
To: Community Priorities Advisory Committee

From: Mike Isom, Development Services Manager
Kathy Pease, Planning Manager

Date: September 20, 2017

Subject: September 27th Meeting Agenda Packet

The following materials are attached for committee review and consideration in advance of the September 27th CPAC meeting:

1. ***Meeting Agenda***
2. ***Responses to Police Department questions received***
3. ***Roseville Joint Union High School District letter in support of school resource officers – letter from Superintendent Ron Severson***
4. ***September 13th Meeting Summary***

Follow up materials for the Committee's information from previous meetings include:

5. ***Priority Ranking Exercise Purpose – memo from Dominick Casey***
6. ***CORRECTED Public Works Prioritization Results – memo from Dominick Casey (Note: the previous summary memo inadvertently included the table from the first ranking exercise, and not the second)***

If you have any questions prior to the meeting, please contact Mike Isom at (916) 774-5527 or misom@roseville.ca.us, or Kathy Pease (916) 774-5434 or kpease@roseville.ca.us.



EngageROSEVILLE

Community Priorities Advisory Committee

Meeting #6

Wednesday, September 27, 2017 / 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Mahany Meeting Rooms | 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, CA

A G E N D A

- 6:00 pm** **I. Welcome!**
- A. Roll Call
 - B. Agenda Overview
- 6:05** **II. Questions/Clarifications From Previous Meeting**
- *James Maccoun, Police Chief*
- 6:20** **III. Police Department Priorities**
- A. Review Online Survey Results
 - B. Committee Rankings/Discussion
- 7:50** **IV. Public Comment**
- Members of the public are invited to offer comments on any item within the purview of the CPAC. For those wishing to make oral comments, please complete a Speaker Card, turn it in to a staff member and wait for your name to be called. Speakers are asked to observe a 2-minute time limit.
- 7:55 pm** **V. Next Steps**
- 8:00 pm** **Adjourn**



Roseville Police Department

To: Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC)
From: Jim Maccoun, Police Chief
Date: September 20, 2017
Re: Responses to questions from committee

After the September 13, 2017 CPAC meeting, the following questions were submitted in writing for staff's response. The following are responses to those questions.

- 1. The department provided information on the top step salary and benefits for each position. In the department's budget projection, are those the rates used, regardless of the step the person in the position holds?**

When the department requests a new position from the City Manager and Council, the department uses the top step salary and benefits to estimate future costs. However, the Finance Department uses actual salaries in the department's annual budget.

- 2. Should the City expect to see cost savings over the next several years as more senior staff retire and the new staff coming in will have a broader step range and sharing more of the cost of the benefits? How does staff factor this into the budget projections?**

We expect there will be savings (offset by costs of hiring, equipping and training new staff), but we have not factored those savings into the budget projections provided to the committee.

- 3. Please share calls for service and report statistics for the past 10-15 years.**

Comprehensive data on calls for service over that period of time is not available. The Police Department recently changed computer aided dispatch and records management systems, and each system defines calls for service in different ways. As a result, there is not an "apples to apples" comparison from year to year that would yield any useful conclusions..

The following are the number of police reports, including crimes, services and collisions processed by records by fiscal year:

| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1668 | 1713 | 1630 | 1547 | 1398 | 1300 | 1275 | 1237 | 1237 | 1112 | 1109 |
| 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Our Uniform Crime Reports, which are the number of “Part 1 crimes” (major categories of indexed crimes reported to the state and the FBI) are available on our website covering the years 1995 through 2015. The table includes both the raw number of index crimes reported, and the per-capita crime rate, adjusted for population. http://www.roseville.ca.us/police/useful_links/crimes_n_arrests.asp

- 4. Does the department use an automated record and report-writing system? If so, when was it implemented? Has it increased efficiency for sworn and non-sworn officers in their clerical part of their jobs since its implementation? If not, why not?**

The police department has used automated records systems since the early 1990s, and automated field reporting for our officers and community service officers since spring of 2016. Earlier versions of our records management system were indexes of key data from crime, collision and services reports, with locations, names, arrests, MOs, items of property and other data, but not the narrative sections. Staff wrote their reports on paper, and the records unit entered data from them into the records system and then stored the paper reports. Our current records management system allows records staff to attach images of the actual reports in portable document format, so that authorized staff can read the actual reports on their secure computers, rather than requesting a paper copy from the records unit.

