



Community Priorities Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting #3

August 9, 2017

Prepared by:



Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
800 Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710

August 2017

I. Welcome and Introductions

Welcoming Remarks, Roll Call and Agenda Overview

The third meeting of the Engage Roseville Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC or Committee) was held on Wednesday, August 9, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Maidu Community Center, 1550 Maidu Drive, Roseville, California. The purpose of the CPAC is to develop recommendations for the City Council regarding service-level priorities and potential service reductions for the five City departments whose operation constitutes the majority of General Fund expenses.

This summary is intended as a succinct synopsis of the meeting's presentations and discussion. More detail on all items, plus meeting materials and a schedule, can be found on the City's Engage Roseville webpage at http://www.roseville.ca.us/council/engage_roseville/default.asp.

Facilitator Lou Hexter of MIG welcomed all CPAC members and other attendees, and called on **CPAC Chair Krista Bernasconi** to officially open the meeting and take a roll call of the CPAC members.

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Present:

Krista Bernasconi, Matthew Bridge, Ellaison Carroll, Pete Constant, Stephanie Dement, Kristine Dohner, Richard Duffy, Jack Ellison, Derk Garcia, Valerie Gross, Julie Hirota, Bruce Houdescheldt, Kathryn Kitchell, Marcus Lo Duca, Tracy Mendonsa, David Nelson, Jason Probst, Richard Roccucci, Roy Sterns, John Tallman, Sergey Terebkov, Elaine Webb, Randall Wilson

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Absent:

Wendy Gerig, Joe Landon, Michael Laperche, Sr., Dennis Snelling

Returning to the podium, Lou introduced CPAC members to the contents of the handout packets distributed, which included: a meeting agenda; a white paper from the Public Works Department; a PDF of this evening's PowerPoint presentation; a City Council Staff Report on the formation of the CPAC; and a memorandum containing responses to written questions posed by the CPAC subsequent to the July 26th meeting. He then reviewed the agenda for this evening's meeting. He reminded CPAC members of the process design, which calls for two meetings with each City department. During the first meeting, each department will present an overview of costs for services supported by General Fund discretionary funds. At the second meeting, each department will provide potential options for cost savings. The CPAC will discuss those options and any others brought forward, and on that basis, will reach a preliminary consensus on prioritizing those services.

II. Discussion of Mission

To open the meeting, **City Manager Rob Jensen** reiterated the CPAC's mission as directed by City Council, with the purpose of clarifying what subjects fall within its scope. Although the CPAC is welcome to bring up ideas for increasing City revenue, its main charge is specifically to make recommendations regarding priorities for services financed in whole or in part by General Fund (GF) discretionary dollars. Also, since some questions submitted after the last meeting took substantial time to research, they may choose to avoid an undue burden upon City staff by not answering questions that are outside the scope of this charge. Further clarification of what subjects are within the scope of questions to be answered will take place as necessary.

CPAC members provided the following questions regarding the CPAC's charge.

- Can you provide us with a definition of core City services?
 - *The purpose of these meetings is for the CPAC to identify what they consider to be core or essential services by prioritizing them more highly.*
- Will there be any discussion of city staff salaries and how they affect the budget?
 - *This information will not be provided as it is not within the CPAC's defined mission, which is simply to prioritize services. However, we are interested in hearing your suggestions for cost savings or revenue enhancements, and will communicate those ideas to Council as part of the package.*

III. Follow Up Items From Previous Meeting

Jay Panzica, the City of Roseville's Chief Financial Officer, returned to the podium to briefly summarize the responses to questions that were submitted after the previous meeting asking for clarification of points from his "Municipal Finance 101" presentation. A memo summarizing these questions and responses was distributed to the CPAC, and can be found on the City's Engage Roseville webpage

at http://www.roseville.ca.us/council/engage_roseville/cpac_meetings.asp.

