



# CITY OF BEXLEY

## OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

---

# ADMINISTRATION POSITION PAPER

---

### Administration Response to the Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force Recommendations

Revised January 22, 2013

[www.bexley.org](http://www.bexley.org)

## Table of Contents

History & Background	Page 2
Purpose of the Position Paper	Page 4
Key Recommendations	Page 4
Analysis of the Public Service Fee Recommendation	Page 5
Analysis of the Digital Ad Revenue Recommendation	Page 8
Analysis of the Parking Meter Recommendation	Page 9
Analysis of the Speed Camera Recommendation	Page 13
Other Recommendations of the Task Force	Page 16
Administration Additional Recommendations	Page 19
Budget Update & Revised Financial Forecast	Page 21
Conclusion	Page 22

## History & Background

In late 2011, Bexley City Council commissioned and formed the Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force in order to assist City leadership with identifying sources of non-traditional, non-tax revenue in order to help solve structural issues with the City's finances. The Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force was made up of more than 30 private citizens. The task force met five times as a full group and in sub-committee groups. The subcommittee groups were defined as follows:

- Best Practices – Chaired by Kevin Ryan
- Political Engagement – Chaired by Brad Kastan
- PILOT Programs – Chaired by Harlan Robins
- Fines/Fees/Sponsorships – Chaired by Tracey Parsons
- Land Use – Chaired by Greg Adams
- Economic Development – Chaired by Mark Barbash

The task force was provided with a 5-year financial projection for the City of Bexley, based upon 2011 and 2012 budget figures and forward projections, that showed a fundamental

annual shortfall in the range of \$1,000,000<sup>1</sup>. The task force therefore researched and provided a series of recommendations that would collectively raise sufficient non-tax revenue to cover the anticipated shortfall.

The corresponding recommendations and documentation of those recommendations represents one of the most thoroughly researched and comprehensively thought-out task force reports in the history of the city.

---

<sup>1</sup> The City has since honed the expense side of the city budget. Revised forecast estimates are provided on page 21 of this report.

## Purpose of this Position Paper

The purpose of the administration's position paper is to provide an analysis of and response to the recommendations of the Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force. Some of the task force recommendations would require City Council action to implement, and all of them would require support of the administration, so it is imperative that the administration provide a perspective to the task force recommendations.

## Key Recommendations

The task force report includes several recommendations. Of those, some recommendations clearly quantify potential revenue that can be gained, while others were more akin to "best practice" recommendations, or were recommendations that required further study or long-term implementation.

This "position paper" will focus on both the key recommendations of the Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force, as defined in the executive summary of the task force report, as well as the multiple additional recommendations that were not quantified, believing all of them to be valuable recommendations worthy of consideration. The items included as key recommendations were the following (revenue estimates synopsized below are task force revenue estimates):

- Public Service Fees: \$450,000 potential revenue
- Digital Ad Revenue: \$100,000 potential revenue
- Parking Meters on Main Street: \$250,000 potential revenue
- Speed Cameras: \$750,000 potential revenue

## Analysis of the Public Service Fee Recommendation

The public service fee recommendation is a form of a “Payment in Lieu of Taxes” (PILOT). PILOT programs have been instituted throughout the country with varying degrees of success. However, PILOT programs are rare in Ohio, and where they do occur they typically occur in situations involving payments to school districts by property tax exempt users. Local tax structures vary widely throughout the country, so PILOT programs in other states are not necessarily analogous to Bexley’s situation, and caution is essential when comparing out-of-state arrangements, in that the local tax environments must be adequately understood before drawing conclusions that are relevant to Bexley.

The recommended PILOT program is a public service fee, assessed against non-resident students within Bexley. The task force recommends a monthly fee structure ranging from \$5 to \$20 per student, with an anticipated annual revenue of slightly under \$500,000.

### **Overview of Public Feedback**

Public feedback in reaction to this recommendation has been primarily received from Capital University, St Charles, and Columbus School for Girls, all of whom are opposed to the imposition of a service fee on their students. Kate Giller, a Bexley resident and CSG parent, spoke at the January 15<sup>th</sup> public meeting in opposition to the public service fee recommendation.

### **Administration Analysis**

Educational institutions in Bexley include the Bexley City School District, Capital University, Trinity Seminary, Columbus School for Girls, and St Charles Preparatory School. Educational Institutions represent the largest non-residential users of land in the City of Bexley. The support of educational institutions is a core component of the City’s adopted mission and vision statement (Resolution 18-12, adopted by City Council in November 2012). The official City of Bexley Mission & Vision Statement calls for “... a Bexley that is a top-tier community of extremely high quality and excellence that... is known for its excellent educational

institutions and opportunities for learning”. Therefore, having thriving educational institutions is a core component of the City’s adopted Mission and Vision statement.