Automated field reporting, which was implemented in spring of 2016, was a significant advance. This system allows officers and CSOs to write reports directly in the system, rather than writing or typing them in Word and printing them out for supervisory approval, distribution to the DA and other agencies, data entry and storage. The system has not saved time for the officers—they are still writing their reports, just in a different format—but it does create efficiencies for the records staff, and makes the data and narrative sections of reports available more quickly to supervisory staff and the crime analysis unit.

- 5. Are participants in the Citizen’s Police Awareness Academy and the Business Academy paying any fees to cover the full or partial cost of the programs?**

These programs are a valuable part of our public outreach and create more engaged and informed citizens, which is a benefit to the department and community. As a result, the City does not charge for this service, and believes it may be

counterproductive to do so. We also use Citizen's Police Academy to recruit new volunteers, which are a great asset to the department and community.

6. I understand the alarm coordinator works in records and the revenue offset is applied to the community services budget division, but do alarm permits and false alarm charges cover the cost of the program?

Alarm permit fees generally cover the costs of administering the program, including the records clerk and the outside contractor. Fines for excessive false alarms recover a portion of the cost of dispatchers and officers handling those calls. However, the intent of false alarm fines is not to fully recover costs or create revenue, but to give alarm holders an incentive to better manage their systems, and to reduce the amount of time officers spend responding to false alarms so that they can spend that time on more productive activities.

7. How was reimbursement from the school districts for the youth service officers set to match one third of the cost?

The City reached that amount through a negotiation with high school district officials. It was an increase over the district's contributions in previous years. The City's goal is to recover 100% of its costs from the district in future years.

8. Of the 15,500 property items purged annually, about how much is put up for auction, and what kind of revenue does this create?

Some items, like firearms and illegal drugs, cannot be sold and must be destroyed. Our property clerks try to reunite as many owners with their property as they can, and when they cannot, the remainder is sold after the legal holding period. The annual revenue from sales varies, and has been \$946, \$2,746 and \$3,612 over the last three years, respectively.

9. How does the cost of the five additional sworn officers as recommended in the staffing study compare to overtime expenses from the last few years?

Hiring five officers would cost approximately \$1,052,375 the first year (salary, benefits, vehicles and equipment), and approximately \$835,420 a year after that for salaries, benefits and ongoing vehicle costs.

The City spent approximately \$1.46 million on overtime in FY 2015-2016, and \$1.89 million on overtime in FY 2016-2017, mostly for sworn personnel. Those amounts exclude overtime in dispatch and records, but include some professional staff time for CSOs. It is safe to say the lion's share was for sworn officers. Last year, 50 percent of it was to cover staffing shortages and meet minimum staffing levels. Two percent was reimbursed time for supplemental law enforcement services, where a business or organization hires additional officers to provide security for special events. Seventeen percent was for training, and the rest was for other reasons like officers being put on standby or responding to court during their time off, staying beyond their shift to conduct follow-up and write arrest reports, or responding from home for an emergency call-out. While it seems intuitive that hiring more officers should reduce overtime, that usually is not the case. There will always be sickness,

injuries, training needs that cannot be met during regular duty time, and incidents requiring officers to stay beyond their normal shifts or come in on their time off.

- 10. You indicated you had just under 500 applicants for entry-level positions. Does the department pay for the cost of these hires to attend academy, and pay them a salary while attending? If so, is there an agreement to recover some of these costs if an officer leaves the department within so many months or years of graduation?**

Yes, the City pays their academy costs and a salary while they attend academy. They are classified and paid as "police trainees" while they're in the academy, which is a lower salary schedule than police officer. Police trainees are promoted to the "police officer" classification after they graduate. The City gets partial reimbursement for academy costs from California POST (Police Officers Standards and Training).

