



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, CFO

CC: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
 Karen Lancaster, Finance Director
 Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator
 Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services

SUBJECT: Public Services

DATE: May 18, 2018

Question #54: Capital Improvements. How much did the City receive from the local street and sidewalk millage? What percentage of those funds were used for streets and what percent for non-street projects including but not limited to sidewalks? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response:

	FY 17
Street Resurfacing Levy	9,972,068
Sidewalk Levy	655,967
Total:	10,628,035

FY 17 Street/Sidewalk/Bridge expenditures exceeded revenue; therefore, the following percentages were calculated using FY 17 total fund expenditures:

Road	18,326,964	82%
Sidewalk/Ramp/Safe Routes	2,997,566	13%
Bad Debt/Administration/Bridges/Guardrail	928,261	4%
Total:	22,252,791	100%

Question #55: Capital Improvements. What is the fund balance for the street fund expressed in dollars and expressed as a percent of annual spending? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response:

FY 17 Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	8,220,002	37%
FY 18 Projected Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	5,237,209	28%

Question #56: Please provide an estimated cost of reducing the City's standard for snow plowing from the current 4" snowfall to a 3" snowfall. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: A high-level estimate to respond to a large event (>4") is \$55,000. This winter season we had 7 events that were 3" but less than 4". Subsequent to each of those events we did plow local roads, but not at the same response rate as with a 4" event. To respond city-wide at the same rate as with larger events, we would divert staff from other work areas and call staff in on overtime. The estimate to plow at this rate would be an additional \$350,000-\$500,000 per season. This cost does not include additional equipment or employees that might be needed to respond at this rate and frequency. A more detailed evaluation is needed for a more complete estimate, with consideration given to the deferred work in other work areas from this level of response.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, CFO
Karen Lancaster, Finance Director
Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Doug Forsyth, Safety Manager
Matthew Horning, Treasurer
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services
Shryl Samborn, 15th District Court Administrator
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director
Colin Smith, Parks & Recreation Manager
Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources and Labor Relations Director

SUBJECT: FY19 Metrics

DATE: May 18, 2018

As FY19 is the second year of our two-year cycle, staff will be able to incorporate some of the suggestions immediately. Thank you for your feedback. For the remainder of the suggestions, we will be expanding our use of metrics for the FY20/21 budget cycle and will be sure to consider your feedback.

City Administrator

Question #61: “Respond to inquiries from the public within 7 calendar days of receipt.” This is marked with a check, what are the actual metrics? Some Council requests have not been responded to on that schedule, so I suspect the actual performance metric is “respond to X% of inquiries from the public within 7 calendar days.” (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The current average response time for Councilmember requests for information is 4.57 calendar days.

Human Resources

Question #62: Why are so many measures listed as NA across the board (“new hire evaluation, training completion percentage, satisfaction score”? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Those are future areas that we would like to address. Staff will be evaluating options to capture this information when it prepares the FY2020/2021 fiscal plan.

Question #63: “Number of lawsuits/arbitrations lost.” The report lists zero, but didn’t we lose an arbitration over the hybrid benefits plan for police?

Response: You are correct; that should be 1.

Safety Unit

Question #64: “Ensure safety training required to address workplace hazards is identified and assigned to employees.” Do we also measure training participation? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes we do measure safety training participation and completion. The Safety Unit, in collaboration with unit coordinators sets custom training plans each year intended to address workplace hazards for all city staff. All courses have defined assignment and due dates. The courses selected for each employee are based on hazard assessments that have been completed, as well as OSHA/MIOSHA training requirements and in many cases, the Safety Unit will assign courses based on retraining frequencies that exceed OSHA/MIOSHA requirements.

