

Supplemental Material

For

City of Sacramento

City Council

Financing Authority

Housing Authority

Redevelopment Agency

Agenda Packet

Submitted: May 22, 2009

For the Meeting of: May 26, 2009

Additional Material
 Revised Material

TITLE: Report Back on FY2009/10 Budget Development

Contact Information: Leyne Milstein, Finance Director, Finance Department,
(916) 808-8491

Please include this supplemental material in your agenda packet. This material will also be published to the City's Internet. For additional information, contact the City Clerk Department at Historic City Hall, 915 I Street, First Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604, (916) 808-7200.

Supplemental Budget Information

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Department to Respond
1	Report back with a plan to free up some of the Transient Occupancy Tax revenues to the Visitors and Convention Bureau and the Metropolitan Arts Commission, and provide a history of actual, budget, and variance for 3 years.	1/20/2009	2	Finance / CCL
2	We divided the City Planning Department into 2 departments - Development Services and Long Range Planning. Each has its own department head and management ranks. Please report back on the savings we can realize by recombining these departments - especially now that the General Plan is nearing completion and development has slowed dramatically.	1/20/2009	2	City Manager
3	We have employees located in a number of buildings around the City. Please report back on all buildings the City owns or leases, what departments or divisions are housed in these buildings, how much of the building is currently in use and what portion vacant, the projected cost of maintenance and repairs to these buildings, and recommendations for moving some of the employees to the vacant spaces.	1/20/2009	2	General Services
4	There are a number of fees the City charges that do not come close to covering the actual costs. Please prepare a list of fees that do not cover the City's cost and recommendations for increasing them to do so.	1/20/2009	2	Finance
5	What is the actual revenue to the City from the Enterprise Funds - in particular, how much revenue are we getting from Golf (even though it is no longer an enterprise fund) and the Marina Funds?	1/20/2009	5	Finance
6	What is the savings on the consolidation of City buildings - Wouldn't it be cheaper to move people out of buildings and into City Hall as there is some open space and look into selling some of these other buildings? Also, since these buildings are assets, how many can we sell? With the staff relocations, we need to consider the Community as well as the operational needs when relocating staff.	1/20/2009	5	General Services
7	In the space on the 3rd floor that our new Mayor now occupies, who was supposed to go in that space and was there supposed to be a savings realized from staff using that space?	1/20/2009	8	City Manager / General Services
8	The \$50m - does this have a cushion at all? When State furloughs go in place we could really lose even more revenues - have we accounted for this? What is our plan if we are off in our estimates? Do we have the appropriate cushion if we under-projected?	1/29/2009	1 / Mayor	Finance
9	Looking at 311 data we are getting - is it possible for potential cost savings based on where the work is and shifting things?	1/29/2009	Mayor	General Services
10	An independent budget analyst should be looked into? What are the benefits of internal auditors and a budget analyst looking at our books?	1/29/2009	Mayor	City Manager / Finance
11	Request that the City Manager at the 2/24 meeting bring back a long term strategy / plan for discussion.	1/29/2009	Mayor	City Manager / Finance
12	Just a few years ago, we had only one Public Information Officer for the entire City. Please report back with a plan to consolidate the PIO function in one office and the cost savings that will result from doing so.	1/20/2009	2	City Manager
13	When is the last time the City faced property tax declines similar to this?	1/29/2009	3	Finance
14	Can we get a report back on the water rates? and Can we get an update on what the impact of not doing the rate increases is?	1/29/2009	1	City Manager
15	In regards to the utility funds and the bad debt is there something we can be doing to go after this bad debt before we lose it?	1/29/2009	1	City Manager

Note: Highlighted questions were delivered to Council in a previous report.

