0590-00123-0007

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stevelog

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 7 (C.F. 20-0600-S7) CITY ATTORNEY – HIRING FREEZE EXEMPTION

### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 7 proposes to exempt the Office of the City Attorney (City Attorney) from the hiring freeze policy, so long as the City Attorney maintains hiring within budgeted levels, as determined by the City Administrative Officer, and reports on a monthly basis to the Budget and Finance Committee on the status of salary expenditures.

The 2020-21 Budget reflects reduced salary funding for anticipated savings generated as a result of the hiring freeze policy. Accordingly, the 2020-21 Budget includes a reduction of \$5,675,861 in direct costs to the City Attorney's salary appropriation. While there are concerns about reduced staffing levels and impacted services due to the hiring freeze policy, the policy includes a process through which City departments, including the City Attorney, can request exemptions for critical positions on a case-by-case basis, as outlined in the Mayor's March 19, 2020 Belt-Tightening Measures letter.

In order to maintain the anticipated savings reflected in the 2020-21 Budget, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

### **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SJ:04200157

0590-00123-0008

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal A fleveller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

## Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 8 (C.F. 20-0600-S8) CITY ATTORNEY – FLEXIBILITY TO MANAGE HIRING

### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 8 proposes to provide the Office of the City Attorney (City Attorney) with the flexibility to manage hiring within salary funding limits.

In accordance with the Mayor's March 19, 2020 Belt-Tightening Measures letter, City departments are subject to a hiring and promotional freeze policy. The policy includes a process through which departments may request exemptions on a case-by-case basis.

The 2020-21 Budget includes a reduction of \$5,675,861 to the City Attorney's salary appropriation to reflect anticipated savings that maintaining vacancies consistent with the hiring freeze policy will generate.

In order to maintain the anticipated savings reflected in the 2020-21 Budget, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SJ:04200158

0590-00123-0009

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Sleveller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 9 (C.F. 20-0600-S9) – CONTROLLER – HIRING FREEZE EXEMPTION

### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 9 instructs this Office to report on an exemption from the Hiring Freeze Policy for the Office of the Controller (Controller) to fill critical vacant positions that support the Human Resources and Payroll (HRP) project, payroll operations, and the Fraud, Waste, and Abuse unit.

Pursuant to the Mayor's Belt-Tightening Measures letter issued on March 19, 2020, the Mayor will consider exemptions from the hiring freeze policy for positions that 1) are essential to public health and safety, 2) generate revenue, 3) are legally mandated, and 4) where job offers were made on or prior to March 19<sup>th</sup>. If any vacant position meets these criteria, the Controller is encouraged to submit a request for exemption through the existing managed hiring process.

## **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:WKP:01200048

0590-00123-0010

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

forRichard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer From:

## Subject: GENERAL SERVICES - FEASIBILITY OF SELLING OR LEASING LARGE CITY PROPERTIES (BUDGET MOTION 10 - C.F. 20-0550-S10)

## RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council:

- Instruct the Office of the City Administrative Officer, in collaboration with the General Services Department, to meet with all Council Offices within the next 90 days to discuss any newly identified surplus or underutilized City-owned property within each district and explore the feasibility of long-term leases or sale of these properties; and,
- 2. Request the Los Angeles World Airports and the Department of Water and Power to report on the feasibility of long-term leases or the sale of the six City-owned properties that make up the Palmdale Land Holdings.

### SUMMARY

Budget Motion Number 10 requests that the Department of General Services (GSD), with the assistance of the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO), report on the feasibility of long-term leasing or selling large City properties, including the Palmdale Land Holdings. The City already leases and sells its surplus properties that are no longer required for municipal use. This report provides a response on the specific Palmdale Land Holdings and separately addresses the City's on-going efforts to maximize use of its real estate assets. For the purposes of this report, the word "large" is defined as "at least one acre in size."

### Palmdale Land Holdings

In response to the motion, GSD identified six City-owned properties that make up the Palmdale Land Holdings. Five of the sites are owned by Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) and one is owned by the Department of Water and Power (DWP). As these properties are under the purview of the proprietary departments, GSD does not have the authority to sell or lease these properties. LAWA and DWP should be requested to report on the feasibility of long-term leases or the sale of these sites.

## Asset Evaluation Framework and Disposition of Real Estate Assets

In May 2016, the Council and Mayor approved the Asset Evaluation Framework (C.F. 12-1549-S3) that covers all City real estate assets of all sizes owned by the City of Los Angeles in Councilcontrolled departments. This framework sets forth a property review, evaluation, and approval process that requires a Council Motion and involvement from the Council District specifically authorizing pertinent departments to work toward the goal of maximizing and/or capitalizing on the designated economic, housing, municipal, or non-government use of the property.

The framework designates the Municipal Facilities Committee (MFC) as the oversight body and provides guidelines for processing acquisitions, authority to auction, direct sales, leasing for municipal use, or leasing to non-City end users. The MFC actively exercises its oversight of these real estate requests that are not under the specific purview of another designated oversight body. Since spring 2016, this Office has focused largely on economic development and redevelopment projects but also on identifying, assessing, and preparing eligible City owned sites for a variety of housing uses. Through this work, we thoroughly vetted all existing surplus properties. The deals that have resulted into housing developments have been based on a long-ground lease from the City.

The City Council approved a report recommending disposition of certain City properties identified as surplus or no longer needed for City services as of August 2018 in February 2019 (C.F. 18-0856, attached). This Office is working with GSD to implement the recommendations in that report and has provided funding through the CAO 5<sup>th</sup> Construction Projects Report to begin disposition of the agreed upon work plan.

### Large Lot Disposition

In direct response to Motion 10, this Office recommends that the City Council instruct the CAO, in coordination with GSD, to re-visit the surplus list, work with GSD to review the City's database of properties, identify lots that meet the minimum criteria in each of the Council Districts, and meet with Council Members within 90 days of the release of this memo. We will review any existing and newly identified surplus or underutilized City-owned property within each district and explore the feasibility of long-term leases of sale of these properties. Any properties so identified will follow the steps in the Asset Evaluation Framework.

## **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:YC/JVW/BLM 15200167

Attachment

TRA	NSMITTAL	
To: Council	DATE 09-06-18	COUNCIL FILE NO. 16-060Q-S145
From: Municipal Facilities Committee		COUNCIL DISTRICT

At its meeting of August 30, 2018, the Municipal Facilities Committee approved recommendations in the attached City Administrative Officer (CAO) report and instructed staff to transmit to Council for consideration.

Council approval of the report recommendations would direct the CAO to collaborate with the Department of General Services (GSD) to reduce the number of properties marked "surplus" in the City's database by moving control of certain property to other departments, and leasing or selling properties that are in use for a non-City purpose. The report also recommends that the CAO and GSD evaluate the Own a Piece of Los Angeles program to determine if the program needs to be amended or renewed in order to facilitate the sale of surplus properties. The report also recommends that the CAO and GSD weigh the costs and benefits of preparing single family sites for disposition and initiate discussion to transfer City-owned land to adjacent state or federal agencies. The CAO will also work with GSD to assess the resources necessary to implement these recommendations.

<u>Fiscal Impact Statement:</u> Approval of the recommendations in this report will have no immediate impact on the General Fund. There may be unknown future costs for City staff to conduct the work and unknown future revenues from property sales.

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr. City Administrative Officer Chair, Municipal Facilities Committee

RHL:JVW/blm15190026

Attachment

## OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Date:	August 27, 2018	CAO File No. Council File No.	0220-048 <b>30-0000</b> 16-0600-S145
То:	Municipal Facilities Committee	Council District:	All
From:	Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer		
Subject:	REVIEW OF CITY-OWNED SURPLUS PROPERTY		

## SUMMARY

As part of the City of Los Angeles' Comprehensive Homeless Strategy (CHS), approved in February 2016, the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) was tasked with implementation of Strategy 7D, "Using Public Land for Affordable and Homeless Housing." This report focuses on CAO's Asset Management Group (AMG) assessment of the 428 City-owned properties identified as "surplus" by the City's Department General Services (GSD) Real Estate Services Division (RES).

At the outset of the review, the CAO hoped to identify numerous properties available for housing development from the list of 428 properties. Unfortunately, the initial review has produced only three parcels that are either in the development process or being evaluated for affordable housing and one parcel that will be a Navigation Center for homeless services. As a result, the CAO's AMG initiated the evaluation of approximately 300 additional properties, including property owned by other public agencies, privately-owned sites and City-owned parking lots. The CAO will report at a future date on the non-surplus properties it has reviewed.

The 428 properties initially designated as surplus have been assigned to the following three categories:

	Property Category	
1)	Potential or pending use as permanent housing or navigation center	4
2)	Parcels that should be removed from the surplus property list	152
3)	Parcels that should be further reviewed by GSD (and other departments as necessary) for potential sale or transfer	272
	Total	428

There are 152 properties that are not surplus and should be removed from the surplus property list, including parcels that are part of the proposed Adopt-a-Lot program and which will be managed by GSD, parcels that are in use for a City purpose but should be managed by a department other than GSD, parcels that are in active use for a non-City purpose and should be leased or sold to the user, parcels where a disposition strategy has already been determined, and parcels that are not City-owned.

There are 272 properties that are surplus and should be further reviewed by GSD and other departments for potential sale or transfer, including parcels that are eligible for the Own a Piece of Los Angeles (OPLA) program, parcels that are ineligible for OPLA and which are not easily developable, parcels that are potential single family sites, and parcels bordering state or federal land. None of these properties meet the criteria for affordable multifamily housing, interim housing, or homeless facilities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Direct the City Administrative Officer's Asset Management Group to collaborate with the Department of General Services to do the following:
  - a. Evaluate the feasibility of transferring the 87 properties identified in Attachment A to the appropriate City department;
  - b. Confirm that 29 properties identified in Attachment B are in active use for a non-City purpose, and propose a lease or sale strategy for each of those properties;
  - c. Confirm that the eight (8) properties identified in Attachment C are not City-owned and should be removed from the City's database;
  - d. Evaluate the OPLA program to determine if amendments to OPLA or a new program is needed to facilitate the sale of surplus properties, including the 150 properties identified in Attachment D and the 47 properties identified in Attachment E that are not developable, and report back on necessary changes to OPLA or the need for a new program;
  - e. Work with the Bureau of Engineering and the City Attorney's office to determine the costs and benefits of preparing the 60 single family sites identified in Attachment F for disposition;
  - f. Initiate discussions with state or federal agencies that are adjacent to the 15 Cityowned sites identified in Attachment G regarding the feasibility of transferring the property for an appraised value or in a swap for other land; and
  - g. Confirm that the six (6) properties in Attachment H should be maintained by the City and managed by GSD as part of the proposed Adopt-A-Lot program.
- 2. Direct the City Administrative Officer to work with Department of General Services to assess and determine the resources necessary to effectuate recommendations a-g above.
- 3. Direct the City Administrative Officer to:
  - a. Continue to provide periodic updates and disposition recommendations on properties to the Municipal Facilities Committee; and

b. Work with the Department of General Services and the Housing and Community Investment Department to use any feasible sites identified by recommendation e above as affordable homeownership opportunity sites.

## BACKGROUND

In February 2016, the Comprehensive Homeless Strategy (CHS) was adopted by the City in response to the homelessness crisis in Los Angeles. As part of the CHS' Strategy 7D, "Using Public Land for Affordable and Homeless Housing," the CAO followed the Council approved Asset Evaluation Framework (C.F. 12-1549-\$3) and the Property Evaluation Process (C.F. 16-0600-\$145), to conduct initial reviews of the City-owned surplus properties for possible use as housing or homeless facilities. Recently, the CAO also began reviewing properties for interim housing sites under the A Bridge Home Program, approved in the FY 2018-19 Budget.

The CAO's AMG reviews potential properties using the following standards:

- Properties over 15,000 square feet in size are evaluated for permanent housing;
- Properties over 20,000 square feet are evaluated for interim "bridge" housing sites; and
- Additional properties under 15,000 square feet are also evaluated for permanent housing, if they are zoned for development as multifamily housing.

Once properties are sorted by size, they are evaluated on the following criteria:

- Properties that are accessible and buildable; and
- Properties that are located in an appropriate area for the proposed use.

This review and evaluation is facilitated by reviewing property information and making site visits. Once the initial review is complete, CAO staff meets with each Council office to review potential properties in the district. Council offices then issue a motion directing staff to further evaluate the property as a potential housing location. Once the motion has been issued, CAO staff begin the due diligence phase of the Property Evaluation Process, which includes requesting a Planning Analysis from the Department of City Planning, a Title Report and review from GSD, and a questionnaire from the Department of Transportation (LADOT), if applicable.

If a property is then deemed feasible for affordable housing and approved by the Municipal Facilities Committee, the CAO's AMG works with the Public Land Development Group of the Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) to further refine the proposed project. HCIDLA issues a Request for Proposals to select a developer for the site and enters into an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) with the selected developer, which is followed by a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) if the developer meets the requirements outlined in the ENA. For interim housing, the Bureau of Engineering conducts the feasibility assessment for the sites.

The CAO's AMG has now completed the initial review of the 428 City-owned Surplus properties and has placed the properties into three categories:

Of the 428 properties, there are a total of four sites that are proposed or are pending review for affordable housing or other homeless use, (Attachment I) as follows:

Under evaluation for Permanent Affordable Housing	1
Approved for Permanent Affordable Housing	2
Approved as a Navigation Center	1
Total	4

CAO's AMG staff are working with HCIDLA and the Council office to determine the project parameters for the sites that are under evaluation for permanent affordable housing. Of the two sites that have been approved for permanent affordable housing, one has a signed DDA and will be under construction next year, and the other has a signed ENA and is in the process of acquiring entitlements. Together they will provide over 200 units of new affordable housing in the City.

The Navigation Center is in the design phase. When completed, it will provide on-site hygiene facilities including showers and laundry, storage, case management and training classrooms for the homeless.

Each of the 428 properties was also evaluated for use as interim housing, safe parking and storage. None were identified that were suitable for those purposes.