Question #65: “Reduce incident and accident rates...” is there a danger that focusing on reducing incident rates will lead to non-reporting of accidents rather than actual incident reduction, thereby eliminating the information necessary to identify and address unsafe situations? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: This is a great question. The goal to reduce incidents is an internal Safety Unit goal for the city and not a unit level goal that we push out to the organization. Leading indicators, or proactive activities, such as training, self-inspections and eventually job hazard analysis and risk assessment completion, are tracked on the unit level. Our hope is that improved performance in leading indicators for city units will lead to incremental reductions in incident rates over time. We always stress to our staff that they should report all incidents and near misses and are currently working on a comprehensive incident reporting system that will make reporting more accessible and capture more useful data that can be used to identify and address workplace hazards.

Community Services

Question #67: Planning - Approval timing: Am I reading the cart correctly in that it typically takes an extra 170 days between planning commission approval and Council approval of applications? Other than the minority of projects that get bogged down with multiple postponements, what drives this number? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: This number includes all petitions that are considered by City Council, which include site plans, rezonings, and annexations. Zoning actions by City Council are often driven up in duration while the City awaits approval of annexation by the State of Michigan.

Question #68: Planning - The notes describe an increase of 1 FTE in FY19. Is that position already allowed in the current headcount? I didn't see planning called out for an FTE increase in the cover memo. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: This is the first budget that reflects the shift of the Zoning Coordinator from the Building Services to Planning Services. While not an increase in City staffing, it does represent a reallocation of FTEs.

Question #68: Parks - How will we measure farmers market admissions?
(Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The Michigan Farmers Market Association (MIFMA) performed Market Assessment Reports on the Ann Arbor Farmers Market over the last few years. Part of the report includes attendance estimates. MIFMA visited in both the summer and winter months. Attendance estimates were made by counting all adults and children entering the market during a specified 20-minute period, from 20 minutes after the hour to 20 minutes until each hour. Four team members were assigned to four entrances. Team members only counted shoppers entering the market during the specified time. Based on this data an estimated 13,000 people visit the Market every Saturday in the summer. Wednesday estimates are half that amount. Saturday numbers in the winter are approximately 3,500 people.

Question #69: Parks - If the PROS plan survey was in 2017, why not satisfaction survey in 2019? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Staff intend to perform the survey around Labor Day, 2019 so it is included in fiscal year 2020.

Question #70: Parks - Can an equity goal of scholarships awarded be included?
(Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Scholarships are based entirely on need, so there is no cap on the number awarded. Staff are exploring methods of better promoting the availability of scholarships in the hope that more can be awarded.

Information Technology

Question #71: Why have several metrics gone to N/A (targeted technologies, self-service applications implemented, self service application transactions)?
(Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: There are three measures with N/A:

- Adoption rate of Targeted Technologies. – There was a change in the way the data was collected. Staff will reconcile the data and incorporate in future reports.
- New self-service applications – the goal is to increase 5 semi-annually or 10 per year. Ten can be reported in future reports. However, this is an item which staff doesn't directly control and is based on opportunities as they arise. A more realistic goal or re-designed measure can be considered through the normal metric review process.
- Total number of transactions for self-service applications – There was a change in the way the data was collected. Staff will reconcile the data for future reports. This measure is really an activity measure instead of a performance measure, so it will be discussed during the normal metric review process to determine whether it should be removed from performance reporting.

Treasurer's Office, Risk Management, and Customer Service

Question #72: A few are listed as "per quarter," in this format are they really per year?
(Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes. This change has already been made for the final budget book.

Question #73: Where do the risk management targets come from? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response:

Workers' comp expenditures – National Academy of Social Insurance
Claim volume - ICMA municipal benchmarks, median value, Pop. > 100k
Claim expense - ICMA municipal benchmarks, median value, Pop. > 100k
Claims to litigation – ICMA municipal benchmarks, median value, Pop. > 100k

Public Services

Question #74: Fleet and facilities – Can a green fleets performance measure be included here? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes, we are currently considering an appropriate measure.

Question #75: Engineering – Private Development: Do we have benchmarking data for plan review and right of way permit targets? Basically I am wondering where these targets come from. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The goal for ROW permit reviews was set based on reviewing previous volumes of permit applications and available staffing levels to review them. While the ideal goal would be 100%, staffing levels and fluctuations in the number of permits received have shown this to not be a realistic measurement of performance.

