



MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor & City Council

FROM: Katano Kasaine
Director of Finance

SUBJECT: FY 2019-21 Budget Development
Questions/Responses #5

DATE: June 7, 2019

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to the full City Council and public, responses to questions raised by City Councilmembers related to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-21 Proposed Biennial Budget. To the extent additional information becomes available on any of the responses below, updates will be provided.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #5

1) What is the annual cost of the police officers who cover Council meetings? (Kaplan)

Typically, two Area 1 Officers staff City Council meetings on regular time. There is not a special tracking code for City Council meetings, and since the assignment is normally on regular time, this information is not tracked in Oracle which is necessary to pull the true annual costs.

2) What is the annual cost of police officers who attend community meetings? (Kaplan)

The NSA requires every officer attend a community meeting once a quarter. The officers usually attend community meetings on regular time vs. overtime.

3) Why is the recent Q3 R&E Report's projected 2018-19 OPD expenditure \$20M more than projected? What costs were incurred in addition to overtime to create this discrepancy between current projection and the projection from June 2018? (Taylor)

OPD is projected in third quarter by \$7.8 million once reimbursements are included. This overspending is due to additional personnel costs (overtime) to provide policing services, and roughly \$0.9 million is due to accident repairs of OPD's vehicles.

4) What are the total number of people being taken into custody per year for the most recent few years divided by category of offense for which they were taken in (e.g.

**How many for drug dealing, how many for shooting, how many for burglary, etc.)?
(Kaplan)**

A table below lists arrests by category for calendar years 2016, 2017, and 2018.

Violent Crime	2016	2017	2018
CRIMINAL HOMICIDE - MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE	3	3	1
CRIMINAL HOMICIDE - MURDER AND NONNEGLIGENT HOMICIDE	30	44	25
FORCIBLE RAPE - ATTEMPTS TO COMMIT FORCIBLE RAPE	8	4	8
FORCIBLE RAPE - RAPE BY FORCE	46	55	33
ROBBERY - FIREARM	217	242	234
ROBBERY - KNIFE OR CUTTING INSTRUMENT	44	49	54
ROBBERY - OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPON	2	2	7
ROBBERY - STRONG-ARM (HANDS, FISTS, FEET, ETC.)	58	45	126
ASSAULT - FIREARM	67	66	78
ASSAULT - HANDS, FISTS, FEET, ETC. - AGGRAVATED INJURY	194	219	268
ASSAULT - KNIFE OR CUTTING INSTRUMENT	294	345	237
ASSAULT - OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPON	174	207	297
Violent Crime — Total	1,137	1,281	1,368
Property Crime	2016	2017	2018
ARSON - OTHER (CROPS, TIMBER, FENCES, SIGNS, ETC.)	1	2	1
ARSON - STRUCTURAL - SINGLE OCCUPANCY RESIDENTIAL	4	11	21
BURGLARY - ATTEMPTED FORCIBLE ENTRY	2	2	0
BURGLARY - FORCIBLE ENTRY	9	9	35
BURGLARY - UNLAWFUL ENTRY - NO FORCE	179	213	165
LARCENY THEFT (EXCEPT MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT)	839	811	762
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - AUTOS	29	17	24
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - TRUCKS AND BUSES	50	66	16
Property Crime — Total	1,113	1,131	1,024
Crime — Total	2,250	2,412	2,392
All Other Offenses	2016	2017	2018
ALL OTHER OFFENSES (EXCEPT TRAFFIC)	549	569	506
ASSAULT - OTHER ASSAULTS - SIMPLE, NOT AGGRAVATED	2,206	2,132	2,112
CURFEW AND LOITERING LAWS (PERSONS UNDER 18)	82	105	58
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	71	26	20
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	348	325	256
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - POSSESSION OF MARIJUANA	351	95	69
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - POSSESSION OF OPIUM OR COCAINE	80	79	31
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - POSSESSION OF OTHER	1,065	1,067	652
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - SALE/MANUFACTURING MARIJUANA	36	13	4
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - SALE/MANUFACTURING OPIUM OR COCAINE	44	56	34
DRUG ABUSE VIOLATION - SALE/MANUFACTURING OTHER	127	107	79

DRUNKENESS	25	5	40
EMBEZZLEMENT	14	9	16
FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING	41	39	26
FRAUD	15	4	3
GAMBLING - ALL OTHER	6	8	3
LIQUOR LAWS	3	4	6
MISCELLANEOUS OFFENSES*	3,509	3,127	2,463
OFFENSES AGAINST THE FAMILY AND CHILDREN	128	122	70
PROSTITUTION AND COMMERCIALIZED VICE	712	600	418
RUN-AWAYS (PERSONS UNDER 18)	79	76	66
SEX OFFENSES	71	76	68
VANDALISM	173	207	178
WEAPONS - CARRYING, POSSESSING, ETC.	463	467	381
	10,19		
All Other Offense - Total	8	9,318	7,559
	12,44	11,73	
Grand Total	8	0	9,951

5) What OPD positions are available for civilianization? How many of them will be civilianized in 2019-20? 2020-21? (Taylor)

The positions below are available for civilianization. None are scheduled to be civilianized in FY2019-20 or FY2020-21. Civilianization would result in additional costs.

