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During its consideration of the Los Angeles Fire Department's (the "Department") 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the Diesel Exhaust Capturing Systems (the "Systems") in fire stations are considered capital improvements or equipment, eligible for MICLA financing. Based on information provided by the Department and supplemental research, the Systems are MICLA eligible. The Systems are installed to fire stations, at which point they become affixed to the facilities – as required by MICLA policy. They are installed to facilities and connected to the tailpipes of heavy apparatus to remove hazardous diesel exhaust fumes and prevent such contaminants from being emitted within fire stations. Such installations improve the air quality and create healthier work environments at stations. The Systems can thus be considered essential capital equipment and an adequate use of MICLA funds.

While the life span of each System is contingent on its use – busier stations require frequent repairs – the average life span is estimated at 10 years, thus meeting MICLA useful life requirements. Many of the current Systems have been operating for more than 15 years and require replacements. Although the installation and purchase of these Systems are MICLA eligible, the maintenance required for these Systems is not, as maintenance is not a capital expenditure. Other funds will need to be identified for ongoing maintenance.

In the 2016-17 Adopted Budget, the Department received $100,000 for the purchase and installations of five Systems. While the average cost of these Systems is $20,000, the actual per unit cost varies widely by station as the configuration is different for each station. The anticipated amount of necessary Systems is a maximum of 110 units. The total cost estimate for all stations with aging Systems is up to $1.8 million, which would be phased-in over 5 years.

Should the Systems be financed through MICLA, they would be initially financed with MICLA Commercial Paper (CP) Notes and subsequently placed into long-term debt. The total estimated debt service, assuming the City borrows at a 5.5 percent interest rate over 10 years, is $2.39 million, including the borrowing amount and $590,000 in interest. The estimated annual debt service over ten years is $238,800. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance. We cannot fully predict what interest rates will be in the future.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 1, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – OPERATIONS VALLEY BUREAU (OVB) HEADQUARTERS

During its consideration of the Fire Department's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report on the level of funding required in 2017-18 for the construction of the Operations Valley Bureau (OVB) headquarters and possible funding options. To date, the Fire Department has been splitting its OVB operations between Fire Station 81 in Panorama City and Fire Station 83 in Encino, which is operationally inefficient. The Fire Department would like to consolidate these operations in space available within the Fire Station 88 complex, in Sherman Oaks.

The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) has performed a rough order of magnitude estimate to establish a modular building facility at the site at an estimated cost of $1.1 million. This includes a modular building and improvements such as concrete, electrical, telephone and data, signage and permits.

A potential funding source for this project could be through the Proposition F General Obligation Bond Program. All Proposition F projects approved by the voters have been completed and remaining uncommitted funds must be defeased in accordance with tax-exempt bond requirements. Funds that have been committed are for fire and animal shelter capital projects that will be completed by the end of 2017-18. There is a small amount of uncommitted Proposition F funds that do not require defeasance and are available to fund the OVB project.

The continuation of 14 positions in three departments (BOE, Bureau of Contract Administration and Board of Public Works/Office of Accounting) will also be required for the OVB project and two other Proposition F-eligible projects (Fire Station 39 in Van Nuys and North Central Animal Shelter in Northeast Los Angeles). These positions would be funded by Proposition F. The attached chart shows positions and costs.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There would be no General Fund impact if this project and associated positions for this project, along with Fire Station 39 and North Central Animal Shelter are funded through Proposition F. The North Central Animal Shelter will also use MiCLA funds that were approved in the 2016-17 Budget.
### 2017-18 Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9389-D Principal Civil Engineer - PM III</td>
<td>$180,863</td>
<td>$72,056</td>
<td>$252,919</td>
<td>$126,459</td>
<td>$126,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7927 Senior Architect</td>
<td>$149,981</td>
<td>$59,752</td>
<td>$209,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7246-3 Civil Engineering Associate III</td>
<td>$117,345</td>
<td>$46,750</td>
<td>$164,095</td>
<td>$164,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7237 Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$127,556</td>
<td>$50,818</td>
<td>$178,374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7561-1 Building Mechanical Engr. I</td>
<td>$134,927</td>
<td>$53,755</td>
<td>$188,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9171-1 Senior Management Analyst I</td>
<td>$115,863</td>
<td>$46,160</td>
<td>$162,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7925 Architect</td>
<td>$127,556</td>
<td>$50,818</td>
<td>$178,374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1116 Secretary</td>
<td>$70,324</td>
<td>$28,017</td>
<td>$98,341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,024,415</td>
<td>$408,127</td>
<td>$1,432,542</td>
<td>$528,407</td>
<td>$742,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,024,415</td>
<td>$528,407</td>
<td>$742,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1523-1 Senior Accountant I</td>
<td>$89,387</td>
<td>$30,275</td>
<td>$119,662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1523-2 Senior Accountant II</td>
<td>$96,758</td>
<td>$32,772</td>
<td>$129,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,145</td>
<td>$63,047</td>
<td>$249,192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7294 Senior Construction Inspector</td>
<td>$456,352</td>
<td>$164,195</td>
<td>$620,547</td>
<td>$310,274</td>
<td>$310,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$456,352</td>
<td>$164,195</td>
<td>$620,547</td>
<td>$310,274</td>
<td>$310,274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:

- Animal: $958,343
- Fire: $1,172,048
Date: May 1, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ZOO DEPARTMENT – ELEPHANT HABITAT

During its consideration of the Zoo Department's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Zoo Department to report on the financial impact of moving elephants out of the Zoo.

The Zoo Department reports that the total cost of the Elephant Habitat was $41.48 million from four funding sources as follows:

- Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association $18,948,648
- Proposition A-2 (Los Angeles County) 11,913,540
- Proposition CC (Los Angeles City) 8,319,110
- Zoo Enterprise Trust Fund 2,300,000
- Total $41,481,298

In the Zoo Department's response, the General Manager has expressed concerns that non-City monies expended on the project might need to be repaid if the Elephant Habitat is closed. The General Manager also indicates that closure of the habitat would represent a significant breach of trust in the Zoo Department's partnership with the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association and philanthropic citizens who contributed to the project.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The full General Fund impact of closing the Elephant Habitat at the Los Angeles Zoo is currently unknown. Additional discussion with the City Attorney will be necessary to fully determine the impact.
DATE: April 28, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: John R. Lewis, General Manager, Zoo Department

SUBJECT: ZOO DEPARTMENT - BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK QUESTION NO. 60

This memo is in response to the Budget and Finance Committee's request for information regarding the financial impact of moving elephants out of the Zoo.

Background
In December 2010, the Zoo Department opened the new Elephants of Asia habitat. At 6.56 acres, it provides natural surfaces with varied terrain and hills, and includes a waterfall, two pools, and a 16,600 square foot, two-story barn. It is the largest habitat in the history of the L.A. Zoo and is capable of caring for elephants of all sizes and ages. The space provided also vastly exceeds the standards of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, the accrediting organization for zoos and aquariums in North America that assures that highest standards for animal care and welfare are met.

Project Financing
The total cost of the Elephants of Asia project was $41.48 million, with sources of funding as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association</td>
<td>$18,948,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition A-2 (L.A. County)</td>
<td>11,913,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition CC (L.A. City)</td>
<td>8,319,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Enterprise Trust Fund</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,481,298</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Impact of Habitat Closure
If the elephants were moved out of the Zoo and the Elephants of Asia habitat ceased to exist, there could be fiscal implications as it relates to the Proposition A-2 funds and possible repayment requirements. This issue was previously reviewed by the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) in a report dated December 1, 2008 (attached), when the project was under construction (C.F. 08-2850). In this report, the CAO stated that, “Of the $42 million project budget, $12 million has been expended. If the project is
canceled, the City will have to repay $10 million to the County of Los Angeles and to the City's General Obligation Bond Fund. In correspondence dated November 19, 2008, the City Attorney has advised that these funding sources must be repaid upon cancellation of the project. The County recently informed us that the City would be required to repay the $4.9 million in expended County funds within 60 days of the decision to cancel the project. The Zoo Department defers to the CAO and the Office of the City Attorney to further update this information.

In addition to the financial risks to the City, it is important to highlight the significant contribution made to this project by the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association (GLAZA), with funds secured through fundraising from major donors, foundations and corporations. At the time of the previous debate regarding the Elephants of Asia project, GLAZA offered to pay the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA) debt service portion of the project in the amount of $14,479,700 which eliminated the General Fund contribution to the project of approximately $1.2 million per year for 20 years. GLAZA provided an upfront payment of $6 million of its $14,479,700 commitment at the time of permanent financing of the project, leaving an approximate balance of $8.5 million of MICLA debt service to be financed. GLAZA has complied with its agreement with the City and completely fulfilled its financial contribution to this project ahead of schedule. The closure of the habitat would represent a significant breach of trust in our partnership with GLAZA and with some of the City's most philanthropic citizens who contributed to this project. Ultimately, this would significantly hinder GLAZA's future fundraising endeavors which are critically important as we develop a new master plan that will rely on support from the philanthropic community as part of the overall financial plan for the Zoo's future improvements.
REPORT FROM

OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Date: December 1, 2008
To: Budget and Finance Committee
From: Raymond P. Ciranna, Interim City Administrative Officer
Reference: October 21, 2008 Cardenas-Rosendahl-Alarcon Motion (C.F. 08-2850)
Subject: Canceling the Los Angeles Zoo Pachyderm Forest Exhibit – Fiscal Impact

SUMMARY

On November 19, 2008, this Office was asked to report on the fiscal impact of canceling the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project. The Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project has a budget of $42 million and has currently expended almost $12 million on various project elements, including design, demolition, construction of a temporary yard and perimeter fencing. As discussed in our November 18, 2008 report, the cancellation of the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project will cause significant fiscal impact to the City:

- The General Fund would have to repay $10 million to the County of Los Angeles and the City's General Obligation Bond Fund. To mitigate this impact, the City could attempt to recover some of these costs, if a replacement exhibit is approved. However, this recovery plan is contingent on County approval of the replacement exhibit and reuse of the funds.
- The City would need to return GLAZA's $5 million donation for the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit.
- A replacement exhibit would have to be constructed at the proposed 6.1 acre site. We do not have sufficient information to determine whether the City could build a replacement exhibit within the remaining project funds.
- The operating cost of a new exhibit is unknown. Given the large size of the exhibit and the likelihood that the number of animals would increase, the operating cost for any new exhibit could be comparable to the additional operating and maintenance cost of a new elephant exhibit with additional elephants.
- A policy decision on whether to move Billy to a sanctuary or follow Association of Zoos and Aquariums protocols on where to place him would have to be made by the City Council. If the City Council decides to move Billy to a sanctuary, the transportation and construction costs of this move would have to be paid by the City. Although we do not have an estimate for the transportation costs, the cost to move a female elephant in 2007 was about $16,000. The cost to construct a new space at the sanctuary was estimated to be approximately $2 million in 2005 and this figure would need to be updated.
Alternatively, if the City were to complete the proposed Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project the costs would be as follows:

- The project would be completed with the $42 million in funding from various sources, including $14.5 million in MICLA.
- The cost to the General Fund would be $1.2 million a year, for 20 years, in debt service on the $14.5 million.
- If the City authorizes the Zoo to acquire three additional elephants to be housed in the new exhibit, the initial cost of operating and maintaining the new elephant exhibit would be approximately $522,500. This cost is comprised of $459,000 in annual costs and $63,500 in one-time costs. If we include the current cost of caring for Billy, the annual cost would be $615,000.
- The cost to obtain the three additional elephants is unknown. The Zoo has reported that it would first attempt to obtain the animals through a transfer or loan, similar to the process used to obtain two of its recently acquired gorillas.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council, subject to the approval of the Mayor receive and file the Cardenas-Rosendahl-Alarcon Motion

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The annual cost to the General Fund to construct the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit Project is $1.2 million in MICLA debt service for 20 years. Additionally, the cost to operate and maintain the new 6.1 acre elephant exhibit, including the housing of three additional female elephants, is $615,000 annually, plus a one-time cost of $63,500.
FINDINGS

1. Current Project

The current budget for the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit is $42,009,575 from five sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition A-2 – Los Angeles County Bond Measure</td>
<td>$11.91 M</td>
<td>$4.89 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association (GLAZA)</td>
<td>4.85 M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition CC – Los Angeles City Bond Measure</td>
<td>8.47 M</td>
<td>5.10 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Enterprise Trust Fund</td>
<td>2.30 M</td>
<td>.28 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA)</td>
<td>14.48 M</td>
<td>1.70 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pachyderm Forest Exhibit Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42.01 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.97 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Canceling the Project

Of the $42 million project budget, $12 million has been expended. If the project is canceled, the City will have to repay $10 million to the County of Los Angeles and to the City's General Obligation Bond Fund. In correspondence dated November 19, 2008, the City Attorney has advised that these funding sources must be repaid upon cancellation of the project. The County recently informed us that the City would be required to repay the $4.9 million in expended County funds within 60 days of the decision to cancel the project. Once these monies are repaid to the County, the City may reapply for the $12 million allocation. However, County staff has indicated that the Board of Supervisors will make the final determination on whether these County bond monies would be awarded to an alternate project.

The repayment obligation of $10 million poses a significant impact to the City's General Fund, especially given the size of our current deficit and the outlook for 2009-10 and beyond. As we discussed in our earlier report, the City could undertake an analysis to determine whether some of the expended monies could be redesignated as eligible under a new project. However, until this analysis is completed, we cannot estimate what portion of the $10 million can be credited to a new project.

GLAZA has made a $4.85 million commitment to the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit. If the project is cancelled, GLAZA has indicated that they would request that the City return the money so that they may return the donations to their donors.

A replacement exhibit would have to be constructed at the proposed 6.1 acre site. This site is located in the middle of the Zoo and cannot be left in its current condition. Given the size of the exhibit, we may need to build two exhibits to utilize the entire 6.1 acres. We do not have sufficient information to
determine whether the City could build a replacement exhibit within the remaining project funds. Also, we don’t know whether the $12 million in County bond monies will be authorized for re-use on another Los Angeles Zoo project by the Board of Supervisors. If the City moves ahead with a replacement project and the County monies are ultimately not provided, the City would have to replace these funds with MICLA. Additionally, depending on the cost of the replacement exhibit, the City would also likely need to replace the $5 million in GLAZA funding.

To develop a cost estimate for a replacement project, the Zoo would need to determine which animal(s) to place in the exhibit space, thereafter, the Zoo and BOE would need to undertake a comprehensive analysis to determine what changes, if any, would be needed at the site. This analysis would also assist in determining how much of the expended monies could be eligible for a new use. The decision to place another animal in the yard would require extensive analysis beyond the scope of this report. The City Engineer has indicated that this process would take weeks to complete and possibly require the use of an outside consultant due to BOE’s current workload.

The cost to operate and maintain the replacement exhibit is likely to be comparable to the cost to maintain the new elephant exhibit. The size of the exhibit would be the same and it is likely that the Zoo would acquire additional animals to house in the exhibit. The cost for the acquisition of additional animals is unknown, but are likely to be acquired via loans from other institutions, much like the Elephants would be.

The Zoo has experienced increased attendance as a result of opening new exhibits under the Zoo Bond Construction Program (Attachment 1). The cancellation of the existing project and the construction of a replacement project will delay Zoo attendance revenue increases by at least two years.

A policy decision on whether to move Billy to a sanctuary or follow Association of Zoos and Aquariums protocols on where to place him would have to be made by the City Council. If the decision is made to send Billy to the PAWS sanctuary, the City would be required to pay transportation costs for the move and construction costs for his new space. The transportation costs to move Ruby to the PAWS sanctuary were $15,819 in 2007 and were paid by the Zoo. The Zoo has indicated that the cost to transport Billy would likely be higher. In 2005, PAWS estimated it would cost the City $2 million to upgrade their facility to accommodate a male elephant. Given that the previous estimate is three years’ old, we asked PAWS to give us an updated number and are awaiting a response. According to PAWS, the construction would need to be completed before the transfer.

3. Completing the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit

The City can complete the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project within the $42 million in funding from various sources. The City has received and evaluated construction bids for the final phase of construction and could award the construction bid to the lowest/responsive bidder. The project would be completed by June 2010.

The Zoo currently spends approximately $156,000 to operate and maintain its current elephant exhibit. The additional cost to the City to operate and maintain a new exhibit with four elephants is
estimated to be $459,000 annually, plus a one-time cost of $63,500, and would be addressed during the annual budget process (Attachment 2). For comparison purposes, three other exhibits have been opened at the Zoo as part of the Zoo Bond Construction Program since 1998. The exhibits and their incremental operating and maintenance costs follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit (Opening Date)</th>
<th>Initial Budget Funding*</th>
<th>Ongoing Incremental Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Ape Rainforest (July 2000)</td>
<td>$87,786</td>
<td>$123,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Lion Cliffs (June 2005)</td>
<td>$246,654</td>
<td>$475,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Gorilla (November 2007)</td>
<td>$182,877</td>
<td>$206,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachyderm Forest (June 2010)</td>
<td>$522,500</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes one-time costs

The City has opened several new exhibits at the Zoo and many facilities throughout the City in recent years. The cost to operate and maintain these facilities is considered as part of the annual budget process. Our office includes a five year projection on these costs as part of the supporting documentation provided to the Budget and Finance Committee. These costs are incremental and significant. However, many of the projects are being constructed as a result of voter-approved General Obligation Bonds and the City must operate them. To the extent that it can, the City has paced the completion of non-voter approved construction to mitigate the costs of opening and maintaining new facilities.

The construction of this project includes the issuance of $14.5 million in MICLA. The annual debt service for this size issuance is $1.2 million for 20 years. This cost is budgeted annually as part of the City's Capital Finance Administration Fund.

The Zoo plans to acquire three female elephants to exhibit in the new expanded exhibit. The cost of these animal acquisitions is not known. The Zoo has reported that it would first attempt to obtain the animals through a transfer or loan, similar to the process used to obtain two of its recently acquired gorillas.

4. Conclusion

Cancellation of the Elephant Forest Exhibit would require the City, at least initially, to repay $10 million in voter-approved bond fund expenditures from the General Fund. It is uncertain at this time whether the City would be able to recuperate any of these funds and apply them towards construction of a new exhibit. Given the City's difficult financial situation in 2008-09 (and likely in 2009-10), it may not be possible for the City to identify funds to reimburse the bond expenditures discussed above.

We recommend that the City proceed with the completion of the Pachyderm Forest Exhibit project.
### Annual Zoo Attendance 1997-98 through October 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1,249,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1,365,819</td>
<td>115,985</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Chimps of the Mahale Mountains</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1,369,998</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1,537,253</td>
<td>168,255</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Red Ape Rainforest</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1,517,366</td>
<td>(19,887)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Winnick Family Children's Zoo</td>
<td>August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1,516,067</td>
<td>(1,299)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1,389,639</td>
<td>(126,428)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1,396,538</td>
<td>6,899</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1,523,469</td>
<td>126,931</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Zoo Entrance &amp; Sea Lion Cliffs</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1,564,674</td>
<td>41,205</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1,602,171</td>
<td>37,497</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Campo Gorilla Reserve</td>
<td>November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09*</td>
<td>458,983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Through October 2008

Attendance increase since 1997 352,337 28%
### Zoo Exhibit Incremental Operation and Maintenance Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit and Opening Year (FY)</th>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Ongoing Budget Funding</th>
<th>One-time Budget Funding</th>
<th>Total Budget Funding</th>
<th>Incremental Ongoing Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pachyderm Forest</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Animal Keepers</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Gardener Caretakers</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Custodian</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Maintenance &amp; Construction Helper</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) PT Educational Interpretive Staffing</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Animal Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Food</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Expenses</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exhibit Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape &amp; Irrigation Supplies</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool, Ozone &amp; HVAC Systems Maintenance</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>One-time Equipment/Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radios</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office furnishings, locks, computers, trash cans, litter vacuum, etc.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>522,500</td>
<td>459,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Campo Gorilla - FY 2007-08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Ongoing Budget Funding</th>
<th>One-time Budget Funding</th>
<th>Total Budget Funding</th>
<th>Incremental Ongoing Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Animal Keeper (9 mos funding)</td>
<td>74,136</td>
<td>103,658</td>
<td>182,877</td>
<td>206,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Gardener Caretaker (9 mos funding)</td>
<td>30,741</td>
<td>43,308</td>
<td>182,877</td>
<td>206,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Interpretive Staffing</strong></td>
<td>(4) PT Educational Interpretive Staffing</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>206,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Maintenance of Exhibit</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td>182,877</td>
<td>182,877</td>
<td>206,966</td>
<td>206,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit and Opening Year (FY)</td>
<td>Package</td>
<td>Ongoing Budget Funding</td>
<td>One-time Budget Funding</td>
<td>Total Budget Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sea Lion Cliffs - FY 2003-04</strong></td>
<td>Data breakdown taken from proposed budget</td>
<td><strong>Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Animal Keeper (5 months)</td>
<td>94,465</td>
<td>259,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) PT Animal Keeper (5 months)</td>
<td>22,022</td>
<td>96,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Jaguar 800 mhz radios and accessories ($2,800 each)</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniforms (5-FT @$150 ea; 3-PT @ $60)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FF &amp; E and PC's</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>34,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dive Room FF &amp; E</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Support/Exhibit Maintenance</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Animal Food Cost</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sea Lion Cliffs - FY 2007-08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Aquarist I (additnl Technical Support)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>184,387</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red Ape Rainforest - FY 1999-00</strong></td>
<td>Data breakdown taken from proposed budget</td>
<td>(1) Animal Keeper</td>
<td>31,905</td>
<td>51,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Gardener Caretaker</td>
<td>27,520</td>
<td>43,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) PT Animal Keeper</td>
<td>28,361</td>
<td>28,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>87,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: May 1, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION – POSITIONS TO SUPPORT LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS’ INSPECTION PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Bureau of Contract Administration (BCA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the positions that will be needed to support the Los Angeles World Airports’ (LAWA) inspection program.

BCA will require 10 additional positions, consisting of two Senior Electrical Inspectors, four Senior Construction Inspectors, and four Construction Inspectors, to support LAWA’s inspection program. It is recommended that these 10 positions, which were deleted in the Mayor’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, be continued in 2017-18. Using the Bureau’s new salary savings rate of five percent, this Office has estimated the cost to be $1,525,385, comprised of $1,114,005 in direct salary and expense costs and $411,380 of indirect costs, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Direct Cost</th>
<th>Indirect Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Electrical Inspector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$201,525</td>
<td>$30,128</td>
<td>$84,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Construction Inspector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$404,244</td>
<td>$60,256</td>
<td>$169,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$357,595</td>
<td>$60,256</td>
<td>$156,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,525,385</td>
<td>$30,128</td>
<td>$84,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These positions will be front-funded by the General Fund and will be fully reimbursed by LAWA.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

There is no General Fund impact as the cost of the positions will be front-funded by the General Fund and will be fully reimbursed by the Los Angeles World Airports. The total cost is $1,525,385, consisting of $1,114,005 in direct salary and expense costs and $411,380 of indirect costs. Should the item be funded, a corresponding increase to General Fund revenues can be added to offset the cost of these positions.
Date: May 1, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY ATTORNEY – SALARY SAVINGS RATE RESTORATION

During its consideration of the City Attorney’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on restoring $1.2 million by returning the Department’s salary savings rate to two percent from the proposed three percent.

Decreasing the salary savings rate in the City Attorney’s Office from three percent to two percent will result in a General Fund obligation of $1.51 million, consisting of $1.18 million in direct costs and $338,189 in related costs.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of restoring the salary savings rate from three percent to two percent is $1,518,189, which consists of $1,180,000 in direct salary costs and $338,189 in related costs. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:SCL:04170095

Question No. 78
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ZOO DEPARTMENT – PROCUREMENT OF FOOD SUPPLIES

During its consideration of the Zoo Department’s (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department to report on the food supplies contract with Sysco, including pricing comparisons with other vendors, the possibility of using multiple vendors to potentially lower costs, and whether there would be a cost savings to using multiple vendors. The Department’s response is attached.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:KG:08170031

Question No. 66

Attachment
DATE: April 28, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: John R. Lewis, General Manager
Zoo Department

SUBJECT: ZOO DEPARTMENT - BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
BACK QUESTION NO. 66

This memo is in response to the Budget and Finance Committee's request for information regarding the City's food supplies contract with Sysco utilized by the Zoo Department and the opportunities for potentially lowering costs.

Background

The City's General Services Department establishes City-wide commodities purchasing contracts based on competitive bidding policies defined by the City Administrative Code. These contracts are accessible to all City Departments through the City's Supply Management System. Contract terms and pricing are established through negotiated terms from the competitive bid process.

The current food supplies contract with Sysco provides for wholesale food and related items such as:
- Canned, dry food and beverages
- Dairy products
- Bakery products
- Meat, seafood and poultry
- Fresh produce
- Paper and disposable goods
- Kitchen equipment and smallwares
- Cleaning supplies required for food handling

The Zoo Department utilizes the Sysco contract for its fresh produce, dairy, and canned goods products in supplying a large portion of its animal food.

Fiscal Impact

The negotiated contract pricing for the Sysco contract is based on a 15% discount off the monthly Consumer Price Index. This discount term is negotiated by the General
Services Department Purchasing Agent through a Request for Quote bid process based on City-wide estimated expenditures and additional volume discounts. The Consumer Price Index is based on seasonally adjusted average, detailed expenditure categories across the country and provides for a nationally compared average pricing on products.

Per discussion with the General Services Department, multi-vendor contracts are not issued for the same commodities. A multi-vendor contract would result in a distribution of the itemized items from a single larger contract resulting in potentially reduced savings from reductions in volume. The single vendor contracts help to achieve greater discounts through volume pricing. Additionally, contracts are negotiated in terms of achieving not only the lowest or best pricing, but also in terms of associated qualifications such as delivery turnaround, ability to meet supply and demand, compliance with City ordinances, and providing an open, fair, and competitive bid process.

Currently, the Sysco contract is able to meet the Zoo’s needs in terms of supply, turnaround, depth and variety of food products, food quality guarantee, as well as provide good customer relations.

Based on recent discussions, GSD staff may conduct market research analysis based on a review of the Consumer Price Index as well as perform random sampling and audits of vendor expenditure reports to determine the competitiveness of pricing for the Sysco contract.

JRL:DMV:MK
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: Controller – PaySR Risk Mitigation Positions

During its consideration of the Controller’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the CAO to report on resources required to add the PaySR risk mitigation positions in Controller, ITA and Personnel.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget includes the continuation of one Senior Systems Analyst I position in the Controller’s budget at a cost of $159,691. In addition to this position, the Controller is requesting one Sr. Management Analyst II, one Fiscal System Specialist I, a paygrade for a Fiscal Systems Specialist (from a I to a II), and a reallocation of a Sr. Systems Analyst II to a Financial Management Specialist IV, at a total cost of $212,794

ITA is requesting four positions, one Systems Analyst II and two Programmer Analyst IVs for PaySR Risk Mitigation; and one Programmer Analyst IV for PaySR support and succession planning. The cost of the ITA positions is $305,907.

Personnel is not requesting additional staff at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding the requests of the Controller and ITA is as follows:

Controller – $300,297; $212,794 direct costs, $87,503 indirect costs.

ITA - $446,612; $305,907 direct costs, $140,705 indirect costs.

The total cost for all requests is $746,908

Should these positions be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FINANCE — LATAX MODERNIZATION PROJECT

During its consideration of the Office of Finance’s (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding sources available for the additional $250,000 requested for the LATAX Modernization Project (Project). In addition, the Committee requested this Office to report on impacts to the project schedule and successful Project implementation should the $250,000 not be funded.

LATAX is the Department’s core system for managing the collection of tax and permit revenue. The system was implemented in 2004 and will no longer be supported by January 2020. On April 19, the Department submitted a request to the Mayor’s Office requesting approval to execute a contract to migrate the LATAX system to a new Java-based technical environment. The contract term is two years upon execution of the agreement. The total cost of the contract is $1.5 million. The Department will use current year funds in the amount of $500,000 to initiate the Project. The Proposed Budget provides $500,000 in the Department’s Contractual Services account for the contract. An additional $500,000 is needed for the contract in 2018-19.

The Department requests $250,000 for Oracle cloud services ($130,000), Middleware software ($85,000), and technical training ($35,000). These items are required to establish a separate technical environment for the development and testing of the new system. The current LATAX technical environment is not sufficient to support both the new development effort and the current system. As a result, a parallel system environment with the capabilities of the current technical environment is required. If the request is not funded, the Department will be unable to initiate the Project due to the need for the parallel development environment. As a result, the two-year project schedule will be delayed until sufficient funding is provided. The delay will put the Department at risk of not meeting the deadline to successfully implement the Project prior to the 2019-20 business tax renewal season, which begins January 2020.

The General Fund is the only eligible funding source for this request. The Department is projected to have a year-end surplus of $698,542 in the Salaries General account. The Council may reappropriate $250,000 to the 2017-18 Office and Administrative ($215,000) and Contractual Services ($35,000) accounts to fund the request. However, the surplus could be required to close the City’s year-end deficit, projected to be $9.75 million in the Mid-Year Financial Status Report. Therefore, providing authority to reappropriate this balance is not recommended at this time.
The General Fund impact of funding licensing and training for the LATAX Modernization Project is $250,000. In 2018-19, funding in the amount of $750,000 is required to complete the project. No additional funding will be required when the modernized system is fully implemented. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – TIMELINE OF ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES OF 2017-18 FUNDING FOR MEASURE M AND THE PAVEMENT PRESERVATION PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on a timeline for the anticipated expenditures of 2017-18 funding provided for Measure M and the Pavement Preservation Program (PPP). The Bureau's response is attached.

The Bureau reports that they anticipate expending approximately 60% of the PPP funding from July 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017 and the remaining 40% will be expended between January 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018 for a total of 2,200 lane miles completed (655 lane miles of resurfacing and 1,545 lanes miles of slurry seal).

Lastly, the Bureau is reporting that an expenditure plan for Measure M is currently being developed using an integrated approach which includes the Bureau of Engineering, the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the City Administrative Officer.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:NCT:06170108
Question No.173
Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Nazario Sauceda, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 173
MEASURE M AND PAVEMENT PRESERVATION PROGRAM FUNDING

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to report on a timeline for the anticipated expenditure of 2017-18 funding provided for Measure M and the Pavement Preservation Program (PPP). In addition, BSS was asked to indicate the date by which all projects will be completed, and to distinguish between miles resurfaced and miles slurry sealed.

BSS anticipates expending approximately 60% of the PPP funding from July 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017. The other 40% of the funding will be expended between January 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018. The PPP funds in the budget will allow BSS to complete a minimum of 655 lane miles of resurfacing and 1,545 lane miles of slurry seal.

Currently, the City is working on an integrated approach led by the Mayor's Office, where an expenditure plan for Measure M funding is being developed. BSS is part of a collaborative effort, that includes the Bureau of Engineering, the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the City Administrative Officer, to develop a solid plan for Measure M and a timeline for the anticipated expenditure of the funding.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – MEASURE M ROAD RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on how much of Measure M road reconstruction funding can the Bureau of Street Services expend in 2017-18. The Bureau’s response is attached.

The Bureau is reporting that an expenditure plan for Measure M is currently being developed using an integrated approach which includes the Bureau of Engineering, the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the City Administrative Officer. BSS does not currently have a timeline for the anticipated expenditure of the funding.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:NCT:06170109

Question No. 174

Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Nazario Saucedo, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 174
MEASURE M ROAD RECONSTRUCTION FUNDING

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to report on how much of Measure M road reconstruction funding can BSS expend in 2017-18.

Currently, the City is working on an integrated approach led by the Mayor's Office, where an expenditure plan for Measure M funding is being developed. BSS is part of a collaborative effort, that includes the Bureau of Engineering, the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the City Administrative Officer, to develop a solid plan for Measure M and a timeline for the anticipated expenditure of the funding.
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: REVISED BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – REQUESTS FOR ALLEY PAVING AND POTHOLE FILLING BY COUNCIL DISTRICT

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on how many requests the Bureau of Street Services receives for alley paving and pothole filling by Council District. The Bureau’s response is attached.

The Department provided a revised chart with additional information on potholes for both alleys and streets.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:NCT:06170110

Question No: 178

Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Nazario Sauceda, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 178
ALLEY PAVING AND POTHOLE FILLING REQUESTS

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to report on the number of requests BSS receives for alley paving compared to pothole filling requests, and to provide a breakdown by Council District (CD).

The total number of alley-related service requests are as follows:

2015-16
Alley Paving = 758
Alley Pothole Filling = 1,826

2016-17 (YTD)
Alley Paving = 863
Alley Pothole Filling = 2,535

Attached is a listing of these service requests by CD.
### ALLEY PAVING & POTHOLE FILLING REQUESTS
#### BY COUNCIL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Alley Paving Requests</th>
<th>Pothole Filling Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015-16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>758</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,826</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Alley Paving Requests</th>
<th>Pothole Filling Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016-17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>863</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,535</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF SANITATION – FRANCHISE STAFFING

During the Budget and Finance Committee’s consideration of the Bureau of Sanitation’s (Bureau) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, this Office was requested to report back on the number of positions required to administer the City’s Exclusive Franchise System for the collection and handling of solid waste from commercial and multi-family properties.

On February 3, 2015, Council (C.F. 14-1422) approved the Bureau’s Franchise staffing plan, which is comprised of 112 positions (70 new positions, 31 contractor positions, and the reassignment of 11 existing positions within the Bureau). As the City’s Franchise System would be the largest and most complex franchise system of this type in US history and as the City has never implemented such a system of this magnitude, the Bureau used a consultant to develop the staffing plan. The consultant used benchmarking studies from other large US cities and knowledge and experience from staff who were involved in the implementation of the franchise system for the city of Seattle, WA to develop the staffing plan. Approximately 63 percent (or 70 of the 112 positions) are field inspectors or customer service representatives. The inspectors will ensure that franchise haulers are complying with the service delivery provisions included in the Franchise Agreements by verifying that haulers are responding to customer service requests and complaints in a timely manner, using collection routes that minimize vehicle miles traveled and reduce carbon emissions, and inspecting facilities to ensure safe working conditions. The customer service representatives will handle the large call volume anticipated during the transition period to the Franchise System and will track billing disputes or questions that are referred to the franchise haulers.

During the Council and Committee deliberations on the proposed staffing plan, the Council wanted to ensure that the Bureau had the adequate resources to properly implement the Franchise System. The Council also felt that the relatively small savings achieved through a reduced staffing plan would not offset the potential liabilities and loss of franchise revenues from the delayed implementation of the Franchise System.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget continues all positions previously approved by the Council. Once the Franchise System has been fully implemented and the workload begins to stabilize, the ongoing staffing needs will be reevaluated through the budget process.

This report is informational and no action is required.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: The Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: AGING—GENERAL CITY PURPOSES, AGING VARIOUS PROGRAMS

During its consideration of the Department of Aging's (Department) 2017-2018 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the options to provide one-time funding in the amount of $192,000 to offset the impact of the cuts to the Older American Act social services program as a result of sequestration. Funding in this amount had previously been provided in the Budget for General City Purposes (GCP), but was not continued in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget.

The Department of Aging reports that the $192,000 in GCP funds is used to provide $95,453 in senior services such as case management and $96,547 for administration of the $3.2 million in senior services funded through GCP. In the current fiscal year, $80,019 of the $192,000 has been expended through the end of March. A General Fund appropriation in the amount of $192,000 would be required to fund the continuation of these services in 2017-2018.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To comply with the City's Financial Policies the restoration of the $192,000 reduction to the Budget for General City Purposes, Blue Book Item 6, will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to General Fund expenditure.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: The Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: AGING—EVIDENCE-BASED HEALTH PROGRAMS

During its consideration of the Department of Aging’s (Department) 2017-2018 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on options to provide restoration of contractual services funding in the amount of $83,726 to support Evidence Based Health Programs.

The Department of Aging reports that the $83,726 in contractual services supports the delivery of monthly classes to 2,725 seniors. A General Fund appropriation would be required to fund the continuation of these services in 2017-2018.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To comply with the City’s Financial Policies the restoration of the $83,726 reduction to the Department of Aging’s, Blue Book Item 9, will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to General Fund expenditure.

RHL: MTS: 08170039
Question No. 222
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – FUNDING OPTIONS FOR CITY APPROPRIATION FOR LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INITIATIVE FOR SOCIAL ENTERPRISE (LA RISE)

During its consideration of the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD)’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on one-time or ongoing funding options to restore the 2016-17 $2 million City appropriation for the Los Angeles Regional Initiative for Social Enterprise (LA RISE) program, including whether the City could borrow money as a stopgap measure if funding were available from Measure H or the federal government.

The $2 million City funding for the expansion of the LA RISE program in FY 2016-17 is provided by the General Fund. The City originally requested to include funding for the LA RISE program in the proposed Measure H budget. However, the current draft of the Measure H budget does not include funding for LA RISE. The City Debt Policy provides for the funding of infrastructure, and precludes the City from borrowing to fund services. The LA RISE program is a workforce development service program for homeless individuals, and is not eligible to be funded by City bond or borrowed funds. Unless EWDD is able to identify eligible Special Funds (grants), General Fund funding in the amount of $2 million is necessary to continue the City appropriation for LA RISE on a one-time or ongoing basis in FY 2017-18.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Continuation of the FY 2016-17 City appropriation for the Los Angeles Regional Initiative for Social Enterprise (LA RISE) program in FY 2017-18 would result in a $2 million impact to the General Fund.

RHL:SAM:02170145

Question No. 231
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – 2014 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back to address the 2014 Audit recommendations to ensure more street miles are slurried and/or resurfaced for this coming fiscal year, from money left over from salary savings after the goals have been met. The Bureau’s response is attached.

BSS indicates that the salary savings were for other programs and had to be expended as intended in the budget. In order to utilize the surplus funds for a different purpose, approval is needed by the Mayor and Council to reprogram the funds within the budget.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:NCT:06170113

Question No. 224

Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Nazario Sauceda, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 224
SALARY SAVINGS FOR ADDITIONAL PAVEMENT PRESERVATION MILES

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to address the 2014 Audit recommendations to ensure more street miles are slurried and/or resurfaced for this coming Fiscal Year (FY). BSS is asked if the departmental outcomes can focus more on money left over from salary savings after the goals of the year have been met to resurface and/or slurry more miles, rather than having a surplus. In addition, BSS is asked if there are public private partnerships, if necessary, that can be implemented with the additional funds.

Last FY 2015-16, the BSS’ Pavement Preservation Program (PPP) was working at full capacity. The resources were maximized; therefore, shifting savings to do more PPP miles was only feasible if the Bureau had additional resources (i.e., staff, equipment). In addition, these salary savings were for other programs so they had to be expended as intended in the budget. In order for these savings to be utilized for a different purpose, it needs to be approved by the Mayor and Council for reprogramming in the budget.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER – CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ELIGIBILITY FOR PROPOSITION HHH

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether capital infrastructure improvements for the Rose Avenue Parking Lot Restroom at Venice Beach and the North Hollywood Day Laborer/Homeless Service Center, currently funded in the Unappropriated Balance, are eligible for Proposition HHH.

Proposition HHH funding may be allocated for the acquisition or improvement of real property used to provide services or goods to, or otherwise benefit, those who are homeless, chronically homeless or at risk of homelessness. These funds may not be used for to support operations or services. In order to be eligible for Proposition HHH funding, facilities must serve primarily homeless population(s).

The Rose Avenue Parking Lot Restroom at Venice Beach is not restricted to use by homeless populations. As such, this project is not eligible for Proposition HHH funding.

Similarly, in order for the Day Laborer component of the North Hollywood Day Laborer/Homeless Service Center to be eligible for Proposition HHH funding, it would be required to serve primarily day laborers who are homeless. However, the Homeless Service Center proposed for the same site would be eligible for Proposition HHH funding as it is envisioned to serve primarily homeless populations.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:MB:02170144

Question No. 284
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: RECREATION AND PARKS – ELIMINATION OF VACANT POSITIONS

During its consideration of the Department of Recreation and Parks’ 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the proposed elimination of vacant positions could instead be a reduction in the RAP’s salary account, while retaining the positions. The Department’s response is attached.

If the 53 regular positions (44 Gardener Caretakers and 9 Senior Gardeners) are restored without funding, there is no fiscal impact for 2017-18. However, since the regular positions are restored, these 53 regular positions will be included in the Department’s 2018-19 base-salary calculations (Wages and Count).

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact for 2017-18.

RHL: JSS: 08170034
Question No. 53
Attachment
May 1, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
Budget and Finance Committee
City Clerk, City Hall Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Richard Williams, Legislative Assistant

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET QUESTION NO. 53 – ELIMINATION OF VACANT POSITIONS

In response to the Budget & Finance Committee’s request for information regarding the proposed elimination of vacant positions, the Mayor’s FY ’17-18 proposed budget allocates a $3,000,000 reduction in RAP’s salary account and the elimination of 53 critical vacant positions including 44 Gardener Caretakers and 9 Senior Gardeners. As discussed during the Budget & Finance Committee hearing, these positions are vital to fill our natural attrition rates (the highest category in RAP’s current workforce), reduce liabilities, mitigate risks and to perform and maintain the current standard levels expected for providing safe, welcoming and well programmed parks. Should position restorations not occur or should any positions remain unfilled, RAP respectfully requests that the 53 positions be retained and the salary reductions be one-time adjustments in FY ‘17-18. It is understood that the salaries for these positions will be included in the wages and count for following FY ‘18-19.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 202-2633.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SHULL
General Manager

MAS:ndw

cc:
Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Office of the Mayor
Zachia Nazarzai, Office of the Mayor
Terry Sauer, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Jay Shin, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Anthony-Paul (AP) Diaz, Esq., Executive Officer & Chief of Staff, RAP
Vicki Israel, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Ramon Barajas, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer, RAP
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: RECREATION AND PARKS – VENICE PIER REPAIR: COST, MULTI-YEAR STRATEGY, AND POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

During its consideration of the Department of Recreation and Parks’ 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department to report on the cost, including a multi-year strategy or phased system for spreading out the cost, and potential funding sources (including the County’s Proposition A) for fixing the Venice Pier. The Department’s response is attached.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:JSS:08170035

Question No. 54

Attachment
Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET QUESTION NO. 54 – VENICE PIER

In response to the Budget & Finance Committee’s request for information regarding Venice Pier, the Department is working with a consultant team to evaluate and assess the condition and safety of the Venice Pier. The evaluation and assessment is being approached in two phases. The first phase will assess and document the physical condition of the pier to provide the scope of work for maintenance repairs. The second phase is the structural evaluation and potential structural and seismic upgrades.

The first phase is complete and funded by the use of Quimby funds. The scope of work developed from this assessment is prioritized into 1) high priority, repairs that must be addressed within the year, and 2) low priority, repairs that can be addressed beyond the year. The maintenance repair plans are 90 percent complete.

The cost estimate for this maintenance repair is $12 million, of which $6 million are for critical repairs. The cost estimate for the structural and seismic upgrade is to be determined at this time. The available allocated Quimby funds for the project are $1.0 million. Staff is working with the consultant team to further prioritize the high priority scope of work in order to implement a portion of the project with the available funds.

Potential funding for this project is high and the Department will need to evaluate how to obtain funding to keep the pier open, safe and accessible. Potential funds can be allocated through the City’s General Fund, potential grants, future Quimby fees, and the Los Angeles County Ballot Measure A. The Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District is currently working on the draft framework and guidelines for the allocation process and for competitive grants for Measure A. At this time, it is anticipated that the initial allocations of the formula-based portion of Measure A funding will be available in July 2018 and that the initial allocations of the competitive grant portion of Measure A funding will be available in January 2019. The annual funding from the formula-based portion of Measure A funding will
be divided, by a formula identified in the ballot measure, between the 188 "Study Areas" in the County of Los Angeles. 43 of the 188 Study Areas in the County are located within the City of Los Angeles. It is unknown at this time how much in annual funding will be available to each of the 43 Study Areas in the City from the formula-based portion of Measure A.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 202-2633.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Shull
General Manager

cc:

Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Office of the Mayor
Zachia Nazarzai, Office of the Mayor
Terry Sauer, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Jay Shin, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Anthony-Paul (AP) Diaz, Esq., Executive Officer & Chief of Staff, RAP
Vicki Israel, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Ramon Barajas, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer, RAP
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: RECREATION AND PARKS – BRUSH CLEARANCE FUNDING SOURCE

During its consideration of the Department of Recreation and Parks’ 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department and this Office to report on what is required to address brush clearance concerns. What are potential funding sources to meet the $750,000 need? The Department’s response is attached.

The Department reports that the funding shortfall for brush clearance is $750,000 for 2017-18. This Office agrees with the Department that no other department special funds are available to address this issue.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact is $750,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:JSS:08170033

Question No. 57

Attachment
May 1, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
Budget and Finance Committee
City Clerk, City Hall Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Richard Williams, Legislative Assistant

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET QUESTION NO. 57 – BRUSH CLEARANCE

In response to the Budget & Finance Committee’s request for information regarding brush clearance, RAP’s expense budget for brush clearance remains the same since 2008 although the demand and costs have significantly increased in recent years due to our expanded park land, environmental compliances, increases in dead trees and vegetation due to drought, infestation and other environmental factors. The funding shortfalls for the past nine years, including the prior and current fiscal year is $582,000 and $750,000 (estimated) respectively. RAP expects an even bigger funding gap in FY ’17-18 due to the extraordinary growth of brush and debris resulting from the recent and heavy rainfalls sustained throughout the City this year.

