



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** September 13, 2016  
**TO:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
**FROM:** Chuck Springer, Director of Finance  
**SUBJECT:** City Council Budget Questions and Responses

Information regarding the FY 2016-17 Proposed Budget and Five Year Forecast was presented to the City Council on August 4<sup>th</sup>, with Council discussions on August 9, 16 and 23rd. Below is a summary of the most recent questions and requests, from the City Council as I understand them, and the responses compiled to date. For the items that require further research, we will provide additional information at a future City Council meeting.

- 1. Please provide FY 2016-17 revenue projections for the Water Works Park at 80,000 and 85,000 estimated visitors as compared to 90,000 estimated visitors which was used to project revenue in the FY 2016-17 Proposed Budget.**

The wave pool will be the second attraction at the Denton Water Works Park that is open to all ages, in addition to the lazy river. The addition of the wave pool will attract more customers in the 12 year old -25 year old demographic, which is currently an underserved age group with the existing park amenities. The wave pool addition will also extend the length of stay for visitors at the waterpark, thus adding value to the user's experience. Fiscal Year 14-15 daily attendance totals reached 83,000 visitors. The average daily attendance is 1,000 visitors during approximately 89 operating days. We estimate that the addition of the wave pool will provide an additional capacity for up 900 visitors.

In estimating the increase in attendance for Fiscal Year 16-17, staff used actual attendance data from prior years and included an escalator of an additional 202 visitors per operating day, which is expected to be generated from interest in the new wave pool. In addition, the restructuring of the membership pricing will allow customers to have more flexibility to purchase passes at a discounted rate for groups of four or more. Currently the family passes only allow immediate family members to be on the pass. The restructure of passes to individual passes will allow the discount to include extended family members and friends.

Per Council's request, [Attachment 1](#) and [Attachment 2](#) reflect revenue projections for Water Works Park using 80,000 and 85,000 attendance levels and at various admission rates.

- 2. Please provide information on alcohol sales at water parks.**

[Attachment 3](#) is a listing of local water parks indicating which have alcohol sales.

**3. Please provide information on Council meals, Council Contingency budgets, and travel and training budgets for both General Fund and Council.**

We are budgeting \$14,575 in FY 2016-17 for City Council meals. This figure includes funding for lunch, dinner, snacks, and associated drinks during the year. We are budgeting \$17,500 in Council contingency funds for FY 2016-17. This equates to \$2,500 per Council member. [Attachment 4](#) is the total travel and training budget for the General Fund by department. For FY 2016-17, we are budgeting \$396,737 which is approximately \$473 per FTE. This amount includes \$30,670 for City Council travel and training.

**4. Please provide information on how travel and training budgets are set for each department including City Council and what happens when the department exceeds their travel and training budget.**

The Council travel budget is part of the overall City Manager's Office (CMO) budget. Therefore, if the Council travel plans exceed the budget amount, we make other changes within the CMO budget to accommodate the requests. Essentially, we have tried to budget Council travel funds consistent with what we have seen historically. In years when Council wants to travel more, we attempt to make it work by finding other funding within the department. Departments budget for what they anticipate needing for employee development, maintaining credentials/certifications, etc. If there is a need for more funding, the departments are responsible for finding the resources in the existing budget. Likewise, if they do not need all of the funds, they have an opportunity to allocate these resources to other items that may be needed.

**5. Please provide information on the Airport Enterprise Fund and the long term financial projection.**

[Attachment 5](#) is a report on the history of the Airport Enterprise Fund.

[Attachment 6](#) includes two Five Year Forecasts for the Airport Enterprise Fund. The first page is the Proposed FY 2016-17 Forecast showing the elimination of the Return on Investment (ROI) and the Debt Service payment starting in FY 2016-17. The second page shows the Airport 5 Year Forecast keeping both the ROI and the Debt Service payment in the Airport Fund which will result in exhausting the fund balance by the end of FY 2018-19.