Sworn Position	Professional Staff Position
IT Officer (1)	System Analyst I
Fleet Officer (1)	Fleet Specialist
BFO Admin Officer (1)	Administrative Analyst II
Evidence Tech Officer (3)	Police Evidence Technicians
Evidence Tech Sgt. (1)	Management Assistant
Lead PIO Officer (1)	Public Information Officer II
PIO Officer (1)	Public Information Officer I

6) What total funding and what additional (new in FY 19-21) funding is in the proposed budget for illegal dumping enforcement? Please itemize these proposed expenditures? (Kalb)

There are 5.0 FTEs (1.0 Clean Community Supervisor and 4.0 Environmental Enforcement Officers) budgeted in the proposed budget for the Illegal Dumping Enforcement program. Council approved adding of these positions, along with necessary one-time equipment/vehicle costs, in the FY 2018-19 Midcycle Budget. The FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget includes one-time funding of \$125,000 over two years (\$25,000 in FY 2019-20 and \$100,000 in FY 2020-21) to install additional cameras in high illegal dumping activity areas to enhance monitoring and enforcement.

7) If the council were to agree that we need 20% increase in walking/ patrol officers in the Areas with the highest crime in the city, where would you advise that this budget allocation come from within the OPD budget? (Taylor)

To increase walking/patrol officers in areas with the highest crime by 20% would require at least 35-40 additional officers. These officers would have to come from specialized units. Below are the specialized units (information as of March 21, 2019). This would significantly impact the work of these specialized units.

Unit	Positions	Filled Positions
Ceasefire	32	28
Community Resources Officer	35	35
Crime Reduction Team	40	32
Foot Patrol Unit	30	24
Helicopter Unit	3	3
Motors Unit	16	14
Marine Unit	1	1
K9 Unit	9	8
ABAT Unit	2	2
Special Events Unit	1	1
Total	169	148

8) What is the vacancy rate of parking control technicians? If we were to increase the number of parking control technicians, how much increased revenue would we expect with full deployment? (Taylor)

The current vacancy rate is approximately 20% (12.54 out of 61.04 FTE). Filling of these vacancies would likely result in a commensurate increase in revenues from parking fines.

9) Which (and how many) parking management vacancies will be filled by end of fiscal year? How much will these additional roles improve parking enforcement in East Oakland Neighborhoods and Commercial corridors? How much with these newly filled positions improve the situation? What are the performance metrics by which DOT's success will be measured? (Taylor)

Currently, there are no vacant management positions in DOT's Parking Enforcement Unit. Since January of 2018 the unit has been operating without one of its four Parking Enforcement Supervisors. In response to these challenges, the unit has taken measures such as developing and implementing an Acting Supervisor Development Program, which provides an opportunity for Parking Control Technicians to gain valuable supervisor experience. Staff recognizes that effective management and front-line supervision is critically important to parking enforcement.

Parking Enforcement promotes compliance and the safe, efficient use of limited curb space by residents, commuters and visitors by issuing parking citations. When staff encounters a parking violation in the field, he or she is expected to issue a citation. In addition to covering enforcement beats and street sweeping maps. Parking Enforcement also provides dispatch services. Dispatch is available Monday - Friday, 9 AM to 5 PM (closed for lunch between

12:30 - 1 PM). With adequate coverage, PCTs are often on site within 12 to 15 minutes of a constituent call for enforcement. Parking Enforcement works with OPW's Street Sweeping Unit on a daily basis to coordinate resources and supports OPD's Abandoned Vehicle Unit by redirecting requests from the community to the 311 Call Center or Oak311 mobile app.

The ultimate measure of Parking Enforcement success is compliance, which can be determined by a combination of metrics such as citations issued and dispatch requests. These metrics involve diverse systems and depend on many factors such as total PCT-hours spent enforcing and community awareness of and use of dispatch services. DOT staff are working internally with ITD and HR and with the City's parking citation system vendor (Conduent) to develop efficient means of capturing and reporting compliance and other key performance indicators.

