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GF Revised Projected Shortfall - FY19-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Revised Projection</th>
<th>Revised Shortfall</th>
<th>June Shortfall</th>
<th>April Shortfall</th>
<th>Revised Var %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAXES</td>
<td>$ 107,746,307</td>
<td>$ 108,526,134</td>
<td>$ 779,427</td>
<td>$ 405,296</td>
<td>(1,485,839)</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES TAXES</td>
<td>$ 72,238,718</td>
<td>$ 70,186,142</td>
<td>(2,052,576)</td>
<td>(2,993,928)</td>
<td>(10,338,431)</td>
<td>-2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCHISE FEES</td>
<td>10,159,904</td>
<td>10,077,268</td>
<td>(82,636)</td>
<td>(948,206)</td>
<td>(1,366,885)</td>
<td>-0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING AND DEV FEES</td>
<td>4,070,782</td>
<td>2,787,451</td>
<td>(1,283,331)</td>
<td>(1,238,055)</td>
<td>(455,959)</td>
<td>-31.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES AND PERMITS</td>
<td>6,910,576</td>
<td>7,143,937</td>
<td>233,361</td>
<td>94,420</td>
<td>(71,952)</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>5,551,652</td>
<td>3,722,750</td>
<td>(1,828,902)</td>
<td>(1,930,927)</td>
<td>(812,734)</td>
<td>-32.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>4,228,066</td>
<td>2,756,073</td>
<td>(1,411,993)</td>
<td>(1,378,941)</td>
<td>(1,166,993)</td>
<td>-35.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INCOME</td>
<td>1,941,400</td>
<td>1,365,809</td>
<td>(575,991)</td>
<td>(575,991)</td>
<td>(589,405)</td>
<td>-26.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>2,972,510</td>
<td>3,154,707</td>
<td>182,197</td>
<td>(405,369)</td>
<td>(96,851)</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER FROM</td>
<td>9,197,293</td>
<td>9,232,066</td>
<td>34,773</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(244,581)</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$ 234,017,968</td>
<td>$ 227,912,336</td>
<td>(6,105,632)</td>
<td>(8,897,693)</td>
<td>(16,609,630)</td>
<td>-2.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Estimate as of July 17, 2020

Sales Tax

- May collections reported in July
  - 3.95% ($215,909) above budget projection
  - 1.7% ($94,969) above prior year actual
  - $49.5 million (69%) collected to date
- Losses due to business closures and restrictions and COVID-19 stay-at-home orders offset by increases from essential businesses, online retailers, new vendors and retail that could easily pivot to modified business model of takeout, delivery service and/or curbside pickup
- Individual accounts will be reviewed for trends when monthly detail is received
FY 19-20 Revised General Fund Response

• Steps available to address current year projected shortfall of $6.1 million (2.61% of annual budget)
  – Expenditure cuts
    • General Fund departments: $7.4 million identified through the end of the current year
  – Vacancy Savings
    • Projected $4.2 million above budget including held vacancies
  – Contingency one-time uses
    • Not expected to be necessary for current year

FY 19-20 Revised General Fund Summary

• Revenue shortfalls in current year but less than anticipated
• Uncertainty of how deep, how long and type of recovery
• Shortfall response for current year includes use of expenditures reductions, vacancy savings and one-time uses
• Service level reductions
• Rate of recovery dependent on future social distancing restrictions and public confidence
FY 2020-21 Proposed Revenues

- Property value growth initially projected as strong but “Certified Estimate” Tax Roll showed record amount of disputed values
- Sales tax projected to be flat at current estimate
- Interest rates near zero indefinitely
- Other revenues will be depressed due to uncertainty related to coronavirus impact
Budget Overview – FY 2020-21

• Extended facility closures
• Employee furloughs and held vacancies
• Service level reductions
• Use of expenditure reductions to cover shortfalls
• Maintain a structurally balanced budget