CPAC members asked Jay to answer the following questions:

- Is what we come up with going to be what is put in place by the Council?
 - *No. The CPAC, staff, Council and other stakeholders will simply make recommendations as to what to prioritize. The City Manager will*

- present the budget, which will be informed by those recommendations, to Council, who have final authority.*
- But Council will take what we tell them into account?
 - *Yes, the CPAC is a major player and considered to be representing the public.*
 - Do we have expenses and revenues for each of the items we'll be prioritizing? That way, if there's an item we consider to be lower priority but we find that it only takes a small part of the budget, there may be room in the budget to recommend prioritizing it more highly. And will other funding information be available as well—for instance, the services that are funded by grants, so we can take that into account?
 - *You will be provided expense and revenues for all services which are financed by GF discretionary dollars. Non-discretionary items, such as grant funding, will not be included.*
 - What if there are conflicting recommendations made by other City commissions or boards, particularly those which include CPAC members—for instance, the CPAC and the Transportation Commission?
 - *That's a great question. We will be making a full report to the Council that includes all recommendations. We will bring that full report to applicable commissions as well.*
 - Does the schedule for the Capital Improvement Plan and Rehabilitation of Assets in the FY 2017-18 Budget that you provided include just the General Fund, or does it include other sources such as enterprise funds?
 - *Just General Fund money.*
 - Is the \$14M funding shortfall for deferred items that you mentioned just for next year or is it a five-year figure? And does the projected budget deficit include this \$14M?
 - *It is the current amount to date. It is an approximate one-year figure. It was arrived at by dividing the total estimated five-year debt amount to figure the average funding shortfall per year. Whatever we defer in one year, we'll add on to the deficit for the next year. In addition to the deferred item deficit, there was also an operational deficit of around \$2M in the current budget year, which was already addressed through service level reductions prior to the formation of the CPAC.*

IV. Overview of the Public Works Department

Presentation

The City Manager introduced **Rhon Herndon**, Public Works Director, who in turn introduced his colleagues: **Jason Shykowski**, Principal Engineer, Engineering Division; **Mike Dour**, Alternative Transportation Manager; and **Jerry Dankbar**, Street Maintenance Superintendent. Rhon provided an introduction to the

services provided by Public Works and the percentage of each service financed by General Fund discretionary dollars. Following Rhon, each individual presented greater detail about the GF discretionary-funded services provided by their division.

The complete presentation is available on the city's "Engage Roseville" webpage at http://www.roseville.ca.us/council/engage_roseville/cpac_meetings.asp.

CPAC Member Questions and Comments

CPAC members provided the following comments and questions regarding the Public Works Department's presentation.

Questions About Specific Services

- What is the source of the 75% of Public Works Engineering (Roadway and City Building) CIPs (Capital Improvement Projects) which are not financed by GF discretionary funds?
 - *A variety of sources, including developer fees.*
- Your presentation states that the Crossing Guard Program is 88% funded by the GF. Why doesn't the School District fund a larger proportion of that?
 - *That's a good question. So far, that's all they have been willing to fund. That's something that the CPAC can make a recommendation about.*
- How much usage does the traveler information webpage get in the age of Google Maps, and how much does that cost to operate and maintain?
 - *It's part of the ITS system—one of the smaller pieces. The last estimate of hits is a couple years old, and showed more than 1,000 hits per month. It has advantages over Google Maps, including the ability to view the video feeds and get count data, which we track 24/7.*
- I'm curious about the funds spent on special events. Are they mostly City-sponsored events, or private groups?
 - *Most of them are City-sponsored events, in which case we cover all costs for setup and teardown, etc.*
- You mentioned that Roseville receives only \$1.2M of the gas tax collected. What is the other \$3M used for?
 - *Contracts for large-scale road resurfacing that is beyond the City's direct capacity to provide economically.*
- You said that street sweeping was completely non-discretionary. Where does the funding for street sweeping come from?
 - *Environmental Utilities Solid Waste pays for that entire program.*
- When you talked about the ability to go after graffiti perpetrators, is that a city code violation, or is that a state law where all the money's going to

the courts? Is there a way to go after the taggers, or, if they're juveniles, to go after their parents for payment?