Supplemental Budget Information

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Department to Respond
16	We would like a report back from CMO on who the internal auditor should report to - the City Manager's Office or Council. We discussed getting more auditors in place and possibly moving this unit to the Office of the City Council - can we get an update and have a discussion on what he is working on?	1/20/2009	4 / 2	City Manager
17	(1) What City departments are currently over budget and by how much? (2) Include a history of actual, budget, and variance for 3 years; and (3) Provide a breakdown of departments that are over budget and how the money was spent. <i>Note: when possible provide information relative to what is a labor item and included in a labor agreement and what isn't.</i>	1/20/2009	2	Finance
18	By department, how many positions are filled in the City presently and how many positions were filled last year?	1/20/2009	2	Human Resources / Finance
19	We want a report back on the staff to management ratios in each City department including organizational charts with management personnel clearly identified.	1/20/2009	2	Finance / Human Resources
20	(1) How many fire stations do we have now vs. 1968, (2) how many FTE now vs. 1968, (3) other options for reducing fire costs, and (4) is there an opportunity to file a claim with the State of CA for fire/ambulance response and approximately how much does responding to the State cost the City on a yearly basis? Provide a report back on the ability to use pass through money from SHRA to fund brown outs and with a "long term fix" for the brown outs - what does this delay in the brown outs mean?	2/10/2009	3	Fire / City Manager's Office
21	Budget Format: During the last budget briefing provided to the City Council, the format varied from department to department. Some departments reported the percentage of cuts they were taking; others did not. The City Manager advised the Council of a new "right sizing" policy to determine what number of positions should be eliminated, yet only one departmental budget report – Development Services – even mentioned the concept. If this is a guiding policy, then it ought to be discussed in each department's report, including an explanation of the guidelines used to determine what the "right size" is.	3/17/2009	2	Finance Department
22	Is there an alternate option at the 35% reduction level to closing 3 community centers? (i.e. spreading reduced hours equally among all neighborhoods)	2/24/2009	1	Parks and Recreation
23	Can the five remaining parks in Natomas funded through Park Development Impact Fees (PIF) be constructed and what will the maintenance impact be?	2/24/2009	1	Parks and Recreation
24	Baseline Budgets for City Departments: I have requested information on departmental budgets for the last three fiscal years. I am particularly interested in the number of positions added to departmental budgets after the City budget was approved. I have received this information only for the Police, Fire, Code Enforcement, and Development Services Departments. I suspect that these added positions have been used to establish a higher baseline budget for City departments, and that subsequent fiscal year budget cuts were made from the higher baseline figure. It would be very helpful if the Council were provided this information for each City department, so that we can realistically assess the actual level of cuts each department has made.	3/17/2009	2	Finance Department

Note: Highlighted questions were delivered to Council in a previous report.

Supplemental Budget Information

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Department to Respond
25	I think we need to look at what the President is recommending/suggesting - we need to do shared responsibility and all take a hit so we can keep as many people as possible. Can we look at some of our outsourcing to see what we can do (maybe CRCIP projects) internally by our staff?	1/29/2009	5	Development Services, General Services, and Transportation
26	Joint Powers Authorities Budgets: Last year, the City cut funding for the Human Rights Commission (a JPA on whose board I serve) by \$40,000. For an agency this small, this was a difficult cut to absorb. Please provide information on what other JPA funding cuts the City has made. This is an area where the City can likely save some money, but the Council needs to be assured that these cuts will not harm the core functions of these agencies.	3/17/2009	2	Finance Department
27	Transient Occupancy (TO) Tax Revenues: A report back with a plan to use TO tax revenues for general fund relief (all I've received to date is a history of how these revenues are used).	3/17/2009	2	Finance Department
28	City Fees and Charges: A report back on fees the City charges that do not cover the City's costs.	3/17/2009	2	Finance Department
29	The council needs to be involved in the reprogramming/reprioritization of the CIPs	1/29/2009	2	City Treasurer / City Manager
30	What happens when the State takes \$12 million from our Risk Fund?	5/19/2009	2	Finance / HR
31	Requested more information on the balance between rep and unrep layoffs.	2/10/2009	6	Human Resources / City Manager's Office
32	Federal Stimulus Dollars and the City Budget: According to Congresswoman Matsui's Office, additional federal dollars will be flowing to the City from the recently enacted Comprehensive Appropriations bill. The Council needs a thorough briefing on the Federal Stimulus and Appropriations dollars, including the amounts the City is slated to receive; the conditions, if any, attached to these funds; and the likely impact on the City's budget. For example, per Rep. Matsui's office, we are to receive, along with the County of Sacramento, \$4.7 million to address the issue of homelessness (stimulus package) and \$200,000 for the Sacramento Police Department's Youth Gang Intervention/Prevention Program (appropriations bill). Council should be providing policy direction with regard to the stimulus dollars and receiving timely information with regards to federal dollars flowing from the appropriations measure and the pending federal budget. Without this information, it will be very difficult for the Council to make good decisions with regard to next year's budget.	3/17/2009	2	Government Affairs
33	Please review the Parks report that the community submitted and return to Council with a report back and recommendations on the proposal.	5/19/2009	Mayor	Parks
34	Are the cuts being proposed in Parks proportional across all Parks and Recreation services - of the proposed cuts proportional among line staff, front line supervisors and managers?	5/19/2009	6	Parks
35	We need to re-look at our youth activities - we just had an adopt a park program in the City and we need to look at evaluating options from this program as we address the community proposal submitted.	5/19/2009	1	Parks
36	Can we get a report back on the 11 youth programs proposed for elimination/reduction in low income areas - are those proportional to higher income areas of the City?	5/19/2009	1	Parks