Question #76: Public Works - Is the 20% reduction in requests for missed pickup from previous year (e.g. FY 18 is 20% less than FY17, which is 20% less than FY16)? Why are FY17 and 18 listed as positive numbers but FY19 as negative? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: 20% was a year-to-year measure, we are currently measuring the % change quarter-to- quarter rather than cumulative due to data challenges. Negative numbers indicate an INCREASE in calls, rather than a decrease (goal).

Question #77: Systems Planning - Glad to see downtown alley work plan in here--is the work plan finalized? If so, please send a copy. I'm trying to assess the value of 20% implemented. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The work plan is attached.

Question #78: Systems Planning - Can an equity goal be included here, especially for public engagement, in future years? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes. In the coming fiscal year, staff is planning in incorporate racial equity considerations in the community engagement strategy for the Transportation Master Plan update and the Solid Waste Resource Management Plan update. Once a plan is developed, a performance measure can be appropriately developed.

Question #79: Wastewater - Is the odor study of the treatment plant or for the conveyance system (e.g Arborview sewer odor) (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The planned odor study includes investigation of odor sources in several City locations including the Wastewater Treatment Plant, Arborview, and Nichols Arboretum west entrance.

15th District Court

Question #80: Can performance measures for the specialty courts be included (e.g. graduation rate)? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The 15th District Court can run performance data for our court. Comparison data is available annually in a statewide report (FY 2017 Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report on Performance Measures and Outcomes for Michigan's Problem-Solving Courts - <http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/Publications/Reports/SCAnnualReport.pdf>). Please note that the State Court Administrative Office cautions courts not to rely heavily on recidivism data for problem-solving programs that have been in operation less than four years.

There are no formal performance measures for the dedicated domestic violence docket. However, the program has received grant funding from the U.S. Department of Justice since 1998. Each grant requires the court to submit data, but they are not technically performance measures. Staff will evaluate if any of the measures are meaningful to add in future metric reviews.

Question #81: Are there any measures of how the indigent defense system is working? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: According to the Constitution, criminal defendants have the right to assistance of counsel. Upon request, the 15th District Court appoints counsel for defendants deemed indigent. Indigent defendants are entitled to have counsel paid for by the court's funding unit. The court's indigent defense contract provides all indigent defendants with highly competent counsel.

The Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (MIDC) is currently working with municipalities toward the implementation of minimum standards for indigent defense systems. Compliance with Standards 1-4 (listed below) is expected by March 2019. Our local plan to meet or exceed the MIDC requirements was approved by MIDC. Per the MIDC (Interim) Regional Manager assigned to Washtenaw County, MIDC anticipates employing performance measures to track compliance.

- 1) Education and Training of Defense Counsel
- 2) Initial Interview
- 3) Investigations and Experts
- 4) Counsel at First Appearance and Other Critical Stages

Downtown Alleys Program Work Plan

I. Purpose

The need to improve practices and operations in the downtown alleys has been identified. The following items are considered driving factors in recognizing this need and developing the Downtown Alleys Program:

- a. Increased draw on internal resources and staff time to provide services and to respond to complaints/concerns.
- b. Water quality threats.
- c. Existing winter access and maintenance challenges.
- d. Inclusion of 'Delivery and Waste Management' as one of seven policy issues identified through the Downtown Design Manual effort.
- e. Anticipation of increased stress on the downtown alleys if organics collection is added to the waste collection services already provided, per the potential development of a comprehensive Organics Management Program.
- f. Interest in providing better customer service to downtown business owners and residents and improved downtown atmosphere.