Property Taxes
Property Tax Revenues

• Certified Roll for FY 2020-21 budget will be available on or before August 20, 2020
  (1 day after Budget Retreat)
• FY 2020-21 Revenue projections and rates based on “certified estimate” July 27, 2020
• Council requested that the Tax Assessor/Collector calculate the voter-approval tax rate in the manner for a special taxing unit (8%) pursuant to Section 26.04 of the Texas Code
  – Gives flexibility in setting a tax rate up to 8%

2020-21 Appraisal Issues

• DCAD did not provide a Certified appraisal roll for Tax Year 2020 on July 27, 2020
• Instead DCAD provided a “Certified Estimate”
  – Includes only properties certified as of July 25, 2020
  – Certified roll will be issued on or before August 20
• Issues
  – DCAD offices closed during spring for COVID-19
  – Record number of protests 20,000 more than last year
  – Arbitration hearings will not be held until Fall 2020
2020-21 “Certified Estimate”

- Tax Year 2019 Certified Value - $28.4 billion
- 2020 “Certified Estimate” as of 7/24/2020
  - Certified $21.7 billion
  - Value under protest: $9.5 billion DCAD estimate
  - Value under protest: $5.0 billion property owner’s estimate
- Range of 2020 certified value
  - $29.9 billion an increase of $1.5 billion or +5.3% at 85% of value under protest
  - $26.5 billion a decrease of $1.9 billion or -6.7% at 50% of value under protest

“Certified Estimate” Revenue Projection

- Dallas County Tax Assessor/Collector will calculate rates off of the 7/27/2020 certified estimate
  - We expect that the No New Taxes and Voter Approval rates will be well above current tax rate of $0.5941
  - DCAD advises that for budgeting purposes to estimate 85% collection of disputed property instead of the 50% they provided for certification
    - Exceedingly large portion of the tax base under review
    - Prior year percentages of value and results not applicable
Property Tax Estimates

- City Manager Recommendation
  - Maintain Tax Rate of $0.5941
  - Maintain Debt Service rate at $0.1200
  - Use 82.5% valuation of disputed property to budget for revenues
    - Projected Valuation of $29.42 billion +4.4% over prior year
    - Increase of $3.9 million to General Fund revenue
      - New growth accounts for $3.3 million of the increase
    - Partially offsets decrease of $7.0 million from other revenue sources

Other Revenues
### Other Projected Revenue Changes

**Sales Taxes:**
- Decrease from FY 19-20 Budget (At current collection rate)  
  - (1,511,479)

**Other Revenues:**
- Interest Income  
  - (1,755,465)
- Franchise Fees  
  - (275,971)
- Zoning and Development Fees  
  - (1,022,316)
- Fees and Permits  
  - 159,956
- Fines  
  - (1,526,111)
- Charges for Services  
  - (620,963)

**Transfers From**
- Entertainment Venue  
  - (541,474)

**New Revenues**
- Auto Pound administrative fee  
  - 80,000

**Miscellaneous Revenue Changes**  
  - 48,799

**Total Revenue Increase/(Decrease)**  
  - (6,965,024)

---

### Budget Balancing
FY 20-21 Budget Balancing Measures

• Continue steps used to address current year projected shortfall
  – Expenditure cuts
  – Vacancy Savings
  – Contingency one-time uses

• Reduce expenditure growth and evaluate current services and programs

Projected Vacancy Savings

• Vacancy Savings
  – $2.6 million for General Fund
  – Estimated at 1.5% of FY 2020-21 projected salary and benefits

• Excess vacancy savings
  – Savings from positions held vacant
  – Fully funded in budget to allow for positions to be filled if services are restored
  – Provides capacity to absorb additional losses if revenue losses are worse than projections
Summary

• Revenue shortfalls as a result of pandemic impact and “certified estimate” tax roll
• Uncertainty of how long and type of recovery
• Shortfall response for current year includes use of expenditure reductions and vacancy savings
• Avoid one-time use for operational funding
• Service level reductions
• Rate of recovery dependent on future social distancing restrictions and public confidence
• Present a structurally balanced budget
Sales Taxes