Historically, we have not had a problem with officers sponsored in the academy voluntarily leaving our department within their first few years of service. We do not have any kind of contract with entry-level officers requiring them to reimburse the City for academy costs if they leave within a defined period of time. Other law enforcement agencies have gone to court over such hiring/retention contracts, and the contracts were not upheld by the courts.

September 15, 2017

Dear Committee Members,

First, thank you for investing your time on this commission. It is an imposing task to try to prioritize services in a city the size of Roseville. Your efforts are much appreciated.

I know you have been discussing the role, impacts and costs of law enforcement for our city. As you weigh difficult choices, I wanted to share with you my perspective on the School Resource Officer Program.

The Roseville Joint Union High School District has enjoyed a partnership with the Roseville Police Department that goes back to the late 1980's. Our comprehensive high schools have had a police officer assigned to their campuses for almost three decades. The impact of that officer cannot be overstated. Each of our schools serves close to 2,000 teenagers and about 150 adult staff. With hundreds of parents, community members, and other visitors dropping by the campuses daily, each school is essentially a small city. And, everything that happens in a small city eventually happens on a high school campus. At different times there are thefts, drugs, alcohol, accidents, fights, confrontations, bullying, child abuse, auto accidents and suicides. It has been a blessing to have a real police officer on hand to help navigate those instances.

Our schools are amongst the safest in the nation. Student confrontations and fights are very rare, we suffer little in the way of theft or vandalism, and organized gang activity is almost non-existent. Part of the reason is that this is a great community and most parents send us students who possess great personal values. Part of it is because as a school district we dedicate tremendous resources in personnel, training, awareness and accountability. And, a significant part is the result of having an officer on campus.

The mere presence of a uniformed officer on campus and the visual of a police car in the parking lot is a huge deterrent to crime. Our School Resource Officers build relationships and they know our students. As they become aware of possible problems, both on and off of campus, they are able to intercede. It is almost impossible to measure the range of crimes and disruptions that **do not occur** because of this program. When there is a problem, our officers are swift to act because they have a history and understanding of the issues and characters on each campus. They build relationships with students and families that facilitate investigative work on both school and non-school related crimes. Their presence on campus is a major deterrent to crime or misbehavior and the close proximity allows the school to partner with law enforcement in proactive ways. In short, our schools and the greater Roseville Community are much safer because of the officers on campus.

As the Federal and State grants that helped fund the School Resource Officers disappeared over the years, the RJUHSD has picked up part of the cost. For many years, we contributed \$25,000 per officer. Currently, a SRO serves 70% of their contract year on our campuses. The officers are on campus 4 days a week for the 180 days when school is in session. This year, we are contributing \$48,800 per officer to support the program and pay an hourly overtime rate for support at our continuation high school. This has stretched our budget to uncomfortable levels, but it has been a major priority for the school district. As a matter of fact, between the city and the schools, we survived the greatest recession in recent US

history without making cuts to this program. We are hopeful that we can figure out how to manage this current budget dilemma as well.

Families move to this city for two primary reasons. First, it is a safe community that is well policed. And secondly, we have outstanding schools. A reduction in the School Resource Officer program will have a negative impact on our two most important attractors.

Again, thank you for your consideration and thank you for investing your time in this process.

Sincerely,

Ron Severson

Superintendent, Roseville Joint Union High School District



Community Priorities Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting #5

September 13, 2017

Prepared by:



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

September 2017

I. Welcome and Introductions

Welcoming Remarks, Roll Call and Agenda Overview

The fifth meeting of the Engage Roseville Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC or Committee) was held on Wednesday, September 13, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Mahany Meeting Rooms, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, California. The purpose of the CPAC is to develop recommendations for the City Council regarding service-level priorities and potential service reductions for the five City departments whose operation constitutes the majority of General Fund expenses.

