



# Community Priorities Advisory Committee DRAFT Recommendations Report

February 28, 2018

Prepared by:



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

***Special thanks to the Community Priorities Advisory Committee for their dedication and service.***

**City Council At-Large Appointees:**

Ellaisson Carroll	Pete Constant	Stephanie Dement
Kristine Dohner	Jack Ellison	Valerie Gross
Kathryn Kitchell	Michael Laperche, Sr.	Marcus Lo Duca
Tracy Mendonsa	Jason Probst	Elaine Webb
Randall Wilson		

**At-Large Alternates**

Richard Duffy	Richard Roccucci
---------------	------------------

**Appointed Focus-Area Stakeholders:**

<b>Appointed Stakeholder Positions</b>	<b>Primary Member</b>	<b>Alternate Member</b>
Planning Commission	Krista Bernasconi	Bruce Houdesheldt
Parks & Recreation Commission	Roy Stearns	Matthew Bridge
Transportation Commission	David Nelson	Sergey Terebkov
Chamber of Commerce	John Mason	Wendy Gerig
BIA	John Tallman	Jeff Jones
RJUHSD	Julie Hirota	Joe Landon
RCSD	Derk Garcia	Dennis Snelling

**Committee Facilitator:** Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. (MIG)  
 Lou Hexter, Senior Facilitator  
 Maria Mayer, Project Associate

**City Staff:**

Rob Jensen, City Manager  
 Dominick Casey, Assistant City Manager  
 Jay Panzica, Chief Financial Officer  
 Megan MacPherson, Public Affairs-Communications Director  
 Mike Isom, Development Services Manager  
 Kathy Pease, Planning Manager  
 Brian Jacobson, Public Information Officer  
 Joe Mandell, Senior Deputy City Attorney

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Background and Process.....	12
Guiding Principles.....	12
Meeting Process.....	13
Overarching Recommendations .....	13
Department Programs and Levels of Service Recommendations .....	17
Public Works Department.....	17
Police Department.....	20
Fire Department .....	28
Parks, Recreation & Libraries.....	35
Development Services Department.....	38
Fund Stabilization Recommendations.....	41
APPENDIX A – COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS AND INFORMATION INDEX.....	58

## Executive Summary

The Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC) was empaneled by the Roseville City Council in July 2017 as part of the larger Engage Roseville community engagement process. Engage Roseville is a broad, citywide initiative intended to involve the community in a meaningful way in decisions regarding prioritization of City services and programs in light of fiscal challenges.

Committee members were appointed to represent a range of viewpoints from neighborhood associations to transportation, planning and parks commissioners to business interests. They were given the following charge:

- a) Develop a common understanding of municipal finances and the City's budget to provide context for recommendations about funding and levels of service;
- b) Review aspects of key general-funded City operations, prioritizing community expectations for the levels of service provided by five general-funded City departments:
  1. Police;
  2. Fire;
  3. Parks, Recreation & Libraries;
  4. Public Works; and
  5. Development Services;
- c) Review fiscal strategies and constraints associated with continued delivery of high-quality services at current or increased levels; and,
- d) Work in good faith to achieve consensus in developing options and recommendations.

Over the course of nine months and 16 meetings, the Committee received information on the operations and services from each of the five Departments and deliberated the relative value these functions provide to the Roseville community. The Department presentations and following discussions informed a set of prioritization exercises in which members were asked to select a certain number of services valued highly, as well as an equal number of services they considered low priority. With each high priority vote receiving a +1 score and each low priority vote receiving a -1 score, the scores were aggregated to get an overall net score. Those receiving a +5 net score or higher were designated as HIGH PRIORITY services; those receiving a -5 net score or lower were designated as LOW PRIORITY services; the remainder were listed in order of their net scores and designated as MEDIUM PRIORITY services.

In addition to the tables of service priorities, the Committee also generated a number of recommendations that flowed from themes in their discussions. These are presented below, divided into three segments:

- 1) **Overarching value statements** that the Committee believe should guide the City in making budget decisions related to these departments;
- 2) **A prioritized list of services and functions, along with specific recommendations** by department; and
- 3) **A set of fund stabilization/revenue enhancement strategies** to be considered by the City to mitigate the need for service reductions in the five departments.

## A. Overarching Value Statements

These recommendations cut across all departments and describe ways the City could approach cost reductions, realize cost efficiencies, and explore fund stabilization options.

- O1 **Seek to reduce rather than eliminate services.** Recognizing that every service is important to someone, the CPAC expressed a desire for the City to look for opportunities to scale back but maintain services where possible, rather than eliminate them entirely.
- O2 **Prioritize efficient public safety as the cornerstone of City services.** The CPAC placed a high priority on public safety services. However, they also recognized the need to provide such services cost-effectively, and recommended measures such as seeking ways to reduce overtime costs, regional solutions, evaluating response models – particularly for minor traffic accidents and medical calls, and ensuring mutual aid agreements are not fiscally disadvantageous to Roseville.
- O3 **Maintain Roseville's competitive edge in the region, with desirable neighborhoods (schools, parks, open spaces) and a business-friendly environment.** CPAC members expressed that Roseville's services and programs are what make it an attractive community that's competitive in the region. There was concern that a significant reduction in services might diminish Roseville's desirability for residents and businesses.
- O4 **Maximize flexibility in staffing levels.** CPAC members expressed the opinion that the City should rely on temporary, part-time and contract staff to the extent feasible to minimize benefit costs and to be able to more quickly adapt to changing economic conditions and demands for service.
- O5 **Generally, the City shouldn't subsidize services that the private sector can provide.** Members generally felt that it wasn't appropriate for the City to directly compete with private enterprises. However, they also recognized that it may be appropriate in certain circumstances to subsidize certain programs or services that serve a public purpose or provide a greater public benefit, such as free wifi at the public libraries or at-risk youth recreation programs, among others.
- O6 **Seek opportunities for increased cost recovery for all City services, where applicable / appropriate.** Committee member discussion focused on increasing user fees for recreation programs, fitness memberships, higher user fees/cost recovery for permits, facility rentals, and other services where appropriate.
- O7 **Utilize technology and automation where possible to increase efficiencies and reduce costs.** Seek to reduce staff and overhead costs through automation of certain programs and tasks.
- O8 **Recruit, train and deploy volunteers where appropriate.** The CPAC expressed a desire for the City to increase its use of volunteers and unpaid interns, where possible and operationally appropriate, to help maintain service levels using fewer paid City staff.
- O9 **Pursue fund stabilization/revenue enhancement strategies to preserve Roseville's quality of life.** The majority of Committee members expressed support for the City to explore strategies to increase revenues through various options – including tax measures – requiring approval of Roseville voters. However, some members also stressed the need for the City to explore further reductions in programs and services in lieu of revenue enhancements.

## **B. Departmental Priorities and Recommendations**

As described above, the Committee selected services they deemed of greatest priority among those presented by the Department heads, as well as those of lowest priority. For each department, the high- and low-priority services are shown in descending order. Full tables along with the vote counts are shown later in this report. In addition to the service prioritization, Committee discussions surfaced a number of value statements and recommendations that informed their priorities. These are shown in this section as well.

---

### **PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

---

#### *High Priority Services (in order of net score)*

ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Operations
Asphalt remove/replace, patching and crack sealing
Street Drainage Issues
Maintain underground drainage systems
Emergency support for Police and Fire
Capital Improvement Project Management
Pavement management program
Floodplain Management
Graffiti abatement
Traffic Incident Management
Sidewalk repair and trip hazard removal
Fall leaf pickup program

#### *Low-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

Review of Traffic Control Plans
Presentations
Placer County Flood Control District Membership
Special events traffic control implementation
FEMA's Community Rating System
Update Speed Limits
Special Event Assistance

#### *Recommendations*

PW1	Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Public Works Department budget.
PW2	Explore user fees wherever possible.
PW3	Seek opportunities for cost recovery wherever possible.

---

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**


---

*High-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

OPERATIONS – PATROL: Uniformed Patrol / First Responders
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Investigation of Property and Person Crimes
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Answer and Record 911 & Emergency Calls
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Proactive Enforcement and Problem Solving
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Investigate Crime and Traffic Incidents
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION: Crime Suppression Unit - assist patrol with high level investigations, gang enforcement, known offenders, human trafficking, narcotics, municipal code enforcement)
OPERATIONS – PATROL: K9
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Sex Crime Investigations / Victim Services Liaison
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Special Operations Teams (SWAT, RCT, EOD, HNT)
PD ADMINISTRATION: Oversight & Leadership
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Emergency Medical Dispatch
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Regional / High Level Narcotics Investigations
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Crime Scene Investigations
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Neighborhood Issues

*Low-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Purge Records Per Applicable Statutes
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Rabies Control Program
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Staffs Front Counter, Answer Non-Emergency Calls
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Destruction of Contraband
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Manage Alarm Permitting & False Alarm Reduction Program
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Deceased Animal Removal
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION: Police Safety Outreach & Community Relations - Citizen’s academy, crime prevention programs, neighborhood watch, citywide communications team, coordinate department community events, crime prevention through environmental design, public information and safety education programs.
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Provide resources / referrals – Main Library / Civic Center Resource Centers, Gathering Inn
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION – Crime Suppression: Police Programs Coordination - Coordinate training/travel for PD personnel, manage volunteer program (citizens on patrol, citizens academy, business academy, vacation checks, crime prevention newsletter, handicap parking citations, Northern CA retail crime association).
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Parks officer

### Recommendations

P1	Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Police Department budget.
P2	The full-service model should continue to be our approach.
P3	Consider outsourcing more specialized services, such as some forensics and major accident investigations.
P4	Coordinate with adjoining jurisdictions to eliminate redundancy at a regional level.
P5	Eliminate unnecessary overtime.
P6	Consider shared communications services with other regional agencies.
P7	Do not fill the Parks Officer position for now.
P8	Consider cross-training to allow staff to be deployed where needed.
P9	Preserve school resource officers through greater cost recovery from the school district.