- 10) Please let us know if any developer Impact Fees have been returned/reimbursed to developers for any reason after the first half of the fees had already been remitted to the city. If so, please state the dollar amount of returned impact fees over the past two years. In the May 15, 2019 FY 19-21 Budget Development Questions/Responses #2, response #11 states "It is also possible that a development falls through and the assessed revenues due at the issuance of a certificate of occupancy are never actually paid to the City and the revenues already received at the time of issuance of a building permit are required to be refunded." Chapter 15.72 of the OMC provides that applicants for development projects must pay applicable impact fees unless exempt under that chapter. Section 15.72.080 further provides (1) that the City Administrator *may* (discretionary) grant reduction, waiver, and/or appeal of the fees under five enumerated scenarios and (2) that such reduction, waiver and/or appeal requires a written application "made no later than the date of application for the building permit for the development project on a form provided by the City." Has every instance of a returned impact fee been preceded by the required application filed within the required time frame? Have there been instances when fees were returned for any reason other than one of the five scenarios enumerated in OMC Section 15.72.080.A? Please provide the dollar amount of fees returned for each of the five scenarios listed in 15.72.080.A. (Kalb)**

Section 15.72.080 does not specifically address reimbursements of Affordable Housing Impact Fees. Rather, it provides that an applicant for a building permit, prior to receiving the building permit, may apply for an exemption, reduction, or waiver of the Affordable Housing Impact Fee. The possibility of a refund due to non-development of a property is not the same as a waiver. That said, staff has not identified any reimbursed Affordable Housing Impact Fees at this time, though a more detailed evaluation of the City's impact fees is ongoing.

- 11) How much Transit Occupancy Tax (TOT) from Short-Term Residential Rentals (STRR) are we expected to receive per fiscal year in the FY19-21 budget cycle? How many STRR companies are cooperating with the City of Oakland to make sure we receive the taxes we are owed based on our existing required TOT? Please share specifics. What are the budget implications and opportunities if we earmark 25% of the TOT from STRRs per year to our Affordable Housing Trust Fund? (Kalb)**

Staff cannot divulge this information as there is not a sufficient number of taxpayers in the category. California Government Code Section 6254(i) exempts from disclosure information

required from any taxpayer in connection with the collection of local taxes that are received in confidence. This question suggests that by disclosing the aggregate amount paid by all STRRs, this will not result in the disclosure of the amount paid by any individual taxpayer and, therefore, is not governed by section 6254(i). However, at this time, the City has not secured the agreement of ALL STRRs that operate within the City to collect and pay the transient occupancy tax due. The City continues to pursue such an understanding with other major operators, whose business model is to collect payment on behalf of the host. In addition to the major players in this market, there are a couple of very small STRRs that also operate in the City which do collect and pay the transient occupancy tax due. As a result, to disclose the aggregate amount paid by all STRRs as requested would effectively disclose the amount of transient occupancy tax paid by an individual taxpayer, which, as noted, is exempt from disclosure under the state law.

12) Please identify which city job classifications are considered substantially below market in compensation, and how much money is being set aside in the proposed budget to bring up the salaries for these classifications. If this is a large number of classifications, please list the top 25 miscellaneous classifications that the Administration would want to prioritize in terms of bringing those positions closer to the market salary levels taking into consideration recruitment needs and retention challenges. (Kalb)

This information is not readily available and requires conducting a market research of comparable job classifications at other municipalities. Typically, the proposed budget includes salary adjustments based on anticipated wage increases in negotiated MOUs. Additionally, each department periodically examines their staffing model/capacity, and based on a host of factors, including service delivery needs and recruitment/retention challenges, proposes to either create a new classification that better suits their program needs and/or to augment existing classification's salary table to bring up compensation to a market level based on their research.

13) How much is being added to the proposed FY19-21 budget (above the baseline) for vegetation management and wildfire prevention? Please itemize and distinguish between on-going and one-time expenditures. (Kalb)

The FY 2018-19 Adopted Midcycle Budget contained \$1.07 million in wildfire prevention services. The FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget contains \$1.10 million in wildfire prevention services in one time funds each year. The proposed budget also contains \$100,000 each year for vegetation management plan implementation.

14) My office receives numerous complaints that our parking restrictions are not being enforced in many neighborhoods that are within a residential parking permit zone. If we were to create and hire one or two additional parking control technicians effective January 1, 2020, would that lead to a net increase in revenue for the city? What would be the cost to do this in this 2-year budget (effective Jan. 2020) and what would be the expected revenue? (Kalb)

Please see the response to Question 8. The cost of 1.0 FTE Parking Control Technician is \$120,078 in FY 2019-20 and \$124,432 in FY 2020-21. While the addition of new parking enforcement staff would yield additional revenue through parking fines, it would likely be sufficient to cover the costs of the parking enforcement program (including the Parking

Control Technician, hearing officers, parking citation assistance center staff, etc.). We would not anticipate a significant increase in unrestricted revenue above the amount required for cost recovery.