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

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

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Present:

Krista Bernasconi, Matthew Bridge, Ellaisson Carroll, Kristine Dohner, Richard Duffy, Jack Ellison, Derk Garcia, Valerie Gross, Julie Hirota, Kathryn Kitchell, Joe Langdon, Michael Laperche, Sr., Marcus Lo Duca, John Mason, Tracy Mendonsa, David Nelson, Jason Probst, Richard Roccucci, Dennis Snelling, Roy Sterns, Elaine Webb, Randall Wilson

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Absent:

Pete Constant, Stephanie Dement, Wendy Gerig, Bruce Houdesheldt, John Tallman, Sergey Terebkov

Following the roll call, Krista discussed procedures that have been put in place for the CPAC to put forward formal motions, as necessary. Any motion must be directed through the Chair, whose role is to preside over the meeting and decide all questions of order. She explained that between meetings, the Chair and Vice Chair will continue to meet with staff and MIG to clarify the process and plan for each meeting.

Krista noted that, next week, the project team will debut an online survey which will enable CPAC members to provide their first round of preliminary priority rankings for services prior to the second meeting with each department. This will allow greater efficiency and provide more time for discussion.

Agenda Overview

Lou Hexter returned to the podium to review the evening's agenda, which is devoted to the Police Department's presentation on their GF discretionary fund services, followed by CPAC questions and discussion and then the public comment period. CPAC members had previously received a packet via email which included the agenda, Police Department budget narrative, white paper, PowerPoint presentation and service prioritization matrix, plus follow-up materials from Meeting #4 held on August 23, 2017.

II. Police Department Overview

Overview

Lou introduced Chief of Police **Jim Maccoun**, who in turn introduced his colleagues **Captain Troy Bergstrom**, Operations Division; **Captain Stefan Moore**, Services Division; **Claudia Villa**, Administrator, Records Division, Property/Evidence and CSI Units; **Katie Braverman**, Administrator, Communications Division; and **Shelly Bracco**, Police Budget Analyst. Chief Maccoun provided a general introduction to the Police Department, its mission, guiding principles, staffing, policing models, funding and administration. Captain Bergstrom provided additional detail about the services provided by the Operations Division, and Captain Moore did the same for the Services Division. Finally, Chief Maccoun explained which services the Police Department considers to be essential to its operation; which are enhanced or discretionary services; and the likely impacts of service cuts to the enhanced services.

CPAC Comments

CPAC members provided the following questions and comments regarding the presentation:

Definition of Essential Services

- It seems that all of these services are essential to the operation of a police department in a large city. How did you determine which you consider to be non-essential?
 - *We took a very pragmatic approach to creating this list. These services involve functions that do not absolutely require specialized teams, but can be fulfilled by any uniformed officer and therefore can be reassigned to Patrol. It's not optimal to do so, but it's possible.*
 - *Follow-up question: Does that represent a cost savings, given that you'll still need the same number of officers serving in a certain capacity to handle those incidents?*

- *No, you're correct—it doesn't necessarily do so. Additionally, the ancillary specialized teams don't add much extra cost, since those officers are already funded in the budget. They may entail some training or equipment expenses, but those are not big-ticket items. Therefore, eliminating them doesn't represent much of a cost-saving.*
- Can we get lists of what other comparable nearby cities consider to be essential services and their costs? It would help us gain perspective on what is fair and reasonable. Or perhaps it would be easier to do for the enhanced or discretionary services. And also, your services aren't listed in order, are they?
 - *What we called essential services are actually functions, not necessarily a representation of the people who may currently fulfill them. They're not in any sort of rank order. We could provide an organizational chart to show how they're structured. I don't know if any other cities have made a comparable list of essential and enhanced services. We can certainly provide organizational charts and information from other departments around our region and see which of these functions they list.*
 - CPAC member comment: I'd like to caution against relying too much on making comparisons between other cities and ours in terms of essential services—it can fog the issue. As Chief Maccoun explained during the presentation, there are too many variables to allow a reliable correlation between staffing levels and a department's success in fighting crime. Also, Roseville with its large size, major mall, etc. has a unique situation and additional resources when compared to other nearby cities. While it is worthwhile to look to other cities for general ideas, we need to avoid getting lost in comparing the numbers.
- I'm curious how much staff sharing occurs between the PD and city administration or public service agencies. I know that, for example, you shared Police and Fire personnel with the City PIO, before that became a dedicated role. But does the City help support the police, for instance with their marketing or communications staff?
 - *While we don't operate in an organizational silo, anyone who works in our building—even the custodian—has to be backgrounded and meet certain legal standards. So that limits us. But we have a great cooperative relationship with other City departments. For instance, when we have a major event, we'll work with the PIO.*

Staffing Efficiencies

- Does using Community Services Officers (CSOs) provide a cost-saving, as well as an efficiency of work?