- 6. Please provide information on the status of the City wide inventory of sidewalk needs, associated funding sources and projected timelines for completion.**

## PROPOSED SIDEWALK PROGRAM PLAN

## Goal:

Develop a Street Sidewalk Plan to identify all sidewalk needs along public streets within the City of Denton, estimate the costs of each of those needs, prioritize those needs and develop a multi-year funding request to satisfy those needs.

**Funding:**

### **Current Funding:**

2014 Bond Program	\$2,000,000
(including \$80,000 allocated to Downtown Sidewalk priorities)	

**Mgr. Recommended Funding (FY2016-17 Budget):**

## ADA PROWAG\* Funding for ADA

Improvements along Streets	\$168,064 (in FY16-17, from General Fund)
----------------------------	---

# ADA Transition Plan Study for

250,000 (from FY15-16 EOY Budget Balance)

## Downtown Sidewalk Program

145,000 (in FY16-17, from Traffic Safety Fund)

\$770,064

## \*Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines

**\*\* May be funded from Downtown TIRZ. TIRZ Board will consider at next meeting.**

### Programming of Sidewalk Funding:

### 2014 Bond Program Funding:

The Bond Oversight committee identified only an allowance for sidewalk funding, leaving the identification of specific sidewalks up to staff, with review by the Mobility Committee. Staff developed a prioritized project funding listing, based on (1) ADA concerns, (2) school locations, (3) citizen requests, (4) missing sections identified from previous projects or developments, and (5) worn “foot paths,” which totaled \$3,480,000. This listing was provided to the Citizens Bond Committee and to the Council Mobility Committee for review and comment. Implementation has begun on the highest priority projects.

## ADA PROWAG Funding

This funding will be used to bring existing intersection crosswalks to current ADA standards, including upgrading of pedestrian buttons to include audible alerts.

### ADA Transition Plan:

This funding will be used to secure a consultant to identify ADA compliance issues on all City street sidewalks and crossings and finalize the City's ADA Transition Plan for street sidewalks.

### **Downtown Sidewalk Funding:**

This funding (\$352,000) will be used to construct the remaining three “Top 5” priority sidewalks in the Downtown Area.

**Additional Sidewalk Plan Activities:**

**Maintenance Activities:**

Streets allocates approximately \$1,000,000 of its street maintenance budget each year for repair of curb & gutter, sidewalks and ADA ramps (approximately 1/3 to each area), based on citizen complaints, staff observations and needs identified as part of street reconstruction and major maintenance activities.

**City Street Sidewalk Inventory:**

An inventory survey of the City’s Street and Sidewalks was conducted as part of the 2015 Street OCI Survey. This inventory mapped locations of sidewalks along City streets and provided general information about those sidewalks, including type (asphalt, concrete or other), width categories (no specific dimensions), general location from the curb or street edge, general condition (good, fair, poor and very poor), and ADA ramp locations. City staff has been placing that information into a GIS Sidewalk Map and adding key destinations (schools, parks, libraries, churches, etc.), in order to assist in prioritization of missing sidewalk segments.

**TxDOT Road Sidewalk Inventory:**

A High School intern was used during the summer to conduct a visual inventory survey of sidewalks along TxDOT roadways (the City’s OCI Survey does not include TxDOT roads) to gather data on those sidewalks similar to that gathered in the City’s OCI survey. This information is being added to the City’s GIS Sidewalk Map.

**Sidewalk Prioritization System:**

City staff is developing a Sidewalk Prioritization System, to be used to prioritize construction of missing sidewalks based on a number of critical factors, such as ADA needs, potential for pedestrian traffic, a deficiency index (based on safety, need, sidewalk continuity, etc.) and a feasibility index (based on available right-of-way, obstructions to construction, etc.). This Prioritization System should be completed by the end of this calendar year.

