

Questions and Responses Generated from May 16, 2023 Budget and Finance Policy Committee and City Council Meeting on the FY 24 Proposed Budget

1. **Question:** The community agency funding chart includes funding for the organization “Through the Looking Glass”. What is this organization and why the decrease in funding from \$1,805,670 in FY 23 to \$27,206 in FY 24?

Response: Through the Looking Glass Provides primarily home-based mental health and developmental/occupational therapy intervention to parenting families with disability, developmental, medical or trauma issues (in child/youth, parent or parenting grandparent/caregiver), serving children/youth (prioritizing 5 to 26 years) and their families with unmet needs. The entire family is served, as appropriate. Most intervention is provided during weekly home (or community) visits of 1.5-2 hours, working with children, parents/caregivers together. Services include: Identification and guidance/intervention regarding disability or developmental issues, crisis and trauma intervention, preventive mental health services/play therapy to children/youth who do not qualify for EPSDT, parenting skills, nurturing parent/child relationships, therapeutic play preparing for child surgeries, case management/systems navigation/referrals, disability adaptations/strategies supporting parenting, development, homework, school functioning. The funding chart for FY 23 has been corrected and the proposed funding in both FY 23 & FY 24 is \$27,206.

2. **Question:** The community agency chart includes Larkin Street - 3404 King Street - TAY Transitional Housing with funding of \$415,144 in FY 23. However, there is no funding proposed for FY 24. There is also funding of \$407,643 in FY 24 for Larkin Street. What is the status of Larkin Street?

Response: Larkin Street received one-time funding in FY 23 under the category of “community facility improvement” for rehab work to upgrade the kitchen shared by the participants at Turning Point by making general improvements and replacing the countertops and flooring. It will also address the immediate needs to bring the facility up to ADA compliance; improve the energy efficiency; and ensure that the building meets city Health and Safety codes for the well-being of the participants and staff. In addition, in FY23, Council authorized \$407,643 in funding for Larkin Street/Turning Point, but they were only operational for the first three quarters of FY23. They are currently not operating due to the pending rehab project (which is funded by CDBG). However, because of the rehab, Larkin Street declined the RRH funding (\$218,388) and are only contracted for the \$189,000, which we expect will be fully spent on the first 3 quarters combined with some security costs that the contract is being amended to cover. The rehab was delayed, in part because of the ownership transition, but also because of HUD requirements pertaining to the CDBG bid and environmental review (NEPA). We currently expect the rehab to be done by the end of the calendar year, and we anticipate they will still need only \$189,000 in FY24 for transitional housing/services. The community agency funding chart has been revised accordingly.

3. **Question:** The community agency funding chart also includes funding of \$1,133,244 for the Step-Up Housing Project at 1367 University Avenue. What is the status of this project?

Response: This project will be discussed at the Budget and Finance Policy Committee and a written update will be provided to Council for the June 13, 2023 meeting.

Questions and Responses Generated from May 16, 2023 Budget and Finance Policy Committee and City Council Meeting on the FY 24 Proposed Budget

4. **Question:** What is the projected salary savings amount for FY 23? What is the historical trend for the last 3 years prior to the pandemic?

Response: Please see the attachment narrative Five Year General Fund Salary Savings Narrative and spreadsheet entitled “General Fund Target and Actual Salary Savings_ FY 2018-FY 2023.”

5. **Question:** What is the status of the implementation of the Small Business Rental and Legal Support grant program, funded through the City’s allocation of federal ARPA funds?

Response: The implementation of this program was paused in light of the State eviction moratorium. However, the program could be started in FY 24. Alternatively, OED has identified some other options to help assist small businesses and is exploring if these options would meet ARPA regulations. OED will schedule time to discuss these ideas with Mayor Arreguin after further research.

6. **Question:** What is the impact if the new FY 24 HR requested positions for Employer of Choice are not funded on 7/1/24?

Response: The greatest impact would be on the Department’s efforts to revamp training. As HR redesigns the Skilled Workers Academy, reconfigures the whole training curriculum, and tries to launch the LEARN module on NeoGov, an HR Tech will be integral to the logistical pieces of these endeavors., including the ability to go live with LEARN before the end of the calendar year.

7. **Question:** Provide the fund balance for the Asset Seizure and City Optional Public Safety.

Response: The Asset Seizure is comprised of funds seized by the state through the asset forfeiture process that are disbursed to state and local entities and are primarily intended to be spent on efforts to enhance law enforcement and prosecution resources and the funds disbursed through asset forfeiture cannot be used to cover or supplant routine funding made available to the agency. The Asset Forfeiture fund balance is \$64,233.76. Revenues continue to be minimal and sporadic (\$10,000 over past 3 years). The City Optional Public Safety funds are provided by the State for “front line law enforcement services” and “front line municipal police services.” Funding shall not be used by local agencies to supplant other funding for Public Safety Services nor be used for capital or construction projects, or administrative fees above .5%. The Citizens’ Options for Public Safety fund balance is \$990,561.27. Annual revenues vary slightly around \$190,000.

8. **Question:** Do we need to budget for more than \$1M for the Southside Complete Streets project?

Response: Current project funding plan based on construction bid results will NOT require additional General Fund or impact other local funds if the Public Works planned use of \$1.6M in new allocations from the UC Settlement Fund across FY 24 and FY25 are approved.

Questions and Responses Generated from May 16, 2023 Budget and Finance Policy Committee and City Council Meeting on the FY 24 Proposed Budget

9. **Question:** Is there funding available within the comprehensive Waterfront planning effort that could be used for the J&K Parking Lot and Bicycle Park (Unfunded Tier 2 and 3 departmental requests and Council budget referrals)?