15) Please provide a list of all the budgeted non-sworn City positions that have been vacant continuously for 5 or more years as of April 30, 2019, and what would be the savings in the budget if 10% of these positions (as determined by the City Administrator) were frozen for two years effective July 1, 2019? What service impacts if any would this have on city services. (Kalb)

A table below lists positions that have been vacant for five or more years, along with proposed budget for each position. Departments often utilize vacancy savings to fund temporary employees to meet their workload. As of May 2019, 2 of 7 listed positions here are currently linked to fund temporary staff. **Of note, these are not General Purpose Fund positions.**

DEPT	JOB CLASSIFICATION TITLE	FTE	VACANCY DATE	FY20	FY21	Status
OPW	Auto Equipment Mechanic	1.00	30-NOV-2012	167,523	173,310	Encumbered – linked to TCSE
OPW	Custodian	1.00	21-JUN-2014	105,610	109,260	Recruitment Plan in Progress
OPW	Electrical Engineer II	1.00	16-JUL-2010	244,836	253,291	Inactive
OPW	Environmental Program Specialist	1.00	22-JUN-2014	196,201	202,974	Recruitment Plan in Progress
OPW	Stationary Engineer	1.00	14-MAR-2014	173,929	179,939	Approved (pending HR Assignment)
OPRYD	Recreation Specialist I, PPT	0.48	12-APR-2013	36,014	37,314	Encumbered – linked to PT
LIBRARY	Museum Guard	1.00	20-JUN-2014	86,423	89,529	Recruitment Plan in Progress
	Total	6.48		1,010,536	1,045,617	

16) Does the proposed budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) back-fill the capital funds, as the Council and the Administration promised in writing to the public and to the East Bay Regional Park District, for the Caldecott Trail project (originally funded by EBRPD Measure WW) that were diverted for another, ‘shovel-ready’ project last year? Please identify where in the proposed Budget and CIP documents this is described. (Kalb)

The FY 2019-21 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget includes \$486,300 in FY 2019-20 for the Caldecott Trailhead Improvement project. This \$486,300 is funded using the Measure KK bond proceeds. For more detail on this CIP project, please refer to page A24 in the FY 2019-21 Proposed CIP Budget document. (<https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/FY-2019-21-Capital-Improvement-Program.pdf>)

- 17) Why are Park Maintenance positions singled out for substantial cuts (freezing of FTEs)? If seven of these positions were restored in the Budget, what other currently vacant GPF-funded positions would the Administration choose (however reluctantly) to freeze to maintain a balanced budget? (Kalb)**

Park maintenance positions are not being singled out. **These positions reside in the Landscape and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) fund, which has a major structural deficit.** Since the LLAD's inception, its revenue has not increased annually to keep up with increases in operating expenses, and this has resulted in the continued growing deficit in the fund.

A new revenue measure is necessary to close this ongoing structural deficit in the fund and to provide much needed improvements in the City's parks, facilities, grounds, and programs. Staff are not able to identify any other positions to be frozen in lieu of these vacancies.

- 18) How/where is the spending of Housing Impact Fees reflected in the proposed Budget and CIP documents? (Kalb)**

Please reference responses to Questions 8, 9, and 11 in the Budget Questions–Responses Memo #2.

- 19) In 2015, the city established a joint partnership with OUSD to hire social worker case managers (two hired by the City and two hired by OUSD) to work with families to reduce chronic absenteeism in our OUSD district elementary schools. To facilitate timely hiring of staff for this program, it makes sense to grant the funds for our half of this partnership to the school district contingent on OUSD keeping their positions active and filled. Where in the Proposed Budget Document does it show the funds (sufficient for two FTEs) being authorized for granting to OUSD specifically as a match to reduce Chronic Absenteeism in OUSD District Elementary Schools? The City had previously (in FY15-17 and FY17-19) identified our portion of this program to be funded half from our on-going funds and half from our one-time funds. Is that still the breakdown in the proposed Budget? - (Kalb)**

There were originally 2.0 FTEs; however, 1.0 FTE was funded with one-time funds and is no longer budgeted. Funding for the remaining 1.0 FTE was reprogrammed as contract O&M dollars to OUSD for the chronic absenteeism program of approximately \$139,405 in FY 2019-20 and \$144,507 in FY 2020-21.