In addition to being dominant land users and being a focus of the City’s long-term vision, educational institutions also represent the largest segment, or “industry”, of non-resident contributors to the City’s payroll tax revenue. The non-profit educational institutions in Bexley are, therefore, central to the City’s mission and vision, and also the largest contributor, as a group, to city income tax revenue. However, the task force report posits that non-resident students in the City of Bexley represent an additional burden to the city’s safety services, above and beyond that of residents of the city. This is undoubtedly true. City of Bexley safety and infrastructure services are from time to time deployed and dedicated to our educational institutions. However, an examination of police reports and calls from the past several years demonstrates relatively few calls to Bexley’s private schools, and calls to Capital University are heavily mitigated by Capital’s administration of their own public safety department. The additional burden placed upon city services by these users is not demonstrably higher than, say, the burden attributable to non-resident traffic to Bexley’s businesses or religious institutions.

In addition to these considerations, we have examined the legal enforceability of the proposed service fee. Based on research conducted by the Bexley City Attorney, and consultation with municipal and tax attorneys, the proposed fee is not believed to be legally enforceable, as it would pay towards a service that benefits all users of the service, but that is charged through to only a select number of people (*Drees Company et al v. Hamilton Tonwhip et al*). This sort of a fee is, per our counsel, a tax, and is not a tax that is allowable under the Ohio Revised Code. Therefore, any PILOT initiative would need to be a voluntary program that involved a cooperative approach with the listed private educational institutions.

### **Administration Position**

Legal issues notwithstanding, it is the position of the Mayor and administration of the City of Bexley that an imposed public service fee would be detrimental to the City’s long-term best interests. Supporting and encouraging the growth of educational institutions is a core

premise of the city’s economic development policy. This policy is driven by the concept of “playing to your strengths” – because Bexley is a renowned center of educational excellence, building upon that success and fostering an environment that is conducive to the payroll growth that follows the overall growth of educational institutions is in the best interests of the City. It is the position of the administration that an imposed service fee structure would erode the competitiveness of Bexley as a location for educational institutions, and jeopardize the special relationships the City enjoys with our valued educational partners. For these reasons, the administration recommends against the imposition of an imposed public service fee on non-resident users of Bexley educational institutions.

**Administration Alternate Recommendation**

As an alternate to a public service fee assessed against non-resident students of Bexley’s private educational institutions, the administration recommends in favor, and has been working towards, finding cooperative cost-sharing opportunities that would be mutually beneficial to the city and to our private educational stakeholders. Ideas that are currently being explore include the sharing of police dispatch services between Capital University and Bexley Police; the sharing of IT infrastructure between Capital University and/or Bexley City Schools; and the sale, by the City, of fleet maintenance services to Capital University, Bexley City Schools, and any other of the educational institutions in Bexley that could be served by the City’s full-service maintenance garage. Bexley directors and the management of Capital University met to discuss and further explore these concepts at a meeting in late 2012, and research between associated departments is currently underway to study the feasibility of some of these ideas. Below is a chart listing the general cost savings and efficiencies that could result from the sharing of services:

<b>Service Sharing Concept</b>	<b>Approx. Annual Savings/Efficiency</b>
Combined Police Dispatch	\$100,000 to \$200,000
IT Infrastructure Sharing	\$50,000 to \$100,000
Service Garage Sharing	\$25,000 to \$100,000
<b>Total Annual Savings/Efficiencies:</b>	<b>\$175,000 to \$400,000</b>

## Analysis of the Digital Ad Revenue Recommendation

The Digital Ad Revenue recommendation calls for the creation, by the City, of a referral site/app for businesses serving residents of Bexley. The City would develop the site and a corresponding mobile or web app and charge vendors to advertise their services specifically to residents of Bexley. From the Task Force report:

“The city has an opportunity to create a web and mobile presence to help both residents and businesses find each other. The idea is to create a local-only, city-sponsored online “Bexley pages”. The concept would benefit residents by having a trusted source for home and personal services. The city would benefit by generating income from the listings.”

### **Overview of Public Feedback**

To the best of our knowledge, no public feedback has been received on this recommendation.