Therefore, total additional funding need for brush clearance in FY ’17-18 is $926,844, an additional $750,000 to the amount included in the Mayor’s proposed FY ’17-18 Budget. RAP has no available funding to cover the shortfall and respectfully requests that $750,000 be funded to the Department through City General Funds, to meet our brush clearance responsibilities, reduce liability and mitigate risk factors and to prevent the diversion of needed program and service monies to benefit the public.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 202-2633.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SHULL
General Manager
Honorabie Councilmember Krekorian
May 1, 2017
Page 2

MAS:ndw

cc:

Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Office of the Mayor
Zachia Nazarzai, Office of the Mayor
Terry Sauer, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Jay Shin, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Anthony-Paul (AP) Diaz, Esq., Executive Officer & Chief of Staff, RAP
Vicki Israel, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Ramon Barajas, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer, RAP
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: RECREATION AND PARKS – COST AND POTENTIAL FUNDING TO MAKE RESEDA PARK A CLASS PARK

During its consideration of the Department of Recreation and Parks’ 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department to report on the cost and potential funding to make Reseda Park a CLASS park. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department’s estimate to provide CLASS Parks program at the Reseda Park during 2017-18 is $210,824 (12 months funding: $178,334 direct cost and $32,490 indirect cost). The Department has no other special funds available for this item.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding this item is $210,824. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:JSS:08170036

Question No. 58

Attachment
May 2, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
Budget and Finance Committee
City Clerk, City Hall Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Richard Williams, Legislative Assistant

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET QUESTION NO. 58 – RESEDA RECREATION CENTER AS A NEW CLASS PARKS SITE

In response to the Budget & Finance Committee’s request for information regarding the Reseda Recreation Center, the total estimated annual direct cost to provide CLASS Parks program at the center is $178,334. The estimated costs includes staffing, expenses and a one-time cost to convert an existing room to a Teen Club Room to provide CLASS Parks program according to current program standards. Please see below for the cost breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Direct Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Recreation Coordinator</td>
<td>$66,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Recreation and Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>$40,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expense, Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$50,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Expense to Create a Teen Club Room</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$178,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RAP has no available funding for this cost in FY ’17-18.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 202-2633.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SHULL
General Manager
Honorable Councillor Krekorian
May 2, 2017
Page 2

MAS:ndw

cc:

Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Office of the Mayor
Zachia Nazarzai, Office of the Mayor
Terry Sauer, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Jay Shin, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Anthony-Paul (AP) Diaz, Esq., Executive Officer & Chief of Staff, RAP
Vicki Israel, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Ramon Barajas, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer, RAP
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – DETAIL OF MEDIAN ISLAND LANDSCAPES TO BE MAINTAINED

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back to provide the detail of median island landscapes to be maintained, how much work is estimated to be needed, and what the costs are. The Bureau’s response is attached.

The Bureau is responsible for the care and maintenance of approximately 10.5 million square feet of landscaped medians throughout the City of Los Angeles. The Urban Forestry Division of BSS has subdivided the City into four major areas which include North/Central, Bay/Harbor, West Valley, and East Valley. A Request for Bids has been released, bids have been received and are currently under review for each area. The estimated cost for Citywide biweekly median island maintenance for 2017-18 is $2.7 million assuming all low bids are deemed responsive and awarded. BSS estimates that within 60-90 days of issuance of notices to proceed, all of the landscaped medians will be brought into compliance within the City’s maintenance standard.

BSS provided the following attachment which includes a detailed list of Median Island Landscapes to be maintained.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Nazario Saucedo, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 179
MEDIAN ISLAND LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to provide the detail of median island landscapes to be maintained, how much work is estimated to be needed to catch up, and what are the costs of doing so.

BSS' Urban Forestry Division (UFD) is responsible for the care and maintenance of approximately 10.5 million square feet of landscaped medians throughout the City of Los Angeles. In order to maintain and care for the landscaped medians, the UFD has subdivided the City into four major areas namely North/Central, Bay/Harbor, West Valley and East Valley, and lets contracts to the lowest, responsive, and responsible bidder for each area.

BSS received bids for FY 2017-18 contracts and were opened on April 19, 2017. These bids are currently under review by the Bureau of Contract Administration. Upon execution of the contracts and issuance of notice to proceed, contractors will be required to maintain the medians on a biweekly basis. If all low bidders are deemed responsive, the estimated cost for citywide biweekly median island maintenance for FY 2017-18 is $2.7M.

Attached is the listing of landscaped medians and other green areas to be maintained by Council District, which totals approximately 10.5 million square feet.
## CONTRACT: LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE OF MEDIAN ISLANDS
WEST VALLEY

### TURF MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alabama Ave. @ 7725- Alabama SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baird Ave. @ 6015- Reseda SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brand Blvd.- Sepulveda Blvd. to City Line</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canoga Ave.- Victory Blvd. to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canoga Ave. @ 7453- Canoga SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hayvenhurst Ave.- Saticoy St. to De Celis Place</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hayvenhurst Dr.- Sapphire Dr. to N/O Lanai Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lassen St.- E/O Youanda Ave. to Geyser Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Louise Ave.- Haynes St. to Victory Blvd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr.- Benedict Canyon Dr. to Beverly Glen Blvd.</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nordhoff St. @ Zelzah Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oxnard St.- Canoga Ave. to Vassar Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Parthenia St.- Van Nuys Blvd. to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rinaldi St.- Variel Ave. to Canoga Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Devonshire St. to Rayen St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Van Nuys Blvd. to Variel Ave.</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tampa Ave.- Rinaldi St. to Devonshire St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Topanga Canyon Blvd.- Ventura Blvd. to Ave. San Luis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vanalden Ave. @ Rosita St.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vanowen St.- Wystone Ave. to Vanalden Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Victory Blvd.- Corbin Ave. to Oakdale Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Gledhill St. to Prairie St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Oxnard St. to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Welby Way to Bessemer St.</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROUNDCOVER MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alabama Ave. @ 7725- Alabama SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ave. San Luis- Dunman Ave. to Fallbrook Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ave. San Luis- Fallbrook Ave. to Shoup Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ave. San Luis- Valley Circle Blvd. to Dunman Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baird Ave. @ 6015- Reseda SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Balboa Blvd.- Constable Ave. to Orozco St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Balboa Blvd.- Gault St. to Hartland Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brand Blvd.- Sepulveda Blvd. to City Line</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caballero Creek- Ventura Blvd. to Ventura Fwy.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Canoga Ave. @ 7453- Canoga SM Service Yard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Corbin Ave.- Oakhill Way to Rinaldi St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>De Soto Ave.- E/s Vanalden St. to Victory Blvd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>De Soto Ave.- Victory Blvd. to Ventura Fwy.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Devonshire St.- Valley Circle Blvd. to Larwin Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Etiwanda Ave. @ 10210- Granada Hills SM Service Yard</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Greenbriar Dr. @ Tamoshanter Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Larwin Ave. @ Germaine St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Larwin Ave. @ James Allen Circle</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lassen St.- Vanalden Ave. to Tampa Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lemarsh St. W/O Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Louise Ave. S/O Ventura Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Louise Ave.- Vanowen St. to Victory Blvd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>March Ave.- Justice Ave. to Ingomar St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mayall St. @ Reseda Blvd.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mayall St. @ Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Merridy St. - Cul-de-sac E/o Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Merridy St. C/o Rhea Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr.- Benedict Canyon Dr. to Beverly Glen Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr.- Flamingo Road to Valmar Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr. @ Ave. San Luis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr. @ Laurel Canyon Blvd.</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mulholland Dr. @ Laurel Pass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Napa St. @ Shoup Ave. (Slope)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nordhoff St.- Tampa Ave. to Corbin Ave. (Grade separation)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nordhoff St. @ Zelzah Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pacoima Wash @ Parthenia St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Parthenia St.- Cedros Ave. to Kester Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Parthenia St.- Sepulveda Blvd. to Burnet Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Parthenia St.- Pacoima Wash to Nobe Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plummer Ave. @ Hayvenhurst Bridge (Planters)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Reseda Blvd. @ Parthenia St. (Grade Separation)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Romar St. W/O Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Roscoe Blvd.- 550' E/o Louise Ave. to 414' E/o Louise Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Roscoe Blvd.- 415' E/o Louise Ave. to 265' E/o Louise Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Camarillo St. to Moorpark St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Clark St. to Weddington St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Devonshire St. to Lassen St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Lanark St. to Raymer St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Lassen St. to Rayen St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd. @ Lanark St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Balboa Blvd. to Louise Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Corbin Ave. to Winnetka Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Hayvenhurst Ave. to Balboa Blvd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Lindley Ave. to Wilbur Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Louise Ave. to White Oak Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Mason Ave. to Variel Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Sepulveda Blvd. to Woodley Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Valjean Ave. to Hayvenhurst Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Van Nuys Blvd. to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Vanalden Ave. to Corbin Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Variel Ave. to Canoga Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sherman Way- White Oak Ave. to Hesperia Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sherman Way- White Oak Ave. to Lindley Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Sherman Way- Winnetka Ave. to Mason Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Sherman Way @ Etiwanda Ave. (NE corner)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Stare St. E/o Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Stare St. W/O Yolanda Ave</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Superior St.- Tampa Ave. to Corbin Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tampa Ave.- Blackhawk St. to Key West Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tampa Ave.- Prairie St. to Gledhill St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Topanga Canyon Blvd. @ 9324- Topanga SM Service Yard</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Valley Circle Blvd.- Bell Canyon Blvd. to Stagg St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Valley Circle Blvd.- Germaine St. to Weinberg St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Valley Circle Blvd.- Lemay St. to Victory Blvd.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Valley Circle Blvd.- Roscoe Blvd. to Ingomar St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Valley Circle Blvd.- Vanowen St. to Bell Canyon Blvd.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Vanalden Ave. @ 8820- Northridge SM Service Yard</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Vanalden Ave. @ Rosita St.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Vanowen St.- Encino Ave. to Jellico Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ventura Blvd.- Lindley Ave. to Garden Grove Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Victory Bl.- Canoga Ave. to Varie Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Victory Blvd.- Yardmouth Ave. to Newcastle Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Victory Blvd.- Louise Ave. to White Oak Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Vintage St. @ Etiwanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Vintage St. @ Rhea Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Vintage St. W/o Yolanda Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Bullock St. to Martha St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Gledhill St. to Prairie St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- S/O Nordhoff St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- San Jose St. to Devonshire St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>White Oak Ave.- Welby Way to Bessemer St.</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Wilbur Ave.- Vose St. to Hartland St.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONTRACT: LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE OF MEDIAN ISLANDS
### EAST VALLEY

### TURF MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baird Ave. @ 6015- Reseda SM Service Yard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chandler Blvd.- Ethel Ave. to Van Nuys Blvd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coldwater Canyon Blvd.- Hatteras St. to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colorado blvd.- Townsend Ave. to Caspar Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eagle Rock Blvd.- Colorado Blvd. to Estara Ave.</td>
<td>1, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Figueroa St. @ York Blvd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- Glenfeliz Blvd. to Ferncroft Road</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- Seneca Ave. to Glenhurst Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd.- Daventry St. to Louvre St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd.- Nettleton St. to Cohasset St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Huntington Dr.- Maycrest Ave. to Monterey Road</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>La Prada Ave. @ Figueroa St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Magnolia Blvd.- Sunnyslope Ave. to Buffalo Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Monterey Road- Ave. 60 to Via Marisol</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oxnard St. @ 15145- Van Nuys SM Service Yard</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Radford Ave.- Riverside Dr. to Hortense St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Fernando Road North- Eagle Rock Blvd. to Cypress Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Fernando Road North- Verdugo Road to Cypress Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sherman Circle- Sherman Way to Gault St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vineland Ave.- Chandler Blvd. to Ventura Blvd.</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wentworth St. @ 9401- Sunland SM Service Yard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Woodman Ave.- Addison St. to La Madla St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROUNDCOVER MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alhambra Ave. @ Lowell Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arleta Ave.- Fillmore St. to Devonshire St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ave. 45- Griffin Ave. to Homer St. (Stairway)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ave. 50 @ Figueroa St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ave. 58 @ Figueroa St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ave. 59 @ Hayes Ave. @ Echo St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ave. 64 @ Marmion Way</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bluffside N/o Valley Heart Dr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burbank Blvd. @ Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cahuenga Blvd. West- Barham Blvd. to Hill Park Dr.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Campo De Cahuenga- Grade Separation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chandler Blvd. @ 10911- No. Holwvm SM Service Yard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chatsworth St. @ Arleta Ave.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coldwater Canyon Blvd. @ Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crestmoore St. @ Mimosa Dr. (Stairway)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Division St. @ Ave. 33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Division St. @ Sunny Heights Dr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dundee Dr.- Dundee Olace to Commonwealth St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eagle Rock Blvd.- Colorado Blvd. to Estara Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Figueroa St. @ Marmion Way</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Figueroa St. @ York Blvd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd. - Saluda Ave. to Pali Ave.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fryman Road - Iredell St. to Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd. - Glenfeliz Blvd. to Ferncroft Road</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd. - N/O Riverside Dr. &quot;Victory Memorial&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd. - Seneca Ave. to Glenhurst Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd. @ Lake Ave. @ Cove Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glencoe Blvd. - Cohasset St. to Nettleton St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glencoe Blvd. - Daventry St. to Louvre St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Griffin Ave. - North Main St. to North Mission Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Huntington Dr. - Locke Ave. to Monterey Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Huntington Dr. - Maycrest Ave. to Van Horne Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Huntington Dr. - N/S slope - Maycrest Ave. to Van Horne Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd. - Calabasas Blvd. to Ventura Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lansdowne St. to Drucker St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Blvd. - Valley Heart Dr. to Ventura Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Blvd. @ Fwy. 101 (N/S)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Blvd. @ Sherman Way (Grade Separation)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Laurel Cyn. Bl. - Archwood St. to Fwy. 170</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Marmion Way @ Museum Dr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Marmion Way - Ave. 50 N/E Island.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Marmion Way - Ave. 50 to Ave. 60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Marmion Way - Ave. 54 to Ave. 55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mission Grade Separation @ So. Pacific-El Paso RR Line</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Monceito Dr. - Simi Valley St. to Griffin Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neola Place @ Wiota St. (Stairway)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Oak Grove Dr. - North Figueroa St. to Wiota St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oxnard St. @ 15145- Van Nuys SM Service Yard</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Oxnard St. - Nagle Ave. to Buffalo Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Riverside Dr. - Moorpark St. to Plazidiz Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>San Fernando Road @ 11370- San Fernando SM Service Yard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>San Fernando Road @ Cypress Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>San Fernando Road @ Truman (North of City of San Fernando)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sherman Circle - Sherman Way to Gault St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sherman Way @ 12251- Asphalt Plant-II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sunny Heights Dr. @ Division St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sunnyside Dr. @ Hillside Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Valley Blvd. - Boca Ave. to Vineburn Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Valley Grade Separation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Valley Heart Dr. - Cedros Ave. to Kester Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Valley Heart Dr. - Kester Ave. to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Valley Heart Dr. - North Bank - Radford Ave. to Whitsett Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Van Nuys Blvd. - Lome St. to Keswick St. (Grade Separation)</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Van Nuys Blvd. - Haddon St. to Telfair Ave.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vanowen St. @ Fulton Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ventura Blvd. - Van Nuys Blvd. to Telfair Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Victory Bl. @ Fwy 170</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vineland Ave. @ Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vineland Ave. - Saran Ave. to Bix Ave. (Bikeway W/S)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Wentworth St. @ 9401- Sunland SM Service Yard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yosemite Dr. @ Townsend Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CONTRACT MAINTENANCE OF MEDIAN ISLANDS
## NORTH-CENTRAL

### TURF MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baird Ave. @ 6015- Reseda SM Service Yard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37th. St. @ Grand Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd St.- Figueroa St. to Flower St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alameda St. @ Main St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aliso St. @ North Alameda St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burton Way- La Cienega Blvd. S/to City Line</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cesar Chavez Blvd.- North Indiana St. to North Lorena St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highland Ave. N/S- Melrose Ave. to Wilshire Blvd.</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hill St. @ South 23rd. St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jefferson Blvd. West- South Figueroa St. to South Vermont Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Moraga Dr.- N/O Bellagio Road to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Normandie Ave. @ Venice Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Normandie Ave. @ Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Olympic Blvd. West @ South Victoria Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Romaine St. @ 6640- Romaine SM Service Yard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Vicente Blvd.- Beverly Blvd. to West Pico Blvd.</td>
<td>4, 5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. Charles Place- Victoria Ave. to Buckingham Road</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. West @ Grand Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Keystone to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Longwood Ave. to Cadillac Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Cadillac Ave. to Keystone Ave.</td>
<td>5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Venice Blvd. West @ South Union Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Washington Blvd.- La Brea Ave. to West Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wellington Road @ Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROUNDCOVER MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23rd. St. West @ South Union Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd. St. @ 1274- Central SM Service Yard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30th. St. @ Hoover St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30th. St. @ McClintock Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3rd. St. @ Beaudry Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4th. @ Lorena St. (NE of bridge)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th. St. Bridge S/W of Stairway</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6th. St. @ Norton Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6th. St. @ South Boyle Ave.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6th. St. W/O Camuelos St. (Stairway)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7th. St. @ East 2222- 7th. SM Service Yard</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8th. St. @ San Pedro St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aberdeen Ave. @ Inverness St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adams Blvd.- Buckingham Road to West Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alameda St. @ Main St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alvarado St. @ Bellevue Ave. (Stairway)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Alvarado Terrace @ 14th. St. &amp; Malvern Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ave. 26 @ San Fernando Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ayers Ave. @ Prosser Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bagley Ave. @ Kincardine Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ballona Creek- Cochran Ave. to Fairfax Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Barbydell Dr. @ Club Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bellevue Ave.- Boston St. to Edgeware St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Benedict Canyon Dr.- 2800' S/O Mulholland Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Benedict Canyon Dr. E/S to S/O Cielo Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Benedict Canyon Dr.- Hillgrove Dr. to City Line (Planters)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beverly Dr. @ Beverlywood St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Beverwil Dr.- Beverlywood St. to Cattaraugus Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beverwil Dr.- Pico Blvd. to Alcott St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bunker Hill- Flower St. to 3rd. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Castle Heights @ Vicar St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cheviot Dr. @ Queensbury Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cochran St. @ 1274- Wilshire SM Service Yard</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Commerical St.- Alameda St. to Hewitt St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Crenshaw Blvd. @ Fwy. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Crescent Heights @ Sunset Blvd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dewap Road- 1st St. to Temple St. (Slope and planters)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Earlman Dr. @ Manning Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Earlman Dr. @ Queensbury Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Effie St. @ Lake Shore Dr.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fairfax Ave. @ Pico Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Figueroa St. @ 23rd. St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Figueroa St. North- West 1st. St. to West 5th. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Figueroa St. North @ West 4th. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Figueroa St. North- 1st. St. to 2nd. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fletcher Dr.- Ave. 34 to Roderick Rd.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Flower St. South- E/S of Street @ 4th. St. Viaduct</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Franklin Ave.- Vine St. to Wilcox Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- N/E corner Berekley Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- Reservior St. to Effie St.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- Allesandro St. to Duance St.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd.- Kent St. to Clinton St. (Slope)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Glendale Blvd. W/S Triangle island</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Heliotrope Ave. @ Rosewood Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hill St.- Temple St. to 4th. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I-405 Project</td>
<td>5, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Iris Dr. @ Cahuenga Blvd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jefferson Blvd. @ Rodeo Road</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Jefferson Blvd. West- South Figueroa St. to South Vermont Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Kilrenney Dr. @ Motor Ave. S/E corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kilrenney Dr. @ Motor Ave. S/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>La Brea Ave.- 12th. St. to San Vicente Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>La Brea Ave.- Adams Blvd. to 23rd. St.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>La Brea Ave.- S/O Coliseum St. to Veronica St.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>La Brea Ave. @ Adams Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>La Cienega Blvd.- S/o Rodeo Road to S/o Aladdin St.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Blvd.- Hollywood Blvd. to Selma Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Laurel Canyon Blvd.- Woodland Lane to Fareholme Dr.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Lorenzo Dr. @ Motor Ave. N/E corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lorenzo Dr. @ Motor Ave. N/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Los Angeles St. - Aliso St. to West 1st. St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Los Angeles St. @ Alameda St.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Main St. @ 3rd. St. planters</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Main St. @ Alameda St. (planters)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Manning Ave. - Putney Road to Ashby Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Manning Ave. @ Dunleer Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Manning Ave. @ Edith St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Manning Ave. @ Gilmerton Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Missouri Ave. @ 11165 - Bellaire SM Service Yard</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Monte Mar Dr. @ Hillsboro Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Moraga Dr. - N/W Bellagio Road to Sepulveda blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Motor Ave. - Manning Ave. to Valavista Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Club Place N/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Club Place S/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Dunleer Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Forrester Dr. S/E corner</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Forrester Dr. S/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Motor Place N/E corner (river rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Motor Place S/E corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Patricia St. S/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Patricia St. N/E corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Motor Ave. @ Patricia St. N/W corner (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Motor Ave. - Monte Mar Dr. to Pico Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mt. Olympus Dr. - N/s of Electra Dr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>National Blvd. @ Manning Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>National Blvd. @ Shelby Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Normandie Ave. @ Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Olympic Blvd. - Dewey Ave. to Serrano Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Olympic Blvd. @ 2484 - Asphalt Plant-I</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Olympic Blvd. @ Prosser Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Orange Dr. - Coliseum St. to Veronica St.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pico Blvd. - Cloverdale to Fairfax Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Pico Blvd. - La Brea Ave. to Cochran Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Pico Blvd. - San Vicente Blvd. to Mulfield Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Pico Blvd. - Victoria Ave. to West Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Plesant Ave. @ Progress Place</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Romaine St. @ 6640 - Romaine SM Service Yard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Rosbury Place @ Motor Ave. (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Rosbury Place @ Motor Ave. (River rock)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>San Fernando Road @ 452 - East SM Service Yard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>San Vicente Blvd. @ Fairfax Ave.</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>San Vicente Blvd. - 3rd. St. to Burton Way</td>
<td>5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>San Vicente Blvd. - Highland Ave. to Orange Dr.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>San Ysidro Dr. - Peavine Dr. to City Line</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Santa Monica Blvd. - Fwy. 405 to Beverly Hills City Line</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>St. Charles Place - Victoria Ave to Buckingham Road</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Stadium Way - Bernard St. to Coronel St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. @ Douglas St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. - Hill St. to Ord St. Slopes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LOCATIONS</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd.- Thurston Circle to Sepulveda Place</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. West @ Beaudry Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Temple Ave. @ Belmont Ave.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Vineyard Ave. to St. Charles Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Venice Blvd. @ Normandie Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- San Vicente Blvd. to Victoria Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- South Longwood Ave. to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Vermont Ave.- Jefferson Blvd. to Exposition Blvd.</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Vermont Ave.- M.L. King Jr. Blvd. to Exposition Blvd.</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Washington Bl.- Redondo Bl. To Arlington Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Washington Blvd.- Redondo Blvd. to Cochran Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Washington Blvd. @ West Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Washington Blvd.- La Brea Ave. to West Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Washington Blvd.- Manhattan Place to St. Andrews Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Wellington Road @ Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Western Ave. @ Fwy. 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Westholme Ave.- Eastborne Ave. to Ashton Ave.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Wonderview Dr. @ Tareco Dr.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONTRACT: LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE OF MEDIAN ISLANDS
### BAY-HARBOR

## TURF MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baird Ave. @ 6015- Reseda SM Service Yard</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42nd. St. West- 4th. Ave. to Stocker Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8th. Ave.- Stocker Place to West Vernon Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9th. Ave.- M.L. King Jr. Blvd. to Creed Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Athens Blvd.- Figueroa St. to Ainsworth St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Avalon Blvd.- East Century Blvd. to 104th. St.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bristol Ave.- San Vicente Blvd. to Highwood St.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Broadway- West 93rd. St. to 112th. St.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Century Blvd.- Clovis Ave. to Avalon Blvd.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Crenshaw Blvd.- Rodeo Pl. to M.L. King Jr. Blvd.</td>
<td>8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Culver Blvd.- Sawtelle Blvd. to McConnel Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Degnan Blvd. @ So. Norton Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Degnan Blvd.- M.L. King Jr. Blvd. to West 43rd. St.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>East 'E' St.- Mcfarland Ave. to Broad Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East 'I' St.- Southernland Ave. to Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harbor Blvd. N &amp; S- Swinford St. to West 7th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hoover St. South @ West Gage Ave.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leimert Blvd.- Sutro Ave. to 43rd. Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M.L. King Jr. Blvd.- Sutro Ave. to Crenshaw Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M.L. King Jr. Blvd. @ So. Broadway</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Manchester Ave. West- Ballenca Ave. to Pershing Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Dr. North- North Gaffey St. to South Western Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pampas Ricas Blvd.- West Sunset Blvd. to El Cereo Place</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Paseo Del Mar- South Western Ave. to Stargazer Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rodeo Rd.- Exposition Blvd. to Cimmeron St.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>San Vicente Blvd.- Wilshire Blvd. to 26th. St.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Santa Monica Blvd.- Saltair Ave. to Bundy Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Howard Hughes Dr. to Manchester Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Slauson Ave.- Culver Blvd. to Braddock Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stocker St.- Creed Ave. to Crenshaw Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Stoner Ave. @ 1479- Stoner SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd.- Temescal Canyon Rd. to El Medio Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Venice Blvd. @ 2000- Venice SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vernon Ave. South- West Gage Ave. to West 88th. St.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wilton Place @ South 5860- Southwest SM Service Yard</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GROUNDCOVER MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>C.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103rd. St.- Wilmington Ave. to Success Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103rd. St. East- Wilmington Ave. to Graham Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104th. St. East- Wilmington Ave. to Graham Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>111th. St. @ East 5223- Westchester SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>212th. St. West- South Hobart St. to Western Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>223rd. St. East- Hesperian Ave. to South Alameda St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29th. St.- Carolina St. to Peck Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8th. Ave. @ Stocker Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Abbott Kinney Blvd. @ 2000- Venice SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alameda St. @ Pacific Coast Hwy.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alberta Ave. @ Mildred Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alia Rd. @ Marina Expressway</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Almar Ave. @ Almar Place</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Almar Ave. @ Tahquitz Place</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anita Ave. @ Carmelina Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arlington Ave.- 54th. St. to Slauson Ave.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Athens Blvd.- Ainsworth St. to Vermont Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bowdoin St.- Radcliff Ave. to Temescal Canyon Road</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bowdoin St.- Temescal Canyon Road to Erskine Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Broadway- 80th. St. to 90th. St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Broadway- Broadway Place to 40th. Place</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bundy Dr. @ Rose Marie Lane</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Canal St. @ Mildred Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Central Ave. @ Imperial Hwy. (NW &amp; SE Corners).</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Century Blvd. East- Holmes Ave. to Success Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Channel Road East- Amalfi Dr. to Entrada Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Culver Blvd.- Sawtelle Blvd. to McConnell Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Culver Dr.- Ingledow Blvd. to Centinela Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Culver Dr.- Messemmer Ave. to Inglewood Blvd.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Culver Dr.- N/o Sawtelle Blvd. to NW &amp; NE ends.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Denver Ave. @ 8602- South SM Service Yard</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>E' St. East- Sanford Ave. to Avalon Blvd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Entrada Dr. @ Ocean Way</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Eubank Ave.- Anaheim St. to 'E' St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Figueroa St.- 80th. St. to 90th. St.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Figueroa St. @ Frigate Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gaffey St. @ 1400 @ Capitol Dr.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gaffey St.- End of Fwy. 110 to West Santa Cruz</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Gage Ave. @ E/O Avalon Blvd.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gateway Blvd.- Pico Blvd. to Gainsville Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Graham Ave.- East 103rd. St. to East 104th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Harbor Blvd. North- Swinford St. to West 7th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Harbor Blvd. South- West 7th. St. to West 14th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Harry Bridges Blvd.- Figueroa St. to Bay View</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Haverford Ave., S/O Bowdoin St. (Stairway).</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I' St. East- Alameda St. to Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Imperial Hwy - Pershing Dr. to Vista Del Mar</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>John S. Gibson Blvd.- Figueroa St. to North Pacific Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kenter Ave. @ Homewood Road</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Leimert Blvd.- Sutro Ave. to West 43rd. Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Lincoln Blvd.- LMU to Westchester Parkway</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M.L. King Jr. Blvd.- Sutro Ave. to Crenshaw Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M.L. King Jr. Blvd. W/O Crenshaw Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Main St. @ 4200- Main St. SM Service Yard</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Manchester Ave.- Rayford Dr. to Saran Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Manchester Ave.- Saran Dr. to Pershing Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Manchester Ave.- Vermont Ave. to Central Ave.</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>C.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Marquez Ave.- Jacon Way to Sunset Blvd. (Slope)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Hwy.- Sanford Ave. to Eubank Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Palms Blvd.- Steward Ave. to Beethoven St.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Dr. North- Gaffey St. to Western Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Paseo Del Mar- Western Ave. to Weymouth Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Pershing Dr.- Sandpiper Dr. to West Imperial Hwy.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Pershing Dr. @ Culver Blvd.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Santa Monica Blvd.- Centinela Ave. to Rochester Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Santa Monica Blvd.- Saltair Ave. to Bundy Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Hughes Dr. to Manchester Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd.- Hughes Dr. to Manchester Ave. Hardscape</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Stocker St.- Don Felipe Dr. to Don Lorenzo Dr. Slope</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Stoner Ave. @ 1479- Palisades SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Summerland Ave.- West Gaffey St. to Western Ave.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd.- Mandeville Canyon Road to Allenford Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. @ 1,200' W/O Brooktree Road</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. @ Chautaugua Blvd.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. @ Northfield St.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd. @ Via De La Paz</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Thatcher Ave. @ 3311- Thatcher @ SM Service Yard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Lincoln Blvd. to Sepulveda Blvd.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Venice Blvd.- Lindon Blvd. to Abbott Kinney Blvd.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Western Ave.- 261st. St. to West Lomita Blvd.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Western Ave. @ 25th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Wilmington Ave.- East 103rd. St. to East 104th. St.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Wilton Place @ South 5860- Southwest SM Service Yard</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Zanja St.- Walgrove Ave. to Penmar Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – ELIGIBILITY OF USING THE NEW GAS TAX (SB 1) AS A FUNDING SOURCE TO ADDRESS CURB AND GUTTER REPAIRS

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services’ (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on whether the new Gas Tax (SB 1) can be used as a funding source to address curb and gutter repairs that have not been completed.

SB 1 can be used for road repairs within the City, which includes curb and gutters. Please note, SB 1 requires submission of a project list, approved by the City Council, to the State Controller prior to the release of funds to the City.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Interim City Administrative Officer

Subject: **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT – EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR I AND INTERN POSITIONS**

During its consideration of the Emergency Management Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on possible funding sources for the restoration of two Emergency Management Coordinator (EMC) I positions and as-needed intern positions, as well as impacts to services should these positions not be continued. These positions have historically been funded through the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant program.

The EMC I positions represent two of a total of four in the Department’s Community Emergency Management Division. The Department reports that the impacts of not continuing these positions include a reduction in the number of completed Neighborhood Emergency Plans Prepared, various duties and responsibilities assigned to the Disaster Management Bureau Program, and the number of staff available to ensure continuity of operations during Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activations. The restoration of each EMC I position would require an appropriation of $150,466, which is comprised of $106,434 in direct costs and $44,032 in related costs.

The Department utilizes interns to assist with community and business-specific outreach, the revision of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, and long-term sustainability and resiliency strategies for the City. Approximately seven interns are retained per year and each intern completes 1,039 hours of service at a rate of $19.58/hour. The Department expects to expend $142,405 towards this program in Fiscal Year 2016-17.

Subsequent to the release of the Proposed Budget, this Office and the Mayor’s Office of Public Safety identified approximately $110,000 in UASI grant funds that could be reappropriated to 2017-18 to fund the EMC I positions or interns. Additional grant support for these positions is contingent upon identification of available funds by the Mayor’s Office.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The General Fund impact of restoring two Emergency Management Coordinator I positions is $300,932, consisting of $212,868 in direct costs and $88,064 in related costs. The General Fund impact in funding the internship program is $145,605. Should an appropriation be made for these purposes, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – RESOURCES NEEDED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR GRANT PROGRAMS

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on whether the Bureau of Street Services has adequate resources to take advantage of opportunities for grant programs, including Active Transportation Program, Cap and Trade, and Measure M. The Bureau’s response is attached.

The Bureau is reporting that they currently have enough resources to deliver $10 million to $15 million of grant-funded projects annually. During the budget preparation process, it was agreed that BSS would utilize their existing resources to complete grant-funded projects currently in progress. Additionally, the Mayor’s Office has asked BSS to identify productivity improvements prior to requesting additional staff.

However, should opportunities arise to acquire additional grant funds for new projects, this Office has agreed to work with BSS, the Bureau of Engineering, the Department of Transportation and the Mayor’s Office to ensure that the projects can be delivered successfully.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:NCT:06170112
Question No.184
Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017
TO: Budget and Finance Committee
FROM: Nazario Sauceda, Director
Bureau of Street Services

SUBJECT: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMO – QUESTION NO. 184
GRANT-FUNDED PROGRAMS

The Budget and Finance (B&F) Committee instructed the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to report if they have adequate resources to take advantage of opportunities for grant programs, including Active Transportation Program (ATP), Cap and Trade, and Measure M.

Currently, BSS has resources to deliver $10 million to $15 million of grant-funded projects annually. If BSS is asked to perform more grant-funded work, BSS can provide a module that was developed reflecting resources needed to deliver an additional $10 million worth of projects for grant-funded programs such as ATP, Cap and Trade, and Measure M.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF STREET SERVICES – MEDIAN ISLAND MAINTENANCE SPECIAL FUNDS TRANSFER

During its consideration of the Bureau of Street Services’ (BSS) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on the feasibility of transferring Measure R and Measure M funds proposed for Median Island Maintenance to the Bureau’s budget. The Proposed Budget has Median Island Maintenance funded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>Street Services Budget - Measure R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>Measure R Special Purpose Fund Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
<td>Measure M Special Purpose Fund Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,100,000</td>
<td>Total Funding Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau can spend directly from both Special Purpose Fund Appropriations and from the Street Services Budget. Therefore, no obstacle exists to implementation of the Median Island Maintenance contract with the Proposed Budget.

However, the Bureau believes that coordinating payments with another City department, in this case the Department of Transportation, can lead to additional complexity in the payment process. With the Proposed Budget, this could be the case with the Measure R Special Purpose Fund Appropriation. However, the overall impact of any additional complexity will depend upon the number of payments processed for the $1,000,000 appropriation.

Conversely, moving the Special Purpose Fund Appropriation into the Street Services budget may impact the ability of the City to efficiently track and account for any funds that may remain after completion of the contract. Additionally, funds within a Special Purpose Fund Appropriation do not revert at the fiscal year end and are, therefore, more easily accessed in the following fiscal year for continuing projects.
RECOMMENDATION

Funds totaling $2.1 million should be transferred to the Bureau of Street Services contractual services account. The following actions need to take place for the transfer to occur:

- Increase appropriation in Department 86, Fund 100, Account No. 3040 by $2,100,000
- Decrease appropriation in Measure R, Fund 51Q, Account No. 94-676 by $1,000,000
- Decrease appropriation in Measure M, Fund 59C, Account No. 50-G02 by $1,100,000

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no fiscal impact.
During its consideration of the Fire Department's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the LAFD Special Training Fund (Special Fund) 40J is eligible for funding a diversity recruitment program. In addition, the Committee asked how the appropriation of $450,000 from this fund for Firefighter hiring and training differed from or overlapped with the Personnel Department’s request for funding recruitment.

The Special Fund was created under Administrative Code Section 5.148 to allow for the receipt and disbursement of funds related to Fire Department training activities. Within the fund there are two accounts; a General Account for funds received from classroom rentals, grants, equipment rentals, and special service fees for training members from outside agencies, and a State Educational Account for receipt of State funds utilized for training of Department members. Per the Administrative Code, expenditure of funds shall be for fire-service related training activities for Department members, including training-related expenses and equipment, contracts for training, and enhancing training facilities. Utilizing the fund to support diversity recruitment would not be pursuant to the Fund's intended purpose.

The Personnel Department's request for funding for Public Safety recruitment (Blue Book Item No. 14) is unrelated to the Special Fund or training appropriations. The $450,000 identified from the Special Fund will go towards Firefighter hiring and training expense costs in 2017-18 including classroom materials, uniforms and equipment as detailed in the Fire Department Blue Book Item No. 36.

The Department historically incurs training costs in excess of receipts received in the Special Fund, and anticipates continuing to do so as personnel and mandatory training programs increase. Should Special Funds be reappropriated for other uses, the Department may increasingly rely on the General Fund for training purposes or risk a reduction in providing training to sworn members.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – SENIOR PROJECT COORDINATOR POSITION

During its consideration of the Fire Department's (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the process through which the Senior Project Coordinator (SPC) position added for youth programs in Item No. 37 of the Department's Blue Book can be exempted.

To obtain a civil service exemption for a new position under Los Angeles City Charter Section 1001(b) for management, professional, scientific, or expert services, the Department must first submit a request to the General Manager of the Personnel Department to allocate the position. Once the position has been allocated by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners, the Department must request a position exemption from the Mayor's Office. The Mayor's Office will evaluate the request and obtain input from the Personnel Department, then forward its recommendation to the Council, who may disapprove it within 10 Council meeting days with a two-thirds vote. If the Council does not act on the recommendation within the specified time period, the exemption shall be deemed approved.

The Department is seeking to fill the position with a uniquely qualified individual that has experience in education, youth development, or other related fields. The ideal candidate would also have experience designing programs for Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) implementation and an understanding of the Department's recruitment process. The majority of SPC positions have received civil service exemption because of the special expertise and qualifications required for those positions. A civil service exemption provides the Department with the flexibility necessary to recruit from a broader pool of candidates who possess the knowledge and skills required for this program.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY ATTORNEY – RESOURCES FOR TWO NEW ATTORNEY POSITIONS

During its consideration of the City Attorney’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the resources required to add two new attorney positions in the Employment Litigation Division.

After consultation with the City Attorney’s Office, two Deputy City Attorney III positions would be requested to address its current and projected employment litigation caseload. The resources required to provide full year funding for two additional Deputy City Attorney III positions totals $486,205, which consists of $356,704 in direct salary costs and $129,501 in related costs. Funding the two attorney positions for nine-months will total $369,075, which consists of $265,708 in direct salary costs and $103,367 in related costs. The addition of the two Deputy City Attorney positions would also be subject to pay grade determination by the Employee Relations Division of the Office of the City Administrative Officer.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of fully funding two additional Deputy City Attorney III positions for one year is $486,205, which consists of $356,704 in direct salary costs and $129,501 in related costs. Funding the two attorney positions for nine-months will total $369,075, which consists of $265,708 in direct salary costs and $103,367 in related costs. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:SCL:04170097
Question No. 79
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRANSFER (IGT) PROGRAM REVENUE

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the amount of Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) Program revenue available to support the Department’s supplemental budget requests, as submitted to the Committee on April 26, 2017; provide an outline of the resources and position authorities required for these requests; and report on the General Fund implications of using IGT funds for these purposes in the coming year and in future years. The Committee also requested a status update on the Department’s reported funding/reimbursement agreements with Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) and California Hospital for two of the five proposed Advanced Provider Response Units (APRUs).

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget programs $6 million in IGT Program receipts, representing funds from the 2015-16 Program Year, for sworn salary costs in the Fire Department’s Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Program. In its letter to the Committee dated April 21, 2017, the Fire Department indicated that IGT funds totaling $12 million, representing receipts from Program Years 2015-16 and 2016-17, may be available for programming in 2017-18. This would allow up to $6 million to support the Department’s supplemental budget requests. The Department has yet to apply for these funds, and it is not known how much will be received at this time.

In its supplemental budget request submitted to the Committee on April 26, 2017, the Fire Department identified three requests that are eligible for funding from IGT Program receipts. A summary of the requests and the projected 2017-18 direct costs and full-year direct costs are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Positions/Accounts</th>
<th>No. Months/ Hours</th>
<th>2017-18 Direct Cost</th>
<th>2018-19 (Full-Year) Direct Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Two Engine</td>
<td>Sworn Salaries (24 positions)</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>$730,614</td>
<td>$2,922,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>Sworn Bonuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,168</td>
<td>36,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sworn Constant Staffing Overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td>306,858</td>
<td>1,227,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,073,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,186,056</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Basic Life Support</td>
<td>Sworn Variable Staffing Overtime</td>
<td>8,333 hours</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Ambulances</td>
<td>Ambulance Maintenance (5)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,692</td>
<td>35,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$515,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>$535,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As summarized in the chart above, the 2017-18 direct cost to the City of implementing the Fire Department’s three supplemental requests is estimated at $2,420,716. If the additional $6 million in IGT Program Year 2016-17 funding is received, the Council could authorize this amount, plus an estimated $697,146 in related costs for a total of $3,117,862, to be covered by the additional funding, with no additional impact to the General Fund. However, these supplemental requests, as presented by the Department, depend on delayed implementation and donations in 2017-18. The full-year, direct cost of supporting the three IGT Program-eligible supplemental budget requests would be $6,141,356 ($8,028,936 including related costs). Since the IGT funding available for 2018-19 is not anticipated to represent more than one Program Year (2017-18), and agreements with private partners are currently limited to one year, the cost of these initiatives, if continued, will likely be assumed by the General Fund in 2018-19 and beyond.

IGT funding cannot be relied upon to support the costs of ongoing activities indefinitely; the Department must apply for funding annually and receipts are dependent upon Department Medi-Cal expenditures, funding availability from the federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and the number of entities applying for funds, among other factors. It is therefore recommended that any proposal to budget the additional $6 million anticipated from the IGT Program funds in 2017-18 be limited to one-time activities, placed into the Unappropriated Balance to be appropriated to the Fire Department EMS Program contingent upon receipt of the funds.

The Fire Department reports that it is still in the process of completing agreements with LAWA and California Hospital for the implementation of Advanced Provider Response Units (APRUs) within their respective service areas. The Fire Department anticipates implementation of all five proposed APRUs by July 2017.

A detail of the positions requested for the three supplemental budget requests is provided as an attachment.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The General Fund impact of restoring two Engine Companies for three months, adding five Basic Life Support rescue ambulances for six months, and five Advanced Provider Response Units, contingent upon $6 million in additional Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) Program receipts, would be zero dollars in 2017-18 and up to approximately $8.0 million in 2018-19 and beyond. Alternatively, approving the recommendation in this memorandum to
fund only one-time activities would authorize the appropriation of up to $6 million in IGT Program funds to the Fire Department for one-time purposes in 2017-18. This recommendation is in compliance with the City’s Financial Policies in that one-time funding is used for one-time purposes.

RHL:JCY:04170099

Question No. 11

Attachment
# 2017-18 Budget Supplemental Request

## Department:
FIRE

### Request 1 Name of Request:
Restore Two Engine Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Class Title</td>
<td>Class Code</td>
<td>Reg, Sworn, Reso, As-Needed, or Hiring Hall</td>
<td>Wages &amp; Count Salary</td>
<td>Salary Savings Rate (%)</td>
<td>Number of Months Funding Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FIRE CAPTAIN I (PD)</td>
<td>2142-1</td>
<td>Sworn-Reg</td>
<td>$146,032</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FIREFIGHTER III (PD)</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Sworn-Reg</td>
<td>$112,259</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ENGINEER (PD)</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>Sworn-Reg</td>
<td>$116,526</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24 TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>2017-18 Cost</th>
<th>2018-19 Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001010</td>
<td>Salaries General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001012</td>
<td>Salaries - Sworn</td>
<td>$730,614</td>
<td>$2,922,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001030</td>
<td>Sworn Bonuses</td>
<td>$36,168</td>
<td>$36,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001093</td>
<td>Overtime, Constant Staffing</td>
<td>$306,856</td>
<td>$1,227,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,073,640</td>
<td>$4,186,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pension/Health (Add/Delete Rate): $697,146 $1,667,255

TOTAL COST: $1,770,786 $5,853,311

### Request 2 Name of Request:
Expansion of Advanced Provider Response Units (APRUs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Class Title</td>
<td>Class Code</td>
<td>Reg, Sworn, Reso, As-Needed, or Hiring Hall</td>
<td>Proposed Salary</td>
<td>Salary Savings Rate (%)</td>
<td>Number of Months Funding Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADVANCED PROVIDER</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Civ-Reso</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>2017-18 Cost</th>
<th>2018-19 Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001010</td>
<td>Salaries General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001012</td>
<td>Salaries - Sworn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001030</td>
<td>Sworn Bonuses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001098</td>
<td>Overtime, Sworn Variable Staffing</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Ambulance Maintenance</td>
<td>$31,384</td>
<td>$35,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$831,384</td>
<td>$1,420,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pension/Health (Add/Delete Rate): $220,325

TOTAL COST: $831,384 $1,640,475
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF SANITATION – CONSTRUCTION SERVICES TEAM

Attached is a memorandum from the Bureau of Sanitation (Bureau) dated May 2, 2017, responding to the Committee’s request for additional information on the creation of a Construction Services Team within the Bureau.

In its 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Bureau requested nine-months funding and regular authority for one Heavy Duty Truck Operator, one Carpenter, one Cement Finisher, one Plumber, and one Masonry Worker to expand the Bureau’s existing Construction Services Team. This request was not approved as it could not be determined whether there were enough ongoing construction projects to justify the expansion of the Construction Services Team. In its memorandum dated May 2, 2017, the Bureau is now requesting an unfunded Senior Construction Engineer (SCE) resolution authority to oversee the Construction Services Team. This position would oversee two Engineering Associates and 16 construction positions (which includes the five positions that were not approved in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, but the Bureau will be requesting again in future budgets).