**Problem:**

While street reconstruction and maintenance costs can be fairly well estimated using unit prices (since the roadway width is already defined, no additional right-of-way is required and additional storm drainage is not normally required), missing sidewalk segments are not so easily estimated. Missing sidewalk segments require prioritization (based on need factors), assessment of existing right-of-way (to determine if additional right-of-way is required for the sidewalk and, if so, how much), assessment of drainage implications (is storm drainage work required to place the sidewalk and to what extent), assessment of ADA implications (is special construction needed to comply with ADA requirements), assessment of required construction to place a sidewalk (retaining walls, etc.), and cost estimating of each sidewalk segment. These assessments generally require an engineer or experienced engineering technician.

**Recommendations:**

- A. Allow staff to develop a prioritized listing of Sidewalk Needs for missing sidewalk segments and very poor and poor sidewalk segments in preparation for a potential 2019-2020 Bond Program, as the 2014 Bond Program Sidewalk Funding is being expended on the current Bond Program Priority Listing.
- B. This assessment and prioritization work might be done quicker using a consultant. But, an outside consultant could cost as much as \$300,000. Staff feels that funding could be better spent on constructing sidewalks and that the Sidewalk Program funding need is so great that it would take much longer to fund it than the time required to assess and estimate the needs.
- C. Allow staff to proceed with implementing the 2014 Bond Program Sidewalk Program, using the current funding and current listing. The listing can be adjusted if factors indicate there is a substantial priority need for other sidewalk segments. This action would allow implementation of sidewalk construction while the full City Sidewalk Program is being prepared, rather than awaiting preparation of it to expend any funding.
- D. As part of the City's website restructuring, add Sidewalk Program Information to the website, along with an on-line form for citizens to report sidewalk problems and make requests for sidewalk construction.

**7. Please provide additional information on lobbyist contracts.**

The City uses three lobbyist firms. Focused Advocacy (Snapper Carr), Capital Edge (Washington DC), and Solutions for Local Control (Fred Hill). The Focus Advocacy contract was approved by Council in August in the amount of \$166,000 per year. The Solutions for Local control contract is approximately \$42,000 per year. The Council will be asked to approve a new contract with this firm on September 20<sup>th</sup>. The Capital Edge contract expires in September 2017, and it is approximately \$54,000 per year.

**8. Please provide information on how the Economic Development partnership funds for the Chamber of Commerce are divided up between General Fund and utilities, and why this allocation methodology is used.**

For FY 2016-17, we have budgeted the following amounts for the Chamber of Commerce contract.

\$62,897 General Fund (Economic Development Department)  
\$109,000 Electric Fund  
\$29,355 Water Fund  
\$22,000 Wastewater Fund  
\$21,000 Solid Waste Fund

\$244,252 Total

Since the Chamber contract is viewed as a way to increase economic development across the city, we have budgeted for this expense across multiple funds. The idea is that multiple parts of the organization benefit from economic development (e.g. property tax and utility revenue), and as a result, there should be a shared partnership in the costs. The allocation to each fund, however, is largely unscientific, and it has been based mostly on past allocations which began many years ago. In other words, we have not done an analysis to show whether DME receives 50% of the benefit of the chambers efforts. With that said, the utility funds most likely pay for more than their proportional share of services. As a result, if we shifted all of the costs to DME (or all utilities), the ratepayers would be paying the entire cost of services that benefit, at least in part, taxpayers.

**9. Please provide information on DME's budget. Specifically, have they proposed an increase to their solar rebates.**

In the FY 2016-17 proposed budget, the solar rebate from DME is recommended to increase from \$180,000 to \$200,000. We have also added \$30,000 for rebates for customers that install energy efficiency upgrades (e.g. HVAC, solar screens, insulation, etc). In addition, we added \$60,000 for the below programs for customers.

**1) Standard Offer Incentive**

- a. Available for DME customers that have a minimum peak demand of 200kW.
- b. Participants must reduce their peak demand by a minimum of 50kW.
- c. Eligible projects are those that are permanent energy efficient/conservative upgrades.

**2) Engineering Audit**

- a. Available for DME customers that are on rate schedule General Service Large or General Service Time of Use
- b. Participants are eligible for one detailed audit rebate every three years.
- c. Engineering firm that customer chooses must meet the minimum scope of work.

