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# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 

## MAYOR'S SALARY ORDINANCE

## AS OF JUNE 1, 2018



File No. 180575

Ordinance No. $\qquad$

FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2019 and FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2020

| Item \# |  | Dept | Dept Division | Dept section | Dept ID Ttw ${ }^{2}$ | Fund $\mathrm{ID}^{\mathrm{ID}}$ | ProjectID |  | Activi ty Type Numb |  | $\|$Account <br> $-\quad$ ID | BY Should Be Amount | Savings/(Cost) | BY+1 Should Be Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BY }+2 \\ & \text { Savings/ (Cost) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ;GFS | DPH | 251961 | 251912 | 251912 | 10020 | 10030928 | 1 |  | 11159 | 506070 | 5,200,000 | - | 2,300,000 | 2,900,000 |
| 2 | GFS | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | 207982 | 10020 | 10009105 | 2 |  | 11187 | 506070 | 400,000 |  | 2,900,000 | (2,900,000) |
| 3 | Self Sup. |  | 207915 | 207917 | 207917 | 28100 | 10024777 |  |  | 10000 | 532310 | 15,510,315 | 1,000,000 | 15,510,315 | - |
| 4 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207917 | 207917 | 28100 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 10000 | 540000 | 1,000,000 | (1,000,000): | - |  |
| 5 | Self Sup |  | 232337 | 207922 | :207922 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 535960 | 188,200 | 220,000 | 191,450 | $(220,000)$ |
| 6 | Self Sup |  | 232337 | 207922 | 207922 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 527610 | 239,000 | $(220,000)$ | 239,000 | 220,000 |
| 7 | GFS | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | 10020 | 10024340 | 1 |  | 17369 | 506070 |  | $(175,000)$ | - |  |
| 8 | GFS H | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | 10020 | 10024341 | 1 |  | 10005 | 506070 | - | 300,000 | - | - |
| 9 | GFS | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | :10020 | 10033390 | 1 |  | 20357 | 506070 | 1,125,000 | $(125,000)$ | - | - |
| 10 | GFS | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10020 | 10023900 | 131 |  | 17182 | 591270 | 1,245,094 | - | 3,000,875 | (1,755,781) |
| 11 | Self sup |  |  | . | 230018 | 17380 | 10026734 | 1 |  | 10000 | 493001 | 1,245,094 | - | 3,000,875 | 1,755,781 |
| 12 | Self Sup |  | : |  | 230018 | 17380 | 10026734 | 1 |  | 10000 | 570000 | 1,245,094 | - | 3,000,875 | $(1,755,781)$ |
| 13 | Self Sup: |  |  |  | 232331 | "15680 | 10016951 | 4 |  | 15808 | 499998 | - | 1,260,000 | - | - |
| 14 | Self Sup | SHF |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 |  | 15230 | 500010 | - | 1,260,000 | - |  |
| 15 | Self Sup | SHF |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 |  | 15230 | 499998 | 1,260,000 | $(1,260,000)$ |  | - - |
| 16 | Self Sup |  |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 |  | 15230 | 567000 | 1,260,000 | $(1,260,000)$ |  |  |
| 17 | GFS | ECN | 229991 |  | 229991 | 10010 | 10022531 | 9 |  | 16652 | 538000 | 3,334,000 | $(25,000)$ | 3,309,000 | - |
| 18 | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026740 | 1 |  | 10000 | 538010 | 83,083,797 | 3,207,791 | 84,168,364 | 3,207,791 |
| 19 | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026737 | 1 | 8 | 10000 | 538010 | 1,291,947 | - | 691,947 | $(691,947)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | GFS P | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10000 | . 10001910 | 1 |  | 10000 | 560000 | - | 2,000,000 | - |  |
| 22 | GFS P | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10020 | 10032880 | 1 |  | 20034 | 506070 | 2,000,000 | $(2,000,000)$ | 1,000,000 : | (1,000,000) |
| 23 | GFS | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | : 10000 | 10001903 | 1 |  | 10000 | :560000 |  | 4,574,360 | - | 4,079,600 |
| 24 | GFS P | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10000 | . 10001903 | 1 , |  | 10000 | 560000 | 4,574,360 | $(4,574,360)$ | 3,079,600 | $(3,079,600)$ |
| 25 | GFS :D | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | 207982 | :10020 | 10033381 | 11 |  | 20455 (new) | 567000 | 5,000,000 | ( $5,000,000$ ) | - | - |
| 26 | GFS | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | "207982 | 10020 | 10033381 | 1 |  | 11193 | 567000 | - | 5,000,000 | - |  |
| 27 | Self Sup 7 |  | 207915 | 232341 | 232341 | : 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | $487230$ | - | $(1,487,134)$ | - | $(1,487,134)$ |
| 28 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 232341 | . 232341 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 520190 | (1,276,737) | 1,276,737 | (1,267,597); | 1,267,597 |
| 29 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486020 | - | 252,194 | - | 252,194 |
| 30 | Self Sup: | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | :207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | :486030 | - | 64,360 | - | 64,360 |
| 31 | Self Sup: |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486050 | - | 30,719 | - | 30,719 |
| 32 | Self Sup: |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486070 | - | 21,267 | - | 21,267 |
| 53 | Self Sup. |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | $486090$ | - | 3,349 | - | 3,349 |
| 34 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486100 | - | - | - | - |
| 35 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486110 | - | 1,191,488 | - | 1,191,488 |
| 86 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | $1 \times$ | :": | 17582 | 486190 | - | 43,132 | - | 43,132 |