Based on its class specification, the SCE does not appear to be the appropriate classification to oversee the Construction Services Team. According to the class specification, the SCE directs a large group of professional engineers and technical staff that are responsible for reviewing and managing the activities of construction contractors. The SCE classification works with engineers and private contractors to design, process bids, negotiate construction contracts, and interprets designs concerning buildings and municipal facilities. The SCE proposed by the Bureau mainly supervises trade and craft positions. The more appropriate classification to oversee the Construction Services Team is the Construction and Maintenance Supervisor classification, which currently oversees these positions.

It has been determined that the SCE position is not required to generate the cost savings from using in-house construction forces and that this work can be performed with existing resources. The Bureau has an existing Construction Services Team headed by one Construction and Maintenance Supervisor that oversees the work of five Equipment Operators, four Maintenance and Construction Workers, and one Maintenance Laborer.

RECOMMENDATION

Not approve the Senior Construction Engineer position and instruct the Bureau of Sanitation to use in-house construction forces when feasible.
DATE: May 2, 2017

TO: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
    Honorable Mitchell Englander, Vice Chair
    Honorable Nury Martinez, Member
    Honorable Bob Blumenfield, Member
    Honorable Mike Bonin, Member
    Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Enrique C. Zaldivar, Director
    LA Sanitation

SUBJECT: LA SANITATION – REPORT BACK ON BUDGET & FINANCE
         QUESTION NO. 202: CONSTRUCTION SERVICES TEAM

Question No. 202: How would the Bureau use the internal construction service team? Report on how it would be structured, the costs and savings, and funding options.

During the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Proposed Budget Deliberations held on April 27, 2017, LA Sanitation was asked to report back on the benefits of an internal construction services team.

Currently, LA Sanitation (LASAN) maintains five (5) closed landfills. The staff assigned to maintain the landfills is highly skilled and experienced in all phases of earth moving, grading and various construction work. Several post closure maintenance activities will continue throughout the 30-year post closure period and beyond. However, beginning in 2000, the construction services staff has been performing non-landfill construction projects at times when they are available. Since then, millions of dollars were saved by performing work in house such as development of 6000 W. Jefferson, construction of greenway projects, paving of the Green Acres Farm Roads, excavation and re-compaction of the East Valley Collection Yard, and many others. LASAN is now proposing to expand its in-house construction services program to continue saving money and limit its dependency on contractors for projects that are limited in cost and duration. LASAN pays contractors $10-20 million annually in emergency sewer repair and watershed improvements projects. Some of these repairs and improvements could be performed in-house, or in the case of emergency sewer repair, in-house crews could stabilize the site until the contractor can mobilize forces, reducing emergency surcharges. An in-house construction crew would also provide LASAN with the flexibility and agility to act quickly to protect public safety and provide excellent customer service.

In order to review, assess, analyze current and future sewer repairs and watershed improvements projects and determine which ones could be managed in-house, a senior construction engineer position will be needed. In addition to the tasks above, this position will also plan and coordinate the current limited construction activities performed by LASAN construction staff, which supports some of the projects of the LASAN Watershed Protection Program and Water Reclamation Plants. Individual projects can be analyzed to determine if it is more efficient to do the work using City forces or contractors.
The Senior Construction Engineer will supervise the LASAN Construction Projects crew and two (2) Environmental Engineering Associates. Attached is the organizational chart showing the proposed staffing structure, including craft positions that will be requested in future years’ budgets.

With this position supporting all LASAN Programs, the proposed Senior Construction Engineer position would have funding of 48% by the Solid Waste Resources Recovery Fund (SWRRF), 47% by the Sewer Construction and Maintenance (SCM) Fund and 5% by the Stormwater Pollution Abatement (SPA) Fund. The salary for nine (9) months with 3% salary savings is $85,506. LASAN recommends that this position be added as an unfunded resolution authority.

Since 2000, LASAN’s existing construction crew with its current limited capabilities has performed several construction projects, making LASAN more responsive and saving money. Adding the Senior Construction Engineer to the current staff will provide an additional tool needed for scoping, planning, analyzing, organizing and scheduling all future construction projects, making the program run more efficiently. With more efficiency, more projects may be performed and more savings will be realized. In addition, for small projects, the additional costs of going through the bidding process can also be saved by using in-house forces and results can be produced more quickly.

Thank you in advance for your continued support of LA Sanitation. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of these items further, please feel free to contact myself or Lisa B. Mowery, LASAN’s Chief Financial Officer at (213) 485-2210.

LBM/ECZ:lbm

Attachment

c: 
Members of the City Council
Ana Guerrero, Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Matt Szabo, Deputy Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Mayor’s Office of City Services
Greg Good, Chief of Legislative and External Affairs, Mayor’s Office
John Chavez, Mayor’s Office of Budget and Innovation
Sharon Tso, CLA
Richard Llewellyn, Jr., Interim CAO
Kevin James, President, BPW
Heather Repenning, Vice President, BPW
LASAN Executive Team
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GCP – CLEAN AND GREEN JOBS PROGRAM

During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding options to provide $99,000 for the Los Angeles Conservation Corps for the Clean and Green Jobs Program item.

The Proposed Budget provides $1,000,000 within the GCP budget for the Clean and Green Jobs Program (Program). The GCP portion includes $500,000 from the General Fund, $200,000 from the Multi-Family Bulky Item Fee Fund, $100,000 from the Sewer Operations and Maintenance Fund, $100,000 from the Integrated Solid Waste Management Fund, and $100,000 from the Citywide Recycling Trust Fund.

The Program is administered by the Los Angeles Conservation Corps (LACC) and provides employment opportunities for youth, ages 14 to 17, to paint over graffiti, create murals, plant trees, clean alleyways, and collect recyclables and trash. The LACC requests $99,000 to offset costs associated with the minimum wage increase from $10.50 to $12.00, effective July 1, 2017.

Funding for this program is eligible for the Multi-Family Bulky Item Fee Fund, Sewer Operations and Maintenance Fund, Integrated Solid Waste Management Fund, and the Citywide Recycling Trust Fund. However, the Proposed Budget fully allocates these funds. Should Council approve the $99,000 increase, offsetting General Fund and/or Special Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding the requested increase to the Clean and Green Jobs Program is $99,000 in 2017-18. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund and/or Special Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – POSITION CONTROL OFFICER POSITION AUTHORITY

During its consideration of the Fire Department's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provide an assessment of the potential savings associated with adding a Position Control Officer (Fire Captain I) position for the Return to Work unit as requested in the LAFD supplemental budget request letter dated April 26, 2017.

As discussed in the LAFD budget hearing with the Committee on April 26, 2017, adding a Position Control Officer (PCO) to manage and facilitate sworn members returning from Injury-on-Duty (IOD) and other types of leave may help reduce the amount of overtime currently required to backfill these members' responsibilities while they are on leave or light duty. The Department reports that it costs the LAFD approximately $14,625 per month to backfill each field vacancy (sworn member on platoon duty) on an overtime rate of time-and-a-half. The Department also reports that at any given time, there are over 270 sworn members off duty due to IOD and workers' compensation-related injury or illness situations. These incidents and claims are often not managed beyond the initial outreach phase due to the lack of staff to provide more personalized attention or follow up on whether the employee is ready to return to work or to move on from their modified duties.

The cost of a Fire Captain I is $211,961, consisting of $136,134 in direct salary costs and $75,827 in related costs. If a PCO position were authorized, and could assist five Firefighters in returning to field duty three months earlier than the current rate, an overtime savings of $219,375 could be realized, offsetting the cost of the position.

It should be noted that the Personnel Department has not reviewed the appropriateness of the requested Fire Captain I position with the proposed duties, which include developing policy guidelines regarding accommodation of medical restrictions; monitoring member placements on State rates, light duty, internal assignments and other accommodations; and assisting the Personnel Services Unit with implementation of compliance regulations. The work may be more appropriate for a Senior Personnel Analyst I, the cost of which is $166,395, consisting of $118,815 in direct salary costs and $47,580 in related costs.

Should the PCO Fire Captain I or Senior Personnel Analyst I position authority be approved, the position could be authorized without funding, with funds transferred to the Sworn Salaries or Salaries General account from overtime savings generated during the year to cover the cost of the position.
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding one Fire Captain I position is $211,961, consisting of $136,134 in direct salary costs and $75,827 in related costs. The impact of funding one Senior Personnel Analyst I is $166,395, consisting of $118,815 in direct salary costs and $47,580 in related costs. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified. Alternatively, the position authority could be approved without funding, with the Department providing funding through overtime account savings generated during Fiscal Year 2017-18.

RHL:JCY:04170105

Question No. 13
During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the proposed funding level for Domestic Abuse Response Teams (DART) maintains the current level of services in each of the 21 sites.

The Proposed Budget provides $1,524,000 for the DART Program, which is administered by the Office of the Mayor and the Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst. The teams consist of police officers, victim advocates, and volunteers who respond to domestic violence incidents and provide intervention services for victims and family members at the 21 DART sites. The Mayor’s Office reports that services at the 21 DART sites will be maintained at current levels in 2017-18.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – FUNDING OPTIONS FOR A CONSULTANT AND STEPS TO CREATE AN ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICT IN THE VENICE AREA

During its consideration of the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD)'s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested EWDD to report on potential funding options to hire a consultant and to take the steps that would be required to create an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in the Venice area. The Department’s response is attached.

The EWDD estimates the cost for a consultant to prepare an analysis regarding the feasibility of an EIFD in the Venice area to be $75,000, with potential funding options from additional General Fund funding or as part of the Department's General Fund appropriation in the amount of $300,000 for economic development contractual services included in the Proposed FY 2017-18 Budget. The Department states that necessary steps include but are not limited to the preparation of an initial EIFD capacity analysis, a database and rating of potential project sites, and analysis of potential tax increment.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should the Council choose to add funding for the cost of a consultant for an analysis on creating an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in the Venice area, the additional impact to the General Fund is $75,000. Alternatively, if the Council chooses to direct the Economic and Workforce Development Department to fund the consultant from the existing FY 2017-18 Proposed Budget of $300,000 (General Fund) for economic development contractual services, there is no additional impact to the General Fund. The Department’s proposal complies with the City’s Financial Policies.

RHL: SAM:02170146

Question No. 229

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Jan Perry, General Manager
Economic and Workforce Development Department

Subject: ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK FOR QUESTION NO. 229

On April 28, 2017, the Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Economic and Workforce Development Department to report on potential funding options to hire a consultant and to take the steps that would be required to create an Enhance Infrastructure Finance District in the Venice area.

BACKGROUND

With the demise of California Redevelopment Agencies in 2011, communities hoping to encourage economic development have struggled to find financing tools that create investment in communities. California Senate Bill 628, approved by Governor Brown on September 29, 2014, created EIFD's to potentially fill the gap that dissolution left. One or more of these districts may be created within a city or county to finance the construction or rehabilitation of a wide variety of public infrastructure and private facilities. An EIFD may fund facilities and development with the property tax increment of those taxing agencies that consent (cities, counties, special districts, but not schools).

To understand the feasibility of creating an EIFD as a potential funding source to support infrastructure improvements, affordable housing and other vital economic development initiatives in Venice, it is necessary to understand the framework for using this property tax increment financing mechanism, so a capacity analysis evaluating the Venice community and Venice project specific sites is needed.

Utilizing a prequalified list of consultants, a real estate economics firm could be retained to facilitate meetings to identify key assumptions and present technical analysis. It is anticipated that a Request for Proposals (RFP) from EWDD to procure a consultant to prepare a feasibility study could be released within 2 weeks of Council authorization, with responses due within 3 weeks of release, and selection of a consultant within 10 days of receiving responses to the RFP. Upon selecting a consultant, it’s anticipated to take 2 weeks to place a consultant under contract and issue a notice to proceed.
The cost to retain a consultant to prepare an analysis could be as much as $75,000. Potential funding options could include dedicated General Funds, use of Council Office discretionary funds, or funding through EWDD’s limited economic development consultant funds.

Without careful planning and sound investment in projects that would otherwise not occur, forming an EIFD risks unnecessarily reducing future General Fund revenues. Accordingly, EWDD submitted a proposed EIFD Establishment and Investment Policy February 9, 2017 (CF 14-1349-S1), which was considered by the Economic Development Committee on February 14, 2017, and is currently pending a review and report back from the Chief Legislative Analyst, and (CF 14-1349-S2) which was referred to the Budget and Finance and Economic Development Committees on February 13, 2017.

The submitted proposed Establishment and Investment Policy:

1. Outlined the City’s preliminary assessment of whether to form a proposed EIFD;
2. Explained the City’s approach to committing tax increment to an EIFD;
3. Provided an overview of EIFDs; and
4. Established the City’s procedures and policies related to accepting and responding to requests to establish EIFDs within City boundaries.

An initial EIFD capacity analysis will provide Council District 11 with an understanding of potential EIFD revenues based on a number of variable points. The analysis will evaluate revenues of a single and multiple EIFD’s and evaluate revenues on a site specific level to provide understanding of the relative EIFD revenue capacity of areas within Venice. Moreover, a sensitivity analysis matrix could be prepared to examine the impact of the participation of varying taxing entities and the impact of varying terms of the financing instrument.

To effectively determine the feasibility of creating an EIFD in Venice, it is necessary to create a data base of potential project sites and create a set of guidelines to rate projects for their inclusion in an EIFD. As projects are made available to neighborhood stakeholders for rating and inclusion in an EIFD, an analysis of potential tax increment can be prepared to determine the feasibility of establishing the district to fund infrastructure improvement, affordable housing and/or other economic development projects.

Additional variables involved in an EIFD analysis include gaining insight into the needs of the Venice neighborhood, including the inclusion or exclusion of project(s) geographies/boundaries, inclusion or exclusion of taxing entities, and assumptions related to market variables.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – FUNDING OPTIONS FOR A CONSULTANT AND STEPS TO CREATE AN ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICT IN THE VENICE AREA

During its consideration of the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD)'s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested EWDD to report on potential funding options to hire a consultant and to take the steps that would be required to create an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in the Venice area. The Department's response is attached.

The EWDD estimates the cost for a consultant to prepare an analysis regarding the feasibility of an EIFD in the Venice area to be $75,000, with potential funding options from additional General Fund funding or as part of the Department's General Fund appropriation in the amount of $300,000 for economic development contractual services included in the Proposed FY 2017-18 Budget. The Department states that necessary steps include but are not limited to the preparation of an initial EIFD capacity analysis, a database and rating of potential project sites, and analysis of potential tax increment.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should the Council choose to add funding for the cost of a consultant for an analysis on creating an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) in the Venice area, the additional impact to the General Fund is $75,000. Alternatively, if the Council chooses to direct the Economic and Workforce Development Department to fund the consultant from the existing FY 2017-18 Proposed Budget of $300,000 (General Fund) for economic development contractual services, there is no additional impact to the General Fund. The Department's proposal complies with the City's Financial Policies.

RHL: SAM:02170146

Question No. 229

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Jan Perry, General Manager
Economic and Workforce Development Department

Subject: ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK FOR QUESTION NO. 229

On April 28, 2017, the Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Economic and Workforce Development Department to report on potential funding options to hire a consultant and to take the steps that would be required to create an Enhance Infrastructure Finance District in the Venice area.

BACKGROUND

With the demise of California Redevelopment Agencies in 2011, communities hoping to encourage economic development have struggled to find financing tools that create investment in communities. California Senate Bill 628, approved by Governor Brown on September 29, 2014, created EIFD’s to potentially fill the gap that dissolution left. One or more of these districts may be created within a city or county to finance the construction or rehabilitation of a wide variety of public infrastructure and private facilities. An EIFD may fund facilities and development with the property tax increment of those taxing agencies that consent (cities, counties, special districts, but not schools).

To understand the feasibility of creating an EIFD as a potential funding source to support infrastructure improvements, affordable housing and other vital economic development initiatives in Venice, it is necessary to understand the framework for using this property tax increment financing mechanism, so a capacity analysis evaluating the Venice community and Venice project specific sites is needed.

Utilizing a prequalified list of consultants, a real estate economics firm could be retained to facilitate meetings to identify key assumptions and present technical analysis. It is anticipated that a Request for Proposals (RFP) from EWDD to procure a consultant to prepare a feasibility study could be released within 2 weeks of Council authorization, with responses due within 3 weeks of release, and selection of a consultant within 10 days of receiving responses to the RFP. Upon selecting a consultant, it's anticipated to take 2 weeks to place a consultant under contract and issue a notice to proceed.
The cost to retain a consultant to prepare an analysis could be as much as $75,000. Potential funding options could include dedicated General Funds, use of Council Office discretionary funds, or funding through EWDD's limited economic development consultant funds.

Without careful planning and sound investment in projects that would otherwise not occur, forming an EIFD risks unnecessarily reducing future General Fund revenues. Accordingly, EWDD submitted a proposed EIFD Establishment and Investment Policy February 9, 2017 (CF 14-1349-S1), which was considered by the Economic Development Committee on February 14, 2017, and is currently pending a review and report back from the Chief Legislative Analyst, and (CF 14-1349 - S2) which was referred to the Budget and Finance and Economic Development Committees on February 13, 2017.

The submitted proposed Establishment and Investment Policy:

1. Outlined the City's preliminary assessment of whether to form a proposed EIFD;
2. Explained the City's approach to committing tax increment to an EIFD;
3. Provided an overview of EIFDs; and
4. Established the City's procedures and policies related to accepting and responding to requests to establish EIFDs within City boundaries.

An initial EIFD capacity analysis will provide Council District 11 with an understanding of potential EIFD revenues based on a number of variable points. The analysis will evaluate revenues of a single and multiple EIFD's and evaluate revenues on a site specific level to provide understanding of the relative EIFD revenue capacity of areas within Venice. Moreover, a sensitivity analysis matrix could be prepared to examine the impact of the participation of varying taxing entities and the impact of varying terms of the financing instrument.

To effectively determine the feasibility of creating an EIFD in Venice, it is necessary to create a data base of potential project sites and create a set of guidelines to rate projects for their inclusion in an EIFD. As projects are made available to neighborhood stakeholders for rating and inclusion in an EIFD, an analysis of potential tax increment can be prepared to determine the feasibility of establishing the district to fund infrastructure improvement, affordable housing and/or other economic development projects.

Additional variables involved in an EIFD analysis include gaining insight into the needs of the Venice neighborhood, including the inclusion or exclusion of project(s) geographies/boundaries, inclusion or exclusion of taxing entities, and assumptions related to market variables.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LIBRARY -- PATRONS ENTERED INTO THE COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM AT LIBRARIES

During its consideration of the Library Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Library Department to report on how many homeless patrons have been entered into the Coordinated Entry System in 2016-17.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:EOS:08170040
Question No. 38
Attachment
May 1, 2017

The Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
City Council Budget and Finance Committee
200 N. Spring Street, Room 435
Los Angeles, CA 90012

2017-18 Budget Impact Memo: The Number of Homeless Library Patrons Entered into the Coordinated Entry System

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

During the budget hearing on April 26, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) to report on the number of homeless patrons who have been entered into the Coordinated Entry System (CES) in 2016-17.

Library patrons have the opportunity to be entered into the CES at “The Source,” a monthly event hosted by the Los Angeles Public Library in conjunction with the County of Los Angeles Department of Mental Health and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. The Source connects people who are homeless or experiencing mental health issues to providers and resources for daily life and stable living. Participants may receive assistance for social services, health care, food, clothing, and housing. In addition, The Source provides identity cards from the Department of Motor Vehicles, bus tokens, and hygiene kits. The Source has expanded from Central Library to the Exposition Park Regional and Will and Ariel Durant branches.

More than 1,200 people have participated at The Source since the event began in December 2015, and as of March 30, 2017, 396 CES applications have been completed through The Source Program and interactions at 14 other LAPL branches.

Please let me know if you have additional questions about the LAPL budget or programs. I may be reached at (213) 228-7461 or kmorita@lapl.org.

Sincerely,

Kristina Morita
Assistant General Manager

cc: Richard Llewellyn, City Administrative Officer
   Terry Sauer, Chief Administrative Analyst, CAO
   Elaine Owens-Sanchez, Senior Administrative Analyst, CAO
   Madeleine M. Rackley, Business Office Manager, LAPL
   Robert Morales, Senior Management Analyst, LAPL
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GENERAL CITY PURPOSES – JUSTICE FUND ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTION

During its consideration of the General City Purposes Proposed (GCP) Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on a mechanism to ensure that funding for the Justice Fund is not transferred from the GCP until the City Council makes the policy decision to participate in the Fund. Further, this Office was asked to propose language for a possible Exhibit H item to ensure that no transfer occurs prior to Council’s authorization of the contract related to the Justice Fund.

For all items within the GCP Budget, adoption of the Budget constitutes an instruction for the administering department to draft any contract required by that item, and submit that contract for execution to the contractor, subject to the approval of the City Attorney. The Mayor is authorized to execute any such contract. Further, the administering department is responsible to monitor the contractor and authorize payments. In the case of the Justice Fund, this Office is designated as the administering department. Therefore, unless specific action is taken to restrict these actions, adoption of the Proposed Budget enables this Office to begin administering the contract associated with the Justice Fund without City Council approval.

In order to ensure that funding is not released for use until the City Council makes the final policy decision related to the City’s participation in the Justice Fund, the following instruction should be included in the Budget:

No funds are to be transferred from the General City Purposes Budget in support of the Justice Fund until and unless the City Council has made a policy decision that the City is to participate in that Fund.

This instruction could either be added to Exhibit H or to the Non-Departmental Footnote section of the Budget. Since the Non-Departmental Footnote section includes all other special instructions related to the execution of items in the GCP, if this instruction is to be added, this Office recommends that it be added to that section, rather than to Exhibit H.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK – POTENTIAL FUNDING FOR ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE DEPARTMENT’S LETTER

During its consideration of the Office of the City Clerk (City Clerk) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on potential funding for the items included in City Clerk’s letter to the Committee.

City Clerk requests funding in the amount of $95,788 for early online voting pop-up polls for Neighborhood Council (NC) elections for 50 NCs. This is a joint request with the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (DONE). The pop-up polls for early online elections are only viable if DONE’s request to continue (and possibly expand) online voting is approved. DONE requests funding in the range of $356,350 - $436,190, depending on whether online voting is available for 50 or 96 NCs. If online elections were expanded to all 96 NCs, City Clerk’s costs would roughly double in cost to approximately $190,000.

City Clerk requests funding in the amount of $252,965 for municipal election outreach and voter awareness efforts. Typically, funding for outreach is not provided during non-municipal election years. City Clerk recommends that funding is provided to continue the current expanded outreach programs.

City Clerk requests clarification of the duties and responsibilities associated with support of the Department of Cannabis Regulation. The Proposed Budget includes regular authority for one Management Analyst to provide general administrative, accounting, personnel, and procurement support. City Clerk has existing units that provide similar support services to the Mayor, Council, Chief Legislative Analyst, and various other City agencies.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The total General Fund impact of City Clerk’s request is $705,103. Of that amount $452,138 is to fund early online voting and pop-up polls. It also includes $252,965 for expanded voter outreach efforts. Online voting will be expanded to 50 of the 96 NCs. If the program is expanded to all 96 NCs, this figure would rise to approximately $626,190. If the NC election items are approved, DONE would require an appropriation of $356,350 to implement its portion of the NC elections.

Should these items be funded, offsetting General Fund Revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:KG:08170042

Question No. 383
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY ATTORNEY – LOS ANGELES JUSTICE FUND POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDS

During its consideration of the City Attorney’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on opportunities for funding the Los Angeles Justice Fund from sources other than the General Fund, and to consider, among others, the Consumer Protection Trust Fund.

The Consumer Protection Trust Fund receives settlement revenues from consumer protection litigation filed under the California Business and Professions Code Section 17200. Examples of consumer protection litigation cases may include wage theft, mortgage, bank and foreclosure fraud, identity theft, and other unlawful business practices. Accordingly, the use of the Consumer Protection Trust Fund is restricted by the California Code for the exclusive use by prosecuting attorneys for the enforcement of consumer protection laws, and is, therefore, not an eligible source of funds for the Los Angeles Justice Fund.

Sources of funding other than the General Fund may include grant funds. Determining and evaluating eligible grant funds for this purpose will require additional research and analysis.

This memorandum is for information purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the proposed use of funds for gender equity activities in the Equity and Community Well-Being item.

The Proposed Budget appropriates $200,000 for Equity and Community Well-Being, which is administered by the Office of the Mayor. The funds provide for staff within the Mayor’s Office and expenses to promote gender equity citywide, in City departments and City programs, such as the Los Angeles State of Women and Girls Address and Young Women’s Assembly. The programs focus on girls, young women, and transgender youth.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FINANCE – CALL CENTER METRIC

During its consideration of the Office of Finance’s (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on why the metric for the percentage of call center calls answered decreased from 98 percent in 2016-17 to 85 percent in 2017-18.

After reviewing the Proposed Budget, the Department projects that 98 percent of call center calls will be answered in 2017-18, consistent with the estimate for 2016-17. The Department indicates that while this metric demonstrates an area of improvement over the prior call center phone system going from the 80s to high 90s in percent of calls answered, it is no longer a useful measure of the current call center. The Department is in the process of developing new call center metrics and will recommend replacing the existing metric with a new measure in next year’s budget. This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:ZMB:1170045

Question No.1
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUILDING & SAFETY – ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK FOR LIEN PROCESSING

During its consideration of the Department of Building and Safety’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding available to add an Administrative Clerk position to support lien processing.

The 12-month fully burdened cost to add an Administrative Clerk is $74,402. The General Fund portion is $59,521 and the Building and Safety Building Permit Enterprise Trust Fund (Enterprise Fund) eligible portion is $14,881. A range of funding timeframe options and totals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Months Funded</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Enterprise Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$59,521</td>
<td>$14,881</td>
<td>$74,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$44,642</td>
<td>$11,160</td>
<td>$55,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$29,761</td>
<td>$7,440</td>
<td>$37,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$14,881</td>
<td>$3,720</td>
<td>$18,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for this request could be allocated when an ordinance is adopted by the Mayor and Council to implement the revised lien approval procedures.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of approving an additional Administrative Clerk to support lien processing is $59,521.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUILDING & SAFETY – FEE SUPPORTED POSITIONS

During its consideration of the Department of Building and Safety’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the 100 percent fee-supported positions requested in the Department’s letter.

The Department requested one Structural Engineering Associate IV to support the Land Use and Subdivision Section. Additionally, the Department requested six positions consisting of one Structural Engineering Associate IV, two Structural Engineering Associate IIIs, one Structural Engineering Associate II, one Building Mechanical Inspector, and one Administrative Clerk to establish a new Citywide Business Case Management Unit to support the Mayor’s Office of Economic Development in assisting new businesses navigate the City’s permitting and development processes. The seven requested positions are 100 percent eligible to be funded by the Building and Safety Building Permit Enterprise Trust Fund (Enterprise Fund).

The 12-month fully burdened cost to add the additional seven positions is $1,022,798. A range of funding timeframe options and totals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Months Funded</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Enterprise Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,022,798</td>
<td>$1,022,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$767,099</td>
<td>$767,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$511,399</td>
<td>$511,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$255,700</td>
<td>$255,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Building and Safety Building Permit Enterprise Trust Fund impact of approving the additional seven positions is $1,022,798.
May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY - TIMING OF MEASURE H FUNDING

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the options available to fund the $62,500 requested for the Homeless Management Information System to match a $500,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

In order to receive $500,000 in new HUD grant funds, a match of at least 25 percent ($125,000) must be leveraged. The City and County equally share the leveraged amount and therefore the City’s contribution is $62,500. These funds will support the Homeless Management Information System, which is a HUD-mandated requirement and is designed to capture data on the number and demographics of homeless individuals in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC). This initiative is critical to ensuring that the CoC continues to receive its annual McKinney-Vento awards totaling over $110 million.

At its April 28th budget hearing, LAHSA reported that it had identified approximately $6.1 million in 2016-17 savings, and these savings could be a source of funding for the cash match. If all of these savings are used to front-fund Measure H-eligible initiatives, then an appropriation of $62,500 is recommended for this purpose. It should be noted that LAHSA also requested funding of a related grant match item for its CoC Planning Project of $125,000, bringing the total amount of funding for cash matches requested by LAHSA to $187,500.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To comply with the City’s Financial Policies, the addition of $62,500 to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s (LAHSA) 2017-18 Budget will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to General Fund expenditure. If both of the LAHSA-requested grant matches are funded, the addition to the LAHSA 2017-18 Budget will be $187,500.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CONTROLLER – REPORT ON SPECIAL FUND BALANCE RECONCILIATION PROPOSAL

During its consideration of the Controller's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on potential special funding sources for a Sr. Management Analyst II and Sr. Management Analyst I to perform reconciliation of all special fund balances in the city.

The two positions will require a General Fund appropriation. Reimbursements may be available to the extent that the time of the analysts can be identified as working on specific special funds. Actual reimbursements would be calculated according to the time spent working on each individual special fund.

The use of special funds to reimburse the General Fund for positions is subject to the restrictions on the use of each specific special fund. Reimbursement of direct and indirect costs would be applicable only for the work that is eligible and is not guaranteed.

Reimbursements are most likely to occur through related cost payments by those special funds and would occur if the Controller staff accurately reflects its time spent on specific special funds, allowing those costs to be incorporated into future year related cost calculations. Direct funding by a special fund for this purpose is impractical since it is difficult to predict the amount of time that these proposed positions will spend supporting specific special funds. Furthermore, reimbursements from these special funds may only be available on a one-time basis.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of the two positions is $367,865, consisting of $265,311 in direct costs and $102,554 in indirect costs. Should these positions be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:MCK:BGF:JJI:03170029

Question No. 85
During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the impacts of the $100,000 reduction to the Great Streets Item.

The Proposed Budget appropriates $160,000 for the Great Streets item in GCP, a reduction of $100,000 from 2016-17. Funding for this item is provided by the General Fund. The $100,000 reduction reflects funds that were first appropriated in 2015-16 for one Senior Project Coordinator and one Rehabilitation Construction Specialist III in the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) to oversee facade improvement projects in support of the Great Streets Initiative. EWDD did not fill the positions nor did it initiate the facade improvement program. The positions were not continued in 2016-17. Instead, the $100,000 was transferred from EWDD to the Mayor's Office to fund a contractor to provide economic development support for the seven winners of the 2016 Great Streets Challenge. The Challenge provides economic, cultural, and transportation assistance to community partners that lead a Great Streets Project.

As a result of the $100,000 reduction to the Great Streets item in GCP, funding is not continued for economic and cultural support of the Great Streets Challenge. The Mayor's Office will work with the Department of City Planning and the Department of Transportation to use existing resources to support the Challenge.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of restoring funding for the Great Streets item in GCP is $100,000 in 2017-18. Should this item be restored, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LIBRARY DEPARTMENT – GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS

During its consideration of the Library’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on how the Library Department's General Fund reimbursements compare to other similar departments, including Recreation and Parks and the Zoo. Why does the City receive reimbursements for some employee costs and related costs but not other variable costs such as utilities? How does this work in departments with independent funding? Is there a unified policy that guides this? If not, is there a recommendation for one?

The Library Department is unique in that the City Charter Sec. 531.d. mandates that "beginning in fiscal year 2014-15 and thereafter, the Library Department shall be responsible for payment of all of its direct and indirect costs, which shall include, but not be limited to, health, dental, pension, building services and utility costs." The costs charged to the Library consist of direct costs based on current year expenditures calculated by the General Services Department (GSD), the Municipal Improvement Corporation of Los Angeles (MICLA), related costs reported in the Controller’s Cost Allocation Plan (CAP), and other direct costs not captured in the CAP.

The CAP originated as a method to recover indirect costs for work done with federal grants. Although designed for federal grant reimbursements, the CAP is also used to bill state or other non-federal grants, fees for service billings, and inter-departmental billings. The CAP consists of groups of indirect costs (indirect cost centers or cost pools) and departments or portions of departments that benefit from or receive service from those indirect cost centers. The indirect costs benefiting a department are divided by the direct salaries of that department to develop indirect cost rates. The CAP is based on the actual costs of a given fiscal year and is derived from the City’s most current year-end report of actual expenditures. The Controller distributes the year-end actual costs with the assistance of City Departments and various automated and manual reports available at the time. Since the final actual costs of the current year cannot be known until a future date, the indirect cost rates approved for use in the current year are always based on the actual costs of a previous year – therefore they are referred to as “estimated costs.” The CAP includes a Carry Forward Adjustment which is the difference between the “estimated costs” and the “actual costs.” It allows rates to “catch up” to the final actual cost and helps to ensure that the City and grantor are made whole over time.

The various related costs reimbursed to the General Fund are not based on the department, but by the policies of the special fund which funds the department. While the Library is instructed to reimburse the General Fund per the Charter, other departments, such as the Cultural Affairs Department (DCA), operate by rules established by ordinance. The Arts
and Cultural Facilities and Services Trust Fund which funds the DCA authorizes the use of the fund in support of programs and operations of the Department, including the reimbursement of overhead costs, but does not require full reimbursement of related costs (Ad Code Sec. 5.115.4). If there is insufficient revenue in the special fund required for the operational needs of the Department, the related costs may be subsidized by the General Fund.

The Department of Recreation and Parks pays for Utilities and Sanitation Services directly from the Department’s operating budget. Funding in the amount of $26.8 million is appropriated in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for these purposes. The Department of Recreation and Parks also pays for the majority of the employees’ health, dental, and pension costs. In addition to the Utilities and Sanitation Services, the Department reimburses $43.9 million of the $45.1 million for employee health, dental, and pension costs. This represents 97.5% of the employee benefits and pension costs.

The Department of the Zoo (Zoo) is not currently required to reimburse the General Fund for related costs. The Zoo does not receive a General Fund subsidy and is funded through the Zoo Enterprise Trust Fund. (ZETF). Funds in the ZETF are used for costs and expenses arising from the operation, maintenance and management of the Zoo (Ad Code Sec. 22.714).

For El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument, the General Fund is not obligated to finance any cost or expense associated with the operation, management, maintenance or control of the Monument (Ad Code Sec. 22.631). However, The El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Revenue Fund appropriates a reimbursement of General Fund costs for related costs that the department incurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Related Costs</th>
<th>Reimbursed</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Percent Reimb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$ 69,331,785</td>
<td>$ 69,331,785</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>$ 7,879,909</td>
<td>$ 7,313,513</td>
<td>$ 566,396</td>
<td>92.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Parks*</td>
<td>$ 45,096,044</td>
<td>$ 43,951,324</td>
<td>$ 1,144,720</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo**</td>
<td>$ 15,213,220</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 15,213,220</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Pueblo</td>
<td>$ 911,500</td>
<td>$ 911,500</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2017-18 Add/Delete rates; does not include Utilities and Sanitation services.
**Figures calculated using CAP 39 for Salaries, General and Salaries As-Needed.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: AGING – IMPACT OF GENERAL CITY PURPOSES BUDGET REDUCTIONS

During its consideration of the Department of Aging (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the items for the Department reduced in the General City Purposes (GCP) budget are included in any other parts of the budget, what would be the service impact if no additional funding were provided, and the cost of restoring those services, if unfunded.

Funding in the amount of $192,000 for various Aging programs was eliminated from the GCP. The $192,000 for various Aging programs is not included in any other parts of the budget. Per the Department, the $192,000 in GCP funds is used to provide $95,453 in senior services, such as case management, and $96,547 for administration of the $3.2 million in senior services funded through GCP. In the current fiscal year, $80,019 of the $192,000 has been expended through the end of March. A General Fund appropriation in the amount of $192,000 would be required to fund the continuation of these services in 2017-2018. The $192,000 reduction was re-allocated to the Purposeful Aging line item in the 2017-18 Unappropriated Balance budget, and programming for those funds has yet to be determined.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To comply with the City’s Financial Policies, the restoration of the $192,000 reduction to the Budget for General City Purposes, Blue Book Item #6, will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to General Fund expenditures.

RHL/AC:08170043

Question No. 469
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT – HUMAN TRAFFICKING RESOURCES

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to report on resources that are needed to address human trafficking in each of the bureaus and to include how many arrests have been made in each bureau.

The Department’s response is attached which details the resources that are dedicated to address Human Trafficking and the number of corresponding arrests. The LAPD concludes that existing resources are sufficient to maintain the effectiveness of the Human Trafficking Units and does not recommend expanding the Human Trafficking Task Forces, given the existing patrol demands.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:FGO:04170108

Question No. 136

Attachment
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 136 – Resources to Address Human Trafficking

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding resources needed to address human trafficking in each of the bureaus, including how many arrests have been made in each bureau.

The Department remains committed to combatting human trafficking throughout the city and has three units dedicated to that mission:

- The Human Trafficking Unit (HTU) is part of Detective Support & Vice Division (DSVD). The unit is comprised of two detective supervisors and seven investigators who possess specific expertise in investigating the commercial sexual exploitation of both minors and adults in addition to cases of involuntary servitude.

  In 2016, DSVD’s HTU investigated 95 human trafficking of a minor cases and made 30 arrests for that offense. The unit served 64 search warrants, conducted training on 49 occasions in addition to being responsible for the rescue of 98 minors and adults.

- The Operations – South Bureau Human Trafficking Task Force is comprised of one sergeant and four officers. In 2016, the Task Force investigated 55 human trafficking cases resulting in 37 arrests including 11 for human trafficking, pimping and supervising for prostitution. The unit was responsible for the rescue of 16 minors.

- The Operations – Valley Bureau Human Trafficking Task Force is comprised of one sergeant, one detective and seven officers. In 2016, the Task Force made 22 combined arrests for human trafficking and pimping. In addition, the unit made 313 arrests of male prostitution suspects and 113 of female suspects. The unit also
participated in 170 meetings with community members and was responsible for the rescue of 10 minors and adults.

The Department is pleased with the demonstrated effectiveness of the Human Trafficking units. However, given the existing patrol demands and the specialized knowledge necessary for these investigations, the Department does not recommend an expansion of human trafficking task forces in FY 2017-18.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

JORGE A. VILLEGAS, Assistant Chief
Director, Office of Administrative Services
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – CLEAN STREET LA

During consideration of the Board of Public Works 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office report back on options to increase the appropriation for the Clean Street Los Angeles program (CSLA) to the 2015-16 funding level of $600,000 and to include a list of program expenses under the Office of Community Beautification aside from graffiti abatement.

The total proposed budget for the Clean Street LA is $240,000. The Board of Public Works in the attached report has proposed three funding levels for the Committee’s consideration:

1) a $360,000 increase to the total of $600,000
2) a $660,000 increase to the total of $900,000
3) a $960,000 increase to the total of $1,200,000

Should the Council decide to increase the Clean Street LA budget, funds will be required from the General Fund.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenues or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Richard H. Llewellyn, Interim City Administrative Officer

From: Kevin James, President, Board of Public Works

Subject: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMOS – QUESTION 159 – CLEAN STREETS LA

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to report on options to increase the appropriation for Clean Streets Los Angeles program (CSLA) to the 2015-16 funding level of $600,000 and to include a list of program expenses under the Office of Community Beautification (OCB) aside from graffiti abatement. The Board of Public Works, OCB would like to provide the following information in conjunction with the CAO’s budget memo.

Beginning in January 2016, OCB began contracting with ten non-profit organizations for cleanup along the public right-of-way as part of CSLA. This cleanup work focused on weed abatement, litter cleanup, and bulky item pickup. In 2015-16, OCB received $600,000 for six months of CSLA work, or $100,000 a month. In 2016-17, OCB received $900,000 for 12 months of CSLA work, or $75,000 a month. The 2017-18 Proposed Budget reduces this funding to $240,000, or $20,000 a month. This represents a 73% reduction in services and a vital component of CSLA, which comes at a time when the OCB contractors are really finding their stride in providing public right-of-way cleanup services. A reduction of this magnitude would greatly set back the progress that OCB is making in cleaning up along the public right-of-way, representing 375 less locations cleaned per month, 5,800 less bags of trash collected, and 1,280 less bulky items picked up.

The following table provides potential service alternatives and estimated workload indicators that could be considered to restore funding to the level of 2015-16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding per month</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations Cleaned</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Bags filled</td>
<td>6,338</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky Items Pick-Up</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other OCB Expenses:

The Budget and Finance Committee also requested a list of OCB program expenses, other than graffiti removal. These program expenses are as follows:

- **$177,000 - Support for community based volunteer cleanup program**
  One of the primary missions of OCB is to coordinate and support volunteer cleanup projects throughout the City of Los Angeles. Funding is provided in the amount for the purchase of trash bags, brooms, rakes, shovels, and paint rollers, among other items, to support volunteer efforts. During the past year OCB worked with 22,164 volunteers, coordinating 306 community beautification projects. These volunteers provided a total of 96,230 volunteer hours cleaning the various neighborhoods of Los Angeles and collecting a total of 57,474 trash bags as a result of these efforts. Based upon information provided by the Volunteer Sector, these volunteers provided a value of $2,654,985 to the City, meaning the City is getting back 15 times the value for the investment made.

- **$1,751,000 - Clean and Green Program**
  This program is mix-funded. The Board of Public Works’ proposed budget includes $751,000 and the General City Purpose the remaining $1 million, which the latter portion is 50% special funded. Funding is used to contract with the Los Angeles Conservation Corps to provide jobs for 350 local youth who perform services Citywide including community cleanup, litter abatement, weed removal, alley cleanup, tree planting, and community outreach.

- **$180,000 - LA River Corps**
  Funding provides for cleanup and docent services in the portion of the Los Angeles River from Fletcher Drive to San Fernando Road. It provides funds to the OCB non-profit contractors to provide supplemental cleanup services in Council District 1 high impact areas by hiring youth to work on weekend cleanup crews during the school year.

- **Amounts Vary - Supplemental Funding**
  OCB also receives funding for additional clean-up and beautification services throughout the year. In 2016-17, this totals roughly $1.8 million from a variety of funding sources including Street Furniture Revenue Fund, Council District Real Property Trust Fund, CRA/LA Excess Non-Housing Bond Proceeds, Athens Services Community Benefits Trust Fund, AB1290 Funds, Arts and Cultural Facilities & Services, and other Bureau of Sanitation managed special funds.
The following are recent photos of public right-of-way cleanup performed by various OCB contractors citywide to demonstrate the scope and breadth of the work performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: 8451 San Fernando Rd.</td>
<td>Location: 8451 San Fernando Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Before photo 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="After photo 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: 23200 Roscoe Blvd.</td>
<td>Location: 23200 Roscoe Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Before photo 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="After photo 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: 13003 Hoover St.</td>
<td>Location: 13003 Hoover St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Before photo 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="After photo 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CIEP (MUNICIPAL FACILITIES) – FUNDING FOR SIXTH STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

During its consideration of the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program (CIEP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding options to provide $2 million for the Sixth Street Viaduct Replacement Project (Project).

The Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE) requested $2 million for 2017-18 for the Art Plaza, which is part of the landscaping portion of the Project. There is no specified funding provided in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Project.

Based on the Project timeline, landscaping construction will likely start in 2018-19. Therefore, additional landscaping construction monies will not be need until that time. Per BOE, 100 percent design plans are expected to be complete in June 2018. At that time, BOE would request a proposal from Skanska Stacy and Witbeck (SSW), the Project contractor. Upon receiving the proposal and negotiating the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP), the decision would be made regarding whether to award the task order or go out to bid. Since construction will likely not be able to begin until early 2019, the City will have time to go through the standard bid/award period if the City cannot agree on the GMP with SSW.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should Council fund the $2 million request for the Sixth Street Viaduct Replacement Project, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:jls:05170109

Question No. 508
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF ENGINEERING – USE OF SB1 REVENUE FOR THE PACIFIC AVENUE BRIDGE AND LINCOLN AVENUE BRIDGE PROJECTS

During its consideration of the Bureau of Engineering 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Bureau report back on the potential use of newly authorized Gas Tax funding from California Senate Bill 1 (SB1) for the Pacific Avenue and Lincoln Avenue Bridge Projects.

Although detailed funding guidelines have not yet been published by the State, the repair of public bridges appears to be eligible under SB1.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:DHH:O6170131

Question No. 170
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Attn: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Office of the City Administrative Officer

From: Gary Lee Moore, City Engineer
Bureau of Engineering

Subject: Budget and Finance Committee Question No. 170

The Budget and Finance Committee, during its April 27, 2017 hearing on the Mayor’s fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, requested the Bureau of Engineering (ENGINEERING) to report back on the new Gas Tax (SB1) as a potential funding source for the Pacific Avenue and Lincoln Avenue Bridges. Per the attached from the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) dated April 29, 2016, the Pacific Avenue Bridge was a type of project that would be eligible for funding from the existing Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund. In accordance with the finding of the CAO, it would seem that both bridges could be eligible for SB1 funds.

If there is any additional information required, please contact me at (213) 485-4935 or Robert Kadomatsu at (213) 485-4944.

