



Community Priorities Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting #4

August 23, 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 fourth meeting of the Engage Roseville Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC or Committee) was held 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, 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, Bruce Houdesheldt, Julie Hirota, Kathryn Kitchell, Joe Langdon, Michael Laperche, Sr., Marcus Lo Duca, John Mason, Tracy Mendonsa, Jason Probst, Richard Roccucci, Dennis Snelling, Roy Sterns, John Tallman, Sergey Terebkov, Elaine Webb, Randall Wilson

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Absent:

Wendy Gerig, David Nelson

Please note that John Mason has asked that the meeting notes reflect that he was marked absent at the past two meetings but was in fact in attendance at those meetings.

II. Follow Up Items From Previous Meeting

Follow Up from Chief Financial Officer

Chief Financial Officer **Jay Panzica** provided a memo giving responses to additional questions submitted by the CPAC regarding the city's overall finances and budgeting process.

Policy Regarding Responses to Questions Submitted by CPAC

Planning Manager Kathy Pease apologized for the time taken in responding to all of the CPAC members' additional questions, and clarified the approach that will be taken going forward: Staff requests that the CPAC submit any questions by the Friday following each meeting. The City will do its best to respond to such questions in advance of the next meeting. Staff requests that questions be limited to areas covered by the CPAC's charge.

Follow Up From Public Works Department

Public Work Director **Rhon Herndon** gave a brief overview of the handouts provided to the CPAC in response to requests for further information on Public Works' services:

- A memo responding to questions about Public Works' services that either required further research or were submitted subsequent to CPAC Meeting #3.
- A list of General Fund discretionary services provided by Public Works, with a brief description of each, anticipated impact if reduced or eliminated, annualized cost estimate, and some comment on the prioritization level that Public Works might assign to each.
- Further information on the cost of Alternative Transportation services. **Mike Dour**, Alternative Transportation Manager, noted that these are covered by TDA funds rather than GF discretionary; however, there were a large number of questions about this, particularly in regard to whether some leftover TDA funds could be applied to services such as street maintenance. To that end, a breakdown of the current use of TDA funds was included in the handout. Mr. Dour noted that prioritizing Alternative Transportation services would not be discussed since that is not within the CPAC's purview, nor are they considering any reduction of routes.

III. Public Works Department Priorities

Lou Hexter returned to the podium and introduced the activity on which the balance of the evening's agenda would be focused: prioritizing the services provided by Public Works that are at least partially funded with GF discretionary dollars. The 37 services, along with the GF discretionary fund cost of each, were listed on two large posterboards. CPAC members were provided with seven green dots, symbolizing the highest priority services, and seven yellow dots, symbolizing the lowest priority. They were asked to distribute one dot per service to indicate which they considered the seven highest priorities and which they consider to be the seven lowest. After group discussion of CPAC members' rationales for their choices, they would vote a second time and see how much had changed as a result. Again, CPAC members were reminded that these are preliminary priorities, not final choices; they will be refined over the course of the

last three meetings to create final recommendations to the City Council. In the meantime, this exercise is intended to start the dialogue and give some indication of what is prioritized by CPAC members' constituencies. Lou also explained that although Public Works provided comments on their own priorities and defined some services as necessary, all are on the table for discussion.

There was some discussion of the process and whether the planned method for the ranking activity would prove useful. The consensus was to try it and see whether it worked well or if the group wanted to adopt a different ranking system. The CPAC requested that in future, they be provided with a greater level of detail on each department's GF discretionary-funded services during the initial presentation so that they have a firmer basis for assigning preliminary rankings.

The rankings resulting from the first round of voting are shown below. Each service was assigned a numerical score based on the number of green and yellow dots it received, with green dots counting as a positive number and yellow dots a negative number. Those scoring five points or more are rated as High Priority; those scoring -5 or less are ranked as Lowest Priority; and those receiving less than 5 but more than -5 are ranked as Medium Priority.