Note: Highlighted questions were delivered to Council in a previous report.

Supplemental Budget Information

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Department to Respond
37	Have we looked at our non-profit partners to make sure that we aren't losing more value in services from the cuts proposed? What do we lose as a community by cutting \$28k in the City's Budget for Stanford Settlement in community investment/benefit?	5/19/2009	1	Parks
38	The fully funded parks in Natomas need to be built and I understand the maintenance reduction across the board but to drop them all the way to the lowest level seems unfair.	5/19/2009	1	Parks
39	Provide more information on the balance between rep and unrep layoffs in Development Services.	2/10/2009	5 / 6	Human Resources / City Manager's Office
40	Would like a report back on the details of the management promotions in Development Services	2/10/2009	Mayor	Human Resources / City Manager's Office
41	How much are we paying for the various Chamber (Metro, Black, Hispanic & Asian) Memberships?	2/24/2009	8	Economic Development
42	How much are we paying for memberships related to Economic Development - SACTO, SARTA, Metro Chamber, etc.? Region vs. City of Sacramento benefits.	2/24/2009	5	Economic Development
Pending				
	We have a JPA with the County in the Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency. Please report back on the savings we can realize by withdrawing from the JPA and bringing the housing & redevelopment functions into an existing city department (Economic Development). Include a history of a history of actual, budget, and variance for 3 years.	1/20/2009	2	City Manager
	For the Police and Fire staff that take home City vehicles - Do the employees use any of their own money for gas and how much would we save if the employees paid for the gas on take home vehicles?	1/20/2009	8	City Manager
	What steps or measures are in place or consequences for departments that over-spend their budgets?	1/29/2009	Mayor	City Manager
	Are we looking at long-term strategies - we need to create a structurally balanced plan moving forward? I am as concerned about 2013 as I am about 2010 - we don't want to be in this situation year after year. What does a long-range four year projection look like? How will PERS/SCERS impact us down the road? If labor comes to the table now and we have to make concessions later how will that look? We need to be anticipatory.	2/24/2009	Mayor	City Manager / Finance
	What can we do to establish a 10% reserve	2/24/2009	Mayor	City Manager / Finance
	Mandatory vs. Discretionary Programs and Expenditures: Please provide information that will assist the City Council in determining our budget cutting options by providing information about mandatory vs. discretionary programs and expenditures. For example, I assume the City has no choice but to comply with federal and state mandates, court rulings, and the provisions of the City Charter. However, there are many programs and expenditures that are required either by City Code or by resolutions enacted by the City Council that have not been codified. It is in these last two categories that there should be some room for the Council to exercise the option of suspending or discontinuing programs. It would be very helpful if this information were included in budget materials.	3/17/2009	2	City Manager

Note: Highlighted questions were delivered to Council in a previous report.