Attachment

cc: Matt Szabo, Office of the Mayor
Barbara Romero, Office of the Mayor
John Chavez, Office of the Mayor
Ted Bardacke, Office of the Mayor
Sharon Tso, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
Kevin James, Board of Public Works
Joel F. Jacinto, Board of Public Works
Luz M. Rivas, Board of Public Works

c:/GLM/rmk/B&F Committee Report Back No. 170_Final.doc
Date: April 29, 2016

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Miguel A. Santana, City Administrative Officer

Subject: BUREAU OF ENGINEERING – PACIFIC AVENUE BRIDGE

During its consideration of the Bureau of Engineering’s (BOE) 2016-17 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that this Office report on funding options for the Pacific Avenue Bridge (Bridge) project.

The Bridge is currently closed to vehicular traffic, but is used by cyclists and pedestrians. The sidewalk and concrete railing has been damaged, but is currently closed off by a concrete barrier rail and fencing to protect the public. Council District 11, in coordination with BOE, obtained a consultant to prepare a feasibility report on repair options for the Bridge. The scope of the selected alternative is to repair the existing deteriorated sidewalk and upgrade the structure to better resist earthquake lateral forces. It will include construction of concrete pedestals with elastomeric bearing pads, demolition of the sidewalk, and replace the railing at the end of the bridge. Based on this scope of work, the BOE estimates that the total project cost will be $5,584,000, including $643,000 for design and $4,941,000 for construction.

Should the Council decide to include this project in the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program (CIEP) for Physical Plant, an appropriation of $643,000 would be needed in 2016-17 to fund the design. Funding for a project of this type would be eligible for the Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund (Gas Tax), Measure R Local Return Fund, and General Fund. However, the Proposed Budget fully allocates these Funds. Should project design be funded, offsetting General Fund and/or Special Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of adding this project to the Capital Improvement Budget would be $643,000 in 2016-17, and approximately $4,941,000 in a future year. Should this be funded, offsetting General Fund and/or Special Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

MAS:REM:06160127

Question No. 112
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: TRANSPORTATION – RESTORATION OF GENERAL FUND SALARY REDUCTIONS

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on the potential restoration of General Fund salary reductions to maintain parking enforcement and traffic control services.

The Department’s letter (Attachment 1) indicates over 75 percent of the General Fund salary account is dedicated to Parking Enforcement and Traffic Control services and that these reductions will impact staffing and hiring. Our findings indicate that 67.93 percent of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget’s salary allocation is for Parking Enforcement (Attachment 2). In addition, no salary savings from traffic officer vacancies are assumed in the base funding which allows for full employment. Nevertheless, the Department has the discretion to decide how the reductions will be taken and has indicated that this reduction will be monitored and reported on through the Financial Status Reports.

The one-time salary reduction of $1,069,824 is part of a larger citywide global reduction and represents 1.5 percent of the overall General Fund salary allocation. The direct salary reduction to Parking Enforcement is $81,070, while the remaining reductions are spread out amongst various other programs within the Department which are for other purposes.

Decreasing the one-time salary reductions will result in a General Fund obligation of $1,069,824 in direct costs, and $317,310 in related costs.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The General Fund impact of restoring this reduction is $1,069,824 in direct salary savings, and $317,310 in related costs, Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriation will need to be identified.
April 21, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
Budget and Finance Committee
Attention: Richard Williams, Office of the City Clerk
200 North Spring Street, Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18

Honorable Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a response to the Mayor’s Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-2018. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) recognizes the complex social and financial challenges facing the City and supports the Mayor’s vision.

In the current fiscal year, LADOT has launched several important initiatives improving transportation infrastructure and mobility options in the City. Specifically, LADOT launched the Vision Zero Media Campaign and Action Plan with the goal of reducing traffic deaths to zero by 2025. LADOT also introduced its Transportation Technology Strategy: *Urban Mobility in a Digital Age* which provides the framework for LADOT to use data to achieve mobility and infrastructure changes that improve transportation experiences in the City while preparing for the arrival of autonomous vehicles and transit. Finally, we have continued our focus on neighborhood services with the launch of the speed hump program. The Mayor’s Proposed Budget provides resources allowing LADOT to continue this trajectory and achieve the objectives of our strategic plan.

In addition to the Department’s proposed operating budget, LADOT administers several special funds that include Proposition A, Proposition C, Measure R, and the Special Parking Revenue Fund. These funds are critical in allowing the Department to continue achieving specific goals relative to those funds.

Department of Transportation 2017-18 Proposed Budget Summary

The 2017-18 proposed operating budget decreases the Department’s total appropriations from $160.1 million to $158.4 million, a decrease of $1.7 million or 1.07 percent. Despite the decrease in appropriations, the Proposed Budget increases the total number of authorized positions from 1,548 to
With these additional resources, the Department plans to accomplish the following objectives:

- Coordinate and implement projects that prioritize safety and account for human error for the City’s Vision Zero Initiative to reduce the number of traffic injuries and fatalities;
- Implement new projects and policies around shared mobility outlined in the Transportation Technology Strategy to improve mobility options and reduce traffic congestion;
- Continue to support Metro regional projects, and begin support for new regional projects approved by the voters through Measure M;
- Implement Phase I of the expansion of transit services.

The Department has the following observations about its FY 2017-18 Proposed Budget:

A reduction of over $1 million to the General Fund salary account may adversely affect the hiring of key positions. Over 75 percent of the Department’s General Fund salary account is provided for parking enforcement and traffic control services. A reduction of this size may require the Department to scale back services. However, the Department will monitor salary expenditures and report on the status through the Financial Status Reports.

A reduction of over $1 million to the General Fund overtime account ($300,000) and expense accounts ($700,000) will adversely affect LADOT's ability to staff special events and provide emergency or on-call field operations. Each year, the Department absorbs over $2 million in unfunded General Fund overtime costs by under-hiring and creating savings in expense accounts. With limited opportunities to achieve natural savings due to these reductions, the Department may be required to curtail services. LADOT will monitor expenditures and report on the status through the Financial Status Reports.

Thank you for your on-going support and consideration of this proposed budget. My staff and I are available to answer any questions or provide additional information as requested.

Sincerely,

Seleta J. Reynolds
General Manager

C: Matt Szabo, Office of the Mayor
   Barbara Romero, Office of the Mayor
   John Chavez, Office of the Mayor
   Sharon Tso, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
   Richard H. Llewellyn, Office of the City Administrative Officer
### 2017-18 Proposed General Fund Allocations

#### All Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation</td>
<td>2,029,991</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp Planning and Land Use</td>
<td>533,089</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Project Delivery</td>
<td>63,121</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities</td>
<td>5,150,926</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Enforcement</td>
<td>60,376,002</td>
<td>53.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Citation Processing</td>
<td>13,067,597</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Sign Management</td>
<td>9,567,261</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>1,483,495</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
<td>3,094,866</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Coordination</td>
<td>97,626</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management and Special Events</td>
<td>2,628,719</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>397,953</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guard Service</td>
<td>336,506</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1,154,144</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>3,731,787</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding:** 94,313,083  **Percent:** 100.00%

#### Salary Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation</td>
<td>1,946,840</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp Planning and Land Use</td>
<td>430,589</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Project Delivery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facilities (GF-SPRF)</td>
<td>5,140,026</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Enforcement</td>
<td>46,776,246</td>
<td>67.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Citation Processing</td>
<td>2,748,959</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Sign Management</td>
<td>2,258,255</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>1,401,469</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
<td>2,543,866</td>
<td>3.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Coordination</td>
<td>22,626</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management and Special Events</td>
<td>708,219</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>269,553</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guard Service</td>
<td>296,356</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>817,842</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>3,500,170</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding:** 68,861,016  **Percent:** 100.00%
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: TRANSPORTATION - L.A. NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVE FUNDING

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposition C Anti-Gridlock Transit Improvement Fund Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on the restoration of $550,000 to assist with community building and the revitalization of transit-oriented neighborhoods using public and private partnerships through the L.A. Neighborhood Initiative.

These funds were inadvertently omitted, due to a miscommunication during the budget preparation process. The Proposition C Anti-Gridlock Transit Improvement Fund is already fully allocated. Should the Council desire to restore funding, an existing special purpose fund appropriation could be reduced. Potential opportunities include:

- Proposition A (Reserve for Future Transit Services): Full funding is available in this appropriation.
- Measure M (Street Reconstruction / Vision Zero): Full funding is available in this appropriation as the detailed plan is not yet developed.
- Measure M (CIEP- Grand View Drive (8430) Bulkhead): $415,000 is available. Subsequent to preparation of the proposed budget, DWP proposed to pay for this project (C.F. 17-0489).
- Measure R (Median Island Maintenance): $400,000 in partial funding may be available in this appropriation. The proposed budget proposes $3.1 million in available funding. However the total estimated cost is $2.7 million, if the lowest bids receive awards.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The fiscal impact is $550,000 and will need to be offset with a reduction to another line item within the Proposition C Anti-Gridlock Transit Improvement Fund, or other eligible funds should an appropriation be made for this purpose.
During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on potential funding options for the Housing and Community Investment Department’s (HCID’s) request to add Pupil Service and Attendance Counselors (PSACs) in three of the 16 FamilySource Centers that do not currently have them. The existing contract with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to place PSACs in 13 FamilySource Centers was executed in 2014 and since that date the contract has been funded with Community Service Block Grant funds and the General Fund. This contract is eligible to receive funding allocated to the FamilySource Center system from Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Community Services Block Grant (CSBG); however these fund will be fully utilized to fund the operations of the 16 FamilySource Centers and the HCID does not project potential savings within current year funds that could be utilized to fund a portion of the LAUSD contract. However, the City’s Financial Management System (FMS) shows that there are approximately $2.4 million in unspent and uncommitted appropriations within CSBG Fund No. 428 for prior years, which may be able to be utilized to expand the LAUSD contract. Further investigation by the Department would be required to determine what portion, if any, of these unspent and uncommitted appropriations could be utilized to support an expansion of the contract with LAUSD.

In the absence of the available grant funds, the only other potential funding source is the General Fund. As a policy decision, the Council and Mayor could appropriate additional General Fund to expand the LAUSD contract to add three PSACs. As noted in the HCID hearing before your committee, the estimated total cost to add three PSACs is $580,000.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If no grant funds are identified to fund this request, the General Fund impact of expanding the LAUSD contract to deploy three additional PSACs within the FamilySource Center system is $580,000. Should this request be supported by the General Fund, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations would need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – MEASURE H FUNDING OF POLICE OVERTIME

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether Measure H can provide funding for Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) overtime relative to homeless-related services.

The following are among proposed uses for Measure H funding involving law enforcement agencies as they are tied to at least one of the 21 Measure H-eligible County strategies:

- Provide case management for inmates in Los Angeles County jails who identify themselves as homeless (jail-in-reach);
- Place case managers in clinics working with the regional jail re-entry pilot program to provide homeless services expertise;
- Staff mobile teams to work with homeless people in the field to clear their criminal records;
- Provide interim housing for people leaving jail while they await permanent housing;
- Strengthen an existing outreach system by expanding existing law enforcement staff to assist with homeless encampments.

Measure H requests relative to eligible strategies and related activities such as these have included requests for social workers, custody assistants, and sheriff deputies; however, these requests involve existing County-funded programs. It does not appear that funds for law enforcement overtime are currently being considered by the Measure H Revenue Planning Work Group for approval by the County Board of Supervisors.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL: KDU: 02170148

Question No. 287
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CULTURAL AFFAIRS – embRACE LA PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Department of Cultural Affairs’ (DCA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the costs associated with funding the embRACE LA program.

DCA requested $150,000 in General Fund for the embRACE LA Program in their 2017-18 Proposed Budget. The program consists of placement of an Artist-In-Residence in four participating Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Community Police Stations to conduct two, eight-week creative writing workshops for Sworn Officers and civilian community members at each location ($40,000), commission one mural on an interior wall at each of the four Community Police Stations ($40,000), discussion facilitation ($10,000), marketing and communications ($10,000), and salaries for coordination and support ($50,000).

The program was proposed as a response to a Motion (O'Farrell/Wesson/Harris-Dawson/Ryu, C.F. 15-0840) to address human relations issues with regard to race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, diversity, and multiculturalism in Los Angeles. As a result of funding constraints, this item was not funded.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Funding for the embRACE LA program would require an additional General Fund appropriation of $150,000. Should funding be provided from the Arts and Cultural Facilities and Services Trust Fund, doing so would require either additional General Fund revenue to the fund, the reduction of proposed expenditures or appropriations from the fund, or the reduction of revenue to the General Fund as a result of reduced related costs paid by the fund.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – MOBILE WORKER PLAN

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on potential funding sources for the Mobile Worker Plan, including the Innovation Fund.

In the Information Technology Agency’s letter to the Budget and Finance Committee, the Department requested funding to pilot a Mobile Worker Plan, which would replace 500 City landline telephones with mobile devices. The funding of the pilot Mobile Worker Plan would require a General Fund appropriation in the amount of $100,000. The Mobile Worker Plan is not eligible for any other funding sources.

The Information Technology Agency may apply for an Innovation Fund grant to fund the Mobile Worker Plan. However, there is no guarantee that an Innovation Fund grant would be awarded.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding the Mobile Worker Plan is $100,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, offsetting General Fund revenue or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – ADVANCED PROVIDER RESPONSE UNIT (APRU)

During its consideration of the Fire Department's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to report back on the possibility of securing of an Advanced Provider Response Unit (APRU) for the San Fernando Valley. The Committee also inquired whether funding for the APRU could be placed in the Unappropriated Balance (UB) without funding, pending receipt of funds through a public-private partnership.

The LAFD's response is attached. The LAFD reports that the cost of an APRU including salary, indirect and overtime backfill costs is $342,013. This does not include ambulance maintenance costs, which are estimated at $6,277 for a total cost of $348,290.

An item placed in the UB must have an appropriation amount and a corresponding revenue source. Should an appropriation of $348,290 for the Valley APRU be made in the UB, a corresponding revenue increase of $348,290 should be made in LAFD General Fund Departmental Receipts, with appropriations to be transferred to the LAFD contingent upon an agreement and funding through a public-private partnership.

It should be noted that funds secured through a public-private partnership may not be ongoing in nature. This could result in requiring General Fund appropriations to continue the APRU in future years.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no impact to the General Fund as revenue would be recognized to offset the $348,290 appropriation to the Unappropriated Balance. To the extent that the public-private partnership funding is not ongoing, there may be a General Fund impact in the future.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee

From: Ralph M. Terrazas, Fire Chief
Los Angeles Fire Department

Subject: ADVANCED PROVIDER RESPONSE UNIT (APRU) FOR VALLEY

The Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to report on an APRU for the Valley, including whether an APRU could be included in the Unappropriated Balance without funding, pending availability of funds through a public private partnership. LAFD will work with the staff of Council District 12 toward developing a public private partnership for a donation to fund an APRU for the Valley. The salary cost of an APRU staffed with an EMS Advanced Provider ($117,000 salary cost + $47,060 indirect cost = $164,060) and a Firefighter III/Paramedic backfill ($177,953) totals $294,953, or $342,013 with indirect costs. This excludes the cost of an ambulance which would be supplied from the Department’s reserve inventory.

B&F Question No. 25
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GENERAL SERVICES – FUEL SITE MAINTENANCE

During consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Department of General Services (GSD), your Committee requested a report back on the Department’s letter to delete one plumber and add one Plumber Supervisor to oversee the Jet Fuel Site and Alternative Fuel Site Maintenance Programs, with no additional funding. The net cost of adding one Plumber Supervisor (Class Code 3446) with a total direct and related cost of $153,219 and deleting one Plumber with a total direct and related cost of $135,764 is $17,455.

GSD requested one Senior Plumber in the 2016-17 budget and was provided funding and regular authority for one Plumber, which has not been filled. Currently, this unit consists of one Plumber Supervisor and two Plumbers. The addition of a second supervisor position is not recommended. Should the Council consider additional support, it is recommended that one Senior Plumber, without funding, be provided and that a vacant Plumber position be deleted to offset the cost of the new position.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The net cost of adding one Senior Plumber (Class Code 3444) with a total direct and related cost of $143,471 and deleting one Plumber (Class Code 3443) with a total direct and related cost of $135,764 is $7,707.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – FIRE PSYCHOLOGIST POSITION AUTHORITY

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on available options for adding position authority for a Fire Psychologist as requested in the Los Angeles Fire Department (Department) supplemental budget request letter dated April 26, 2017, including an estimate of potential cost savings due to fewer workdays lost.

The Department reports that in order to ensure compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rules, the City does not compile information on the reasons for employees’ sick time usage. Therefore, the number of days lost, and the costs of sick time use and backfill in the field specifically due to mental health issues cannot be calculated. The Department does maintain records on workers’ compensation stress claims and reports that from calendar year 2012 to date, 36 stress claims were filed with the Department totaling 27,032 Injured on Duty (IOD) hours. Approximately $445,000 is annually incurred in stress-related workers’ compensation claim costs, which is comprised of $300,000 in backfill costs, $106,300 in stress-related IOD costs and $38,700 in associated medical expenses.

In its letter to the Budget and Finance Committee, the Department proposed absorbing the costs associated with position authority for one Fire Psychologist within its 2017-18 Salaries General appropriation. The cost of this position is $167,763, which is comprised of $122,312 in direct costs and $45,451 in related costs. The Department could feasibly fund the position through savings generated by reductions in stress-related workers’ compensation claims and IOD-related backfill costs; however, a reliable estimate of any potential savings generated from adding this position is difficult to quantify.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no General Fund impact in 2017-18 if the Fire Psychologist position is provided without funding as requested by the Fire Department. However, the ongoing General Fund impact of funding the position in future years is $167,763, which is comprised of $122,312 in direct costs and $45,451 in related costs.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – NEXUS STUDY FUNDING

During consideration of the Board of Public Works 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Board to report back on the cost, timeline and eligible funding sources for the Public Works Trust Fund Nexus study.

The Board has received one bid and the estimated total project cost is $160,000. The Board has $50,000 in its 2016-17 Budget, and another $50,000 will be transferred from the Unappropriated Balance in the Year-End Financial Status Report. Therefore, an additional $60,000 is required. The Board can execute the contract as soon as it receives the required appropriation.

Should the Council decide to fund the nexus study, funds will be required from the General Fund.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenues or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Richard H. Llewellyn, Interim City Administrative Officer

From: Kevin James, President, Board of Public Works

Subject: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMOS – QUESTION 161 – NEXUS STUDY

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back with options to add one-time funding of $60,000 to the Board of Public Works' budget for the completion of its proposed Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) Nexus Study.

In February 2017, the Board of Public Works released a Request for Proposal to solicit proposals for forensic accounting, auditing and tax compliance study services of the PWTF. The PWTF purpose is to hold deposits made by permittees/depositors for Public Works related projects. As of March 31, 2017, the total PWTF balance is approximately $123.1 Million. However, the proposed Nexus Study will focus its analysis on approximately $11.6 Million due to Pre/Post-1989 interpretation and analysis of what can and cannot be done with funds from cash deposits or bond defaults, including assessment of alternatives to develop a Nexus Policy that will serve as a road map to determine reasonable relationship guidelines. The following provides an overview of the Nexus Study scope of work:

1. Review Deposits - Review/research deposits held based on pre-1989 and post-1989 State Law requirements, including validation and/or identification of deposit data;

2. Conduct Benchmarking/Performance Analysis – Collect benchmarking data to compare and contrast fund management models, process flows, metrics, and policies used by other U.S. Public Works municipalities, including the identification of legal/financial restrictions to ensure the funds are not spent or managed improperly;

3. Develop Policy Alternatives – Provide potential recommendations and/or options (based on best practices, benchmarks, and/or case law) that may be available for consideration to develop a PWTF financial policy focused on setting a "reasonable relationship" or "Nexus" between the (a) original purpose and proximity of the project location where funds were originally collected for, and (b) "like purpose" Public Works projects that has a physical "Nexus" to said funds.

4. Develop "Road Map" – Develop road map or action plan needed to manage unclaimed deposits based on proposed recommendations (i.e. escheat, heir find, refund, other legal use of deposit, etc.).

5. Geo-Code Data - Provide geo-code/spatial data in a compatible format to plot project information onto the City's Geographical Information Systems platform/software, inclusive of project location/site (X & Y Coordinates), Project Deposit Type and Work, etc. This would allow City to visually layer original deposit project sites against potential public works capital improvement or construction projects.
The current Fiscal Year 2016-17 adopted budget has $50,000 and an additional $50,000 is available in the Unappropriated Balance. The Office of the City Administrative Officer anticipates a request to transfer the $50,000 from the Unappropriated Balance to the Board of Public Works' budget in the year-end Financial Status Report. Therefore, $100,000 is available and a proposed award is expected before the fiscal year end. In April 2017, one proposal was received at approximately $135,000, which is expected to provide four out of five deliverables requested. The deliverable not provided in the proposal received is for geo-coding, which has an estimated cost of $25,000.

Therefore, an additional $60,000 in one-time funds is recommended. The following are options the Budget and Finance Committee could consider to fund this request:

- Authorize the Office of Finance to redirect interest earned on the PWTF No. 834 from the General Fund 101/62 to the Board of Public Works Fund 100/74. Annually, the PWTF earns approximately $800,000 and earnings are transferred to the General Fund. With interest rates on the rise as well as fund deposits, it is anticipated that the interest earnings for Fiscal Year 2017-18 will increase as well; or

- Reduce $60,000 from the proposed Capital Improvement Expenditure Plan in anticipation that the Nexus Study would provide the equivalent funding, if not more, for Public Works related capital infrastructure fund needs; or

- Reduce $60,000 from the proposed Sidewalk Repair Program Tree Planting and Coordination Services in anticipation that the Nexus Study would provide the equivalent funding for tree planting and coordination services; or

- Mixture of any of the above.
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

CIEP PHYSICAL PLANT – USE OF MEASURE M FOR TRANSIT GREENWAYS AND STORMWATER BMPs

During its consideration of the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program (CIEP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on the potential to use $5 million of Measure M Local Return for transit related greenway projects and stormwater best management practices (BMPs).

Transit related greenway projects, green street projects and stormwater projects are eligible for funding under Measure M. Measure M Local Return funds can be used for these projects. Should the Council and Mayor decide to designate Measure M Local Return Funds for these purposes, both direct funding of projects and front funding of grant projects can occur.

Additionally, future Measure M funds administered by Metro may be made available for these type of projects.

Measure M Local Return is fully allocated in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget. However, subsequent to the submission of the Proposed Budget, DWP proposed to fund the Grandview Ave (8430) Bulkhead project. Therefore, $415,000 is now available for re-appropriation. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose that exceeds $415,000, additional revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GCP – CALIFORNIA CONTRACT CITIES ASSOCIATION AND INDEPENDENT CITIES ASSOCIATION

During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding necessary for the California Contract Cities Association (CCCA), which should be at $12,500 rather than $10,000, and for the Independent Cities Association (ICA), which should be $8,500 instead of $5,250. This Office was also requested to discuss the need to include travel authority in both the CCCA and ICA items.

The Proposed Budget provides $10,000 for the CCCA and $5,250 for the ICA in GCP. Based on information received from the CCCA and ICA, the dues for 2017-18 membership renewal are $8,043 and $5,250 respectively. Funding in the amount of $1,957 is available for travel related to the CCCA in the Proposed Budget. No funding is available for travel expenditures related to the ICA. Should funding be increased from $10,000 to $12,500 for CCCA and from $5,250 to $8,500 for ICA, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to the appropriations in the amount of $5,750 will need to be identified.

The appropriations provide funding for membership and participation in the associations. The following language may be added in the nondepartmental footnotes of the Adopted Budget to provide clarity on the ability to expend appropriations within the GCP Intergovernmental Relations Program for travel purposes:

Authorize the transfer of funds from the General City Purposes (GCP) Intergovernmental Relations Program Accounts to the Travel Accounts within the Mayor and Council's budgets to pay for or reimburse these offices for travel related to the governmental oriented organizations listed in GCP.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of increasing funding for the California Contract Cities Association and the Independent Cities Association is $5,750 in 2017-18. Should the Council increase the appropriations, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT – POTENTIAL FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY

During its consideration of the Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested General Services Department to report on the potential funding for the implementation of security for City Council in both City Hall and Council field offices and to report if funding was included in the proposed budget. Attached is the Department’s response.

GSD requested $882,000 to begin addressing the most critical security issues in City Hall and City Council field offices based on evaluations completed by the Los Angeles Police Department. These funds were not included in the Proposed Budget. However, some funding may be available for this purpose in the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program. GSD will work with the City Administrative Officer to identify such funding.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:ACG:05170110h
Question No. 407
Attachment
May 3, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian
Chair, Budget & Finance Committee
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attention: Richard Williams, Legislative Assistant

**BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE'S QUESTION NO. 407**
**FOR THE 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET**

During the budget deliberations, your Committee requested that the Department of General Services (GSD) report back on potential funding for the implementation of security for City Council in both City Hall and Council field offices and to report if funding was included in the Proposed Budget.

GSD requested $882,000 to begin addressing the most critical security issues in City Hall and Council field offices based on evaluations completed by the Los Angeles Police Department. These funds were not included in the Proposed Budget. However, funding may be available for this purpose in the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program. GSD will work with the City Administrative Officer to identify such funding.

Should you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please contact Assistant General Manager Valerie Melloff at (213) 928-9586.

Tony M. Royster
General Manager and City Purchasing Agent

cc: Matt Szabo, Deputy Mayor
Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: RECREATION AND PARKS – GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS; INCLUDE POLICY OPTIONS TO LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF CHARGE BACKS IN 2017-18 OR ON A GO-FORWARD BASIS

During its consideration of the Department of Recreation and Parks’ (RAP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested RAP and this Office to report on the projected General Fund reimbursements for the next five years and to include policy options to limit the amount of charge backs for RAP to the General Fund in 2017-18 or on a go-forward basis. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department’s response is that the total General Fund reimbursement combined with the costs of Utilities and Sanitation Services is estimated to exceed $115 million in 2022-23. The Department based its estimate on the following assumptions: 1) the projected annual increases to the General Fund reimbursement for the next five years will increase by the average of the last 5-years’ actual increases in percentage, 2) water and electricity rate increases will be based on projections provided by the Department of Water and Power for 2018-19 and 2019-2020, but no additional increases will be assumed for 2021 through 2023, and 3) no other General Fund reimbursement categories will be added.

The Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget includes General Fund reimbursement of $43.9 million. This amount reimburses the General Fund for 97.5% of the Department’s employee costs (pension and health care). The following are some of the categories of General Fund services which are currently not reimbursed by the Department: a) General Services Department services such as Fleet Maintenance for Department vehicles, Supply Services, and Mail Services, b) petroleum for Department vehicles, and c) bank fees. The Department also pays for electricity, water and sanitation services directly and $26.8 million is included in the Department’s Proposed Budget for this purpose.

The level of General Fund reimbursement from the Department is evaluated and adjusted annually. The decision to require a certain level of General Fund reimbursement from the Department is a policy issue which can be evaluated by the Council on an annual basis.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
May 1, 2017

Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
Budget and Finance Committee
City Clerk, City Hall Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Richard Williams, Legislative Assistant

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET QUESTION NO. 40 – GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS

In response to the Budget & Finance Committee’s request for information regarding General Fund Reimbursements, the total amount of the Mayor’s proposed FY ’17-18 budget for RAP pay back to the City General Fund is approximately $70.8M including reimbursements for Utility charges and Refuse Collection from DWP and Public Works and for General Fund Reimbursements. This amount, which has increased each year since FY ’08-09 is estimated to exceed $115M in FY ’22-23. The projection is based on (1) the past 5-year actual average increase for General Fund Reimbursement and (2) increase rates through FY ’19-20 provided by DWP and Public Works and no increase for the years following for Utility and Refuse Collection. As we stated at the Budget and Finance Committee Hearings, these staggering costs will continue to erode at our abilities to provide our core mandated responsibilities and will continue to exceed the actual monies allocated towards programming and public service needs. In fact, next year alone RAP’s total budget reflects 30.5 percentage of dollars diverted for “chargebacks” to the City’s General Fund, with the overall budget for program and services at 69.5 percent.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 202-2633.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. SHULL
General Manager

MAS:ndw
Honorable Councilmember Krekorian
May 1, 2017
Page 2

cc:

Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Office of the Mayor
Zachia Nazarzai, Office of the Mayor
Terry Sauer, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Jay Shin, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Anthony-Paul (AP) Diaz, Esq., Executive Officer & Chief of Staff, RAP
Vicki Israel, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Ramon Barajas, Assistant General Manager, RAP
Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer, RAP
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GENERAL SERVICES – HELICOPTER MECHANIC TO SUPPORT LAPD AND LAFD OPERATIONS

During consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Department of General Services (GSD), your Committee requested a report back on adding a regular position authority for one Helicopter Mechanic, without funding, to support the Police Department (LAPD) and Fire Department (LAFD) helicopters. Your Committee also requested that we include options for the LAPD to absorb the cost of this position.

Currently, LAPD and LAFD have proposed to swap and replace existing helicopters within the fleet. While there is no increase to the total number of helicopters for each department, GSD did request regular authority for one Helicopter Mechanic position due to the advanced technology and increased flight hours.

This request was included as a supplemental request to GSD’s budget submission but was not included in the Mayor’s Proposed Budget.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is a General Fund impact of $96,891 in direct costs and $41,297 in indirect costs for one Helicopter Mechanic (Class Code 3742). It is not anticipated that LAPD would have any year-end salary savings to offset the cost of this position.

RHL:DP:05170107h

Question No. 403
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT – BASIC CAR BOUNDARY STUDY

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to report on options to fund a study to re-boundary and increase the current 168 Basic Car areas in order to better meet contemporary policing needs.

The LAPD reports that the estimated cost for a boundary study to examine the Basic Car areas is $224,000, and concludes that there are currently no funds identified to support this study. The Department's response is attached.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding a boundary study for Basic Car areas is approximately $224,000. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:FGO:04170107

Question No. 125

Attachment
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 125 – Basic Car Study

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding options to fund a study to re-boundary and increase the current 168 Basic Car areas in order to better meet contemporary policing needs.

The estimate for a boundary study to examine the Basic Car areas is $224,000. There are currently no funds identified to complete this study.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

Jorge A. Villegas, Assistant Chief
Director, Office of Administrative Services
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT – POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES TO SUPPORT THE COMMISSIONS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on potential funding options for the Housing and Community Investment Department’s (HCID’s) request for one Human Relations Advocate and one Management Assistant for Commissions and Community Engagement support. The work done by these positions may be eligible for funding from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) or the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG); however, the administrative funds for these grants have been fully allocated to support other grant work and are not available to support HCID’s request for two positions. In the absence of the available grant funds, the only other potential funding source is the General Fund. As a policy decision, the Council and Mayor could appropriate additional General Fund to provide funding for the two positions requested by HCID.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding the two positions requested by HCID is $145,219. Should this request be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations would need to be identified.

RHL:NSC: 2170161D

Question No. 248
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

Subject: CAPITAL FINANCE ADMINISTRATION (MICLA) – POTENTIAL FUNDING FOR WEST LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL BUILDING

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Capital Finance Administration Fund, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that this office report on the feasibility of adding $250,000 to the MICLA/CIEP list for the West Los Angeles Municipal Building.

The West Los Angeles Municipal Building (WLAMB) is a two-story facility located at 1645 Corinth Avenue in Council District 11. The Council Office has been working with City staff to optimize utilization of this facility, which is currently utilized as a field office by Council District 11 and as a satellite office for the Housing and Community Investment Department. The WLAMB also serves as a constituent service center for the West Los Angeles area.

The requested funding of $250,000 for the WLAMB would be utilized for capital repairs and improvements. MICLA financing of this project would be limited to capital improvements, and not ordinary repairs, maintenance costs, or supplies.

DEBT IMPACT STATEMENT

The issuance of MICLA Bonds is a General Fund obligation. The total cost of MICLA financing the improvements is approximately $418,000, including $168,000 in interest, amortized over 20 years at a 5.5% interest rate. During the life of the bonds, the estimated annual debt service payments would be $21,000 over 20 years. Actual interest rates may differ as rates are dependent on market conditions at the time of issuance. We cannot fully predict what interest rates will be in the future.

RHL:BCH/AG:05170112

Question No. 504
During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the purpose of the Massage Parlor Regulation item.

The Proposed Budget provides $130,000 within GCP for the County Service – Massage Parlor Regulation item, which funds contracts with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health for massage-technician testing and requested massage-parlor inspections in accordance with Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 103.205.1. Pursuant to the LAMC, all persons performing massage services for any location in the City shall be required to possess a valid, unrevoked California Massage Therapy Council Massage Practitioner or Massage Therapist certificate. Any person operating as a massage practitioner or massage therapist without the required certificate shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. The Police Department contracts the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health to conduct annual inspections of massage parlors to ensure compliance with regulating provisions.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
During its consideration of the General City Purposes (GCP) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the dues required for the Government Alliance on Race and Equity.

The Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) membership network is a professional peer-to-peer network that enables government racial equity directors and subject area experts to exchange information, collaborate to advance their practice, and develop solutions to racial equity challenges. Annual dues for jurisdictions with over 20,000 employees are $15,000. Benefits of membership include access to training and facilitation from GARE, members-only resources that support peer-to-peer connections, specific tools such as the Racial Equity Scorecard and Results Based Accountability Software, and support with the development of new policies and the implementation of best practices.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The General Fund impact of providing funding for membership to GARE is $15,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: EXHIBIT H - PORT OF LOS ANGELES REIMBURSEMENT OF FIRE BOAT EXPENSES

During its consideration of Exhibit H of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the Exhibit H instruction directing the Fire Department to develop an agreement with the Port of Los Angeles for the costs of haul-out, repair, and maintenance for the City's fire boats could be revised to instruct the Port of Los Angeles to reimburse the Fire Department for these costs. The instruction can be revised to request the Port of Los Angeles to reimburse the Fire Department for these costs pursuant to the existing Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Port.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:SMB:10170128
Question No. 519
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CULTURAL AFFAIRS – FUNDING FOR CENTRAL TICKETING SYSTEM AND TIMELINE TO RE-ESTABLISH THE PERFORMING ARTS DIVISION

During its consideration of the Department of Cultural Affairs’ (DCA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested DCA to report on funding necessary to institute a central ticketing system in 2017-18 and the anticipated impact on equity; and to report on the funding and timeline for re-establishing the Performing Arts Division.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Funding for the central ticketing system would require an additional General Fund appropriation of $150,000 to $250,000. The cost of adding one Arts Manager II and one Performing Arts Coordinator II to the Performing Arts Division, currently part of the Community Arts Program, without funding would require additional revenue of $257,081 to fund salaries and related costs for nine months.

Should funding be provided from the Arts and Cultural Facilities and Services Trust Fund, doing so would require either additional General Fund revenue to the fund, the reduction of proposed expenditures or appropriations from the fund, or the reduction of revenue to the General Fund as a result of reduced related costs paid by the fund.

RHL:EOS:08170046

Question No. 440

Attachment
At its May 1, 2017 meeting, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back on the funding needed to institute a central ticketing system in FY 2017-18 and the anticipated impact on equity. A report on the funding and time line for re-establishing the Performing Arts Division was also requested.

Centralized Ticketing System

The recently reinstated Performing Arts Division has begun the process of centralizing administrative processes and exploring opportunities to reanimate the City's theaters. As part of these efforts, a centralized ticketing system would provide opportunities and efficiencies for all DCA-managed theaters. Costs for a centralized ticketing system are estimated to be between $150,000 to $250,000. The implementation of this system would allow DCA to raise additional income by making ticket purchasing more accessible and would provide a mechanism to assess various surcharges (facilities, programming, etc.) to improve the condition of the City's theaters. Additionally, this system would help DCA gather analytic and statistical information to improve DCA's service delivery model. Finally, for the majority of LA-based performing arts organizations, small nonprofits, or individual artist groups, City-owned theaters are one of the most accessible options for performances – a ticketing system would serve to assist these groups who cannot manage their own ticketing.

Time Line

DCA's Performing Arts Division manages four City-owned theaters: the Warner Grand Theatre (San Pedro); the Vision Theatre (Leimert Park), the Barnsdall Gallery Theatre (East Hollywood), and the Madrid Theatre (Canoga Park) in addition to overseeing two City-owned, operator-managed theaters: the Nate Holden Performing Arts Center (West Adams, managed by Ebony Repertory Theatre) and the Los Angeles Theatre Center/The New LATC (Downtown Los Angeles, managed by the Latino Theater Company).

Phase I: FY 2017-18 - Unfunded Resolution Authorities for two key positions (Arts Manager II and Performing Arts Program Coordinator II) are requested to continue the re-establishment of the Performing Arts Division. The Arts Manager II will assist the Director with the relaunch of the Performing Arts Division, including planning, coordination, venue management, web redesign, implementation of a ticketing system, programming development, and overseeing budgetary and workforce issues. The Performing Arts Program Coordinator will serve as an onsite manager for the Madrid Theatre and will be
responsible for activating this theater and managing the proposed consortium model for Valley-based arts organizations consisting of 10 to 15 artist organizations. This position will have a major impact on DCA’s ability to provide additional services to the Valley. Staffing costs will be offset by increased theater receipts and operating account efficiencies.

Phase II: FY 2018-19 - Three additional positions with funding as well as continuing authority and funding for two resolution authority positions approved in Phase I would be requested (Estimated $350,000 Direct Costs) to build capacity to bring all fiscal and payroll functions in house to fully capture the revenue generated at the City’s theaters. These positions will assist in planning of theater event/programming efforts, as well as operations and production management, resulting in increased theater rental receipts. Funding in the amount of $100,000 for as-needed personnel to meet workload demands and $100,000 for programming to implement new initiatives to leverage new monies would also be requested.

Phase III: FY 2019-20 – An increase in theater capital improvements ($500,000) and programming funds ($200,000) would be requested to meet facility use demands and to market the theaters to renowned events/programmers that would help yield greater receipts to use for the expansion of performing arts programming to underserved communities.

Please contact Alma Gibson (213) 202-5530 or Ben Johnson (213) 202-5508 with questions or for additional information.

cc: Elaine Owens-Sanchez, Office of the City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – TREE TRIMMING AND ALLEYS

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Unappropriated Balance (UB), the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the amount of additional alley paving and street tree trimming that would be provided through the $1 million allocation, and whether to move the money into the Department’s budget.

Of the $1 million budgeted for tree trimming and alleys in the UB, $500,000 is allocated for contract tree trimming services and $500,000 is allocated toward the pavement and repair of alleys. This funding would enable the Bureau of Street Services to trim approximately 3,000 trees and pave 10 alleys (at approximately 520 feet per alley). This estimate assumes that the alley does not require concrete gutters or drainage-related construction.

Regarding the transfer of this funding to the department, please see the related memo on the Unappropriated Balance – Items to Transfer to Departments, which recommends transferring the $1 million from the UB to the Bureau of Street Services.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – ITEMS TO TRANSFER TO DEPARTMENTS

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Unappropriated Balance (UB), the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the list of items in the UB that should be moved to the General Fund or to General City Purposes.

The table below identifies the items recommended to be moved out of the UB and placed into department budgets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unappropriated Balance Line Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Transfer to:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>($2,300,000)</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Expenditure Program</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>($275,000)</td>
<td>General City Purposes Fund</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Hardware Replacement</td>
<td>($900,000)</td>
<td>Information Technology Agency</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Aging</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
<td>Department of Aging</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Trimming and Alleys</td>
<td>($1,000,000)</td>
<td>PW Bureau of Street Services</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>($4,675,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,675,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no fiscal impact in that there is no net change to the overall funding provided. Funding is proposed to be transferred between departments.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – TIMING OF MEASURE H FUNDING

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the options available to address cash flow issues while LAHSA awaits the receipt of funds from the 2017-18 award of Measure H funds. The Committee also asked whether front-funded costs can be reimbursed by Measure H, and what strategies are being considered to ensure continuity of LAHSA services.

At its April 28th budget hearing, LAHSA requested assistance for 1) front funding anticipated Measure H-funded programs and 2) continuing appropriations for items not proposed to be funded either through the Proposed 2017-18 Budget or Measure H (Homeless Management Information System and Continuum of Care Planning Project cash matches, Downtown Drop-In Center operating costs, and involuntary storage associated with the HOPE Teams).

During its budget hearing, LAHSA reported $6.1 million in savings that will not be needed for LAHSA programs during 2016-17. It is recommended that these funds be used to provide cash flow assistance in the event that receipt of awarded Measure H funding is delayed. Some LAHSA programs (Administration, Crisis and Bridge Housing for Singles and Youth, and Regional Coordination) are anticipated to receive funds through both the Proposed 2017-18 Budget and Measure H and therefore will have General Fund appropriations that can be used for the initial months of 2017-18. These programs are not recommended for front funding. However, there are line items not proposed for funding in the 2017-18 Budget, but that are requested for Measure H funding, for which front funding of $5,817,178 is recommended. LAHSA’s reported $6.1 million in savings is sufficient to cover these costs. Use of existing savings achieves continuity since the funds are already available within LAHSA’s contract with the Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) and can be paid upon invoice or amendment to the existing contract. It is not known with certainty whether front-funded costs for anticipated Measure H funds are reimbursable; however, it is anticipated that the County’s award will be on a full-year basis in 2017-18, thereby freeing up these front-funded savings to be subsequently used for other purposes.

In the event that the Committee wishes to consider an alternative to front-funding Measure H programs using LAHSA savings, a reserve fund loan in the amount of $5,817,178 would be necessary. Further, it should be noted that while currently identified savings are
expected to cover three months of LAHSA's anticipated Measure H-funded programs, a delay in receipt of Measure H funds beyond three months should trigger additional discussion and potential Mayor and Council action relative to funding LAHSA programs.

Regarding the LAHSA-requested continuing appropriations for cash matches, Downtown Drop-In Center operating costs, and involuntary storage associated with HOPE Teams, LAHSA's $6.1 million in savings are insufficient to cover these costs ($966,500) in addition to providing front-funding for Measure H programs ($5,817,178). We therefore recommend that these items be funded through an appropriation of $643,928 (see table below for calculation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHSA Savings</td>
<td>$ 6,139,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Funding - Measure H-Requested Line Items</td>
<td>(5,817,178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHSA Appropriations Requests</td>
<td>(966,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAHSA FUNDS AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$ (643,928)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

To comply with the City's Financial Policies, the addition of $643,928 to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's 2017-18 Budget will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to General Fund expenditure.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF SANITATION – LIVABILITY SERVICES DIVISION

During the Budget and Finance Committee’s consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Bureau of Sanitation (Bureau), this Office was requested to report back on the resources required to improve feedback to Council Districts on the status of Clean Street Los Angeles (CSLA) service requests. In addition, this Office was requested to report back on the two additional positions requested in the Bureau’s memorandum to the Budget and Finance Committee dated April 21, 2017 to oversee the Livability Services Division.

The CSLA Program provides each Council District with one dedicated day of service per month. Council Offices are required to submit a list of service locations to the Bureau using a google spreadsheet. CSLA crews take photos of the service locations before and after the cleanups and enter tonnage information and other relevant data into the Bureau’s CleanStat system. To improve feedback to Council Districts on the status of service requests, it is recommended that the Bureau designate an existing position (such as the Community Affairs Advocate or the position that maintains the google spreadsheet) to update the spreadsheet once a service request has been fulfilled. It is also recommended that this position be the designated contact for Council Offices and that this position provide frequent updates to Council Offices on the status of service requests. The Bureau should also explore the use of technology similar to how the My311 application provides users with a notification once the service request has been fulfilled along with photos of the completed services.

In its 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Bureau requested nine-months funding and regular authority for eight positions, which included one Solid Resources Manager II, one Solid Resources Manager I, one Senior Management Analyst I, one Management Analyst, one Senior Administrative Clerk, and three Administrative Clerks to staff its new Livability Services Division. Funding for these positions would need to be provided from the General Fund and, due to the City’s fiscal constraints, this request was not approved. In addition, the Bureau has high vacancies within its clerical and administrative positions, and it was recommended that the Bureau reassign existing vacancies to perform this work. The 2015-16 Budget added one Assistant Director; this new position along with two existing Assistant Directors currently oversees different aspects of the CSLA program. To improve coordination for the CSLA program, it is recommended that the Bureau reassign the CSLA program to fall entirely under the Assistant Director position that was provided in the 2015-16 Budget. In its April 21, 2017 memorandum, the Bureau reduced its staffing request to only the Solid Resources Manager I and II positions. The Bureau does not have any vacancies in these classifications for reassignment. This Office does not recommend these two new positions and has determined that improved coordination for the CSLA program can be achieved through the reassignment of existing resources.
RECOMMENDATION

Instruct the Bureau of Sanitation to designate an existing position to provide Council Offices with updates on CSLA service requests and instruct the Bureau to consolidate oversight of the CSLA program under one Assistant Director.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no General Fund impact from the recommendation in this report. However, should the Council provide nine-months funding and regular authority for the Solid Resources Manager II and I positions, $317,175 ($224,667 direct costs and $92,509 indirect costs) in additional General Fund revenues or a corresponding General Fund reduction would need to be identified.

RHL:WKP:06170130

Question No. 216
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: AGING – MEASURE H FUNDING FOR HIRING HOMELESS SENIORS

During its consideration of the Department of Aging (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department to report on the availability of Measure H funding to support hiring homeless seniors. The Department’s response is attached.