- 20) In years, past, the City Council and Police Chiefs have asserted that some positions at OPD filled by sworn personnel could be filled by qualified civilian personnel. Over the past several years, a small number of positions at OPD have been civilianized. Does the proposed budget document assume that any of our currently budgeted sworn positions at OPD will be civilianized? Does the Chief have an up-to-date list of positions currently occupied by sworn personnel that she believes would be appropriate for civilianizing? If so, please provide it. If not, why not? – we didn't. (Kalb)**

Please see the response to Question 5 above.

21) What amount of Fund 2159 (carry-forward and FY19-21 proposed budget) consists of HEAP grant funds and is any further revenue of this type anticipated during FY 19-21? If so, what is the range that is expected to be received by our city from the state? (Kalb)

\$8.9 million in HEAP carryforward funds is included in the FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget. Any future funding from the state during FY 2019-21 cannot be reliably projected at this time with the State Legislature still reviewing the Governor’s Budget. Once the FY 2019-20 Budget Act is enacted and final HEAP grant numbers become available, staff will return to the Council with more concrete information.

22) How many FTEs are budgeted for the Inspector General’s Office in OPD compared to how many total/proposed positions are in the Budget for the Office of Inspector General within the Police Commission? (Kalb)

OPD Inspector General	FTE
Lieutenant of Police (PERS).PS152	1
Police Officer (PERS).PS168	1
Police Performance Auditor.AP210	3
Police Pgrm & Perf Audit Sup.AP291	1
Police Records Specialist.SS165	1
Total	7

Civilian Inspector General (Police Commission)	FTE
Civilian Inspector General	1
Police Pgrm & Perf Audit Sup.AP291	1
Total	2

23) How much money is being allocated in the proposed Budget to help feed those most in need (not just homeless residents, but all those who are unable to put food on the table for themselves and their family)? How does this compare to our past commitment to funding hunger programs in Oakland? (Kalb)

The FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget includes \$2.6 million per year to fund various food programs citywide. Specifically, there is funding for Meals on Wheels of approximately \$150,000 per year and \$200,000 per year for the Hunger Program that provides food to Oakland residents all year. In addition, the proposed budget also includes new funding of \$150,000 per year to fund a Program Analyst II position to support the expanded food service programs and O&M of \$400,000 per year to support OPL, OPRYD and HSD food programs for children and youth in the Measure HH (SSBT) fund. Furthermore, it adds funding in the SSBT fund of approximately \$530,000 per year for the Summer Food Service Program, which delivers free and nutritious meals to children ages 18 and under throughout the City. The proposed budget also maintains grant funding from the Department of

Agriculture of \$676,000 per year. The overall allocations for food programs in the proposed budget will increase by 46% compared to the FY 2018-19 Adopted Midcycle Budget.

24) Should/can we include funds in an adopted budget that would only be realized if a future ballot measure was passed by the voters in 2020? Has an adopted City of Oakland budget ever in the past 25 years budgeted for funds to be derived from a future ballot measure not yet passed or even approved for the ballot? (Kalb)

The Proposed and Adopted Budgets only include revenues that can reasonably be relied upon. Staff believes that the City has not adopted a budget including funds derived from an unknown future ballot measure. **Staff strongly recommends against including speculative revenues of any type in the adopted budget especially revenues that would be contingent on the approval of 2/3rds of the electorate.**

25) How many Fire Academies and how many Police Academies are proposed for funding for the FY19-21 time-frame? Will this amount keep us on track to fill already-budgeted sworn vacancies? (Kalb)

The Proposed Budget Contains 1 Fire Academy and 2 Police Academies per fiscal year. These provide spaces for 30 new firefighter and firefighter paramedics and roughly 80 new police officers per fiscal year.

26) How many Temporary Part-Time (TPT) employees are currently working for the Oakland Public Library? How many TPTs are budgeted to work for the Library in the proposed FY19-21 budget? How do these numbers compare to two years ago and four years ago? Are there funds identified in the Budget (if so, how much?) to convert current TPT positions into Permanent Part-Time (PPT) positions? (Kalb)

Below is a list showing budgeted FTEs by temporary part-time classifications specific to the Library from FY 2015-16 to 2020-21. Some of these positions have been converted to either permanent part-time or full-time positions over the years, in addition to 54.2 new full-time and permanent part-time positions that have been added during FY 2018-19, funded with Measure Q revenues.