**3) Demand Response Control**

- a. This is not a program that is in place, yet. It is in the planning stages for FY 2017.
- b. This program would allow customers to register their smart thermostats with DME.
- c. Participants allows DME to remotely decrease their consumption through these smart devices, if and when there is a demand for it. (This is voluntary and participants can accept or decline thermostat control at the time of deployment.)

**10. Please provide information on the City's Open Data Portal and plans to include budgetary data along with the display of key strategic performance dashboards.**

City staff will update the City Council on these efforts during the budget work session on September 13, 2016.

**11. Please provide information on how merit increases are handled for employees that are above their competitive pay range.**

During our discussions with Council concerning the compensation plan, we identified some employees below and above the competitive range. However, these employees were still within the proposed salary ranges. If an employee is above the competitive range, it does not mean the employee is "overpaid." There could be several reasons why employees are over the competitive range, including but not limited to, longevity, specialty of the position, or because the value of the position in our organization is greater than the value in other organizations. The employees above the competitive range will not receive any adjustment as a result of implementing the new pay structure; however, they will still be eligible for merit increases. Merit increases are a separate pay component used to recognize and reward employees for good performance. In the event an employee's pay is at the maximum of the salary range, merit increases will be given as a lump sum increase, not a base pay increase.

**12. Below is an additional citizen comment submitted to the City Council through the online budget submission portal.**

- a. Jane Piper-Lunt, 207 North Elm, Denton, Tx, 76201. Submitted August 27, 2016. Contact: [janepiperlunt@outlook.com](mailto:janepiperlunt@outlook.com). I don't see much hope for this years budget coming out sane when Sara can't even get you guys to cut \$11,000! I hope hiring a kick ass city manager and auditor will do what city council won't, that being cutting the waste across the board in all nonessential departments and especially DME. This IS NOT YOUR MONEY, stop the waste.

## Water Works Park Revenue Projections for the 2017 Season

Wave Pool and Concession Stand estimated operating expenses \$608,076

Variables									
	FY 15-16	FY 16-17*	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17
Increase				\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 6.00
Attendance Forecast	72,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Admission Rates	\$11/\$7	\$11/\$7	\$11/\$7	\$12/\$8	\$13/\$9	\$14/\$10	\$15/\$11	\$16/\$12	\$17/\$13
<b>Water Works Park Revenue</b>									
After Hours Rentals	\$ 30,000	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500
Birthday Parties	\$ 34,500	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000
Cabana Rentals	\$ 13,500	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317	\$ 29,317
Memberships	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 195,000
Admissions	\$ 444,085	\$ 493,428	\$ 493,428	\$ 539,604	\$ 585,780	\$ 631,956	\$ 678,132	\$ 724,308	\$ 770,484
Aquatic Programing	\$ -	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000
<b>Concessions Revenue</b>									
Concessions	\$ 81,334	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000
Dippin Dots	\$ -	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500
Snow Cones	\$ -	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627	\$ 24,627
<b>Gift Shop and Locker Rental Revenue</b>									
Merchandise	\$ 10,800	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000
Lockers	\$ 7,920	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800
Total Revenue	\$ 772,139	\$ 947,173	\$ 992,173	\$ 1,038,349	\$ 1,084,525	\$ 1,130,701	\$ 1,176,877	\$ 1,223,053	\$ 1,269,229
Additional Revenue		\$ 175,033	\$ 220,033	\$ 266,209	\$ 312,385	\$ 358,561	\$ 404,737	\$ 450,913	\$ 497,089
<b>Variance</b>		\$ (433,043)	\$ (388,043)	\$ (341,867)	\$ (295,691)	\$ (249,515)	\$ (203,339)	\$ (157,163)	\$ (110,987)