## 2) Properties that should be removed from the surplus property list

There are a total of 152 properties that are recommended for removal from the surplus property list, as follows:

Should be maintained and managed by GSD	6
Should be retained as City property but should be managed by another City department, not GSD	87
In active use for a non-City purpose and should be leased or sold to the user	29
A disposition strategy has already been determined	22
Properties that are not City-owmed or where there was not enough information provided for evaluation	8
Total	1522

The six (6) properties that are being recommended to be maintained and managed by GSD are

all part of the proposed Adopt-a-Lot program.

The 87 properties that are recommended to be retained as City property and managed by another department include parcels that are in active use as streets, parking lots, or parks; parcels that are scheduled to be dedicated and maintained as a sewer easement; and parcels that are adjacent to other City-owned uses and could be incorporated into the existing property.

The 29 properties that are in active use for a non-City purpose include parcels that are being used by adjacent businesses; parcels being used by County agencies including Flood Control and Metro; parcels that are in use as community gardens or by nonprofits; occupied single family homes; and parcels that are in use by adjacent property owners as driveways.

The 22 properties where a disposition strategy has already been determined include parcels that are in the process of being leased to a nonprofit; parcels that will be repurposed for use by the City; and parcels that are controlled by HCIDLA and are in development as affordable housing (Attachment J).

There are three (3) properties on the surplus property list that upon further investigation were determined to not belong to the City. There are another five (5) properties on the list that were unable to be identified by the information provided. The CAO will work with GSD to confirm that these properties should be removed from the list.

# 3) Properties that should be further reviewed by GSD (and other departments as necessary) for potential sale or transfer

Review for the Own a Piece of Los Angeles (OPLA)) program	150
Ineligible for OPLA and which are not easily developable	47
Potential single family sites	60
Bordering state or federal land	15
Total	272

The Own a Piece of Los Angeles (OPLA) program was established by City ordinance in July 2009. It allows for the City to sell remnant parcels under 5,000 square feet to the owners of an adjoining property. There have been 225 City-owned parcels identified as OPLA parcels and approved by the Council to sell. The CAO will work with GSD to evaluate the OPLA program to determine if it requires changes to facilitate the sale of an additional 150 parcels on the surplus property list.

In addition, the CAO's AMG identified 47 properties that are too large for the OPLA program, but that are difficult to develop. The CAO will work with GSD to evaluate these parcels and determine whether these sites should be retained by the City, or recommend a process to sell these parcels

through OPLA or a new program.

The CAO's AMG also identified 60 vacant properties that are accessible by paved roads and are zoned for single family homes. Many of these parcels were acquired through inverse condemnation, and may require geotechnical investigation to determine whether the properties can be stabilized for development. Many of these parcels are in areas with high property values. The City would benefit financially if the properties were added to the property tax rolls and if the City was no longer responsible for maintenance. This report recommends that GSD work with the CAO, the Bureau of Engineering and the City Attorney's office to determine the costs and benefits of preparing these sites for sale, and for the CAO to work with HCIDLA to use sites zoned for single family homes as affordable homeownership opportunity sites, if feasible.

There are 15 City-owned properties that border state or federal land. The CAO will work with GSD to initiate negotiations with state or federal agencies that are adjacent to City-owned parcels regarding the transfer of the property for an appraised value or in a swap for other land, and return to Council for approval of the deal terms.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no immediate impact to the General Fund from approval of the recommendations in this report. There may be an impact to the General Fund for City staff costs to conduct the work required to prepare for the sale of properties, but those are unknown at this time. There may also be revenue from the sale or lease of properties. Any additional fiscal impact will be reported to the Council as soon as they have been determined.

Attachments

RHL:YC/blm:15190012

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Fit	Zoning
1	1000 E Stadium Wy	90012	5415018901	219,567	PF-1XL
1	427 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303009904	15,600	QOS-1XLD
1	435 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303009902	15,201	[Q]QS-1XLD
1	443 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303009900	20,504	
1	455 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303009903	15,254	
1	467 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303009901	11,565	
1	475 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008918	5,967	
1	479 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008906	4,839	OS-1XL
1	483 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008905	<u>4,839</u> 5,301	
		90031	5303008919	14,663	
<u> </u>	487 E Montecito Dr	_			
1	495 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008921	9,459	
	499 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008916	8,980	
1	499 N San Fernando Rd	90031	5415003906	13,623	RE15-1-H
	507 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008915	9,392	
1	511 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008908	8,812	
1	519 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008907	5,737	
1	523 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008917	6,634	
1	527 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008909	5,599	[Q]OS-DXLD
1	531 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008903	24,206	OS-1XL
1	5350 N Lodge Ave	90031	5302007901	45,000	[Q]OS-IXILD
	551 E Montecito Dr,				
1	557 E Montecito Dr,	90031	5303008910	32,790	[Q]OS-11XILD
	559 E Montecito Dr				
1	563 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008920	8,266	[Q]OS-IXILD
1	\$71 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008911	4,800	[Q]OS-1XILD
1	575 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008900	4,800	OS-1XL
1	579 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008912	4,800	[Q]OS-IXILD
1	583 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008904	4,800	[Q]OS-1XILD
1	587 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303008913	4,800	[Q]OS-IXILD
1	601 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013902	15,921	[Q]OS-1XXLD
1	607 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013900	15,651	QOS-IXILD
1	619 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013905	4,800	OS-1XL
1	623 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013901	15,794	[Q]OS-1XILD
1	627 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013904	16,124	[Q]OS-1XXLD
1	631 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013903	16,102	[Q]OS-11XILD
1	643 E Montecito Dr	90031	5303013906	16,163	[Q]OS-1XLD
1	Ave 49/Figueroa St	90031	5467011901	30,237	OS-1XL-HPOZ
1	Avenue 19/Figueroa St	90031	5415003910	9,736	GW (CA)
1	Lacy Stt/Artesian	90031	5205003901	87,622	OS-1XL
1	Montecito Dr/Bernice Ave	90031	5303008914	2,361	[Q]OS-11X1LD, [Q]F 11D
1	Ave 49/Oak Terrace Dr	90042	5467012900	2,743	R3-1-HPOZ
1	Ave 49/Oak Terrace Dr	90042	5467012901	27,871	R3-1-HPOZ

.

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
1	Avenue 52/Terrace 52	90042	5468009901	42,507	OS-1XL, TOC Tier
1	3626 N Primavera Ave	90065	5464004900	15,750	R1-1
1	Avenue 19 /Figueroa St	90065	5415003909	1,413	GW(CA)
2	Kesswick St./Wheatland Ave	91352	2466029900	19,455	M1-1
2	12484 W Viewcrest Rd	91604	2376009900	2,890	RE15-1-H
2	Viewcrest Rd/Laurel Terrace Dr	91604	2376009901	30,377	RE40-1-H
2	7960 Bellaire Ave/ Sun Valley	91605	2305011902	6,063	R1-1
3	6353 N LINDLEY AVE	91335	2124018905	66,752	OS-1XL-RIO
3	19941 W HAYNES ST	91367	2134041900	4,983	R1-11-R110
4	1905 N HIGHLAND AVE	90068	5549018900	10,267	R1
4	3008 N LAKERIDGE DR	90068	5577020900	12,231	RE15-1-H
4	6941 W CAMROSE DR	90068	5549024900	1,442	R2-1XL
4	6945 W CAMROSE DR	90068	5549024901	7,700	R2-1XL
5	16465 W MULHOLLAND DR	90049	2293010902	9,045	RE15-1-H
5	2657 S OVERLAND AVE	90064	4255020900	30,477	R1-1
5	EXPOSITION BLVD/SELBY AVE	90064	4255019900	28,671	R1-1
5	EXPOSITION BLVD/SELBY AVE	90064	4255019901	10,189	R1-1
5	EXPOSITION BLWD/WESTWOOD BLVD	90064	4255021900	23,117	R1-1
5	DWP STONE CANYON RESEVOIR	90068	4379027900	7,011,931	[Q]OS-1XL
5	2353 N BASIL LN	90077	4380032900	41,494	RE40-1-HICR
5	2502 N BEVERLY GLEN BLVD	90077	4382029900	612,484	OS-1XL-HCR
5	BUSHROD LIN/MAINASQUAN LN	90077	4379003905	2,527	R1-1
5	LATIMER LIN/LOUVAN LN	90077	4379004912	2,499	RE40-1-H-HKCR
5	LATIMER LN/MAINASQUAN LN	90077	4379004907	2,500	R1-1
6	7960 N VENTURA CANYON AVE	91402	2301011901	30,532	RS-1
7	11380 N ALETHEA DR 0	91040	2\$51013900	58,729	RE40-1
7	11390 N ALETHEA DR 0	91040	2551015900	48,467	RE40-1
7	11460 N BIG TUJUNGA CANYON RD	91040	2551012901	3,561,191	OS-1XL
7	ALETHEA DR/RIM CANYON RD	91040	2551013901	27,555	RE40-1
7	ALETHEA DR/RIM CANYON RD	91040	2551015901	68,988	RE40-1

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	ALETHEA DR/RIM CANYON RD	91040	2551015902	66,373	RE40=1
7	BIG TUJUNGA CANYON RD/GLEASON AVE		2552007907	43,970	05-1XL
10	2500 S West Blvd	90016	5050006918	4,799	O§=1XL
10	2508 S West Blvd	90016	5050006915	4,800	OS-1XL
10	3612 11th Ave	90018	5044010901	34,800	€M=1\$₽
11	6621 W Manchester Blvd.	90045	4221029900	19,508	R1V2
11	8098 S FALMOUTH AVE	90094	4115021900	46,677	R1-1
11	139 E HURRICANE ST	90290	4225008904	7,847	RW2=1
11	1600 Irving Tabor Ct	90291	4241036906, 4241036907	15,340	M1=1=0
14	23rd St / Washington Blvd	90012	5168014904	79,863	M3-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1
14	4462 E Huntington Dr South	90032	5213024900	6,413	[Q]R1-1D
14	2231 W Fair Park Ave, 2239 W Fair Park Ave	90041	5686021900, 5686021901	38,386	PF=1
14	Harriett St/24th St		5168022901	12,660	M3-1-1-1R10
14	Hanriett 5t/25th St		5168022900	40,631	M3-11-7R10
15	10620 S GRAHAM AVE	90002	6065034908	3,131	OS-1XL
15	1525 E 103rd St	90002	6048012931	22,564	₽ <b>F</b> =1
15	438 North Mesa Street	90731	7449009900	8,991	R2-1XL

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Stq.F4	Zening
1	33517 N Persadiena Ave	90031	5205004900	23,113	ا=1XL
1	3031 E Alhambra Ave	90031	5210024900	2,212	M7-7VL
1	441 W Ave 26	90031	5205001901	96,393	05-1XL
1	Avenue19/Figueroa St	90031	5447001901	13,243	OS=1XL
1	Lacy St/Artesian	90031	5205003900	100,313	OS=1XL
1	2210 N San Fermando Rd 2200 N San Fermando Rd 2214 N San Fermando Rd 2130 N San Fermando Rd	90065	5457001902	24,228	QJM1-1-5DO-RK
2	11220 Ventura Blvd	91604	2378009900	26,384	62-1VIL-1810
4	6614 W Fountain Ave	90028	5532001900	5,495	R3-1XL
4	6910 W FOUNTAIN AVE	90028	\$532008904	4,057	R3=1XL
4	8459 W CRESCENT DR	90046	5563011900	3,885	R1-1
4	8513 Nash Drive	90046	5567015901	3,062	R1-1
4	1901 N Hillcrest Rd	90068	5549019900	14,024	R2-1XL
4	2901 N PASSMORE DR	90068	2427009901	14,895	RE15-1-H
5	1917 N SIPRUCEWOOD LN	90077	4380022900	2,709	RE40-1
7	8411 W Hillrose Street	91040	2555004900	577	R1-11RRFA
7	11020 W OSBORNE ST	91342	2529025900	18,153	RA-1-K
8	5510 S Manhattan Pl	90062	5005031900	5,958	R2-1
10	Irolo/ San Marino	90006	5078001916	5,734	RR4-1, TOC Tier
10	3251 S La Cienega Blvd	90016	4205035900	12,360	MR1-11/L-CP16
11	17853 PORTO MARINA WAV	90272	4416015904	3,690	<b>₹</b> 1-1
11	17909 PORTO MARINA WAY	90272	4416015905	8,887	RI-1
11	818 W WASHINGTON BLVD	90292	4229017900	5,000	C2-11
11	8127 DELGANY AVE	90293	4115007902	5,218	RL-1
11	8152 Zitola Terrace	90293	4115007903	6,963	R1-11
11	8156 ZITOLA TERR	90293	4115007900	6,816	RI-11
11	8163 ZITOLA TERR	90293	4115006900	6,7777	RI-11
11	8271 Rees St	90293	4115009900	7,554	<b>R</b> 1-11
15	2254 E 103RD ST	90002	6066015900	5,246	RD2-11
15	1102 E 108TH ST	90059	6071018900	3,951	MII-11.