Job	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
Librarian I, PT.AP216	4.13	4.13	4.38	4.38	2.95	2.95
Librarian II, PT.AP219	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Librarian, Senior, PT.AP229	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
Library Aide, PT.SS138	40.75	40.75	40.42	40.42	39.51	39.51
Library Assistant, PT.SS139	10.71	10.71	9.37	9.37	8.06	8.06
Literacy Assistant, PT.AP232	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	-	-
Museum Guard, PT.PS158	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88
Program Analyst I, PT.AP361	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.50	0.50
Student Trainee, PT.SS195	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	-	-
Grand Total	60.35	60.35	58.93	58.93	53.98	53.98

27) If the Council modifies the General Fund allocations attributable to the Measure HH tax revenue in a manner that reduces HH allocations to OPRYD, what would be the

impact in terms of youth program services levels at our parks and recreations centers? Would additional General Purpose Fund funded vacant positions need to be frozen for at least two years? If so, how many and which positions would The Administration choose to freeze? Please consider two scenarios: One that reduces the HH allocation to OPRYD by one-third and one that reduces the HH allocations by one-tenth. (Kalb)

In the Mayor's proposed budget, OPRYD is to receive \$12.20 million in Measure HH (SSBT) funding, including 41.62 FTEs. The positions are partially funded from the GPF. Eliminating or reducing funding would require additional GPF funding or elimination of positions.

These positions are intended to provide the following services:

- \$0.51 million (4.02 FTEs) for Oakland Summer "Town Camp" to provide youth summer programming; these positions (Recreation Supervisors, Center Directors, Program Directors and Recreation Leader Leaders) are primarily funded from the GPF.
 - Summer program impacted include boating, nature, overnight camps, leadership skills and develop self-confidence in a safe and inclusive environment.
- \$1.02 million (9.96 FTEs) for Aquatics Activities to provide swimming and water safety to Oakland's youth; these positions (Recreation Supervisor, Program Director, Lifeguards, Pool Managers, Water Safety Instructors) are partially funded from the GPF.
 - Aquatics programs impacted include Junior Lifeguard, private swimming lessons, special needs swim lessons to include introduction and advanced swim lessons.
- \$1.73 million (19.43 FTEs) for Sports to allow Oakland's youth to participate in basketball, football and other sports activities. If funding is eliminated or reduced, the positions (Recreation Supervisor, Program Director, and Recreation Leader, Sports officials, etc.) would require GPF funding.
 - Sports programs impacted include Oakland Neighborhood Basketball League for boys and girls competitive leagues; recreation center leagues that encourage fitness; co-ed woman's and men's softball and other adult leagues.
- \$0.56 million (4.75 FTEs) for the East Oakland Sports Center to provide fitness, performance/dance and aquatic/pool activities. If funding is eliminated or reduced, the positions (Recreation General Supervisor, Program Directors, and Recreation Leader, etc.) would require GPF funding.
 - Eliminating permanent positions at the East Oakland Sports Center would impact fitness training, aquatics, and performance/fitness dance programs.
- \$0.50 million (3.22 FTEs) for Administrative Support [Assist. Director; Management Assistant; Prog. Planner (Transfer In); Prog. Analyst I (Transfer In)]. If funding is eliminated or reduced, the positions would require GPF funding.
 - The Assist. Director is proposed at 0.22 FTE funded from SSBT and 0.88 FTE funded from GPF; the Program Planner and Program Analyst are transfers from the Human Services Department to help oversee SSBT programs; the Management Assistant would help administration functions.
- \$3.88 million (0.00 FTE) for Internal Service Costs; Facilities & Park Maintenance.
- \$4.00 million (0.00 FTE) for Third Party Grants (Non-Profits).

33% Reduction Scenario

Assuming that the Third-Party Grants (\$4 million) and Internal Services Costs (\$3.88 million) are not included in the one-third reduction, a 33 percent reduction would result in eliminating \$1.43 million in programming funding. To meet this elimination, OPRYD would likely:

- (\$0.50 million; 3.22 FTEs) Eliminate Administrative Support for programs and activities. Because some positions are partially supported by the GPF, GPF funding would need to be increased to support the positions or eliminate the positions.
- (\$0.51 million; 4.02 FTEs) Eliminate Oakland Summer Town Camp positions supporting programs and activities. Because positions are partially supported by the GPF, GPF funding would need to be increased to support the positions or eliminate the positions. Eliminating these positions may result in closing recreation centers and programs.
- (\$0.56 million; 4.75 FTEs) Eliminate permanent position at the East Oakland Sports Center. Eliminating these positions may result in closing the East Oakland Sports Center.

10% Reduction Scenario

Assuming that the Third-Party Grants (\$4 million) and Internal Services Costs (\$3.88 million) are not included, a 10 percent reduction would result in eliminating \$0.43 million in program support funding. To meet this elimination, OPRYD would:

- (\$0.50 million; 3.22 FTEs) Eliminate Administrative Support for programs and activities. Because some positions are partially supported by the GPF, GPF funding would need to be increased to support the positions or eliminate the positions.