Currently, Los Angeles County (County) has convened a Measure H Revenue Planning Work Group (Group), which is developing three-year funding recommendations for 21 interconnected homelessness strategies. The funding recommendations will be presented to the County Board of Supervisors in June 2017. While some Measure H funding has been requested for the City’s employment programs under Measure H’s C7 – Subsidized Employment Program for Homeless Adults, current drafts of the Group’s funding recommendations do not include funding for the Department’s Older Workers Employment Program.

The Department’s response includes a request for additional positions to support the program. The proposed budget currently includes the reallocation of three Community Program Assistants to Social Worker I’s as requested by the Department. The Department also requested the upgrade of an existing Senior Management Analyst position.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL/AC:08170045
Question No. 114
Attachment
May 3, 2017

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Office of City Administrative Officer

Andy Chen, Administrative Analyst

Laura Trejo, General Manager
Department of Aging

DEPARTMENT OF AGING RESPONSE TO BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE BUDGET IMPACT QUESTION NUMBER 114 – “IS MEASURE H FUNDING AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT HIRING HOMELESS SENIORS?”

The Los Angeles Department of Aging (LADOA) Older Worker Employment Program (OWEP) would be applicable to the Los Angeles County’s Measure H Eligible Homeless Initiative Strategy C-7 – Increase Income, Subsidize Employment for Homeless Adults. The Los Angeles Homeless Services Agency (LAHSA) is currently holding a series of community forums for Measure H to gather input. The LADOA does not anticipate that Request for Proposals (RFP) for homeless services under Measure H will be released and completed before July 1, 2017. LADOA will apply for Measure H grant funds upon LAHSA’s release of their RFP as a permanent source of program funding for OWEP.

In the interim, the LADOA will continue to operate the OWEP program with the $450,000 General Fund upon adoption of the Mayor’s Proposed Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Budget. Based on the success and lessons learned from this year’s pilot, LADOA anticipates achieving its outreach and enrollment goals. Furthermore, with the stability from enrollment in this job training program LADOA can leverage their participation to arrange for transitional housing vouchers and assist with applications to government benefits programs. These additional services were not in the original scope of the employment training program, but are critical in helping the seniors with their goal of unsubsidized employment.

However, the program is staff intensive work which is the reason that the LADOA budget letter to the Budget & Finance Committee requested consideration of additional support. $150,000 of program savings generated when the program enrollment was suspended is available for rollover into Fiscal Year 2017-2018 to cover OWEP staffing ($85,692) and additional enrollments ($64,308). The OWEP program will need a Social Worker I position and upgrading a Senior Management Analyst I position to a Senior Management Analyst II position. These position additions and changes are needed to create a permanent supportive staff. The Social Worker I position is needed because the work involved in working with OWEP participants requires intensive social service supports.
A qualified Social Worker would possess the skills sets and the requisite work background to carry out this specific function of the OWEP program. In addition, the Senior Management Analyst I upgrade to a Senior Management Analyst II position is needed because the current position is funded through Older Americans Act (OAA), Title V funding. To transition OWEP from a pilot to a long term program requires a structural change to a mix of OAA and non-OAA funding. This will avoid negative consequences such as disallowed costs from the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP). With this upgrade, the position can manage both the OWEP and SCSEP programs. The current position also has the necessary background and skill sets attained from managing the SCSEP program to best manage the OWEP program.

If you have any questions, contact Dale Osborne at (213) 202-5636.

cc: Terry Sauer, Office of City Administrative Officer
May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT – PRIOR WORKLOAD AND COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE MTA AND BIFURCATION OF OVERTIME

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to report on the annual workload and costs associated with policing activities and responding to calls related to Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) operations prior to the enactment of the contract with the MTA. In addition, the Committee requested the LAPD to report on the feasibility of bifurcating the departmental overtime to distinguish between standard departmental overtime and the overtime required by the MTA contract to include in this budget and on an on-going basis.

The LAPD reports that the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department routinely requests LAPD officers to respond to MTA-related calls for service within the city limits of Los Angeles, and provides an estimate of approximately 2,300 non-emergency calls for service that LAPD officers respond to annually. The LAPD states that there hasn’t been a mechanism previously established to capture costs associated with responding to and policing MTA activities. However, the newly implemented Transit Services Bureau is working to develop systems and refine premise codes to properly identify calls for service that are MTA-related.

While the Sworn Overtime account itself cannot be bifurcated, the Department reports that it will track MTA-related overtime with a unique overtime activity code that will provide separate tracking from standard sworn overtime. The Department’s response is attached.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 147 – Annual Workload and Costs Associated with Responding to MTA Calls and Bifurcation of Overtime

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding the annual workload and costs associated with responding to calls related to MTA operations prior to the enactment of the contract with MTA; how much the Department already spends on policing MTA activities; and, the feasibility of bifurcating the departmental overtime into standard departmental overtime and the overtime required by the MTA contract in this budget and on a go-forward basis.

Due to the LAPD’s city-wide deployment, LAPD officers are often the closest available police resources to respond to Metro-related calls for service, both emergency and non-emergency. As the “Policing and Security Workload and Staffing Analysis” identified, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) routinely requests LAPD officers to respond to MTA-related calls for service within the city limits of Los Angeles. The consultants of BCA Watson Rice, LLP extrapolated from a four-month sample of LAPD radio transmissions that LAPD officers routinely respond to approximately 2,300 non-emergency calls for service annually. Highlighted was the fact that emergency calls for service, which were presumed to be a substantial number of calls for service, were also routinely handled by LAPD officers.

Although no mechanism previously existed to capture costs associated with responding to MTA-related calls, the newly created Transit Services Bureau is working to develop systems to identify calls for service as being MTA related. The Bureau’s crime analyst has been tasked with refining premise codes and working with Communications Division so that MTA-related calls are properly identified.

The Department will track the overtime funding associated with the MTA contract by assigning a specific line item budget in the Department’s tracking system and create an overtime activity code to track the expenditures every pay period to ensure separate tracking of sworn overtime from standard departmental overtime.
If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

JORGE A. VILLEGAS, Assistant Chief
Director, Office of Administrative Services
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION CENTERS

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on how the City can restore funding for voluntary storage facilities (navigation centers).

Navigation Centers were funded in the LAHSA Budget in 2016-17 for $2.1 million. Efforts to identify suitable sites have been underway during the current year. As the timing of the implementation of the Navigation Center program became less clear, Council transferred all funds available within LAHSA's Navigation Centers line item to pay for additional costs associated with Clean Streets and Operation Healthy Streets programs in the Public Works Bureau of Sanitation (C.F. 14-1499-S5). No appropriations are included in the Proposed 2017-18 Budget; therefore, Navigation Centers are currently unfunded.

Construction and/or rehabilitation of Navigation Centers may be eligible for Proposition HHH funding. Proposition HHH funding may be allocated for the acquisition or improvement of real property used to provide services or goods to, or otherwise benefit, those who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at risk of homelessness. These funds may not be used to support operations or services. Assuming that LAHSA uses approximately $6.1 million in 2016-17 savings to front-fund Measure H-eligible programs in 2017-18, it is anticipated that LAHSA will be reimbursed for these funds, and a portion of these funds can be redirected to Navigation Center activities in 2017-18 for operations and services costs.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT – DEPARTMENT LETTER REQUESTS

During its consideration of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the request for funding in the Department’s letter to the Committee.

The Department requested a total of nine positions and funding in the amount of $1,026,193 as detailed in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Items</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries – 9 positions (2 Project Assistants, 6 Project Coordinators, 1 Administrative Clerk)</td>
<td>$412,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, As-Needed</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services (Cornerstone, translation, online voting)</td>
<td>$387,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD Compliance Officers</td>
<td>$22,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Admin</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Binding</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Mileage</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,026,193</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department is requesting a total of $385,113 to increase education and training enforcement for Neighborhood Council boards regarding mandatory training and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance.

The Department is requesting a total of $125,277 for Neighborhood Council Emergency Preparedness Program, funding for the Congress of Neighborhoods, EmpowerLA awards, and Budget Advocates, and to implement a program that would allow NCs to purchase emergency supply bins. Currently, City Attorney has indicated that NCs cannot purchase emergency supply bins with money from the annual allocation unless the City has access to and is responsible for the maintenance of the bins. DONE has proposed the development of a partnership with the Emergency Management Department to support the emergency bin program. Both Departments requested staffing and resources for this program, but neither funding nor position authority was provided. As proposed by DONE and EMD, the bins would be managed by EMD. A pilot program involving the acquisition of bins for 35 NCs is proposed. Details concerning the proposed locations, access and replenishment guidelines are still under development.
No funding was requested for the Emergency Preparedness bins. The estimated cost for each bin stocked with basic supplies is between $8,000 - $10,000. Additionally, requests from EMD for staffing in support of this program are not included in the proposed budget. DONE has indicated that NCs may be willing to pay for the bins. If not, a source of funding for the bins and future costs related to the bins will need to be identified.

The final item in the Department’s letter to the Committee is a request for increased outreach funding in the amount of $319,453 and funding in the amount of $196,350 to complete the build out of the online voting system/voter registration system. It should be noted that, currently, online voting is suspended pending further consideration by the Council.

In the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Department was provided with $106,200 to conduct outreach for the elections. The Department stated that this level of funding is insufficient to conduct a robust citywide election campaign. The Department proposes the postponement of elections to 2019 and using the current allocation to promote voter registration in the next fiscal year.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To comply with the City’s Financial Policies to fund DONE’s request of $1,026,193 and the Emergency Preparedness bins for $350,000, it will require a corresponding increase in General Fund revenues or a corresponding reduction to the General Fund expenditures.
April 21, 2017

Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
c/o, Richard Williams, City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Honorable Members:

The Department of Neighborhood Empowerment (Department) thanks and appreciates Mayor Eric Garcetti and his budget team and City Administrative Officer Richard Llewellyn and his budget team for working with the Department to provide staffing and resources to support and grow the Neighborhood Councils system for FY 2017-2018.

The Department respectfully requests the Budget and Finance Committee to consider the following changes to the Department’s proposed budget, the majority of which address Neighborhood Council liability issues and elections. A potential source for funding for these items would be the unspent Neighborhood Council funds for the current fiscal year. Each fiscal year, Neighborhood Councils have between $300,000 - $600,000 in unspent funds. Currently, there is $2.4 million in unspent Neighborhood Council funding.


Requests:
1. Staff - 3 Project Coordinators and 1 Project Assistant (request at least 9 months of funding)
   a. 1 Project Coordinator = $50,582 x 3 positions = $151,746
   b. 1 Project Assistant = $38,426
2. $168,000 for contractual services
   a. $150,000 for contractual services to build out on demand mandatory board trainings on the City’s online e-learning Cornerstone platform (creation of the following subject matters with translation into Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Armenian - Ethics, Harassment/Bullying, Neighborhood Council Funding, and ADA Compliance)
   b. $18,000 for Cornerstone user licenses for Neighborhood Council board members
3. $22,741 for Department on Disability (DOD) Compliance Officers and staff assistance
4. $4,200 for transportation (mileage)
DONE Budget & Finance Report
April 21, 2017
Page 2 of 3

Total: $385,113
Impact: The Department works with Personnel Department and the DOD to address harassment issues and ADA compliance in the Neighborhood Council system. This request would bring on the necessary staff and resources to build the training platforms, move all Neighborhood Council members onto the on demand training website and conduct the follow up visits with Neighborhood Council to address all ADA liability issues with DOD.


Requests:
1. Staff - 1 Project Coordinator and 1 Administrative Clerk (request at least 9 months of funding)
   a. 1 Project Coordinator = $50,582
   b. 1 Administrative Clerk = $32,595
2. $10,000 for contractual services (translation)
3. $2,100 for transportation (mileage)
4. $30,000 for office and admin for Neighborhood Council Congress of Neighborhoods, EmpowerLA Awards and Budget Advocates

Total: $125,277

Impact: Requests #1 - #3 are to work with the Emergency Management Department to incorporate Neighborhood Councils into a citywide Emergency Preparedness program. This program would address the ongoing Neighborhood Council emergency bins that create liability for the city, which would instead be managed by EMD.

Request #4 is for additional funding for the growing needs of the Neighborhood Council Congress of Neighborhoods, EmpowerLA Awards and Budget Advocates to put on their annual events for the Neighborhood Council system.


Requests:
1. Staff - 2 Project Coordinators and 1 Project Assistant to support ongoing outreach and voter registration for Neighborhood Councils.
   a. 1 Project Coordinator = $50,582 x 2 positions = $101,027
   b. 1 Project Assistant = $38,426
2. $67,000 for As-Needed salary for elections
3. $50,000 for printing and binding for elections
4. $196,350 – $436,190 for contractual services to continue online voting and voter registration database build out for elections depending on options (see attachment):
   a. No 2018 election – Build out for remaining 47 Neighborhood Councils - $196,350
   b. 2018 elections and online voter registration for 50 Neighborhood Councils - $356,350 - can be split $178,175 FY 17-18 and $178,175 FY 18-19
   c. 2018 elections and online voter registration for 96 Neighborhood Councils - $436,190 - can be split $218,095 FY 17-18 and $218,095 FY 18-19
5. $13,000 for contractual services (translation)
6. $50,000 for office and admin
Total: $319,453 for election outreach and $178,175 - $196,350 online voting/voter registration

Impact: To continue the inclusion of all stakeholders in the election process, the Department recommends funding the build out and use of online voting and voter registration. Given the City budget situation, the Department has priced out several options, one of which includes pushing the 2018 election to 2019 in order to realign with the City Clerks administration of Neighborhood Council elections in the odd years starting in 2021. The Department was provided $106,000 to conduct election outreach for the 2018 elections. Given the requests of Neighborhood Councils for expanded support of election outreach for candidates and voters, the Department will not be able to conduct a robust citywide election campaign for approximately $1000 per Neighborhood Council. If the elections were pushed to 2019, the Department would use these funds to conduct a big voter registration push in 2018 and to prepare election outreach materials so they are ready on July 1, 2018 for the Valley elections, which will start in December 2018.

D. Creation of a Neighborhood Council Equity Special Fund - The Department highly recommends a portion of unspent Neighborhood Council funds from the current fiscal year (25%) be reinvested in the Neighborhood Council system by setting up a separate special fund for capacity building, outreach and translation costs for Neighborhood Councils. These funds would be available to the Neighborhood Councils requiring funding for these services via an application process. Currently, Neighborhood Councils requiring capacity building and translation/interpretation for their communities are unfairly disadvantaged in the yearly allocation they can spend in their communities. In addition, because of the size differences in existing Neighborhood Councils, which range from 3,800 in stakeholder population with the soon to be certified Herman Neighborhood Council to over 90,000 for Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council, some Neighborhood Councils require additional outreach funds to connect with their community. This special account would provide funds to such Neighborhood Councils in order to create more equity in the funding needs for the Neighborhood Councils.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any other questions via email at Grayce.Liu@lacity.org or by calling (213) 978-1551.

Sincerely,

Grayce Liu
General Manager
Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
Everyone Counts is committed to providing our best-in-class Online Voting and Voter Registration solution to the City of Los Angeles' EmpowerLA team. Our solution includes our eLect software solution along with the necessary Election Administration Services to ensure secure elections for all of Los Angeles' Neighborhood Councils.

### 2018 - 96 Remaining NC Build Out Only/No Election - Year Round Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLect License for Voter Registration</td>
<td>$196,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 - 50 NC Elections – continuation of current build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLect License</td>
<td>$297,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLection Services</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpdesk</td>
<td>$58,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billing schedule to be flexible over fiscal years to accommodate budget timing

### 2018 - 96 NC Elections – expand to current full NC count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLect License</td>
<td>$377,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLection Services</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpdesk</td>
<td>$58,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billing schedule to be flexible over fiscal years to accommodate budget timing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLect License</td>
<td>$275,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLect Notify</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (3 days)</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>$287,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Services</td>
<td>$102,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpdesk</td>
<td>$58,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billing schedule to be flexible over fiscal years to accommodate budget timing
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – PROCUREMENT AUTOMATION

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Information Technology Agency to report on the savings that would be generated by funding procurement automation at the requested $1.6 million level and the timeline to realize savings from this project. The Department's response is attached.

According to the Department, $9 million in savings from construction contract procurement efforts would be realized in 2018-19.

Funding in the amount of $1,000,000 was provided in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for Procurement Automation. Providing funding at the requested level of $1,600,000 would require an additional General Fund appropriation in the amount of $600,000.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of providing an additional appropriation to fund the Departmental request for procurement automation is $600,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, offsetting General Fund revenue or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:CEA:11170054

Question No. 416
Date: May 3, 2017  

To: Honorable Paul Krekorian  
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee  
City Hall, Room 460  

Richard Llewellyn, City Administrative Officer  

From: Ted Ross, General Manager  
Information Technology Agency  

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE QUESTION 416 - FY 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET

If procurement reform is funded at the requested $1.6 million level, how much in savings will be realized and how soon?

If funded at the requested level of $1.6 million for year one of Procurement Reform, the Information Technology Agency (ITA) will be able to digitize and automate construction contracting including the certification process for local, minority and woman-owned businesses. Currently this is a manual, time-consuming process for the departments and the Bureau of Contract Administration. Through a digitized and automated process, the City can expect to see efficiency gains approaching 35 percent, which will enable staff to focus on the more critical, value-added aspects of the process such as stronger statements of work and specifications. This will reduce mistakes, improve quality and job satisfaction.

ITA is initially targeting $300 million of construction spend across the Bureau of Engineering, Street Lighting, and Department of Transportation. Based on our analysis, the digitization and automation process will generate three percent in cost savings. When applied to the $300 million figure, the potential cost savings are $9 million, which would be well over a 500 percent return on investment. The digitization and automation of construction contracting will take one year to complete. The City can expect to see savings six to eight months from launch.

Through this digitization and automation process, it will be far easier for contractors to apply for City contracts, thereby expanding the competitive pool, resulting in more competitive pricing. Currently, contractors become ineligible for selection due to a simple failure to include their bond or another component of their package. An electronic application would not allow a contractor to submit until all the required information was complete. There have been instances where the lowest bidding contractor came in a million dollars below the next lowest bid, but the City could not select this contractor due to a simple clerical error rendering the bid ineligible.
Furthermore, it would generate additional soft costs including reductions in contracting cycle times, increased visibility, and greater control to ensure compliance. Compared to paper-based procurement, digitalization and automation not only create a faster but a more transparent process.

Finally, a key component of this procurement reform effort has been to simplify the contracting process, making it easier for businesses to work with the City, particularly small, local businesses that do not have the administrative resources to dedicate to the process that large companies do. Furthermore, the City made it a priority to increase the number of local, minority and woman-owned businesses with which the City contracts. Given size of the City's construction spend and the number of minority-owned contracting businesses in Los Angeles that could benefit greatly from City contracts, this project is absolutely necessary to achieve this goal. Any outreach programs to encourage these businesses to pursue City contracting opportunities will be pointless if we cannot streamline the application process. Lastly, this investment is a necessary foundation for the subsequent digitization of the even larger City service contracts in year two.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – IMPACT OF VACANCY RATE

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Information Technology Agency to report on how the Department’s vacancy rate will affect Cybersecurity, emergency phone systems like 9-1-1, SMS Replacement, FMS maintenance and the maintenance of other vital systems. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department indicates that they would not be able to backfill positions in the 311 Call Center as a result of the funding reductions. However, the positions in the 311 Call Center are fully funded by Special Funds and would not be impacted by the reductions to the salary account.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Paul Krekorian  
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee  
City Hall, Room 460

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE QUESTION 422 – FY 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET

Pursuant to the FY 2017-18 Council budget hearing, the following response is provided regarding ITA’s the inputting of vacancy rate.

Question No. 422: Report back on how the Department’s vacancy rate will affect Cybersecurity, emergency phone systems like 911, SMS replacement, FMS maintenance and the maintenance of other vital systems?

In addition to the salary savings rate and unfunded payouts that all City departments must absorb in the salary account, such as excess sick leave and retirement payouts, the Information Technology Agency (ITA) has some unique costs that must be paid due to the 24/7 response time required for some of our services and to MOU mandated payments for tool and shoe allowance. The salary savings rate and unfunded costs total $3.92M for ITA in 2016-17.

The 2017-18 proposed budget for ITA further reduces the Department’s salary account by $593K and defunds 6 filled positions, further reducing the salary account by $750K. This combined $1.34K reduction, along with the $3.92M already unfunded, will leave ITA starting the year with a $5.26M deficit. In order to end the year within budget, the department would have to endure an effective 12.6 percent vacancy rate for the entire year.

If unchanged, the department will be unable to fill all newly vacated positions, regardless of where the vacancy occurs. While it is not possible to predict where retirements, promotions and transfers will occur, we know that fifty percent of ITA’s staff is currently eligible for retirement, 32 percent is eligible for normal, undiscounted retirement. Based on the classifications of those eligible for retirement, there are clearly foreseeable impacts.
Of the 81 employees who maintain and install the phone and data network, as well as the public safety radios and microwave network, 55% are eligible for normal retirement and 47 percent are 60 years or older. If these staff retire, the City will face more and longer outages of critical systems, possibly jeopardizing public safety and eroding employee productivity.

Of the 80 programmers who support the Financial Management and new procurement system, the payroll system, the LATAx system, MyLA 311 customer relationship management system, as well as lacity.org, BAVN, and numerous other enterprise applications, 29 percent are eligible to retire. Should these staff retire and not be replaced, the citywide systems they support will not be upgraded or enhanced, and will increasingly experience outages disruptive to all City employees and City customers (e.g. accountants are unable to access the financial system, vendors are unable to pay business taxes in LATAx, etc).

One particularly sensitive area is our 311 Call Center (the “face of the City” for many Angelenos requesting information or City services). The department has struggled with staffing the 311 call center as Communication Information Representatives (CIR) in other City call centers are better paid. In FY 16-17, the department has lost 13 CIRs to transfer or promotion to other City departments. If these staff continue to transfer to higher paying call centers and ITA is not able to backfill their position, residents calling the City’s main call center will experience much longer wait times or be unable to get through.

Lastly, the complete inability to backfill newly vacated positions would erase the progress being made on succession planning. Through the NextGen ITA plan, the department has brought in 11 entry level Application Programmers in the past year, infusing new blood, new skills and new ambition in ITA. These employees are rapidly taking promotional exams; if promotional opportunities are not available in ITA, they will move to other departments taking with them the training we have invested and ITA’s ability to explore new technologies. In short, the inability to backfill positions at this critical time would result in a greatly degraded Succession Plan and serious consequences for IT capabilities at the City of Los Angeles.

To mitigate the effects of the salary account reductions, the department is requesting funding and position authority for 6 filled positions:

1 Chief Management Analyst
1 Comm Engineer
3 Comm Engineer Associate III
1 Comm Electrician Supervisor

Total salaries requested $750,327
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BUREAU OF SANITATION – WATER RECYCLING DIVISION

Attached is a memorandum from the Bureau of Sanitation (Bureau) dated May 1, 2017, responding to the Committee’s request for additional information on the creation of a Water Recycling Division at the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (HWRP), which includes a discussion on the roles of the two positions requested by the Bureau, fiscal solvency of its source of funds, and revenue impacts from the sale of recycled water.

In its 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Bureau requested nine-months funding and regular authority for eight positions, which included one Principal Environmental Engineer, one Senior Environmental Engineer, two Environmental Engineers, two Environmental Engineering Associate Ills, one Environmental Engineering Associate II, and one Senior Wastewater Treatment Operator to staff a new Water Recycling Division. This request was not approved as it was determined that the Bureau could implement this program with existing resources. For 2017-18, the total workforce for the Clean Water Program will increase by 18 positions, from 1,282 to 1,300 positions. Within the Clean Water Program, there are 131 positions within the Environmental Engineering series and it was determined that the Bureau could reassign positions within this pool to implement its water recycling projects. In its April 21, 2017 memorandum, the Bureau reduced its staffing request to only the Principal Environmental Engineer and Environmental Engineer positions. The Bureau does not have any Principal Environmental Engineer vacancies, but is reporting 11 Environmental Engineer vacancies.

RECOMMENDATION

Instruct the Bureau to implement water recycling projects with existing resources.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no General Fund impact from the recommendation in this report. However, should the Council provide nine-months funding and regular authority for the Principal Environmental Engineer and Environmental Engineer position, sufficient funds are available from the Sewer Construction and Maintenance Fund. The total nine-month salaries for these two positions are $291,827 ($205,093 direct costs and $86,734 indirect costs).

RHL:WKP:06170132

Question No. 201

Attachment
DATE: May 1, 2017

TO: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair
    Honorable Mitchell Englander, Vice Chair
    Honorable Nury Martinez, Member
    Honorable Bob Blumenfield, Member
    Honorable Mike Bonin, Member
    Budget and Finance Committee

FROM: Enrique C. Zaldivar, Director
      LA Sanitation

SUBJECT: LA SANITATION – REPORT BACK ON BUDGET & FINANCE

QUESTION NO. 201: WATER RECYCLING POSITIONS

Question No. 201: How does the Bureau envision the two environmental engineers overseeing the conversion of the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant being used? Which special funds would fund these positions? Report on the use of the Sewer Construction Maintenance Fund for these positions including a year over year expenditure projection. What would be the impact to the special fund, revenue enhancements, and further developing water recycling programs?

During the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Proposed Budget Deliberations held on April 27, 2017, LA Sanitation was asked to report back on the funding source for positions requested for the Water Recycling Program.

The October 21, 2016 Controller's audit of LASAN’s Recycled Water Program contained the following statement:

The largest obstacle the City faces in increasing its efforts to reclaim more water locally is the lack of infrastructure at its treatment plants and the funding to build infrastructure. While there are plans to equip the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant in the San Fernando Valley with more advanced treatment systems, there are no detailed plans to upgrade the largest of its four treatment plants—Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (HWRP).

On the same day, the Controller and Mayor sent a joint letter to the State Water Resources Control Board and the Department of Water Resources requesting them to remove funding caps for transformational water projects that can positively impact the entire state’s water supply. This demonstrates how vital it is for LASAN to redouble its efforts in the area of water recycling.

LASAN has developed substantive conceptual plans for significantly expanding water recycling at HWRP, including increasing deliveries of recycled water to West Basin Municipal Water District and meeting new demand for Advanced Treated Water at LAX. Now is the time to transition to implementation of these plans.
LASAN submitted a budget request for eight positions to form a Water Recycling Group that will focus on the planning, concept development and implementation that will be required to significantly increase the local water supply. LASAN is revising this request down to two key supervisory positions – one Principal Environmental Engineer and one Environmental Engineer. The remaining six positions will be recruited from our existing ranks.

**One (1) Principal Environmental Engineer**

This position is requested to supervise the Water Recycling Group comprised of six engineers and operational staff. This position will lead a multi-disciplinary project team, oversee the budget and use of resources, and will streamline efforts for continued development and construction of one of the largest water reclamation facilities nationwide.

**One (1) Environmental Engineer**

This position is requested to supervise the day-to-day activities of the environmental engineering associates implementing the program.

This group will be tasked with increasing recycled water production at HWRP in two phases. Phase I is geared towards developing the production of 1.5 MGD of recycled water to LAX and nearby uses, including plant use, by December 2019, with room to expand to 5 MGD. Phase II of expanding water recycling at HWRP involves LASAN’s partnership with LADWP and the West Basin Municipal Water District to develop water production facilities at HWRP that would produce 70 MGD of high quality water for recycling by 2027. The Group will stay up-to-date in worldwide research in technology and processes to implement in our facilities.

The direct salaries for these two positions for nine months are $208,169, from LASAN’s Sewer Operations and Maintenance Fund No. 760, one of the funds under the umbrella term Sewer Construction and Maintenance (SCM) Fund. In future fiscal years, annual salaries plus pension and healthcare costs (based on CAP 37) would be $324,411.

The overall financial picture for the SCM Fund is shown in Schedule 14 of the budget. The SCM receives approximately $700 million in revenues annually, primarily through user fees. The SCM receives $9 million annually from sales of water produced at the Terminal Island Water Reclamation Plant and would receive revenue from future water sales at the D.C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant and the HWRP. Water sales agreements would be structured to achieve full cost recovery for both capital project development and ongoing operations costs as required by Proposition 218. Therefore, the cost of these two positions would be fully recovered through future water sales.

Thank you in advance for your continued support of LA Sanitation. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of these items further, please feel free to contact myself or Lisa B. Mowery, LASAN’s Chief Financial Officer at (213) 485-2210.

LBM/ECZ:lbm
c: Members of the City Council
Ana Guerrero, Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Matt Szabo, Deputy Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Barbara Romero, Deputy Mayor, Mayor’s Office of City Services
Greg Good, Chief of Legislative and External Affairs, Mayor’s Office
John Chavez, Mayor’s Office of Budget and Innovation
Sharon Tso, CLA
Richard Llewellyn, Jr., Interim CAO
Kevin James, President, BPW
Heather Repenning, Vice President, BPW
LASAN Executive Team
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CAPITAL FINANCE ADMINISTRATION – LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGERS

During its consideration of the Capital Finance Administration 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report on the Police Department’s electric vehicles (EV’s) including where vehicles will be located, the vehicles that the charging systems will serve, how the vehicles are used and how often and whether this item should be moved to the Unappropriated Balance (UB).

The Police Department reports that EV chargers have been installed at the Motor Transport Division (104 chargers) and the Northeast Station (6 chargers) and are being installed at nine other facilities consisting of: Central, Pacific, Harbor, West Valley, Topanga, North Hollywood, and 77th Street stations as well as the Davis Training Center and the Ahmanson Recruit Training Center. The installation of EV chargers at these nine sites should be completed by the end of June 2017.

The $2.6 million to be financed through MICLA in the Capital Finance Administration 2017-18 Proposed Budget would be used to install EV chargers at 14 additional facilities consisting of: Southwest, Southeast, Olympic, Rampart, Hollenbeck, Wilshire, West Los Angeles, Devonshire, Foothill, Newton, Mission, Van Nuys, Valley Bureau/Valley Traffic and the Police Academy at Elysian Park.

The Police Department acquired 100 EV’s in 2015-16 and 50 EV’s to date in 2016-17 and is expected to acquire an additional 50 vehicles by the end of this fiscal year. 100 additional vehicles are expected to be acquired during 2017-18.

The Police Department indicates that its existing EV fleet is used for non-emergency transportation, including administrative and investigative purposes with average daily driving distances of 35 to 63 miles. However, the utilization of EV’s is impacted by the unavailability of EV chargers at all Police facilities. These daily average distances, as well as overall use of EV’s, are expected to increase with the installation of additional EV chargers at the Police facilities discussed above.

MICLA funding in the budget is authority to incur debt and as such cannot be moved from the Capital Finance Administration Fund to the UB. Council could defer the MICLA funding for EV chargers, but delaying the roll-out of EV chargers may impede increased usage of EV’s. The Police Department also indicates that at current facilities without EV chargers, employees with EV’s are charging vehicles into outlets that are not rated for the electrical draws required for the vehicles being charged, which may be unsafe.
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There would be no General Fund impact if the authority to purchase the $2.6 million in EV chargers is delayed, should the Council want to further consider the project. However, in accordance with Council policy, specific projects authorized to be funded through MICLA will be brought back to Council for final authorization after the Fiscal Year 2017-18 commences.

RHL/RAS:05170113
Question No. 501
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH AND AUTOMATIC VEHICLE LOCATOR SYSTEM PROGRESS AND FUNDING

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to report back on the level of funding needed for the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) systems, with consideration of placing the funds in the Unappropriated Balance (UB) and use of Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) Program funds to meet the one-time upgrade needs.

The LAFD reports that $1.7 million required for the CAD Enhancement Project to bring the CAD and AVL systems in line with the current goals of the LAFD Information Technology Strategic Plan remains unfunded. A summary of the enhancement needs is presented below, in order of Departmental priority:

1. **Phase II of CAD/AVL** ($700,000) – Phase I of CAD/AVL, which consists of integrating AVL into the CAD system to implement location-based, closest unit dispatch; and creating new Geographic Information System (GIS) maps for dispatch and units in the field, is expected to be completed by September 2017. Phase II consists of fine-tuning the Phase I implementation and applying additional enhancements based on initial results, such as upgrading equipment and adding software components to maximize performance and reliability.

2. **CAD Sustainability and Infrastructure Updates** ($650,000) – The current CAD hardware infrastructure is not sized for the expected demands of a fully implemented CAD/AVL or GIS mapping. Updates, including server upgrades, are required for ongoing CAD sustainability.

3. **CAD Updates at Back-up/Satellite Centers** ($350,000) – Funding is needed to update critical infrastructure at the LAFD back-up dispatch center on the P-4 level of City Hall East and to begin initial development of enhanced capability and resiliency of LAFD CAD systems at the Police Department’s back-up communications dispatch center in the San Fernando Valley.

It should be noted that although these funding requests are identified as one-time needs, additional funding requirements are anticipated for future systems enhancements to meet changing standards and operational needs.
IGT Program funding is designated for providing services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries and for other healthcare-related services. Eligible expenditures include Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Program salaries for sworn personnel and the purchase of ambulances. The CAD Enhancement Project, while serving the base needs of the EMS Program, may not qualify for direct funding from IGT funds. However, IGT funds could be directed to offset existing General Fund costs for eligible EMS Program expenditures, therefore making funding available for support of the CAD Enhancement Project.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget programs $6 million in IGT Program receipts. Up to $6 million in additional IGT Program revenue is anticipated to be available to support LAFD initiatives not currently in the Proposed Budget. However, the LAFD has yet to apply for the funds, and it is not known how much will be received at this time. Should an appropriation be made to fund the CAD Enhancement Project, it is recommended that it be placed in the UB contingent upon receipt of additional IGT funds.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

There is no impact to the General Fund as funding would be contingent upon additional Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) Program receipts to offset a $1.7 million appropriation to the Unappropriated Balance.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY PLANNING – SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS FOR THE VALLEY

During its consideration of the Department of City Planning’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested City Planning to report on additional funding, hiring, and technology solutions needed to provide specialized programs such as the Beverage and Entertainment Streamlined (BEST) Program and Case Management at the Valley Development Services Center.

The Department’s memorandum identifies the additional resources needed to expand these specialized programs to the Valley Development Services Center. The Department identified six positions totaling $627,778, and one-time expenses equal to $17,000, for a cumulative total of $644,778, that would be needed for the expansion of the BEST Program. Expansion of case management would require two positions, which total $305,285, and one-time expenses equal to $3,000, for a cumulative total of $308,285. The City Planning Case Processing Fund impact of approving the additional resources is $953,063.

An interim budget request for 24 positions to address workload demands was approved in April 2017. The Enhanced Case Management (two positions) and the BEST Program (five positions) were addressed in the interim request. The seven additional positions will cover cases located in the San Fernando Valley and help the Department to meet growing customer demands.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no General Fund fiscal impact.

RHL:YC:ACA:JLK:02170163

Question No. 337
DATE: May 3, 2017

TO: Honorable Members of the City Council
Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

Attention: Jason Killeen, Senior Administrative Analyst

FROM: Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP, Director of Planning
Department of City Planning

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK REGARDING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS SUCH AS BEST AND CASE MANAGEMENT IN THE VALLEY - BUDGET IMPACT NO. 337

The Department of City Planning’s Development Service Center (DSC) supports development by providing a range of services to project applicants, homeowners, business owners and the development community which includes customer assistance and problem solving. The DSC’s goal is to guide projects through the design, planning, entitlement and permitting stages. Over the past year, the DSC’s functions have expanded beyond its traditional role of case intake and condition clearance to include specialized services that further enhance the Department’s level of service in the areas of housing, wireless/telecommunications, map processing, and condition compliance. This report focuses on the resources needed to expand specialized services now offered at the Metro office to the Valley DSC.

Beverage and Entertainment Streamlined Program (BEST)

One of the many services offered through the Development Services Center includes the Beverage and Entertainment Streamlined Program (BEST). The BEST Program fast-tracks the Conditional Use Permit process for applicants requesting a stand-alone alcohol or entertainment component. The program is designed to provide a central point of staff contact and early notification of potential issues to facilitate a clear and seamless entitlement process.

In order to expand the BEST Program to the Valley DSC located in the Marvin Braude building, the Department would require the following positions to create a self-contained unit comprised of one Associate Zoning Administrator to serve in a decision-making capacity, one supervising City Planner, three City Planning Associates, and one Senior Administrative Clerk to provide clerical support. This level of staffing would allow the unit to fully execute the BEST Program with its primary focus on requested conditional use permits for properties located in the San Fernando Valley. This expansion of staff would require that the Department secure additional office space at the Marvin Braude
building or other comparable City facility as the Department is nearing full capacity of its current allocated space.

It is important to note that in fall 2016, the Department implemented several changes to the BEST procedures to facilitate greater customer access across Los Angeles. Specifically, the Department relaxed its case intake policy for BEST cases, allowing customers to submit their applications at both the Metro and Valley public counters, and soon to the new West Los Angeles DSC. The change in policy also allows more customers to consult with planners to review plans, clear conditions of approval, and sign building permits in order to commence construction and operations. Additionally, public hearings for BEST cases proposed in the San Fernando Valley are currently held at the Marvin Braude building to provide greater convenience for both applicants and interested parties wishing to participate.

**Case Management**

Another service offered at the Metro DSC is Citywide Development Services Case Management (DSCM). This unit provides one-stop technical consultation for development projects and a single portal for consultation, problem solving, and facilitation. The DSCM team includes case managers from a variety of City departments including the Building and Safety, City Planning, Public Works, Transportation, Fire, Water and Power, Street Lighting, and Housing and Community Investment that work together to guide and facilitate development projects during the design, planning, entitlement, and permitting stages. Representatives from the departments listed above are co-located to create an inter-disciplinary team and work to create a seamless transition as complex development projects move from conceptual design to final permitting and occupancy.

Expansion of the Department’s Case Management Services to the Valley DSC would require the following staff: one supervising City Planner, one City Planning Associate and one Administrative Clerk to provide support. In addition to City Planning staff, a Valley DSCM would also need equivalent staff resources from the other participating departments in order to create the synergy found at the Metro office and to provide the full range of services that makes Case Management a unique and popular service among the development community. Similar to expanding the BEST Program to the Valley DSC, additional office space at the Marvin Braude building would need to be secured for an expanded Case Management service.

For the proposed FY 2017-18 budget program, two additional Planning staff are requested (one City Planner and one City Planning Associate) to supplement the current team of four case managers. These two additional staff members will enable the Department to reorganize the program to create three, two-person teams each specializing in one of the three geographic areas (Central, Valley, West/South) that correspond to the Department’s three project planning divisions. The case managers will serve as experts in their respective geographies, providing technical support and
guidance both internally within the City organization and externally to the public and development community.

**Resources Needed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BESt Program</th>
<th>Direct Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Associate Zoning Admin</td>
<td>$168,805</td>
<td>$168,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 City Planner</td>
<td>$120,587</td>
<td>$120,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 City Planning Associate</td>
<td>$92,349</td>
<td>$277,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Admin Clerk</td>
<td>$61,339</td>
<td>$61,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Workstations</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Office Expenses</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-Matic licenses</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-Matic Set-up</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BESt</td>
<td></td>
<td>$644,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Management**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 City Planner</td>
<td>$120,587</td>
<td>$120,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 City Planning Associate</td>
<td>$92,349</td>
<td>$184,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$305,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expense**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Workstations</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Office expenses</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Case Management** | $308,285
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY PLANNING – HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONE PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Department of City Planning’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on funding options, costs, and benefits of expanding the City’s Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) program as requested in the Department’s letter. The attached Department memorandum is provided for informational purposes only.

The Department requested an additional General Fund appropriation of $396,624 for four positions consisting of one City Planner and three City Planning Associates to support the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone program. The 12-month fully burdened cost to add the additional four positions is $564,408.

In 2011, the Department had five positions and $220,000 in funding allocated to the Historic Resources budget program which includes the HPOZ program. Additional staff and funding have been provided over the past several years which more than doubled the staffing and quintupled the funding for the program. The 2016-17 Adopted Budget provided an additional $244,114 in General Fund monies for two City Planning Associates to support the HPOZ program increasing the base budget for the program to 12 positions and $1.23 million excluding related costs. The City’s General Fund subsidizes 100 percent of the cost to establish an HPOZ ($138,017 per instance), as well as, 100 percent of the cost to prepare a preservation plan ($30,998 per instance). Additionally, the General Fund subsidizes permit fees for HPOZ and Mills Act activities which are eligible to be fully recovered through fees.

Increasing the Department’s HPOZ and Mills Act fees to full cost recovery and adopting new fees for historic preservation services for which fees are not collected will sufficiently increase revenues to fully offset the cost of the additional four positions. Should these positions be funded by the General Fund, offsetting revenues or appropriations will need to be identified. A range of funding timeframe options and totals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Months Funded</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Case Processing Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 564,408</td>
<td>$ 564,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 423,306</td>
<td>$ 423,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 282,204</td>
<td>$ 282,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 141,102</td>
<td>$ 141,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Increasing Historic Preservation and Mills Act fees to full cost recovery and adopting new fees for historic preservation services for which fees are not collected would fully fund the requested four positions.

Should these positions be funded by the General Fund, offsetting revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:YC:ACA:JLK:02170153

Question No. 312
DATE: May 2, 2017

TO: Honorable Members of the City Council
    Budget and Finance Committee
    c/o Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
    Attention: Jason Killeen, Senior Administrative Analyst II

FROM: Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
      Director of Planning
      Department of City Planning

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK REGARDING THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION
OVERLAY ZONE (HPOZ) PROGRAM - BUDGET IMPACT NO. 312

The Budget and Finance Committee requested a report back at its April 28 budget hearing regarding the Department of City Planning's budget request on the potential funding options, costs, and benefits of expanding the City's Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) Program.

Background

The City's Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) provide the most effective tool to protect the unique historic character of Los Angeles' historic neighborhoods. While only eight HPOZs were created in the first two decades of the City's HPOZ program (1979-1998), the City has seen an explosion of interest in new HPOZs in recent years, with an increase to 35 HPOZs, including more than 21,000 parcels citywide in 13 of the 15 City Council districts.

In just the past few months, the City Council has approved five new HPOZs, with a sixth forthcoming, growing the size of the HPOZ program by 20% all at once. Each of these approvals translates into numerous ongoing responsibilities for the Department of City Planning in perpetuity, including:

- taking numerous daily calls from owners performing work on their homes;
- providing Planning sign-offs on permit clearances;
- consultations on proposed projects;
- staffing the five-member HPOZ Boards; and
- writing detailed case determinations, with report findings.
To meet these increasing demands, the Department has taken numerous steps to streamline the HPOZ program, such as exempting more minor requests from HPOZ review, identifying more categories of cases for administrative sign-offs rather than full-blown Board review, and, just last week, bringing to final Council approval amendments to the HPOZ Ordinance that will allow multiple HPOZs to share a single HPOZ Board.

Costs and Benefits

The Department’s request would add one (1) City Planner and three (3) City Planning Associates to the existing staffing of the HPOZ Unit (one City Planner and six City Planning Associates/Planning Assistants). The additional City Planner is necessary to ensure an appropriate span of supervision within the unit, allowing one supervisor to oversee four or five planners.

The proposed staffing will enable the Department to eliminate the large case backlog within six months and then more appropriately balance applications with staffing resources moving forward. For the City of Los Angeles’ small investment, the City may reap the tangible and intangible benefits of protecting its historic resources and spur rehabilitation and reinvestment across the City. The preservation of the City’s historic built heritage maintains a rich and vibrant built environment, anchoring each of Los Angeles’ communities. The HPOZ program has grown to encompass a wide variety of neighborhoods, income levels, and demographics – from Stonehurst in the Northeast Valley to Vinegar Hill and Banning Park in the Harbor, and from Pico Union to Van Nuys.

Right-Sizing and Benchmarking

Even prior to the recent approvals of the new HPOZs, the Department’s HPOZ Unit was experiencing unprecedented backlogs in processing cases and requests. Adding the new HPOZs on top of this existing backlog, without simultaneously adding staff, will only generate frustration and animosity among applicants and community members.

For comparison, in determining the appropriate size of the HPOZ staff, a single planner working solely on HPOZs once typically staffed no more than three or possibly four HPOZs. Today, a single planner must juggle between five and seven HPOZs each and oversee, on average, 3,500 parcels. The Department believes that a “right-sized” HPOZ program would involve each planner administering three to four separate HPOZs, with an average of no more than 2,500 parcels (the Department’s budget proposal would reduce this average to 2,350 parcels). In addition, at current staffing levels, each planner is also expected to average 58 night-time Board meetings during the coming year, in addition to periodic additional community outreach meetings that may be necessary. The proposed budget would reduce meetings to an average of 35 per year per planner.
Los Angeles’ historic resources program remains small when compared with the scope of the City’s historic preservation protections. The City of New York’s historic districts and designation programs are only slightly larger than the City of Los Angeles’ program (34,000 properties vs. 21,000); yet New York has approximately seven times the staffing of Los Angeles (70 staff members for New York’s Landmarks Preservation Commission vs. 10 total staff in the entire Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources).

**Funding Sources**

Total cost of the request is $396,000 in direct costs to be funded by the General Fund, including office and administrative costs. The HPOZ program charges fees for the more significant case requests (Certificate of Appropriateness and Certificate of Compatibility), but these fees do not provide full cost recovery. The Department has proposed significant increases to these fees as part of the fee study currently pending before the Council, which, if approved, will generate additional non-General Fund revenue to support the program.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CIEP (Municipal Facilities) – Options for Bicycle Commuting Infrastructure at City Hall

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the CIEP (Municipal Facilities), the Budget and Finance Committee requested that this office report on the options to support bicycle commuting infrastructure at City Hall.