II. Objectives

- a. Establish an internal workgroup to drive program implementation and provide ongoing monitoring of downtown alley issues.
- b. Engage community stakeholders and internal service areas affected by soliciting input and gathering feedback.
- c. Utilize staff resources for technical expertise
- d. Improve practices and operations in the downtown alleys to address existing issues.
 - i. Conduct a comprehensive review of existing issues and challenges to practices and operations in the downtown alleys.
 - ii. Conduct a comprehensive review of potential opportunities and solutions to improve existing conditions.
 - iii. Recommend alternatives to address existing issues and challenges.
 - iv. Propose an implementation strategy for recommendations.
 - v. Initiate implementation of pilot programs and recommendations.
- e. Establish a group of stakeholders, service providers and/or other agencies to provide ongoing monitoring of downtown alley issues from a community perspective.

III. Engagement Strategy

Success of the Downtown Alley Program depends on active participation of community members, other agencies, and internal staff affected by the issues. This project will establish a foundation of community support by involving stakeholders (internal and external) throughout the process.

- a. Workgroup
 - i. Purpose: The Workgroup (WG) is the internal staff group representing a range of service areas affected by existing downtown alley issues. We anticipate the workgroup will meet 13 times while working through existing downtown alley issues. Some WG discussions will be held as regular

meetings (1.5-2 hours each) and others as workshop meetings (half day each). The WG will drive the program, and provide on-going oversight for downtown alley issues (future, routine meeting schedule to be determined). Due to the interconnected nature of known alley issues, the standing WG members will participate in discussion across all topics to provide the necessary range of perspectives, consistency in process, and comprehensive vantage point to identify potential gaps, conflicts or contradictions among recommended alternatives. Technical experts may be asked to join select WG meetings as resource people for discussion of certain issues.

ii. Membership:

1. Kayla Coleman (Project Manager)
2. Ryan Doty
3. Christina Gomes
4. Jen Lawson
5. Amber Miller (DDA)
6. Molly Maciejewski
7. Tracy Pennington
8. Cresson Sloten

iii. WG authority/responsibility: **The WG will be responsible for (1) recommending solutions and remediation approaches for existing issues in the downtown alleys; (2) defining an implementation strategy for recommendations; and, (3) implementing pilot programs and recommendations.** Recommendations will take into consideration feedback from community stakeholders, service providers, other agencies, internal staff from affected service areas, and other resource persons. The WG will be responsible to design, facilitate, prepare materials for, and summarize results from the stakeholder focus group meetings. A WG Project Manager will guide the process. The Project Manager will report to the Systems Planning Manager and Public Services Area Administrator for direction.

iv. WG operating principles/decision making process: WG members will be expected to maintain ongoing involvement in the Downtown Alley Program. Members will be expected to attend scheduled meetings, and to keep themselves up to date in the case of missed meetings. WG members may be asked to review materials in advance of meetings, and come prepared with ideas for discussion. All members will be encouraged to share their views and opinions with the group. Final recommendations from the WG will be determined by consensus agreement. The Project Manager will help the group work toward a consensus agreement when divergent perspectives are present.

b. Stakeholder Focus Groups:

- i. Purpose: Stakeholder focus groups will be utilized to gather a wide variety of perspectives from those most affected by downtown alley issues. We anticipate that two categories of stakeholder groups will meet four times throughout the process. Stakeholder meetings will allow concerns and

potential solutions to surface from those who experience and/or contribute to downtown alley issues first hand. **Stakeholder group participants will serve the role of providing input toward the process and reaction to materials produced by the Workgroup. Input from stakeholders will be considered advisory; stakeholder focus groups will not operate in a decision making capacity.**