## FIRE DEPARTMENT

### High-Priority Services (in order of net score)

FIRE OPERATIONS: Fire Response including Wildland
FIRE OPERATIONS: Technical Rescue Response
FIRE OPERATIONS: Hazardous Materials Response
FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Office of the Fire Chief and Administrative Staff Responsible For Overall Management Of The Department
FIRE OPERATIONS: Terrorism Liaison Officers and Joint Terrorism Task Force
FIRE TRAINING: Curriculum Development and Delivery of Department Wide Training
FIRE OPERATIONS: Fire Based EMS Response
FIRE OPERATIONS: State and Federal Mutual Aid Disaster Response
FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Computer Aided Dispatch Management and Dispatch Liaison

### Low-Priority Services (in order of net score)

FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Community Engagement
FIRE OPERATIONS: Public Education and Outreach
FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Fire Records Management
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Buckle Up Baby & Life Jacket Programs
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Fireworks and Pyrotechnic Displays
FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Public Education School Programs and Outreach

### Recommendations

F1	Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Fire Department budget.
F2	Reduce overhead and overtime costs.

F3	Reduce number of responders to minor traffic accidents.
F4	Schedule training to avoid overtime.
F5	Increase the use of volunteers.
F6	Consider contracting out EMT services.
F7	Ensure that mutual aid agreements don't disadvantage Roseville.
F8	Move weed abatement to Public Works.
F9	Increase training facility use fees (e.g., Sierra College).
F10	Work with community non-profits to eliminate duplicative efforts (e.g., Buckle Up Baby)
F11	Consider contracting out all inspections and plan reviews (building, fire & hazardous materials); reduce the frequency of inspections.
F12	Prohibit fireworks within the City limits.

---

## **PARKS, RECREATION AND LIBRARY SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

---

### *High-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Maidu, Downtown and Riley Libraries
RECREATION: Roseville Aquatics Complex
RECREATION: At-Risk Youth Programs
LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Youth Library Programs
PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Turf Care
PRL Administration: Department Oversight & Leadership
RECREATION: Maidu Community Center
PARKS: Parks Maintenance – Custodial
PARKS: Parks Maintenance – Playgrounds
PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Infrastructure Maint/Repair

### *Low-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

PARKS: Open Space/Urban Forest
RECREATION: Events – Vernon Street Town Square
LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Adult Library Programs
RECREATION: Events – Community
RECREATION: Cultural Arts & Entertainment Programs
RECREATION: Adult Sports
RECREATION: Events - Non-City Sponsored

### *Recommendations*

PRL1	Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department budget.
PRL2	Increase fees for fitness memberships; more for non-residents.
PRL3	Increase times between maintenance activities; e.g., tree trims, aeration, mowing and edging, etc.
PRL4	Consider all libraries together as one service; don't prioritize one location over another.

---

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT**


---

*High-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

SACOG Meeting Participation
Citywide Permitting System
Technical Advisory Committees (Placer Parkway, Airport Land Use)
Regional Traffic Representation
Represent City in Regional Planning Efforts
Development Agreement Monitoring
Front Counter / “One Stop Shop”/Public Response/Resident Inquiry (phone calls, emails, etc.)
Departmental Oversight, Leadership & Personnel Management
Review Major Projects Occurring in Adjacent Jurisdictions for Impacts to Roseville
Nuisance Abatement/Health and Safety
Billing / Revenue Recovery / Financial Oversight

*Low-Priority Services (in order of net score)*

Special Projects (e.g. 316 Vernon, CPAC, Conf. Center)
Complimentary Infill Development Project Meetings
Drainage Analysis/ Planning/Mitigation
Fee Dispute Resolution
Private Project Coordination / Development Ombudsman
Custom Mapping for Public and City Departments
Sign Enforcement
Permit History Search / Plan Set Duplication Copyright Release Coordination

**Recommendations**

D1	Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Development Services Department budget.
D2	Utilize part-time or contract employees where possible, to reduce pension and benefit costs.
D3	Include operations and maintenance costs when calculating cost recovery.
D4	Ensure cost recovery rates keep pace with cost increases.
D5	Continue to participate in regional planning and technical advisory committees.

**C. Fund Stabilization/Revenue Enhancement Strategies**

Throughout the process, the CPAC was very interested in ways in which to strengthen the City’s revenue-generating/cost-recovery capabilities. During the initial presentations by the Chief Financial Officer, many members were curious to know how revenues could better keep pace with cost increases. This interest continued through each of the departmental discussions, as members sought to understand the specific opportunities for operational efficiencies and cost recovery.

At the February 15 meeting, CFO Jay Panzica provided an overview of the various revenue enhancement mechanisms the City could consider to help bridge the budget shortfall. These options included: General Purpose Sales Tax, Special Purpose Sales Tax, Parcel Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax increase; Utility User

Tax; and Community Facilities District Tax. In addition, responding to Committee interest, Assistant City Manager Dominick Casey presented the attributes of a First Responder Fee.

Mr. Panzica’s presentation highlighted the attributes of each option, as well as background on the feasibility of the various measures. In a subsequent handout, he presented a table of California district sales and use tax rates to provide context for the Committee.

In fulfilling the Committee’s charge to consider opportunities for revenue enhancements, members also recognized that any new tax proposals will have to undergo financial review as well as public education and acceptability assessment (i.e., voter polling). The purpose for CPAC was to indicate their level of interest/acceptability in the various options. To take the pulse of the group, an online survey was distributed, and 17 of the 20 members participated. The first question simply asked whether Committee members supported the notion of exploring a range of options to stabilize the General Fund and enhance revenues, which was strongly supported. The remaining questions asked for their interest in the series of options presented. (The Revenue Options Survey Results, along with CPAC member comments are provided later in this report.) Overall, members were most interested in the Utility Users Tax and an increase to the Transient Occupancy Tax. They were not supportive of a Special Purpose Sales Tax, nor the First Responder’s Fee. A summary of the online survey results is presented below:

---

**Q1. The City of Roseville should explore a range of options to stabilize the General Fund and enhance revenues as ways to minimize cuts to City services.**

Q1: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 – Disagree	0	0%
3 – Neutral	0	0%
4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	10	59%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

---

**Q2. Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a General Purpose Sales Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q2: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	1	6%
3 – Neutral	1	6%

4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	6	35%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q3: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Special Purpose Sales Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q3: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	5	29%
2 – Disagree	3	18%
3 – Neutral	1	6%
4 – Agree	3	18%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	3	18%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q4: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Parcel Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q4: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	3	18%
2 – Disagree	6	35%
3 – Neutral	3	18%
4 – Agree	1	6%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q5: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q5: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	2	12%
3 – Neutral	3	18%
4 – Agree	7	41%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	1	6%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q6: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Utility User Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q6: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	0	0%
3 – Neutral	1	6%
4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	6	35%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	3	18%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q7: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Community Facilities District Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q7: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	3	18%
2 – Disagree	3	18%
3 – Neutral	2	12%

4 – Agree	3	18%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	4	24%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q8: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a First Responder Fee as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q8: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	11	65%
2 – Disagree	2	12%
3 – Neutral	4	24%
4 – Agree	0	0%
5 – Strongly Agree	0	0%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	0	0%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

## A. Background and Process

### ***Guiding Principles***

The City Council directed that the CPAC use the following Guiding Principles. The principles were also posted at the meetings as a constant reminder of the Council's direction.