The Mayor’s Sustainability Team and Council District 14 have been coordinating with the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) and the General Services Department (GSD) to build out the bicycle commuting infrastructure at City Hall. GSD Construction Forces Division provided a rough order of magnitude (ROM) quote of $17,311 to upgrade the bicycle corral on the upper parking lot of City Hall. Upgrades would include new electrical conduit, installation of a card reader system, fencing, as well as other related exterior improvements.

To complement the improved bicycle corral, there is also a request to renovate an existing men’s bathroom. GSD Construction Forces Division provided a ROM quote of $200,000 to convert the men’s bathroom for bicycle commuters to use. The conversion includes two showers, one restroom stall, and an open area with 20-30 lockers. All areas of the facility will be gender neutral.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The total for the bicycle corral project and the renovation of the existing men’s bathroom is approximately $220,000. Should Council fund both requests for building out the bicycle commuting infrastructure at City Hall, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:AST:05170114

Question No. 507
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – SERVICES AND HOUSING FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) to report on how services and housing for human trafficking survivors are part of the County's Homelessness Strategy. Additionally, the Committee asked whether Measure H for services and Proposition HHH for housing and facilities can be used for human trafficking survivors. LAHSA’s memo, attached, discusses the Measure H Revenue Planning Work Group’s intent to address needs within specific subpopulations of homeless individuals once program development is underway during 2017-18.

Proposition HHH funding may be allocated for the acquisition or improvement of real property used to provide services or goods to, or otherwise benefit, those who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at risk of homelessness. Human trafficking survivors may be eligible for housing within the Proposition HHH Permanent Supportive Housing Program for homeless individuals and those at risk of homelessness throughout the City. Use of the Coordinated Entry System, or similar system, would be used to preference vulnerable populations such as human trafficking survivors. In order to be eligible for Proposition HHH funding, facilities must serve primarily homeless populations.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee

Richard Llewellyn  
City Administrative Officer

From: Peter Lynn, Executive Director  
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RE: Budget and Finance Committee Budget Reports – Question No. 278

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority was requested by the Budget and Finance Committee to report back on the following question concerning the FY17-18 budget.

Question: Report on how services and housing for human trafficking survivors are part of the County’s Homeless Strategy. Can Measure H for services and Measure HHH for housing and facilities be used for human trafficking survivors?

The Measure H Revenue Planning Work Group is currently working to develop a spending plan structured around the County’s 21 Strategies eligible for Measure H funding. The expectation is that once funding decisions have been finalized, strategy leads will begin the program development phase and services for specific subpopulations can be addressed then.

While human trafficking is not specifically addressed as a standalone strategy, survivors of human trafficking will be able to access many of the services funded through Measure H, including:

B3 - Partner with Cities to Expand Rapid Re-Housing
The goal of expanding Rapid Re-housing is to help homeless individuals, families and youth - including vulnerable subpopulations such as survivors of human trafficking - connect to permanent housing through the provision of temporary financial assistance and supportive services.

D7 - Services for Supportive Housing
Strategy D7 intends to build approximately 2,500 Permanent Supportive Housing units which would be accessible to all vulnerable subpopulations, including survivors of human trafficking.
E6 - Countywide Outreach System
Strategy E6 will support and enhance a network of integrated street-based outreach teams that will engage with all persons experiencing homelessness, including survivors of human trafficking.

E7 - Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System
This County Strategy includes a recommendation for a substantial amount of funding to provide training to the homeless services workforce, including trauma-informed care and other specialized trainings to ensure that homeless service providers are equipped to provide appropriate care to human trafficking survivors and other vulnerable populations.

E8 - Enhance the Emergency Shelter System
Enhancing the Emergency Shelter System increases crisis housing beds that are available to human trafficking survivors. In addition, through this Strategy, LAHSA has requested an increased bed rate (to $50/night) to enable shelter operators to hire more professional staff equipped to address the needs of particularly vulnerable populations such as human trafficking survivors.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
       Sharon M. Tso, Chief Legislative Analyst

Subject: POLICE – BACKFILL LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY SWORN POSITIONS WITH CIVILIANS

During its consideration of the Police Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Offices of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) and the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), with the assistance of the Police Department (LAPD), to report on:

Using funding from the MTA contract to enhance civilian hiring with the intent of moving sworn staff performing civilian duties back into the field to backfill positions that are supporting MTA. Can new General Fund receipts associated with the MTA contract be used to hire more civilians versus pursuing the hiring goal of 10,052 sworn officers?

Representatives of the CAO, CLA, and LAPD met and clarified that the above question seeks to determine whether civilians could be hired to relieve sworn officers currently performing civilian work in the department, in order to utilize these officers to backfill the officers being assigned to the contract with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). While this would maintain the sworn headcount at 10,000, it could mitigate the impact of assigning 52 officers to LACMTA since an additional 52 officers now performing civilian duties can be reassigned to police duties as civilians are hired and trained to relieve them. It would also allow the City to meet its contractual obligations to LACMTA by ensuring that the 52 officers dedicated to LACMTA are properly assigned and available full time for LACMTA-related work.

This strategy would involve three steps: 1) assigning 52 officers to LACMTA; 2) hiring, training, and assigning civilians to relieve 52 sworn officers performing civilian work; and, 3) redeploying 52 sworn officers from civilian assignments to backfill the officers assigned to LACMTA. Per LAPD, the hiring and training of civilians could take up to 18 months (e.g., Police Service Representatives have an 18-month probationary period). Background investigations also contribute significantly to this lengthy hiring and training period. Due to these issues, implementation of this strategy would be a time consuming process, thereby delaying the backfilling of officers currently being assigned to the LACMTA contract. This could have a negative impact on patrol capabilities, depending on what duties the newly deployed LACMTA officers are reassigned from.

The Police Department provided the attached response which indicates that it does not consider this proposal a viable option. However, it is recommended that the
Department be given additional time to report back on this issue, including: 1) the assignments that will need to be backfilled, and the status of those backfills as officers are assigned to LACMTA duties; 2) a plan for mitigating negative impacts on patrol if civilians were hired and trained in lieu of hiring above 10,000 sworn officers; 3) a list of the civilian assignments officers are currently performing, whether on a full or part-time basis, and the Department’s priority for hiring civilians to relieve officers; and, 4) a list of civilian positions to be hired in lieu of hiring 52 additional officers.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If civilians were hired in lieu of increasing the sworn headcount to 10,052 officers, there would be a General Fund savings of at least $644,535 due to the lower cost of civilian salaries. The cost of the sworn positions assigned to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) contract would be funded from the Police Department’s base budget. The cost of the civilian positions that would backfill sworn positions ($5.6 million) would be reallocated from the Sworn Salaries to the Salaries General account. The final amount needed for civilian salaries would depend upon the actual civilian positions hired; the above amount is based on the average salaries of 52 Police Service Representative II positions. To ensure compliance with its contractual obligations, the Police Department would bill the LACMTA only for actual expenses incurred for sworn and civilian personnel assigned to the contract.
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 120 – Backfill MTA Sworn Positions with Civilians

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding the feasibility of backfilling Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Sworn Positions with Civilians.

Following a May 1 meeting with CAO, CLA and LAPD representatives, Budget Memo No. 120 to Backfill Metro Sworn Positions with Civilians was defined more specifically to address redeployment of sworn personnel performing civilian functions to patrol operations. Instead of hiring 52 sworn personnel to backfill MTA positions, LAPD was asked about the feasibility of hiring at least 52 civilians or a total commensurate with the salaries associated with the sworn backfill.

MTA's intention throughout the Request for Proposal process was to establish an accountable and transparent personnel and billing process for effective and responsible transit policing. The MTA contract is very specific about providing full funding for 52 full-time fixed post sworn officers to perform administrative and field duties, including supervision of officers performing duties on overtime. As stated in the CAO report, “these positions will increase the total LAPD sworn headcount above the 10,000 officer level” and “thereby have the means to mitigate what might otherwise result in a negative impact to patrol deployments.” Hiring civilians to backfill sworn MTA positions is counterproductive to increasing LAPD staffing above the 10,000 officer goal.

The Chief of Police and the Police Commission have a long-standing commitment to hire to 10,000 police officers. The Chief assured that the MTA contract would not adversely impact patrol staffing obligations. If civilians are hired to backfill MTA sworn positions, the Department would still be hiring to 10,000; however, 52 sworn personnel would be assigned full-time to the MTA fixed-post positions impacting patrol operations. The Department does not consider this a viable option.
If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

JORGE A. VILLEGAS, Assistant Chief
Director, Office of Administrative Services
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

TRANSPORTATION – RESTORATION OF OVERTIME AND EXPENSE ACCOUNT GENERAL FUND REDUCTIONS

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on the potential restoration of General Fund reductions in the overtime and various expense accounts, including whether or not this funding is refundable from other sources.

The Department’s letter (Refer to Memo No. 53 - Attachment 1) indicates that these reductions will impact staffing special events and emergency or on-call field operations. The Department reported during their hearing that there has been an increase in special events and that some of these events cannot be reimbursed, for example first amendment events. To the greatest extent possible, the Department is already seeking reimbursement for reimbursable events and is precluded from seeking reimbursement from other events.

The one-time reduction is being proposed as part of a larger citywide global reduction to balance the budget. It should be noted, that of the total reductions being proposed, $138,500 are direct reductions (Overtime $135,000, and $3,500 Printing and Binding) which impact the Emergency Management and Special Events Program. The other one-time reductions are spread out amongst various other programs for other purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtime General</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Binding</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>1,091,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Supplies</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,666,031</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:

The General Fund impact of restoring this overall reduction is $1,666,031. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General fund revenue or offsetting appropriation will need to be identified.
Memo No. 94

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – COMBINING THE STREET RECONSTRUCTION AND VISION ZERO PROGRAMS

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the opportunities and challenges of delivering a combined program of street reconstruction and Vision Zero. The Department's response is attached.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:IR:06170121

Question No. 348

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 348

QUESTION

Report on the opportunities and challenges of delivering a combined program of street reconstruction and Vision Zero, including, but not limited to, the inherent challenges in addressing competing priorities, competing goals, and competing scopes of work and opportunities for public benefit.

RESPONSE


Opportunities

LADOT regularly works with the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) and the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) on multiple street projects. This presents the following opportunities:

- Established working relationships: LADOT, BOE, and BSS already partner on a variety of transportation projects.
- Related work: Some of the types of work that are regularly done by the Bureaus support Vision Zero principles. For example, BOE routinely prepares civil engineering designs to bring sidewalks, curbs, and gutters into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, creating a safer environment for pedestrians. BSS completes the actual reconstruction of the streets, which also provides an opportunity for LADOT to perform work on the street by implementing Vision Zero improvements.
- Reduced Street Closures: Projects by all three agencies may be performed concurrently, when possible, thereby reducing the time the street is under construction.

Challenges

There are some inherent challenges to this type of coordination between multiple Departments:

- Various project scopes: LADOT, BOE, and BSS have different missions and metrics for success.
• Differing levels of community engagement: Most street reconstruction projects may not need extensive community input. Some Vision Zero projects may require extensive outreach. In order to keep street reconstruction and project implementation on track, significant advance time will need to be factored into some corridors for proper outreach.

• Differing Project Boundaries: Failed street segments may not align perfectly with the locations requiring Vision Zero improvements.

Generally, these challenges can be met successfully with thorough planning and inter-departmental coordination, and address safety concerns on corridors with failed street segments. In order to address projects not on streets requiring reconstruction, additional funding for those Vision Zero improvements would maximize the safety benefits of the Vision Zero Program.

SJR/ME:na

c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – 2017-18 BUDGET METRICS

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority’s (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) to report on how many individuals LAHSA anticipates contacting, providing services to, and placing into emergency shelters, temporary housing, and permanent housing using funds through the City’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget as compared to funds requested through Measure H. In response, LAHSA provided the attached memo that both lists metrics associated with the Proposed 2017-18 Budget and anticipated Measure H City programs and provides a side-by-side comparison of levels of service achieved through these two sources.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:KDU: 02170157

Question No. 268

Attachment
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee

Richard Llewellyn
City Administrative Officer

From: Peter Lynn, Executive Director
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RE: Budget and Finance Committee Budget Reports – Question No. 268

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority was requested by the Budget and Finance Committee to report back on the following question concerning the FY17-18 budget.

Question: How many individuals does LAHSA anticipate contacting, providing services to, and placing into emergency shelters, temporary housing, and permanent housing using funds through the City’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget as compared to funds requested through Measure H?

Through the City’s Proposed Budget, LAHSA anticipates being able to fund the following services in 2017-2018:

Emergency Response Teams and Operation Healthy Streets
The Proposed Budget through these two line items will fund 16 Outreach teams that will result in engagement of approximately 8,700 persons and 1,700 shelter placements.

Safe Parking
Ten (10) safe parking spots are anticipated to serve approximately 30 households.

Coordinated Entry System Crisis and Bridge Housing for Singles and Youth/Winter Shelter Program
The Winter Shelter Program funding would serve approximately 5,000 individuals through 861 shelter beds. The City’s Crisis and Bridge Housing funding will be combined and leveraged with the Measure H to continue 24-hour operations in the current 1,653 shelter bed program in the City.1

Homeless Families Solutions System Rapid Re-housing and Crisis Housing for Family System
This line item will help supplement ESG funding to provide Rapid Re-housing to 35 families a year. Additionally, it would supplement ESG and CDBG funding to provide 98 crisis housing units for families.
Through Measure H, LAHSA has recommended funding that would support the following services in 2017-2018:

**E6: Countywide Outreach System**
Outreach Services (Strategy E6) would result in 78,860 outreach contacts and 5,818 shelter placements (approximately 4,600 placements in Service Planning Areas found in the City).

Additionally, 57 outreach teams would be supported, including 25 multidisciplinary teams (13 in the City) administered by the Los Angeles County Health Agency and the remaining teams would be administered by LAHSA. These teams include 9 HOPE Teams (in the City), 8 outreach teams dedicated to work with other county law enforcement agencies, and 15 outreach teams through the Coordinated Entry System.

**B7: Interim/Bridge Housing for those Exiting Institutions**
**E8: Enhancing the Emergency Shelter System**
Through strategies B7 and E8, we anticipate that 3,747 units of crisis and bridge housing will shelter about 11,240 households. One thousand (1,000) of these units will be administered by the Los Angeles County Health Agency.

**B3: Partner with Cities to Expand Rapid Re-Housing**
Through Strategy B3, 3,901 units of rapid re-housing will be funded to serve about 5,500 households (approximately 4,400 households in Service Planning Areas overlap in the City). Eight hundred (800) of these units will be administered by the Los Angeles County Health Agency and 1,250 units include an enhanced shallow subsidy for households who need longer-term rental assistance but do not require the services for permanent supportive housing.

**D7: Services for Supportive Housing**
Additionally, through Strategy D7, the Los Angeles County Health Agency has recommended the creation of 2,500 permanent supportive housing units.

For strategies where it reasonable, Measure H funding will be distributed Homeless Count numbers. While the City has 62-percent of the homeless population, Measure H funding will be allocated by Service Planning Area. The City of Los Angeles is located within the boundaries of Service Planning Areas 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8, which contain 79-percent of the homeless population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City - FY 2017-2018 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>County - Measure H Funding Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>ERT/Operation Healthy Streets: 16 Emergency Response Teams (12)</td>
<td>Strategy E6: Request will support 9 two-person ERT for HOPE Teams, 8 teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Parking</td>
<td>Crisis and Bridge Housing (Year-Round)</td>
<td>Winter Shelter (Seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Parking - 10 Parking Spots; 30 Households</td>
<td>City funding will be supplemented with Measure H funding to continue operating 1,653 beds for single adults and youth and 98 units for families in the City. The City funds 1,531 shelter beds which will be supplemented through Measure H. 122 Transitional Housing units for Transition Age Youth would be funded through the Proposed Budget.</td>
<td>Winter Shelter Program: 5,000 Served; 861 Beds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

existing, 3 Mayor’s Request, 1 Operation Healthy Streets) – 8,700 Persons engaged

dedicated to county law enforcement agencies, 15 CES Outreach Teams, and 25 multidisciplinary teams. These 57 teams will engage with approximately 18,000 people resulting in an estimated 5,800 shelter placements of which approximately 4,600 placements overlap in the City. *(Multidisciplinary teams administered by County Health Agency)*

- Strategies B7 and E8 will provide 3,747 units serving approximately 11,240 households *(1,000 units administered by County Health Agency)*

- 424 shelter beds funded in FY16-17 are in the Measure H request, to be full funded through strategy E8
| Permanent Housing | Rapid Re-housing: Supplements ESG funding to provide rapid re-housing assistance to 35 families | Strategy B3 request includes 3,901 units of RRH to serve 5,500 households of which approximately 4,400 households overlap in the City. Strategy D7 requests creating 2,500 units of permanent supportive housing |

1 The City’s 2015-2016 budget included funding for 1,157 beds at 14-hour operations. The City’s 2016-2017 budget expanded the number of beds by 496 and converted 95% of all city funded beds to 24-hour operations.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – IMPLEMENTATION OF A COORDINATED VISION ZERO/STREET RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on how a coordinated Vision Zero/street reconstruction program could be successfully implemented through the outreach, planning, and project delivery process, using the Vision Zero Action Plan to drive project selection and prioritization. The Department’s response is attached.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
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Question No. 349

Attachment
DATE: May 3, 2017

TO: Budget and Finance Committee
    c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
    Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

FROM: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
       Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 349

QUESTION

DOT, with the assistance of Engineering and Street Services, to report on how a coordinated Vision Zero/street reconstruction program could be successfully implemented through the outreach, planning, and project delivery process, using the Vision Zero Action Plan to drive project selection and prioritization.

RESPONSE

As part of the City’s Vision Zero Action Plan, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) identified 40 corridors for targeted safety improvements; assembled design teams from throughout the agency; and contracted with consultants and community based organizations to assist with outreach and design. As a result, in the next few months, LADOT will have conceptual designs for safety improvements along these high priority corridors.

For the coordinated Vision Zero/street reconstruction program in Fiscal Year 2018, Bureau of Engineering (BOE) has indicated that the primary criteria in developing the work plan are streets in the poorest condition and on a Vision Zero Priority Corridor along the HIN. Once these streets are identified, LADOT will hand off its conceptual designs to BOE, and BOE and LADOT will begin the design and coordination necessary to execute the street re-construction program. As part of this integrated design process, BOE expects to incorporate stormwater treatments where appropriate.

SJR/ME:na

c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – POLICE TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Information Technology Agency to report on the cost to replace the telephone systems at all of the City’s Police stations. The Department’s response is attached.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of replacing the telephone systems at 26 Police facilities is $2,901,050. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, offsetting General Fund revenue or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Paul Krekorian  
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee  
City Hall, Room 460

Richard Llewellyn, City Administrative Officer

From: Ted Ross, General Manager  
Information Technology Agency

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE QUESTION 418 – FY 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET

Pursuant to the FY 2017-18 Council budget hearing, the following response is provided regarding ITA's proposed replacement of phone systems at 22 LAPD stations.

Question No. 418: Report back on the cost to replace the phone systems at all 22 Police stations?

The cost to replace the land lines with cloud-hosted Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) phones at the 26 LAPD facilities (including the Police Admin Building, Valley Dispatch, the Detention Center and the Bomb Squad facility) is $2,901,050. This includes needed phones, phone installation and configuration, pulling cable (where necessary), and required network infrastructure.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – 2017-18 SHELTER BEDS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) to report on how many shelter beds are available in the City and County for pregnant women and women who have recently given birth. Additionally, the Committee asked how this information is factored into the Measure H request. Of particular note in LAHSA’s memo, attached, is a discussion regarding recently expanded participant eligibility for family shelters, the conversion of shelter operations from 14 to 24 hours, new mothers receiving highest priority for shelter access, and a request to create 375 additional units of family shelter using Measure H funds.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee

Richard Llewellyn
City Administrative Officer

From: Peter Lynn, Executive Director
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RE: Budget and Finance Committee Budget Reports – Question No. 270

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority was requested by the Budget and Finance Committee to report back on the following question concerning the FY17-18 budget.

_question: How many shelter beds are available in the City and County for pregnant women and women who have recently given birth? How is this factored into the Measure H request?

The City of Los Angeles does not fund beds specifically set-aside for pregnant women or women who have recently given birth. However, there are 63 beds in the City specifically set aside for Transitional Age Youth (Age 18-24) single parenting mothers. In addition, there are 753 beds dedicated for all families (including single parents) within the Coordinated Entry System that are expecting and women who have recently given birth.

LAHSA along with the Department of Public Social Services recently expanded participant eligibility for family shelters, which allows programs to begin serving pregnant women earlier on in pregnancy. Women are now eligible for family shelter upon entering second trimester or being identified with a high-risk pregnancy. Getting women into programs earlier allows family programs more time to secure permanent, safe and stable housing before giving birth.

Through City Homeless Initiative Strategy 7A and County Strategy EB, shelter beds have been transformed to operate a bridge housing model. This allowed shelter operations to be converted from 14-hours to 24-hours. Shelters that are accessible and allow participants to remain in a safe environment throughout the day are better suited to serve pregnant women and women who have recently given birth. Funding is being recommended through the Measure H programs to ensure continued funding for those expanded operations accomplished through one-time funds.

Women that have recently given birth and are experiencing homelessness are given highest priority for shelter access. Women who are hesitant to access the shelter
system are provided with the option of using a motel voucher while working to secure permanent housing.

Through the Measure H planning process there is a request to create 375 additional units of family shelter. Increased capacity for family shelter is intended to ensure that families and pregnant women experiencing homelessness are able to obtain shelter the same day they present needing support.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – LINKAGE FEE REVENUES

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget for the Unappropriated Balance (UB), the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether there should be a line item in the UB for Linkage Fee revenues above the $10 million included in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Currently the Proposed Affordable Housing Mitigation Impact Fee (Linkage Fee) is pending before the Housing Committee and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee (C.F. 17-0274). If the City Council proceeds with the proposed fee, revenues may exceed the $10 million assumed in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget.

If revenues exceed $10 million from the Linkage Fee, an appropriation to the UB is not required. However the City Council may, at its discretion, provide an appropriation in the UB to be backed by Linkage Fee revenues.

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: EXHIBIT H – INCLUSION OF VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONS IN EXHIBIT H

During its consideration of EXHIBIT H in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on adding various instructions to Exhibit H. The following instructions are provided as requested, along with the related fiscal impacts.

1. Request the City Attorney to expeditiously prepare and present an ordinance providing the Board of Recreation and Parks Commissioners with authority to keep restrooms of the Board’s choosing at Venice Beach open 24 hours per day all year long.

   FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

   No additional fiscal impact is anticipated for 2017-18 as the funding for the 24-hour restroom access is already included in the Proposed Budget (See Recreation and Parks Blue Book No. 26).

2. Request the Los Angeles Housing Authority to re-issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the management and operation of a Safe Parking Program modeled after the framework of the program in the City of Santa Barbara.

   FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

   The fiscal impact for the management and operation of a Safe Parking Program cannot be quantified at this time. Costs can be identified upon selection of a contractor.

3. Instruct the City Administrative Officer (CAO), the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), and the Department of Transportation to develop a Five-Year Plan to end the General Fund and the Bureau of Street Services’ reliance on specific transportation funds (i.e., Proposition A, Proposition C, Measure M, Measure R, and Special Parking Revenue Fund).

   FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

   There is no fiscal impact from the adoption of this instruction at this time as it is a report back. However, should this plan be implemented, there will likely be a negative fiscal impact to the General Fund in future years in an amount unknown at this time.
4. That the City Council adopt a policy directing that 50 percent of Measure M local return funds be dedicated to the implementation of Vision Zero projects to end traffic fatalities on High Injury Network Streets by 2025.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no new General Fund impact from changing the allocation of resources within the Measure M special fund. However, this may impact other projects or programs.

RHL:MDG:01170062c

Question No. 548
May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: HUMAN RESOURCE BENEFITS - POLICE SWORN ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE PREVENTION AND RESOLUTION PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Human Resource Benefit’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on whether the Police sworn Alternative Dispute Prevention and Resolution (ADR) program is fully funded in the Proposed Budget.

Subsequent to the release of the Proposed Budget, the City and Los Angeles Police Protective League have approved and signed the ADR Program Agreement, which will become effective upon approval of the California Department of Industrial Relations. Once state approval of the ADR program is obtained, the Personnel Department will conduct a competitive procurement process for the various components of the program with an estimated implementation period of approximately one year. Based on this timeframe, it is unlikely that the ADR program will be operational in 2017-18 and no funding was included in the Proposed Budget.

In the Personnel Department’s letter to the Budget and Finance Committee, the Department requested funding to implement the program be placed in the Unappropriated Balance and provided a preliminary estimate of $3.25 million annually, which consists of Agreed-Medical-Legal Examiner Network ($1 million), Member Advocates ($150,000), ADR Coordinator ($250,000), Mediators ($200,000), and Arbitrators ($450,000). The pending ADR Program Agreement creates a formal Working Group to oversee the defined terms and conditions of the ADR program. The proposed funding levels should be reevaluated once the Agreement is executed, the Working Group has established the policies and defined terms of the program, and a competitive procurement process is completed.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding the Personnel’s request for the Police sworn Alternative Dispute Prevention and Resolution Program is $3.25 million. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:JJ/01170057

Question No. 151
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL AND LAPD VALLEY STATIONS

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Information Technology Agency to report on the transition plan to address telephone carrier’s elimination of support for the City’s telephone landlines in 2020, including the timeline to replace the telephone systems in four Police Stations in the Valley. The Department’s response is attached.

Replacing existing telephone systems with Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) systems at four Police Stations (Devonshire, Foothill, Mission and Van Nuys) would require an appropriation of $684,000. The Information Technology Agency anticipates that this work would be completed by June 30, 2018.

Currently, there are bond proceeds remaining within the Proposition Q General Obligation Bond Fund that may be used to fund a portion of this project. The infrastructure costs for the replacement ($387,000) would be an eligible use for this funding. The remaining cost, $297,000, would require a General Fund appropriation.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of replacing the telephone systems at four Police stations is $297,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, offsetting General Fund revenue or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified. The remaining balance of funding required to fully fund this project, $387,000, could be provided by Proposition Q. Proposition Q funds are General Obligation Bond Funds and there is no General Fund impact associated with using this funding.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Paul Krekorian
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
City Hall, Room 460

Subject: RESPONSE TO BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE QUESTION 419 -- FY 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET

Pursuant to the FY 2017-18 Council budget hearing, the following response is provided regarding ITA's proposed transition from current phone land lines:

Question No. 419: Report back on the transition plan for addressing AT&T and Verizon eliminating support for the City’s telephone land lines? Include the timeline to replace the failing phone systems in 4 Valley LAPD stations (Van Nuys, Foothill, Devonshire, and Granada Hills). Include use of VoIP and a timeline for completion in 2017-18.

The City uses traditional phone (POTS) land lines for 30,000 staff in over 500 facilities, but the carriers have announced that they will discontinue traditional phone (POTS) lines in 2020. Further, these phone systems are showing an increased number of outages each year - 12 percent more this year than last year - with the current average at 922 phone outages per month. In order to provide reliable voice communications for City staff and facilities, these City phone systems must be replaced.

The cornerstone of ITA’s POTS replacement project is the Mobile Worker Plan. Providing smartphones for the majority of City workers to replace their desk phones has the following advantages:

1. Improves staff mobility & access to info (“knowledge workers”)
2. Improves staff safety during emergencies & disaster response
3. Accelerates transition from failing phone system
4. Reduces demands on City network infrastructure since maintenance and repair of the cellular network are supported by the cell providers.

For those workers who manage multiple lines, or those situations where a desk phone is shared by multiple users, ITA will implement Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), the
current technology for the desktop, used by 85+% of businesses. VoIP desk phones transmit over the City's data network, so maintenance and repair would fall to City staff, and for some locations, the City would need to install additional network hardware to handle increased bandwidth requirements.

The cost benefits of the Mobile Worker Plan are significant compared to the cost to implement all VoIP desk phones citywide. The cost to purchase and configure a VoIP desk phone is $270 with an on-going $15/monthly service. In addition, network upgrade costs to support VoIP technology may add up to $85,000 per stand-alone facility for the hardware and labor to install it. This is compared to $60 to acquire the smartphone, with a $13/monthly service, with the vendor absorbing the costs to improve cellular coverage. This is more than 73% less expensive to implement and 13% less expensive per month.

It is important to note that, while the Mobile Worker Plan will prevent the loss of phone systems in 2020 at a dramatically reduced costs while creating a more efficient workforce, the overall cost for the service will still exceed the monthly costs the City presently pays for land lines (the City already invested millions of dollars in phone infrastructure in the past). Savings are derived from avoided costs for replacement devices and infrastructure, as well as reductions in maintenance requirements.

ITA's Mobile Worker Plan proposes migrating ~20,000 of the City's workforce to smartphones, with ~10,000 to VoIP desk phones. Of the estimated 10,000 VoIP desk phones, approximately 9,400 would go to LAPD stations.

The Department requests $684K to migrate the first four LAPD stations to VoIP. The timeline to migrate these approximately 1,100 phones to VoIP desk phones would be:

- Van Nuys: 7/1/2017 - 9/30/2017
- Foothill: 9/1/2017 - 12/31/2017
- Devonshire: 12/1/2017 - 3/31/2018
- Granada Hills: 3/1/2018 - 6/30/2018

Additionally, the Department requests $100K to begin implementing the mobile worker plan, starting with those employees with the most expensive land lines.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – ADDITIONAL RESOURCES NEEDED FOR STRIPING CREWS FOR THE STREET RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the additional resources necessary for the DOT striping crews to maintain the current 7-10 day turnaround given the proposed increase in the street reconstruction program. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department reports that a total of 12 new positions (6 positions per crew) would be required to maintain a 7-10 day turnaround to meet the workload associated with the proposed street reconstruction program. These positions would create one new mark-out crew and one new striping crew. The Department requests additional time to work with other involved Departments to develop a more accurate estimate of required resources. Resources required for equipment have not been included.

This Office has estimated the costs for all positions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Direct Cost (12 mos)</th>
<th>Indirect Cost (Add/Delete)</th>
<th>Total (12 mos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Paint &amp; Sign Poster III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$75,581</td>
<td>$35,190</td>
<td>$443,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Paint &amp; Sign Poster II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$66,670</td>
<td>$32,636</td>
<td>$397,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Laborer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$54,396</td>
<td>$29,118</td>
<td>$334,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2 crews)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,174,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The fiscal impact of adding 12 months of funding for these positions is $1,174,364, including both direct and indirect costs. Should these positions be funded, offsetting revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:IR:06170119

Question No. 340

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 340

QUESTION

DOT, with assistance of the CAO, to report on the additional resources necessary for the DOT striping crews to maintain the current 7-10 day turnaround given the proposed increase in the street reconstruction program.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) requires additional resources in order to maintain a seven to ten day striping turnaround in order to support a new Street Reconstruction Program.

Under a separate budget memo (No. 174), the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) reports that the expenditure plan and timeline for a Street Reconstruction Program is currently under development. It is important that LADOT base its striping plan and required resources on the work program set forth through this coordinated effort. As examples, critical components required for the identification of needed resources include: 1) the number of lane miles in the annual program; 2) the number of crews used by BSS to perform the reconstruction; and 3) the timeline of reconstruction for each location.

LADOT estimated that an average striping cost for a typical three-lane street is approximately $35,000 per centerline mile, or roughly $12,000 per lane mile. As a comparison, LADOT's costs, comprised of field staff and contractors, for the Pavement Preservation Program are nearly $25 million, or about $10,400 per lane mile. In this Program, however, 70 percent of the streets receive slurry treatments and have uncomplicated markings. Recent cost estimates for striping on more complicated streets is approximately $50,000 to $60,000 per centerline mile. It is expected that many of the streets in the Street Reconstruction Program will be large, complicated streets requiring many pavement markings.

At a minimum, LADOT anticipates the need for one additional mark out crew and one striping crew. Each of these crews are comprised of two Traffic Paint and Sign Poster III positions, two Traffic Paint and Sign Poster II positions, and two Maintenance Laborers, for a total of twelve positions.
At this time, LADOT requests additional time to work with the Bureau of Engineering and the BSS to establish the work plan and develop an accurate assessment of striping needs for the new 2017-18 Street Reconstruction Program.

SJR/ME

c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION

During consideration of the Board of Public Works (Board) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Board to report back on additional staffing and resources needed for the Office of Petroleum and Natural Gas Administration and Safety (OPNGAS), as well as additional funding sources and revenue.

The Board has submitted the attached memorandum asking for an additional $600,000 for contractual services and $261,003 in salaries and expenses to provide the following services in 2017-18:

- Renegotiate long term Franchise Agreements with 50 entities;
- Prepare an Oil and Gas Infrastructure Inventory Report;
- Risk assessment of idle and orphan wells within the City;
- Prepare an Oil Drill Site Setback and Amortization Study;
- Conduct fee studies of oil drill sites, idle wells, refineries, inspections, and pipelines fees; and
- Conduct Citywide Methane and Public Health Assessment.

In its 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Board requested $600,000 for contractual services, which was not approved. The Board estimated the cost of each contract, and this Office does not have clear understanding of basis of these estimates at this time. Also the contracting procedure in the City, going through RFP process, bidding, contract negotiation and execution, takes a minimum of six months. This Office is not convinced that $600,000 is required in 2017-18. An alternative to the Board’s request could be a $200,000 appropriation in the Unappropriated Fund.

In its 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Board also requested twelve-months funding and regular authority for six positions to staff the OPNGAS. Due to the City’s fiscal constraints, only four positions with nine-months funding were approved. We would note that the Board is now requesting nine-months funding and regular authority for one Environmental Affairs Officer that was not part of its original request. We have insufficient information and time to adequately evaluate the need for this new request. Therefore, the Council could instruct this Office to report back to the Budget and Finance Committee in ninety days with a comprehensive analysis of the OPNGAS staffing and resource needs.
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of the Board’s request is $861,003 in direct and $100,803 in indirect costs. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenues or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:RA:06170126

Question No. 164

Attachment
Date: May 2, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
   Richard H. Llewellyn, Interim City Administrative Officer
From: Kevin James, President, Board of Public Works
Subject: 2017-18 BUDGET MEMOS – QUESTION 164 – OFFICE OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS ADMINISTRATION AND SAFETY

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Board of Public Works (Board) to report on additional staffing and resource needs for the Office of Petroleum and Natural Gas Administration and Safety (OPNGAS), as well as potential funding sources and revenue. In order to meet the anticipated workload for the Office, the concept of a fully staffed OPNGAS would include the following changes and additions to the Proposed Budget at a total additional cost of $861,003.

- $97,743 - Add nine months funding and regular authority for one (1) Environmental Affairs Officer (Class Code: 7320) in Petroleum Administration;
- $60,823 - Add nine months funding and regular authority for one (1) Management Analyst (Class Code: 9184) in the Franchise Agreement and Contract Administration section;
- Unfunded (No Cost) – Replace the one (1) Senior Management Analyst (SMA) I with a SMA II, subject to paygrade determination by the CAO Employee Relations Division;
- $102,437 - Add three months funding to the existing nine months funding for three positions included in the Proposed Budget to hire and begin work in July 2017 instead of October 2017; and
- $600,000 – Add one-time funding for consultant services to provide supplemental technical expertise for the OPNGAS.

Proposed Environmental Affairs Officer (Class Code 7320)

The Environmental Affairs Officer will be engaged in the technical environmental affairs related to oil fields and refineries, such as California Environmental Quality Act compliance, public health, noise, climate change, air and water quality, hazardous substance and solid waste management, wastewater and storm water management, pollution prevention, site assessment and remediation, methods, controls, and technologies to mitigate pollution and other environmental impacts. This position will review proposed environmental regulation, legislation, and policies, and ensures that the City and its operations are complying with applicable environmental laws and regulations. This position will also assist the Petroleum Administration functions by managing oil and gas issues, liabilities related to thousands of improperly abandoned oil wells across City, and numerous oil spills and volatile organic compounds (VOC's) emitting from oil drill sites in South LA, West LA and in Wilmington.
The addition of this position would also allow for the following activities:

- Oil and Gas Infrastructure Inventory Report;
- Risk assessment of idle and orphan wells within the City;
- Community & Operator Workshops on oil and gas activity within the City;
- Our LA 2040 General Plan Update for inclusion of public health, safety, water and energy sections related to oil and gas operations Citywide;
- Formalize Community stakeholders relationship and expand public participation;
- Environmental assessments and inspections for compliance soil, geotechnical, water and air regulations which could lead to fines, penalties or new fees;
- Formalize Regulatory Liaison with local, regional, state, and federal oil and gas regulators, including coordination of public health impact assessment;
- Lead a regional oil and gas regulator's working group for Los Angeles Basin; and,
- Additional support for Local, State, and Federal Policy legislation impacts.

**Proposed Management Analyst (Code 9184) and Sr. Management Analyst II (Code 9171-2)**

The Franchise and Contract Administration (FCA) section, overseen by the Petroleum Administrator, is responsible for overseeing and monitoring the City's franchise agreements, including acting as lead negotiator and reporting on evaluation of oil, gas, and electric utility fees. In the Proposed Budget, the one SMA I would continue work in renewing franchise agreements at previously established rates, billing and collection of revenues.

Upgrading the SMA I to a paygrade II would allow for the more complex analysis needed to update formulas and rate structures for oil and gas leases consistent with the market and current best practices. Based on lessons learned during the hiring of our City's Petroleum Administrator, having the proper classification in these critical and unique positions is important. Otherwise, the Board may be required to return to the City Council to change the classification during the fiscal year, which impacts the operations effectiveness. The proposed upgrade (Class Code 9171-2) should be subject to paygrade determination. Further, one MA (Class Code 9184) position is requested to assist in performing benchmarking studies, collecting data, researching standards set forth by Federal and State rules and regulations, and establishing policies and procedures on leasing oil and gas production. These two positions would also assist in negotiating with those requesting drilling rights or oil leases to determine the minimum price of oil, production suspension, abandonment, and other protective provisions to be included in leases of City-owned land for exploration and to determine the terms on which bids are to be requested. These positions would also allow the OPNGAS to make progress on the following:

- Comprehensive Update of Los Angeles Municipal Oil Code;
- Fee studies of oil drill sites, idle wells, refineries, inspections, and pipelines fees;
- Professional Land Analysis of City's royalty interests and verification of payments;
- Re-Evaluate & Modernize the Construction Site Review Permits of Abandonment Wells;
- Oil Well and Drilling Bond Management;
- Data Management of Oil District, Drilling Permits & Inspection Records; and,
- Request for online drilling permitting process and data.
Additional funding for positions included in Proposed Budget

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget included only partial funding for the Petroleum Administrator position, or Utility Rates and Policy Specialist III. The Board is requesting to add back the $30,000 reduction from this position’s salary, which is equivalent to three months funding for this existing, filled position.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget also provides nine months funding for three new positions which would allow the Board to hire and begin work in October 2017. This is an additional three month deferral, for a total of nine months since the Board originally anticipated beginning the work of the OPNGAS in January 2017 (C.F. 15-0387).

Supplemental Technical Expertise

In order to supplement the OPNGAS with technical expertise for specific one-time studies, it may be more advantageous to hire outside consultants on an as-needed basis. Some issues that may be studied include:

- **$300,000 - Oil Drill Site Setback and Amortization Study**: A law firm will need to be retained to assist the OPNGAS on existing and proposed non-conforming use regulations as they relate to termination procedures for oil and gas-related uses. Under California law, a municipality may require termination of a legal nonconforming use by one of two “constitutionally equivalent alternatives: it can eliminate the use immediately by payment of just compensation, or it can require removal of the use without compensation following a reasonable amortization period.” This study will also consider recent estimates of potential abandonment and relocation costs and determine the amortization period. It will make certain economic assumptions used in the analysis, extend the analysis to include historical information and develop forecasts for investment costs and revenue from 2017 through 2030. There are 23 oil fields that intersect the City boundaries and nearly a dozen different operators who will need to participate in the study.

- **$150,000 - City Wide Methane and Public Health Assessment**: Methane is the primary component of natural gas, and the oil and gas industry is the nation’s largest industrial source of methane emissions. Methane escaping during the production, delivery and use of natural gas can undermine the climate benefit natural gas has over other fossil fuels because methane traps heat in the atmosphere much more effectively relative to carbon dioxide, especially over the short term. In fact, it is 84 times more potent than CO2 in the first 20 years after it is released. The Citywide study will need to examine the methane buffer zone, active oil drill sites, abandoned oil fields, gas storage fields and multiple technical monitoring systems. This assessment findings will be integrated into a City-wide health impact study.

- **$150,000 - Pipeline franchise agreement audits**.
Funding Sources and Revenue

A franchise fee is paid to the City as compensation for the occupancy of a portion of the street subsurface, and in 2016-17, the revenue budget for franchise fees is $16.9 million. This includes Electric Line, Gas, and Pipelines only. The franchise fees for Electric Line and Gas are all deposited as General Fund revenue. In accordance with Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 5.500, oil pipeline franchise fees are deposited as follows:

- 50 percent of all oil pipeline franchise fees are placed in the General Fund;
- 25 percent of all oil pipeline franchise fees are equally distributed to each of the 15 Council District (CD) Real Property Trust Funds (RPTF); and,
- 25 percent of all oil pipeline franchise fees are distributed to each CD RPTF based on the amount of pipeline footage located within the CD.

Therefore, petroleum-related functions and staffing is funded by the General Fund. Exhibit H of the Proposed Budget includes a statement to "Disapprove any proposed Ordinance amendments (C.F. 15-0387) that would delete references to the word 'oil' from the Los Angeles Administrative Code Chapter 100, Section 5.500, to prevent a reduction in General Fund revenue on an ongoing basis."

Although there would be no changes in the 2017-18 Budget, there is a potential for additional revenue in future years based on potential enhancements:

1. Franchise rate setting and negotiations;
2. Contracting of industry experts to assist in the financial audits of utility accounting to establish the appropriate framework for negotiations to enhance safety requirements and compliance and financial reporting;
3. If new state legislation is needed to allow for the appropriate funding formula changes to remedy environmental justice issues, then the City Council could explore this option further;
4. Another variable to consider is the pending court decision regarding a potential surcharge to be added to the SCG franchise fee. There is an appeal in the case of Rolland Jacks vs. City of Santa Barbara, which involves a surcharge collected for general revenue purposes under a franchise agreement. The appeals court ruled that the surcharge, although approved by the PUC, was not part of the franchise as the city asserted but rather it was a tax. The trial court considered whether the additional one (1%) percent surcharge was part of this franchise fee or a tax, in accordance with Proposition 218 and Proposition 26.
5. Lastly, another option is to dedicate 10 percent, or $1.5 million of franchise revenues to the OPNGAS.

Ultimately, any final decision regarding the potential re-distribution of the current level of franchise income is a policy decision with appropriate input from the Office of the City Attorney.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – FIRE BOAT MAINTENANCE COST RECOVERY

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the CAO to report on the prior-year costs of fire boat maintenance at the Harbor Department. The CAO was to include whether the City can recover any of these costs, and if not, what is currently outstanding.

The Fire Department (Fire) has reported the following fire boat maintenance expenditures and estimated costs, totaling $2,059,391:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>$172,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$0 (no contract maintenance work performed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$0 (no contract maintenance work performed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>$52,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>$534,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>$1,300,000 (projected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the above expenditures between FY 2011-12 through FY 2015-16 were submitted to the Harbor Department for reimbursement and no payment was received. Fire believes these costs are fully reimbursable and plans to submit a request for reimbursement of these expenditures at year-end.

According to Fire, the City Attorney has interpreted that, under Article 9 of the MOU, the Harbor Department should provide reimbursement for contract fire boat maintenance. The MOU between the Harbor Department and the City establishes if there is a billing dispute, the matter should be brought to the CAO and Mayor for resolution.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of receiving reimbursement for the outstanding fire boat maintenance costs is $2,059,391.
During its consideration of the Personnel Department’s (Department) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee (Committee) requested the Department to report on the historical number of Police and Fire applicants, and how recruitment funding provided in prior years has impacted the number of applicants. In addition, the Committee requested a report on efforts to partner with other agencies to obtain free advertising, such as Public Service Announcements. The Department’s response is attached, which includes a request for an additional $445,000 in recruitment expense funding.

The Department’s response does not include the historical number of Police and Fire applications received. However, the Department provided the following information separately.

### Table 1 Police Applications and Effect of Recruitment Funds on Successful Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications Received</th>
<th>Recruitment Funding</th>
<th>Successful Applicants</th>
<th>Percentage of Successful Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>7,861</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17 (end of April 2017)</td>
<td>5,157</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>517*</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes class hired for the May Academy but not the June Academy

### Table 2 Fire Applications and Effect of Recruitment Funds on Applicant Diversity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>Percentage Change from Prior Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>(5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Funding*</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$724,500*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes base budget and supplemental one-time recruitment funding. Funds are also used to support various youth programs that educate participants on fire science and introduce them to the field of firefighting.