28) Please list proposed FY19-21 funding for façade grants by area of the City (downtown, etc.). Please breakdown the amount for each area by fund. (Kalb)

The proposed budget does not include any new funding for the Façade and Tenant Improvement Programs ("FIP" and "TIP"). Prior to the dissolution of the Oakland Redevelopment Agency, the programs were funded from Community Development Block Grants ("CDBG") and former Redevelopment Agency ("Agency") tax increment revenue. Under dissolution law, staff was permitted to complete those FIP and TIP projects that were subject to agreements executed prior to the dissolution. Staffing for these efforts has been funded from the post-dissolution Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund ("RPTTF") as reflected in the Oakland Redevelopment Successor Agency's Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule ("ROPS"). These projects have since been completed and staff costs are therefore no longer eligible for reimbursement from the RPTTF.

Each former Redevelopment Project Area also has residual bond proceeds that can be used within that Project Area's geographical boundaries on eligible projects. The remaining bond proceeds that are designated for the FIP and TIP programs are in the following amounts:

- Downtown (Central District) - \$368,000 for the Historic Façade Program and \$615,000 in the Tenant Improvement Program
- Broadway/MacArthur/San Pablo Redevelopment Project Area - \$166,000 for the FIP and \$79,000 for the TIP
- Central City East Project area - \$492,000 for the FIP and \$390,000 for the TIP
- Coliseum Project area - \$435,000 for the FIP and \$540,000 for the TIP

29) Please show a breakdown of the budget for our senior centers and for all senior services housed within Department of Human Services. (Kalb)

A table below summarizes all the funding associated with the senior centers included in the FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget:

Org and Desc	Categ	Sum of FY19-20	Sum of FY20-21
		Biennial Working Total	Biennial Working Total
75231 - Multipurpose Senior Service Program	ISF	69,267	82,709
	O&M	259,927	236,798
	Personnel & OH	1,840,461	1,902,951
	Utilities	11,000	7,790
	Work Orders	0	0
75231 - Multipurpose Senior Service Program Total		2,180,655	2,230,248
75241 - Senior Companion Program	ISF	6,724	6,794
	O&M	239,442	235,736
	Personnel & OH	278,567	288,272
	Utilities	1,100	1,100
	Work Orders	18,098	19,588
75241 - Senior Companion Program Total		543,931	551,490
75631 - Senior Center	ISF	1,165,809	1,187,165
	O&M	739,422	739,422
	Personnel & OH	1,609,886	1,666,898
	Utilities	6,840	6,840
75631 - Senior Center Total		3,521,957	3,600,325
75651 - Senior Aide Program	ISF	17,135	17,315
	O&M	15,000	15,000
	Personnel & OH	457,370	469,378
	Utilities		
75651 - Senior Aide Program Total		489,505	501,693
Grand Total		6,736,048	6,883,756

30) How much is in the proposed budget to facilitate our required Council Redistricting process in 2020-21? Please itemize and describe how the Administration came to this dollar amount. (Kalb) - Michelle

The FY 2019-21 Proposed Budget includes \$57,000 for the Council redistricting process (\$41,000 in FY 2019-20 and \$16,000 in FY 2020-21). Overall total budget can increase to \$73,000, if necessary, with a carryforward of current year's \$16,000. Numbers were based on initial estimates for supplies, materials, and other costs associated with a typical redistricting process and do not include staff costs.

31) Where in the Proposed Policy Budget or proposed Capital Improvement Program document does it say how much money is being allocated for Storm water Trash Reduction. What new expenditures (one-time and on-going) above current ongoing activities are being budgeted for FY19-21 to achieve substantial progress toward

compliance with requirements set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board? How much money is being allocated in FY19-21 for trash capture devices? Please delineate between the small devices and large devices. (Kalb)

Funding towards illegal dumping and homeless encampment abatement, street sweeping, and implementation of the excess litter fee all provide trash reduction credit. There is no specific CIP project funding in the FY 2019–21 budget allocated for the installation of trash capture devices. Instead, the City will leverage existing bond funding, transportation funding, and other capital funding to incorporate the installation of full trash capture devices in capital projects. On June 12, 2017, City Council approved Resolution No. 86773 C.M.S. for the identification of Capital Improvement Projects funded by the General Obligation Bond (Measure KK) including the adoption of a Trash Capture Transportation Map that provided locations for transportation projects in high trash generation areas to ensure that those transportation projects will incorporate full trash capture devices, as appropriate. For example, DOT projects will install approximately 1,250 small trash capture devices at a cost of up to \$3.1 million as part of the 3 Year Paving Program. The City is also conducting feasibility studies at 4 locations for the installation of one or more large trash capture devices to be funded by Caltrans through a Cooperative Implementation Agreement. Under the Cooperative Implementation Agreement (in development) Caltrans would fund the planning, design, and construction of added large trash capture devices and the City would be responsible for ongoing operations and maintenance of the devices.