- *That's a good question for the Police Department. All we do is abate it. I know that in the past, they have caught some juveniles and the parents have had to pay—we've gotten a little money from that.*

Road Quality

- There is road widening being done on roads that are already in good shape. Can that money be spent instead on repairing roads that need it?
 - *Road widening is paid for by developer traffic mitigation fees where a development project will increase traffic. These funds cannot legally be used for street maintenance.*
- In regards to your projection of how road quality will decline if maintenance is deferred, isn't a lot of the red shown on the map due to older roads that are unrecoverable?
 - *Not entirely. The roads are designed for a 20-year life. We can get 50 to 60 years of life by recovering them every year. We can bring those roads back without doing a full reconstruction—the technologies for doing so are constantly improving.*
- Therefore, is it possible for us as a committee to look at a reallocation of how the funds are spent? If we divert some of the maintenance funds to those roads that are in worse shape now, will that save us money down the line?
 - *It's most cost-effective to keep the good roads good. When you let the good roads degrade, it costs more in the long run. If you start from the bottom, then your better roads never get fixed, and the situation as a whole worsens. We do work off both the bottom and the top of the list, but we focus on keeping those on the top.*
 - *The CPAC can make recommendations, but we do have software that tracks the condition of all roadways in the city, when they were last maintained, etc., and gives us recommendations.*
- Are we just sticking to short-term recommendations, or should we consider more broadly how costs might go down over time—for instance, can the city take on more road resurfacing and how do costs change if paving streets with concrete rather than asphalt, as you've discussed?
 - *The Roller-Compacted Concrete Project is underway as a pilot project. It is slightly less expensive to construct than an asphalt street, so we think the development community will be positive about this innovation. Once we finish this project, we'll showcase it. Concrete keeps better than asphalt, not needing resurfacing every seven-ten years. If this project is successful, as we expect, we will add it to our construction standards. Our vision is that concrete streets will become the norm for all new street construction. Because we collect tax revenue based on population and roadway miles, our share of gas tax*

monies will continue to increase as the City grows, and due to the lower cost of maintaining the concrete streets, there will be additional revenue to address the remaining asphalt roads.

Floodplain Management

- Of the \$466,000 cost for floodplain management—what portion of that represents the cost of being included in the Community Rating System? And what is the implication of moving from a Class 1 to a Class 2 or 3 rating? Does this include work in the field, or mostly filling out documentation to get the class rating?
 - *The cost for the CRS program is about \$161,000 per year. For every class above 10, you get a 5% decrease on homeowners' flood insurance. However, due to the need to maintain other required activities, a 50% reduction would result in less than a 50% saving for the City. The rating is a result of work done in the field, but there is substantial tracking and documentation.*
- How much of the flood control funding goes to assist the Police Department in helping the homeless in the floodplain?
 - *Public Works' Floodplain Manager plays a support role only. The Police Department is responsible for dealing with the issue of homelessness, and has requested our support within the floodplain area. It's a very small percentage of the cost, and because a lot of key issues have been dealt with and policies put in place, costs will be much smaller moving forward.*

Transit Ridership and Costs

- You talked about trends for transit ridership—is it being utilized as much as previously, considering all the options for getting around including Uber, etc.?
 - *Last year, we had approximately 375,000 individual trips. This year it looks like there will be a reduction in our local ridership but not in our commuter ridership. In our next short-range master plan, we'll evaluate why that is occurring.*
- Of 375,000 trips on transit for the last year—what's the ridership split between commuter, local and Dial-A-Ride?
 - *Local is about 190,000 trips per year, and commuter is a little over 100,000. The remaining 70,000-80,000 are Dial-A-Ride.*
- Do the TDA funds cover the cost of your rolling stock? And what is the cost and frequency of replacement for larger buses compared to transit vans?
 - *Yes, we use TDA funds for purchase and maintenance, but we also sometimes use some federal FTA grants. As for cost and frequency of replacement, large buses cost about \$425K and last about 12 years. The smaller buses are only around \$150K but they have a five to seven-year life.*