### Atttalchment C:

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
5	16654 W CALNEVA DR	91436	APNTBD4, 2287009019	25,258	RE15-1-H
8	Across from 1905 Rodeo Road.	90018	5042010905	6,500	R2=1
10	2436 5 BUCKINGHAM RD		5050008907		
10	WEST BLWD/ADAMS BLVD		5050006902	4,800	R2=1
11	15206 Earlham St	90272	4412027902	10,340	R1-1
15	12243 Blakley Avenue		6148021270		
15	13th Street / Beacon Street & Palos Verdes Street		7456012900		
15	930 E 111th Place		6071021908	434,409	

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft	Zoning
1	949 S Canondelet St	90006	5136001900	3,137	R4=1
1	1816 Hancock St	90031	5210025910	2,249	OS-1XL
1	820 E Montecito Dr	90031	5304002902	4,005	QR1-1D
1	Montecito Dr/Sinova St	90031	5304014900	901	[Q]R1=1D
1	Von Keithian Ave/El Reno St	90031	5207026900	1,142	QIRE20-10
1	Ave 54/Glen Ellen Pl Alley	90042	5468013900	559	RD2=1
1	1049 W Andalusia Ave	90065	5454018900	4,800	RA-1-K
1	1931 N Isabel St	90065	5455007900	500	R1-1
1	2800 E Firederick St	90065	5455009901	882	R1-1
1	2800 E Macon St	90065	5455008903	2,773	R2-1-6D0
1	2801 E Firederick St	90065	5455008902	2,575	R1-1-6600
1	2801 E Future St	90065	5455009900	880	R1-12500
1	3633 E Maceo St	90065	5454020900	4,761	RE20=1
1	3640 East Riverview Avenue	90065	5454020901	4,789	RE20=1
1	3655 E River View St	90065	5454020904	4,766	RE20-1
1	3676 E Loosmore St	90065	5454021900	3,291	RE20-1
1	513 W River St	90065	5446009904	249	UC(CA)-CDO
1	River St/Figueroa St Alley	90065	5446009901	249	RD2-1-600-R10
1	River St/Figueroa 5t Alley	90065	5446009902	250	RD2-1-CDO-RIC
1	River St/Figueroa St Alley	90065	5446009903	249	RD2-1-CDO-RIC
1	Roseview/Loosemore Alley	90065	5453003905	1,057	RD3-1-CDO-RIC
4	1770 N SEAVIEW TR	90046	5551032901	4,788	R1-1
4	2008 N BEECH KNOLL RD	90046	5567021901	2,279	R1-1
4	7452 W MULHOLLAND DR	90046	5570007900	4,443	R1-1
4	8242 W GOULD AWE	90046	5556003900	4,324	R1-1
4	8284 W GOULD AWE	90046	5556003901	4,602	R1-1
4	8415 W YUCCA TR	90046	5556018900	3,093	R1-1
4	8430 W Yucca Tr	90046	5556020900	3,470	R1-1
4	8889 W CRESCENT DR	90046	5563005901	4,248	R1-1
4	LOOKOUT MOUNITAINI AVE/WONDERLAND AVE	90046	5562001902	3,921	R1-1
4	2766 N PITCHER DR	90068	5585003900	3,591	R1-1
4	6939 W VALLEYTON TR	90068	2429022900	2,164	R1-1
5	10201 W LELIA LIN	90077	4371039903	2,627	RE40-1-HOR
5	1029 NHOLLLYBUSHI LIN	900777	4371024902	2,737	RE40-2-HHHOR
5	10328 W CARIBOW LIN	90077	4371046900	2,519	RE40-1-HUR
5	1037 N HOLLLYBUSH LIN	90077	4371024903	2,874	RE40-1-HI-HOR
5	10535 W/ FORUM! LIN	900777	4371001900	3,316	RE40-12HUR
5	10587 WW SCENARIO LIN	900777	4380009900	2,545	RE15-1-HOR
5	12077 N BEVERLLY GLEN BLVD	900777	4371016900	3,079	RE15-12HORR
5	1215 N ARIMO LN	900777	4371028901	2,670	RE40-1-HOR
5	1243 NI BASILL LIN	900777	437/103/1902	2,551	RE15-1-HORR

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
5	1307 N BASIL LN	90077	4371031903	2,552	RE15-1-HCR
5	1313 N BASIL LN	90077	4371031904	2,735	RE40-1-HCR
5	1319 N BASIL LN	90077	4371032900	2,552	RE40-1-HCR
5	1401 N ARIMO LN	90077	4371030900	2,541	RE15-1-HCR
5	1446 N LANGTRY LN	90077	4371033903	10,887	RE40-1-HCR
5	1529 N LANGTRY LN	90077	4371037900	2,678	RE15-1-HCR
5	1559 N DESSERYLN	90077	4371035903	2,554	RE40-1-H-HCR
5	16111N DESSERYLN	90077	4371035902	2,552	RE15-1-HCR
5	1628 N MIRABEL LN	90077	4371035901	2,564	R1-1
5	1707 N CRATER LN	90077	4371038901	2,541	RE40-1-HCR
5	17211N CRATER LN	90077	4371038902	2,621	RE40-1-1415R
5	1722 N CALGARY LN	90077	4371041906	2,535	R1-1
5	1729 N ELM TREE LN	90077	4371039900	2,714	RE40-1-HCR
5	1734 N CALGARY LN	90077	4371041905	2,532	A2-1&K
5	1737 N ELM TREE LN	90077	4371039902	2,922	RE15=1-HI-HICR
5	1753 N Wild Rose Lane	90077	4371041900	2,501	RE40-1-14CR
5	1814 N ELM TREE LN	90077	4371041901	2,559	R1-1
5	1910 N DELLWOOD LN	90077	4380019900	2,668	RE15-1-HCR
5	2038 N DELLWOOD LN	90077	4380016900	2,802	RE15-1-H-HCR
5	2247 N ELK LN	90077	4380006900	2,690	RE40-1-HCR
5	2312 N DELLWOOD LN	90077	4380003900	2,642	RE15-1-#CR
5	2647 N BASIL LANE	90077	4379004915	2,498	RE40-1-1+1+1+1CR
5	919 N HOLLLYBUSH LN	90077	4371023900	2,415	RE40-1-HI-HICR
5	969 N HOLLYBUSH LN	90077	4371024900	3,080	RE40-1-++++++tCR
5	ARIMO/BBVEERLY GLEN	90077	4371032903	2,379	RE15-1-HCR
5	ARIMO / BEEVERILY GLEN BLVD	90077	4371032907	2,757	RE15-1-HOR
5	Beverly Glen / Fernbrush	90077	4371031905	2,571	RE15-1-HOR
5	BUSHROD LN/DEXORE LN	90077	4379020902	2,588	RE40-1-HHHOR
5	Hollybush Lane	90077	4371025902	2,629	RE40-1-HIHUCR
5	LATIMER LN/LOUVAN LN	90077	4379004914	2,935	RE40-11-HOR
5	LATIMEER LN/IWANNASSQUANNI LINI	900777	4379004910	2,496	RE40-1-HIHUR
5	LATIMEER LN/MANAGQUANNI UNI	900777	4379006902	2,490	RE40-1-HOR
5	POINTER LIN/BOOMPASS LINI	900777	4379015907	2,660	RE40-1-HHHOR
55	BUSHROD LN/BONPASLIN		4379015903	2,585	ALL-HORR
5	BUSHROD LN/DEXORE LIN		4379020903	2,588	ALI-HORR
5	ELMI TIREEE LINI/CCALLOGARRY LINI		4371041908	2,543	RE40-12HIGR
5	RIDGETOP LN/POINTER LN		4379013903	2,487	RE40-1-HOR
77	13131 MACLAYST	91342	2513028908	2,125	OS-1XL
7/	15501 W/ CHATSWORTH ST	91345	2649001900	2,898	RS-1WL

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561013901	1,278	O§=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561013902	3,230	OS-1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561016901	2,211	O\$=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561019907	2,374	OS-1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561019913	61	OS=1XL=K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561020900	2,851	O§=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561021900	2,705	O\$=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561022900	2,192	O\$=1XL
7	la tuna canyon Rd/Willdwood fire RD	91352	2561022901	4,108	OS=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561022902	2,735	OS=1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023903	1,249	ÓŚ=1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023904	1,250	OS-1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYONI RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023905	2,300	OS-1XL
7/	LA TUNA CANYONI RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023909	2,411	OS-1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023910	1,249	0\$-1XL-1K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILLDWWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561024905	2,003	<b>05-1</b> XL-K
7/	LA TUNA CANYONI RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561024920	1,508	0\$-1XU-K
7/	LA TUNA CANYONI RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561024921	2,099	05-1X11-1K
7/	la Tuina Canyoni Rd/W/ILLDW/0000 Fire RD	91352	2561025900	2,072	<b>05-11XL</b>
77	LA TUINA CANYON RD/WILLDWOOD FIRE RD	911352	2561026900	1,249	<b>05-1</b> XL
7/	la tuna canyoni RD/W/IID/W/00D FIRE RD	911352	2561028902	1,252	05-11X11-1K
77	la tunna canyonn RD/WILLDWCOOD FIRE RD	9113552	2561028919	2,499	05-11X[L+K

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561029901	1,851	ا−1XL=K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561029906	1,979	OS-1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561029907	2,788	OS=1XL=K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561029910	4,022	OS=1XL=K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401004900	4,921	OS-1XL-K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD	91352	2401004901	1,563	RE11=1
7	SIMMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD	91352	2401005901	3,323	O\$-1XL
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD	91352	2401022900	1,195	A2=1&K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401022903	2,260	OS-1XL-K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401025901	1,873	OS=1XL-K
7	6238 West Deerwood Trail	91402	2569014900	1,856	RE40-1
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003909	1,535	0\$=1XL
7	8742 LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003900	1,842	OS=1XL-K
7	SMMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401001900	883	RE20-1
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003901	2,001	OS-1XL
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003904	2,899	OS-1XL
7/	SMMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003905	3,983	OS-1XL
7	SMMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003907	3,153	OS-1XL
77	SMIMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401003908	1,586	OS-1XL
7/	SMMIC LA TUNA CANYONI RD		2401022902	1,758	A2-11
7/	SMMIC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401025900	1,958	A2-1&K
77	SMIMIC LA TUINIA CANYONI RID		2401025902	1,874	A2-1
7/	SMIMIC LA TIUNA CANYON RD		2401025908	1,893	A2-1&K
77	SMINIC LA TUNIA CANYONI RD		2401025904	2,616	ଭଞ

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401025905	2,276	A2-1&K
7	SIMIMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401025906	2,011	A2-1&K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401025907	1,874	A2-1&K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401026900	1,464	OS-1XL-K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401026901	1,852	A2-1&K
7	SIMIMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401026902	1,875	A2-1&K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401026903	222	[Q]/CIM-1
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401027900	2,065	A2-1
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401027901	1,601	A2-1&K
7	SIMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		2401027903	2,739	A2-1&K
11	40 E JIB ST	9029221	4225011901	2,783	A2-1&K
13	1463 Angelus Avenue	90026	5424010901	4,982	R1-1VL
13	1467 N Angelus Ave	90026	5424010900	4,982	R1-1VL
13	TEMPLE ST/HOOVER ST	90026	5501003900	1,572	C2-1
13	Temple St/Hoover St/Silverlake	90026	5501004900	4,832	C2-1
13	Lake View Ave/India St	90039	5438008900	3,091	R2-1VL
13	SUNNYNOOK DR/LEGION LN	90039	5435034900	2,040	R1-1
14	4530 E Dudley Dr, 4519 E Cæto St	90032	5214009900	4,739	[Q]R1-1D
14	4540 E Dudley Dr	90032	5213024901	1,609	[Q]R1-1D
14	1653 W Sillver Oak Tr	90041	5689031905	3,791	R1-1
14	558 E Terrill Ave	90042	5301016900	1,172	[Q]R1-1D
1\$	110TH St/Compton Ave	90059	6070008901	1,328	PF-1
15	1004 Eæst E St	90744	7424017903	2,228	M2-1VL-0
15	1305 E Sæmdison St	90744	7426008900	3,748	QJMR2-1VL

Attatchment	E:

## Develop Program to Sell Properties not Developable nor Eligible for OPLA

47 Properties

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq.FL	Zoning
1	Hill Str/Ord	90012	5408016900	18,868	C2-2
1	1811 N Eæstlake Ave	90031	5210025905	13,167	OS-1XL
1	3124 N Main St	90031	5210025906	7,975	RE11-1
1	1029 W Andalusia Ave	90065	5454019901	8,660	RE20-1
1	1085 W Andalusia Ave	90065	5454018902	9,777	RE20-1
1	3644 E Maceo St	90065	5452001900	4,782	RE20-1
1	3649 E Loosmore 5t	90065	5454016901	14,182	RE20-1
1	3718 E Carmino Real	90065	5451017904	5,000	RIM
1	4276 N Scandia Wy	90065	5472012900	5,143	RE11-1
4	1635 LAUREL CANYON BLVD	90046	5555032900	6,161	R1-1
4	8131 W GOULD AVE	90046	5556001901	50,345	R1-1
4	8296 E BAIRD RD	90046	5556008900	5,646	R1-1
4	8301 W WYNDHAM RD	90046	5567007901	7,248	R1-1
4	8317 W WYNDHAM RD	90046	5567007900	6,120	R1-1
4	8436 W GRAND VIEW DR	90046	5556016900	19,244	R1-1
4	NASH DR/JEWETT DR	90046	5567015900	13,381	R1-1
4	1700 N MARMONTAWE	90069	5556023902	7,315	R1-1
4	8341 WGOODSON PL	90069	5556022902	6,242	R1-1
4	TO THE NORTH OF 1698 MARMONTAWE	90069	5556023901	19,253	R1-1
5	3195 5 MOTOR AVE	90064	4318033901	6,896	PF-1XL
5	10427 W LARNED LANE	90077	4371006900	12,601	RE40-1-HICR
5	10465 W LISBON LN	90077	4371008900	5,232	RE15-1-HCR
5	10533 E LISBON LN	90077	4371007900	7,500	RE15-1-HICR
5	1526 N YONKERS LN	90077	4371015901	14,999	RE440-1-H-HKCIR
5	1540 N Orater Lane	90077	4371009900	5,185	RE15-1-HICR
5	1553 N CULEBRA LN	90077	4371034900	5,039	RE440-1-H
5	1600 N DESSERY LN	90077	4371034903	7,447	RE40-1-HICR
5	1948 N SPRUCEWOOD LN	90077	4380021900	45,390	RE40-1-HICR
5	2081 N ROSCOMARE RD	90077	4377013900	14,294	RE15-1-H-HCR
5	2329 N LATIMER LN	90077	4380031901	15,599	RE440-1-HKCR
5	2660 N ROSCOMARE ROAD	90077	4378014900	15,254	RE15-1-H-HICR
5	BEVERLY GLEN BLWD/HQULLYBUSH LN	90077	4371020900	14,166	RE40-1-H-HICR
5	9509 HIGH RIDGE	90210	4384033900	31,054	RE15-1-H-HKCR
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561023914	10,295	OS-1XL-K
7	SIMIMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401001901	26,314	OS-1XL-K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401002900	35,791	OS-1XL-K
7	SMIMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401003903	8,227	OS-1XL-K
7	SMIMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401005900	6,493	OS-1XL-K
7	SIMIMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401006900	29,962	OS-1XL-K