- Second largest General Fund revenue source
- Sales Tax collections are diversified across major categories and taxpayers
- Major categories
  - Retail Trade – 25%
  - Information – 10%
  - Wholesale Trade – 8.4%
- Top Taxpayers
  - Top 10 taxpayers - $9.4 million or 14%
  - Top 20 taxpayers - $14.3 million or 21%
  - Top 25 taxpayers - $16.1 million or 24%
Sales Tax – Top 300 City Average and Comparative City Grouping

Sales Tax Received in June, for April Sales Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Top 300 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales Tax – Irving vs Top 300 City Average

Sales Tax compared to same Month in Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Top 300 Average</th>
<th>Irving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Fund Revenues Projection through September 30th based on 0% to 20% Reduction in Sales Tax

Sales Tax

Sales Tax Major Categories
Franchise Fees

• Franchise Fees
  – Expect drop due to decreased business activity
  – Electric is largest provider at 51% of budget
  – State law change
  – Consumer preferences change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$19.2</td>
<td>$18.9</td>
<td>-$0.3</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Zoning and Development Fees

- Expect drop due to decreased business activity
- Building Permits is largest revenue component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>-$1.1</td>
<td>-25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Fees and Permits

- Ambulance Fees ($2.5 million) and Emergency Medical Services Fee ($1.8 million) make up majority of revenue category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Fines

- Municipal Court Fines ($3.8 million) make up majority of revenue category
- Continued decline in revenue
  - End user inability to pay
  - State law changes
  - Court closures due to COVID-19 pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>-$1.6</td>
<td>-27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Charges for Services

- Charges for Services
  - Continued decline in revenue
    - Social distancing restriction closures in recreation, libraries and building rentals
    - Limited facilities reopening
    - Reopening continuance dependent on state and local social distancing restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>-$0.6</td>
<td>-14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Investment Income

- Investment Income
  - Continued decline in revenue
    - Interest rates near zero indefinitely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>-$1.8</td>
<td>-90.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
• Miscellaneous Income
  – Continued decline in revenue
    • Subject to social distancing restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
Transfers from Other Funds

- Transfers from Other Funds
  - Updated cost of services models
    - IT Internal Service Fund
    - Enterprise Funds
      - Water & Sewer System Fund
      - Solid Waste Services Fund
      - Municipal Drainage Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget $</th>
<th>Variance from Budget %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9.2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Amounts in shown in millions)
## GF Projected Shortfall for FY19-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
<th>Var %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAXES</td>
<td>$ 107,746,707</td>
<td>$ 106,260,868</td>
<td>$(1,485,839)</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES TAXES</td>
<td>72,238,738</td>
<td>61,900,307</td>
<td>$(10,338,431)</td>
<td>-14.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCHISE FEES</td>
<td>19,159,904</td>
<td>17,793,019</td>
<td>$(1,366,885)</td>
<td>-7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING AND DEV FEES</td>
<td>4,070,782</td>
<td>3,634,823</td>
<td>$(435,959)</td>
<td>-10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES AND PERMITS</td>
<td>6,910,576</td>
<td>6,838,624</td>
<td>$(71,952)</td>
<td>-1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>5,551,652</td>
<td>4,738,918</td>
<td>$(812,734)</td>
<td>-14.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>4,228,066</td>
<td>3,061,073</td>
<td>$(1,166,993)</td>
<td>-27.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INCOME</td>
<td>1,941,800</td>
<td>1,352,395</td>
<td>$(589,405)</td>
<td>-30.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>3,026,617</td>
<td>2,929,766</td>
<td>$(96,851)</td>
<td>-3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER FROM</td>
<td>9,197,193</td>
<td>8,952,612</td>
<td>$(244,581)</td>
<td>-2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 234,072,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 217,462,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(16,609,630)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7.10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repeat of estimate shared on April 16, 2020
B2 – Employee Compensation
Budget and Strategic Plan Review Pt. III
July 30, 2020

Agenda

• Salaries
  – Step and Merit Increases
  – Vacancy Savings
  – Market and COLA adjustments

• Benefits
  – Pensions
  – Health Insurance

• Recommendations
Salaries

COVID-19 Impact on Personnel Projections

• Current Year
  – Furloughed employees from closed facilities
    • Recreation
    • Aquatics
    • Libraries
    • Arts and Museum
  – Held vacancies
  – Position Review Committee
Step and Merit Increases