- *Yes, CSOs are a great force-multiplier, since they can handle many types of calls at reduced cost and help your agency be more efficient. However, when considering program reductions, it's necessary to keep in mind that sworn officers have more flexible capacity—they can do everything a CSO can do plus some functions that they cannot.*
- *With reference to the staffing study that indicates the ideal staffing numbers at present and in the future—what would be the impact of having additional staffing of more CSOs? Would there be some trade-off with having more CSOs vs. sworn officers, in terms of priorities and dealing with staff attrition over time?*
 - *Yes, because we have much more operational efficiency with the sworn staff than with some of the very specialized professional staff. If workforce staffing is not necessarily optimal, that flexibility is important, particularly in the case of major incidents that require a larger scale response. We want to have that reserve capacity available.*
- *You've noted that you currently have 44 volunteers. Is there a way to quantify the cost savings that they provide? Can the number of volunteers be expanded, and would that create any more efficiencies, or would it be a challenge if the program got too big?*
 - *Volunteers represent a significant cost savings in terms of free labor. I don't have a dollar amount at hand, but since we track the number of hours, types of duties and output of our volunteers each year, we could easily provide it. As for expanding volunteers, there is no limit placed on the number we can have. We try to make the program as big as we can. actively recruiting volunteers and finding ways to use them. The only expenses are for uniforms and backgrounding. Really, it's a question of our volunteers' capacity.*
- *Since you already have some successful partnerships, such as your Special Operations partnership with Rocklin—have you considered other opportunities to create cost efficiencies by working with other cities? I know, for instance, a lot of agencies do regional dispatch.*
 - *We could, and in the past we did try to partner with the city of Lincoln, which failed because they were unable to support the relationship to the level we needed. We have a cooperative relationship with the only other tactical team in the area, which is Placer County. There are certainly some additional partnerships that are available, although there can be jurisdictional, prosecutorial and other issues when you cross county lines. As for regional dispatch, that is a valid model and there are several ways to do it, but the trade-off is being able to determine and maintain operational and quality control. We have not actively explored it. The only regional dispatches in California are in Yolo and Shasta Counties.*

- I'm assuming that the five additional officers recommended in the 2015 staffing study have not been hired.
 - *Correct.*
- It seems as though those hired to do the essential services can also pick up the discretionary services. When you hire new people, do you try to recruit and hire those who are bilingual or minorities, so that they can perhaps do better with community relations?
 - *For the generalist job functions, we hire people who will function well in the community as generalists and then train them or utilize pre-existing skills to move them into the specialist functions. We're always seeking people with extra skills, particularly in languages, for the sake of diversity and improved community relations—our testing system doesn't give extra civil service points for it, but it's always a bonus when we're able to attract a candidate who allows us to communicate better with our community. Right now we're pretty well represented. So, in conclusion, we cast a wide net, we get people in as generalists, and sometimes we're able to find people that meet a lot of different criteria.*

Costs and Funding

- Are there many grant opportunities available for law enforcement? One area, for instance, is mental health, which is clearly a growing concern among organizations across the country, and you have a mental health task force.
 - *Grants are a double-edged sword, since they can get you through a limited period but then leave you without another option when they expire, so that's something to consider carefully. At present, both the state and federal government are not giving many grants to local law enforcement. In terms of mental health, most grants come through the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) and flow to the counties; they will not fund our social services. So we try to use our social services program to connect with the County and bring mental health services into Roseville.*
- It seems as though many of the services provided by the Social Services Unit, which is relatively new, were already provided by the City and many of those people were already in place. How did adding that unit increase the PD's overall budget?
 - *Hiring the Social Services Administrator was the biggest cost. The officer positions were already in the department doing similar duties, but the emphasis was different. Bringing the Social Services Administrator on board created a relationship with Sacramento State, bringing in interns as another free or very low-cost labor source. Also, the model has shifted from more of a strict enforcement model to trying to find other*

solutions, since it's not possible to arrest away the problem of homelessness.