\* Does not include changes to the season pass structure



## Water Works Park Revenue Projections for the 2017 Season

Wave Pool and Concession Stand estimated operating expenses \$608,076

Variables									
	FY 15-16	FY 16-17*	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17	FY 16-17
Increase				\$1.00	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$5.00	\$6.00
Attendance Forecast	72,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Admission Rates	\$11/\$7	\$11/\$7	\$11/\$7	\$12/\$8	\$13/\$9	\$14/\$10	\$15/\$11	\$16/\$12	\$17/\$13
<b>Water Works Park Revenue</b>									
After Hours Rentals	\$30,000.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$37,500.00
Birthday Parties	\$34,500.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00
Cabana Rentals	\$13,500.00	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40	\$29,317.40
Memberships	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00
Admissions	\$444,085.47	\$524,267.57	\$524,267.57	\$573,329.59	\$622,391.60	\$671,453.62	\$720,515.63	\$769,577.65	\$818,639.66
Aquatic Programing	\$0.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00
<b>Concessions Revenue</b>									
Concessions	\$81,334.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00	\$119,000.00
Dippin Dots	\$0.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00	\$8,500.00
Snow Cones	\$0.00	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13	\$24,627.13
<b>Gift Shop and Locker Rental Revenue</b>									
Merchandise	\$10,800.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00	\$12,750.00
Lockers	\$7,920.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00	\$9,350.00
Total Revenue	\$772,139.47	\$986,312.10	\$1,031,312.10	\$1,080,374.12	\$1,129,436.13	\$1,178,498.15	\$1,227,560.16	\$1,276,622.18	\$1,325,684.19
Additional Revenue		\$214,172.63	\$259,172.63	\$308,234.65	\$357,296.66	\$406,358.68	\$455,420.69	\$504,482.71	\$553,544.72
<b>Variance</b>		<b>(393,903.37)</b>	<b>(348,903.37)</b>	<b>(299,841.35)</b>	<b>(250,779.34)</b>	<b>(201,717.32)</b>	<b>(152,655.31)</b>	<b>(103,593.29)</b>	<b>(54,531.28)</b>

\* Does not include changes to the season pass structure

## Metroplex Water Park Alcohol Comparison Survey

Park	Location	Municipally Operated	Alcohol Sales
NRH2O	North Richland Hills	Yes	No
Surf-n-Swim	Garland	Yes	No
Sun Valley	Lewisville	Yes	No
Hawaiian Falls	Roanoke	No	No
Bahama Beach	Dallas	Yes	No
Hurricane Harbor	Arlington	No	Yes

**General Fund Travel and Training**

	FY2014-15 Budget	FY2014-15 Actuals	FY2015-16 Budget	FY2015-16 YTD	FY2016-17 Proposed
City Council	26,750	48,068	30,670	25,573	30,670
City Manager's Office	36,125	37,192	37,125	44,682	37,125
PCO	15,867	14,088	15,867	9,170	15,867
Legal	7,256	14,849	9,000	10,298	15,000
Municipal Judge	2,150	1,215	2,150	1,100	1,433
Human Resources	7,168	6,936	7,168	2,493	7,168
Finance	33,470	16,134	37,070	18,900	35,060
Municipal Court	3,000	2,555	3,000	3,183	4,000
Economic Development	24,912	29,118	24,912	18,142	24,912
Planning & Development	16,700	12,184	16,700	25,534	16,700
Human Services	1,786	3,179	1,786	1,786	1,786
Building Inspections	28,400	20,941	34,600	26,165	34,000
Gas Well Review	4,400	5,797	4,450	-	4,450
Facilities Management	6,200	15,068	7,700	7,656	11,200
Libraries	25,983	16,937	21,983	17,076	23,483
Police	20,750	8,982	21,000	20,502	31,600
Fire	24,500	27,339	37,000	28,108	45,500
Community Improvement	10,220	6,426	10,220	6,309	10,220
Transportation	11,200	4,559	11,200	4,090	11,200
Traffic Control	2,000	76	3,000	-	2,000
Parks	19,530	17,389	23,215	16,828	33,363
Total	\$ 328,367	\$ 309,030	\$ 359,816	\$ 287,595	\$ 396,737

