115,872</b>	<b>87,628</b>	<b>90,157</b>	<b>475,855</b>	<b>79,352</b>	<b>7,331,915</b>

# Memorandum

---

**To:** City Manager Jonathan Douglass  
**From:** Director Drew Juden  
**Date:** 5/8/2015  
**Re:** Uniform Patrol Fleet Vehicles

---

## Dear Sir

Since the demise of the police Crown Victoria, the department has been in search of a new fleet vehicle. The year after it was announced that the Crown Victoria's would no longer be produced for police service we purchased 1 of each police vehicle that was available on the market at the time. That was the Chevrolet Impala, Chevrolet Tahoe, and the Dodge Charger. The Ford Police Interceptor was not out at that time and available for purchase. We did an extensive study over the past 3 years of those vehicles and discovered that the only vehicle that would be suitable for our service was the Chevrolet Tahoe.

The newer model police sedans do not contain enough equipment room for the equipment that a Public Safety Officer carries on duty. This is due to the small trunk space and the very narrow back seat and passenger compartment space. DPS Officers carry their bunker gear with them while on duty because they may be pressed into fire duty at any moment. We also assign a self-contained breathing apparatus to some of the vehicles and if the officer happens to be a member of the Tactical Team they must carry their tactical gear with them at all times. With that said our other concern was that front wheel drive vehicles do not perform well in the city environment. They work very well for State Highway Patrol, people who are on the interstate, or agencies that turn their vehicles over with less than 50,000 miles.

One of our concerns is that we must have a fleet vehicle that we maintain so that we may transfer the equipment from vehicle to vehicle. It takes approximately \$8,000-\$12,000 to outfit the interior of a police vehicle; with things such as cameras, cages, radios, consoles, prisoner seats, and lockers or gun racks to secure the patrol rifle or shotgun.

When we started the Tahoe program it appeared that was going to be the vehicle of choice. The fuel mileage is no different than the Crown Victoria, Charger, or any other vehicles that we tested. The basic cost of the Chevrolet Tahoe is somewhere around \$30,000 and the cost of a sedan is approximately \$25,000-\$27,000 depending on how you outfit the vehicle. The other selling point to the Chevrolet Tahoe was the longevity of the vehicle. We still have one of the first Chevrolet Tahoe's we bought on the road and it has in excess of 180,000 miles on that vehicle and it still appears to be fairly serviceable. We generally take our sedans out of service at 100,000 miles. Thus as you can see this almost doubles the life expectancy or the useful life of the vehicle. We have not gotten to the point where we have a full fleet of Tahoe's so we are not seeing the advantage yet of being able to transfer the interior equipment. This should occur in the next couple of years. Until we get a full fleet of Tahoe's and start placing older Tahoe's out of service we will not get that cost savings benefit. We are still in that transition period between the Crown Victoria's and the Tahoe's.

May 8, 2015

We are able to utilize sedans for other applications such as Detectives or School Resource Officers. Generally those individuals are not required to transport prisoners. We do not have to spend the amount of money on the interior of those vehicles that we do on the patrol vehicles. We also do not carry as much equipment in those vehicles as we do in our patrol vehicles. We have things such as traffic cones, traffic control devices, and breaching equipment to be able to gain access to schools. It takes a tremendous amount of room to outfit a patrol vehicle that is out on patrol each and every day this is why the Tahoe is the best fit for our department.

The Tahoe now offers 4 wheel drive, we are going to attempt with this new purchase of Tahoe's for a very limited amount of the vehicles. This is so that we will have good maneuverability during snow storms. Most of the general public and maybe some members of council think that our current Tahoe's are 4 wheel drive. They are not, they are 2 wheel drive and they did not get around in the snow this year at all. This is the reason why we are choosing the Tahoe's to be utilized for Command Staff vehicles as well as day to day patrol vehicles.

At the Command Staff level the reason we utilize the Tahoe is because we have large command boxes in the back of the vehicle which carry boards that are utilized in tactical situations and fire situations. These accountability boards allow us to track our people and maintain situational awareness of the event as well as the people.

I will be glad to answer any questions as it relates to our vehicle purchase program but I still feel the Chevrolet Tahoe is the best vehicle for our fleet.

Respectfully,

Charles A. Juden, III.  
Director of Public Safety

## Council Letter

---

Date of Meeting: 15-05-12

Originating Department: Public Works Department

To the Mayor and City Council:

Subject: Briefing on Flood Plain Revisions and MS4

Action Options:

1. Other action Council may deem appropriate

Background:

In 2010, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had the Scott County Missouri area remapped for flood plain purposes. These new maps, which were effective in June of 2012, were not favorable to Sikeston and the Scott County area.

The City Council at that time engaged two different civil engineering firms specialized in Hydraulics and Hydrology (H&H) to review these maps and provide recommendations for a revision to be submitted to FEMA. At first, the council worked with AMEC of Nashville, TN. Later in the timeline, the council engaged Algeier Martin of Rolla, Missouri to add further comment.

We currently have a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) proposal that has been submitted by AMEC and is ready for submission to FEMA. Due to concerns with the submission, no action has been taken. Instead, we have asked Algeier Martin to review the submission further.

At this time, we are at a fork in the road. We have the following options to consider:

- Do Nothing, and leave the existing map alone
- Submit the LOMR as proposed by AMEC
- Explore further modifications/improvements to the LOMR (which will have costs associated)

Dr. Charles Patterson of Algeier Martin and Missouri University of Science and Technology (formerly, UMR) will be joining us on May 12<sup>th</sup>, to help discuss the history and the options before us.



While Dr. Patterson is with us, we are also (as time allows) give a brief introduction to the MS4 requirements the city is under, and the challenges ahead.

For the purpose of this discussion, he asked me to share some definitions for your review. These include:

MS4 (Multiple Separate Storm Sewer System) – all communities in MO with Population of 10,000 or greater OR adjacent to one of the nine urbanized areas in Missouri that are required to develop a Stormwater Management Plan/Program.

<http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/stormwater/sw-local-gov-programs.htm>

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) is aimed at reducing the impact of flooding on private and public structures. This is achieved by providing affordable insurance for property owners and by encouraging communities to adopt and enforce floodplain management regulations. These efforts help mitigate the effects of flooding on new and improved structures. Overall, the program reduces the socio-economic impact of disasters by promoting the purchase and retention of Risk Insurance in general, and National Flood Insurance in particular.

Base Flood -A flood having a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The 100 Year Flood is synonymous with the 1% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability)

Regulatory Floodway - means the watercourse and the adjacent land areas that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than one foot.