- FY 2020-21 Step/Merit costs - $1,304,825
  - General Government - $809,953
  - Civil Service - $494,872

Current Year Vacancy Savings

- Vacancy Savings
  - General Fund to date $3.1 million above budget
- Held Vacancies
  - 81 Positions
    - Library-3
    - Municipal Court-3
    - Communications- 2 PT
    - CAD-1
    - Streets- 8
    - CIP- 8
    - CSO- 1
    - Traffic-2
    - Water- 5
    - ICVB- 3 PT, 1 FT
    - Housing- 1
    - Parks- 8 PT, 5 FT
    - Fire- 5
    - Phase II Police additions- 13 Officer positions, 6 Telecommunicator positions (19)
    - IAC- 2
  - Projected savings to end of year $4,863,005
Projected Vacancy Savings FY 2020-21

- Vacancy Savings
  - $2.6 million for General Fund
  - Estimated at 1.5% of FY 2020-21 projected salary and benefits
- Excess vacancy savings
  - Savings from positions held vacant
  - Fully funded in budget to allow for positions to be filled if services are restored
  - Provides capacity to absorb additional losses if revenue losses are worse than projections

COLA and Civil Service Market Adjustments

- City Manager recommendation
  - Fund Step and Merit raises for all employees
  - No Market or COLA adjustments for FY 2020-21
  - For COLA current change in CPI from May 2019 is +1.3%
  - Most benchmark cities are not proposing Market Adjustments unless required by prior meet and confer agreements
Benefits

Health Insurance

- Success at reducing cost over past three years
- Trends in medical and prescription costs
  - 12 month rolling average
    - Medical +6.8%
    - Prescription +7.1%
- Proposed rate increase – 5%
- General Fund impact $821,634
Pensions

- Fund General Government/Police pensions at actuarially defined contribution rate of 17.28%
- TMRS – increase from 14.64% to 14.93%
  - General Fund cost $257,533
- SBP – increase from 2.11% to 2.35%
  - General Fund cost $213,131
  - Funding was reduced in FY 2019-20 to maintain the cap of 16.75%
  - Without the cap, this rate would be lower for FY 2020-21
- FRRF - City Manager’s Proposed Budget
  - 3.5% increase to 20.25% per Council discussion on May 20
  - General Fund cost $1,239,445

Recommendations to Council

- No COLA/Market increases
- Health insurance premium increase at 5%
- Budget at 1.5% for vacancy savings
- 81 positions currently held vacant, but funded
  - Position Review Committee to determine necessity to fill remaining positions
- Pension funding
  - Actuarially determined rate for Police/General Government
  - 3.5% rate increase for Fire
Discussion
C - Capital Improvement Program
Budget and Strategic Plan Review
Update Pt. III
July 30, 2020

Agenda

• Recap Budget & Strategic Plan Review Meeting of June 25, 2020 – Scenario One
• Hardrock / Pioneer Real Estate Acquisition Status
• **Scenario Two:** Maintain bond sale at $20 M, defer FY 20 projects to FY 21
• **Scenario Three:** Increase bond sale from $20 M to $23.5 M
Budget & Strategic Plan Review Recap

• The current impacts to the budget revenues due to the COVID-19 Pandemic require that the General Obligation Bond Sale for FY 2019-20 be reduced from the originally planned $32.5 Million to $20 million.
• This level of reduction is based on the sustainable revenues for the operations of the City while advancing capital funding for infrastructure projects.
• Proposed bond sale reductions
  – Street Bonds - $15.550M reduced to $6.4M
  – Park Bonds - $11.450M reduced to $9.7 M
  – Building Bonds - $3.6M reduced to $2.0M
  – Fire Bonds - $400K – no reduction
  – Gateway Bonds – $1.5M – no reduction
• After proposed FY 20 bond sale of $20 M, there will be a remaining authorization of $124,960,000 in 2006 bonds.