- 1. The purpose of the Committee is to make policy-level findings and recommendations pertaining to Fire; Police; Parks, Recreation & Libraries; Public Works; and Development Services programs and services in the context of declining revenues and maintaining a balanced General Fund and essential quality of life services.**
  - *The Committee's work will be to determine if the existing levels of services and programs provided by these five General Fund departments remain appropriate in light of fiscal challenges. If so, the Committee will work to determine and recommend appropriate fiscal measures to maintain or augment these levels of service. If not, the Committee will work to prioritize and recommend appropriate modifications to programs and services.*
- 2. The Committee's findings and recommendations will focus on policy-level changes and priorities to the specified programs and services over the next 1-5 years, while considering longer-term opportunities to stabilize the General Fund.**
  - *The Committee's policy recommendations should identify priorities for services and service standards to guide the City Council in making near-term reductions or deferrals of City services. In addition, the Committee will be asked to provide policy guidance with respect to new potential revenue sources.*
- 3. The Committee will present written findings and recommendations to the City Council no later than its March 7, 2018 meeting.**
  - *The Committee will work to finalize recommendations and present them to the City Council for consideration with the Fiscal Year 2019 budget.*
- 4. Committee members are charged to consider the entire Roseville community in preparing findings and recommendations and limit focus on areas of special interest.**
  - *While each committee member brings individual opinions and ideas, each member should consider the opinions and ideas of the entire community. To aid the committee members, the City will prepare a parallel city-wide survey and additional community engagement activities that will provide value-added information on community preferences and priorities.*
- 5. Committee members shall recognize that from diverse points of views, new opportunities and ideas come forth. The Committee should seek consensus in developing its findings and recommendations, while recognizing that consensus on every issue may not be possible and a majority of the committee can forward a recommendation to the City Council.**

- *The committee process should be collaborative, based on mutual respect among the members seeking to understand the interests of each other and striving for consensus. However, a majority of the committee may forward recommendations to the City Council when consensus cannot be reached.*

### **Meeting Process**

During the first three meetings, the Committee reviewed background information on the City’s budget and finances from both Rob Jensen the City Manager, and Jay Panzica the City’s Chief Financial Officer.

Department Directors from each of the five departments spent the next ten meetings between August 2017 and January 2018 providing information on the services, costs and revenues of each of their major operations. Each department had two meetings each. The first department meeting included a white paper and/or background materials with an overview of the department’s operations. A power point presentation was provided. The Committee had the opportunity at the first meeting to ask questions. Committee members were also given several days after the presentation meeting to ask any additional questions they might have which would be responded to by staff as part of the next packet.

Prior to the second department meeting, a priority ranking list was sent to the Committee to provide a preliminary ranking of services via survey monkey. At the second meeting the Committee was able to further reflect on their rankings and were given an opportunity to vote for their highest ranked services and lowest ranked services via a dot exercise. Following the meeting, the Consultant MIG, provided the results of the priority ranking.

## **B. Overarching Recommendations**

At its February 28, 2018, meeting, the CPAC had an opportunity to register the level of support or agreement for each of the draft recommendations. The results of the voting are shown below:

### **OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results**

#### **d01: Seek to reduce rather than eliminate services.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Unqualified “Yes”	58.82%	10
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO2: Prioritize efficient public safety as the cornerstone of City services.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO3: Maintain Roseville's competitive edge in the region, with desirable neighborhoods (schools, parks, open spaces) and a business-friendly environment.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	70.59%	12
Acceptable; best current option	23.53%	4
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO4: Maximize flexibility in staffing levels.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	58.82%	10
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0

Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO5: Generally, the City shouldn't subsidize services that the private sector can provide.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	41.18%	7
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO6: Seek opportunities for increased cost recovery for all City services, where applicable / appropriate.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dO7: Utilize technology and automation where possible to increase efficiencies and reduce costs.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	88.24%	15
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2

Can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

---

**dO8: Recruit, train and deploy volunteers where appropriate.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	58.82%	10
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	23.53%	4
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

---

**dO9: Pursue fund stabilization/revenue enhancement strategies to preserve Roseville's quality of life.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	64.71%	11
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

## C. Department Programs and Levels of Service Recommendations

As described above, Committee members had an opportunity to consider a list of services, programs and functions for each General Fund department and determine which they considered high priority and those they felt were lower priority. In the tables below, the results show the number of votes for highest priority and for lowest priority. A net score allowed for an overall ranking of the services. Those receiving a score of +5 and higher are considered high priority; those receiving a score of -5 and lower are considered low priority. The remaining services are shown in order of the net score received and are to be considered medium priority.

For the departmental recommendations that follow the service prioritization tables, the results of the testing for level of agreement are shown.

### 1. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Public Works Department Services Ranking #2 - Results				
Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score & Ranking	
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
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

Public Works Department Services Ranking #2 - Results				
Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score & Ranking	
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

RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results (from the CPAC Meeting of February 28, 2018)

**dPW1: Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Public Works Department budget.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	41.18%	7
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	35.29%	6
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dPW2: Explore user fees wherever possible.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	23.53%	4
Acceptable; best current option	41.18%	7
Can live with it	29.41%	5
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dPW3: Seek opportunities for cost recovery wherever possible.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

## 2. POLICE DEPARTMENT

<b>Police Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score &amp; Ranking</b>	
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Uniformed Patrol / First Responders*	15	0	15	HIGH
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Investigation of Property and Person Crimes*	13	0	13	HIGH
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Answer and Record 911 & Emergency Calls*	11	0	11	HIGH
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Proactive Enforcement and Problem Solving*	11	0	11	HIGH
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Investigate Crime and Traffic Incidents*	10	0	10	HIGH
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION: Crime Suppression Unit - assist patrol with high level investigations, gang enforcement, known offenders, human trafficking, narcotics, municipal code enforcement)	9	-1	8	HIGH
OPERATIONS – PATROL: K9	9	-1	8	HIGH
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Sex Crime Investigations / Victim Services Liaison*	8	0	8	HIGH
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Special Operations Teams (SWAT, RCT, EOD, HNT)	7	0	7	HIGH
PD ADMINISTRATION: Oversight & Leadership*	6	0	6	HIGH
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Emergency Medical Dispatch*	5	0	5	HIGH
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Regional / High Level Narcotics Investigations*	5	0	5	HIGH
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Crime Scene Investigations*	5	0	5	HIGH
OPERATIONS – PATROL: Neighborhood Issues*	5	0	5	HIGH
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Preserve Evidence and Chain of Custody*	4	0	4	MEDIUM
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Mental Health Threat Assessment Team (threat assessment officers, mental health officers)	5	-2	3	MEDIUM
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: POP Unit (homeless issues)	4	-2	2	MEDIUM
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Auto Theft Investigations (RATTF)	3	-1	2	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: Recruiting / Screening / Hiring*	3	-1	2	MEDIUM
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Sex, Drug and Arson Registration & Monitoring*	2	0	2	MEDIUM
SERVICES - TRAFFIC: Enforce Traffic Safety Laws	5	-4	1	MEDIUM

### Police Department Services Ranking #2 – Results

*Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise*

Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score & Ranking	
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Youth Services (officers in high schools)	5	-4	1	MEDIUM
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Computer / Cell Phone Forensic Analysis*	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: Internal / External Communication & Transparency*	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Monitor/Respond/Record Law & Fire Radio Transmissions*	1	0	1	MEDIUM
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Fulfill Court Orders to Produce Documents*	1	0	1	MEDIUM
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Answer & Record Routine Admin and Business Lines for Police, Fire, & Animal Control*	1	-1	0	MEDIUM
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Process Police Reports and Citations*	1	-1	0	MEDIUM
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Coordinate Fire and Medical Responses in City and Adjoining Unincorporated Areas (with Automatic Aid Agreements)*	0	0	0	MEDIUM
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Preservation of Private Property (Found or Safekeeping)*	0	0	0	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: Professional Standards / Complaint Investigation*	0	0	0	MEDIUM
OPERATIONS - POLICE & FIRE COMMUNICATIONS: Prioritize Requests and Calls for Service*	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Maintain Evidence / Property Storage Space*	0	-1	-1	MEDIUM
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Animal Cruelty Investigations*	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Respond to Public Records Act Requests*	0	-2	-2	MEDIUM
SERVICES - INVESTIGATIONS: Permitting – Entertainment, Massage, Taxi, Firearm Sales, Pawn Shops, etc.*	1	-4	-3	MEDIUM
SERVICES - TRAFFIC: Traffic Complaints/School Safety	1	-4	-3	MEDIUM
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Mediate Animal Related Issues*	1	-4	-3	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: Community Engagement*	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: City Council Priorities*	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
SERVICES - TRAFFIC: Major Accident Investigation Team	3	-7	-4	MEDIUM
PD ADMINISTRATION: Budget*	0	-4	-4	MEDIUM

### Police Department Services Ranking #2 – Results

*Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise*

Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score & Ranking	
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Purge Records Per Applicable Statutes*	0	-5	-5	LOW
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Rabies Control Program*	0	-5	-5	LOW
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Staffs Front Counter, Answer Non-Emergency Calls*	0	-6	-6	LOW
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Destruction of Contraband*	0	-6	-6	LOW
SERVICES – POLICE RECORDS/PROPERTY & CSI: Manage Alarm Permitting & False Alarm Reduction Program*	0	-8	-8	LOW
SERVICES - ANIMAL CONTROL: Deceased Animal Removal*	0	-8	-8	LOW
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION: Police Safety Outreach & Community Relations - Citizen's academy, crime prevention programs, neighborhood watch, citywide communications team, coordinate department community events, crime prevention through environmental design, public information and safety education programs.	1	-10	-9	LOW
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Provide resources / referrals – Main Library / Civic Center Resource Centers, Gathering Inn	1	-10	-9	LOW
SERVICES - COMMUNITY SERVICES - CRIME SUPPRESSION – Crime Suppression: Police Programs Coordination - Coordinate training/travel for PD personnel, manage volunteer program (citizens on patrol, citizens academy, business academy, vacation checks, crime prevention newsletter, handicap parking citations, Northern CA retail crime association).	0	-12	-12	LOW
SERVICES - SOCIAL SERVICES: Parks officer	0	-14	-14	LOW