Supplemental Budget Information

Item	Question	Meeting	District	Department to Respond
	Public Information Officer (PIO) Savings: What cost savings can be realized from reducing the number of Public Information Officers in various departments and replacing them with one. (So far, all I've gotten is a job description for PIOs and an explanation of why we have so many of them; what I want is a dollar amount.)	3/17/2009	2	City Manager / Government Affairs
	Consolidation of Services: On the issue of combining Development Services and Long Range Planning into one department, and pulling the functions now performed by the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency into city government, I have been advised that staff is looking into these matters. Please try to provide this information in advance of the budget hearings.	3/17/2009	2	City Manager
	Staff have been calling indicating that the cuts amongst line and management - I need to know the salary cuts - are we moving management into other positions and keeping the salaries the same? How much have management salaries factored into the proposed cuts vs. line staff cuts.	5/19/2009	2	CMO / Finance
	County JPAs - what is the County doing with this and what is the impact to us?	5/19/2009	2	Finance
	Could we get an update from the County Assessor on where we are currently? We have received reports indicating 4% to 56% moving forward and can do more work on this and report back.	5/19/2009	Mayor	Finance

Note: Highlighted questions were delivered to Council in a previous report.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 30

Question:

What happens when the State takes \$12 million from our Risk Fund?

Response:

Risk Funds are reserved to cover City liability settlements over the life of a claimant. The \$14.2 million referenced during the Council discussion reflects the FY2009/10 (one-year) revenues associated with the City's liability portion of Risk Funds.

The funds (liability and worker's compensation funds combined) proposed to be used to cover the State take pursuant to Proposition 1A, are those assets that have been set aside over time as required for the long term administration of this program, thus the overall impact in the short term is minimal.

The City's capacity to pay claims over the three years should not be impacted as the State is required to pay back the \$12 million including interest, within three years.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 31

Question:

Please provide a report back on the details of the balance between represented and unrepresented layoffs in all departments.

Response:

The following provides an overview of represented and unrepresented staffing reductions by department for the 2009/10 fiscal year:

FY2008/09 Funded FTE	Unrepresented		Represented	Total	Unrepresented as a % of total	Represented as a % of total
	Exempt Management	Admin/Confidential & Management Support				
All City Departments	583.70	263.50	4,096.57	4,943.77	17.1%	82.9%

FY2009/10 Proposed Unfunded FTE Detail by Department	Unrepresented		Represented	Total	Unrepresented as a % of total	Represented as a % of total
	Exempt Management	Admin/Confidential & Management Support				
Manager	2.00	-	-	2.00	100.0%	0.0%
Attorney	2.00	2.00	-	4.00	100.0%	0.0%
Clerk	-	1.00	-	1.00	100.0%	0.0%
Treasurer	3.00	-	-	3.00	100.0%	0.0%
Finance	4.00	-	-	4.00	100.0%	0.0%
Information Technology	6.50	3.00	2.00	11.50	82.6%	17.4%
Human Resources	1.25	3.00	-	4.25	100.0%	0.0%
Labor Relations	-	1.00	-	1.00	100.0%	0.0%
Fire	-	-	50.00	50.00	0.0%	100.0%
General Services	6.00	4.00	24.50	34.50	29.0%	71.0%
Transportation	2.00	-	23.95	25.95	7.7%	92.3%
Neighborhood Services	1.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	75.0%	25.0%
Convention, Culture & Leisure	1.00	-	2.36	3.36	29.8%	70.2%
Economic Development	3.00	-	-	3.00	100.0%	0.0%
Parks & Recreation	4.00	3.00	137.70	144.70	4.8%	95.2%
Code Enforcement	1.00	1.00	6.00	8.00	25.0%	75.0%
Development Services	8.00	1.00	74.00	83.00	10.8%	89.2%
Grand Total	44.75	21.00	321.51	387.26	17.0%	83.0%

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 32

Question:

Federal Stimulus Dollars and the City Budget: According to Congresswoman Matsui's Office, additional federal dollars will be flowing to the City from the recently enacted Comprehensive Appropriations bill. The Council needs a thorough briefing on the Federal Stimulus and Appropriations dollars, including the amounts the City is slated to receive; the conditions, if any, attached to these funds; and the likely impact on the City's budget. For example, per Rep. Matsui's office, we are to receive, along with the County of Sacramento, \$4.7 million to address the issue of homelessness (stimulus package) and \$200,000 for the Sacramento Police Department's Youth Gang Intervention/Prevention Program (appropriations bill). Council should be providing policy direction with regard to the stimulus dollars and receiving timely information with regards to federal dollars flowing from the appropriations measure and the pending federal budget. Without this information, it will be very difficult for the Council to make good decisions with regard to next year's budget.