Public Works Ranking #1 – Results				
Service	Highest Priority (Green Dots)	Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots)	Final Score - Ranking #1	
Asphalt remove/replace, patching and crack sealing	14	0	14	HIGH
Floodplain Management	13	-1	12	HIGH
Emergency support for Police and Fire	11	0	11	HIGH
Street Drainage Issues	12	-2	10	HIGH
Pavement management program	9	0	9	HIGH
Graffiti abatement	9	0	9	HIGH
Maintain underground drainage systems	7	0	7	HIGH
ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Operations	7	-2	5	HIGH
Capital Improvement Project Management	6	-1	5	HIGH
Traffic Studies	6	-1	5	HIGH
Clean creeks and drainage ditches	5	0	5	HIGH
Fall leaf pickup program	5	0	5	HIGH
Departmental Oversight	5	-2	3	MEDIUM
Flood Alert Program	5	-2	3	MEDIUM

Public Works Ranking #1 – Results				
Service	Highest Priority (Green Dots)	Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots)	Final Score - Ranking #1	
Drainage outfall inspection and cleaning	3	0	3	MEDIUM
Sidewalk repair and trip hazard removal	2	0	2	MEDIUM
Traffic Incident Management	4	-3	1	MEDIUM
Sidewalk Complaints	3	-2	1	MEDIUM
Maintain drainage pump stations and floodwalls	1	-1	0	MEDIUM
Budget	0	0	0	MEDIUM
Responding to General Questions from the Public	0	0	0	MEDIUM
Regional Partners/Project Coordination	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
Public Records Requests	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
Litter removal from the public right-of-way	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
Council	0	-2	-2	MEDIUM
Traffic signs and posts inspection/replacement	0	-2	-2	MEDIUM
Weed abatement program	3	-6	-3	MEDIUM
Review of Traffic Control Plans	2	-5	-3	MEDIUM
Street markings inspection/replacement	0	-5	-5	LOW
Soundwall / Fence Issues	0	-6	-6	LOW
Adult Crossing Guard Program	4	-12	-8	LOW
Presentations	0	-8	-8	LOW
Special events traffic control implementation	0	-12	-12	LOW
Placer County Flood Control District Membership	0	-13	-13	LOW
Update Speed Limits	0	-13	-13	LOW
FEMA's Community Rating System	0	-14	-14	LOW
Special Event Assistance	0	-18	-18	LOW

It was recommended that the CPAC focus its discussion on those services on which members had strong differences of opinion, rather than those on whose priority level the majority agreed or that received few to no votes. CPAC members provided the following questions and comments during the discussion.

Departmental Oversight

- I didn't rank this as either high or low priority because it's a necessity that should be off the table.
- I prioritized this highly because someone needs to maintain checks and balances.
- I gave this a low priority because I don't think that oversight necessarily needs to reside within the Public Works Department. It's worth considering whether an administration could oversee several departments, with a more junior level engineer managing the day-to-day operations of Public Works.

Traffic Incident Management and ITS

- Traffic incident management is important, especially in busy traffic areas where it is a major issue—but can it be funded through different sources?
 - *CPAC member response: This is a subset of the ITS (Intelligent Transportation System). Unlike many cities in the region, Roseville has an amazing ITS system which helps it address issues many other cities cannot. For instance, when major traffic incidents take place, ITS can shift signal timing to help redirect traffic. Traffic in Roseville may seem bad, but cities with a similarly high ADT (average daily traffic) but no ITS have much worse congestion. Some money could be saved by not doing it, but we must consider what has already been invested in it and what we lose by not maintaining it. It is integral to providing an operational city infrastructure.*
- There was mention last week of a website showing traffic conditions which is a part of the ITS system and which apparently is most frequently utilized by real estate brokers and developers. I gave it a low priority because it might be possible to charge brokers and developers for using it.

Review of Traffic Control Plans

- Might we also charge developers for review of their traffic control plans?
 - *The traffic studies that this refers to are not associated with development or Capital Investment Projects; rather, they are plans made in cases where residents make requests for, say, a new stop sign to deal with a speeding problem, or a crosswalk to access a park. When we have a developer submitting a traffic control plan, we'll charge the applicant for the cost of plan review. But some projects don't fully recover their costs. For small projects, the dollar amount doesn't really cover traffic control review, and for plans associated with big utility projects, we don't have a full cost recovery due to franchise agreements.*

Adult Crossing Guard Program vs. Emergency Support For Police and Fire

- These two programs have somewhat similar dollar amounts, but while many of us gave a low priority to the adult crossing guard program, just as many

prioritized emergency police/fire support highly. I'd be interested in knowing why people gave those rankings.