### **Administration Analysis & Recommendation**

This recommendation is highly creative, and outside of the scope of work performed by most municipal governments. As referenced by the Task Force report, the City of Bexley does not have adequate in-house resources to dedicate the time needed to properly execute this recommendation. However, with the assistance of the creative and technical expertise from the Task Force committee, the administration recommends for the exploration and execution of this recommendation.



## Analysis of the Parking Meters Recommendation

The parking meter recommendation of the Task Force is to install meters on Main Street west of Cassingham, on Drexel near Main, and on Pleasant Ridge. The task force states there are 188 spaces in that area. It also recommends a \$0.75/hour charge and a 2 hour limit. The task force projects \$250,000 annual revenue from these meters from fees but did not consider additional income potential from parking fines, nor the cost of enforcement. It was unclear whether the income projection included a cost to lease/buy the equipment.

### **Overview of Public Feedback**

Public feedback has been received on this recommendation as follows:

#### **AGAINST:**

- Greg Margulies, resident and President of the Bexley Area Chamber of Commerce
- Jordan Finegold, resident
- Glenn Soden, resident
- Howard Schottenstein, resident
- Ellen Miller, resident
- Informal conversations with some merchants suggested that encouraging turnover in parking is not necessary, due to manageable demand at the current time.

#### **FOR:**

- Kevin Brashear, resident
- Informal conversations with some merchants suggested that encouraging turnover in parking would be desirable to some merchants along Main Street.

### **Analysis of the Administration**

In reviewing this proposal, the city administration contacted various vendors in an attempt to determine costs. We also talked to parking administration personnel in Columbus and Easton. It should be noted that very few Central Ohio suburbs have parking meters.

One of the stated reasons the Alternative Revenue Task Force recommended parking meters was that merchants do not have access to these parking spaces for customers since they are often used all day with little turnover. While this might be accurate in some areas, in other areas restrictions already exist to prevent all day parking. Anecdotal information is that all day parking is not a serious problem. This anecdotal information was gathered through conversations with a variety of local merchants throughout the entirety of East Main Street.

Aside from providing for additional revenue, metering of parking has a real benefit to merchants in areas where parking is limited and difficult to find. Meters encourage turnover of parking spaces and therefore provide a more steady supply of parking inventory to customers of Main Street businesses. It is not the position of the administration that metered parking should be installed unless installing it does serve to benefit merchants by freeing up otherwise unavailable parking spaces. Merchant input and merchant needs should be of primary consideration when studying the possibility of metered parking in Bexley.

The primary purpose of this review is to give the City Council additional information regarding the feasibility of parking meters. A more in-depth study should be conducted before a final decision is made. It also should be noted that any evaluation will vary greatly based on assumptions such as hourly rate, hours of enforcement, and usage rate. Other options such as lease versus buy, individual meters versus multi-space units, and payment options offered will all affect net revenue.

The administration contacted two reputable parking meter providers. The information provided includes a summary of information provided by those providers as well as information from other cities. The revenue projections the administration developed are not as high as the task force, but that could be due to different assumptions including rates of utilization, hourly rates (the administration assumed an hourly rate of \$1.00), and operating costs. Based upon our assumptions, a net annual revenue in excess of \$100,000 is estimated, assuming use of meters along Main Street between Parkview and Cassingham; on Drexel Avenue between Main Street and Sherwood; and on Pleasant Ridge between Astor and Main Street.

In addition to revenue, other factors should be considered as part of the decision process. These issues include:

- **Feedback from local merchants**

Would they support parking meters or do they see them as a deterrent to customers, especially given that few other local suburbs have meters?

- **Feedback from local homeowners**

If parking is no longer free, at least some people will park on side streets currently reserved for residents.

- **Feedback from parking lot owners**

Again, if parking is no longer free, some people will park in lots not intended for public parking which will impact those parking lot owners.

The past few years have seen a marked increase in consumer traffic to Main Street, particularly during lunch and evening hours. With this increase in customer traffic has come an increase in parking demand. It would appear that parking conditions in at least portions of Main Street, Drexel Avenue, and Pleasant Ridge have matured to the point that the installation of parking meters, in addition to generating additional revenue, could possibly represent good development policy. However, prior to this conclusion being reached, the administration first recommends that we consider approving a parking enforcement officer to begin to more comprehensively enforce existing restrictions on parking on Main Street and surrounding streets. Once a more comprehensive enforcement of existing parking restrictions is undertaken, we will have a better sense of the need (or lack thereof) to further encourage shorter-term parking by the use of meters.