Response:

A report containing this information was provided to the City Council on April 21, 2009. For additional information see Item 23, Update: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 33

Question:

Please review the Parks report that the community submitted and return to Council with a report back and recommendations on the proposal.

Response:

“Rescue Sacramento Parks” presented a report and recommendations to City Council to preserve park maintenance services in the face of General Fund reductions. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) appreciates the support and advocacy of the citizen group, and agrees with their assessment that the reductions would bring park maintenance service down to a level that is not acceptable and that labor concessions would greatly alleviate layoffs and substantially restore service levels.

However, DPR does not agree that park maintenance should be fully restored at the expense of recreation programs and services; park planning, design and development; grant administration; and other crucial administrative and fiscal services. DPR is a full service department and all services in the department have been asked to share in the reductions ranging from 24 - 43%, with Park Planning, Design and Development assuming the largest proportionate share. Park maintenance is being reduced by 34% (after some restoration with new, non general found sources from property assessments). The proposed reduction for Recreation is 31%, which includes the closure of three community centers, two clubhouses, elimination of recreation swim at five pools, and reductions to youth and older adult services.

Following is a response to the seven recommendations brought forward by “Rescue Sacramento Parks” and staff’s recommendations to City Council:

1) Refocus Lay-Offs on Mid and Upper Pay DPR Employees: Reductions encompass all layers of staffing in the department and are planned to provide a minimal level of management and supervisory oversight to operations. DPR is unique in City operations in that the majority of staff are seasonal and non-career. At any one time during the year, staffing levels range from 1,600 – 2,000 employees. Even with a combined reduction of 52% in the General Fund since July 1, 2008, line staff would continue to make up the majority of the workforce.

Over the past two years, management has been reduced both in number and layers, and span of control continues to increase. At the same time, the volume and complexity of managing and complying with grants and other non general fund sources and related agreements has increased. Currently, there are 44.2

management positions, or a ratio of 2% - 3% of DPR's workforce. Of these positions, 40.2 are fully or partially funded by the General Fund, and 9 of these positions are included in the Fiscal Year 2009/10 reduction plan including park maintenance operations, or 22%. There are 43 Park, Program and Custodial Supervisor positions. Of these, 34 are in the General Fund, and 7 of these positions are included in reduction plans, or 20%. Front line staff in the General Fund are proposed to be reduced by 30%, which includes non career staffing.

Staff does not recommend a further reduction in management nor supervisory oversight.

2) Cancel/Defer Capital and Discretionary Expenditures: DPR has complied with, and will continue to comply with the citywide freeze on discretionary expenditures.

Virtually all of the funds in DPR's capital program cannot be used for maintenance and operations, and are time sensitive (Park Development Fees, Quimby Fees, Capital Grants). The current program is focused on repair and rehabilitation of current park facilities and has little impact on park maintenance services. Several projects will provide for more efficient maintenance operations including irrigation improvement/control projects.

Staff does not recommend that the above projects be deferred or cancelled. However, "Rescue Sacramento Parks" has a valid point in raising this policy question in regards to developing new parks at this time, which in turn would require additional maintenance, water, and other utility costs. New park development is approximately 8% of DPR's proposed capital program. The Council may wish to make a policy determination regarding new park development.

3) Review Recreation Programs: General Fund reduction plans continue to allow for park and recreation services to the community in Fiscal Year 2009/10 including park maintenance services, the operation of park and recreation facilities (centers, clubhouses, pools, etc.) and core programming for youth and older adults, albeit, at greatly reduced levels. This second year of reductions, without labor concessions, will necessitate the closure of centers and significantly reduced opportunities for aquatics and core programming, in addition to impacts on park maintenance services.