DRAFT

RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results (from the CPAC Meeting of February 28, 2018)

**dP1: Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Police Department budget.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	35.29%	6
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	41.18%	7
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP2: The full-service model should continue to be our approach.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	23.53%	4
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP3: Consider outsourcing more specialized services, such as some forensics and major accident investigations.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	23.53%	4
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	11.76%	2

Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	17.65%	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP4: Coordinate with adjoining jurisdictions to eliminate redundancy at a regional level.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP5: Eliminate unnecessary overtime.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	82.35%	14
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP6: Consider shared communications services with other regional agencies.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6

Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP7: Do not fill the Parks Officer position for now.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	23.53%	4
Acceptable; best current option	5.88%	1
Can live with it	29.41%	5
Disagree but can live with it	23.53%	4
Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP8: Consider cross-training to allow staff to be deployed where needed.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	47.06%	8
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP9: Consolidate the budget function within the Department and coordinate more with the City’s Finance Department.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified “Yes”	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dP10: Preserve school resource officers through greater recovery from the school district.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified “Yes”	64.70%	11
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

### 3. FIRE DEPARTMENT

<b>Fire Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score and Ranking</b>	
FO1. FIRE OPERATIONS: Fire Response including Wildland*	13	0	13	HIGH
FO4. FIRE OPERATIONS: Technical Rescue Response*	12	0	12	HIGH
FO3. FIRE OPERATIONS: Hazardous Materials Response*	10	0	10	HIGH
FA1. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Office of the Fire Chief and Administrative Staff Responsible For Overall Management Of The Department*	9	-1	8	HIGH
FO8. FIRE OPERATIONS: Terrorism Liaison Officers and Joint Terrorism Task Force*	8	0	8	HIGH
FT1. FIRE TRAINING: Curriculum Development and Delivery of Department Wide Training*	9	-2	7	HIGH
FO2. FIRE OPERATIONS: Fire Based EMS Response*	7	-2	5	HIGH
FO5. FIRE OPERATIONS: State and Federal Mutual Aid Disaster Response*	6	-1	5	HIGH
FSS5. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Computer Aided Dispatch Management and Dispatch Liaison*	5	0	5	HIGH
FT2. FIRE TRAINING: Management of the Fire Training Center*	5	-1	4	MEDIUM
EP2. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS: City-Wide Emergency Preparedness and Training	4	0	4	MEDIUM
EP1. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS: Coordination of City's Response to Emergency Incidents and Planned Events, and Large Scale Disasters Within the City	4	-1	3	MEDIUM
EP3. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS: Management of the City's Emergency Operations Center	4	-1	3	MEDIUM
FLS4. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Arson Investigation Program*	3	0	3	MEDIUM
FSS2. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Purchasing and Maintenance of Equipment*	4	-2	2	MEDIUM
FA5. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Internal/External Communications*	2	0	2	MEDIUM
FO6. FIRE OPERATIONS: Company Inspections*	2	0	2	MEDIUM
FSS4. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Apparatus Support*	2	0	2	MEDIUM

<b>Fire Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score and Ranking</b>	
FSS1. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Logistical Needs of the Department*	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
FSS7. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: GIS and Mapping*	1	0	1	MEDIUM
FLS1. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Fire Inspection Program*	1	0	1	MEDIUM
FLS3. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Code Enforcement, Plan Review, & New Construction Inspections*	2	-2	0	MEDIUM
FSS8. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Data Analytics*	0	0	0	MEDIUM
FLS9. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Volunteer Program	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
FA4. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Department Policy*	0	-2	-2	MEDIUM
FO9. FIRE OPERATIONS: SWAT Medic Program	0	-2	-2	MEDIUM
FLS2. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: CUPA Inspection Program*	2	-5	-3	MEDIUM
FT3. FIRE TRAINING: Sierra College Regional Fire Training Academy Partnership	1	-4	-3	MEDIUM
FA7. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Internal / External Communication & Transparency*	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
FA9. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Financial Management – Budget, Accounts Payable, Purchasing, Grant Administration, Accreditation Management, Operational Statistics*	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
FSS6. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Fire Records Management*	0	-3	-3	MEDIUM
FA3. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: City Council*	0	-4	-4	MEDIUM
FA6. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Payroll, Department Staffing Management (Telestaff System)*	0	-4	-4	MEDIUM
FT5. FIRE TRAINING: Liaison with State and Local Emergency Medical Authority*	0	-4	-4	MEDIUM
FA2. FIRE ADMINISTRATION: Community Engagement*	1	-6	-5	LOW
FO7. FIRE OPERATIONS: Public Education and Outreach*	1	-6	-5	LOW
FSS6. FIRE SUPPORT SERVICES: Fire Records Management*	0	-5	-5	LOW
FLS8. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Buckle Up Baby & Life Jacket Programs	0	-9	-9	LOW
FLS5. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Fireworks and Pyrotechnic Displays	0	-12	-12	LOW

<b>Fire Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score and Ranking</b>	
FLS7. FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY: Public Education School Programs and Outreach	0	-12	-12	LOW

RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results (from the CPAC Meeting of February 28, 2018)

**dF1: Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Fire Department budget. (Multiple Choice)**

	<b>Responses</b>	
	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	35.29%	6
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF2: Reduce overhead and overtime costs.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Unqualified "Yes"	58.82%	10
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF3: Reduce number of responders to minor traffic accidents.**

<b>Responses</b>	
<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>

Unqualified "Yes"	58.82%	10
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF4: Schedule training to avoid overtime.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	70.59%	12
Acceptable; best current option	23.53%	4
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF5: Increase the use of volunteers.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	35.29%	6
Acceptable; best current option	41.18%	7
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF6: Consider contracting out EMT services.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF7: Ensure that mutual aid agreements don't disadvantage Roseville.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	82.35%	14
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF8: Move weed abatement to Public Works.**

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	41.18%	7
Acceptable; best current option	47.06%	8
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

---

**dF9: Increase facility use fees (Sierra College).**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	35.29%	6
Acceptable; best current option	47.06%	8
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

---

**dF10: Work with community non-profits to eliminate duplicative efforts (e.g., Buckle Up Baby).**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	41.18%	7
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

---

**dF11: Consider contracting out all inspections and plan reviews (building, fire & hazardous materials); reduce the frequency of inspections.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	23.53%	4
Acceptable; best current option	23.53%	4
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	23.53%	4
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0

Disagree, actively opposed	17.65%	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dF12: Prohibit fireworks within the City limits.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	11.76%	2
Acceptable; best current option	0.00%	0
Can live with it	23.53%	4
Disagree but can live with it	35.29%	6
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	23.53%	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

DRAFT

#### 4. PARKS RECREATION & LIBRARIES

<b>Parks Recreation &amp; Libraries Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score and Ranking</b>	
LM1. LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Maidu, Downtown and Riley Libraries	11	0	11	HIGH
R4. RECREATION: Roseville Aquatics Complex	8	0	8	HIGH
R6. RECREATION: At-Risk Youth Programs	7	0	7	HIGH
LM5. LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Youth Library Programs	7	-1	6	HIGH
P3. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Turf Care	6	0	6	HIGH
PRLA1. PRL Administration: Department Oversight & Leadership*	6	-1	5	HIGH
R1. RECREATION: Maidu Community Center	5	0	5	HIGH
P5. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Custodial	5	0	5	HIGH
P6. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Playgrounds	5	0	5	HIGH
P8. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Infrastructure Maint/Repair	5	0	5	HIGH
R5. RECREATION: Johnson Pool	4	0	4	MEDIUM
P7. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Landscape Maintenance	2	0	2	MEDIUM
LM6. LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Maidu Museum & Historic Site	4	-3	1	MEDIUM
R2. RECREATION: Roseville Sports Center	3	-2	1	MEDIUM
PRLA2. PRL Administration: Financial Management/Budget*	1	0	1	MEDIUM
P4. PARKS: Parks Maintenance - Irrigation	1	0	1	MEDIUM
R9. RECREATION: Youth Classes	1	-1	0	MEDIUM
R3. RECREATION: Mike Shellito Indoor Pool	3	-4	-1	MEDIUM
R7. RECREATION: Adult & Senior Programs	2	-4	-2	MEDIUM
PRLA3. PRL Administration: Marketing & Communications*	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
PRLA4. PRL Administration: Hiring/Payroll*	1	-5	-4	MEDIUM
P1. PARKS: Park Planning & Dev – Plan, Build & Rehab Parks*	1	-5	-4	MEDIUM
P2. PARKS: Open Space/Urban Forest*	1	-6	-5	LOW
R11. RECREATION: Events – Vernon Street Town Square	0	-6	-6	LOW
LM4. LIBRARY & MUSEUM: Adult Library Programs	0	-6	-6	LOW
R12. RECREATION: Events – Community	1	-8	-7	LOW
R8. RECREATION: Cultural Arts & Entertainment Programs	1	-10	-9	LOW
R10. RECREATION: Adult Sports	0	-12	-12	LOW
R13. RECREATION: Events - Non-City Sponsored	1	-14	-13	LOW

## RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results (from the CPAC Meeting of February 28, 2018)

**dPRL1: Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department budget.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	11.76%	2
Can live with it	29.41%	5
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dPRL2: Increase fees for fitness memberships; more for non-residents.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	76.47%	13
Acceptable; best current option	5.88%	1
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dPRL3: Increase times between maintenance activities; e.g., tree trims, aeration, mowing and edging, etc.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	17.65%	3
Acceptable; best current option	35.29%	6
Can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree but can live with it	11.76%	2

Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	11.76%	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dPRL4: Consider all libraries together as one service; don't prioritize one location over another.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	41.18%	7
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	11.76%	2
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

DRAFT

## 5. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

<b>Development Services Department Services Ranking #2 – Results</b>				
<i>Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise</i>				
<b>Service</b>	<b>Highest Priority</b>	<b>Lowest Priority</b>	<b>Net Score and Ranking</b>	
PLN-6: SACOG Meeting Participation	13	0	13	HIGH
BSPC-4: Citywide Permitting System*	12	0	12	HIGH
PLN-7: Technical Advisory Committees (Placer Parkway, Airport Land Use)	12	0	12	HIGH
ENG-6: Regional Traffic Representation	11	0	11	HIGH
PLN-5: Represent City in Regional Planning Efforts	11	0	11	HIGH
DSA-2: Development Agreement Monitoring*	9	0	9	HIGH
BSPC-6: Front Counter / "One Stop Shop"/Public Response/Resident Inquiry (phone calls, emails, etc.)*	9	0	9	HIGH
DSA-1: Departmental Oversight, Leadership & Personnel Management*	10	-2	8	HIGH
PLN-8: Review Major Projects Occurring in Adjacent Jurisdictions for Impacts to Roseville	8	0	8	HIGH
CE-1: Nuisance Abatement/Health and Safety*	6	0	6	HIGH
DSA-3: Billing / Revenue Recovery / Financial Oversight*	5	0	5	HIGH
BSPC-3: Citywide Addressing & Land Base Management*	3	0	3	MEDIUM
BSPC-8: Complimentary Development Impact Fee Estimates	5	-3	2	MEDIUM
BSPC-5: Enterprise GIS*	2	0	2	MEDIUM
ENG-8: Support Long Range Planning / Development Project Review	3	-2	1	MEDIUM
BSPC-1: Mapping and Development Records Management	1	0	1	MEDIUM
BLDG-1: Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	1	0	1	MEDIUM
ENG-1: Improvement Plan / Subdivision Map Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	1	0	1	MEDIUM
PLN-1: Development Entitlement Processing / Environmental Review / Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	1	0	1	MEDIUM
PLN-3: Develop / Maintain General Plan, Specific Plans and Other Required Planning Documents* (cost recoverable if associated with development project)	1	0	1	MEDIUM
BLDG-2: Enhanced Plan Check Services (Expedited, Accelerated, 3rd party, Concurrent Review, Simple Tenant Improvement) (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
BLDG-3: Inspections* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
BLDG-4: Outside Plan Check Contract Management* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM

### Development Services Department Services Ranking #2 – Results

Note: Services indicated by the Department as core services were marked with an asterisk at the committee's request to aid in the prioritization exercise

Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score and Ranking	
			Net Score	Ranking
ENG-2: Infrastructure Inspection Services* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
ENG-3: Professional Service Agreement Management (for Contracted Services)* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
ENG-4: Encroachment Permit Management* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
ENG-5: Traffic Impact Analysis / Planning / Mitigation* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	MEDIUM
PLN-4: Zoning Ordinance Enforcement*	0	0	0	MEDIUM
PLN-2: Full Time Planner at Front Counter	2	-6	-4	MEDIUM
CE-3: Follow-Up with Complainants/Coordinate City Response	1	-5	-4	MEDIUM
DSA-4: Special Projects (e.g. 316 Vernon, CPAC, Conf. Center)	1	-7	-6	LOW
PLN-9: Complimentary Infill Development Project Meetings	3	-11	-8	LOW
ENG-7: Drainage Analysis/ Planning/Mitigation	1	-10	-9	LOW
DSA-6: Fee Dispute Resolution	0	-9	-9	LOW
DSA-5: Private Project Coordination / Development Ombudsman	2	-12	-10	LOW
BSPC-2: Custom Mapping for Public and City Departments	0	-11	-11	LOW
CE-2: Sign Enforcement	1	-14	-13	LOW
BSPC-7: Permit History Search / Plan Set Duplication Copyright Release Coordination	0	-15	-15	LOW

#### RECOMMENDATIONS Voting Results (from the CPAC Meeting of February 28, 2018)

**dD1: Utilize the prioritization of services table to guide decision-making for the Development Services Department budget.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	64.71%	11
Acceptable; best current option	0.00%	0
Can live with it	29.41%	5
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dD2: Utilize part-time or contract employees where possible, to reduce pension and benefit costs.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	47.06%	8
Acceptable; best current option	23.53%	4
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree, more work needed	11.76%	2
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dD3: Include operations and maintenance costs when calculating cost recovery.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	5.88%	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dD4: Ensure cost recovery rates keep pace with cost increases.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified "Yes"	70.59%	12
Acceptable; best current option	17.65%	3
Can live with it	5.88%	1
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	5.88%	1
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

**dD5: Continue to participate in regional planning and technical advisory committees.**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Unqualified “Yes”	52.94%	9
Acceptable; best current option	29.41%	5
Can live with it	17.65%	3
Disagree but can live with it	0.00%	0
Disagree, more work needed	0.00%	0
Disagree, actively opposed	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>

## D. Fund Stabilization Recommendations

Throughout the CPAC process, members expressed a great deal of interest in ways to stabilize the general fund (i.e., create greater reliability) and enhance revenues. Some ideas related to programs and services of specific departments were suggested along the way before the Committee devoted an entire session to the topic. At its January 24 meeting, Jay Panzica, the City’s Chief Financial Officer, provided a broad overview of the types of revenue enhancements – i.e., taxes and fees – that municipalities typically consider. As he explained, there are benefits and challenges to each of the options, and the City will have to get voter approval to implement any of them. The task for the CPAC then was to provide input into the City’s consideration of the various options. The interest and acceptability of the revenue enhancement strategies were tested in an online survey administered in advance of the February 28<sup>th</sup> CPAC meeting. The results, along with Committee comments, are provided below.

### ENGAGE ROSEVILLE

#### COMMUNITY PRIORITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVENUE OPTIONS SURVEY RESULTS

**Q1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement: The City of Roseville should explore a range of options to stabilize the General Fund and enhance revenues as ways to minimize cuts to City services.**

Q1: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 – Disagree	0	0%
3 – Neutral	0	0%

4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	10	59%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: EXPLORING REVENUE OPTIONS**

The residents of the City of Roseville demand that reductions in services be explored prior to consideration of revenue enhancements. Through fourteen (14) meetings of the Community Priorities Advisory Committee, information regarding the costs of various services has been provided, but no specific reductions in service have been proposed. The process has instead focused on the relative values of the services provided, with no meaningful discussion of reductions in those services and the effect those reductions would have upon: (i) the budget of the City of Roseville; or (ii) the quality of life of the residents of Roseville.

Any discussion of revenue enhancements at this juncture is premature. Revenue enhancements may ultimately be required to close the budget shortfall, but it would be impossible, given the currently lack of analysis, to determine what portion of the projected budget shortfall can be closed through service reductions.

\*\*\*\*\*

The way this question is phrased is concerning. "Enhance revenues as ways to minimize cuts to City services"" implies that there will still be services cut. Depending on the type of revenue, my answer to this question changes. If the revenue source is TAX, my answer is STRONGLY DISAGREE- since I don't expect any services to be minimized if there is a TAX.

The City should first demonstrate how proposed cuts, minimized services and fee increases to some services (i.e. parks and rec) impact the overall deficit. This has not been shared.

\*\*\*\*\*

CPAC has not shown a strong preference to cut services in any meaningful way. Token reductions does not help the Council make decisions. The level of service from all of the departments we have heard from makes Roseville, Roseville and it is why people moved here in the first place. We lost a key component of the financing vision that was put in place years ago to ensure the Roseville could continue to provide a high level of service. It was a tax, the Utility Users Tax and it was key to Roseville fulfilling its vision. That tax was eliminated and for many reason was not pursued as the retail growth took off and the real estate market boomed. A return of the UUT is important to the residents of Roseville.

\*\*\*\*\*

Raise fees/taxes to impact the wealthiest residents/businesses first, especially those who have benefited in recent economic times and from the excellent infrastructure and services the City provides.