- Is the new Parks officer referred to on Slide 58 part of the \$1.3M staff costs that are listed on Slide 56?
 - *We do still have some vacancies. We haven't filled that park position, but we're getting close. We just hired a number of lateral transfer officers into our division, whom we're training very quickly, which means that patrol will be fully staffed, and we can put an officer in that position.*
- Is it true that the costs for staffing the Social Services POP Unit probation officer are covered through Placer County?
 - Yes.
- Was the shelter contract put out for competitive bid?
 - *No, the shelter contract was not competitively bid.*
- Do the labor costs on your list include benefits, etc.?
 - *Yes, they are fully loaded.*

Ranking Priority of Services

- Why are we prioritizing essential services when, by their very nature, they can't be cut? It seems pointless for laypeople to prioritize these. Also, the enhanced services seem to be part of the essentials. For instance, working with young people while they're still in school helps turn them around and therefore contributes directly to reduction of crime. Does the CPAC have the option of holding the Police Department harmless and not voting to prioritize their services?
 - *Ideally, nothing will be cut, but it will eventually be necessary to make choices. Service levels can be reduced and functions can be reassigned, sometimes to non-specialists. The City budget is all one system, so it's helpful to have priorities for all General Fund discretionary services to provide a context for making these choices. We certainly can take items off the table, but the purpose of having them there is to stimulate discussion which provides helpful context. As an example, when voting on Public Works services, many CPAC members ranked the adult crossing guard program as low-priority; however, subsequent discussion revealed nuances, such as the fact that most considered it to be an important program but doubted that it needed to be Public Works' financial responsibility.*
- To that end, please provide an opportunity to include comments in the survey.
- Encourage the PD to consider lowering service levels where possible.
- Why does the list of PD services show asterisks, indicating that a service is considered essential, at different levels? Some category titles have asterisks

while the services listed underneath have none; in other categories, individual services are marked with an asterisk.

- *The high level asterisks denote that all services in that category are deemed essential.*
- Can you designate which services are required by law?
 - *Yes, we can do so.*
- The CPAC voted on whether to remove essential services from the prioritization list. The consensus was to leave all services on the list for the prioritization exercise; voting results were as follows:
 - Remove: 6
 - Leave on: 11

General Comments

- When speaking of volunteers, it's worth noting that officers also contribute a substantial number of volunteer hours, for instance, with the Police Activities League.
- As someone who works outside of Roseville and returns here every day, I'm extremely grateful!

III. Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to offer comments or ask questions regarding any item within the purview of the CPAC. No public comments were offered.

IV. Next Steps

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Mahany Meeting Rooms, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville.

The following action steps were identified:

- The City will provide a link to the survey early next week, most likely on Monday, and give CPAC members until the end of the week to respond.
- Once the deadline has passed for survey completion, the City will summarize the results to present at the beginning of Meeting #6.

Wallgraphic notes taken at the meeting are attached.