### Attatchment E:

## Develop Program to Sell Properties not Developable nor Eligible for OPLA

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	HAINES CANYON AVE/BLANCHARD CANYON RD	91402	2569022902	22,001	RE40-1
7	SMMC LA TUNA CANYON RD		APNTBD5	25,081	
12	23270 W SHERMAN WAY	91307	2028011901	36,400	A1-1
13	200 N Silver Lake Blvd	90004	5501004902	16,808	RE15-1-H
14	4338 E Rædium Dr	90032	5209016901	9,357	[Q]RE20-1D
14	1671 W Townsend Ave	90041	5689031907	6,585	PF-1
14	1877 N Avenue 56	90042	5480028900	9,938	RE11-1
15	John Gibson Bilwd/Harbor Firwy	90731	7412024902, 7440016911	522,272	M2-1VL

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft	Zoning
1	711 Montecito Dr	90031	5304017901	4,969	[Q]R1-1D
1	5524 Echo Dr	90042	5468027900	5,232	RD2-1-HPOZ
1	Andalusia Ave/Camino Real	90065	5451017900	26,433	R1-1
1	3642 E Roseview Ave	90065	5454016902	25,081	RE20-1
1	313 N Furness Ave	90065	5467023900	7,364	RE40-1
2	11265 Læwrie Dr	91604	2378018900	8,004	RE15-1-H
2	11273 Laurie Dr	91604	2378018901	16,400	RE15-1-H
2	11247 Laurie Dr	91604	2378018902	17,238	RE15-1-H
2	3897 N Eureka Dr	91604	2378018903	32,942	RE15-1-H
2	11253 Læwrie Dr	91604	2378018904	16,113	RE15-1-H
2	11259 Læwrie Dr	91604	2378018905	12,617	RE15-1-H
3	4835 N CALDERON RD	91364	2076003900	16,314	RE40=1
4	1762 N SEAVIEW TR	90046	5551032902	6,387	R1-1
4	1758 N SEAVIEW TR	90046	5551032903	5,645	R1-1
4	1754 N SEAVIEW TR	90046	5551032904	5,395	R1-1
4	1752 NSEAVIEW TR	90046	5551032905	5,062	R1-1
4	1951 N LAUREL CANYON BLVD	90046	5556001900	11,984	R1-1
4	8455 W GRAND VIEW DR	90046	5556017900	4,292	R1-1
4	8327 W GRAND VIEW DR	90046	5556019900	5,177	R1-1
4	8320 W LOOKOUT MOUINITAIN AVE	90046	5567004902	13,425	R-1
4	8310 W LOOKOUT MOUNITAINI AVE	90046	5567004903	14,619	R1-1
4	8300 W LOOKOUT MOUNITAINI AVE	90046	5567004904	16,184	R1-1
4	8244 W LOOKOUT MOUNITAIN	90046	5567004905	15,207	R1-1
4	2172 N BEECH KNOLL RD	90046	5567008900	5,810	R1-1
4	3090 N HOLLLYRIDGE DR	90068	5583021900	6,946	R1-1
4	3634 N KNOBHILL DR	91423	2274010900	15,654	RE15-1-H
4	3650 N KNOBHILL DR	91423	2274010901	15,082	RE15-1-H
5	11381 CHALON RD	90049	4369007900	65,844	RE20-1-HIHUR
5	1318 BENEDICT CANYON DR	90210	4356011900	52,606	RE15-1-HIHOR
5	11080 CIELO DRIME	90210	4357015901	5,916	RE15-1-HIHOR
8	1736 W/ Gage Awe	900417	6002030901	2,010	R3-1
8	1740 WV Gagge Awe	900477	6002030905	1,763	R3-1
111	545 IN BIENVENEDA AXE	90272	44140117901	8,592	RL-1
111	412 PASEO MIRAWAR	90272	4416007905	16,523	RE15-1-H
111	17547 W CASTELLAMMARE DR	90272	4416010900	3,711	RL-1
111	17553 W/ CASTELLAMM/XRE DR	902772	4416010902	3,6775	R1-1

Attatchment F:	Determine Costs and Benefits of Preparing Single Family Sites
----------------	---

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft	Zoning
11	17550 W REVELLO DR	90272	4416011900	3,744	R1=1
11	17637 W Castelliammare Dr	90272	4416012900	3,666	R1=1
11	17908 W CASTIELLIAMMARE DR	90272	4416015900	9,137	R1=1
11	17945 PORTO MARINA WAY	90272	4416015901	9,475	R1-1
11	17863 PORTO MARINA WAY	90272	4416015903	4,089	R1-1
11	17919 PORTO MARINA WAY	90272	4416015906	4,897	R1-1
11	17924 W PORTO MARINA WY	90272	4416015907	5,507	R1-1
11	17916 W PORTO MARINA WY	90272	4416015908	5,244	R1-1
11	17910 W PORTO MARINA WY	90272	4416015909	5,435	R1-1
11	17857 PORTO MARINA WAY	90272	4416015910	3,686	R1-1
11	17600 W TRAMONTO DR	90272	4416021900	8,357	R1-1
11	1433 N MARINETTE ROAD	90272	4422003901	53,024	RE40=1-14
12	22345 MALDEN ST	91304	2004018900	19,282	RE11-1
12	22330 NAPA ST	91304	2004018901	11,317	RE11=1
12	22322 NAPA ST	91304	2004018902	11,679	RE11=1
12	17666 W. PARTHENIA ST	91325	2787031901	25,258	R <b>A</b> =1
12	11954 CALLE VISTA CT	91326	2872004900	18,087	RE15-1
14	3757 N Harrimam Ave	90032	5306001900	7,514	[Q]R1-1D
14	5079 N Townsend Ave	90041	5476003901	8,847	R1-1
14	5081 N Townsend Ave	90041	5476003902	5,026	R1-1
14	5085 N Townsend Ave	90041	5476003903	5,000	R1-1
14	5091 N Townsend Ave	90041	5476003904	5,000	R1-1
14	521. N Marie Ave	90042	5483013900	2,772	R1-1
15	16215 Bonsallo Ave	90247	6120021900	5,677	R2-1

Attatchment G

## Intlate Negotiations with State or Federal Agencies Adjacent to City-owned Sites

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
5	1013 N HOLLYBUSH LN	90077	4371024901	11,604	RE40-1-H-HKCR
5	1044 N FERNBUSH LN	90077	4371027901	10,317	RE440-1-H-HKCR
5	1423 N BASIL LN	90077	4371033900	35,900	RE40-1-HCR
5	1517 N MIRABEL LN	90077	4371033902	26,193	RE40-1-HCR
5	10222 W ORTIZ LN	90077	4380021902	10,072	RE40-1-H-HKCR
5	2164 N POINTER LN	90077	4380028900	2,629	RE15-1-HCR
7	SMIMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401009900	3,749	OS-1XL-K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401011900	2,350	OS-1XL-K
7	SMMC La Tuna Camyon Rd	91352	2401011901	2,412	OS-1XL-K
7	SMMC La Tuna Canyon Rd	91352	2401011902	2,133	OS-1XL-K
7	8764 W LA TUNA CANYON ROAD	91352	2401012902	2,049	OS-1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561012902	1,157	OS-1XL
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD	91352	2561024906	1,850	OS-1XL-K
7	LA TUNA CANYON RD/WILDWOOD FIRE RD		2561019910	1,655	RE15-1
11	BUNDY DR/CHALON RD	90049	4493029900	17,045	RE15-1-H

Total:

Attatchment H:

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft.	Zoning
7	15240 WTUPPER ST	91343	2656024900	12,626	RA-1
9	5863 S WALL ST	90003	6006002900	5,142	MR1-1
14	5154 E Wadena St	90032	5309004905	6,224	[Q]R1-1D
15	1631 E 110TH St	90059	6069009900	1,931	R2-1
15	1831 E 108TH ST, 1831 1/2 E 108th St	90059	6065036900	3,564	R2-1
15	12hEEST	90744	7418006900	4,720	(Q)62=1VL=0-GUGU

Attatchment I:

## Sites with Potential Use as Housing, Interim Housing,

### 4 Properties

1

or Navigation Center

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. Ft	Status
8	729 W MANGHEISTER	90044	6032015901	11,966	In development as a Navigatiom Center
11	11950 W MISSOURI AVE	90025	4259020900	32,629	In development as permanent affordable housing
11	206 n venice Blvd	90291	4238024903	6,319	In development as permanent affordable housing, im conjunction with LADOT Lot #731
13	1140 N Glendale Blvd, 1142 N Glendale Blvd, 1144 N Glendale Blvd	90026	5404016900	20,626	Under evaluatiom for permanent affordable housing in conjunction with LADOT Lot #676

Council District	Address	Zip Code	Parcel Number	Sq. FL	Zoning
1	649 N Avenue 50	90042	5469009900	6,163	RD2-1
3	18801 EDLEEN DR	91356	2176026900	21,374	RA-1
3	18807 EDLEEN DR	91356	2176026905	18,031	RA-1
3	18813 EDLEEN DR	91356	2176026901	18,473	RA-1
3	18817 EDLEEN DR	91356	2176026903	18,410	RA-1
3	18821 EDLEEN DR	91356	2176026902	18,777	RA-1
5	5001 Balboa Boulevard	91316	2258016901	15,921	QJPF-1XL
6	14123 WINDRIDHKOFFF ST	91331	2642030900	25,659	RA-1
7	12562 N SAN FERIWANDO ROAD	91342	2506034901	6,897	RD301XL-CPIO
7	12562 N SAN FERMANDO ROAD,,12552 N SAN	91342	2506034900, 2506034903	61, <b>97</b> 6	RD301XL-CPIO
7	12564 N SAN FERNVANDO ROAD	91342	2506034902	6,897	RD301XL-CPIO
7	12566 1/2 N SAN FERMANDO ROAD		2506035900	20,675	RD301XL-CPIO
8	5732 S Orenshaw Blvd	90043	5006009901	11,422	C2-2D-SP
8	5975 S Western Ave	90047	6001014900	121,478	M2-1
8	Gage Ave/Western Ave	90047	6002030904	1,621	OS-1XL
10	969 S Normandie Ave	90006	5078001914	8,529	R4-1
10	1803 S Arlington Ave, 2508 W 18th St	90019	5072030900	11,736	RD1.5-1-0-@PIC
11	3631 CENTINELA AVE	90066	4246008900	13,400	[0]RD1.5-1
13	5636 Fountain Ave	90028	5536002916	16,870	R3-1
13	5637 W La Mirada Ave	90038	5536002911	3,998	R3-1
15	501 North Mesa Street	90731	7449002900	16,211	R2-1XL
15	600 E L St	90744	7423026900	59,178	[T][Q]RD5-1XL-0 CUGU

0590-00123-0012

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Steveley

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – EXEMPTION FROM THE HIRING FREEZE AND THE USE OF GRANT FUNDS TO OFFSET FURLOUGHS (BUDGET MOTION 12 – C.F. 20-0600-S12)

### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 12 requests that the Bureau of Street Services (Bureau) be exempt from the hiring freeze as long as the Bureau stays within budgeted levels and that the Bureau be authorized the use of grant funds to offset furlough days.

The proposed furloughs result in a \$9.40 million salary account reduction and the hiring freeze results in a \$1.56 million salary account reduction. The Bureau states that it can manage meeting this funding reduction through a combination of higher salary savings (including attrition) and the utilization of off-budget revenue sources.

The 2020-21 Budget appropriates \$167,606,197 to the Bureau. We estimate that between 76 percent and 99 percent of the revenue supporting this appropriation has significant downside risk during 2020-21 (including the General Fund, Gas Tax, SB1, Measure R, Measure M, Proposition C, Sidewalk and Park Vending, Stormwater, and the Street Damage Restoration Fee Fund). To allow the Bureau to be relieved of the hiring freeze and furloughs would make any required future reduction to the Bureau's budget more severe and more difficult to accomplish.

While off-budget funds may become available, those funds may be necessary to offset at-risk revenue declines in order to support the Bureau's currently budgeted level of salary costs.

At this point, in light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the actions in this Motion are not recommended.

### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:06200107

0590-00123-0013

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stanley

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CITY PLANNING – ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST II AND CITY PLANNING ASSOCIATE FOR THE WILDLIFE PILOT STUDY (BUDGET MOTION 13 – C.F. 20-0600-S13)

## RECOMMENDATION

To note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 13 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add resolution authority without funding for one Environmental Specialist II and one City Planning Associate in the Department of City Planning (Department). These positions would, once funding is identified, conduct the Wildlife Pilot Study to examine biological resources and identify potential impacts on wildlife habitats in the Santa Monica Mountains.

The Department's 2019-20 budget includes resolution authority for these two positions, but the 2020-21 Budget did not continue these authorities due to the City's fiscal constraints.

As the result of various salary account reduction, including those from the Hiring Freeze, it is unlikely that, if approved unfunded, the Department would be able to fill these positions. Further, there are no special funds eligible to support the costs of the positions. Finally, approval of this Motion would result in an unfunded demand on the Department's 2020-21 budgetary resources and would not comply with the City's Financial Policies requiring position authorities be supported by funding.

In light of these concerns, the City's current economic condition, and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the action in this Motion is not recommended. Budget Motion 49 also requests approval of these positions, and this Office has prepared a memo recommending against adding the positions.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved and the positions are funded, the total costs are \$248,220 (\$168,709 direct cost and \$79,511 indirect costs).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion complies with the City's Financial Policies. If the motion is approved and the positions are added without funding, this action is not in compliance with the Financial Policies, which state that positions added in the budget should be funded.

RHL:SEV:02200173c

0590-00123-0014

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stalft

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

## Subject: BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – ONE UNFUNDED MANAGEMENT ANALYST TO SUPPORT GRANTS UNIT (BUDGET MOTION 14 – C.F. 20-0600-S14)

### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 14 requests the 2020-21 Budget be amended to add resolution authority without funding for one Management Analyst in the Board of Public Works (Board) to support a Grants Unit in the Board Office.

The Board currently does not have dedicated staff to seek grant funding opportunities. The Board requested a Management Analyst for this purpose in its original budget request. The Mayor's Office denied this request. The Board proposed not filling this position until grants are awarded, yet they also said this position was necessary to seek out and apply for grants. The Board did not present a plan for targeting specific grants for specific purposes. Absent this information, it is not possible to determine the revenue potential from adding this position. Additionally, grants typically do not reimburse the costs of applying for grants or developing projects or scopes of work for grant applications.