- Since there often seem to be large local buses with very few riders, have you considered switching the mix for efficiency, so there are more frequent smaller buses during less busy times.
 - *We have eleven routes, on which the ridership varies. If we used smaller buses on some of the busier routes, they would frequently be at capacity. We do sometimes juggle buses, so if a commuter bus is in maintenance, a local bus will take its place. We also use the smaller, Dial-A-Ride "cutaway buses" at less busy times on certain routes. When we update our Short-Range Transit Plan, our consultants will recommend a fleet size and mix based on transit trends. The commuter is a 40-foot bus, the local buses are 30 feet, and the cutaway buses are about 20 feet. It's something we can reconsider in our Short-Range Plan and we can also check in with our fleet maintenance group. We try to keep a consistent type of bus in our yard for efficiency in maintenance.*
- If some of the TDA funds are used for road maintenance, can savings on bus purchases or maintenance be used to address the road maintenance backlog? Can you move money between buckets?
 - *Seeking grants is a big part of our alternate transportation program—not only state and federal but also competitive grants, with which we've been very successful. We're always looking at ways to increase the size of the pie.*

Requests for More Information

- Can we get a complete break out of specific programs within Public Works services that are funded by GF discretionary funds? This is necessary for us to make recommendations on specifically what services need to be prioritized.
 - *At the next meeting, we will focus on the costs just for those services we'd like you to prioritize, as well as describing proposed options for reducing services, and the impacts and ramifications of each reduction.*
- It would be helpful to receive this information in advance of the next meeting so that we can study and give it some thought beforehand. It might also be useful to focus on the services that are discretionary, rather than spend much time on non-discretionary costs.
 - *We will provide the information next Wednesday, August 16—one week ahead of the next meeting.*
- Do you know and can you include the ramifications of previously deferred maintenance?
 - *Yes, we have an analysis from the pavement management system which we can provide.*

- I'm trying to reconcile the Streets number given in the white paper with the non-discretionary amount noted in the PowerPoint. There's a difference of a couple million dollars—does the impact fee account for that? Is that an offset?
 - *We will need to check on that discrepancy and answer at the next meeting*
- Will the information that Public Works brings to us include recommendations for ranking of services?
 - *No, the department will provide some options for cost savings that they have considered, but it's the committee's job to rank services.*
- Is it possible to get more information on specifics about special events and how much they cost and if there's a possibility for recovering that money through permitting or sponsorships?
- In relation to the question about the CRS rating program: when a resident requests a letter of map revision related to floodplains—is that in that category?
- In terms of the analysis for the roadway system, does your analysis take diversion of traffic to other roads and its impacts into account? If so, what does that do to tax dollars?

The CPAC requested that departments provide costs per discretionary fund service. Public Works will have that information ready for the CPAC by next Wednesday if possible.

V. Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to offer comments or ask questions regarding any item within the purview of the CPAC. The following comments and questions were offered:

- A couple of thoughts to consider: What are the trends in cost increases and decreases and do you take those into account? And do you consider how costs will change in the future due to improvements made now—such as putting in concrete streets and therefore having lower maintenance costs in ten years?
- Does the grant funding for bus services include fuel?
 - *Fuel is one of the costs paid for through the TPA. There are no GF dollars used.*
- When you do your calculations do you consider both current and projected costs?
 - *We do fund balancing as we go forward. Examples are the public facilities fees or park fees collected for new development. Our maintenance costs do increase with new facilities, so we will take that*

into account. When we bring a new facility to the Council for approval, we'll let them know how it will increase those costs.

- Are you budgeting based on the assumption that the same amount of money will be coming in for the next several years?
 - *It depends on the economic vitality of the community. We'll see more money coming into those impact funds if we have a peak in growth rather than a recession. However, those will have no or minimal effect on our General Fund budget—they are separate revenue streams.*

VI. Next Steps

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, August 23, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Mahany Meeting Rooms, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville.

Wallgraphic notes taken at the meeting are attached.

Engage ROSEVILLE

CPAC MTG 3
8.9.17

CPAC CHARGE

- ▶ DEF. OF CORE SVCS?
 - WILL BE ID'D IN THESE MTGS.
- ▶ NO DISCUSSION OF SALARIES?
 - NOT W/IN MISSION - SVCS
- ▶ CPAC MAKES RECS - COUNCIL HAS FINAL AUTH.
- ▶ DO WE GET COSTS FOR ALL SVCS - NET TOO?
 - YES
 - NONDISCRETIONARY
- ▶ CONFLICTING RECS?
 - WHOLE RPT TO EA COMMITTEE