Comparison to Emergency Support for Police and Fire

- What does this consist of, and why is Public Works responsible for it?
 - *Public Works assists the Police and Fire Departments so they can do their job. We are first responders, and have the necessary and up-to-date equipment to help with setting up detours and barricades, cleaning up after accidents, and removing hazardous material. If Public Works didn't do it, the Police and Fire Departments would have to do it at a much higher cost, and it would take longer—not to mention impeding their own responsibilities. It doesn't need a large crew—once the scene is in place, one or two people often can handle what's necessary.*
- What's an example of a situation for which Public Works would be called out to assist?
 - *If there is a big accident that's taken place late at night, they'll call us and we'll bring our emergency trailer, which is kept ready in the yard, to help detour traffic according to Police direction. We will create a traffic plan so that the city is not liable should there be another accident.*
 - *In terms of removing hazardous materials, we are trained to identify them and help keep people away, but not to engage with the materials. We have the equipment needed to collect the materials, but the Fire Department is in charge and will ride with us to dispose of them. We don't pay for Public Works staff to receive the full training.*

Crossing Guard Program

- I prioritized this service highly because young children going from home to school are our most vulnerable citizens. This works as follows: if the City notifies the School District that there is a problem as indicated by their standards, they will pay for a crossing guard. However, if the School District requests a crossing guard for a specific intersection, the City assesses it and pays for a guard only if the intersection meets their qualification standards based on the amount of traffic. In my opinion, the City is responsible for the safety of children on city streets—after all, if we need supervision on our playgrounds, we don't ask the City to pay for it.
- I prioritized this highly because volunteers can be unreliable; professional crossing guards are needed. Also, while the children are in the streets, they are the City's responsibility. They come under the school's responsibility only once they are on school property. Citizen safety is stated in the city's mission as a number one priority, and schools can't be held responsible for funding that. PTAs are a great source for fundraising, but they cannot fund a staff

position, so that's not a viable option—even if the school could raise enough money, which many can't.

- There are near misses even when a crossing guard is in place. It's hard to put a price tag on our children's safety. Elementary school parents can be the most inattentive drivers—they're often preoccupied and in a hurry.
- I've seen great variation in whether crossing guards are school or City employees, even where there are similarly sized streets with a similar number of kids. How is it determined whether the City or School District provides the guard?
 - *It is based on city standards of traffic and other factors. For instance, the City will pay for a crossing guard for a school at a major four-way intersection, whereas the School District will provide a guard for a school located on a side street with less traffic. If an intersection doesn't meet the City standards for providing a crossing guard, the school has the option of designating a school employee.*
- I gave this a low priority because the school and parents are the beneficiaries of this service. Their PTAs have fundraising capabilities, and since it is a school-related matter, the school should have some responsibility to pay.
 - *This isn't practical because low income and Title I schools with fewer resources are often those who tend to be located on busier thoroughfares and therefore have the greatest need.*
- This service is very high priority and needs to be done; perhaps in giving it a low priority for Public Works GF discretionary dollars, the Committee is suggesting that there might be a better funding source—it's not the highest priority for spending that money.
- I abstained on ranking this service because I was concerned about where funds were coming from.
- What about the Safe Routes to School program? Can that help fund the cost?
 - *This program involves staff in the Engineering Division. It was previously grant-funded; the prior grant has expired, and so currently it is covered by TDA funds. A new grant will kick in beginning in 2021. Its purpose is to organize events/programs such as Walk and Bike to School Day, and the Public Work staff member helps them organize these events.*
- The matrix of discretionary reductions provided by Public Works notes that this program may be eligible for TDA funds, but that steering TDA funds toward this will reduce funds available for road resurfacing and alternative transportation projects.
 - *Certain GF discretionary items must be funded in order to support maintenance of effort; this may be one that can instead be funded with the balance of TDA funds. In any given year, about \$1.7M of TDA funds are available to be used toward what we choose, which could*

be CIPs, bikeways, transit, or something more operational. However, there's only so much excess TDA money available, and it's being used for a myriad of things. If we allocate TDA funds for this program, there will be less for road resurfacing or other options.