The Board now indicates that the position will seek alternative sources of funds to implement various community beautification and tree management initiatives in preparation for the Olympics and City infrastructure improvements. The Board suggests a portion of the Management Analyst salary could be funded by grants in the future. Given the level of revenue uncertainty contained within the 2020-21 Budget and absent a more concrete plan from the Board, the expectation that yet to be identified grant funds can fund the requested positions is speculative. Further, there are no special funds eligible to support the costs of this position and it is unlikely the Board will have sufficient General Fund savings to fund the position in light of the salary reductions in the 2020-21 Budget. This position, therefore, is unfunded and is therefore not in compliance with the City's Financial Policies which state that the budget should not include unfunded positions.

Furthermore, it is unclear if the Board would be duplicating the efforts of another department or bureau (Sanitation, Street Services, and Engineering) and/or competing with project managers who are already developing projects and seeking grant funding.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, and the fact that this position is proposed to be unfunded, the action in this Motion is not recommended.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If approved and funded, the total cost of the position is \$114,794 (\$82,030 direct cost and \$32,764 related cost).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies. If the motion is approved and a position is added without funding, this action is not in compliance with the Financial Policies, which state that positions added in the budget should be funded.

RHL:BA:06200102

0590-00123-0016

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Shulf

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – EMBRACELA FUNDING (BUDGET MOTION 16 – C.F. 20-0600-S16)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until such time as the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 16 requests the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to report on the General City Purposes emBRACE LA program funding in the first Financial Status Report of 2020-21 and to identify \$117,000 for second quarter programming.

emBRACE LA is a program that supports human relations issues with regard to race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, diversity, and multiculturalism in the City of Los Angeles. If the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-06920), it may identify this program as a potential recipient for this funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action to identify \$117,000 for second quarter programming. The CAO will report on the status of the emBRACE LA program funding in the first Financial Status Report of 2020-21.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to hold this item in Committee has no fiscal impact at this time. Approving this motion would require a General Fund appropriation of \$117,000 and an equal reduction to another line item in the Budget or revenue increase.

#### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BYO:01200041

0590-00123-0017

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stanley

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – ASIAN AMERICAN DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM, FIRST TO SERVE, AND COMMUNITY REFLECTIONS (BUDGET MOTION 17 – C.F. 20-0600-S17)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until such time as the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 17 requests the City Administrative Officer to identify \$50,000 for each of the following re-entry case management services in Council District 8: Asian American Drug Abuse Program, First to Serve, and Community Reflections. The total funding required for all three programs is \$150,000 with potential sources of funding to include the Justice Fund of the General Fund.

The Asian American Drug Abuse Program, First to Serve, and Community Reflections programs provide underserved families and individuals with a variety of case management services such as treatment for substance abuse, transitional housing, and medical services. As proposed in the motion, reducing the \$1 million appropriation in the General City Purposes budget for the Justice Fund could offset the cost of this program. Otherwise, this request would require a General Fund appropriation. Alternatively, if the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-06920), it may identify these programs as potential recipients for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action to identify \$150,000 for the Asian American Drug Abuse Program, First to Serve, and Community Reflections programs.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to hold this item in Committee has no fiscal impact at this time. Approving this motion would require a reduction in the Justice Fund appropriation or a new General Fund appropriation of \$150,000 and an equal reduction to another line item in the Budget or revenue increase.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BYO:01200042

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0018

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Skulpt

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – MOVIES IN THE PARK (BUDGET MOTION 18 – C.F. 20-0600-S18)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until such time as the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 18 requests the City Administrative Officer to identify \$11,900 for each of the following parks for Movies in the Park: Algin, Mt. Carmel, Harvard, St. Andrews, Van Ness, Martin Luther King Jr., and Denker. The total funding required for all seven parks is \$83,300.

As proposed in the motion, reducing the \$1 million appropriation in the General City Purposes budget for the Justice Fund could offset the cost of this program. Otherwise, this request would require a General Fund appropriation. Alternatively, if the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-06920), it may identify these programs as potential recipients for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action at this time to identify \$83,300 for Movies in the Park.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to hold this item in Committee has no fiscal impact at this time. Approving this motion would require a reduction in the Justice Fund appropriation or a new General Fund appropriation of \$83,300 and an equal reduction to another line item in the Budget or revenue increase.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BYO:01200043

0590-00123-0019

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Havefty

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

#### Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 19 (C.F. 20-0600-S19) CITY ATTORNEY – SALARY FUNDING RESTORATION

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 19 proposes to restore funding for salaries in the amount of \$7,470,565 in the Office of the City Attorney (City Attorney).

The requested restoration of \$7,470,565 consists of \$5,675,861 in direct costs and \$1,794,704 in related costs and represents the City Attorney's corresponding reduction for the hiring freeze policy.

Consistent with the hiring freeze policy, the 2020-21 Budget reflects reduced salary funding in anticipation of savings generated from maintaining vacancies. While the hiring freeze policy curbs hiring, the policy includes a process through which departments, including the City Attorney, can request exemptions on a case-by-case basis, as outlined in the Mayor's March 19, 2020 Belt-Tightening Measures letter. Restoration of funding assumes that the City Attorney shall be exempt from the hiring freeze.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$7,470,565 (\$5,675,861 direct cost and \$1,794,704 related costs).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SJ:04200159

0590-00123-0020

Date: June 15, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Hault

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 20 (C.F. 20-0600-S20) – CONTROLLER – FUNDING FOR RETIREMENT AND SICK LEAVE PAYOUTS AND PAYROLL OPERATIONS STAFFING

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 20 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget for the Office of the Controller (Controller) to add funding for currently unfunded retirement and sick leave payouts and to fill vacant positions to support the payroll operations section. The cost for this request is \$391,860, which includes \$300,000 in salaries and \$91,860 for indirect costs.

As a practice, the City does not budget for retirement and sick leave payouts. All City departments are expected to absorb these unbudgeted obligatory costs using existing funds. This Office believes that, as they have in past years, the Controller will be able to pay for obligatory retirement and sick leave payouts within its existing budget.

The 2020-21 Budget fully funds the Controller's payroll operations section, but the department may have difficulty filling vacant positions due to the hiring freeze and salary reductions assumed in the 2020-21 Budget.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$391,860 (\$300,000 for direct costs and \$91,860 for indirect costs).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:WKP:01200046

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0021

Date: June 15, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Rehalt Skulpt

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

#### Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 21 (C.F. 20-0600-S21) – CONTROLLER – SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE UNIT

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 21 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add 12-months funding of \$166,180 (\$116,563 for direct costs and \$49,617 for indirect costs) and regular authority for one Special Investigator II in the Office of the Controller (Controller) to support the Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Unit (FWA).

The Controller currently has one Special Investigator II assigned to FWA and the additional position would help address the growing backlog of cases requiring investigation. If the new position is added, the Controller reports it would be able to process an additional 30 cases per year for a total of 60 cases per year. In 2018-19, the Controller received 119 cases for investigation. There are no special funds eligible to support the costs of this position.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$166,180 (116,563 for direct costs and \$49,617 for indirect costs).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:WKP:01200039

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0022

Date: June 15, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal A Slevelle

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 22 (C.F. 20-0600-S22) – CONTROLLER – ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR HUMAN RESOURCES AND PAYROLL (HRP) PROJECT

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 22 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add nine-months funding of \$197,866 (\$135,490 for direct costs and \$62,376 for indirect costs) to fill two vacant Payroll Analyst positions in the Office of the Controller (Controller) to support the Human Resources and Payroll (HRP) Project.

The 2020-21 Budget includes four fully funded positions to directly support HRP and this additional funding is not necessary.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$197,866 (\$135,490 for direct costs and \$62,376 for indirect costs).

#### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:WKP:01200047

0590-00123-0023

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Staller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 23 (C.F. 20-0600-S23) HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE POSITION

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 23 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add funding and authority for one Project Coordinator in the Housing Community Investment Department (HCID) to support the Youth Development Task Force (Task Force) to be offset by a decrease in the HCID's expense accounts.

The Task Force was established on December 11, 2019 in order to formulate a Citywide Youth Development Strategy (C.F. 16-0596-S1). The Task Force began holding bi-monthly meetings as of April 17, 2020. At its May 29, 2020 meeting, the Task Force discussed its key goals and proposed timeline, which include developing recommendations for a Youth Development departmental structure by May 2021. This proposal is to add a Project Coordinator to support this Task Force, but at this time there is no comprehensive analysis of the proposed Project Coordinator's role or workload. The HCID indicates that the proposed position's responsibilities will be developed in the upcoming months after HCID has the opportunity to consult Task Force members and other stakeholders. The cost of nine-months funding for one Project Coordinator to support the Task Force is \$95,182 (\$72,869 for salaries and \$22,313 for indirect costs).

The HCID confirmed that there are no special funds eligible to support the costs of the position. Therefore, in order to offset costs using expense accounts, as the Motion proposes, the General Fund portion of the Leasing and Contractual Services Accounts would need to be reduced. Lease costs are not discretionary and cannot be reduced. The HCID's 2020-21 General Fund budget for contractual services is for Family Source Centers and the Domestic Violence/Human Trafficking Shelter Operations. Any reduction to these items would result in service impacts. Therefore, this Office does not recommend reducing these accounts to offset the proposed position.

Alternatively, if the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-0692), it may identify this program as a potential recipient for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action to identify funding for this purpose.

## **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to hold this item in Committee pending an evaluation of opportunities to redirect Police Department resources will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the total cost of nine-months funding for one Project Coordinator to support the Youth Development Task Force is \$95,182 (\$72,869 for salaries and \$22,313 for indirect costs).

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:MOF:02200176

From:

#### CITY OF LOS ANGELES INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0024

Date: June 15, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

**REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM** 

forRichard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 24 (C.F. 20-0600-S24) HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT – VAN NUYS FAMILY SOURCE CENTER

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities and the City Council has considered the yet to be released report from the Housing and Community Investment Department on this matter.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 24 requests the 2020-21 Budget be amended to add \$1 million to the Housing Community Investment Department (HCID) for a Van Nuys Family Source Center Revolving Loan Program.

On April 7, 2020, the Council instructed the HCID to report on the feasibility of piloting a revolving loan program at the Van Nuys Family Source Center to help families pay for necessities during a financial emergency. As of June 11, 2020, the HCID has not released a report on the feasibility of a pilot revolving loan program, but the Department anticipates releasing a report within two weeks. The Budget and Finance Committee should defer action on this item pending the City Council's consideration of that report. The HCID confirmed that the pilot revolving loan program would not be eligible for Community Development Block Grant or Community Service Block Grant funding.

If the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-0692), it may identify this program as a potential recipient for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21 and absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to hold this item in Committee pending an evaluation of opportunities to redirect Police Department resources will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, offsetting appropriations or additional revenues in the amount of \$1 million need to be identified.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:EIC:02200177

0590-00123-0025

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruha DA Hand

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 25 (C.F. 20-0600-S25) CITY CLERK – SUPPORT FOR THE PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

#### RECOMMENDATION

Instruct the City Clerk to place on the agenda of the first regular Council meeting on July 1, 2020, or shortly thereafter, the following instructions:

That the Council, subject to the approval of the Mayor:

- 1. Transfer \$160,000 from the Department of City Planning Fund No. 100/68, Account 001010, Salaries General, to the City Clerk Fund No. 100/14, Account 001010, Salaries General, to support the Planning and Land Use Management Committee; and,
- 2. Authorize the City Administrative Officer to make technical corrections as necessary to the above transaction to implement the Mayor and Council intentions.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 25 recommends that the 2020-21 Budget be amended to provide funding to support the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee in light of increased and unique technical and legal workload demands. Specifically, the Motion recommends decreasing the Department of City Planning's (DCP) Salaries General Account by \$160,000 and increasing the City Clerk's Salaries General Account by a like amount. The funding source is the General Fund.

The proposed recommendation is similar to what was adopted for the 2019-20 Budget (C.F. 19-0600-S134), in that staff with technical planning expertise will support the work of the PLUM Committee. In light of the increasing workload demands, technical requirements of planning issues, and complex legal matters, this Office recommends approval of the \$160,000 transfer from the Planning Department to the City Clerk.

The transfer of \$160,000 from the DCP Salaries General Account would reduce DCP's salaries funding. As a result, DCP may be required to identify increased revenues or reduce expenditures to offset this budget reduction. This Office will monitor the DCP vacancies and advise on any issues that may arise as part of the Financial Status Reports.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendations in this report will have no negative impact on the General Fund and will result in no net increase to the 2020-21 Budget.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendations in this report comply with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:AJ:08200074D

0590-00123-0026

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Allevelle

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CITY PLANNING – POSITIONS AND EXPENSE FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSIT ORIENTED DISTRICT SPECIFIC PLAN RELATED TO THE EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 26 – C.F. 20-0600-S26)

#### RECOMMENDATION

To note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 26 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add nine-months funding (\$235,566 direct cost and \$103,464 related cost) and resolution authority for one City Planner and two City Planning Associates and to add expense funding (\$1,380,000) to hire consultants for the Department of City Planning (DCP) to develop a Transit Oriented District Specific Plan for the neighborhoods along the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project (Project).

The Project will extend light rail service north from the Van Nuys Orange Line station to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. A portion of the stations included in the Project fall within a Community Plan that DCP is currently updating. Several other Project rail stations are not included within any current long-range land use planning effort. The positions and funding would provide the resources to begin the work needed to apply consistent land use planning standards across all stations included in the Project. There are no available special funds eligible to support the costs of these positions and expenses.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the total costs of the positions and expenses are \$1,719,030 (\$1,615,566 direct cost and \$103,464 related cost).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NSC:02200180C

0590-00123-0027

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

#### Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – USE OF SB1 FUNDING PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2021 FOR CONTRACT TRUCKING SERVICES (BUDGET MOTION 27 – C.F. 20-0600-S27)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 27 requests that the Bureau of Street Services (Bureau be authorized the use of SB1 funding for contract trucking services that are necessary for the Pavement Preservation Program (PPP) prior to January 1, 2021 and specifically proposes moving \$6 million from PPP Funding in SB1 to their operating budget to provide funding for as-needed contract trucking.

A total of \$23.99 million of the PPP funding is in a SB1 special purpose fund appropriation. Of this amount, \$12.23 million is available as of July 1, 2020, while the remaining \$11.76 is not authorized until January 1, 2021 and is contingent on the availability of funds. Overall, in the SB1 Fund, revenues are estimated at \$72,052,876 and a total of \$36,456,837 (50.6%) is contingent upon the availability of funds.