Budget & Strategic Plan Review Recap

• Proposed reductions in the Street Bond sale for FY 19-20 can be offset for the current year due to ongoing delays with two Road to the Future Projects
  – Hardrock & Pioneer
  – Nursery Road
• Bonds were originally sold in year 1, and funds are currently in the bank, for the two RTTF projects which have been delayed due to the acquisition of Real Estate required to expand the roadway.
• These funds will be reallocated to other year 3 RTTF projects which are smaller projects and scheduled to be funded this year.
• Funding will be pushed back to FY 2021 and FY 2022 for the Hard Rock/Pioneer and Nursery Road projects.
### Budget & Strategic Plan Review Recap – Scenario One

**Bonds Sold in FY 18**
- Hardrock/Pioneer $5,477,346
- Nursery Road $3,777,679
- Total $9,255,025

**Re allocation of FY 18 Bond Sale Proceeds to Fund FY 20 RTTF Projects**
- Lindy Lane $2,500,000
- Cedar Drive $950,000
- Glenmore / Shepherd $900,000
- Neighborhood Street Reconstruction $2,000,000
- Total Reallocation $6,350,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reallocation to Glenmore/Shepherd Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining Unallocated Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,305,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget & Strategic Plan Review - Recap Proposed FY 20 Bond Sale Reduction – Scenario One

**Original Street Bond Sale** $15,550,000

**Reduction in FY 20 Bond Sale**
- FY 20 RTTF projects – reallocation of funds $6,350,000
- Esters in-house design savings $500,000
- Regent in-house design savings $800,000
- Street Rehabilitation $1,500,000
- Total Proposed Reduction $9,150,000

**Street Improvement Projects remaining for FY20 Bond Funding**
- Street Rehabilitation (Overlay) $4,500,000
- ROW Acquisition $1,000,000
- Signals $500,000
- Street Lighting $400,000

**Total Street Bonds - $6.4 M**
### Hardrock / Pioneer
### Real Estate Acquisition Status

- **7 of 11 parcels acquired**
- **Parcel #2**
  - Liens on the property
  - Originally anticipated eminent domain proceedings
  - Liens pose a small risk
  - Owner has agreed to terms of easement
  - Proceeding with easement acquisition
  - Expect Mayor signature to finalize easement within 60 days

---

### Hardrock / Pioneer
### Real Estate Acquisition Status

- **Parcel #9**
  - Owner has agreed to terms of easement
  - Proceeding with easement acquisition
  - In process for Mayor signature via Administrative Award
- **Parcel # 10, Parcel #11**
  - Owner has agreed to terms
  - Resolving encroachment with utility easement
- **Proceed to bid Hardrock / Pioneer after acquisition of all parcels**
**Scenario Two**

- Maintain Bond Sale at $20 M
- Defer FY 2020 projects to FY 2021
  - Lindy Lane
  - Cedar Drive

**Scenario Two**

Bonds Sold in FY 18 for Reallocation
- Hardrock/Pioneer **Not to reallocate**
- Nursery Road $3,777,679

Reallocation of FY 18 Bond Sale Proceeds to Fund FY 20 RTTF Projects
- Lindy Lane **$2.5 M Defer to FY 2021**
- Cedar Drive **$0.95 M Defer to FY 2021**
- Glenmore / Shepherd $1,500,000
- Neighborhood Street Reconstruction $2,000,000

Remaining Funds Available for Nursery Road **$277,679**

Total $3,777,679
Scenario Three

• Modified Bond Sale
• Recap Scenario One
  – Proposed Street Bond Sale of $6.4 M
  – Total Bond Sale of $20 M
• Scenario Three
  – Proposed Street Bond Sale of $9,900,000 (change of $3,500,000)
  – Total Bond Sale of $23,500,000

Bonds Sold in FY 18 for Reallocation
  – Hardrock/Pioneer Not to be reallocated
  – Nursery Road Defer to FY 2021 $3,777,679

FY 20 Projects
  – Lindy Lane $2.500 M allocated from Nursery Road
  – Cedar Drive $0.950 M allocated from Nursery Road
  – Glenmore / Shepherd $1,500,000
  – Neighborhood Street Reconstruction $2,000,000
  – ROW Acquisition $1,000,000
  – Street Rehabilitation $4,500,000
  – Street Lights $500,000
  – Traffic Controls $400,000