In comparing budgetary impacts between recreation services and park maintenance services, the cumulative impact of Fiscal Year 2009 and 2010 General Fund reductions is 45% for recreation services, and 47% for park maintenance services. This factors additional Fiscal Year 2009/10 non general fund sources for park maintenance which will somewhat alleviate reductions.

Staff does not propose an alternative reduction plan.

4) Increase Park User Fees: Staff continues to evaluate fee rates and related revenues. To help mitigate General Fund reductions for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010, Council approved recommended new fees and fee increases for a number of services including: field use by youth organizations, picnic area use, swimming pool admissions, community center room rentals, access leisure, and sports, enrichment and dance programs.

"Rescue Sacramento Parks" recommends a review of the fee structure for large events. Staff will review the structure in Fiscal Year 2009/10 and recommend any changes to further recoup City costs.

5) Temporarily Reclassify Permanent Employees to Temporary Status: The determination to withdraw benefits from career or permanent staff for a period of time would largely be an item of negotiation, as most of DPR's career employees are represented by Local 39.

6) Privatize Basic Park Maintenance: DPR concurs with "Rescue Sacramento Parks" that there are cost savings in contracting out basic park maintenance, estimated to be in excess of 40%. However, the service level would be minimal and response to customers would be reduced. Privatization of basic park maintenance would continue to require City staff to provide contract management and inspection, and more specialized services including irrigation system oversight and emergency repair and oversight of park facilities such as playgrounds, tot lots, all-weather fields, sports courts, picnic and seating areas. The Council may wish to make a policy determination regarding contracting basic park maintenance services.

7) Joint Maintenance Agreements with Other Agencies: DPR will continue to engage other agencies for joint maintenance such as securing grants through the Sacramento Employment and Training Agency, and paying for services through agreements with other agencies such as the Sacramento Local Conservation Corps and Sacramento County for the "Work Release Program". Note such service agreements require budgetary commitments.

In addition, DPR continues to expand its "Adopt A Park" and volunteer programs. "Adopt A Park" opportunities vary by season and include but are not limited to: gardening, weeding, pruning, planting, brush clearing, spreading mulch, litter and invasive plant removal, and playground or play field preservation or improvement. DPR has 11,000 volunteers that are integral to maintaining services throughout the department. Only one department in the City utilizes more volunteers than DPR.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 34

Question:

Are the cuts being proposed in Parks proportional across all Parks and Recreation services - are the proposed cuts proportional among line staff, front line supervisors and managers?

Response:

All services in Parks and Recreation are recommended for reduction in Fiscal Year 2009/10.

In the Proposed Fiscal Year 2009/10 budget, General Fund budgets are recommended to be reduced between 24% and 43%, with Park Planning, Design and Development Services being reduced the most. Recreation is proposed to be reduced by 31% and park maintenance a net of 34% (given some restoration with new, non general fund sources from property assessments).

As to staffing, the proposed budget calls for a 22% reduction in management, 20% in front-line supervision, and 30% in front line staff (which includes non career staffing).

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 35

Question:

How does the City's "Adopt A Park" Program address the recommendations made by "Rescue Sacramento Parks"?

Response:

As stated in Item #1, DPR continues to expand its "Adopt A Park" and volunteer programs which will help mitigate General Fund reductions. "Adopt A Park" opportunities include gardening, weeding, pruning, planting, brush clearing, spreading mulch, litter and invasive plant removal, and playground or play field preservation or improvement. DPR has 11,000 volunteers that are integral to maintaining services throughout the department.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 36

Question:

Eleven summer camps for low income youth are a part of DPR's reduction plan. Are youth program reductions proportional across all levels of incomes in the City?

