



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Budget and Finance Supervisor
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: FY22-3 Budget: Community Services

DATE: May 11, 2021

Question #34: The FY2020 budget allocated \$500,000 for the update to the City's Master Plan. The evaluation team selected INTERFACE. The initial cost proposal from INTERFACE was \$549,447.00. In December 2019, Council was presented with a professional services agreement for \$791,737.00 --an increase of \$242,290 over the firm's proposal. The increased costs were attributed to the following elements. Which of these additional elements were based on recommendations from the Council Appointee team and which were to address staff identified needs. I don't recall the evaluation team, as a body, making these recommendations to Council.

- Increased project coordination
- A comprehensive public engagement database of input
- Additional stakeholder interviews (up to 90 from previous up to 50)
- Three additional open houses
- Additional plan summary products after adoption
- Creation of a neighborhood outreach team
- Creation of topic-area working groups to support plan and/or steering committee (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: The evaluation team assisted City staff in making a recommendation to the City Council for proposed Master Plan consulting services. The items referenced above resulted from a blend of discussion of the entire committee, a subset of the group who produced independent recommendations, and staff initiation. Project Coordination, additional open houses, additional stakeholder interviews, and the creation of a project outreach team were initiated by staff, and supported by the group. The intention of the work was to be based in extensive public engagement, and

the originally proposed 3 open houses, and 25-30 stakeholder interviews were doubled, to provide more and greater opportunity for more varied, productive engagement. Project coordination was expanded to include steering committee involvement and the creation and support of topically focused support groups to assist in the development, evaluation, and finalization of the master plan document. A project outreach team was recommended in place of a more traditional marketing-oriented component of the original proposal. Staff's ultimate recommendation to the City Council was intended to present an effective master plan process, with the benefit of feedback and suggestions through the evaluation efforts conducted.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Budget and Finance Supervisor
Mike Kennedy, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: FY22-3 Budget: Fire

DATE: May 11, 2021

Question #13: What will be the impact to the community of not filling the vacant Fire Inspection position? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: This fourth fire inspector position has been unfilled for all of FY21 due the uncertainties with COVID-19. The reduction of this inspector position will likely impact the frequency of fire inspection; however, we are unable to absolutely quantify a specific impact. In addition to COVID-19 pausing inspections for a large portion of 2020, there has been significant personnel turnover and worker's compensation time off injuries in fire prevention over the last two years. To combat this, we have improved fire inspector accountability and productivity, which has assisted with inspection frequency. With the enhanced systems in place, I do feel we will be able to sufficiently manage with the three inspectors.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Budget and Finance Supervisor

SUBJECT: FY22-3 Budget: Fund Balances

DATE: May 11, 2021

Question #19: I am looking for the ratio of each department's total revenue/expenses to their existing fund balances. In other words, I want to know the % of fund balance each department has relative to the size of the department. Does this make sense? To have an apples-to-apples comparison of fund balances across departments. I've been trying to put it together myself from the book, but I bet you can do it easily. (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Fund balances are reported/tracked at the Fund level, as opposed to department level and are available in the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. The table below includes the % of fund balance relative to FY20 actual expenditures. The below amounts do not account for minimum fund balance requirements per City policy, or the FY 22 planned operating expenditures, capital/one-time investments in calendar years 2020 or 2021, or FY 22 planned uses of fund balance.

Fund #	Fund Name	06/30/20 Unassigned Fund Balance	FY 20 Expenditures	% Fund Balance to Expenses
0010	General Fund	19,554,234	109,672,608	18%
0021	Major Street Fund	17,442,391	11,764,989	148%
0022	Local Street Fund	5,347,606	5,379,167	99%
0042	Water Supply Fund	9,795,883	21,940,411	45%
0043	Sewage Disposal Fund	32,494,670	25,448,960	128%
0062	Street, Bridge, Sidewalk Millage	7,550,159	16,295,632	46%
0069	Stormwater Fund	13,553,091	9,569,216	142%
0072	Solid Waste Fund	9,512,728	18,431,219	52%



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Budget and Finance Supervisor

SUBJECT: FY22-3 Budget: Independent Community Police Oversight Commission (ICPOC)

DATE: May 11, 2021

Question #45: p. 117: the "administration" budget for the Police Commission shows a near 100% increase from FY2020 to FY2022: please explain what these funds are for. (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The amount on page 117 in FY20 for the Police Commission reflects the actual amount spent in that year (\$81,815). The budget for the Police Commission in FY20 was \$150,000, which is the same budget as FY21. The FY22 budget increases the Police Commission budget by \$5,000 to \$155,000. In FY20, \$80,340 was spent on the salary, benefits and IT costs for the FTE allocated to the Police Commission. The remaining expenses were related to printing, training and materials & supplies. In FY21, \$96,245 is budgeted for the salary, benefits and IT costs for the FTE allocated to the Police Commission. The remaining funds are budgeted for legal expenses, printing, training and materials & supplies. In FY22, \$99,553 is budgeted for the salary, benefits and IT costs for the FTE allocated to the Police Commission. The remaining funds are budgeted for legal expenses, printing, training and materials & supplies.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Budget and Finance Supervisor
Missy Stults, Sustainability and Innovation Manager