32) What are the emergency call response times for each Area (1-5). What have response time trends been for each of the past 5 years? What changes have been made to staffing and resource allocations to reduce response times in 2019-2021 Fiscal Year? What is the target response time in 2019-20? In 2020-21? (Taylor)

OPD is not able to measure the response times by area with the current Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) technology. New technology being installed in 2020 will make this information available in 2021.

For the past 24 months:

The average City-wide response time for Priority 1 calls is 7 min 59 seconds

The average City-wide response time for Priority 2 calls is 1 hour 11 minutes

OPD watch commanders share resources when possible to reduce response times, especially during periods that draw a large amount of resources to an area such as a shooting, sideshow, or serious accident.

OPD is drafting together an RFP request for a performance-based staffing study to review staffing allocation and options for call response and case closure. During this process, we will explore the operational and financial consequences of various staffing configurations and response time goals.

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

Subject: FY 2019-21 Budget Development Questions/Responses #5

Date: June 7, 2019

Citywide	Mar 1 - 31	Apr 1 - 30	Monthly % Change	24-Month Average*	Historical Range (per month)*	Apr 1 - 30 vs. 24-Month Average*	YTD 2018	YTD 2019	Year-to-Date % Change	YoY Previous 05/17 - 04/18	YoY Current 05/18 - 04/19	Year-over-Year % Change
Communications												
911 Calls	8,855	8,894	0%	8,387	7,670 - 9,103	6%	33,269	34,627	4%	96,807	104,472	8%
Other Incoming Calls	21,011	20,415	-3%	21,398	19,604 - 23,192	-5%	86,843	79,009	-9%	271,401	242,150	-11%
Total Calls	29,866	29,309	-2%	29,785	28,200 - 31,369	-2%	120,112	113,636	-5%	368,208	346,622	-6%
Officer Calls for Service												
Calls Routed to Patrol	21,188	21,097	0%	21,049	19,991 - 22,107	0%	82,661	81,443	-1%	256,914	248,271	-3%
Officer-Initiated Calls	8,678	8,212	-5%	8,735	7,892 - 9,579	-6%	37,451	32,193	-14%	111,294	98,351	-12%
Total Patrol Calls	29,866	29,309	-2%	29,785	28,200 - 31,369	-2%	120,112	113,636	-5%	368,208	346,622	-6%
% Officer-Initiated Calls	29%	28%	-4%	29%		-4%	31%	28%	-9%	30%	28%	-6%
Call Volume												
<i>(calls routed to patrol)</i>												
Priority 1 (P1) Calls	3,265	3,537	8%	3,416	3,195 - 3,637	4%	12,975	12,894	-1%	41,551	40,431	-3%
Priority 2 (P2) Calls	11,142	10,930	-2%	11,177	10,610 - 11,745	-2%	44,183	42,772	-3%	136,338	131,918	-3%
Median Response Times												
<i>(calls routed to patrol)</i>												
P1 Median Response Time	00:08:29	00:08:25	-1%	00:07:59	00:07:27 - 00:08:30	5%	00:07:31	00:08:30	13%	00:07:33	00:08:24	11%
P2 Median Response Time	01:12:36	01:22:19	13%	01:10:47	01:01:46 - 01:19:48	16%	01:02:09	01:15:22	21%	01:05:37	01:15:57	16%

*Historical data is for 24 months

33) Please describe and itemize our current and proposed expenditures for our 911 dispatch operation. What monies are being allocated specifically to help reduce 911 hold times? (Kalb)

There are several projects underway to reduce 911 hold times. Over the past year OPD has been successful in hiring new dispatchers and several are currently in training. It takes about 8 months from hire to working solo at a dispatch terminal. As the newly hired dispatchers fill positions, the call wait times should be reduced somewhat. In anticipation of reaching our authorized FTE count, OPD worked with Federal Engineering, an emergency dispatch consultant, to perform a staffing study. Based on this study, to improve dispatch service, training and reduce the amount of mandatory overtime the dispatchers are working, we need to hire 25 additional full time employees. There are phone upgrades planned for the non-emergency lines later this summer that should help with reducing repeat calls to the emergency lines, and potentially help to reduce wait times.

For questions, please contact Adam Benson, Budget Administrator, at (510) 238-2026.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

KATANO KASAINÉ
Director of Finance