Response:

In order to reach the 35% reduction level, DPR recommended closure of community centers, clubhouses, reduced hours at swimming pools, and reduced or eliminated sports programs, summer recreation programs and special events, which include the 11 youth programs in question. All reductions would affect children, teens, adults and older adults. When viewed across the entire City, the Department's recommendations would affect all age levels and all neighborhoods. When determining which specific summer youth programs would not operate if the recommended reductions are approved, DPR staff will carefully consider the geographic distribution of all its programs for youth to ensure fairness and equity.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 37

Question:

Have we looked at our non-profit partners to make sure that we aren't losing more value in services? What do we lose as a community by cutting \$26,000 in General Fund grants for Stanford Settlement?

Response:

DPR has a long history of successfully collaborating with a number of non-profit organizations, school districts and governmental agencies, and greatly values the services provided in concert with partners.

At the 35% level of reductions in the General Fund, the magnitude and depth of proposed service reductions for City services will have significant impacts on those who rely on and enjoy those services. Proposals will result in the complete closure of community centers, clubhouses, reduced hours at swimming pools, and reduced or eliminated programs for children, teens, adults and older adults. Continuing to fund our non-profit partners would require further reductions to City run programs. It is unfortunate that the funding reductions proposed for DPR's non-profit partners will also affect children, teens, adults and older adults. However, it is not inconsistent with the recommended actions for City programs.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 38

Question:

There are fully funded parks to be developed in Natomas. What is staff's recommendation as to their future maintenance level? Is it fair to isolate these parks for a lower service level?

Response:

The proposed parks to be built in Natomas include River Birch, Valley Oak, Dogwood, Wild Rose in North Natomas, and Oakbrook in South Natomas. If all five projects were to begin in July 2009, they would be completed by July 2011 or the beginning of Fiscal Year 2011/12.

Given DPR's proposed 35% reduction plan, if there are no labor concessions, DPR anticipates a citywide park maintenance reduction from Level 3 to between Level 1 and Level 2. When these additional parks come on-line in Fiscal Year 2011/12, the acreage will need to be absorbed by the existing maintenance crews, mainly in the North Natomas area. Since the addition of five parks in a system of 200 is not significant enough to reassign staff from other areas of the City, there will be a further erosion of park maintenance in the North Natomas areas that are serviced by the crews to which the parks are assigned.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 39

Question:

Please provide more information on the balance between represented and unrepresented layoffs in Development Services.

Response:

Layoffs in DSD began in November 2007 with the discharge of 3 limited term employees and temporary employees. The second round occurred in March of 2008 with the layoff of twenty-eight (28) permanent employees. The third round occurred in January of 2009 with the layoff of eight (8) permanent employees. The fourth round occurred in February of 2009 with the layoff of twenty-three (23) permanent employees. The fifth round will occur in June of 2009 with the layoff of twenty-four (24) permanent employees.

The total number of represented and unrepresented employees affected by layoff is as follows: (includes proposed layoffs)

Total represented: 76

Total unrepresented: 10 (including limited term)

In addition, the Voluntary Separation Program (VSP) accounted for the following reductions in workforce: (includes anticipated VSP's)

Total represented: 11

Total unrepresented: 3

Further, a total of 35 vacant positions (non VSP) were eliminated. A grand total of 135 out of 221.5 positions were eliminated from DSD since the beginning of the economic downturn.

The business decisions for this extraordinary reduction in employee services were based on maintenance of statutorily mandated services and customer needs to sustain as much economic growth as possible through the services of DSD.

Maintaining the appropriate ratio of supervisory to line staff was a key factor in making staffing decisions. Decisions were not primarily based on the ratio of represented to unrepresented staff. It is important to note that there are represented staff who have supervisory duties and conversely there are unrepresented staff who have no supervisory or management duties.

The process to reduce the workforce and maintain essential services while maintaining the ratio of supervisors to line staff was not a simple exercise. It had to take into consideration the multiple factors of VSP, layoff, bumping rights and impacts, employee skill sets, represented employee limitations in allowable duties, exiting vacancies, changed or reduced workload in specific technical areas due to the economic slowdown, Natomas flood mapping impacts, insourcing opportunities, disciplinary actions in process, staff reductions due to department revenue losses, staff reductions due to the citywide budget crisis and more.