Response: Council authorized \$1.01 million in 2019 for the Waterfront Specific Plan/BMASP. PRW has spent approximately \$735,000 of this amount and anticipates spending the remaining funding by the end of the project. Councilmember Taplin's budget referral for the \$800,000 for the bike park is for a portion of the design development and construction. PRW funded the conceptual design with Parks Tax this year. The project is estimated to cost \$2.0 million and the \$800,000, if funded, would serve as a match for several grant opportunities.

10. **Question:** What is projected revenue and would it cover the cost of the Tier 2 West Berkeley Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program?

Response: The \$1.046 million yearly cost reflects a 2019 estimate for 6 new parking enforcement officers (PEOs) and 1 Supervisor plus vehicles with ALPR and new signage. On the revenue side, that estimate projected that hiring six (6) more PEOs is expected to increase citation revenue in both new and existing RPP areas. Staff estimate that each new PEO would issue up to \$75,000/year in RPP citations, for a total of \$450,000/year. Compiling current and potential future RPP program costs and revenues was a significant effort, so Transportation Parking Services has not been able to update the estimate since then in light of other high priorities and limited staff capacity. \$75,000 a year in revenue however, will not cover the cost of a fully loaded PEO, plus a share of a supervisor, plus non-personnel costs, including vehicle maintenance and replacement contributions, ALPR software and hardware maintenance, and signage. Given its current and projected financial forecast, the On-Street Parking funding cannot afford to add these positions to its expenditure budget. Further, Public Works ability to implement any new RPP district is hampered by staffing with upcoming vacancies in Parking Services.

11. **Question:** Regarding traffic calming/safety budget referrals under \$40,000 - why can't these just be part of the Transportation baseline instead of referrals? Also, what is being funded in the Traffic Calming program with the \$50,000 increase in baseline? What's been done in the queue, what's pending, and how much more money is needed?

Response: Traffic Engineering estimates our annual Traffic Calming budget needs to be about \$125,000. We will come close to that level in FY 24 as a result of a Tier 1 allocation for an additional \$70,000 approved for year 2 of the biennial budget. At the \$125,000 funding level, Public Works should be able to handle a few referral-type projects per year with the existing budget. From the FY 23 baseline of \$50,000, about \$5,600 is left for traffic calming device implementation. Public Works estimates needing an additional \$80,000 beyond the current planned \$120,000 budget in FY24 to complete the list. Traffic Calming Queue List (based on ranking/order) follows:

A. Sixth Street – Installation of 2 speed feedback signs (case from 2018).
Approximate Cost: \$31,000.

Status: DC Electric will be installing these devices within the next 4 weeks. Traffic calming budget (FY23) has been placed aside for this implementation.
Location: Sixth St between Allston Way & Channing Way.

B. Hopkins St – Installation of 1 speed table (case from 2018).

Questions and Responses Generated from May 16, 2023 Budget and Finance Policy Committee and City Council Meeting on the FY 24 Proposed Budget

Approximate Cost: \$15,000.

Status: This project is currently on hold. The speed table has been included in the engineering plans. FY24 to be used when available.

Location: Hopkins St between Kains Ave & Curtis St.

C. Delaware Street – Installation of a raised crosswalk (case from 2017).

Approximate Cost: \$20,000.

Status: This project will be added to a CIP during the fall 2024 once the FY24 budget is available.

Location: Delaware St between West Street and Acton Street

D. Sacramento St – Installation of 2 speed feedback signs (case from 2019).

Approximate Cost: \$32,000

Status: This project will be implemented once the FY24 budget is available.

Location: Sacramento St between Rose St and Cedar St.

E. Bonar St – Installation of 2 speed tables (case from 2019).

Approximate Cost: \$20,000.

Status: This project has been added to Parker-Addison Mobility and Safety Improvements Project. No need to use traffic calming budget for this implementation. The Parker-Addison Mobility and Safety Improvements Project budget will cover the cost of these speed tables.

Location: Bonar St between Addison St and Allston Way.

F. Sixth St – Installation of 2 speed feedback signs (case from 2020).

Approximate Cost: \$32,000.

Status: This project will be implemented once the FY24 budget is available.

Location: Sixth St between Camelia St and Cedar St.

G. Arlington Ave – Installation of 2 speed feedback signs and implementation of signage/striping improvements along this corridor (case from 2021).

Approximate Cost: \$75,000.

Status: This project required a council referral due to the amount of work that is needed along this stretch.

Location: Arlington Ave between Mendocino and The Circle.

21	Pedestrian Safety Upgrades for Arlington Avenue	3/21/2023	\$	35,000	Allocation of \$35,000 for traffic control measures on Arlington Avenue from The Circle to Mendocino Avenue, to enhance pedestrian safety at hidden crosswalks and where paths cross mid-block, and refresh painted markings that narrow lanes and encourage reduced speeds.	Hahn and Taplin
22	Speed Feedback Signs for Arlington Avenue	3/21/2023	\$	40,000	Allocation of \$40,000 for two Speed Feedback Signs on Arlington Avenue between The Circle and Mendocino Avenue, to encourage slower speeds on a stretch with numerous hidden and mid-block crosswalks.	Hahn and Taplin

H. Colusa Ave – Potential Installation of 1 speed feedback sign (case from 2021).

Approximate Cost: \$20,000.

Status: This project will be implemented once the FY24 budget is available.

Location: Colusa Ave between Thousand Oaks and Vincente

12. **Question:** What is program and planning costs for Vision 2050?

Questions and Responses Generated from May 16, 2023 Budget and Finance Policy Committee and City Council Meeting on the FY 24 Proposed Budget

Response: Vision 2050 improvements to asset management planning are on hold pending filling vacancies and the CIP Manager position is no longer needed given Measure L did not pass.