### **Recommendation of the Administration**

The administration believes that parking meters in selected areas could provide a revenue opportunity to the city and also a benefit to merchants *if the parking congestion in Bexley has reached the point where proactive action needs to be taken to encourage rotation of parking spaces*. Further study must be undertaken to ascertain whether or not this is the case. Such study should first determine the extent to which simply enforcing current restrictions would free up parking supply. It is recommended that the City hire a part-time parking control

officer to enforce the City's parking restrictions. Such a position should be able to pay for itself and raise at least an additional \$20,000 in revenue annually. If, after enforcement of existing restrictions, it is determined that parking supply is fundamentally short, a review should include such considerations as hours (and days) of meter operation; feasible hourly rates; market-based assumptions of usage; and a study of various locations on and along Main Street that could best benefit from metered parking.

## Analysis of the Speed Camera Recommendation

The speed camera recommendation calls for the installation of speed cameras in five specific locations in Bexley, in order to prevent drivers from speeding in Bexley. The five areas identified by the task force where residents could benefit from speed monitoring through speed cameras included:

- Northbound College Ave. close to Livingston Ave.
- Drexel Ave. between Broad and Fair
- Eastbound Broad St. at Parkview Ave.
- Eastbound Main St. at Parkview Ave.
- Westbound Broad St. at Gould Rd.

### **Overview of Public Feedback**

Public feedback has been received on this recommendation as follows:

#### **AGAINST:**

- Lary Gill, resident
- Jordan Finegold, resident
- Glenn Soden, resident
- Joel Topolosky, resident
- Elliott Luckoff, resident
- Barry Hellman, resident
- Ron Boeckman, resident
- Bill Lonergan, resident
- Lee Nathans, resident
- James Moyer, Columbus resident
- Larry Helman, resident
- Karl Petzinger, resident

#### **FOR:**

- David Goldstein, resident
- Kevin Brashear, resident
- Ann Brown, resident

### **Administration Research**

In response to the Alternative Revenue Task Force report, the city administration met with speed camera vendors and researched comparable communities in Ohio and their implementation of speed cameras. We learned that static speed cameras in high traffic areas resulted in the greatest level of controversy, as these speed cameras were viewed as being

installed primarily for the purpose of revenue as opposed to safety. Primary examples of communities with controversial speed camera policing include Elmwood Place and Heath.

The concept of speed cameras as recommended is an expansive program that would involve a relatively high density of speed cameras in Bexley. It is the opinion of the administration that this sort of an installation would widely be perceived as “policing for profit” as opposed to using an innovative tool to enforce greater neighborhood safety in a targeted manner. Ultimately, it is the position of the administration that the installation of speed cameras as recommended would be detrimental to our ability to effectively enforce our laws and would be detrimental to the safety culture and perception of Bexley. Bexley is a unique community with a fantastic police department and safety culture. We must be purposeful and deliberate in protecting the integrity of that culture. For this reason, the administration does not support the use of speed cameras in Bexley as recommended by the task force.

Prior to the recommendation of the Task Force to install speed cameras, the administration had been considering the use of a single, moveable speed camera that could be rotated through residential neighborhoods and school zones where speeding is an urgent safety issue. This solution could provide an interesting and compelling alternative to having dedicated, stationary patrol enforcement of speed limits. With such a concept, the City would provide substantial notice to residents of the use of a speed camera, and adequate signage to ensure that attentive drivers were aware of the presence of a speed camera in the area. However, this concept would not necessarily yield a high revenue return, as it is the position of the administration that most dangerous speeding situations in Bexley occur on residential streets with relatively low traffic volume and relatively infrequent, but nonetheless dangerous, speeding. Therefore, the placement of a speed camera in this context would offer an effective deterrent against unsafe speeding but would not raise substantial revenue.

### **Administration Recommendation**

Were it the desire of Bexley City Council to enact a speed camera system, it is the recommendation of the administration that such a system be smaller in scale, and rely on a single, targeted, mobile speed camera that can be rotated through to residential areas where

speeding is a safety concern of police and of residents in the neighborhood. However, due to the publicized nature of the speed camera recommendation and its association with revenue, it is the recommendation of the administration that any action on this item be tabled for future consideration, when any safety-based use of speed cameras could be contextualized apart from any revenue motives.



## Other Recommendations of the Task Force

In addition to the four primary recommendations of the Alternative Revenue Task Force, the Task Force also presented council and the administration with several other concepts for alternative revenue and/or cost savings that the administration believes should be explored and implemented as possible. These ideas, synopsized below along with administration remarks in italics, could provide substantial additional cost savings and revenue over the long term when implemented, and are all supported by the administration.