Through this complex downsizing process and despite the challenges, the department was able to maintain the same ratio of line staff per supervisor or manager. The chart below illustrates the ratio:

	2007/08 (*)	2009/10 (*)
Supervisors/Managers	29.5	11
Line Staff	192	75.5
Line Staff to Supervisor/Manager Ratio	1:7	1:7

* Development Services Department employees only

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 40

Question:

Please provide a report back on the details of the management promotions in Development Services.

Response:

Due to an anticipated \$8.5 million revenue deficit and a \$2 million General Fund reduction, the Development Services Department is proposing labor reductions totaling 24 FTE for fiscal year 2009-2010. These 24 positions are in addition to 111 positions that were eliminated in prior year reductions. With a substantially reduced staff in key positions from layoff, the Voluntary Separation Program, and vacancy elimination, several of these key positions had to be filled in order to maintain statutorily mandated and essential services in the department.

Thus, four fully funded and vacant positions were filled under a “promotional only” recruitment. The City’s promotional recruitment and interview process was used. The positions were posted and eligible candidates were selected by the Human Resources Department. Selected candidates were interviewed by a panel consisting of represented and unrepresented employees from DSD. The panel submitted the top three finalists to the Director for final recommendation. Of the four positions, three were filled by represented employees.

The promotions and positions filled were as follows:

- Customer Services Representative (represented) to Administrative Technician (unrepresented)
- Development Services Technician (represented) to Program Analyst (unrepresented)
- Accounting Technician (represented) to Program Analyst (unrepresented)
- Administrative Officer (unrepresented) to Program Manager (unrepresented)

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 41

Question:

How much are we paying for the various Chamber of Commerce (Metro, Black, Hispanic, and Asian) memberships?

Response:

The City membership contributions are as follows:

Asian Pacific	\$ 5,000
Black Chamber	\$ 5,000
Hispanic Chamber	\$ 5,000
Metro Chamber	\$10,000

In addition, the City participates in a variety of special projects, events and promotions with these Chambers. The specific events and level of participation varies from year to year. Participation has been eliminated or reduced to bare minimum levels due to the current budget status at the City.

Supplemental Budget Information – Item 42

Question:

How much are we paying for memberships related to Economic Development - SACTO, SARTA and the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce? What is the region vs. City of Sacramento benefit?

Response:

Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce \$10,000

The Metro Chamber is a regionally focused organization whose membership includes 1,183 business representing over 86,000 employees in the City of Sacramento. The Chamber provides multiple services to these businesses and partners with the City on many business retention and expansion efforts. The Chamber offices and most of its 90 events per year are hosted in the City. The Chamber's State of the City Address is a major annual event on behalf of the City. The Chamber aligns much of its legislative agenda with the City and is a major promoter of the City and the region.

Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization \$45,000

SACTO is the region's leading facilitator for business attraction efforts. It brings together the organizations, information and resources in the pursuit of jobs, talent and investment needed to ensure regional prosperity and global competitiveness. Over the last 33 years, SACTO has assisted hundreds of companies locate and expand in the region, generating billions of dollars of investment and strengthening the economy. Over the past year SACTO has been instrumental in the attraction of 6 new businesses to the City of Sacramento and an additional 4 for the region.

Sacramento Area Regional Technology Alliance \$25,000

SARTA is a non-profit organization founded to foster entrepreneurial growth and attract investment capital to the greater Sacramento region. SARTA has many partnerships with local government. Among others some examples include: CleanStart to accelerate the development of clean energy technology ventures within the region, MedStart to build and strengthen the medical technology industry in the region, and VentureStart to connect entrepreneurs to regional investment resources, management talent and complementary companies and entrepreneurs. The many promotional efforts of SARTA help promote City industries and growth. A few examples include the Liquidity Event (Mayor Johnson emceed in January), MedStart launch, Tech Index Celebration, PowerSurge clean tech event, HiTech Forums, the Entrepreneurial Breakfast (June 11 at Sac State), TechSurge event (July 16 at Citizen Hotel rooftop terrace), MedStart event (Sept. 30 at UCDMC), Sacramento Clean Tech Showcase (July 16 at Sac State).