Engage ROSEVILLE

CPAC Mtg. 5. 9.13.17

CPAC QUESTIONS-POLICE

- ▶ HOW ARE NON-ESSENTIAL SVCS DETERMINED?
 - CAN GO BACK TO PATROL
 - SPECIAL TEAMS - NOT MUCH EXTRA COST
- ▶ WHY VOTING ON ESSENTIAL SVCS?
 - DISCUSS @ END
- ▶ DO CSOs ETC. PROVIDE A COST-SAVING?
 - YES - BUT LIMITED IN WHAT THEY CAN DO VS. SWORN OFFICERS
- ▶ WOULD ADD'L CSOs PROVIDE OPTIONS?
 - PREFER FLEX CAPACITY
- ▶ SAVINGS THRU VOLUNTEERS?
 - SIGNIFICANT - FREE LABOR
- ▶ HOW DOES ROSEVILLE COMPARE TO OTHER CITIES RE. ESSENTIAL SVCS?
 - PATROL, COMM. ETC. NESS
- ▶ CAN WE GET LIST? ARE THEY RANKED?
 - CAN DO - NOT SURE OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE
- ▶ DOES CITY ASSIST?
 - NEED CERTAIN LEGAL STANDARDS FOR POLICE
 - DO WORK W/PIO, COLLAB. W/CITY
- ▶ GRANT OPPTYs?
 - NOT MANY
 - MENTAL HEALTH \$ TO COUNTY - WORK WITH THEM

- ▶ PARTNER W/ OTHER CITIES?
 - COULD HAVE TRIED IN PAST
 - PARTNER W/ PLACER
 - REGIONAL OPS
 - HAVE NOT EXPLORED
- ▶ EXPAND VOLUNTEERS?
 - DO BEST WE CAN - NO LIMIT
- ▶ SOCIAL SVCS UNIT - WHAT DID IT ADD TO BUDGET?
 - ADMIN BIGGEST COST BUT HELPED BRING IN INTERNS
 - ALLOWS OTHER SOLUTIONS
- ▶ COST OF NEW OFFICERS INCL.?
 - YES
 - PROBATION \$ THRU PLACER
- ▶ CAUTION AGAINST CITY COMPS. ^{FOGS THE ISSUE}
 - LARGE, BIG MALL, ETC. - UNIQUE SITUATION IN ROSEVILLE
- ▶ DOES THE DEPT. HIRE MULTILING?
 - HIRE GEN'L, MOVE INTO SPECIAL SKILLS
 - LANG. ABILITIES A BONUS
- ▶ GRATEFUL FOR ROSEVILLE!
- ▶ SHELTER CONTRACT COMPETITIVE BID?
 - NO
- ▶ OFFICERS VOLUNTEER TOO

- ▶ MOST SVCS. SEEM ESSENTIAL
 - CAN CPAC CHOOSE TO HOLD POLICE DEPT HARMLESS, NOT VOTE?
 - IDEALLY, NOTHING CUT - BUT WILL HAVE TO MAKE CHOICES
 - IT'S ALL 1 SYSTEM
 - PRIORITIES TO PUT IN CONTEXT
 - CAN TAKE ITEMS OFF TABLE BUT HELPFUL TO DISCUSS
- ▶ PROVIDE OPPTY FOR COMMENTS IN SURVEY
- ▶ ENHANCED SVCS ARE PART OF ESSENTIALS
 - MUST LOOK AT ALL - CAN REDUCE NOT CUT
- ▶ DOES IT BENEFIT TO VOTE ON ESSENTIALS?
 - THEY ARE FUNCTIONS - VARIOUS PPL CAN DO THEM
- ▶ NUANCED DETAILS WOULD HELP - IN PACKET
- ▶ CAN ESSENTIALS BE REDUCED?
 - COULD MOVE TO NON-SPECIALISTS
- ▶ HELPS TO GET NUANCE FROM CPAC
 - CONSIDER LOWERING SVC LEVELS
- ▶ WHY ASTERISKS @ DIFF LEVELS?
 - HIGH LEVEL ASTERISKS INCL. ALL SVCS IN CATEGORY

| | |
|--------|----------|
| REMOVE | LEAVE ON |
| ### | ### ### |

- ▶ DESIGNATE IF REQ. BY LAW?
 - CAN DO SO
- ▶ NEED NOT VOTE FOR ALL 10 CHOICES
- ▶ SHOULD LOOK @ OTHER CITIES FOR IDEAS
 - JUST DON'T GET LOST IN #s
- ▶ ARE LABOR COSTS FULLY LOADED?
 - YES

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Engage Roseville CPAC Meeting #5, September 12, 2017
Discussion Notes



City Manager
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Memorandum

TO: Community Priorities Advisory Committee

FROM: Dominick Casey, Assistant City Manager 

DATE: September 15, 2017

SUBJECT: Priority Ranking Exercise Summary

Staff has received questions from CPAC members asking what the final discussion process will be for determining committee priority recommendations. I would like to take this opportunity to share the planned process for this discussion. Once the final department (Development Services) has completed its second meeting and priorities have been established for all departments, staff will prepare a preliminary report capturing the high, medium, and low priorities. It's important for CPAC to note, that there will be an opportunity to refine the preliminary rankings.