### **Best Practices:**

#### **Increase the use of volunteers**

- Reduce overtime labor that has traditionally been used for things like holiday decoration and annual plantings.
  - *The City has reduced overtime labor for these activities, and is exploring the concept of supplementing City labor with volunteer labor.*
- Although Bexley enjoys the convenience of curbside recycling, one city has raised significant revenue by encouraging citizens to drop off cardboard once a month that the city then sells.
  - *This concept needs to be explored further. It is our understanding that this concept was in place in a community that did not offer curbside recycling. We also believe that our current contract with our trash hauler might prohibit such a concept.*
- Other cities have utilized volunteers for office work such as answering phones and receptionists.
  - *This is a compelling concept that we will be exploring in the coming months. This has the capacity to streamline some otherwise inefficient processes of having workers rotate through to the central receptionist position when the City receptionist is not available.*





## Shared Services

- Working with partners such as Bexley City Schools and Capital University, who have their own snow removal equipment and technology infrastructure, the City can leverage our own assets or purchase these services achieving cost savings.
  - *This is a key counterproposal provided under the "Service Fee" section of this report and has the potential to provide significant savings.*

## Land Use/Economic Development:

- **Redevelop the City Hall site with a commercial use that generates new revenue for the city.**

- *The City is actively pursuing this recommendation. New funds created by this revenue source could be used to move city hall and the service garage off of otherwise productive, tax-paying commercial use.*

- **Identify and promote the redevelopment of underperforming commercial properties**

Several properties on Main Street, Cassady, and Livingston represent uses that are functionally obsolete or physically deficient. The committee recommends identifying the most likely redevelopment opportunities and promoting them.

- *The City has researched possible redevelopment sites and is in the process of promoting them to likely developers. Redevelopment of underperforming sites has the capacity to bring in substantial forms of new revenue.*

- **Explore a Business Incubator Concept with Capital University**

Capital University's programs are ideal partners in formulating a business incubator concept. Physical space and program details need to be explored. This could be a way to foster business growth and generate payroll revenue to the City, while also enabling Capital University to enhance its programming.

- *Preliminary discussions with Capital University suggest that this is a mutually desirable concept, and it is continuing to be explored. While revenue estimates from this sort of a relationship are not able to be ascertained without greater detail, this concept has the capacity to enhance Bexley's business environment and lead to additional payroll revenue.*

- **Develop a Land Bank Program to Be Able to Assemble for Redevelopment**

Certain properties in the city – most notably environmentally impacted sites, and sites off of Livingston Avenue – are not attractive to developers due to existing conditions at the site. This presents a “catch-22” – without assemblage and a change of environment to these sites, they will continue to underperform. A well-administered land bank program, preferably through the City’s proposed CIC (Community Improvement Corporation), would provide a mechanism by which to begin to affect change in the case of difficult properties and/or difficult areas.

- *The Mayor has been working with the Chair of Finance as well as the Bexley Community Foundation to explore concepts for creating a land bank for Bexley. This concept has the potential to significantly increase revenue by leveraging the City’s grant opportunities and payroll tax capacity to turn around otherwise difficult redevelopment projects.*

- **Explore Options to Abandon Alleys on Main Street and North Cassady Avenue**

Commercial sites on North Cassady Avenue and on Main Street east of Drexel Avenue (particularly on the south side of Main Street) lack sufficient depth to allow for most types of commercial development. The City should explore policies to abandon alleys for certain types of redevelopment. Additionally, rezoning of residential properties immediately adjacent to these shallow parcels should be explored as a means by which to enhance the feasibility of payroll-generating development. Any rezoning efforts should address upfront the need to provide greater emphasis on setbacks, landscape buffers, and other considerations in order to respect and acknowledge the interface between commercial and residential and the need to preserve the neighborhood fabric.

- *This idea could help to increase the feasibility of sites on Main Street and North Cassady, particularly the shallow Main Street sites located east of Drexel Avenue, which would in turn lead to enhanced revenue opportunities. Any movement in this direction would require substantial public feedback and public awareness before allowing any changes to the existing zoning and land use policies in Bexley.*



## Administration Alternative Revenue Recommendations

To complement the recommendations of the Alternative Revenue Task Force, the Bexley administration recommends that the following alternative revenue concepts be explored and implemented as appropriate.