Total Street Bond Sale $9,900,000

Staff Recommends Street Bond Sale of $9.9 M
D-2020 Resident Survey Results
Budget and Strategic Plan Review
July 30, 2020

Introduction

- Conducted every 2 years
- Random sample of single-family and multifamily homes
  - 4,892 via USPS
  - 9,997 via email
- Valid Responses: 2,059
- Response Rate: 13.8%
- Margin of Error: +/- 2.0%
### Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Irving</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irving as a Place to Live</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving as a Place to Work</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of City Services</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood as a Place to Live</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Life</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving as a Place to Raise Children</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark Percentages

- Overall Quality of City Services: 79%
- Neighborhood as a Place to Live: 73%
- Irving as a Place to Raise Children: 59%

### Community Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Cultural event opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Development and redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Opportunities to participate in community matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Appearance of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Shopping opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Benchmark Percentages:
  - Cultural event opportunities: 79%
  - Development and redevelopment: 58%
### Community Characteristics

#### Maintenance and Appearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Quality of code enforcement</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Cleanup of junk and debris</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Parking in the yard</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Exterior maintenance of structures</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Maintenance of business property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Appearance of streets and corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Pickup of Litter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resident Priority

### Public Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Quality of fire services</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Quality of police services</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Quality of animal services</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Adequacy of street lighting</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resident Priority*
Public Safety

Feelings of Safety

- Neighborhood during day: 95%
  - Benchmark: 81%
- Neighborhood park during day: 92%
  - Benchmark: 63%
- Neighborhood in the evening: 78%
  - Benchmark: 48%
- Neighborhood park in the evening: 62%
  - Benchmark: 28%

Quality of City Services

Community Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent &quot;Excellent&quot; or &quot;Good&quot;</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of libraries</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of Irving Arts Center</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/landscaping of city parks</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of walking trails</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of parks</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parks facilities</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of recreation centers</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of aquatic facilities</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark:
- Overall quality of libraries: 82%
- Overall quality of Irving Arts Center: 72%
- Maintenance/landscaping of city parks: 72%
- Miles of walking trails: 56%
- Overall quality of parks: 79%
- Quality of parks facilities: 79%
- Overall quality of recreation centers: 79%
- Quality of aquatic facilities: 79%
### Quality of City Services

#### Public Works

**Percent "Excellent" or "Good"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate public works services in the following areas:</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2 Year Change</th>
<th>Multi-Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition of major streets</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of sidewalks in YOUR neighborhood</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of streets in YOUR neighborhood</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of traffic signs and roadway striping</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining streets (filling potholes, smoothing bumps)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement and number of streetlights</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of your water service</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater drainage</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeping</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of traffic signals</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic management during rush hour</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality of City Services

**Solid Waste Services**

**Percent "Excellent" or "Good"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Irving</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brush and Bulky Waste</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Collection</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Solid Waste Services</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside Recycling</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Disposal</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Priority Item*
Knowledge

74% Made me feel valued as a resident

Professionalism

72%

Promptness

68%

Willingness to help

70%

Overall service

69%

Percent "Excellent" or "Good"

Benchmark

67%

70%

Aggregate Score

City Performance

Value of services for the taxes paid to the city.

Irving

49%

Benchmark

44%

Overall direction that the city is taking.

Irving

57%

Benchmark

49%

Job city does at welcoming resident involvement.

Irving

49%

Benchmark

36%

City Performance

Percent "Excellent" or "Good"

Benchmark

67%
Recommend living in Irving to someone who asks. 79%

Remain living in Irving for the next five years. 83%

Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by each of the following?

- U.S. Government: 38%
- Dallas County Government: 39%
- State of Texas: 52%
- City of Irving: 68%
Rate the usefulness of the following in finding out about city services and programs.