** Combines recruitment funding received in 2015-16 ($455,000) and 2016-17 ($269,500). The application period began in 2015-16, and the testing period ended in 2016-17.
Table 3 Increase in Diversity among Eligible Fire Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>Percentage Change from Prior Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>102.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Filipino</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>121.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact to restore the recruitment expense funding to the 2016-17 Adopted Budget level would be an additional $445,000. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:LC:11170058c

Question No. 94

Attachment
May 3, 2017

The Honorable Members of the Budget & Finance Committee
c/o Erika Pulst
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attn: Leah Chu, City Administrative Office

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE QUESTION 94

The Committee asked the Department for a report back of historical data on the number of Police and Fire applicants and funding.

Question No. 94: Provide historical data on the number of Police and Fire applicants and how recruitment funding provided in prior years has impacted the number of applicants. In addition, report on efforts to partner with other agencies to obtain free advertising, such as PSAs.

LAPD: Prior to the recession, when unemployment was low, the allocation for LAPD recruitment was frequently over $1,000,000, even surpassing $3,000,000 one year. After the recession, recruitment funding was a fraction of those figures, remaining at $185,000 for FYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15. For the corresponding years, hiring dipped from 413 to 303, and then went even lower to 280, before increasing to 450 and 499.

For the current fiscal year, additional allocations of $115,000 in the Mayor's Proposed Budget and $270,000 by Council allowed for a number of achievements:

- Development of a brand-new marketing campaign – the first in a decade;
- Investment of over $50,000 in recruitment equipment (canopies, banners, cellular telephones), promotional materials, and distant travel (e.g., out-of-town military bases);
- Continuing shift to digital advertising (via social media and streaming music services) which allows for geo-targeting of millennials;
- Diversity outreach to under-represented groups, such as African-American candidates and female Asian-American candidates;
- Leveraging of innovative technology – such as virtual reality – as recruitment tools.
As a result, not only will this year’s hiring exceed 500 for the first time since the recession, it is actually on track to reach 565; the increase exceeds the size of an entirely-full Academy class. Moreover, we have already tested this year 702 expedited candidates (who complete multiple test parts in a single week) and may test as many as 900 before the end of June, compared to 638 last year.

Restoring the higher levels of recruitment funding is imperative to promote the LAPD brand during a period of increased competition from other law enforcement agencies (including Border Patrol); challenges posed by media coverage of police in the post-Ferguson era; and the changes required of recruitment in the millennial age – namely, the need for innovative technology in outreach and hiring efforts.

LAFD: The base budget of $105,000 that had been in effect for LAFD recruitment in FYs 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 was enhanced by $350,000 in FY 2015-16 when Firefighter testing resumed after a lengthy hiatus. This amount was reduced to $175,000 in FY 2016-17 and earmarked for diversity outreach. To maximize its use and impact, we extended the Firefighter application deadline by five months. Over that stretch of time, aside from supporting LAFD’s recruitment section through the purchase of equipment and promotional materials, the funds allowed for four niche campaigns targeting African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic, and female candidates by running ads, sponsored content, or videos on websites and in publications serving those under-represented groups, such as LA Focus, Kore.am, La Opinion, and ESPN-W, respectively. (The funds further made possible a promotional deal with the L.A. Sparks women’s basketball team).

The results were striking: over 2,650 additional diverse candidates joined the applicant pool during the extension period alone.

Free Advertising: We already utilize a number of strategies to secure free advertising or to negotiate added value to our outreach spending. For instance,

- In developing LAFD’s “Wear Your Strength on Your Sleeve” campaign, we obtained certain pro bono services from the firm of Quigley Simpson; we developed the “Choose LAPD” campaign in-house by tapping the talents of the department’s seasoned graphic designers.
- Upon the launch of the new LAPD campaign, we held a press conference and obtained news coverage through several outlets, including KNBC and Univision.
- We leveraged City assets by hanging banners at City parks and on street light poles, running PSAs on DASH buses, and recruiting at City venues, like the Greek Theatre.
- Our advertising deals included value-added features (e.g., extra billboards and posters on bus tails), plus additional time if the platforms were not committed to other advertisers upon expiration of our contracts.

Outlook for FY 2017-18 Free Advertising: Efforts to partner with other agencies and private entities for donated services or matched funds will be widened in the coming fiscal year, especially with regard to the use of innovative technology.
Requested Funds: Below is a review for how FY 2017-18 funds will be spent.

$445,000 in Restorations
- Digital advertising on social media and through streaming music services; geotargeting of millennial candidates.
- Purchases of necessary equipment and promotional materials; travel outside of five-county area for recruitment.
- Larger-item ad buys (e.g., billboards) in strategic locations informed by data; promotional deals with sports teams (e.g., L.A. Sparks).
- Enhanced diversity outreach.
- Completion of two VR modules.
- Redesign of JoinLAPD website.
- Implementation of Virtual Mentor portal to expedite processing of candidates through electronic notifications, reminders, prep videos, and tips for success. The portal is expected to reduce lapse rates by at least 5% at various steps of the testing process.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (213) 473-3470 or Susan Nakafuji at (213) 473-9120.

WENDY G. MACY
General Manager
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

EXHIBIT H - POLICE SWORN ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROGRAM

During its consideration of Exhibit H in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on providing six months of funding in the Unappropriated Balance for an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Coordinator to finalize negotiations on the Police sworn Workers’ Compensation ADR program and initiate the state approval process.

Based on estimates from the Personnel Department, the cost for six-months funding for the ADR Coordinator is $125,000. The ADR Program Agreement between the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Police Protective League is effective upon approval of the California Department of Industrial Relations. Once state approval of the ADR program is obtained, the Personnel Department will conduct a competitive procurement process for the various components of the program, including the ADR Coordinator, with an estimated implementation period of approximately one year. Based on this timeframe, it is unlikely that the ADR program will be operational in 2017-18 and no funding was included in the Proposed Budget.

The pending Agreement creates a formal Working Group to establish policies and manage the implementation of the ADR program. The ADR Coordinator will be responsible for administrative oversight of the dispute prevention and resolution process, including attending all Working Group meetings and assisting in gathering and submitting data required to be provided to the state as required by law. These duties may begin before the formal implementation of the full ADR program and as such may be appropriate to fund prior to the other components of the program.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of providing six-months funding for the Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinator is $125,000. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ANIMAL SERVICES – IMPEDIMENTS IN HIRING ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICERS AND REQUIRED RESOURCES

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Animal Services to report on the impediments experienced in hiring Animal Control Officers, including any issues related to the Personnel Department, background checks, testing, and certified lists. In addition, the Committee requested the Department to report on necessary resources to hire additional Animal Control Officers in 2017-18, including funds necessary or contract services.

The Department’s response is attached, which includes detailed information regarding the impediments that the Department has experienced with hiring Animal Control Officers.

The Department reports that 24 vacancies exist in the Animal Control Officer I position class which is due primarily to hiring delays. The funding required to fill 24 Animal Control Officer I positions is $2,348,257, which consists of $1,572,816 in direct salary costs and $775,441 in related costs. The 2017-18 Proposed Budget includes a total reduction to the Department’s Salaries General account in the amount of $1,552,601.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of filling 24 Animal Control Officer I positions will cost $2,348,257, which consists of $1,572,816 in direct salary costs and $775,441 in related costs. Should funding be restored for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:FGO:04170111
Question No. 426
Attachment
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Felicia Orozco, Office of the City Administrative Officer
200 N. Spring Street, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: QUESTION NO. 426 - REPORT ON THE IMPEDIMENTS THE DEPARTMENT HAS EXPERIENCED IN HIRING ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICERS, INCLUDING ANY ISSUES RELATED TO THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT, SUCH AS ISSUES WITH BACKGROUND CHECKS, TESTING OPPORTUNITIES, AND LACK OF A CURRENT CERTIFIED LIST. AS THIS IS AN EMPLOYEE SAFETY ISSUE AND ONE THAT INCREASES THE CITY'S LIABILITY, REPORT ON THE RESOURCES NECESSARY TO HIRE ADDITIONAL ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICERS IN 2017-18, INCLUDING FUNDS NECESSARY FOR ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTS OR CONTRACT SERVICES

SUMMARY

The Department Personnel Ordinance contains 24 authorized Animal Control Officer (ACO) position authorities that are currently vacant due to hiring delays. However, the Mayor's proposed 2017-18 budget does not provide any funding to hire any of these officers. The direct salary necessary to hire these 24 Animal Control Officers for a full year is $1,549,584. The related cost would be approximately $2,169,418 for a total cost of $3,719,002. The impediments we have encountered preventing hiring these officers and the remedial actions we have requested are summarized below.

BACKGROUND

The Department of Animal Services has been working on recruiting and hiring Animal Control Officers for well over a year. The City allocated a total of 24 new Animal Control Officer (ACO) positions over two budget cycles. These positions are necessary for adequate field deployment and appropriate response times to critical calls for service.

The current Department Personnel Ordinance (FY17) authorizes 54 ACO I's and 29 ACO II's for a total of 83 ACO's. Of those 25 are currently vacant (as of 3-18-17). There are 18-22 candidates that are still in some phase of the background process. If cleared they will be scheduled for medical and psychological exams.
The exam for Animal Control Officer opened in July 2015. It was opened as a continuous exam meaning the exam would be given multiple times until a sufficient number of eligibles were on the list. The first test date was in August of 2015. At that time 51 applicants were invited to take the exam. Only 38 of them showed up. Of those only 23 moved on past the physical abilities test. The Personnel Department had another test administration scheduled for October of that year where another 55 applicants were invited. It became clear to Animal Services that the examination schedule was insufficient for our needs and a meeting was arranged with the Examining Division of the Personnel Department. During the meeting we explained our concerns and the Examining Division managers were open to assist. In response they scheduled a number of additional test dates inviting well over 330 candidates. At the end of the testing cycle over 100 candidates had passed all elements of the written and physical exams and were eligible for interview.

After certifying the list, interviewing candidates and making selections, those selected moved on to the Backgrounds portion of the process which is where the real challenge was met. In short, the Personnel Department did not have an active contract for field investigations. As such, they were limited to available City staff to complete the field investigations. Likewise, once the field investigation was completed, it was determined that many of the candidates did not meet the threshold for maturity, integrity, or judgment required for this position. Unfortunately as those candidates were non-selected, they remained on the eligibility list preventing the Department from moving past them and hiring candidates with lower scores. Overall the Department was only able to hire 10 Animal Control Officers from this effort. Five of them have completed training and have been deployed at animal shelters. Two of them terminated employment and three remain in the training program.

Animal Services is working in cooperation with the Personnel Department to make necessary changes to the process. Those changes must be discussed with the affected labor organization but we believe that these changes will make for a more seamless and efficient hiring process to the benefit of both the City as well as the candidates. Until those changes are made, however, we are continuing to work with the process as it currently exists.

Respectfully submitted,

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
General Manager
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY – 2017-18 FUNDING FOR MOBILE SHOWERS AND SAFE PARKING

During its consideration of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) to report on whether the funding proposed for Mobile Showers and Safe Parking is adequate. While LAHSA did not provide a recommended level of funding, the attached memo suggests that additional funding may need to be identified once LAHSA gathers feedback from its pilot programs for both Safe Parking and Mobile Showers and establishes solutions for each that address the City's Comprehensive Homeless Strategies.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:KDU: 02170159

Question No. 277
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee

Richard Llewellyn
City Administrative Officer

From: Peter Lynn, Executive Director
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

RE: Budget and Finance Committee Budget Reports – Question No. 277

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority was requested by the Budget and Finance Committee to report back on the following question concerning the FY17-18 budget.

**Question: Is the funding proposed for Mobile Showers and Safe Parking adequate?**

**Safe Parking**

Beginning with the City’s Comprehensive Homeless Strategy 6B, *Establish Citywide Safe Parking Program* LAHSA has been working to develop a safe parking program able to meet the needs and challenges unique to Los Angeles. In February 2017, LAHSA released a Request for Information (RFI) seeking qualified community based organizations capable of administering a safe parking program following conventional City municipal codes. However, the bids submitted did not meet minimum qualifications or capacity to implement the type and size of program initially intended. Consequently, LAHSA is working to contract with HOPICS to provide a pilot program with 10 parking spots. It would be possible to provide additional Safe Parking locations in Fiscal Year 2017/2018, should there be additional funding made available.

Funding from the 2016-2017 budget for Strategy 6A will support the first two months of operation through the end of the fiscal year. Funding requested in the 2017-2018 budget will support the program through 6/30/2018, with a budget of $347,000. Participants will be assisted with Case Management and Housing Navigation services, including identification, benefits connection, and Temporary Financial Assistance related to repairing vehicles and obtaining state mandated vehicle insurance. Additionally, families will be integrated into the Coordinated Entry System for Families and will be connected to permanent housing resources such as Rapid Rehousing. Data collected during the pilot program will drive future program and funding request decisions, including program expansion.
Mobile Showers

Similarly, the City’s Comprehensive Homeless Strategy 6C, Establish Citywide Mobile Showers and Public Restroom System also calls for LAHSA to fund mobile shower operations serving persons experiencing homelessness across the City. To that end, LAHSA issued an RFI for mobile shower services in February 2017. Of the two vendors who responded, one was not capable of beginning operations by the established program start date, and the other declined to pursue public funding for this year.

LAHSA’s current strategy is to open conversations with the RFI proposer that was not able to meet the original program start date. This proposer has experience providing mobile shower services in other parts of California, but will need financial support to create a new shower trailer in Los Angeles. Purchasing of vehicles and trailers involves significant risk and requires accounting for multi-year maintenance expenses, depreciation, and storage costs. The cost of this equipment is also significantly higher than the current budget would allow. One proposal we received indicated a cost of $650,000 for the purchase of one ADA compliant trailer quipped with three showers, two bathrooms, and one pair of laundry machines.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS – METRO COORDINATOR

During consideration of the Board of Public Works (Board) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on potential funding sources for a new Metro Coordinator and where this position should be housed.

To coordinate with Metro and expedite Measure M regional projects, a Metro Coordinator position can be authorized. Potential funding sources include the following: Measure M, Measure R, Proposition C and Proposition A. This position may be housed at the Board of Public Works to be on neutral ground and have access and authority to expedite regional Metro projects.

A Senior Civil Engineer would be well suited for this position. The total cost for nine-months funding and a regular authority for a Senior Civil Engineer is $159,830, consisting of $110,236 in direct salary costs, $44,594 in related costs, and $5,000 in office expenses. Full year costs are $202,106, consisting of $146,981 in directs costs and $55,125 in related costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Direct Costs (9 months)</th>
<th>Indirect Costs</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Total Cost (9 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$110,236</td>
<td>$44,594</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$159,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The fiscal impact for nine-months funding is $152,625 for both direct and indirect costs and $5,000 for office expense, totaling $157,625. This position can be funded with special funds including Measure M, Measure R, Proposition C and Proposition A. As proposed all the special funds are fully allocated in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional revenues or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified. Subsequent to the submission of the Proposed Budget, DWP proposed to fund the Grandview Ave (8430) Bulkhead project proposed in Measure M. Therefore, $415,000 in Measure M is now available for re-appropriation. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose that exceeds $415,000, additional revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
During its consideration of the Board of Public Works 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office and the Chief Legislative Analyst to report on including the new Senior Accountant I position for Measure M Fund Administration in the Department of Transportation instead of the Board of Public Works.

The City Administrative Officer reports that the Proposed Budget provides for Fund Administration in the Board of Public Works instead of the Department of Transportation because the majority of the expenditures from the Measure M fund in the Mayor's Proposed Budget is for work to be performed by the Bureau of Street Services and Bureau of Engineering in the Department of Public Works. For this reason, placing Fund Administration in the Board of Public Works reduces the cost and complexity of the accounting process. Additionally, the Department of Public Works is one of several critical partners to Metro, provides service daily to Metro, and, is therefore, well positioned to provide support.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY – SALARY ACCOUNT FUNDING RESTORATION

During its consideration of the Information Technology Agency’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on potential funding sources to provide $750,000 and six position authorities requested in the Department’s letter.

The Information Technology Agency is requesting regular authority for six positions: three Communications Engineering Associate III, one Communications Engineer, one Communications Electrician Supervisor, and one Chief Management Analyst. Five of these positions are currently filled, while the Chief Management Analyst was vacated in April 2016. The Department is using the authority for the Chief Management Analyst for an analyst position in-lieu to meet workload needs. Funding for the six positions would require a General Fund appropriation of $1,041,121, which consists of $746,116 in direct costs and $295,005 in related costs.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of adding six regular position authorities is $1,041,121, which consists of $746,116 in direct salary costs and $295,005 in related costs. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:CEA:11170052

Question No. 411
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE – PAVEMENT PRESERVATION

During its consideration of the General Services 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the reduction in the Unappropriated Balance (UB) for Pavement Preservation and whether this funding is backfilled from Measure M or Gas Tax (SB 1) funding.

The 2016-17 Adopted Budget included $2,553,602 in the UB for Pavement Preservation. During 2016-17, those funds were transferred to the General Services Department ($853,602), Bureau of Street Services ($1,575,000), and the Bureau of Engineering ($125,000) to support the overall Pavement Preservation Program.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget discontinues this UB funding for Pavement Preservation. The Bureau of Street Services budget provides 2,200 lane miles for Pavement Preservation and will not require additional funding from the UB. However, the General Services Department is funded to support 1,900 lane miles for Pavement Preservation. In order to provide the required testing support for the 2,200 lane miles, the General Services Department will require an additional $630,000 from the General Fund. Should the Council provide this additional funding, a General Fund offset or additional revenue must be identified.

The Measure M and Gas Tax funds do not provide funding for Pavement Preservation. However, the Proposed Budget allocates a total of $35 million for street reconstruction and Vision Zero from Measure M ($20 million) and Gas Tax ($15 million).

This memorandum is for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:JL:01170059c

Question No. 406
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: ANIMAL SERVICES – DEPARTMENT BUDGET REDUCTION AND IMPACT TO THE NO-KILL RATE

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Animal Services to report on the $365,000 reduction portion to the Department’s budget, and how it will affect the no-kill rate policy goal of the City since positions that support the policy may be left unfunded. The Department’s response is attached.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding this item is $365,000. Should funding be restored for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Felicia Orozco, Office of the City Administrative Officer
200 N. Spring Street, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: QUESTION NO. 456 – REPORT BACK ON THE RECENT $365,000 ADDITIONAL CUT TO THE DEPARTMENT WHICH LEAVES EIGHT POSITIONS UNFILLED RATHER THAN JUST THE TWO ANTICIPATED, AND HOW IT WILL AFFECT SUSTAINING OR INCREASING THE NO-KILL RATE POLICY GOAL OF THE CITY SINCE SOME OF THESE POSITIONS ARE FOR EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

SUMMARY

The Department requests that the proposed reduction of $365,000 not be approved and the funds be restored to the Department’s 2017-18 budget. Reasons are described below.

BACKGROUND

The need for this finding has been mentioned a number of times already by the Department, including in our Report Back No. 426 regarding the impediments in filling vacant Animal Control Officer positions. This proposed $365,000 reduction would require us to leave an additional six to eight positions vacant for the fiscal year. To avoid layoffs that requires a number of actions depending on actions occurring in 2017-18.

(Budget Item #8: an additional $227,000 reduction in the Salaries General Account; Item #9: a reduction of $29,898 in the Contractual Services Account; and Item #10: additional reduction of $108,413 in the Salaries General Account).

Respectfully submitted,

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
General Manager
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT – POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE CHILD SAFETY AND HEALTHY ACCOUNT PROGRAM STUDY

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) report on funding options to conduct the Child Safety and Healthy Account Program study. This study would investigate the potential impacts that the proposed Children's Savings Account (CSA) Program would have on potential program participants and the resources that would be required to effectively implement such a program.

The HCID has determined that the proposed Child Safety and Healthy Account Program study would not be eligible for funding from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) nor other existing special funds. The Department mentioned the potential for funding from foundation, corporate and/or individual funding; however, this would require additional investigation by the Department to identify specific sources. In the absence of the available grant or other special funds, the only other potential funding source is the General Fund. As a policy decision, the Council and Mayor could appropriate additional General Fund to conduct the Child Safety and Healthy Account Program study.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If no grant or other special funds are identified to fund this request, the General Fund impact of conducting the Child Safety and Healthy Account Program study is $150,000. Should this request be supported by the General Fund, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations would need to be identified.

RHL:NSC:21701640

Question No. 241
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

FROM: RUSHMORE D. CERVANTES, GENERAL MANAGER
LOS ANGELES HOUSING + COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

DATE: MAY 3, 2017

REGARDING: LOS ANGELES HOUSING + COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT – BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK FOR QUESTION NO. 241

On April 28, 2017, the Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Los Angeles Housing + Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) to report on funding options for the $150,000 needed for the Child Safety and Healthy Account Program Study.

For the past year, HCIDLA staff has been working with the CLA, CAO, and staff from Councilman David Ryu’s office to develop recommendations for the planning, design phases, and program management of a Children’s Savings Account (CSA) program in the City of Los Angeles.

HCIDLA has also consulted with policy experts from the Center for Enterprise Development (CFED), a national nonprofit based in Washington, D.C. dedicated to expanding economic opportunities for low-income families and communities in the United States. CFED has supported the development and growth of CSA programs across the country.

HCIDLA does not have available funding to hire the required consultant for this project. A consultant is needed in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the CSA. General (or other local) Funds would need to be identified in the City’s budget to hire a consultant for this project. Community Development Block Grant funds are not available nor are they allowable for this type of work. Other funding options could include foundation, corporate and/or individual funding to support this type of program.
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

FROM: RUSHMORE D. CERVANTES, GENERAL MANAGER
LOS ANGELES HOUSING + COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

DATE: MAY 3, 2017

REGARDING: LOS ANGELES HOUSING + COMMUNITY INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT – BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT BACK FOR QUESTION NO. 237

On April 28, 2017, the Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Los Angeles Housing + Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) to report on the cost of adding staff to support grant-seeking functions as compared to the risks of potentially losing grant opportunities as a result of understaffing that function. How can HCIDLA modify programs to address the decline in grant funds?

Currently, HCIDLA does not have a grant-seeking unit. However, HCIDLA does apply for grants that have supported housing-related programs, such as the LEAD Hazard Reduction and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention grants, which support lead abatement efforts. HCIDLA has also formed partnerships with other organizations to leverage available funding, such as the California Community Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation. Given that HCIDLA does not have a dedicated staff to seek grant opportunities, the number of grants the department seeks are limited.

The Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) funds numerous projects and programs in the City. For example in the 2016-17 Program Year (PY42), which just ended in March, the Con Plan funded 12 departments and bureaus, including LAHSA and HACLA, and represented 86 different programs or projects across the City. If the Con Plan’s funding of over $120 million is reduced, all of the programs and projects funded by the Con Plan will be impacted. For HCIDLA, the Con Plan funds (fully or partially) over 200 positions. These positions provide Con Plan administration management, project oversight and execution, affordable housing creation and monitoring, and support for special population programs, such as the City’s homelessness efforts. Also, HCIDLA monitors all the Neighborhood Improvement projects, including determining project eligibility, setting up the contracts, reviewing procurement of the construction contractor, reviewing and approving invoices, reviewing labor compliance and prevailing wages, reviewing environmental compliance, and numerous other tasks.

Federal funds require close monitoring and planning, all of which are provided by the staff that are supported by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administrative funds. Given the limited funding and HCIDLA’s inability to backfill positions, the City is at risk of improper or inadequate monitoring, which may lead to sanctions, including return of expended funds from non-federal sources.
During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) report on the cost of adding staff to support grant-seeking functions as compared to the risks of potentially losing grant opportunities as a result of understaffing that function. Additionally, the Department was asked how it could modify programs to address the decline in grant funds.

The HCID response states that HCID does not currently have a grant-seeking unit; however, the Department does apply for housing related grants and has formed partnerships with other organizations to leverage available funds. The HCID further elaborated on programs and projects funded by the Consolidated Plan and how HCID grant staff support the effective administration of the Consolidated Plan grants. Additionally, the Department mentioned the risk improper or inadequate monitoring that may lead to sanctions if the Consolidated Plan staff within the department are not adequately funded.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

There is no impact to the General Fund. This memo is for informational purposes only.
On April 28, 2017, the Budget and Finance Committee instructed the Los Angeles Housing + Community Investment Department (HCIDLA) to report on the cost of adding staff to support grant-seeking functions as compared to the risks of potentially losing grant opportunities as a result of understaffing that function. How can HCIDLA modify programs to address the decline in grant funds?

Currently, HCIDLA does not have a grant-seeking unit. However, HCIDLA does apply for grants that have supported housing-related programs, such as the LEAD Hazard Reduction and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention grants, which support lead abatement efforts. HCIDLA has also formed partnerships with other organizations to leverage available funding, such as the California Community Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation. Given that HCIDLA does not have a dedicated staff to seek grant opportunities, the number of grants the department seeks are limited.

The Consolidated Plan (Con Plan) funds numerous projects and programs in the City. For example in the 2016-17 Program Year (PY42), which just ended in March, the Con Plan funded 12 departments and bureaus, including LAHSA and HACLA, and represented 86 different programs or projects across the City. If the Con Plan’s funding of over $120 million is reduced, all of the programs and projects funded by the Con Plan will be impacted. For HCIDLA, the Con Plan funds (fully or partially) over 200 positions. These positions provide Con Plan administration management, project oversight and execution, affordable housing creation and monitoring, and support for special population programs, such as the City’s homelessness efforts. Also, HCIDLA monitors all the Neighborhood Improvement projects, including determining project eligibility, setting up the contracts, reviewing procurement of the construction contractor, reviewing and approving invoices, reviewing labor compliance and prevailing wages, reviewing environmental compliance, and numerous other tasks.

Federal funds require close monitoring and planning, all of which are provided by the staff that are supported by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administrative funds. Given the limited funding and HCIDLA’s inability to backfill positions, the City is at risk of improper or inadequate monitoring, which may lead to sanctions, including return of expended funds from non-federal sources.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – BIKEWAY CLEANING AND REPAIR PROGRAM

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the cost of the Bikeway Cleaning and Repair Program and the number of miles of bike lanes and routes that would be cleaned and repaired on an annual basis. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department reports that the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) requires a total of 11 new positions to meet this workload. Seven of these positions were part of BSS’s original budget submission. DOT reports that BSS submitted a revised request for resources, but this Office has not received this request. The total cost for all 11 positions is $1,272,153. Additionally, in their original request, BSS requested a total of $821,735 in expense funding ($700K for overtime, $65K for construction, $8,400 for field equipment, and $48,335 for various expense accounts). The cost estimate to meet new equipment needs is not provided.

This Office has estimated the costs for all positions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Direct Cost (12 mos)</th>
<th>Indirect Cost (Add/Delete)</th>
<th>Total (12 mos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Sweeper Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>$76,604</td>
<td>$35,483</td>
<td>$112,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Duty Truck Operator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>$66,971</td>
<td>$32,722</td>
<td>$199,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Services Supervisor I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>$105,905</td>
<td>$43,880</td>
<td>$149,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>$95,360</td>
<td>$40,858</td>
<td>$272,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Services Worker II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>$65,611</td>
<td>$32,332</td>
<td>$195,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Services Worker I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>$55,369</td>
<td>$29,397</td>
<td>$84,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Sweeper Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$75,472</td>
<td>$35,158</td>
<td>$110,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Engineering Associate II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$103,878</td>
<td>$43,299</td>
<td>$147,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,272,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The fiscal impact of adding 12 months of funding for these positions is $1,272,153, including both direct and indirect costs. An additional $821,735 was requested for other expenses, for a total cost of $2,093,888. Should these items be funded, offsetting revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
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Question No. 339

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 339

QUESTION

DOT and Street Services to report on the cost of the Bikeway Cleaning and Repair program and the number of miles of bike lanes and routes that would be cleaned and repaired on an annual basis.

RESPONSE

The Multi-Departmental 2017-18 Proposed Budget request for Vision Zero included a request for two crews in the Bureau of Street Services (BSS) to proactively inspect, sweep, and maintain existing bike lanes in the Metro Zone and the Valley Zone. Each crew consists of one Street Services Supervisor I, one Motor Sweeper Operator, and one Truck Operator. The estimated salary cost for these positions is approximately $385,000. Small asphalt repairs identified by the two supervisors would be taken care of by the regular BSS pothole program using existing funding. The number of curb miles swept annually would depend on the travel time needed to move from one bike lane to another. BSS would establish a metric after gaining some experience with this new activity of sweeping the bike lane network which is spread out across the city.

In addition, BSS requested one Motor Sweeper Operator to sweep protected bike lanes that have been and will be constructed by LADOT. The estimated cost for salaries and associated expenses for this position is approximately $63,000. This position will require using a mini-sweeper and associated trailer, which could be purchased at approximately $100,000. Finally, the request would include one Transportation Engineering Associate II, who would be responsible for an on-going, comprehensive review of the bike network to create the workplan and provide the necessary expertise directing the maintenance work. The salary for this position is $104,000.

LADOT requests a Transportation Engineering Associate II to assess the health of the on-street bike network and create “spot treatment” projects, such as new bike signals, bike boxes, or adjustments at intersections and transitions to strengthen weak points in the network and reduce conflicts and exposure to injury. The salary for this position is $104,000.

BSS’ original 2017-18 budget request was to address large asphalt repairs (LARs) that involve removing damaged asphalt prior to installation of large sections of new pavement on an overtime basis ($700,000...
Overtime and $65,000 Construction Expense). Subsequently, BSS submitted a revised request to the Office of the City Administrative Officer to change the LARs component to a dedicated crew of nine employees and funding for new equipment, for a total of approximately $1.2 million, as follows:

**Large Asphalt Repair Crew (9 months)**
1 – Street Services Supervisor II
2 – Equipment Operator
1 – Motor Sweeper Operator
2 – Street Services Worker II
1 – Street Services Worker I
2 – Heavy Duty Truck Operator
9 – Total

**New Equipment (9 months lease):**
1 – Compact milling machine (profiler)
1 – Paver
1 – Roller
1 – Backhoe
2 – Trailers
6 – Total

SJR/ME:ab

C: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY PLANNING – SHORT-TERM RENTAL TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX

During its consideration of the Department of City Planning’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the impacts that various short-term rental policy options would have on the short-term rental portion of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue included in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget.

The short-term rental portion of Transient Occupancy Tax revenue included in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget does not assume any policy changes. In 2016, the City and Airbnb executed a TOT collection agreement. Under the terms of the agreement, Airbnb remits TOT in aggregate to the City on behalf of its users. The data reviewed by this Office in 2016 revealed that 63.37 percent of booking receipts were attributed to a user’s primary property. If the user lists more than one property, the primary address refers to the property that generates the highest booking receipts. 15 percent of booking receipts listed under the primary address came from bookings that would exceed the proposed 180-day cap. The proposed ordinance establishes fines for hosts, property owners, and hosting platforms. The Department’s proposed ordinance would direct 90 percent of the short-term rental portion of TOT revenue to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the remaining 10 percent to a new Short-Term Rental Enforcement Trust Fund.

Percentage of Booking Receipts by Property Number

- First Property 63.37%
- Second Property 17.28%
- Third Property 9.88%
- Fourth and Higher Properties 9.47%
The pending policies could impact revenues, as follows:

- This Office projects the $33.7 million would be reduced to $21.4 million if short-term rental platform (Platforms) users are limited to one address per user account. Since primary property does not imply primary residence, actual receipts could be lower.

- This Office projects the revenues would be further reduced from $21.4 million to $18.2 million if the annual number of nights booked is capped at 180.

- The City does not have an efficient means to enforce the proposed regulations without the cooperation of the short-term rental online platforms. Imposing fines on hosting platforms may result in costly litigation and could result in the termination of the existing TOT collection agreement. If the agreement is terminated, the City would need to collect TOT payments directly from the host. Under this scenario, the projected revenues could be reduced to as little as $2 million.

- TOT is an unrestricted General Fund receipt and restricting the short-term rental portion of TOT revenue to a Special Fund places unnecessary restrictions on the revenues and creates an overall TOT revenue gap as consumers shift from hotels and motels to short-term rentals. To address this issue, the Mayor's Proposed Budget included an instruction in Exhibit H, specifically recommending against the diversion of TOT revenue for other purposes outside the General Fund.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. Should policies be adopted that reduce the budgeted TOT receipts, offsetting General Fund revenues or appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: POLICE – POTENTIAL SAVINGS FROM MOBILE FIELD BASE REPORTING

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) report back on the potential for savings should funding be identified for investing in Mobile Field Base Reporting (MFBR). The Department’s response is attached.

The LAPD reports that officer operational time of up to 45 minutes per shift might be saved by implementing MFBR. The Department also anticipates significant administrative efficiencies from implementing MFBR due to reductions in duplicative data entry when completing crime reports. The Department provided examples of cost savings from two jurisdictions in the United Kingdom which implemented a Records Management System (RMS) that included MFBR: Hampshire Constabulary identified $35 million in savings over five years from improved business processes and technology, while Sussex Police projected $22 million in savings from time efficiencies, intangible benefits, and decommissioning of legacy systems. It should be noted that these savings estimates were based on implementing a complete RMS which is inclusive of MFBR but also includes other complex systems; therefore, only a portion of these savings are attributable to MFBR. Without MFBR data to analyze and compare with its baseline data, the Department could not estimate the City’s potential financial savings.

The Department indicated that funding in the amount of $1.0 million would move the RMS project forward in 2017-18 and allow for the implementation of MFBR. Additional revenue of $368,021 in the Forfeited Assets Trust Fund could be allocated for this purpose.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should available revenue in the Forfeited Assets Trust Fund of $368,021 be approved for this purpose, the General Fund impact of funding the remaining requested amount of $1.0 million would be $631,979. Should this item be funded, offsetting General Fund revenues or reductions to appropriations will need to be identified.
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Question No. 143

Attachment
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 143 – Potential Savings from Mobile Field Base Reporting

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding potential savings from investing in Mobile Field Base Reporting (MFBR) and potential funding sources available.

The Records Management System (RMS) and MFBR is a critical core component toward modernizing our police force and implementing the Connected Officer Program. Additional time and resources will be required to complete a comprehensive analysis and provide quantitative cost / benefits for MFBR. However, this response is based upon the experiences and testimonies of other large public safety agencies that have successfully navigated large scale change and deployment of MFBR from an operational and cost benefit perspective.

Without real Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) data to compare, it is difficult to calculate actual cost savings as each incident and situation is unique, and our efficiencies are dependent on LAPD policy and procedures. However, the below list highlights possible tangible and intangible cost savings. This report utilizes the below-listed efficiencies and applied them to our Department to obtain a cost-saving model analysis.

The Commercial Off-the-Shelf RMS projects vary based on the focus of each agency. Several departments have reported the following results from implementing NicheRMS and deploying Mobile Field Base Reporting:

1. Hampshire Constabulary calculated cash savings of $35 million USD over the first five years due to improved business processes and IT Systems rationalization. Time savings figures that are part of the savings have not been shared with Niche.

2. Springfield Missouri Police report increasing the number of cautions and citations issued by approximately 300% using e-ticketing. The increases meant that additional police work was accomplished in the same period.
3. Sussex Police calculated a total benefit value of $22 million USD, including cashable savings of $3.4 million per year based on time savings, intangible benefits such as increased community visibility (that also reduces calls for service), decommissioning of legacy systems and improved incident submission by citizens.

4. Regina Police Service officers used to take approximately 20-40 minutes to book prisoners. Time spent for the same function after implementing MFBR decreased by 8-12 minutes.

5. North Wales Police (NWP) Officers are spending an additional 15% of their time in the field (50 minutes per shift). NWP attribute mobility with increasing visible police presence equivalent to adding 188 beat patrol officers which are a 13% force multiplier. In addition, North Wales Police officers are spending 40% less time preparing packages for prosecution. The time saved equates to additional officers in patrol.

6. South and North Wales Police clearance rates went from six percent below the national average to five percent above the national average.

Currently, LAPD incident reports are handwritten or prepared using a word processor. Typically, five to 20 copies are made of each report which are then manually distributed. Limited data from the report is keyed into a legacy, 40-year old mainframe system by records clerks assigned to each of the 21 area stations. Workflow is achieved by individuals receiving paper copies of reports for review and investigative follow-up. One of the report copies is sent to Police Headquarters where it is scanned into the legacy content-management system, and metadata is re-keyed. This electronic image of the report is not available for days after the incident. Further, the report narrative is only captured as an image and is not searchable using modern ‘Google’ or any other search techniques. Paper copies are often retained in cabinets or boxes.

Contrast this with data captured directly at the source with edits and enforced coding to match federal and state law enforcement standards. Improved accuracy promotes increased prosecution rates as cases are forwarded electronically to the District Attorney and City Attorney. Domestic Violence victims have less time to recant as cases are quickly filed for prosecution. Officers record the data and resume patrol without needing to return to the station. Reports are electronically routed to sergeants for efficient approvals. Data is available immediately to crime analysts for analysis of suspect demographics, location, modus operandi and many other attributes. Access to reports can be limited to fields or report sections to protect privacy and reduce litigation exposure for the Department.

In analyzing potential savings, this report evaluated three areas: patrol and detective operations, efficiencies in administrative functions, and the decommissioning of legacy systems. The immediate benefits and cost savings are as follows:

**Patrol and Detective Operations**
- Reduces time-consuming research and mapping
- Increases productivity and accountability
- Increases officer safety and citizen safety
3.5

- Maximizes resource efficiencies and increases productivity
- Increases officers’ visibility in the community
- Automates time-consuming tasks
- Improves report quality and accuracy
- Provides faster response times by officers to incidents
- Increases officer time on the street
- Increases interaction with the public
- Provides faster investigations and higher clearance rates which leads to faster prosecution and a safer city

**Administrative Efficiencies**

- Provides more timely and accurate data available to support Vision Zero and other public safety open data initiatives by the City of Los Angeles
- Provides better information to support transparency in law enforcement operations
- Provides faster, easier, less costly access to requested reports for crimes and collisions
- Provides better information and cross-referencing capabilities to support investigations
- Eliminates redundant data in the RMS database
- Reduces paper and office supplies
- Reduces document retention costs

**Decommissioning of Legacy Systems**

- Eliminates present mainframe server environment that supports our crime, arrest, booking, property and communications to County, State, and Federal agencies

**Intangible Cost Savings**

- Improves processing of Discovery requests through improved data quality, searches and access within the RMS reducing City liability and increases public transparency
- Provides LAPD, one of the biggest public safety agencies, the capability to accept electronic data instead of paper or digital forms reducing future costs
- Increases officer presence in the community through operational efficiencies gained through single data entry, improved analytics, and access to information

**Increased officer operational time:** Based on other agencies’ reports and testimony, it is estimated that officers will have more time available to spend in the field. This equates to an additional 15% of their available time, or approximately 45 minutes per shift.

**Administrative Efficiencies:** There will be cost savings based on the elimination of duplicative data entry when completing crime reports. In 2016 the Department processed 125,430 Part-1 crime reports. Once the crime report is complete, a records clerk has to input / re-key the data into the Crime and Arrest Database. Based on other agencies’ reports and testimony, it is estimated that the new system would create efficiencies by eliminating this duplicative process and save the Department significant time and funding.
Funding Sources
Year 1 was funded by $4 million from the General Fund for the archival of the Evidence and Property Management System data. Year 2 was funded with $4 million in grant funding. The Department will continue to aggressively seek grant opportunities to supplement funding for this contractual project. The Department requested $4 million in the proposed budget; however, a minimum of $1 million in 2017-18 would allow us to continue with the RMS project and begin implementation of the MFBR. Other potential funding sources are the General Fund or the Forfeited Assets Trust Fund.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

JORGE A. VILLEGAS, Assistant Chief Director, Office of Administrative Services
During its consideration of Exhibit H for the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Office of the City Administrative Officer report on the purpose of Exhibit H, Item No. 28 which proposes authorizing the Controller to transfer funds above $1.5 million within the LAPD Revolving Training Fund No. 670 (Fund) to the General Fund.

The Fund receives reimbursements from Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) courses, college affiliation programs, and special service fees and payments, and allows the Department to expend Fund receipts on travel and tuition expenses for POST and non-POST certified training; expenses and equipment directly related to the delivery of training within the Department; and, the short term rental of training facilities.

The Los Angeles Administrative Code (Section 5.146) does not cap the balance of the Fund at $1.5 million; rather, it requires that annual receipts in excess of $1.5 million be transferred to the General Fund. The Department has made these prior year transfers as required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount Transferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$287,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>727,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>605,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,620,817</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts totaling $2.46 million have been received in 2016-17 and the Department will transfer $955,447 of that amount to the General Fund. It should be noted that the current balance of the Fund is $4.12 million, as it includes both current year receipts ($2.46 million) and unspent prior year receipts ($1.66 million). To ensure prior year receipts are expended timely, the Department has implemented an internal policy to disencumber funds after three years, except for legitimate purposes such as ongoing training expenses.

Given that the Administrative Code already requires transfers to the General Fund of revenue in excess of $1.5 million, the item in Exhibit H is redundant unless the Council determines to modify the Administrative Code by capping the balance of the Fund in addition to annual revenue receipts. Prior to approving such a modification, it is recommended that the Department report back on its annual training expenditures and how the loss of prior year encumbrances would impact the training program.
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Proposed Budget assumes up to $600,000 in LAPD Revolving Training Fund (Fund) revenue in 2017-18 for Miscellaneous Police Services, Revenue Source Code 4086. There will also be a positive impact of $805,207 to the General Fund in the current year with the transfer of $955,447 in excess revenue from the Fund. The 2016-17 positive General Fund impact is net of the revised 2016-17 revenue budget for Miscellaneous Police Services ($600,000).
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Question No. 517
May 3, 2017

Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING – STAFFING FOR THE SIXTH STREET BRIDGE

During its consideration of the Bureau of Engineering 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that the Bureau report back on one unfunded Senior Civil Engineer position requested by the City Engineer.

The Bureau's report back included a request for two additional unfunded positions (a total of three unfunded positions) as follows:

- One Senior Civil Engineer for the Sixth Street Bridge. This position will provide support for the landscaping project and may be a General Fund impact;
- One Civil Engineer as project manager for the Downtown LA Arts District Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Project. The Bureau reports that this project may be funded by an Active Transportation Program grant. If not, this may be a General Fund impact; and,
- One Senior Civil Engineer for additional engineering project support for Recreation and Parks projects. The Bureau reports that Recreation and Parks may be able to provide funding to avoid a potential General Fund impact.

The full year costs of these positions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Year Salary Cost</th>
<th>Related Costs</th>
<th>Total Full Year Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$117,533</td>
<td>$47,213</td>
<td>$164,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$117,533</td>
<td>$47,213</td>
<td>$164,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$99,910</td>
<td>$42,162</td>
<td>$142,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$334,976</td>
<td>$136,588</td>
<td>$471,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have discussed these requests with the Bureau and, if the request is approved, they will absorb the incremental cost within their Adopted Budget.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
The Budget and Finance Committee, during its April 27, 2017 hearing on the Mayor’s fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 Proposed Budget, requested the Bureau of Engineering (ENGINEERING) to report back on the unfunded Senior Civil Engineer resolution authority position for the Sixth Street Viaduct project that was included in our letter to the Committee. The proposed position would perform the project and construction management of a $23.2M landscaping project and other grant funded projects that would provide additional improvements related to the Sixth Street Viaduct project. A Senior Civil Engineer is requested because ENGINEERING does not currently have a dedicated position for these projects and ENGINEERING requires a project manager with the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to deliver these projects related to the Sixth Street Viaduct project.

Additionally, ENGINEERING requests an unfunded Civil Engineer resolution authority position to perform project management on the $15M Downtown LA Arts District Pedestrian & Cyclist Safety project, an approved Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 project (C.F. 14-0499-S3). On May 1, 2017, the Council District 14 staff informed ENGINEERING that funding authorization for this ATP Cycle 3 project would be accelerated by the State of California Department of Transportation and may be authorized for use to initiate the Downtown LA Arts District Pedestrian & Cyclist Safety project beginning July 1, 2017.

ENGINEERING also requests the continuation of an unfunded Senior Civil Engineer resolution authority position that was originally approved in the FY 2016-17 Adopted Budget. The Senior Civil Engineer position is currently filled and is providing engineering construction support services on Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) projects. ENGINEERING is currently in discussions with the RAP and anticipates receiving in FY 2017-18 the necessary salaries from the RAP Quimby Fund to fully offset the cost of the Senior Civil Engineer position.

If there is any additional information required, please contact me at (213) 485-4935 or Robert Kadomatsu at (213) 485-4944.

cc: Matt Szabo, Office of the Mayor
    Barbara Romero, Office of the Mayor
    John Chavez, Office of the Mayor
    Ted Bardacke, Office of the Mayor
    Sharon Tso, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
    Kevin James, Board of Public Works
    Joel F. Jacinto, Board of Public Works
    Luz M. Rivas, Board of Public Works
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – TRAFFIC CONTROL STAFFING RESOURCES

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the resources necessary to staff Traffic Control Officers to maintain the necessary level of parking enforcement in light of increased demand for traffic control. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department proposed a new model to meet increased demand that assumes the elimination of the Part-Time Traffic Officer (PTO) Program, including the addition of a new Traffic Officer III pay grade level. The proposal requires additional negotiations with labor. The DOT plan includes the addition of 50 new position authorities over their current proposed authorized level of 618 officers, for a total of 668 authorized positions going forward. The feasibility of this proposal requires further exploration as the Department currently has the ability to deploy current resources in a manner that meets core enforcement needs.