- ii. Membership: Potential stakeholders have been identified below; completion of the Community Engagement Toolkit Stakeholder Analysis worksheet will further inform stakeholder selection.
 - 1. Downtown alley community members – external
 - a. Business owners
 - b. Downtown residents (owner occupied, long term rental, short-term/student rental)
 - c. Merchant associations
 - d. Property owners/landlords (commercial and residential)
 - e. University of Michigan
 - 2. Service providers and other agencies – external
 - a. Huron River Watershed Council
 - b. Recycle Ann Arbor
 - c. Washtenaw County Public Health
 - d. Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner’s Office
 - e. Waste Management
 - f. DTE
 - g. AT&T
 - h. Comcast
- c. Stakeholder Summits:
 - i. Purpose: Stakeholder Summits will be utilized at critical points in the existing issues analysis to convene all identified stakeholders for combined discussion. These meetings will be used to gather input and for information sharing. Meetings format may be a combination of presentation, discussion and/or open house. Three Stakeholder Summit meetings are anticipated.
- d. Stakeholder interviews:
 - i. Purpose: Stakeholder Interviews will be utilized to get specific feedback from certain stakeholders in a one-on-one, or small panel, format. Interviews with selected stakeholders will be scheduled as needed throughout the process. Interviews may be conducted with participants from either of the stakeholder categories identified above; additionally, stakeholder interviews will be utilized to engage with a third stakeholder category:
 - 1. Affected service areas – internal
 - a. Attorney’s Office
 - b. Communications
 - c. Community Services – Planning, Parks
 - d. Community Standards
 - e. Public Works – Solid Waste, Stormwater, Street Maintenance

- f. Project management – Traffic Engineering
- g. Systems Planning – Solid Waste, Water Quality

IV. Process

a. **Task 1 (2 months; June-July 2016):** Program Initiation + Issues and Opportunities

Analysis

- i. Complete Community Engagement Toolkit
- ii. Establish Downtown Alley Workgroup (WG)
- iii. Workgroup (WG) 1; anticipated 2hr meeting:
 - 1. Review work plan and schedule
 - 2. Establish a WG charter
 - 3. Review issues/challenges identified to date and gather additional input
 - 4. Prepare for stakeholder focus groups
- iv. Stakeholder (SH) 1: Meet separately with two stakeholder groups to discuss issues related to all themes
 - 1. What have you always hoped for in the downtown alleys?
 - 2. Provide overview of work plan and schedule
 - 3. Review issues/challenges identified to date and gather additional input; what have we missed?
 - 4. Preliminary discussion of opportunities: How could identified issues be addressed?
- v. Stakeholder tour of downtown alleys: A walking tour of downtown alleys. One combined tour for all stakeholders, held on same day as SH1.

Task 1 Deliverables:

- Comprehensive list of existing issues/challenges
- Preliminary list of opportunities/solutions (for further examination during Alternatives Analysis)
- WG charter

b. **Task 2 (8.5 months; August 2016- April 2017):** Alternatives Analysis

- i. WG 2; anticipated 2hr meeting:
 - 1. Stakeholder input de-brief: presentation of feedback from SH1 and alleys walking tour
 - a. Comprehensive list of existing issues/challenges – all discussion areas
 - b. Preliminary list of opportunities/solutions – all discussion areas
 - 2. Revisit work plan/strategy; any changes based on stakeholder feedback?
 - 3. Identify any specific questions, or additional information needed for each theme.
 - a. What do we want to know?
 - b. Who do we need to ask to get that information?
 - 4. Identify needs for benchmarking research:

- a. What solutions are other communities using to address these issues?
 - b. Assign WG member responsibility for benchmarking research
- ii. Conduct benchmarking research
 - 1. Note: Field trips to other local communities may be required for research and discussion about past experiences.
- iii. WG 3; workshop style, ½ day anticipated:
 - 1. Report on benchmarking research – Discussion Area 1 and 2
 - 2. Review stakeholder input on opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 1 and 2
 - 3. Identify potential opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 1 and 2
 - 4. Note: Likely that select resource persons will be invited to lend input and expertise and/or that resource persons will be identified to invite during implementation strategy discussion. And/or identify needs for separate interviews with select resource persons.
- iv. WG 4; workshop style, ½ day anticipated:
 - 1. Report on benchmarking research – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 - 2. Review stakeholder input on opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 - 3. Identify potential opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 - 4. Note: Likely that select resource persons will be invited to lend input and expertise and/or that resource persons will be identified to invite during implementation strategy discussion. And/or identify needs for separate interviews with select resource persons.
- v. WG5; anticipated 2hr meeting:
 - 1. Review potential opportunities/alternatives and draft recommendations (all themes)
 - 2. Prep for SH2
- vi. SH 2: Meet separately with two stakeholder groups to discuss opportunities/alternatives for all themes
 - 1. Present potential opportunities/alternatives to address each issue
 - 2. Are there other opportunities that we have missed?
 - 3. Do you see any potential barriers to these opportunities that we need to consider in selecting recommended alternatives and developing an implementation strategy?
 - 4. Do you have any priority opportunities that you think should be pursued first?
- vii. WG 6; workshop style, ½ day anticipated:
 - 1. Report on benchmarking research – Discussion Area 1 and 2
 - 2. Review stakeholder input on opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 1 and 2
 - 3. Select recommended opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 1 and 2