At the January 24th meeting, staff, with assistance from the facilitation team, will engage CPAC in a discussion to explore the value and impact of the identified priority rankings and how each individually fits within the context of the broader list. Any remaining follow up questions will also be addressed.

The idea behind this format is to provide the committee access to City management staff to help provide additional information and context, as necessary for the identified priorities. The intended result is to emerge from this meeting with a more complete and well-informed list of high, medium, and low priorities for each department. The final three meetings will be dedicated to finalizing priorities and recommendations for the City Council.

If you have any question or comments please free to contact me directly at 774-5288 or dcasey@roseville.ca.us



City Manager
 311 Vernon Street
 Roseville, CA 95678

Memorandum

TO: Community Priorities Advisory Committee

FROM: Dominick Casey, Assistant City Manager

DATE: September 14, 2017

SUBJECT: Public Works Preliminary Priority Ranking Exercise Summary (Edited)

In the second meeting dedicated to the Public Works Department, CPAC members completed a preliminary ranking exercise intended to assist in determining departmental priorities. Each committee member was provided with seven green dots, symbolizing their highest priority services, and seven yellow dots, symbolizing their lowest priority. Each member was asked to distribute one dot per service to indicate their seven highest priorities and their seven lowest. The purpose of the first dot exercise was to: 1) determine areas of clear consensus regarding high or low priority services; and 2) focus discussion on those service areas where there was not clear consensus. Following discussion of the results and on those areas without clear consensus, a second identical dot exercise was performed to determine any change as a result of discussion. The resulting priorities were as

| Public Works Ranking #2 – Results | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| Service | Highest Priority (Green Dots) | Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots) | Final Score - Ranking #1 | |
| ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) Operations | 15 | 0 | 15 | HIGH |
| Asphalt remove/replace, patching and crack sealing | 14 | 0 | 14 | HIGH |
| Street Drainage Issues | 12 | 0 | 12 | HIGH |
| Maintain underground drainage systems | 11 | 0 | 11 | HIGH |
| Emergency support for Police and Fire | 10 | 0 | 10 | HIGH |
| Capital Improvement Project Management | 9 | 0 | 9 | HIGH |
| Pavement management program | 6 | 0 | 6 | HIGH |

| Public Works Ranking #2 – Results | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Service | Highest Priority (Green Dots) | Lowest Priority (Yellow Dots) | Final Score - Ranking #1 | |
| 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 |
| 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 |

follows:

The discussion and rationale regarding priorities can be found in the attached meeting summary. This table illustrates where the General Fund-supported tasks ranked in priority from the CPAC exercise. Discussion regarding some of the priorities may need further evaluation in future committee meetings. For example, crossing guards were deemed a lower priority for the General Fund, but still a high priority for the community. Therefore, the Committee might make a recommendation that that in future budgets this function would be funded outside of the General Fund if service levels must be reduced. The preliminary priority ranking summary memos and meeting notes are intended to be used for later CPAC discussions and final prioritization once all departments have had the opportunity to present.

Ultimately, the priority ranking determined by the Committee is meant to serve as a guide for staff to use as they build and recommend future budgets to the City Council, particularly in instances where reductions in services are necessary to balance revenue and expenses from year to year.

Staff, CPAC Chair, and the facilitation team will continue to explore and implement improvements to the preliminary priority ranking exercise in an effort to maximize efficiency, make the best use of the Committee's valuable time during meetings, and to ensure meetings end promptly at 8PM.

Attachments: August 23, 2017 Meeting Summary