There's significant uncertainty in SB1 that may extend beyond the level of contingent budgeting in the 2020-21 Budget. The first data point since the Stay at Home Order was initiated shows a month-to-month decline of SB1 revenue from \$7.0 million in April to \$3.1 million in May (a decline of 55.7%). At this point, it is difficult to predict what SB1 revenue will be in 2020-21. The City will need the flexibility to adjust the budget and to provide another funding source for the PPP activities during the Fiscal Year. This is more difficult to accomplish if the funds are transferred to the Bureau at the beginning of the Fiscal Year.

In addition, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) must approve allocation of 2020-21 SB1 funds to the City. This is not likely to happen until August 2020 or later.

Finally, keeping the money in the special purpose fund will not impede the ability of the Bureau to accomplish work. The Bureau can spend directly from the Special Fund for these contractual services. The 2020-21 Budget already provides sufficient authority for the Bureau to use contract trucking services for the PPP. Therefore, the actions requested in this Motion are not recommended.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:06200108

0590-00123-0028

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Heweller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – FUNDING AND RESOLUTION AUTHORITY FOR SEVEN POSITIONS WITHIN URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION AND ONE POSITION WITHIN THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (BUDGET MOTION 28 – C.F. 20-0600-S28)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 28 requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide the Bureau of Street Services (Bureau) with resolution authority and nine-months funding for seven positions within the Urban Forestry Division (UFD). This motion also instructs this Office to identify additional options to avoid cuts to the Bureau's Urban Forestry Division. Finally, this motion requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide the Board of Public Works with resolution authority and nine-months funding for one Management Analyst position to lead a Grants Unit and \$400,000 in funding to continue the development of the Urban Forest Management Plan.

#### Bureau of Street Services

The Bureau's seven UFD positions consist of two Tree Surgeon Supervisor Is, three Tree Surgeon Assistants, and two Equipment Operators. These seven vacant positions were not continued from the Tree Trimming program as part of the formulation of the 2020-21 Budget. The estimated cost for nine-months funding of these positions is reflected in the table below:

Budget Request	No. of Positions	Length of Funding	Direct Salary Costs		lary Costs Related Costs		Total	
Tree Trimming	7	Nine-Months	\$	361,736	\$	208,246	\$	569,981
		Twelve-Months	\$	482,315	\$	245,167	\$	727,481

In order to avoid cuts to the Bureau's Urban Forestry Division, offsetting General Fund appropriations or additional revenues will need to be identified.

#### Board of Public Works

#### Management Analyst Position

The estimated costs for nine-months funding for the one Management Analyst for the Board of Public Works (Board), Grants Unit is reflected in the table below:

Budget Request	No. of Positions	Length of Funding	Direct Salary Costs	Related Costs	Total	
Board - Grants Unit	1	Nine-Months	\$ 61,522	\$ 32,764	\$	94,287
		Twelve-Months	\$ 82,030	\$ 32,764	\$	114,794

The Board requested a Management Analyst for this purpose in its original budget request. The Mayor's Office denied this request. Budget Motion 14 also requests approval of this position, and this Office has prepared a memo recommending against adding it.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the addition of this position is not recommended.

#### Urban Forest Management Plan

The Board was recently awarded a \$1.5 million grant from the State of California, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) under the Urban and Community Forestry Program for urban forest management activities and tree planting projects that will contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases. The grant award includes sufficient funding to cover the \$400,000 request in this motion to continue the development of the Urban Forest Management Plan. Front-funding is required for the implementation of this grant. In a separate report, the Board has proposed to the Council that a loan from the Public Works Trust Fund be provided to front-fund this grant award. Therefore, the \$400,000 in funding requested in this motion to continue the development Plan is no longer needed.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, offsetting General Fund appropriations or additional revenues will need to be identified.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:062000109

0590-00123-0029

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Hulper

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (CIEP) –OLD FIRE STATION 39 – PHASE II (BUDGET MOTION 29 – C.F. 20-0600-S29)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 29 requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to include \$700,000 for Phase II of the Old Fire Station 39 Improvement Project.

The total cost of the Old Fire Station 39 Improvement (Operations Valley Bureau) Project is \$5.86 million, with secured funding of \$2.95 million and an unaddressed funding shortfall of \$2.91 million.

Table One: Operations Valley Bureau Scope							
Project Component	Obligated Funds	Revised BOE Estimate	Shortfall	Comment			
Phase I*	\$700,000	\$961,800	(\$261,800)	Shortfall identified in 2019-20 following initiation of Phase 1 scope.			
Phase II**	2,250,000	4,400,000	(2,150,000)	There is sufficient cash flow to fund scheduled activities in 2020-21.			
Unanticipated Costs ***		500,313	(500,313)	Reflects costs for gasoline tank removal (\$32,710) and on-site security (\$467,603).			
	\$2,950,000	\$5,862,113	(\$2,912,113)				

\* Phase I funding authorized through the 2018-19 Adopted Budget (\$600,000) and an interim appropriation of \$100,000 (C.F. 17-0924-S2).

\*\* Phase II funding authorized through the 2020-21 Adopted Budget.

\*\*\* Scope added to the project subsequent to adoption of the 2020-21 Adopted Budget.

As reflected in the chart below, the project has sufficient funding to implement scheduled activities in 2020-21 without the need for additional funding at this time. The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) provided an initial 36-month construction and cash flow schedule for Phase II as reflected in Table Two below. As illustrated by the itemized adjustments reflected in Table Two, additional funding of \$2.06 million will be needed in 2021-22, with the balance of \$855,868 required in 2022-23.

Table Two: Expenditure Plan							
Cash Flow and Funding Schedule	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Total			
Initial BOE Phase II Cash Flow:	\$800,000	\$2,900,000	\$700,000	\$4,400,000			
Unfunded Phase I Costs:	261,800	-	-	261,800			
Tank Removal:	32,710	-	-	32,710			
Security:	155,867	155,868	155,868	467,603			
Adjusted Cash Flow Schedule:	1,250,377	3,055,868	855,868	5,162,113			
Secured Funding:	1,250,377	999,623	-	2,250,000			
Future Funding Needs	-	\$2,056,245	\$855,868	\$2,912,113			
* Table Two does not reflect secured funding and anticipated expenditures in the amount of \$700,000							

for Phase I. Those expenditures are reflected in Table One.

Since there is sufficient funding to cash flow the project needs in 2020-21, the actions in this Motion are not recommended.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$700,000.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:MC:0500159

0590-00123-0030

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stevel for

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM – MACLAY STREET RECONFIGURATION PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 30 – C.F. 20-0600-S30)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and File this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 30 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add \$1.7 million in funding for the Maclay Street Reconfiguration Project (Project) in Council District 7.

On November 27, 2019, Council approved a motion that instructed the Bureau of Engineering (Bureau) to begin the preliminary design of the Project (C.F. 19-1171). The Project includes the construction of a sidewalk, concrete improvements, right-of way acquisition, utility relocation, and installation of signal/signage/striping at the northwest side corner of Maclay Street and Gladstone Avenue to provide a safe pedestrian route. The proposed project schedule, as provided by the Bureau, is as follows:

- Design: July 2020 April 2021;
- Bid and Award: April 2021 September 2021; and,
- Construction: October 2021-July 2022.

The estimated cost of this Project is \$1.7 million. Of this amount, the Bureau reports that \$0.4 million in funding will be required for design and right of way acquisition in 2020-21 and \$1.3 million in funding will be required for construction in 2021-22. Potential eligible funding sources include the General Fund, Gas Tax, Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Funds (SB1), Measure R and Measure M. However, each of these funding sources have been completely programmed for 2020-21. Additionally, there is significant uncertainty in each of these revenue sources given their sensitivity to the economy.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of these revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend adding funding for this purpose at this time.

## **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$1.7 million for full project funding (or \$400,000 if the lesser amount is approved for design and right of way acquisition).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SMC:06200105

0590-00123-0056

Date: July 8, 2020

To: City Council Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhald Stender

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: REPORT BACK ON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM – MACLAY STREET RECONFIGURATION PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 30 – C.F. 20-0600-S30)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

On June 15, 2020, the Budget and Finance Committee approved Budget Motion Number 30 as amended to instruct the City Administrative Officer to report on whether the cost of design and right of way acquisition, estimated at \$400,000, for the Maclay Street Reconfiguration Project (Project) are eligible Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) expenditures. The Project includes the construction of a sidewalk, concrete improvements, right-of way acquisition, utility relocation, and installation of signal/signage/striping at the northwest side corner of Maclay Street and Gladstone Avenue to provide a safe pedestrian route. The Bureau of Engineering reports that right of way acquisition will be required for the proposed sidewalk area.

The construction of sidewalks and related improvements are not an eligible expenditure for MICLA funding as sidewalks cannot be used as a secured asset in a lease/lease back finance. Potential eligible funding sources include the General Fund, Gas Tax, Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Funds (SB1), Measure R and Measure M. However, each of these funding sources have been completely programmed for 2020-21. Additionally, there is significant uncertainty in each of these revenue sources given their sensitivity to the economy.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of these revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend either the action in this Motion as amended or adding a new appropriation from one of the eligible funding sources.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using one of the eligible funding sources, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$400,000

#### **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The proposed expenditures associated with this project are not eligible for MICLA financing. As a result, there is no debt impact to the General Fund.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SMC:AG:06210006

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0031

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Alevelle

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM – TELFAIR MULTIMODAL BRIDGE OVER THE PACOIMA WASH PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 31 – C.F. 20-0600-S31)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and File this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 31 requests the 2020-21 Budget be amended to add \$515,000 in funding to complete design for the Telfair Multimodal Bridge over the Pacoima Wash Project (Project) in Council District 7.

The Project includes the construction of a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge along Telfair Avenue, connecting the communities separated by the Pacoima Wash and providing direct access to the proposed El Dorado Park. The total project cost is \$5.3 million, consisting of \$1.3 million for design and permitting costs and \$4 million for construction. The Project is currently authorized a total of \$900,000 in funding for design (\$400,000 from the Measure M Local Return Fund in 2018-19 and \$500,000 from the General Fund in 2019-20).

The Bureau of Engineering, as the Project Manager, estimates that funding of \$400,000 rather than \$515,000 is required to complete design and apply for water-related permits from the appropriate regulatory agencies. This amended amount is confirmed by Council District 7 staff. Potential eligible funding sources include the General Fund and the Measure M Local Return Fund.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21 this Office does not recommend adding funding for this purpose at this time. During the course of the year, funding may become available as a result of savings generated from other capital improvement projects. Should these funds be eligible sources for this Project, the Council may consider transferring these savings as part of the Construction Projects Reports (CPRs) this Office releases during the year.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$515,000 (or \$400,000 if the lesser amount is approved).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SMC:06200101

0590-00123-0057

Date: July 8, 2020

To: City Council Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal A Hewell

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: REPORT BACK ON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM – TELFAIR MULTIMODAL BRIDGE OVER THE PACOIMA WASH PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 31 – C.F. 20-0600-S31)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

On June 15, 2020, the Budget and Finance Committee approved Budget Motion Number 31 as amended to instruct the City Administrative Officer to report on whether the remaining \$400,000 required to complete design of the Telfair Multimodal Bridge over the Pacoima Wash Project (Project) is an eligible Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) expenditure. It should be noted that the requested funding will also fund water-related permits from the appropriate regulatory agencies.

Bridge construction projects are not commonly lease financed projects as their ability to be used as secured assets is unclear and not commonly done. Should MICLA financing be approved for this project, another asset with a value greater than or equal to the project cost would need to be identified

In light of the City's current economic condition and the current unavailability of funds, this Office does not recommend additional MICLA authorizations. Other eligible funding sources such as the General Fund or the Measure M Local Return Fund are fully allocated in the 2020-21 Budget. During the course of the year, funds may become available as a result of savings generated from other capital improvement projects. Should these funds be eligible sources for this Project, the Council may consider transferring these savings as part of the Construction Projects Reports (CPRs) this Office releases during the year.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using MICLA funding, the 2020-21 Budget would need to be amended to include \$400,000 in MICLA funding. If the Motion is approved using other eligible funds, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$400,000.

#### **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of additional MICLA financing on eligible expenditures associate with this project would cause the City to borrow an additional \$400,000 at approximately 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service would be \$670,000, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$270,000. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$33,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

#### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:SMC:AG:06210007

0590-00123-0032

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Hault

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – ADDITIONAL HOMELESS SERVICES IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 1 (BUDGET MOTION 32 – C.F. 20-0600-S32)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 32 requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add \$285,219 for Shower of Hope – Mobile Showers and \$287,300 for Laundry Truck LA – Laundry Service in Council District 1. The total funding required for both programs is \$572,519.

An additional appropriation is not recommended at this time. A report regarding Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) Program Funding is forthcoming and it will include a recommendation to provide \$572,519 to the City Clerk to extend the contract with Shower of Hope for mobile showers and laundry services in Council District 1. Furthermore, the 2020-21 Budget includes \$20,000 for a Mobile Shower Program and \$25,000 for a Pool Shower Pilot Program in Council District 1 as part of the Council Community Projects line item in the General City Purposes Budget.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact.

#### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BYO:01200044

0590-00123-0033

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – RE TAN HOTEL (BUDGET MOTION 33 – C.F. 20-0600-S33)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the use of \$700,000 of the General City Purposes – Additional Homeless Services Account for a Family Shelter Lease for the Re Tan Hotel, subject to a feasibility evaluation by the City's Homelessness Coordinator.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 33 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to decrease \$700,000 from the General City Purposes (GCP) – Additional Homeless Services Account and to add \$700,000 in funding for a Family Shelter Lease for Re Tan Hotel.

