

~~Priscilla Davidson~~

Priscilla Davidson
76453 Willow St Oakridge

I want to bring to your attention the rules on supplemental budgets, specifically when they are allowed. ORS 294.471 defines the circumstances under which a supplemental budget is allowed. I am sure you are aware of these, but as a citizen I have a right to be heard. Thank you.

Items (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) and (i) as well as 2, 3 and 4 within the ORS clearly do not apply as they deal with ad valorem taxes, sale of property or a service/facility issue.

My concerns are that several councilors voted to pass a budget, fully knowing the anticipated revenues generated by the public safety fee were required to cover the expenditures. Passing of the budget is the authority for the city to spend the appropriated funds. What certain council members did, was fraudulent and deceptive. By their own words, Kinyon and Spliethof acknowledged they had no intention of even discussing the adoption of the fee required to lawfully support the expenditures of the budget they just voted to pass.

1. If you look at 294.471 (a), it allows for a supplemental budget if "an occurrence or condition that is not ascertained when preparing the original budget or a previous supplemental budget for the current year or current budget period and that requires a change in financial planning."

That simple does not apply here, the issues were well known, documented and discussed. You simple cannot pass the original budget one minute and then claim you did not know you needed the anticipated funds that balanced the budget a few minutes later. Especially after requiring the CA to provide documentation from the State, that the process to be used (budget followed by Ordinance) was legal.

2. Moving on to 294.471 (b) it allows for a supplemental budget when "a pressing necessity that could not reasonably be foreseen when preparing the original budget or a previous supplemental budget for the current year or current budget period and that requires prompt action."

Again, this is not the case. Discussion of the original budget had just concluded, changes and cuts were made and a vote taken. Discussion was had, questions asked. All councilors who voted against the public safety fee ordinance, knew it was required to legally allow spending of the allocated funds July 1st. To suggest it was reasonable foreseen that those funds would not be needed is ludicrous. Again, by their own words during the session, they planned to never pass the ordinance. Their willful and wanton disregard for the rules does not create a pressing necessity that was unforeseeable. They knew exactly what they were doing. The Mayor even asked them.

3. The last circumstance that would allow for a supplemental budget in this situation is 294.471 (h) "A reduction in available resources that requires the governing body to reduce appropriations in the original budget or a previous supplemental budget for the current year or current budget period."

There is no reduction. The resource that was included to cover the expenses is still viable.

The plan these councilors set into motion to achieve their personal agenda is despicable, if not criminal. Every Councilor took an oath to uphold the rules and laws of the city and the State, clearly several have not.

I want to point out another ORS that is applicable;

ORS 294.456 Governing body to adopt budget, make appropriations, declare and categorize property tax amount or rate; amendment of budget estimates, appropriations and tax amounts or rates limited; requirements for appropriations and tax amounts or rates.

Specifically;

2 (d) The governing body may amend the budget estimates, appropriations and ad valorem property tax amount or rate in the budget document before adoption under paragraph (a) of this subsection and after adoption if the ***post-adoption amendments are adopted prior to the commencement of the fiscal year*** or budget period to which the budget relates. (Bold and italic's added by me)

This was your only option, and the time has passed.

Perhaps, the prior public safety fee Ordinance can be adjusted, presented and read at the first meeting in June. I would suggest a one year option. While short, this forces the issue, and will not allow time to pass without adjustments being made and the fee becoming permanent. It appears that it would also legally correct the horrendous issue created.

I would also like to see the CA do away with stipends to local volunteers. Those who drive over 15 miles to get here would still receive the stipend to cover gas and food. This is an easy way to cut costs but still support volunteers that incur costs. Not allowing the ambulances to go further than 1 mile when not on a call (when used to go get lunch for example) would help curb fuel consumption. Suspending vacations that would result in overtime from Sept 1st until the end of January would go a long way in reducing the amount of over time paid out, which in turn would also lower PER's and other payroll costs. This is only a 6 month window, but would reduce OT costs, and does not impact planned summer vacations that might have fees paid that are too late to cancel.

These are just a few simple adjustments that can be made that would help lower the amount of the public safety fee. There are many more that will not impact the city's ability to function. It would also show the public that the weight of this problem is not fully being borne by the citizens.

Thank you.