DOT also reports that this plan could result in $146.3 million in revenue, increasing the 2017-18 revenue estimates by approximately $5.4 million. However, this assumes a full twelve months and as noted, negotiating a new pay grade structure is subject to negotiations that have not yet begun.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 455

QUESTION

Report on resources necessary for Traffic Control Officer staffing to maintain necessary level of parking enforcement in light of increased demand for traffic control due to special events, major construction, etc.

RESPONSE

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) proposes to revise the traffic officer staffing model to meet increased demand. The submitted budget request for 2017-18 reflects this new model.

This proposed model eliminates the Part-Time Traffic Officer (PTO) Program and fulfills a commitment with SEIU 721 to formally implement the Traffic Officer III classification. As part of this proposal, LADOT will no longer hire part time Traffic Officers. The new staffing model includes the following positions and duties:

- Traffic Officer I positions will exclusively patrol and enforce parking regulations and laws. Traffic Officer I positions will be fully trained in all aspects of the job but will remain at the Traffic Officer I level during a one-year probationary period and then be eligible to promote to the Traffic Officer II level, as vacancies occur through attrition.
- Traffic Officer II positions perform the full range of duties, including directing traffic and responding to emergencies. They also comprise the largest number of position authorities within the Parking Enforcement and Traffic Control Services program.
- Traffic Officer III level positions will perform the full range of duties and a collateral assignment as a training officer, senior lead, or acting supervisor in the absence of a sergeant. This classification allows traffic officers to get training and professional development as they prepare to move into supervisor classes like Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain.

This model improves LADOT enforcement capacity and provides a more consistent workforce, as turnover in the part-time officer program is high. It increases the availability of staff to respond to service requests and meet the increased needs of special events. In this proposal, LADOT’s Parking Enforcement cadre would be comprised of the following authorized positions: 50 Traffic Officer Is, 588 Traffic Officer IIs, and 25 Traffic Officer IIIs. See below chart for detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification and Paygrade</th>
<th>2016-17 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>2017-18 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>2017-18 LADOT Requested Authorities</th>
<th>Difference in Position Authorities (D-C)</th>
<th>Estimated Difference in Cost (D-C); Direct and Related Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Traffic Officer</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>($1.8 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Traffic Officer I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$3.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Officer II</td>
<td>585*</td>
<td>585*</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Officer III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This new model requires additional funding for positions of about $4.8 million and is anticipated to generate an annual estimate of $146.3 million. This estimate is $5.4 million above the 2017-18 Proposed Budget annual estimated revenue of $140.9 million.

SJR/ME:ab

c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

From: Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Sharon M. Tso, Chief Legislative Analyst

Subject: TRANSPORTATION – OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL $10 MILLION IN POTENTIAL VISION ZERO FUNDING

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report back on the potential for an additional $10 million in funding for Vision Zero corridor projects, independent from the road reconstruction program. In addition, this Office was requested to review additional funding from SB 1 and correct the double budgeting of traffic signal construction.

The Proposed Budget intended to provide $6 million for Traffic Signal projects from SB1. However, there is a total of $12.75 million allocated from both SB 1 and MICLA. Staffing to implement these projects has not been provided and will cost approximately $1,392,494 million for nine-months funding. (See Budget Memo related to Question No. 347). The Department has noted that separately from the Vision Zero Priority corridors, the Department has a list of Tier 1 and Tier 2 locations throughout the City that meet warrants for signal improvements.

Additional funding options for Vision Zero projects could include the following:

- SB 1 – The Proposed Budget assumes $23.4 million, however California City Finance estimated that the City would receive $27.8 million. Therefore, $4.4 million is potentially available. This additional revenue can be used for additional Vision Zero road safety projects.

- Subsequent to the release of the Proposed Budget, the Department of Water and Power (DWP) proposed to pay for one of the capital projects budgeted in the CIEP – Measure M budget, Grand View Drive (8430) Bulkhead via C.F. 17-0489. The CIEP budget allocates $415,000 in Measure M funding. This can be reprogrammed for additional Vision Zero road safety projects

FISCAL IMPACT:

The fiscal impact is approximately $4.815 million in available funding for additional Vision Zero projects. This includes $1,392,494 in both direct and indirect costs for staffing costs.

RHL:IR:06170135

Question No. 351
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE -- EMERGENCY INCIDENT TECHNICIANS

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office and the Los Angeles Fire Department (Department) to report back on potential available sources of funding for the six Firefighter/Emergency Incident Technicians (EIT) positions requested in the LAFD supplemental budget request dated April 26, 2017.

In its letter, the Department requested three-months funding for six Firefighter/EIT positions. Three-months funding for six Firefighter/EIT positions totals $416,126, which is comprised of $248,153 in direct costs, including salaries, constant staffing overtime and bonuses, and $167,973 in related costs. The full-year cost of funding six Firefighter/EIT positions is $1,357,047, which is comprised of $965,488 in direct costs and $391,559 in related costs. The General Fund is the only eligible funding source available for these positions at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of adding six Firefighter/Emergency Incident Technician (EIT) positions in 2017-18 is $416,126, which is comprised of $248,153 in direct costs and $167,973 in related costs, and $1,357,047 inclusive of related costs in 2018-19 and beyond. Should an appropriation be made for these purposes, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT – PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE FIREARM, LATENT PRINT, AND DNA ANALYSES.

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Police Department to report on proposals to enhance Firearm, Latent Print, and DNA analyses, including a range of options of what can be accomplished with various levels or additional civilian hires. The Department’s response is attached and includes the requested information.

The proposal to enhance Firearms Analysis includes adding 28 positions during the next three fiscal years, which would provide sufficient staff to train new analysts, eliminate the current backlog, and expand the National Integrated Ballistic Identification Network (NIBIN) to all 21 geographic Areas. The Department requests the addition of one Criminalist III position to the 2017-18 Proposed Budget to train new analysts and reduce the backlog. The total cost for one Criminalist III position is $184,938, which is comprised of $133,227 in direct salary costs and $51,711 in related costs.

The Latent Print Unit has 15 Forensic Print Specialist positions and three administrative positions that are vacant which impacts the Unit’s service level. The Department reports that filling these vacancies would expand analysis to all incoming property crime cases, and restore service levels for Burglary from Motor Vehicles (BFMV) and Theft from Motor Vehicles (TFMV) cases.

The proposal to enhance DNA Analysis includes upgrading two technical staff positions, adding two administrative staff positions and eight technical staff positions in the next three years to expand services and increase DNA analysis related to property crimes. In the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Department requests the upgrade of two Criminalist II positions to Criminalist III positions to provide technical experience to train analysts and complete casework. This request would be subject to paygrade approval by the Employee Relations Division of the Office of the City Administrative Officer.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of the Police Department’s request to add one Criminalist III position to the 2017-18 Proposed Budget is $184,938, which is comprised of $133,227 in direct salary costs and $51,711 in related costs.
The General Fund impact to fill the 18 vacant positions in the Latent Print Unit is $2,377,979, which consists of $1,659,004 in direct salary costs and $718,975 in related costs.

There is no General Fund impact to upgrade two Criminalist II positions to Criminalist III positions in the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, as the differential in costs would be absorbed by the Department.

Should these items be funded, additional General Fund revenues or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:FGO:04170115

Question No. 130

Attachment
May 2, 2017

The Honorable Budget and Finance Committee
c/o Richard Williams
Office of the City Clerk
Room 395, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Budget Impact Letter No. 130 – Enhance Firearm, Latent Print and DNA Analysis

Honorable Members:

As part of the hearings regarding the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested additional information regarding proposals to enhance firearm, latent print, and DNA analysis, including a range of options of what can be accomplished with various levels of additional civilian hires. Attached you will find proposals for each type of analysis as requested.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at (213) 486-8410.

Jorge A. Villégas, Assistant Chief
Director, Office of Administrative Services
Budget & Finance Committee Q130:  
Proposal to Enhance Firearm Analysis

Enhanced Firearms Analysis

The Firearms Analysis Unit (FAU) currently has a backlog of over 950 examination requests and several new analysts to train. The FAU plans to utilize these additional personnel, once trained, to eliminate the current backlog. Even after all personnel are trained and the current backlog eliminated, the FAU will still be required to artificially restrict access to the National Integrated Ballistics Identification Network (NIBIN), due to the lack of sufficient personnel. NIBIN is a powerful investigative database that compares expended shell cases and bullets recovered from crime scenes, linking them to the weapon that fired them or other crimes where the same weapon was used. When the “link” is relayed to the investigator in a timely manner, it can assist in solving cases that would otherwise remain unsolved. Based on current estimates, if NIBIN were fully utilized in all geographic areas, an additional 85-100 violent crimes would be solved per year. Violent criminals have a known three year recidivism rate of over 65 percent, so each additional violent crime solved incarcerates the suspect and prevents several more violent crimes in the ensuing years. The National Institute of Justice has estimated the total loss per violent crime with injury (the usual outcome when a gun is used) at $32,000.00; the loss for a homicide exceeds $4,700,000.00.

Service Level One (Current 2017-18 FY Budget Request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinates/reviews technical operations &amp; training</td>
<td>Backlog elimination on an accelerated time table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service level would provide the third FAU supervisor a Criminalist III direct report, allowing all three FAU supervisors to focus on supervision while their subordinate Criminalist III’s focus on technical review and training of new analysts. This position will accelerate the training of new analysts and elimination of the existing backlog, which will provide investigators and prosecutors with more timely, critical evidence needed for successful investigations and prosecutions.

Service Level Two (Expanded Above 2017-18 Budget Request) – implement 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Criminalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case assignment &amp; supervision</td>
<td>Expand unrestricted NIBIN access to 10 of 21 geographic areas during the two-year training cycle of these positions; maintain limited access to NIBIN for the remaining 11 geographic areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinates/reviews technical operations &amp; training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Microscopic comparisons &amp; field response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technician I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Test fires, imaging &amp; correlation (for NIBIN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Timekeeping, filing, admin support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This service level will provide the FAU personnel to maximize NIBIN access in 10 of the Department’s 21 geographic areas, and is estimated to provide investigative leads that will result in the solution of 42-50 additional violent crimes each year (an untold number of other violent crimes are prevented when the suspect is incarcerated, further reducing societal costs). This expansion would require two years to fully train the personnel after hire. Attempting to maximize NIBIN access in 10 geographic areas without the listed personnel would result in a large backlog of NIBIN input and results; the delays in results reaching detectives would render the system virtually useless.

Service Level Three (Expanded Above 2017-18 Budget Request & Level Two) – implement 2019/20 FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Criminalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case assignment &amp; supervision</td>
<td>Expand unrestricted NIBIN access to remaining 11 geographic areas during the two-year training cycle of these positions. At the end of the training (2022), unrestricted NIBIN access would be City-wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinates/reviews technical operations &amp; training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Microscopic comparisons &amp; field response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technician I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Test fires, imaging &amp; correlation (for NIBIN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service level will provide FAU with personnel to maximize NIBIN access in the remaining 11 of the Department’s 21 geographic areas, and is estimated to provide investigative leads that will result in the solution of an additional 42-50 violent crimes each year (an untold number of other violent crimes would be prevented with the suspect incarcerated, further reducing societal costs). This expansion would require two years to fully train the personnel after hire. Attempting to maximize NIBIN access in the final 11 geographic areas without the listed Level Three personnel would result in a large backlog of NIBIN input and results; the delays in results reaching detectives would render the system virtually useless.

Expansion to Level Three, when combined with the previous Level One and Level Two, is estimated to provide leads that should solve 85-100 more violent gun crimes per year than are currently (as of May 2017) solved.
Current Service Level

The Latent Print Unit (LPU) has 83 authorized Forensic Print Specialist (FPS) positions, 15 of which are currently vacant. Due to the existing vacancies in the LPU, the Department restricts the number of property crime cases that can be requested for analysis and has eliminated field responses to collect latent print evidence from Burglary from Motor Vehicles (BFMV) and Theft from Motor Vehicles (TFMV) cases. Service levels will improve significantly if the LPU is able to fill the existing vacancies and hire to attrition.¹

Enhanced Service Levels

If the Unit is allowed to fill the vacant positions, service levels will be restored and analysis will be completed on approximately 1,260 additional cases per year. The additional personnel will be assigned to analyze Cold Case Homicides, expand analysis to include all incoming property crime cases, and restore service levels for BFMV and TFMV cases. The enhanced services associated with the filling the fifteen positions are as follows:

- Four FPS IV positions (technical leads) will provide analysis of Cold Case Homicides. Due to the complexity of the homicide cases, each analyst can complete approximately five cases per deployment period. The net gain for these positions is the analysis of 260 cold case homicides per year.
- One FPS will be used to relieve the two remaining Area Latent Print Officers (ALPOs), allowing for their return to Patrol or other operational assignments.
- Five FPS positions will be assigned to the field to restore field responses to BFMV and TFMV scenes. The net gain will be field responses to approximately 2,500 cases per year.
- Five FPS III positions will be assigned to perform analysis on property crime cases. The increased staffing will enable the LPU to analyze all incoming cases, an increase of approximately 1,000 cases per year.
- The LPU also has three administrative vacancies (one Management Analyst, one Senior Administrative Clerk, and one Administrative Clerk). These assignments are currently being performed by personnel loaned into the Unit. Filling these positions will provide critical support to the LPU.

The training period for a newly hired FPS is approximately two years before the employee is able to perform all aspects of the assignment. In Fiscal Year 2015/16, the City Council granted a one-time allocation of $500,000 to fund cash overtime for the LPU to perform analysis on additional property crime cases. An allocation of $800,000 would have an immediate impact during the training period and would enable the LPU to analyze all current incoming cases (does not include BFMV or TFMV).

¹ The LPU has 12 employees that are eligible for regular retirement, ten of which have indicated that they plan to retire prior to December 2018. Failing to account for attrition will reduce service below current levels.
Enhanced DNA Analysis

The Serology/DNA Unit (SDU) can enhance DNA analysis services with the addition of administrative and technical staff. The addition of administrative staff is needed to complete clerical duties that are currently handled by technical staff, resulting in the ability of technical staff to support Criminalists who perform DNA analysis.

The addition of technical staff is needed to expand services provided by SDU, particularly analysis of evidence related to property crimes. Additional personnel will perform DNA analysis exclusively on evidence from property crimes (primarily burglaries) in order to apprehend criminals and reduce the incidence of these crimes. Recidivism rates for burglaries are over 50%. Each burglar identified and arrested will prevent additional burglaries. Victim costs for a burglary are estimated at over $1300, and criminal justice costs add another $4100. If the expansion of SDU was not implemented, opportunities to identify and arrest burglary suspects will be missed, leaving these persons free to commit additional crimes. It is well established that some active burglars will, when they come across the right situation, sexually assault female victims. If those persons were identified using DNA recovered from property crimes, a significant number of burglaries and sexual assaults could be prevented.

Service Level One (Current 2017-18 FY Budget Request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation of Criminalist II to Criminalist III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordinates/reviews technical operations &amp; training</td>
<td>Provide technical experience for accurate reporting of DNA results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service level would provide all SDU supervisors the ability to focus on supervision while their subordinate Criminalist III’s focused on technical review and assignment of tasks to Criminalist IIs. This position will train analysts and complete casework, which will provide investigators and prosecutors with more timely and critical evidence needed for successful investigations and prosecutions.

Service Level Two (2018-19 FY Budget Request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timekeeping, filing, admin support</td>
<td>Technical staff would assist with and complete DNA analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service level would provide SDU with administrative staff to complete clerical duties. Currently, technical staff complete most clerical duties. These duties include filing casework documents, archiving records, timekeeping, and preparation of discovery packages for court.
The SDU plans to utilize these additional administrative personnel to manage those tasks in order for the technical staff to assist with and complete DNA analysis.

**Service Level Three (2018-19 FY Budget Request)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Criminalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case assignment &amp; supervision</td>
<td>Expand DNA services to include analysis of property crime cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinates/reviews technical operations &amp; training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalist II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performs DNA analysis of biological evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This service level will provide the SDU the personnel to perform DNA analysis exclusively on evidence from property crimes (primarily burglaries). In 2016, SDU completed DNA analysis on 440 burglary cases. Fifty-two percent of those cases yielded a DNA profile which was uploaded into CODIS, a state and national database of convicted offender and arrestee profiles. Fifty-seven percent of the unknown profiles uploaded into CODIS, resulted in the identification of an offender name providing an investigative lead to detectives.

The Department responds to approximately 17,000 burglary cases each year. FSD estimates that 15% of those cases would have useful DNA samples. If they were submitted for DNA testing, SDU expansion to Level Three, when combined with the previous Level One and Level Two, is estimated to provide investigative leads that can lead to the solution of 700-800 additional property crimes per year.
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: FIRE – PLAN CHECK STAFFING SUPPORT

During its consideration of the Fire Department’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to report back with potential options for supporting the three Plan Check staffing (Fire Inspector II) positions requested in the LAFD supplemental budget request letter dated April 26, 2017.

Plan Check-related position costs are recoverable by plan check fees if the workload justifies the addition of the positions. The LAFD annually prepares a Cost of Special Services (COSS) fee analysis and schedule for cost recovery of Development Services and fee-related positions. Positions considered for fee recovery must be approved by the Council and allocated by the Civil Service Commission (CSC) prior to incorporation into a COSS fee analysis. Typically, the cost of new positions is built into fee adjustments that are implemented in the year following the addition of the position. On April 18, 2017, the Board of Fire Commissioners approved a COSS schedule which will set fee rates for the 2017-18 Fiscal Year. The proposed 2017-18 COSS schedule will be published for public comment prior to Council approval.

Nine-months funding for one Fire Inspector II position is $159,839, comprised of $100,412 in direct costs and $59,427 in related costs. Nine-months funding for three Fire Inspector II positions would be $479,517. If the positions are approved, this cost will be assumed by the General Fund in 2017-18 because there are no other eligible funding sources available at this time. However, the addition of the positions may generate some additional General Fund revenue to offset a portion of the costs by decreasing permit processing time and increasing the number of permits processed. The 2017-18 proposed COSS schedule includes an approximate rate of $648 for Fire/Life Safety Plan Initial Review (includes two hours of initial inspection), with a $216 per hour rate for each additional hour. There were 2,370 inspection requests in the third quarter of 2016, an increase of 40 percent over the number of requests in the first quarter of 2016, which reduced the rate of plan check completion within 72 hours of requested inspection dates. The potential increase in revenue generation projected by adding the three Inspector positions is estimated at $160,000.

Additionally, the LAFD has proposed submitting an amended COSS schedule after adoption of the budget to include the cost of the additional Inspector positions. The Department believes that these amended rates could be in place by October 2017, coinciding with the CSC allocation of the new positions. However, pursuing this amendment could delay implementation of the 2017-18 COSS schedule and negatively impact General Fund revenue,
which is projected to increase in 2017-18 by $980,000 due to the 2017-18 COSS rate adjustments.

Should the Plan Check positions be approved, it is recommended that General Fund Departmental Receipts be increased by $160,000, and funding of $319,517 in other revenue or offsetting appropriations be identified to offset the remaining cost.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The General Fund impact of funding three Fire Inspector II positions in 2017-18 is $479,517, comprised of $301,236 in direct costs and $178,281 in related costs and offset by General Fund revenue of approximately $160,000 for a total impact of approximately $319,517. Should an appropriation be made for this purpose, additional General Fund revenue or offsetting appropriations will need to be identified.

RHL:JCY:04170106

Question No. 14
Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: Exhibit H (Item 34) – Report on the Revenue Impact of Redirecting Natural Gas Franchise Fee Revenue

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the revenue impact to the General Fund and Council District funds resulting from Council’s action to adopt or delete the Exhibit H recommendation (Item 34) concerning the proposed amendment of Administrative Code Section 5.500.

The Exhibit H Item 34 recommends disapproving the proposed ordinance amendment (C.F. No. 15-0387) to delete the word “oil” from the Administrative Code section pertaining to the Council District Real Property Trust Fund in order to prevent an ongoing reduction to General Fund revenue. Current language in the Administrative Code concerning the Council District Real Property Trust Funds (LAAC §5.500) requires that fifty percent of oil pipeline franchise fee revenue be directed to these funds. Half of this redirected amount (or 25 percent of total oil pipeline franchise fee revenue) is allocated equally among the Council Districts, and the other half (25 percent of total revenue) is distributed according to the amount of pipeline footage located within each respective district. Council district fund receipts from oil pipeline revenue may only be spent on public right-of-way infrastructure improvements. The deletion of the word “oil” from LAAC §5.500 in accordance with the proposed amendment, may subject natural gas franchise fee revenues to the same allocation formula as oil pipeline franchise fees.

The proposed budget includes $16.2 million in General Fund revenue from natural gas franchise fees. Approval of the Exhibit H recommendation (Item 34) concerning the proposed amendment of LAAC §5.500 will ensure that the full $16.2 million in ongoing revenue remains within the General Fund, to be appropriated according to Mayor and Council priorities. Nevertheless, deleting this recommendation will not directly impact General Fund revenue.

General Fund revenue will be impacted if the proposed amendment is adopted. Specifically, $8.1 million of ongoing General Fund revenue may be redirected to the Council District Real Property Trust Funds, resulting in $8.1 million in unfunded appropriations within the proposed General Fund budget for 2017-18. Additionally, utilization of these council district funds will be restricted to public right-of-way infrastructure improvements. Of the $8.1 million in redirected revenue, $4.05 million would be distributed equally among Council Districts, for an allocation of $270,000 per district. The remaining $4.05 million would be distributed according the amount of natural gas pipeline footage within each district. However, the revenue impact to each district cannot be quantified at this time. Unlike oil pipeline franchise fee revenue, which is based on the size and length of pipelines, natural gas franchise fee revenue is based on the...
gross receipts from natural gas sales and the value of unsold gas transported within the City. As such, the City will first need to complete a survey of natural gas pipelines within the City in order to apportion receipts among districts.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Should the Exhibit H recommendation (Item 34) concerning the proposed amendment of Administrative Code Section 5.500 be deleted from the final budget, there will be no impact to the General Fund.

However, if the proposed amendment to redirect natural gas franchise fee revenue from the General Fund to Council District funds be subsequently adopted, $8.1 million in ongoing revenue enhancements or expenditure reductions will need to be identified to offset the ongoing reduction to General Fund revenue.
Budget and Finance Committee

Richard H. Llewellyn, Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer

Exhibit H (Items 3, 9, 12, 34 and 35) – Report on the Budget Impact of Deleting Billboard, Bus Bench, Special Fund, Natural Gas and Transient Occupancy Tax Recommendations

During its consideration of the 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this Office to report on the budget impact in deleting Exhibit H recommendations concerning billboard revenue, bus bench revenue, special fund balances, natural gas franchise fee revenue and transient occupancy tax revenue (items 3, 9, 12, 34 and 35, respectively).

Exhibit H Item 3 requests the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance that would require revenues from digital billboards to be deposited into the General Fund. The proposed budget assumes $12 million in General Fund revenue from billboard leasing, relocation and modernization agreements. Deleting this item does not directly impact the budget; however it does prevent the diversion of this revenue from the General Fund. Furthermore, should the Council not adopt and implement a policy on digital billboards that generates $12 million in revenue, the 2017-18 budget will have $12 million in unfunded appropriations.

Exhibit H Item 9 requests the City Attorney to prepare and present an ordinance to eliminate section 5.523 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code in order to transfer the cash balance and new revenue in Bus Bench Advertising Program Revenue Fund to the General Fund. The proposed budget assumes $3.0 million in General Fund revenue from the Bus Bench Fund. Deleting this item will reduce revenue by this amount and result in $3.0 million in unfunded appropriations.

Exhibit H Item 12 requests the Controller with the assistance of various Offices to conduct a comprehensive review of special fund account balances, interest earnings, and restrictions on the use of funds. The proposed budget does not assume any revenue from this item and as such, there is no General Fund impact from deleting this item.

Exhibit H Item 34 recommends the disapproval of the proposed amendment to the Los Angeles Administrative Code Chapter 100, Section 5.500 (Council District Real Property Trust Funds) that would result in redirecting ongoing revenue from natural gas franchise fees to Council District funds. The proposed budget assumes $16.1 million from natural gas franchise revenue. Deleting this item does not directly impact the budget; however it does prevent the diversion of this revenue from the General Fund. If subsequent action is taken by the Council to adopt the proposed amendment, $8.1 million in ongoing General Fund revenue from natural gas franchise fees may be redirected to Council District funds, resulting in $8.1 million in unfunded appropriations.
Exhibit H Item 35 recommends the disapproval of policy proposals that would earmark or divert ongoing transient occupancy tax (TOT) revenue from short-term rentals or home sharing to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, the (proposed) Short-Term Rental Enforcement Trust Fund, or other restricted purposes. The proposed budget assumes $33.7 million in TOT revenue from short-term rentals. Deleting this item does not directly impact the budget; however it does prevent the diversion of this revenue from the General Fund. If subsequent action is taken by the Council to adopt policies that redirect TOT revenue from short-term rentals to special funds or other restricted purposes, an equivalent unfunded appropriation of $33.7 million results.

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Deleting Exhibit H recommendations concerning billboard revenue, special fund balances, natural gas franchise fee revenue and transient occupancy tax revenue (items 3, 12, 34 and 35, respectively) will not impact the General Fund. However, subsequent policy decisions may reduce General Fund revenue by as much as $53.8 million.

Deleting the Exhibit H recommendation concerning bunch bench revenue (Item 9) will reduce General Fund revenue by $3.0 million and result in $3.0 million in unfunded appropriations.
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CIEP PHYSICAL PLANT – USE OF SB1 REVENUE FOR THE STREET PROJECTS PROPOSED TO BE FUNDED FROM MEASURE M

During its consideration of the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested that this Office report back on the potential use of newly authorized Gas Tax funding from California Senate Bill 1 (SB1) for the street projects proposed to be funded from Measure M.

Although detailed funding guidelines have not yet been published by the State, the scope of work for the street projects proposed to be funded from Measure M appears to be eligible under SB1. However, SB1 has a complex Maintenance of Effort (MOE) provision that the City has not yet been able to accurately quantify. It is critical to understand the MOE provision in order to determine whether existing activities and projects that the City is currently working on are eligible for funding from SB1. Therefore, given that City staff can not accurately advise the Council and Mayor on MOE requirements at this time, a conservative approach was used in the Mayor’s Proposed Budget. Incremental funding for projects that are already underway were not funded in SB1 and only new projects were proposed for funding. It is hoped that over the next few months that City staff will have a more detailed understanding of the MOE requirements of SB1.

There are two completely new projects that were recommended for funding in Measure M. Funding for these projects could be safely moved to SB1. These projects are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tujunga/Strathern/Fair Street/Sidewalk Project (CD6)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Imagine Ventura Blvd Streetscape Improvements (CD3)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposed Budget assumed $23.428 million of SB1 revenue. However, California City Finance has estimated that the City will receive an additional $4.4 million that is not assumed in the Proposed Budget. Therefore, these two projects could be moved from Measure M to SB1 without requiring reductions in appropriations in the Proposed Budget.

Additionally, subsequent to the publishing of the Proposed Budget, DWP has proposed to fund the Grandview Ave (8430) Bulkhead project that was proposed to be funded from Measure M. Therefore, an additional $415,000 of Measure M funds are no longer required.
As a result, a total of $1,215,000 could be available within Measure M for re-appropriation to other purposes. We have attached a new proposed project listing showing these three changes.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (CIEP)
PHYSICAL PLANT

Appropriations to authorize the preparation of plans, the acquisition of rights of way, or the construction of street improvements and other facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC 3</td>
<td>OAKDALE/REDWING/VENTURA STORMDRAIN/FLOODING PROJECT</td>
<td>$ - $ 2,400,000 $ - $ 2,083,000 $ - $ - $ - $ -</td>
<td>4,483,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 5</td>
<td>SEPULVEDA CHANNEL LOW FLOW TREATMENT FACILITY</td>
<td>-- 335,400 -- -- -- -- 335,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ VAR</td>
<td>BALLONA CREEK LOW FLOW TREATMENT FACILITY</td>
<td>-- 529,799 -- -- -- -- 1,882,733 2,412,532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 14</td>
<td>ARROYO SECO URBAN RUNOFF PROJECT 1 (SYCAMORE GROVE PARK)</td>
<td>-- 239,000 -- -- -- -- 239,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 14</td>
<td>ARROYO SECO URBAN RUNOFF PROJECT 2 (HERMAN DOG PARK)</td>
<td>-- 68,500 -- -- -- -- 68,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 1</td>
<td>LA RIVER SEGMENT B URBAN RUNOFF PROJECT 1 (2ND ST/L AR REMOVAL/REUSE URBAN FLOW SYSTEM)</td>
<td>-- 602,000 -- -- -- -- 602,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 1</td>
<td>LA RIVER SEGMENT B URBAN RUNOFF PROJECT 2 (PALMETTO ST/L AR REMOVAL/REUSE URBAN FLOW SYSTEM)</td>
<td>-- 569,500 -- -- -- -- 569,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ 1</td>
<td>LA RIVER SEGMENT B URBAN RUNOFF PROJECT 3 (MISSION RD/L AR REMOVAL/REUSE URBAN FLOW SYSTEM)</td>
<td>-- 443,500 -- -- -- -- 443,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Stormwater Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ - $ 5,187,699 $ - $ 2,083,000 $ 1,882,733 $ - $ 9,153,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>SAN MIGUEL STREET BERM REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>$ - $ 124,000 $ - $ - $ - $ - $ - $ - 124,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>SUNSET BLVD SLOPE MITIGATION - CORONADO TO WATERLOO, PHASE 1</td>
<td>50,000 50,000 -- -- -- -- 785,489 785,489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Var</td>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>50,000 50,000 -- -- -- -- 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>DESCANSO DRIVE, LARISSA DRIVE TO ROBINSON STREET</td>
<td>-- 700,000 -- -- -- -- 700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Var</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY FOR CONSTRUCTION [3]</td>
<td>-- 465,000 -- -- -- -- 455,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Var</td>
<td>BRIDGE AND TUNNEL MAINTENANCE PROGRAM</td>
<td>-- 450,000 -- -- -- -- 450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Var</td>
<td>GUARDRAIL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>45,000 -- -- -- -- 45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9</td>
<td>GAGE STREET PUBLIC SAFETY MEDIAN IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>-- 460,000 -- -- -- -- 460,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>MAXELLA AVE/LINCOLN BLVD</td>
<td>29,730 29,730 -- -- -- -- 502,270 502,270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8</td>
<td>35TH STREET BETWEEN GRAMERCY &amp; CIMARRON</td>
<td>-- -- 500,000 -- -- -- -- 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>BOEING AVE AND 78TH STREET SUBSIDENCE</td>
<td>-- -- 700,000 -- -- -- -- 700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>GLIDER AVE AND WILEY POST STREET SUBSIDENCE</td>
<td>-- -- 300,000 -- -- -- -- 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>CAZADOR STREET (3925) BULKHEAD - LOVELAND/BRILLIANT</td>
<td>-- -- 689,000 -- -- -- -- 689,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>DAVIES WAY (2044) BULKHEAD</td>
<td>-- -- 516,250 -- -- -- -- 516,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>CASTELLAMMARE DRIVE (17434)</td>
<td>-- -- 771,000 -- -- -- -- 771,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14</td>
<td>EUCALYPTUS LANE (6006) BULKHEAD</td>
<td>-- -- 571,000 -- -- -- -- 571,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>GOULD AVE (8250) BULKHEAD</td>
<td>132,000 132,000 -- -- -- -- 735,000 867,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>VERDE OAK DRIVE (2252) BULKHEAD</td>
<td>140,000 140,000 -- -- -- -- 140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>VERDUGO CRESTLINE DRIVE (7675)</td>
<td>52,000 52,000 -- -- -- -- 52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>VISTA CREST DRIVE (3006)</td>
<td>85,000 85,000 -- -- -- -- 85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>MT LEE 1/2RD MILE NORTH OF MULHOLLAND</td>
<td>-- -- 25,000 -- -- -- -- 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>ALVARADO STREET BULKHEAD</td>
<td>27,000 27,000 -- -- -- -- 27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>GLENDALE BLVD/SILVERLAKE BLVD ROCKFALL MITIGATION</td>
<td>34,546 34,546 -- -- -- -- 34,546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14</td>
<td>SOTO STREET (2446) ROCKFALL MITIGATION</td>
<td>71,000 71,000 -- -- -- -- 71,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td>SILVERLAKE BLVD UNDERPASS ARCH PROJECT</td>
<td>-- -- 100,000 -- -- -- -- 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>SHELDON ARLETA SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENT - WICKS STREET</td>
<td>712,540 712,540 -- -- -- -- 1,420,270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (CIEP)

### PHYSICAL PLANT

Appropriations to authorize the preparation of plans, the acquisition of rights of way, or the construction of street improvements and other facilities.

### BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS 2017-18 [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCRETE STREET REPAIR - HANCOCK PARK</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>TUJUNGA/STRATHERN/FAIR STREET/SIDEWALK PROJECT</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>PACOIMA WASH VISION PLAN</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELYSIAN VALLEY BIKE PATH</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>RE-IMAGINE VENTURA BLVD STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - STREET PROJECTS**

| | $1,378,816 | $1,896,000 | $ | $10,389,739 | $ | -- | $800,060 | $14,264,555 |

### STREET LIGHTING PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL Var</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE AND TUNNEL LIGHTING MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Var</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIKEWAY GENERAL BENEFIT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Var</td>
<td></td>
<td>STREET LIGHTING AT EXISTING PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALKS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>403,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>493,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Var</td>
<td></td>
<td>TUNNEL AND UNDERPASS LIGHTING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>477,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>477,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - STREET LIGHTING PROJECTS**

| | $677,000 | $493,000 | $ | -- | $ | -- | $ | -- | $1,170,000 |

**TOTAL CIEP - PHYSICAL PLANT**

| | $2,055,816 | $7,376,099 | $ | $12,472,739 | $ | $1,882,733 | $800,060 | $24,587,987 |

---

1. The City Administrative Officer may approve transfers within the same fund of $25,000 or 25 percent of project amounts (whichever is greater), not to exceed $100,000, to or between eligible capital Improvement projects or accounts approved by the Mayor and City Council.

2. Subject to receipt of actual funds from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

3. The City Administrative Officer may approve transfers of any amount from the Contingencies Account to any project listed or any project previously approved by the Mayor and City Council.

4. Council and Mayoral approval required to allocate Emergency Repairs funding to specific projects requiring emergency repairs as a result of disasters.

5. The City Administrative Officer may approve changes in the planned utilization of funds between the Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund, the General Fund and the Measure M Local Return Fund for Street Projects and may approve transfers of funds not required to complete approved capital projects to other approved capital projects.

6. Category Codes: "FC" indicates Flood Control; "SL" indicates Street Lighting; "M" indicates Miscellaneous (e.g., soundwalls and bulkheads); "WQ" indicates Water Quality.
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – VISION ZERO PRIORITY CORRIDOR RESOURCES

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the projects in Vision Zero Priority Corridors that do not have street segments in poor condition, including what additional resources would be needed to complete Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 treatments. The Department’s response is attached.

The Department has advised that in addition to the capital costs, additional staffing is essential to complete design and construction of these improvements. The cost for 14 additional positions with nine-month funding is estimated below:

- In-House Planning and Design ($421,016 for directs salaries and $188,303 for indirects)
- In-House Construction Crews ($514,086 for direct salaries and $269,089 for indirects)

The Proposed Budget provides $6 million in SB 1 funding for Traffic Signal Installation.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The fiscal impact of adding new positions is $1,392,494 million for direct and indirect costs. Should the Council desire to fund additional positions, this allocation could provide the needed funding.

RHL:IR:06170120

Question No. 347

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 347

QUESTION

Report on projects in Vision Zero Priority Corridors that do not have street segments in poor condition, including what additional resources would be needed to complete Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 treatments. Include in the report elements of the Vision Zero Priority Corridors that can be funded with the resources currently provided in the Proposed Budget.

RESPONSE

During 2016-17, LADOT identified the Vision Zero priority corridors as part of our Vision Zero Action Plan and prepared plans for three phases of projects to make these street segments safer. As the collision landscape changes over time, LADOT will update the High Injury Network at regular intervals and cull new Priority Corridors each year based on the locations with greatest need.

Projects on these corridors would proceed in three phases, from least capital-intensive to most capital-intensive. Phase 1 requires a total of $12.6 million for all streets on the high priority network, regardless of pavement condition. Of this $12.6 million, $1.3 million would address the street segments that do not have pavement in poor condition. Phase 2 requires a total of $37.9 million for all projects on the 2016-2017 Priority Corridors. Of this amount, $3.8 million would address the street segments that do not have pavement in poor condition.

Separately from the Vision Zero Priority corridors, LADOT has a list of Tier 1 (meaning high priority) locations throughout the city that meet warrants for signal improvements ranging from upgrades like left-turn arrows to new full signals. This list represents 40 projects at a cost of approximately $12 million.
The chart below provides a list of the current identified Vision Zero Priority Corridors that do not have street segments in poor condition. Included are the associated estimated costs to build out each phase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Length (mi.)</th>
<th>Phase 1* Cost</th>
<th>Phase 2* Cost</th>
<th>Phase 3* Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado St.</td>
<td>6th St. to 7th St.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St.</td>
<td>6th St. to 7th St.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Blvd.</td>
<td>Fairfax Ave. to Crenshaw Blvd.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$276,000</td>
<td>$838,000</td>
<td>$2,827,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire Blvd.</td>
<td>Rampart Blvd. to Valencia St.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$377,000</td>
<td>$1,272,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th St.</td>
<td>Rampart Blvd. to Beaudry Ave.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$193,000</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
<td>$1,979,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico Blvd.</td>
<td>Robertson Blvd. to La Cienega Blvd.</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saticoy St.</td>
<td>Topanga Cyn. Blvd. to Jordan St.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandie Ave.</td>
<td>Vernon Ave. to I-10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$1,005,000</td>
<td>$3,392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd St.</td>
<td>Normandie Ave. to Vermont Ave.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>$707,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Ave.</td>
<td>Western Ave. to Vermont Ave.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>$419,000</td>
<td>$1,413,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,900,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1 consists of low-cost improvements which can mostly be completed solely by LADOT. These consist of lane markings, speed feedback signs, general signage, signal re-timing, and warning beacons for crosswalks. Phase 2 consists of new traffic signals and traffic signal upgrades such as left-turn phasing. Where necessary, Phase 2 also consists of new curb ramps. Phase 3 consists of civil work to build-out permanent improvements including changes to curb alignment.

The 2017-18 Proposed Budget includes $5.25 million in Measure M and Gas Tax/SB1 funding for the implementation of Vision Zero projects with street segments in poor condition not shown above. These dollars would partially fund Phase 2 elements of the 2016-2017 Priority Corridors which have street segments in poor condition. The total funding need for Phase 2 improvements on those Corridors is $31.2 Million.

In addition to these capital costs, additional staffing is essential to complete design and construction of these improvements. The 2017-2018 Vision Zero Multi-Departmental Request identified four FTE’s to create an in-house Vision Zero Design Team (one Transportation Engineer, one Transportation Engineering Associate III, two Transportation Engineering Associate II’s), one FTE to support the existing Vision Zero Planning Team (Supervising Transportation Planner I), and nine FTE’s to enhance LADOT’s in-house construction crews (one Signal System Supervisor I, two Signal System Electricians, two Assistant Signal System Electricians, two Electrical Craft Helpers, and two Cement Finishers).

SJR/ME:tf

c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – ANNUAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO MEET VISION ZERO BENCHMARK GOALS

During its consideration of the Department of Transportation's 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report on the anticipated annual resources required to achieve the benchmark goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan. The Department's response is attached.

This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.

RHL:IR:06170123

Question No. 350

Attachment
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

Date: May 3, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Paul Krekorian, Chair

From: Seleta J. Reynolds, General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: REPORT BACK FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 PROPOSED BUDGET – QUESTION NO. 350

QUESTION

Report on the anticipated annual resources required to achieve the benchmark goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan.

RESPONSE

The benchmark goals identified in the January 2017 Vision Zero Action Plan represent part of the overall strategy necessary to eliminate all traffic fatalities by 2025. The Action Plan assumes a qualitative goal for many engineering strategies due to the difficulty setting numerical benchmarks with distant horizons for completion, based in part on the expected changes in the collision landscape over the next eight years and the need to adapt strategies based on these changes. The Action Plan is a living document that LADOT will revisit every two to three years.

LADOT's current efforts will refine the cost for the initial 40 corridors and repeat this process on an annual basis. Under separate cover, LADOT has provided a report back for budget Question No. 347 that provides anticipated resource needs for short-term and mid-term project implementation. For long-term street improvements, LADOT anticipates costs consistent with approximately $1 million per mile for each priority corridor along the High Injury Network.

The following table provides the detail on the funding necessary to achieve the benchmark goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan, not including the capital costs to improve the High Injury Network:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed surveys</td>
<td>Complete 100% of the expired surveys along the priority corridors, 75% of the High-Injury Network and 50% Citywide</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Complete 100% of the expired surveys Citywide</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Continue to keep all surveys active; evaluate need for new surveys</td>
<td>Annual cost of $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signs</td>
<td>Maintain and upgrade speed limit signage</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Upgrade the existing sign maintenance program</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Create geocoded database of all department assets</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SRTS)</td>
<td>Install 180 high-visibility crosswalks near 50 schools on the High-Injury Network</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Complete 50 Safe Routes to School safety plans.</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Implement 50 Safe Routes to School safety plans</td>
<td>$250,000,000 (included in Measure M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed mitigation around schools</td>
<td>Install 11 school safety zones</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Install 50 school safety zones</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Install 100 school safety zones</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street design</td>
<td>Complete 12 miles of street design plans</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>Complete 48 miles of street design plans</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>Complete 450 miles of street design plans</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Timing</td>
<td>Optimize 400</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Optimize 1,600 traffic</td>
<td>No additional</td>
<td>Optimize all traffic</td>
<td>No additional resources anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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c: Richard H. Llewellyn Jr., Interim City Administrative Officer
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: CITY PLANNING – AFFORDABLE HOUSING MITIGATION IMPACT FEE

During its consideration of the Department of City Planning’s 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested this office to provide Affordable Housing Mitigation Impact Fee (Linkage Fee) revenue estimates for the Linkage fee under various scenarios and implementation timelines.

The City contracted with BAE Urban Economics (BAE) in April 2016 to prepare the Affordable Housing Mitigation Impact Fee (Linkage Fee) Nexus Study. BAE looked at different development types - office, retail, industrial, warehouse, construction, medical, and institutional, as well as multifamily rental, condo, single-family attached, and single-family detached. The analysis established a legal nexus for a linkage fee in the range of $42 to $74 per square foot for residential and $118 to $309 for nonresidential. Although the nexus study established a legal basis for the aforementioned fee ranges, the study divided the City into three market areas - low, medium and high - to establish economically feasible fee levels.

Feasible fee levels were generally found to vary from $5 to $35 per square foot for nonresidential and $19 to $49 per square foot for residential (depending on the market and type of project). Generally, the Nexus Study found residential development able to support a higher fee than nonresidential. A range of fee amounts, timeframe options and receipt totals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2017-18 Timeframe for Implementation</th>
<th>Number of Months Fees Collected</th>
<th>Fee per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Fee per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Fee per Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5 - Commercial</td>
<td>$10 - Commercial</td>
<td>$20 - Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12 - Multi Family</td>
<td>$20 - Multi Family</td>
<td>$35 - Multi Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12 - Single Family</td>
<td>$28 - Single Family</td>
<td>$40 - Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$56,250,000</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>$118,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$28,125,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$59,062,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Quarter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$14,062,500</td>
<td>$22,500,000</td>
<td>$29,531,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Quarter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
<td>$157,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that these are estimates and actual fees collected will vary depending on the specific regulations adopted. Furthermore, these estimates rely on permitted development activity data from 2011 to 2015, which reflects a time period at the end of the Great Recession plus the surge after economic recovery. Actual economic cycles in any given year will strongly influence the revenue stream.
This memorandum is provided for informational purposes only. There is no General Fund fiscal impact.
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Question No. 549
Date: May 4, 2017

To: Budget and Finance Committee

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

Subject: GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES POLICE MUSEUM

During its consideration of the Capital Finance Administration 2017-18 Proposed Budget, the Budget and Finance Committee requested a report on potential funding sources for $528,000 for the Police Museum at the Old Northeast Police Station at 6045 York Boulevard, in Highland Park.

In July 1990, the Council authorized a 30-year lease with the Los Angeles Police Historical Society for $1 per year (C.F. 83-0397). The purpose of the lease is for the Los Angeles Police Historical Society to operate a police museum at the site, which was the Old Northeast Police Station.

At this time, we are working with the General Services Department, Real Estate Services Division to determine the level of maintenance and capital repairs that the tenant may be required to provide to the facility and with the Construction Forces Division to determine the scope and possible costs of performing capital repairs at the site. We will report back to the relevant policy Council committee when we have more information. Furthermore, without knowing the scope and cost of capital repairs we are unable to identify any possible funding sources at this time.

This memorandum is for information purposes only. There is no fiscal impact.
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Question No. 402