- City Website: 90% (Benchmark: 58%)
- City Spectrum: 89% (Benchmark: 42%)
- City Spectrum Digital: 81% (Benchmark: 45%)
- City Spectrum Briefs: 80%
- Social Network: 76%
- ICTN: 60%

Percent “Very Useful” or “Useful”

---

Priorities

- Street Maintenance and Condition
- Business Development and Redevelopment
- Police and Fire
- Street Lighting
- Sidewalks
Questions
# Resident Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Number of Emails Received</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defund the Police</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Inquiry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Responsibility*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Rate*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of Irving businesses*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training for City employees*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with outside entities *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Stadium Land*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* from one email
## Public Input Sources

- Email notices sent to the City Secretary’s Office
- Ask the BFFs
- City Council Meetings
- Public Input Hearings
  - Public Hearing #1 – June 4, 2020
    - No comments
  - Public Hearing #2 – June 25, 2020
    - Support for the Police

## Resident Input May 19, 2020

- Letter from a Resident on May 19, 2020
- The letter from the resident concerns DCAD and property appraisal values for the upcoming fiscal year
- The resident does not want new projects
- Wants to see a reduced budget, focus on basic and essential items (police, fire, etc.)
- Wants property tax relief
Resident Input May 30, 2020

- Email from a resident on May 30, 2020
- Input concerns the tax rate and revenue collection for Irving
- Wants Irving City Council to adopt a lower tax rate due to DCAD not offering property tax relief

Resident Input June 25, 2020

- Email from a resident on June 25, 2020
- Input concerns updated technology security upgrades to prevent computer attacks
Resident Input June 27, 2020

- Email from multiple residents on June 27, 2020
- Input concerns reducing the police budget
- Residents’ input stated that they would like to see the police budget reduced and funds allocated towards: mental health, violence intervention programs, educational resources, and restorative justice programs

Resident Input June 28, 2020

- Email from a resident on June 28, 2020
- Input concerns various budget and policy questions for the City of Irving
- Resident’s questions were the following:
  - Are residents and City of Irving Employees and visitors encouraged to maximize our city dollars and minimize waste? If so, how? If not, why?
  - Are efforts made to stimulate the economy of Irving by prioritizing purchasing within the city and from businesses and individuals inside our city? If yes, how? If not, why?
  - Are City of Irving employees at all levels encouraged to develop professional skills which not only enrich their possibilities but strengthen our City Team? If so, how? If not, why?
  - Does our City of Irving Team work together with Dallas County, Irving ISD, Dallas County Community College District, Spiritual Organizations, Baylor Scott and White, other medical centers, University of Dallas, DART, The State of Texas to find economies, mutual goals, partnerships, assistance, and avoid duplication? If yes, how? If no, why?
  *We, the City of Irving, have one of the most valuable plots of land in Texas, the former Texas Stadium land, what are our plans? How will you use this land to benefit the citizens of Irving?
  - Multiple departments responded to provide answers to the residents inquiries
    - Responses after this presentation
Resident Input July 13, 2020

- Email from resident on July 13, 2020
- The concern was Finley Rd. from N. Story going to Stafford Rd
- Resident stated that this road needed repairs
- Transportation does not have the street on the future overlay list, but will assess the road

Questions
F- New Strategic Plan
Budget and Strategic Plan Review

July 30, 2020

Background

• Created in February 2015
• Strategic Goals:
  – Financial Sustainability
  – Systematic Infrastructure Investment
  – Vibrant Economy
  – Service Excellence
  – Inclusive and Collaborative Governance
  – Talented and Energized Workforce
What is strategic planning?

- A systematic process to identify why our local government exists, whom it serves, what benefits are derived from our services, and the vision our administration has regarding how residents’ needs can be best served.

Why do we need one?

- Yields results
- Provides management tool
- Fosters agility
- Responds to stakeholder needs
- Narrows communication gap
- Creates accountability
### Mission
- Deliver exceptional services and promote a high quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

### Vision
- Irving will be the model for safe and beautiful neighborhoods, a vibrant economy, and exceptional recreational, cultural and educational opportunities.

---

#### Basic Strategic Plan Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Driven</th>
<th>Management Led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should be involved?

- Mayor and Council
- City Management
- Department Directors
- Key Stakeholders

Questions?