The motion proposes a \$700,000 appropriation to lease 61 rooms in the Re Tan Hotel for families in Council District 13. The City's Homelessness Coordinator has determined that this is a priority project in need of immediate funding. Therefore, this Office recommends approval of the motion. There is currently \$10.0 million appropriated in the 2020-21 Budget for the GCP – Additional Homeless Services Account to establish new crisis and bridge housing beds with hygiene facilities and/or storage for unsheltered individuals experiencing homelessness. The intent of the motion is consistent with the purpose of the GCP – Additional Homeless Services Account and the goal to add 50-100 new beds per Council District. If the City Council approves this recommendation, the GCP – Additional Homeless Services Account will decrease by \$0.7 million to \$9.3 million.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to appropriate a portion of the \$10.0 million in the General City Purposes (GCP) – Additional Homeless Services Account has no fiscal impact at this time.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BYO:01200045

#### CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0034

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhaltheller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM/ MICLA – SYLMAR SENIOR CENTER (BUDGET MOTION 34 – C.F. 20-0600-S34)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 34 requests the 2020-21 Budget be amended to provide \$1.5 million in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding to rehabilitate a vacant building at the Sylmar Recreation Center to establish a new Senior Center in Council District 7.

At this time, the full cost of conversion and the feasibility of rehabilitating the building for that use have not been assessed. Furthermore, a detailed project scope is not yet available, which is necessary to determine MICLA eligibility.

If the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-0692), it may identify this project as a potential recipient for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action to identify funding for this purpose.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is a potential General Fund impact for one-time costs of improvements in an amount currently unknown, with additional ongoing costs in future years for operations and maintenance costs should the facility be operated by City staff.

#### DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of MICLA financing on eligible projects associated with

the Sylmar Senior Center would cause the City to borrow \$1.5 million at approximately 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service would be \$2.5 million, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$1 million. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$125,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:AG:KH:05200161

0590-00123-0035

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Sleveller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: TRANSPORTATION/MICLA – SIDEWALKS AND FLASHING BEACON AT COBALT STREET (BUDGET MOTION 35 – C.F. 20-0600-S35)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 35 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide \$800,000 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding to install sidewalks along Glenoaks Boulevard between Cobalt Street and Bledsoe Street and install a flashing beacon at Cobalt Street to allow students and the surrounding community to cross the street safely.

New sidewalk construction is not an eligible expenditure for MICLA funding as sidewalks cannot be used as a secured asset in a lease/lease back financing. The City Council would have to consider additional funding sources, including the General Fund, for new sidewalk construction at the requested location in coordination with the Public Works Bureaus of Engineering and Street Services.

A fixed pedestrian flashing beacon, such as a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, and the associated curb ramps, if needed, are eligible for MICLA funding. According to staff from the Department of Transportation (LADOT), the estimated cost of a pedestrian flashing beacon is \$75,000, including the cost of curb ramps.

Based on updated information, LADOT staff is recommending a traffic signal instead of a flashing beacon at the identified location, with an estimated cost of \$350,000 including curb ramps. LADOT should coordinate with the Council Office to determine if any of the \$15 million MICLA authority for the Transportation Traffic Signal Safety Project included in each of the previous two Adopted Budgets can be used for the traffic signal. This effort should be coordinated with the construction of new sidewalks at this location if possible in order to maximize the safety benefit of the traffic signal.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the current unavailability of funds for new sidewalk construction, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using funds other than MICLA, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance.

# DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of additional MICLA financing on eligible expenditures associated with this project would cause the City to borrow an additional \$350,000 at approximately 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service would be \$585,000, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$235,000. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$29,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:RC:06200113

0590-00123-0036

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM/MICLA – FUNDING FOR PACOIMA SPREADING GROUNDS STUDY (BUDGET MOTION 36 – C.F. 20-0600-S36)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 36 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to include \$400,000 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding for the Pacoima Spreading Grounds feasibility and concept study. Predevelopment costs such as feasibility and concept studies are generally eligible MICLA expenditures if the projects associated with the costs are MICLA eligible and owned by the City. In this case, the spreading grounds that provide groundwater recharge are not eligible for MICLA financing as they are not owned by the City, but by the County of Los Angeles. Furthermore, the asset cannot be pledged in a lease/lease back financing. Additional research would be needed to identify eligible funding sources.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using funds other than MICLA, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$400,000.

#### DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT

The proposed expenditures associated with this project are not eligible for MICLA financing. As a result, there is no debt impact to the General Fund.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0037

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Alenell

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

## Subject: TRANSPORTATION/MICLA – TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONVERSION AND SPEED FEEDBACK SIGNS (BUDGET MOTION 37 – C.F. 20-0600-S37)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 37 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide \$80,000 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding to convert the traffic signal at the intersection of Coal Canyon Road and Wentworth Street to a rest-on-red light and to install four speed feedback signs along Foothill Boulevard in Sunland-Tujunga to address speeding issues.

At the identified intersection of Coal Canyon Road and Wentworth Street, there is an existing traffic signal that can be converted to a rest-on-red light. Since the changes would not require a new traffic signal, the additional equipment and hardware changes would not be eligible expenditures for MICLA funding. Existing appropriations for the Department of Transportation (LADOT) from the Measure M Local Return Fund, Measure R Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Fund, Proposition C Anti-Gridlock Transit Improvement Fund, Special Gas Tax Improvement Fund, and the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program (SB1) Fund may be eligible for this conversion. LADOT will need to confirm the cost estimate for this proposed signal conversion after further evaluation of the signal conditions at the identified intersection.

Fixed speed feedback signs are eligible for MICLA funding and cost about \$15,000 per sign, for a total of \$60,000 for four signs as indicated in this Motion. LADOT should coordinate with the Council Office to determine if any of the \$15 million in MICLA authority for the Transportation Traffic Signal Safety Project included in each of the previous two Adopted Budgets can be used for the requested feedback signs.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the current unavailability of funds for additional capital projects, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using funds other than MICLA, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$80,000.

## **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of additional MICLA financing on eligible expenditures associated with this project would cause the City to borrow an additional \$60,000 at approximately 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service would be \$100,000, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$40,000. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$5,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:RC:06200114

0590-00123-0038

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Sfor

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: TRANSPORTATION/MICLA – HYBRID BEACON CROSSWALK AND SIDEWALK AT FOOTHILL BOULEVARD AND NORTH BRAND BOULEVARD (BUDGET MOTION 38 – C.F. 20-0600-S38)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 38 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide \$400,000 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding to install hybrid beacon crosswalks and curb ramps at the intersection of Foothill Boulevard and North Brand Boulevard and sidewalk on the westerly side of Foothill Boulevard between North Brand Boulevard and the Pacoima Wash.

New sidewalk construction is not an eligible expenditure for MICLA funding as sidewalks cannot be used as a secured asset in a lease/lease back financing. The City Council would have to consider alternative funding sources, including the General Fund, for new sidewalk construction at the requested location in coordination with the Public Works Bureaus of Engineering and Street Services.

A hybrid pedestrian beacon crosswalk, such as a high intensity activated crosswalk or HAWK signal, and the associated curb ramps, if needed, are eligible for MICLA funding. The estimated cost of a hybrid pedestrian beacon crosswalk is \$300,000, including the cost of curb ramps. The Department of Transportation should coordinate with the Council Office to determine if any of the \$15 million MICLA appropriation for the Transportation Traffic Signal Safety Project included in each of the previous two Adopted Budgets can be used for the requested hybrid beacon crosswalk. This effort should be coordinated with the construction of new sidewalks at this location in order to maximize the safety benefit of the hybrid pedestrian beacon crosswalk.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the current unavailability of funds for new sidewalk construction, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. Approving funding for the portion of this proposal that is not MICLA eligible would put the 2020-21 Budget out of balance.

## **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of additional MICLA financing on eligible expenditures associated with this project would cause the City to borrow an additional \$300,000 at approximately 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service would be \$500,000, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$200,000. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$25,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:RC:06200115

0590-00123-0039

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Staulf

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

#### Subject: POLICE – EXPAND "THROUGH OUR EYES" PROGRAM TO ALL COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP SITES (BUDGET MOTION 39 – C.F. 20-0600-S39)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Hold this item in the Budget and Finance Committee until the Committee has considered redirecting resources from the Police Department to other priorities.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 39 requests the 2020-21 Budget be amended to expand the Police Department's "Through our Eyes" partnership program to all Community Safety Partnership sites and identify additional youth-serving organizations to build similar engagement and relationship-based programs by adding funding (\$100,000) to the Police Department's budget.

The "Through our Eyes" program consists of workshops developed by teen leaders from Legacy LA, a community based non-profit organization focused on youth development, to address tensions between teens and law enforcement. Trained Legacy LA youth leaders and LAPD Community Safety Partnership police officers conduct each 2.5-hour workshop. The Community Safety Partnership program operates in Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles public housing sites and City parks with the goal of fostering relationships with residents, supporting community and youth programs, addressing quality of life issues, and developing programs to address and reduce violent crimes.

If the City Council takes action to redirect resources that the 2020-21 Budget appropriates to the Los Angeles Police Department to disadvantaged communities and communities of color (C.F. 20-0692), it may identify these programs as potential recipients for funding. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, absent this redirection of resources, this Office does not recommend that the City Council take an action to identify funding for this purpose.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to hold this Budget Motion for further discussion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$100,000 unless resources from other budget appropriations are redirected.

#### FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:TJM:04200154

0590-00123-0040

Date: June 10, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Stenlet

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM/MICLA – HUBBARD STREET CURB AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS (BUDGET MOTION 40 – C.F. 20-0600-S40)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 40 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to provide \$615,687 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding for sidewalk and curb improvements along the south side of Hubbard Street from Dronfield Avenue to Foothill Boulevard, and to add a sidewalk to the north side of Hubbard Street in front of 13755 Hubbard.

Sidewalk and curb construction is not eligible for MICLA funding. Eligible funding sources include the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program (SB1), Measure M, Measure R, Gas Tax, and the General Fund. However, each of these funding sources have been completely programed for 2020-21. Additionally, there is significant uncertainty in each of these revenue sources given their sensitivity to the economy.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of these revenues in 2020-21, we do not recommend either the actions in this Motion or adding a new appropriation in the alternative funding sources that we have identified.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. Amending the Budget to add an appropriation from one of the eligible funding sources we have identified would cause the 2020-21 Budget to fall out of balance by \$615,687.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

# **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The proposed expenditures associated with this project are not eligible for MICLA financing. As a result, there is no debt impact to the General Fund.

RHL:LLE:06200117

0590-00123-0041

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer From:

Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM/MICLA - FUNDING FOR TUJUNGA CANYON GREEN STREET PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 41 -C.F. 20-0600-S41)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 41 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to include \$2,990,000 in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding for the Tujunga Green Street Project. This project is located along Tujunga Canyon Blvd. and Commerce Avenue and the proposed design elements consist of permeable concrete sidewalks, a bioswale island, infiltration planters, and double drywell systems. The Green street project components listed above are not eligible for MICLA funding as they do not include an asset that can be pledged in a lease/lease back financing. As the project would increase water quality in the surrounding area, Measure W could potentially fund this project. All Measure W funds are programmed for 2020-21 and any changes should be reviewed in accordance with the established governance structure, including evaluation pursuant to the scoring criteria and Los Angeles County requirements. Additional research would be needed to identify other eligible funding sources.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved using funds other than MICLA, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$2,990,000.

## **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The proposed expenditures associated with this project are not eligible for MICLA financing. As a result, there is no debt impact to the General Fund.

## FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies

## CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0590-00123-0044

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Hewlet

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM – WARNER GRAND PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 44 – C.F. 20-0600-S44)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 44 requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to include \$4 million in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding for Phase I of the rehabilitation and restoration project for the Warner Grand Theater located at 476 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street in Council District 15.

As shown in the chart below, the project has received \$6.5 million in cumulative MICLA funding, of which \$720,000 would be expended on current year activities, for a remaining balance of \$5.78 million that would be prioritized to address the facility's most critical capital improvement needs.

Funding Authority	Total Authorized	Projected Expenditures by June 30, 2020	Remaining Balance	
2017-18 Budget	\$1.5 million	\$720,000*	\$0.78 million**	
2018-19 Budget	5.0 million	<u> </u>	5.00 million	
Totals:	\$6.5 million	\$720,000	\$5.78 million	
* Funding to purchase and install production and stage equipment.				
** MICLA funding authority has been extended to 2021-22 (C.F. 20-0036).				

During the preparation of the 2020-21 Budget, a final scope of work had not been finalized, pending the outcome of budget decisions. The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) worked in conjunction with the Council Office and the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA) to develop three scope options with cost ranging from \$6.8 million to \$66.8 million, as follows:

Option	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Shortfall	Scope
A	\$ 8.4 million	\$ 2.64 million	Stage upgrades, expansion of lobby, ticketing and concessions, digital Marque, relocation and construction of new restrooms, development of VIP lounge, addition of second floor balcony, new sound booth, upgrade of audio, visual and lighting systems, and ADA and elevator upgrades.
В	\$ 6.8 million	\$ 1.02 million	Same as Option A, without improvements to Mezzanine level.
С	\$66.8 million	\$61.02 million	Same as Option A, with seismic retrofit work.

Based on the current level of secured funding, BOE and DCA have provided revised cash flow schedules that reflect project expenditures of \$4 million in 2020-21, with a balance of \$1.78 million to be expended in 2021-22.

Our Office does not recommend additional funding at this time, as there is sufficient funding to fully fund anticipated activities in the upcoming fiscal year. In addition, in light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the actions in this Motion are not recommended.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would need to be amended to include an additional \$4 million in Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) funding, for a total revised project funding authority of \$10.5 million in MICLA funds.

# **DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT**

The issuance of bonds through the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) is a General Fund obligation. The use of MICLA financing for this project would cause the City to borrow an additional \$4 million at a 5.5 percent interest rate over 20 years. The total estimated debt service is \$ 6.7 million, which includes the borrowing amount and interest of \$2.7 million. During the life of the bonds, the estimated average annual debt service is \$335,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:LJS/AG:05200160

0590-00123-0046

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Alkelle

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – FEASIBILITY OF PROVIDING FUNDING FOR MOTOR SWEEPER ROUTE OPTIMIZATION TECHNOLOGY (BUDGET MOTION 46 – C.F. 20-0600-S46)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 46 instructs this Office to report on the feasibility of providing funding (\$1,000,000) for the Bureau of Street Services' (BSS) Motor Sweeper Route Optimization Technology (no positions) for the remapping and optimization for Street Sweeping Routes.