- Are there additional grants that are available or have been sought for this item?
 - *We keep our eyes open for grants at all times so we can use other funds to supplement ours whenever possible, but I don't know of any that are applicable to this. We can't use Safe Routes to Schools money for it.*
- If you look at the TDA breakdown, it includes items such as the Game Day Express, which helps cut down on traffic congestion in Sacramento. We should prioritize spending TDA funds on services that contribute to local safety. Other examples are things for which the City might find a sponsor, such as the Bike and Pedestrian Map or promoting Bikefest—these sorts of items comprise half the TDA budget and are much less important than crossing guards.

Weed Abatement Program

- I prioritized this highly because there are many suits brought over issues caused by overgrowth. There are even attorneys who specifically look for areas with poor shoulder-backing in order to bring lawsuits.
- I gave this a low priority in the interest of suggesting reduction, not elimination.
- Does this cover weed abatement in the right-of-way (ROW) and on city property, rather than on private property?
 - *Yes, particularly anywhere where it conflicts with visibility. It's also a safety issue.*
- I know that, in the past, goats have been used to reduce overgrowth in certain areas. Is there an opportunity to use more?
 - *The City had to cut back on the goats—they're actually quite expensive. Also, it's not appropriate to have goats in the public ROW and near traffic.*
 - *The goats are not a Public Works program; they are overseen by Parks, Recreation and Libraries. The program was pulled out into a separate category and didn't receive any GF discretionary funds this year.*

Sidewalk Repairs

- Although it is relatively expensive, this is an area that needs to be highly prioritized because, similar to weed abatement, it is prone to litigation.

General Comments

- One of the reasons we're here is to help the city set priorities. Many of these programs came into being because the city was being proactive. If we need

to make reductions in funding, the city may need to shift to being more reactive. Yes, it's important to be proactive with weed abatement, for instance, but what is the risk compared to say, school crossings? They're both proactive safety issues, but our charge is to determine which is more important to the community.

- However, something like weed abatement may be highly prioritized because the look and feel of the community is very important to people. Our charge wasn't to determine what we can cut, but what the community prioritizes most highly. So there will continue to be a tension between competing priorities, and that tension is reflected in these polarized numbers.
- It appears that this method of ranking worked fairly well to stimulate useful discussion.

The second round of voting resulted in the following rankings:

Public Works Ranking #2 – Results				
Service	Highest Priority (Green Dots)	Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots)	Final Score - Ranking #1	
ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Operations	15	0	15	HIGH
Asphalt remove/replace, patching and crack sealing	14	0	14	HIGH
Street Drainage Issues	12	0	12	HIGH
Maintain underground drainage systems	11	0	11	HIGH
Emergency support for Police and Fire	10	0	10	HIGH
Capital Improvement Project Management	9	0	9	HIGH
Pavement management program	6	0	6	HIGH
Floodplain Management	8	-3	5	HIGH
Graffiti abatement	6	-1	5	HIGH
Traffic Incident Management	5	0	5	HIGH
Sidewalk repair and trip hazard removal	5	0	5	HIGH
Fall leaf pickup program	5	0	5	HIGH
Adult Crossing Guard Program	9	-6	3	MEDIUM
Weed abatement program	5	-2	3	MEDIUM
Clean creeks and drainage ditches	3	0	3	MEDIUM
Drainage outfall inspection and cleaning	2	0	2	MEDIUM
Maintain drainage pump stations and floodwalls	2	0	2	MEDIUM
Departmental Oversight	4	-3	1	MEDIUM
Traffic Studies	2	-1	1	MEDIUM