### **Administrative Alternative Revenue Recommendation: JEDZs**

In Ohio, Joint Economic Development Zones (JEDZs) are partnerships between a township, who cannot otherwise levy a payroll tax, and a partnering municipality, in which the township is able to levy a payroll tax in their commercial districts. An effective Joint Economic Development Zone partnership is a “win/win” situation, with the township partner benefiting from enhanced revenue as a result of capturing payroll income tax, as well as benefiting from shared resources brought to the township by its municipal partner. The partnering municipality is in turn compensated for collection and for services and resources shared with the partner township. Bexley is currently exploring possible JEDZ partnerships. The City’s ability to be economically non-conflicting with non-adjacent area townships provides us with a unique advantage, in that we can provide strong development partnerships and provide other services that would benefit the partnering township without having conflicting interests. The revenue raised from a JEDZ relationship can vary widely depending upon the characteristics of the township partner. Based on typical JEDZ relationships in the market, Bexley could raise additional revenue ranging from approximately \$75,000 to in excess of \$400,000 per year.

### **Administrative Alternative Revenue Recommendation: Utility Aggregation**

The City of Bexley has the ability to negotiate and aggregate resident utility rates. Under such an arrangement, the City is able to negotiate a more favorable rate than charged *de facto* by the market. Residents are then notified of the pending aggregation, and given the opportunity to opt out. This arrangement has the ability to save residents money who are not otherwise proactively seeking lower utility rates, and the city is also able to negotiate a fee from the utility supplier in consideration of the aggregation. While this fee is nominal, it is a source of alternative revenue. The last time the City of Bexley aggregated, it involved a



contract with IGS energy for natural gas supply. However, that aggregation was a static cost, and while it saved residents money through most of the effective period of aggregation, near the end of the term the IGS rate was above the market. Based on this experience, the administration recommends that any aggregation be negotiated at a floating rate that is set below the standard AEP price to compare rate for electrical aggregation, or the standard Columbia Gas rate for natural gas aggregation. Through such an arrangement, it is projected that the City could generate \$15,000+ per year in fees associated with facilitating utility aggregation.

## 2013 Budget Update & Adjusted Budgetary Forecasts

The City of Bexley administration and City Auditor are completing a revised 5-year operating forecast, following the City's efforts to control the expense side of the City budget through a reduction in employee overhead, the renegotiation of several labor contracts, and the reduction of budgetary expenditures across several departments within the City. The net effect of these expense-side reductions, coupled with the income tax increase passed in 2011, has enabled the City administration to present, and City Council to pass, a balanced budget for 2013.

Based upon progress made in 2012 towards a more sustainable budget as well as the 2011 income tax increase, revised general fund projections for the City of Bexley show budgets through 2015 that range anywhere from containing a mild yearly surplus to a mild annual deficit near the end of the five year term, based upon statistically gathered and market-based assumptions ranging from cautious to moderate in their outlook. Either way, these projections are dramatically improved from the projections initially crafted in early 2012, prior to extensive expense-side work by the administration and City Council. The City administration, in partnership with the City Auditor, is currently in the process of honing financial projections in order to present a refined and updated five-year projection to residents.

While the revised five year forecast should not preclude the institution of alternative revenue initiatives, it is the recommendation of the administration that City Council consider the pros and cons of the alternative revenue recommendations in light of the most current information regarding the city's financial forecast.



## Conclusion

The work performed by the Bexley Alternative Revenue Task Force was a comprehensive review of funding alternatives for the City of Bexley. The expertise, diligence, and professionalism of the members of the task force is to be commended, and the administration is deeply grateful for the thoughtful and considered analysis provided by this volunteer group.

In general, it is the position of the Mayor and the administration that any concepts for alternative revenue should be discussed in this order:

1. Is the idea representative of fundamentally good policy?
2. In what ways (financial, cultural, strategically, etc) does the idea benefit the community?

To this end, emphasis has been placed on concepts that, above all, represent sound policy, and are beneficial to the community.

Based on the preceding analysis, it is the recommendation of the administration that the following alternative revenue concepts be explored. The institution of these concepts will fortify Bexley's financial sustainability into the future, and provide the City of Bexley with the opportunity to increase revenue via alternative routes by at least \$385,000 annually.

<b>Administration Recommendation</b>	<b>Revenue Potential</b>
Service Sharing	\$175,000 to \$400,000
Digital Ad Revenue	\$100,000
Parking Meters	\$20,000 to \$100,000
Single Mobile Speed Camera	-
Economic Development/Best Practices	Varies
JEDZ	\$75,000 +
Utility Aggregation	\$15,000 +
<b>Total Revenue:</b>	<b>\$385,000 to \$690,000+</b>