- ▶ **\$14M** 1-YR. OR 5-YR DEBT?
 - THAT MUCH ANNUALLY
- ▶ WHAT ABOUT PROJ. BUDGET DEFICIT?
 - ANNUAL WILL BE ADDED

PUBLIC WORKS

- ▶ SOURCE OF 75% CIPS?
 - DEVT, ETC.
 - ▶ CROSSING GUARDS
 - ▶ CAN WE BREAK OUT DISCRETIONARY \$?
 - WILL FOCUS @ NEXT MTG.
 - ALSO PROPOSALS
 - RAMIFICATIONS OF CUTS
 - ▶ WOULD LIKE THIS INFO SOONER
 - WILL GET AHEAD OF MTG.
- PLUS IMPACTS

ADDS CAPACITY

- ▶ ROAD WIDENING VS. ROAD REPAIR
 - WIDENING IS DEVEL. FEES
 - CAN'T USE FOR REPAIR
- ▶ USE OF TRAVELER INFO WEBPAGE, ?
 - PART OF ITS - SMALL PIECE
 - ~1,000 HITS PER MO. ALREADY
- ▶ RAMIFICATIONS OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE?
 - HAVE ANALYSIS
- ▶ OTHER USE OF GASTAX?
 - CONTRACT RESURFACING
- ▶ TRANSIT RIDERSHIP?
 - REDUCTION LOCAL, NOT COMMUTER
- ▶ FUNDING FOR ST. SWEEPING?
 - MULTIPLE SOURCES

▶ TALKING TO PARENTS OF TAGGERS?

• PD

▶ IMP. OF CLASS 1 TO CLASS 2?

- COST \$101K/YR
- 5% DECREASE ON FLOOD INS. PER PT.
- RESULT OF WORK IN FIELD, NEEDS DOCUMENTATION

▶ ROAD QUALITY PROTECTION: OLD ROADS UNRECOVERABLE?

- THOSE ROADS CAN BE KEPT IN GOOD SHAPE

▶ CAN WE LOOK AT REALLOCATION?

- MOST COST-EFFECTIVE TO KEEP GOOD ROADS GOOD - BUT DO WORK FROM BOTTOM AS WELL

- HAVE SOFTWARE W. RECS

▶ HOW MUCH FLOOD \$ FOR HOMELESS?

- SUPPORT ROLE ONLY - SMALL %

- FLOOD \$ SMALLER MOVING FWD.

▶ ABILITY TO RECOVER SPECIAL EVENT FUNDS?

▶ FLOODPLAIN ANALYSIS

▶ BROADER PRINCIPLES - WILL COSTS GO DOWN FOR CONCRETE STS. LONG-TERM?

- DEV'T CMTY POSITIVE - KEEPS BETTER - HOPEFULLY NORM
- ROADWAY MILES ↑ WILL PROVIDE MORE REVENUE

▶ OF 375K TRIPS - RIDERSHIP SPLIT?

- LOCAL - 190K, COMMUTER 100K, 70-80K DIAL-A-RIDE
- USE SOME FED GRANTS

▶ COST / FREQ. OF BUS REPLACE? \$400K-12 YRS
SMALLER \$150K - LESS TIME

SWITCH BUS MIX FOR EFFICIENCY?

- RIDERSHIP VARIES - JUGGLE BUSES - COULD RECONSIDER
- WILL GET TRANSP PLAN RECS.

▶ MAYBE CAN MOVE \$ BETWEEN BUCKETS

• SEEKING GRANT \$

▶ DISCREP. BETWEEN PPT & WHITE PAPER? WILL CHECK

▶ COMMITTEE TO RANK SVCS. - DEPT. GIVES OPTIONS

CPAC REQUEST: COSTS PER DISCRETIONARY FUND SVC.

PUBLIC COMMENT

▶ WHAT ARE COST INC./DECR. TRENDS? HOW WILL COSTS CHANGE DUE TO IMPROVEMENTS NOW?

▶ BUS FUEL? - INCL. IN TPA

▶ CURRENT AND PROTECTED COSTS CONSIDERED? - YES

• SEP. REVENUE STREAMS DON'T AFFECT CF BUDGET