It is our understanding that the Bureau of Sanitation (Sanitation) and BSS are currently working together to determine the scope of work of a Street Sweeping Optimization Study. Components of the study may be eligible for partial Measure W funding. BSS and Sanitation are in the process of exchanging data to determine appropriate study criteria. Consensus on the scope of work will be required to move forward. As the Program Administrator for Measure W, Sanitation will have reporting requirements to the County of Los Angeles and will need to demonstrate the water supply/quality benefits pursuant to the County's requirements. This Office recommends that this study be considered for funding in 2021-22, at which time we will have a better understanding of the possible use of Measure W.

#### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, offsetting General Fund appropriations or additional revenues will need to be identified.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:06200110

0590-00123-0047

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhal Alleveller

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – FEASIBILITY OF RESTORING FUNDING FOR THE REPAIR AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FAILED STREETS TO THE 2019-20 FUNDING LEVELS (BUDGET MOTION 47 – C.F. 20-0600-S47)

# RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 47 instructs this Office to report on the feasibility of restoring funding for the repair and reconstruction of failed asphalt streets and failed concrete streets to 2019-20 funding levels.

Restoring funding for the repair and reconstruction of failed asphalt streets and failed concrete streets to 2019-20 funding levels requires a net additional appropriation of \$2.81 million.

- Funding for the repair of concrete streets was reduced by \$4.75 million from \$7.0 million in 2019-20 to \$2.25 million in 2020-21.
- Funding for the repair of asphalt streets increased by \$1.94 million from \$18.14 million in 2019-20 to \$20.08 million in 2020-21. The increase was due to full year funding of positions in 2020-21 that were provided nine-months funding in 2019-20.

Eligible funding sources for the repair of asphalt and concrete streets include General Fund, Gas Tax, SB1, Measure R and Measure M. The Street Damage Restoration Fee (SDRF) Fund can also be used for the repair of asphalt streets but not concrete streets, as the fee is not charged when cuts are made into concrete streets. The SDRF Ordinance requires that concrete street panels be replaced in-kind when work is performed. Proposition A & C are eligible funding sources when repairing and maintaining streets used by public transit. However, each of these funding sources have been completely programed for 2020-21. Additionally, there is significant uncertainty in each of these revenue sources given their sensitivity to the economy.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the action in this Motion is not recommended.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, offsetting appropriations or additional revenues in the amount of \$2.81 million will need to be identified.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:06200111

0590-00123-0049

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Staulty

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: CITY PLANNING – DELETION OF POSITION AUTHORITIES FROM VARIOUS CITY DEPARTMENTS TO RESTORE RESOLUTION AUTHORITY FOR POSITIONS TO CONDUCT THE WILDLIFE PILOT STUDY (BUDGET MOTION 49 – C.F. 20-0600-S49)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

# DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 49 instructs the City Administrative Officer, with the assistance of the Chief Legislative Analyst, to recommend deletions of position authority from departments whose operations may be reduced in light of the COVID-19 State of Emergency to restore resolution authority for one Environmental Specialist II and one City Planning Associate in the Department of City Planning (DCP) without funding to conduct the Wildlife Pilot Study.

The DCP reports that the Wildlife Corridor Pilot Study (Study) will streamline the review process, reduce the amount of staff time needed for each project, and potentially reduce the overall processing timeline for applicants related to entitlement applications in the Santa Monica Mountains Study Area. DCP states that the Study would generate an unquantified amount of savings over a period of years from a reduction in staff time to process individual cases. There are no special funds eligible to support the costs of these positions.

It is not clear what departmental responsibilities and resource needs for COVID-19 response efforts will be in the future due to the fluidity of response efforts. Additionally, it is not clear how departmental operations will change in the long term in response to COVID-19 guidelines and when resources that could be deleted at present may be needed to restore services in the future.

The addition of one Environmental Specialist II and one City Planning Associate without funding in the DCP is not recommended as this would result in an unfunded demand on DCP's 2020-21 budgetary resources and would not be in compliance with the City's Financial Policies requiring position authorities be supported by funding. Budget Motion 13 also requests approval of these positions, and this Office has prepared a memo recommending against adding the positions. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, and the fact that these positions are proposed to be unfunded, the action in this Motion is not recommended.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, and the positions are funded, the total costs are \$248,220 (\$168,709 direct cost and \$79,511 indirect costs).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation to note and file this Motion complies with the City's Financial Policies. If the motion is approved and the positions are added without funding, this action is not in compliance with the Financial Policies, which state that positions added in the budget should be funded.

RHL:NSC:02200179C

0590-00123-0050

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stevelet

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 50 (C.F. 20-0600-S50) PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF SANITATION – LABOR RELATIONS ADVOCATE

# RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 50 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add resolution authority without funding in the Bureau of Sanitation (Bureau) for a position in the appropriate classification to serve as a Labor Relations Advocate.

The Bureau indicates that this position would work with the service providers in the RecycLA program, which is a public-private partnership to provide waste and recycling services to commercial and industrial businesses, institutions, and multifamily buildings. The appropriate classification to serve as a labor relations advocate is a Senior Personnel Analyst.

The Bureau is part of the Consolidated Personnel Services, however, the Bureau has two additional Senior Personnel Analyst positions authorized. One of the Senior Personnel Analyst positions is currently vacant. Adding a position without funding does not comply with the City's Financial Policies, which state that position authorities should be funded. An eligible source of funds for this position is the Citywide Recycling Trust Fund (CRTF). It is projected that the CRTF will require a General Fund subsidy starting in 2021-22.

While this position is eligible for special funds, in light of the potential General Fund impact in future years, and the fact that this position is proposed to be unfunded, this Office does not recommend the action in this Motion.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved and funded, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$189,646 (\$134,528 direct cost and \$55,118 related costs).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies. If the motion is approved and a position is added without funding, this action is not in compliance with the Financial Policies, which state that positions added in the budget should be funded.

RHL:CEA:10200131

0590-00123-0051

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: PERSONNEL – FOUR POSITIONS SUPPORTING THE HUMAN RESOURCES PAYROLL (HRP) PROJECT (BUDGET MOTION 51 – C.F. 20-0600-S51)

# RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

# DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 51 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add funding (\$343,330) and resolution authority for one Personnel Director, two Senior Personnel Analyst Is, and one Personnel Analyst in the Personnel Department to develop and implement the Human Resources Payroll (HRP) project.

The Personnel Department is currently staffing the HRP project with a total of six positions, including four positions that were internally reassigned on a temporary basis from other work assignments and two dedicated positions provided in both the 2019-20 and 2020-21 budgets. If the four new positions in this motion are approved to support the HRP project, the Personnel Department anticipates that a total of six positions will continue to support the HRP project and the four internally reassigned positions will return to perform their original work assignments. There are no special funds eligible to support the costs of these positions.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the actions in this Motion.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$504,162 (\$343,330 direct costs and \$160,832 related costs).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:RR:11200100

0590-00123-0052

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 52 (C.F. 20-0600-S52) BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – ONE UNFUNDED PRINCIPAL PROJECT COORDINATOR AND ONE COMMUNITY SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE TO SUPPORT CLIMATE EMERGENCY MOBILIZATION OFFICE ACTIVITIES

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 52 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add resolution authority without funding for one Principal Project Coordinator (PPC) and one Community Services Representative (CSR) in the Board of Public Works (Board) to support the activities of a Climate Emergency Mobilization Office (CEM). The proposed PPC would serve as the Director of Climate Emergency for the CEM and the CSR would assist the Director of Climate Emergency.

As part of its 2020-21 budget request, the Board requested resolution authority with ninemonths funding for one PPC and resolution authority without funding for one CSR for these purposes. The Mayor's Office denied this request.

The Board currently does not have dedicated staff for climate change. Pursuant to an instruction in the 2019-20 Adopted Budget, the Controller transferred \$200,000 from the General City Purposes, Climate Emergency Commission Account, to the Board and the Board has used this funding. On November 27, 2019, this Office approved a PPC substitute authority to allow the Board to recruit and fill the position. The Board has yet to hire a PPC.

This Office does not support authorizing these positions without funding. There are no special funds eligible to support the costs of the two positions and it is unlikely the Board will have sufficient General Fund savings to fund the positions in light of the salary reductions in the 2020-21 Budget. Further, pursuant to the City's Financial Policies, the budget should not include unfunded positions.

As part of the 2019-20 Year-End Financial Status Report, the City Council and Mayor reappropriated \$500,000 from the 2019-20 Unappropriated Balance, Climate Change Emergency Mobilization Program Account to 2020-21. If these positions are deemed

necessary to advance the City's climate change objectives, the Board can request that the City Council authorize these positions using this funding.

At this time, and in light of the City's current economic condition, the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, and the fact that these positions are proposed to be unfunded, this Office does not recommend the action in this Motion.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If approved and funded, the total annual cost of the two positions is \$304,605 (\$204,214 direct cost and \$100,391 related cost).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City Financial Policies. If the motion is approved and two positions are added without funding, it would not be in compliance with the Financial Policies, which state that positions added in the budget should be funded.

RHL:BA:062000103

0590-00123-0053

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Ruhalt Stault

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

Subject: PERSONNEL – FURLOUGH EXEMPTION FOR VARIOUS POSITIONS IN THE CUSTODY CARE PROGRAM AND PUBLIC SAFETY DIVISION (BUDGET MOTION 53 – C.F. 20-0600-S53)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 53 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to exempt from furloughs various positions including one Physician, seven Advanced Practice Providers, 32 Background Investigator Is, and eight Background Investigator IIs in the Personnel Department's Custody Care Program and Public Safety Division.

The workload associated with providing custody care medical services has increased due to COVID-19. The 2020-21 Budget exempts Correctional Care Nurses from furloughs to ensure the continued provision of medical services in the City's jails. The Department reports that Physicians and Advanced Practice Providers are also integral to providing custody care medical oversight and supervision as well as occupational health screenings for City employees. Custody medical care is mandated and therefore the City will need to provide as-needed staff if regular staff are furloughed. Eliminating furloughs for all Physicians and Advanced Practice Providers would cost \$217,000. Due to the mandatory nature of this work and the potential cost impact of implementing furloughs, we will monitor the impacts of furloughs and, if necessary, report in future Financial Status Reports with recommendations on whether and how to adjust furloughs for these classifications.

The Department reports that furloughs for Background Investigators will result in conducting 120 fewer investigations for public safety candidates. The Department indicates this may reduce the number of candidates that the City can hire as police officers and firefighters. Eliminating furloughs for Background Investigators would cost \$317,300.

There are no special funds eligible to support the costs of eliminating furloughs for the identified positions.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, the Office does not recommend approving the actions in this Motion at this time.

# **FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the 2020-21 Budget would fall out of balance by \$534,300.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:RR:11200101

0590-00123-0054

Date: June 17, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

# Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET MOTION 54 (C.F. 20-0600-S54) UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – FUNDING FOR CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY MOBILIZATION AND CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY PROJECTS

# RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion

# DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 54 requests to amend the 2020-21 Budget to set aside \$800,000 in funding for Climate Change Emergency Mobilization Community Assemblies (\$500,000) and Climate Change Emergency Projects (\$300,000).

The 2019-20 Budget had available funding for both of these projects in the Unappropriated Balance. It included \$500,000, reappropriated from 2018-19, for the Climate Change Emergency Mobilization Program. The City Council and Mayor has already acted to reappropriate this asyet unspent funding to 2020-21. The 2019-20 Budget also included \$300,000 in the Unappropriated Balance for Climate Change Emergency Projects. No City department has requested to spend or reappropriate this funding and it will revert to the City's Reserve Fund. This Office recommends that Mayor and City Council not reappropriate the \$300,000 for Climate Emergency Projects to 2020-21 as the Reserve Fund balance anticipated for 2020-21 will be below the Emergency Reserve threshold of 2.75 percent.

During 2020-21, the City can use the \$500,000 already approved for reappropriation to meet a variety of climate change needs and relevant departments. In 2020-21, the Council and Mayor should complete the process of establishing the Climate Change Commission, hire a Climate Change Director and instruct the Climate Change Director to submit a plan to the City Council for the use of these funds. In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the action in this Motion to add additional funding.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation in this report will have no fiscal impact. Approving the motion would require a General Fund appropriation of \$800,000 and an equal reduction to another line item in Budget or a revenue increase.

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL:BA:062000104

0590-00123-0055

Date: June 11, 2020

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., City Administrative Officer

## Subject: PUBLIC WORKS – BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – SEVEN RESOLUTION AUTHORITY POSITIONS WITHOUT FUNDING (BUDGET MOTION 55 – C.F. 20-0600-S55)

## RECOMMENDATION

Note and file this Motion.

## DISCUSSION

Budget Motion Number 55 proposes to amend the 2020-21 Budget to add seven resolution authority positions without funding in the Bureau of Street Services (Bureau). The positions include one Principal Civil Engineer to support Asset Management & Advanced Planning, two Systems Analysts, and two GIS Specialists to support GIS Street Sweeping efforts, one Street Services General Superintendent II to oversee Risk and Liability Crews, and one Street Services General Superintendent II to oversee Bureau-wide efforts to improve safety, reduce risk, and mitigate liabilities.

The Bureau reports that these positions are critical and have direct impacts on risk, safety, technology and asset management innovation, leadership, sidewalk construction, and grant-funded streetscape projects. The Bureau's 2019-20 budget includes resolution authority for these seven positions, but the 2020-21 Budget did not continue these authorities due to the City's fiscal constraints. Five of these seven positions are currently filled. Two of the five filled positions can be absorbed into existing vacancies in the same classification within the Bureau. The remaining three filled positions will require the Bureau to hold existing funded positions vacant and the use of either an in-lieu or substitute authority. Restoring these positions without funding does not comply with the City's Financial Policies, which state that position authorities should be funded.

In light of the City's current economic condition and the uncertainty of revenues in 2020-21, this Office does not recommend the action proposed in this Motion. For layoff avoidance, the Bureau should submit in-lieu or substitute authority requests as specified above to this Office prior to July 1, 2020.

# FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The recommendation to note and file this Budget Motion will have no fiscal impact. If the Motion is approved, the total costs are \$1,148,807 (\$804,873 in direct costs and \$343,934 in indirect costs).

# FINANCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE

The recommendation in this report complies with the City's Financial Policies. Approving the positions without funding does not comply with the City Financial Policies.

RHL:NCT:06200112