\*\*\*\*\*

The course we are on is not sustainable and will result in additional service reductions in future years. Now is the time to try to get ahead of this forthcoming and worsening problem. .

\*\*\*\*\*

It is abundantly clear that there are short-term steps that can be taken to trim expenses in the next year or 2, however, the structural changes in the broader economy will place Roseville in a downward financial spiral without restructuring the sources of revenue. Dependence on sales taxes from the mall and automall will prove to be flat to declining while we are presently unable to replace fund balances that were drawn down in the last recession. There is a significant gap between funding and needs when one considers the true lifetime costs of employee benefits, facility & building maintenance needs, road and infrastructure maintenance, and the like.

\*\*\*\*\*

No - there are room for improvements and modifications. Some may be small but collectively make a difference. Increasing revenue should not come first - reductions and modifications first. Painful as it is we need to modify our expectations.

\*\*\*\*\*

After assimilating information from staff through very well prepared and detailed presentations regarding 5 departments in the city and follow up discussions in formal sessions with colleagues on CPAC I have developed a position regarding recommendations the committee should send forward to the city council.

At meeting #14 February 15, 2018, Derk Garcia outlined, in a brief report, the status of Roseville as a desirable place to live and why people move here. In that report it was clear the amenities Roseville offers are clearly a result of the “Full Service” philosophy maintained by the city council and embraced by the residents. The 5 departments presented to the committee a schedule of responsibilities and tasks. Each department listed the tasks from “essential to low priority”. That being the case, under the full service philosophy, even low priority items are desired and expected by our residents.

In the beginning we were cautioned that our work was not to consider revenue generating solutions. That was an excellent caution as it placed cutting costs as the primary goal and a great deal of effort and resources were directed that way. Staff reports were detailed and complete. Subsequently answering follow up questions by the committee. The committee concluded it would be best not to eliminate any task or responsibility in its entirety but to select reductions in areas of low priority.

Meeting number #14 the committee was introduced once again to revenue generating possibilities which included taxes, fees, utility taxes, and other areas of revenue generation. We focused on sales tax and found that a revenue-generating 9.2 million dollars could be gained from as little as a 1/4% increase in a sales tax.

### **General Purpose Tax**

- Cannot specify purpose for funds prior to the election
- Requires a 50% + 1 voter approval
- Money goes into the General Fund and is, therefore, more flexible in its usage
- Examples: – Sales Tax – TOT – UUT
- Election Timing:
  - Can only be put on ballot with a simple majority threshold during a regularly scheduled Municipal Election (only one exception)

- Typically, because of its general nature, no defined constituency steps forward to advocate during a partisan campaign
- This requires significant informational burden on the City from start to finish
- City cannot support/object.
- General Purpose: Sales Tax
  - A growing number of cities are successfully using general purpose sales tax measures to maintain fiscal stability and meet quality of life needs
- A General Purpose Sales Tax has become the preferred mechanism since the 2008 recession – In November 2016, 51 of 59 General Purpose Sales Tax were enacted by local voters.
- Roseville has the lowest allowable rate in the state – Currently generates \$52.4M
- 1/4% override would generate \$9.2M annually
- 1/2% override would generate \$19.6M annually. I strongly support a move to raise the general sales tax 1/4%.

\*\*\*\*\*

What the City of Roseville is facing is a multi-year problem. Roseville is not alone; cities throughout California and the nation are facing fund imbalances as a result of a shift in the economy and increasing pension costs.

If the citizens and businesses of Roseville VALUE the quality of life they have this will require a broad based funding source to maintain.

Along with revenue stabilization, Roseville needs to explore options for different service models. Since the railroad established Roseville as a major interstate transportation hub and technology companies found Roseville provided attributes not found in the Bay Area, Roseville has been at the forefront of innovation.

We have the opportunity to retain the competitive advantage.

**Q2. Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a General Purpose Sales Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q2: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	1	6%
3 – Neutral	1	6%
4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	6	35%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: GENERAL PURPOSE SALES TAX**

I like this option because it is incurred by a broad base (residents and nonresidents) who benefit from city services. Since our current sales tax rate is at the state minimum and many other cities have higher sales tax rates, it seems to be a good incremental step to increase revenue and keep Roseville competitive without adding a new type of tax that would require a more complex education campaign with voters.

\*\*\*\*\*

This is an avenue that could/should be explored given our current sales tax is so low compared to other cities in region and state. consideration should be given that taxes are at or below neighboring city rates.

\*\*\*\*\*

We should try and get this on the November 2018 ballot.

\*\*\*\*\*

The merchants located within the City of Roseville (specifically including the Auto Mall and Galleria) have historically enjoyed an advantage over merchants located in adjacent jurisdictions due to the sales tax differential. Increasing the sales tax may ultimately reduce taxable sales, resulting in a diminution in sales tax revenues.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's careless to explore a quick fix to tax every citizen to narrow the deficit problem. The committee has not received appropriate or enough information regarding very important expense data: personnel costs or detailed overhead costs. Every citizen is not using every service, and yet, they'll be taxed as if they did.

\*\*\*\*\*

At the start of this process (the CPAC) we heard that sales tax revenue was declining because of the change in how people spend their money. Internet sales, and trading capital purchases for buying services were all the cause. Of the options available, absent a change in how the state allocates sales tax, this does not seem to be a stable revenue source.

\*\*\*\*\*

A general sales tax or some combination of a special purpose tax and UUT.

\*\*\*\*\*

Taxes aren't fun, but local taxes are better than state or federal.

\*\*\*\*\*

I like the idea of a shared responsibility---tax applies fairly to anyone seeks services, retail in Roseville and meeting the 50%+1 threshold. Am concerned about the need of a future transportation sales tax and how that might raise it too high to be passed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The track record in other cities is encouraging. If the figures cited are correct --51 of 59 General Purpose Sales Tax initiatives passed in November 2016--then Roseville stands a better and 50-50 chance for passage because Roseville is a city when people want the services they now have and seem willing to increase their taxes by modest amounts to continue those services.

\*\*\*\*\*

As a tax importer, this is one of the least disagreeable options. It would be paid largely by those shopping in Roseville. By way of comparison, we have the lowest sales tax in the region (along with Rocklin).

\*\*\*\*\*

So long as Roseville doesn't lose its competitive advantage in the Region, this is the type of broad based revenue source that allows us to retain the quality of life. With 60,000 people visiting or working in Roseville on a daily basis, services (e.g., police) are being provided to them as well as our citizens.

However, any increased revenue source must be coupled with a commitment to explore how to cost effectively provide services

If the public perceives that the sales tax is to enrich the City it is doomed.

The broadest base of funding is always better than a tax or fee on a few.

**Q3: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Special Purpose Sales Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q3: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	5	29%
2 – Disagree	3	18%
3 – Neutral	1	6%
4 – Agree	3	18%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	3	18%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: SPECIAL PURPOSE SALES TAX**

It would depend on what the special purpose was. But overall, I would lean more towards the general purpose sales tax since the funds would be more flexible and could be used more efficiently.

\*\*\*\*\*

We have been provided very little information regarding a Special Purpose Sales Tax, and have not analyzed the benefits and corresponding detriments associated therewith.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's careless to explore a quick fix to tax every citizen to narrow the deficit problem. The committee has not received appropriate or enough information regarding very important expense data: personnel costs or detailed overhead costs. Every citizen is not using every service, and yet, they'll be taxed as if they did.

\*\*\*\*\*

The 2/3rds requirement for passage makes this a very hard sell.

\*\*\*\*\*

Coupled with a UUT, I think this would be a good option. Some burden on the residents while also leveraging revenue from non-resident shoppers. A tax supporting parks and/or libraries would probably be most worthwhile.

\*\*\*\*\*

I have concerns about getting the 2/3 vote to pass.

\*\*\*\*\*

In this city, Parks are funded two ways: General Fund or a Special District tax. Those parks with funding from the General Fund have had maintenance reduced, or the parks have not been completed because of the shortfall of General Fund money. Therefore, I strongly favor asking the people in those General Fund park areas to vote in a Special District tax to bring their parks to a satisfactory conclusion. I am wondering if the same can be done for our libraries, or if there is a way to add libraries into the mix for the voters' approval. If libraries and parks could be added together, it seems that the chances for success would be greater.

\*\*\*\*\*

No, if going to raise sales tax what would be that special project? We have multiple department and activities that need help.

\*\*\*\*\*

Many homeowners, especially those who have bought homes in the new areas of Roseville will feel they are paying twice of the same park, library, etc.

**Q4: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Parcel Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q4: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	3	18%
2 – Disagree	6	35%
3 – Neutral	3	18%
4 – Agree	1	6%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	2	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: PARCEL TAX**

Too narrow a base of payers

\*\*\*\*\*

We have been provided very little information regarding a Parcel Tax, and have not analyzed the benefits and corresponding detriments associated therewith.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's careless to explore a quick fix to tax every citizen to narrow the deficit problem. There committee has not received appropriate or enough information regarding very important expense data: personnel costs or detailed overhead costs. Every citizen is not using every service, and yet, they'll be taxed as if they did.