4. Note: Likely that select resource persons will be invited to lend input and expertise and/or that resource persons will be identified to invite during implementation strategy discussion. And/or identify needs for separate interviews with select resource persons.
- viii. WG 7; workshop style, ½ day anticipated:
1. Report on benchmarking research – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 2. Review stakeholder input on opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 3. Select recommended opportunities/alternatives – Discussion Area 3, 4 and 5
 4. Note: Likely that select resource persons will be invited to lend input and expertise and/or that resource persons will be identified to invite during implementation strategy discussion. And/or identify needs for separate interviews with select resource persons.
- ix. WG 8; anticipated 2hr meeting:
1. Review final recommendations (all themes)
 2. Prep for SH3
- x. SH 3: A summit of all interested stakeholders. The primary purpose of this information will be information sharing.
1. Present recommended opportunities/alternatives
 2. Share outline of implementation strategy
 3. Next steps re: ongoing community involvement

Task 2 Deliverables:

- Comprehensive list of potential opportunities/alternatives.
- Recommended alternatives.

c. **Task 3 (4.5 months; April-August 2017):** Development of Implementation Strategy

- i. WG 9 (through 13): Discussion Area 1 (through 5) implementation strategy (workshop style; ½ day anticipated)
 1. Identify pilot program opportunities
 2. Identify checklist items that require a one-time effort
 3. Identify on-going items that will not have a definitive end point
 4. [Repeat for Discussion Areas 2, 3, 4 and 5]
- ii. SH 4: A summit, for all interested stakeholders, where WG will share implementation strategy for all recommendations. The purpose of these meetings will be information sharing.

Task 3 Deliverables:

- Implementation strategy for recommended alternatives.
- Action Plan for Existing Issues Improvement (includes recommended alternatives and implementation strategy)

Note: Pilot programs for recommended alternatives should be considered for all themes and utilized where feasible. Pilot programs will allow the opportunity to implement a particular solution for a short term, or with a select group. Results from pilot programs will be used to inform final implementation.

d. **Task 4 (TBD):** Implementation

- i. Implement pilot programs
- ii. Implement recommendations per strategies defined in Task 3.

Note: Dependent on the recommendations and implementation strategies identified in Task 2 and 3 additional resources may be needed to complete Task 4.

e. **Task 5 (Ongoing):** Oversight and Monitoring

- i. Internal oversight and monitoring
 1. Hold routine WG meetings for internal discussions to assess current conditions, impact of recommended solutions, and new issues/challenges as they arise. Frequency of ongoing meetings to be determined; quarterly meetings likely.
- ii. External oversight and monitoring
 1. Establish a combined group of downtown alley community members, service providers and other agencies for ongoing oversight. This may include persons selected from stakeholder groups and others.
 2. Hold routine meetings with external oversight group to assess current conditions, impact of recommended solutions, and new issues/challenges as they arise. Frequency of ongoing meetings to be determined; quarterly meetings likely.

f. **Other notes:**

Analysis of existing downtown alley issues will be grouped into five discussion areas:

- Discussion Area 1: Maintenance and Access
- Discussion Area 2: Service Agreements and Capacity
- Discussion Area 3: Stormwater and Recycling
- Discussion Area 4: Security/Public Safety and Enforcement
- Discussion Area 5: Organics