## **Airport Enterprise Fund Report August 2016**

The Airport Enterprise Fund (AEF) is currently in the sixth year of operation. The AEF was created in 2010 in conformance with the 2010 Business Plan as adopted by City Council Ordinance 2010-294. The 2010 Business Plan identified four (4) major initiatives for Airport operations, including: Airport Branding; Enterprise Fund Transition; Hangar/Rental Property Development; and Long-Term Development. All of the major initiatives have been achieved with ongoing operations at Denton Enterprise Airport, with the exception of Hangar/Rental Property Improvements which could be leased to generate additional revenue over the lease of undeveloped land. Several minor investments in improvement were implemented and one major investment in Airport owned and operated T-Hangars will soon be completed. These investments in property improvements were made in conformance with Investment Guidelines presented to the City Council by Staff. Staff was directed by Council to use the Investment Guidelines as a minimum measure to evaluate projects designed to generate revenue which would transition the Airport into financial sustainability as gas well royalty revenue diminishes over the first ten (10) years of AEF operation.

An AEF Financial Pro Forma first projected in 2010 and revised in 2014 indicated the requirement to generate approximately one million dollars (\$1 million) in annual revenue from lease of improved property and new revenue from commissions on fuel sales. In Fiscal 2014/15, a major change in revenue generating development plans had to be considered to accommodate State law and bond funding requirements that prohibited “build-to-suit” aviation facilities using Certificates of Obligation (COs). The only funding options for these developments were either cash or voter approved General Obligation Bonds. A further definition of this policy in 2015 resulted in an interpretation that COs could not be used for property improvements to be leased to tenants unless certain private activity requirements, set by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), were met.

**AIRPORT FUND****Five Year Forecast (in millions)**  
**Proposed**

	2015-16 Estimate	2016-17 Proposed	2017-18 Proposed	2018-19 Proposed	2019-20 Proposed	2020-21 Proposed
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	\$3.40	\$2.45	\$2.37	\$2.15	\$1.74	\$1.16
REVENUES	\$1.22	\$1.47	\$1.48	\$1.39	\$1.33	\$1.28
TOTAL AVAILABLE RESOURCES	\$4.62	\$3.92	\$3.85	\$3.54	\$3.07	\$2.44
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	\$1.63	\$1.55	\$1.70	\$1.80	\$1.91	\$2.03
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	\$0.06	-	-	-	-	-
DEBT SERVICE	\$0.48	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2.17	\$1.55	\$1.70	\$1.80	\$1.91	\$2.03
NET INCOME (LOSS)	(\$0.95)	(\$0.08)	(\$0.22)	(\$0.41)	(\$0.58)	(\$0.75)
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$2.45	\$2.37	\$2.15	\$1.74	\$1.16	\$0.41

**AIRPORT FUND****Five Year Forecast (in millions)**  
**Status Quo**

	2015-16 Estimate	2016-17 Proposed	2017-18 Proposed	2018-19 Proposed	2019-20 Proposed	2020-21 Proposed
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	\$3.40	\$2.45	\$1.84	\$1.10	(\$0.11)	(\$1.47)
REVENUES	\$1.22	\$1.47	\$1.48	\$1.39	\$1.33	\$1.28
TOTAL AVAILABLE RESOURCES	\$4.62	\$3.92	\$3.32	\$2.49	\$1.22	(\$0.19)
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	\$1.63	\$1.55	\$1.70	\$1.80	\$1.91	\$2.03
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	\$0.06	\$0.06	\$0.06	\$0.06	\$0.06	\$0.06
DEBT SERVICE	\$0.48	\$0.47	\$0.46	\$0.74	\$0.72	\$0.81
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$2.17	\$2.08	\$2.22	\$2.60	\$2.69	\$2.90
NET INCOME (LOSS)	(\$0.95)	(\$0.61)	(\$0.74)	(\$1.21)	(\$1.36)	(\$1.62)
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$2.45	\$1.84	\$1.10	(\$0.11)	(\$1.47)	(\$3.09)