\*\*\*\*\*

Not likely to generate enough revenue to make it worth the cost to secure its passage.

\*\*\*\*\*

I think it penalizes homeownership. Need to have a broader base of taxpayers.

\*\*\*\*\*

This is a tax that I think residents will rebel against and not pass. It sounds too much like a property tax measure and voters are generally against raising their property taxes. Proposition 13 remains as a yardstick for many residents and it would be counterproductive and harmful to the passage of other

measure already mentioned, to try to do this one as well. Putting this one before voters might cause all of the issues to fail.

\*\*\*\*\*

Not a great source of revenue.

**Q5: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q5: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	2	12%
3 – Neutral	3	18%
4 – Agree	7	41%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	1	6%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX (TOT)**

I think a small increase could be possible. Our location, hotel quality and room price are what draws people to select lodging accommodations. I would not expect an increase in the TOT to factor in at all. Often people won't even know the tax amount until after their reservation is booked and/or paid. This is a way to share costs with nonresidents who benefit from city services.

\*\*\*\*\*

Explore viability, yes. Not sure if there is room for much increase in staying competitive because of Placer County Tourism fees.

\*\*\*\*\*

We should look into this but make sure we are not higher than surrounding cities.

\*\*\*\*\*

During his recent presentation, Jay Panzica indicated the rate currently assessed by the City of Roseville (6%), coupled with the rate self-assessed by hoteliers through Placer Valley Tourism (6%) equals the rate assessed by neighboring jurisdictions. Increasing the Transient Occupancy Tax would require a corresponding reduction in the assessments paid to, and the activities conducted by, Placer Valley Tourism. Given the benefits provided by Placer Valley Tourism (specifically including the recent renovation of the Placer County Fairgrounds), adjustments in this area should be avoided.

\*\*\*\*\*

Since this tax doesn't impact citizens it should be renegotiated with PVT. The reason offered (tax and assessment already increased by PVT and housed by them) seems short sided [sic]. The TOT should have been explored in alignment with City needs rather than serving recreational tourism ONLY. What a mistake to have given this opportunity away if it could help improve the assets in the general fund. How can the City explore getting these funds returned?

\*\*\*\*\*

Residents do not seem to understand what a TOT is, having been involved in the two prior efforts to pass an increase. Even though it is charged to visitors, the residents do not seem to appreciate this. Also, hotel nights will fluctuate with the economic conditions, I think there are better, more stable options.

\*\*\*\*\*

Only in favor if we remain competitive with similar destinations.

\*\*\*\*\*

Somewhat but not too much in a way that we are higher than surrounding jurisdictions. Be reasonable about TOT and not a bunch of Marxist loot-mongers like they are in San Francisco.

\*\*\*\*\*

I think we're as high as we can get here and anything higher could hurt our tourism.

\*\*\*\*\*

The thing that makes this appealing, is that it is paid by visitors to our city, and so our own residents would likely not object, especially if the information about where this money would be used is something that most residents would approve. Our rate is 6%, one of the lowest. I think we could easily boost that to somewhere between 8 and 10%, as most who rent hotel rooms do not notice there is a TOT involved, they just assume it is there and pay it. This tax strongly improves the services within our city that encourage non-residents to visit our city, such things as swimming and softball meets held on a regional or statewide level. Let's take advantage of those who want to come here to enjoy what we offer.

\*\*\*\*\*

Paid completely by visitors. Most areas of CA are much higher as are cities that I travel to such as Phoenix, Las Vegas, and D.C.

\*\*\*\*\*

Not a significant source of revenue. It would make Roseville less competitive since it would have to be increased above 12%.

**Q6: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Utility User Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q6: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	2	12%
2 – Disagree	0	0%
3 – Neutral	1	6%
4 – Agree	5	29%
5 – Strongly Agree	6	35%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	3	18%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: USER UTILITY TAX (UUT)**

I would tend to lean against, but really need more info on this. I will say that just because something is a stable base for long term revenue does not mean it should be taxed.

\*\*\*\*\*

It seems consistent with original city plan for income structure. Re-implementing a Utility Tax would be more restorative than new income stream.

\*\*\*\*\*

I think the sales tax is the way to go but we could look into bringing back this tax.

\*\*\*\*\*

We have been provided very little information regarding a Utility User Tax, and have not analyzed the benefits and corresponding detriments associated therewith.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's careless to explore a quick fix to tax every citizen to narrow the deficit problem. There committee has not received appropriate or enough information regarding very important expense data: personnel costs or detailed overhead costs. Every citizen is not using every service, and yet, they'll be taxed as if they did.

\*\*\*\*\*

It was a tax we had before, it is not new, but a return to what was key to the service vision for the Roseville community. Utility use by and large does not fluctuate greatly with the economic conditions and therefore should be more stable. Newer housing (2016 and beyond) will have increasingly lower energy usage, but the vast majority of housing in Roseville is pre-2013. While some will opt for solar, it

will not be a large segment of the population as Roseville Electric rates are low enough where solar really does not pencil. Also, since the termination of the UUT in the early 2000's there are new sources of revenue (cellular service, internet service) that will likely offset any energy efficiency reductions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Coupled with a special purpose tax, yes.

\*\*\*\*\*

Agreed, but let's do it in such a way that Phil Ozenick can't sue the City again.

\*\*\*\*\*

I think that has the highest potential of passing. Not sure we tax every utility--I think we need to research/poll what would be best services to tax.

\*\*\*\*\*

We had a 5% UUT, but it was voted out. If we were to propose bringing this tax back, would the immediate opposition be that it was voted out and should not be brought back? Would the city be taking on a losing idea? It does generate a fair amount of money and that would be a reason to have such a tax, so I am in favor, but worried about how the community would react to bring back what they voted out. Question: was it voted out just by the city council or was this a city-wide vote to eliminate it? That could make a difference. If the council voted it out, residents might not feel as opposed.

\*\*\*\*\*

This is the most significant option and the best choice. As our economy moves from one of "owning things" to "sharing" and or "streaming", there must be a way for the City to obtain revenue from this shifting in the economic ecosystem. Self-driving cars (meaning a family may need only 1 or 2 rather than 2 or 3), Air BNB, streaming video entertainment, etc. These can all be taxed through a UUT and it is both fair and predictable for the City.

This is a MUST.

\*\*\*\*\*

I support this for long term solution.

\*\*\*\*\*

Qualifies as a broad-based funding source.

**Q7: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a Community Facilities District Tax as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q7: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	3	18%
2 – Disagree	3	18%
3 – Neutral	2	12%
4 – Agree	3	18%
5 – Strongly Agree	2	12%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	4	24%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: USER UTILITY TAX (UUT)**

The presentation made this option sound unlikely making the work to attempt it less "bang for the buck".

\*\*\*\*\*

We have been provided very little information regarding a Community Facilities District Tax, and have not analyzed the benefits and corresponding detriments associated therewith.

\*\*\*\*\*

It's careless to explore a quick fix to tax every citizen to narrow the deficit problem. There committee has not received appropriate or enough information regarding very important expense data: personnel costs or detailed overhead costs. Every citizen is not using every service, and yet, they'll be taxed as if they did.

\*\*\*\*\*

This may be an option, however CFD's have a negative connotation for many, particularly in new areas of town. I also believe that since a list of authorized facilities is required, that it will require a 2/3rds vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

Too many challenges with this.

\*\*\*\*\*

I am strongly in favor of such a tax, because it provides a stable fund for parks and other services, that funding not dependent upon the General Fund. I think, as stated before, that the city should consider such a district for those park areas that are not General fund.

\*\*\*\*\*

Already exist in newer parts of Roseville.

**Q8: Please indicate your level of agreement with exploring a First Responder Fee as an option for increased revenues in the City of Roseville.**

Q8: Level of Agreement	# of Votes	% of Total
1 – Strongly Disagree	11	65%
2 – Disagree	2	12%
3 – Neutral	4	24%
4 – Agree	0	0%
5 – Strongly Agree	0	0%
I do not have enough information to form an opinion as yet.	0	0%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**COMMENTS RE: FIRST RESPONDER FEE**

Generally people know there's an ambulance fee when there is transportation to a hospital. They might be surprised by the price but they know it's not free.

If we had this fee, I think it shouldn't be charged for the first visit. Maybe the first three responses a year not requiring transportation to the emergency room are free. Each of these responses includes a written follow up showing the fee schedule. Then have the next responses at half the ambulance transportation fee or some other amount.

The fact that a first responder fee is on the list makes me think that the fire department isn't the right department to provide medical response. Our 911 service does a great job of deciding whether to send police or fire department. Providing training to triage between police, fire, and ambulance for the 911 employees is a part of a change in service model. Negotiating levels of service, response times, level of training with the ambulance service is also key to success.

\*\*\*\*\*

This seems to be part of basic and essential city services, so I would prefer not create a new fee to offset the costs.

\*\*\*\*\*

Would prefer not to pay additional fees for this service and much prefer an increase to the sales tax.