SUBJECT: FY22-3 Budget: Sustainability and Innovation

DATE: May 11, 2021

Question #8: Please provide more information about the energy concierge. Why is this structured as a one-time expense? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: This item, which is included in A²ZERO, focuses on providing reliable, effective, inclusive, and accessible information through the creation of an easy to use energy concierge service. The concierge strives to help residents and businesses understand the best, highest impact, and most affordable methods to carry out greenhouse gas reduction activities. Currently, a working group exists on the Energy Commission, with input from non-Commissioners, to recommend potential structures for the concierge. In the coming fiscal year, we will decide upon a pilot structure for the concierge. Since the final structure has not been determined, this budget requests focuses on the primary start-up costs we know we'll have for the concierge, regardless of structure, including: software outreach materials, training, collaborator support (potentially taking the form of professional service support), and community engagement.

Question #9: What will be the roles of the 3.0 FTE in OSI? How do these positions advance different strategies in our A2 Zero Plan? Are any of them focused on achieving Strategy 4: Reducing the miles we travel in our vehicle by at least 50%. Unlike many of the goals in the A2 Zero plan, implementing our non-motorized plan is almost entirely within our authority and is relatively low cost (\$2.5 million). How this strategy being advanced by OSI in the next budget? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: The three new FTE's projected for the OSI budget include: 1) bringing the Urban Trees Coordinator into a full-time position (currently a temporary employee) (focus on Strategy 6); 2) a new team member to support beneficial electrification in the

community and at City facilities (focus on Strategy 2); and 3) a generalist who can help lessen demands on existing team members and further deepen coordination across departments (all Strategies). The third position could very well support Strategy 4 in coordination with the planning unit, transportation unit and AAATA. In addition, freeing up some of the Manager's time means they will be able (along with other staff) to better coordinate with other units and community stakeholders to make progress on Strategy 4. In a separate line of the OSI budget request (infrastructure), we are requesting funding for electric charging infrastructure – which includes cars and bikes, as well as funding to support implementation of the non-motorized plan. The impact sheet submitted to the City Administrator did include more resources to support implementation of the non-motorized plan but those were not included in the recommended budget. To the final point, in the coming fiscal year, OSI plans to support Strategy 4 (Reduce the miles we travel in our vehicles by 50%) by undertaking the following:

- a. Working with the transportation unit to support implementation of the non-motorized plan and Vision Zero (which includes the goal of zero GHG emissions)
- b. Continue working with the AAATA to expand local and regional transit by doing things such as supporting grant submissions, supporting fleet electrification, and community engagement
- c. Supporting Community Services and the Planning Unit in community discussions around zoning, racial equity, and land use more broadly.
- d. If approved, support efforts to advance the City's Master Plan, especially community engagement around the initiative
- e. Working with local businesses to understand the long-term options surrounding telework, a strategy not identified in A²ZERO but one that has proven (differentially) effective at reducing vehicle miles traveled
- f. Continuing engagement with the public on techniques to reduce VMT

Question #18: Over \$2 million of the non-recurring GF expenditures are related to our critical sustainability goals. Many of our OSI strategies require one-time investments. Council has been cautioned not to begin eyeing Recovery Act funds, but given the nature of the funding (one-time), it seems well aligned to assist with one-time funding needs aligned with advancing the A2 Zero plan. I know the total funding and what will be eligible is still undetermined, but would we anticipate these budgeted OSI expenses to be eligible expenses? (Councilmember Briggs)

Response: The OSI Manager has been working with the City Administrator to explore how American Rescue Plan funds might be leveraged to immediately make progress towards the City's carbon neutrality, equity, and sustainability goals, while also leading to near-term returns on investment. The City is still waiting for additional information regarding the amount of anticipated American Rescue Plan funding. However, City staff have been working with federal representatives to submit project ideas for any future infrastructure grants which, if funded, could significantly help advance the carbon neutrality and equity goals outlined in A²ZERO.

Question #44: p. 117: OSI's budget for community engagement requests an increase from 135k to 180k. Will its public engagement specialists work on Strategy 5? Are innovations internal to the City's organization and communication patterns happening to ensure that this work is coordinated with the Solid Waste Department? (Councilmember Disch)

Response: The requested community engagement support does include resources to help engage the community around refrigerant recycling, composting, and sustainable materials management. There are also resources to help support coordination with Solid Waste team members as it relates to shared programmatic priorities and general public engagement. Additionally, OSI Engagement Specialists already collaborate with Solid Waste team members and regularly discuss sustainable materials management concepts in public meetings.