Public Works Ranking #2 – Results				
Service	Highest Priority (Green Dots)	Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots)	Final Score - Ranking #1	
Litter removal from the public right-of-way	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
Sidewalk Complaints	1	-1	0	MEDIUM
Responding to General Questions from the Public	0	0	0	MEDIUM
Traffic signs and posts inspection/replacement	0	0	0	MEDIUM
Street markings inspection/replacement	0	0	0	MEDIUM
Budget	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
Council	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
Public Records Requests	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
Flood Alert Program	1	-4	-3	MEDIUM
Regional Partners/Project Coordination	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
Soundwall / Fence Issues	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
Review of Traffic Control Plans	1	-6	-5	LOW
Presentations	0	-12	-12	LOW
Placer County Flood Control District Membership	0	-16	-16	LOW
Special events traffic control implementation	0	-16	-16	LOW
FEMA's Community Rating System	0	-17	-17	LOW
Update Speed Limits	0	-17	-17	LOW
Special Event Assistance	0	-20	-20	LOW

IV. 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 were offered:

- Finding sufficient funding for these services is the last hurdle we need to cross in order to guarantee a safe future for our children.
- Rather than spending discretionary funding to send people to Sacramento to enjoy sports, spend it to help adults (particularly seniors) to enjoy the arts locally by providing transportation, extending hours, etc.
- In pursuing input from the community during this process, make sure that in addition to efforts such as this committee, the city reach out to neighborhood groups such as RCONA (the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations). Sixteen out of Roseville's thirty-eight

neighborhoods are already organized and can serve as conduits for feedback from the community. More information is available if you need it.

- *The City's Public Affairs and Communications Director, **Megan MacPherson**, explained that the CPAC is only part of the Engage Roseville effort. She described some of the diverse opportunities for community input that are being offered to the larger public.*

V. Next Steps

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, September 13, 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 MEETING #4

8-23-17

DISCUSSION

▷ CHARGE FOR LG TRAFFIC CONTROL REVIEW - DON'T RECOVER FOR OTHERS

▷ ADULT CROSSING vs. EMERG. ASSIST →

WHY PUBLIC WORKS?
• POLICE/FIRE HIGHER \$

• PW HAS EQUIP

EXAMPLE?

• LATE NIGHT ACCIDENT - ASSISTING



▷ CROSSING - YOUNG CHILDREN MOST VULNERABLE
CITY PAYS ONLY IF CITY SEES NEED

▷ SCHOOL vs. CITY GUARD? - HOW DETERMINED
• BASED ON CITY STANDARDS, TRAFFIC

▷ SCHOOL/PTA/PARENTS BENEFIT - SCHOOL SHD PAY
• LOW INCOME SCHOOLS NEED MOST

▷ SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL?
• NOW TDA-FUNDED, GRANTS
• CREATE EVENTS/PROGRAMS

▷ SOME GF ITEMS COULD BE FUNDED w/TDA EXTRA
• ALREADY USING LOTS OF TDA FOR ROAD REPAIR, ETC.

▷ VOLUNTEERS - UNRELIABLE
• CHILDREN IN STS. - CITY'S RESP.
• CITIZEN SAFETY IMP. - SCHOOLS CAN'T FUND

▷ GRANTS? • HAVEN'T HEARD OF THEM

▷ IT'S A PRIORITY - BUT MAYBE NOT FOR GF \$ - (CAN OTHER FUNDS BE FOUND?)

▷ PRIORITIZE SOME PORTIONS - LOCAL STS.

▷ OVERGROWTH - SUITS

• INTERESTED IN REDUCTIONS, NOT ELM.

▷ GOATS? NOT PW
ALSO - NOT IN PUBLIC ROW!
• SAFETY ISSUE

▷ SIDEWALK REPAIRS - ALSO PRONE TO LITIGATION

▷ MAY NEED TO BE REACTIVE
v. PROACTIVE IN FUTURE

PUBLIC COMMENT

▷ LAST HURDLE FOR CHILDREN'S FUTURE
- HIGH PRIORITY!

▷ SPEND \$ TO HELP ADULTS (SENIORS)
TO SEE ARTS HERE

▷ REACH OUT TO NEIGHBORHOODS
RCONA, ETC.

Engage Roseville CPAC Meeting #4, August 23,
2017