\*\*\*\*\*

Recovery of costs associated with services provided at the request of, and in the discretion of the taxpayer are appropriate. First responder fees would operate as a disincentive to requests for assistance

that are not discretionary. Police calls should not be subject to a first responder fee, as those calls are almost always associated with an emergency. Fire Department calls that are of a medical nature and are not associated with an emergency are cause for concern. Rather than impose a fee, the Fire Department should focus on fire calls and allow medical calls to be handled by an outsider provider such as AMR.

\*\*\*\*\*

Terrible idea.

Why aren't we surveyed about all the other service fee ideas generated (i.e. recreational services)? It seems unusual to have one specific fee addressed but no others that were generated in the discussions.

\*\*\*\*\*

I feel the message is wrong and it charges for a service most people believe they are already paying for in the property taxes. I appreciate the ACM's memo; however, I would imagine that the collection would be handled by an outside firm, and while the City may want it to be compassionate, I could see how easily one could find themselves being pursued for the amount not covered by insurance.

\*\*\*\*\*

A small fee seems reasonable, but if it deters residents from calling for help when they need it, it's probably not worth it.

\*\*\*\*\*

Strongly disagree. This only ends poorly for the City. You are going to get a single mother of six from Citrus Heights who loses all her kids in an accident, then gets a bill from the City. Good luck with your fee, in that case.

\*\*\*\*\*

I was initially in favor of learning more---but after discussion, I am not sure this is the right move for our city.

\*\*\*\*\*

People have become dependent upon knowing that if something happens to them, there will be a life saving response that is a free service to them....a critical service to them. A First Responder Fee will make some fee less inclined to seek help and those who oppose such a fee will say it is a fee that will cause some to lose their lives. Let's not make people hate our first responders.

\*\*\*\*\*

Have seen it done back East. Not a popular option and very difficult to collect.

\*\*\*\*\*

For what kind of service call? What classifications?

\*\*\*\*\*

Double taxation. There is firefighter/paramedic on the engine. A contract with AMR.

**Q9: Please provide any suggestions for other General Fund stabilization or revenue enhancement strategies.**

It would seem a combination of additional budget reductions and some revenue increases is the most effective way to deal with the budget shortfalls we have been and will continue to experience. However, long term personnel costs including pension expenses, need to be addressed for overall city fiscal health.

\*\*\*\*\*

Given current financial climate and future sales tax and income trends, Roseville's ability to stay within a balanced budget may require aggressive measures in many directions: reducing costs, eliminating some services or portions of services, outsourcing where possible, streamlining processes, increasing volunteer and intern labor, trimming hard costs within most/all departments. Even though it has been pointed out that the elimination of all identified "low priority" items would be such a small amount of savings when considering the shortfall, tightening belts before considering necessary new income sources exercises prudence.

\*\*\*\*\*

Besides a sales tax increase we should look at additional ways to minimize the City's contribution to CalPERS.

\*\*\*\*\*

The parties ultimately resolving these issues should: (i) make a preliminary allocation of the projected budget shortfall among the various departments; (ii) inquire of each department what service reductions would result from the proposed spending reductions; (iii) make reasonable adjustments, based upon the information received from the respective departments, to the allocations among the departments; and (iv) determine whether the resulting reductions in service would be acceptable to the residents of Roseville. To the extent the acceptable service reductions are insufficient to resolve the budget shortfall, revenue enhancements should then be considered in an amount sufficient to eliminate remaining shortfall.

\*\*\*\*\*

First, determine how the proposed priorities and fee increases proposed over the last 16 meetings impact the deficit. There is not enough information and to have a brief and RUSHED discussion regarding taxes is irresponsible.

A tax increase deserves intentional thought from the committee just as the prioritization activities received. This hasty discussion insults the intellect of the volunteers who have devoted hours and hours of their valuable time reviewing voluminous data points. The NEW information about taxes appears to

be a premeditated and a surprising solution to hurry and close the discussion due to the approaching timeline.

It's not surprising to see a human resources and fund management problem "solved" by suggesting a fix that prevents having the difficult conversations of reducing staff and services. Management and leadership is not about making popular decisions, it's about making tough decisions. No one likes to reduce staff; no manager likes to have difficult conversations.

The City management is compensated well and is expected to make the tough decisions; it's their responsibility and I expect them to come up with additional appropriate fund stabilization and revenue enhancement strategies and make the necessary human resource decisions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Should the Council decide to put a tax/fee on the ballot, I would hope they would also direct staff to review operations and benefits so that residents see that the City is taking care of its own house at the same time they are asking for additional revenue to maintain services.

\*\*\*\*\*

I think it must be combination of less spending/finding efficiencies along with considering a revenue generator, like a tax.

\*\*\*\*\*

I strongly believe that there are areas within the budget we have reviewed that could stand some cutting and trimming, and that should happen, because if this CPAC group or the City Council just say we need to tax more, without trimming, the psychological effect will be on the side of accusations of a money grab by the city, not just a well measured and thoughtful plan of some trimming and some taxes to maintain best services.

\*\*\*\*\*

Make modifications and lean out, use private sector utilization in projects to hire the least amount of people required, our unfunded liabilities in retirement are of great concern.

\*\*\*\*\*

Consult with the California League of Cities and Municipal Finance Officials

\*\*\*end\*\*\*

## **APPENDIX A – COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS AND INFORMATION INDEX**

(Materials available for download at [www.engageroseville.com](http://www.engageroseville.com))

### **General Information and Miscellaneous Correspondence**

- City Council Staff Report – Engage Roseville and Formation of CPAC
- General City Overview - Presentation by City Manager Rob Jensen
- Overview of City Finances - Presentation by Chief Financial Officer Jay Panzica
- Revenue Options - Presentation by Chief Financial Officer Jay Panzica
- General Fund Infographic
- Fiscal Year 2018 City Manager Budget Message
- Consolidated Emails Received from Residents
- Flashvote #1 Results – General Questions
- Meeting Summary – July 12, 2017
- Meeting Summary – July 26, 2017
- Meeting Summary - January 24, 2018
- Meeting Summary – February 15, 2018
- General Fund Staffing Levels – Memorandum from Assistant City Manager Dominick Casey
- Response to Questions Submitted Subsequent to July 26, 2017 Meeting – August 7, 2017 Memorandum from Jay Panzica
- Response to Additional Committee Questions – August 23, 2017 Memorandum from Jay Panzica
- Development of Committee Recommendations – January 10, 2018 Memorandum from Facilitator Lou Hexter
- Preliminary Value Statements – January 24, 2018 Memorandum from Development Services Manager Mike Isom
- Fire Operational Study Recommendation – November 6, 2017 Memorandum from Dominick Casey
- First Responder Fee Information – February 14, 2018 Memo from Dominick Casey
- School Resource Officers – September 14, 2017 Letter from RJUSD Superintendent Ron Severson
- City Volunteer Program Information – November 6, 2017 Memorandum from Dominick Casey
- Balancing Act Budget Tool Variables
- Consolidated Committee Survey Comments – February 1<sup>st</sup> Memorandum from Lou Hexter
- Revenue Options Survey Results
- Statewide Sales and Use Tax Rate Information
- CPAC Member and Alternate Meeting Attendance Record

### **Public Works Department Information and Materials**

- White Paper
- FY2018 Budget Narrative
- Department Presentation
- Alternative Transportation Work Program Cost and Options
- Alternative Transportation Funding Snapshot
- Services Prioritization Matrix
- Discretionary Service Reduction Matrix
- Responses to Committee Questions
- Flashvote Results
- August 9, 2017 Meeting Summary
- August 23, 2017 Meeting Summary

### **Police Department Information and Materials**

- White Paper
- FY2018 Budget Narrative

- Department Presentation
- Services Prioritization Matrix
- Responses to Committee Questions
- Flashvote Results
- September 13, 2017 Meeting Results
- September 27, 2017 Meeting Results

#### **Fire Department Information and Materials**

- White Paper
- FY2018 Budget Narrative
- Department Presentation
- Services Prioritization Matrix
- Fire Shift Schedule Information – October 18, 2017 Memorandum from Dominick Casey
- Responses to Committee Questions
- Flashvote Results
- October 11, 2017 Meeting Summary
- October 25, 2017 Meeting Summary

#### **Parks Recreation & Libraries Information and Materials**

- White Paper
- FY2018 Budget Narrative
- Department Presentation
- Services Prioritization Matrix
- Service Reduction Options
- Pricing Policy
- Responses to Committee Questions
- Resident Feedback
- Letter from Blue Line Gallery
- Maidu Museum – Resident Feedback
- Roseville Historical Society Information – December 29, 2017 Memorandum from RHS President Christina Richter
- November 15, 2017 Letter from Roseville Senior Commission
- Flashvote Results
- November 11, 2017 Meeting Summary
- November 29, 2017 Meeting Summary

#### **Development Services Department Information and Materials**

- White Paper
- FY2018 Budget Narrative
- Department Presentation
- Services Prioritization Matrix
- Annual Work Program
- Development Impact Fee Comparative Analysis
- Responses to Committee Questions
- December 13, 2017 Meeting Summary
- January 10, 2018 Meeting Summary