| Item $\#$ | GFS <br> Type: | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund <br> ID | Project ID | Activity ID | $\|$Activl <br> ty <br> Type <br> Nümb | Authority | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Account } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | BY Should Be Amount | Savings/(Cost) | BY +1 Should Be Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { BY+1 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | Self Sup | 715 | :207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | :10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486220 |  | 126,389 |  | 126,389 |
| 38 | Self Sup |  | ;207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486230 | - | 282,404 |  | 282,404 |
| 39 | Self Sup | 715 | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486250 | - | 24,578 | - | 24,578 |
| 40 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | . 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486270 | - | 29,887 | - | 29,887 |
| 41 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486280 |  | 1,901 | - | 1,901 |
| 42 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486310 |  | 52,369 | - | 52,369 |
| 43 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486340 | - | 108,572 | - | 108,572 |
| 44 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | : 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486350 | - | 70,377 | - | 70,377 |
| 45 | Self Sup | IIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486370 | - | 521,620 | - | 521,620 |
| 46 | Self Sup | TIS | :207915 | 207921 | 207921 | . 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486410 | - | 18,598 | - | 18,598 |
| 47 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486430 |  | 211,101 | - | 211,101 |
| 48 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486440 |  | 8,046 | - | 8,046 |
| 49 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486460 |  | 33,158 | - | 33,155 |
| 50 | Self Sup | TIS | :207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | :17582 | 486470 | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| 51 | Self Sup |  | ,207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486490 | - | 1,587 | - | 1,587 |
| 52 | Seif Sup | Tis | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486500 |  | 105,259 | - | 105,259 |
| 53 | Self Sup | tis | . 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486510 |  | 4,623 | - | 4,623 |
| 54 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | :28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486530 |  | 189,954 |  | 189,954 |
| 55 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486560 | - | 104,487 |  | 104,487 |
| 56 | Self Sup | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486570 |  | 2,500 |  | 2,500 |
| 57 | Self Sup | 715 | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486580 |  | 5,842. |  | 5,842 |
| 58 | Self Sup | 73 | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486590 |  | 20,021 |  | 20,021 |
| 59 | Self Sup | Tis | . 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486630 |  | 136,745 |  | 136,745 |
| 60 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486640 |  | 17,076 |  | 17,076 |
| 61 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486670 | - | 19,095 | - | 19,095 |
| 62 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486690 | - | 485,906 |  | 485,906 |
| 63 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486710 |  | 37,730 |  | 37,730 |
| 64 | Seif Sup | TIS | 207915 | . 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486720 |  | 23,819 |  | 23,819 |
| 65 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486740 | - | 81,079 |  | 81,079 |
| 66 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486750 | - | 7,200 | - | 7,200 |
| 67 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | : 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486760 | - | 5,000 | - | 5,000 |
| 68 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486790 |  | 937 | - | 937 |
| 69 | Self Sup |  | :207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 486800 | - | 3,600 | - | 3,600 |
| 70 | Self Sup |  | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 527000 | - | 39,087 | - | 39,087 |
| 71 | Self Sup | Tis | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 527610 | $\bullet$ | 797,645; | - | 797,645 |
| 72 | Self Sup | 7S | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | -17582 | 529110 | - | 508,323 |  | 508,323 |


| Item \# | GFS Dept <br> Type  | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund | WProjectID | Activity ID | Activi ty Type Numb | ority ID | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Account } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}\right.$ | BY Should Be Armount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EY } \\ & \text { Savings } / \text { Cost }) \end{aligned}$ | BY +1 Should Be Amount | $\begin{array}{r} B Y+1 \\ \text { Savings/(Cl-) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | : 207921 | 207921 | ,28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 530000 | - | 420 | - | 420 |
| 74 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 535000 | - | 1,791,966 | - | 1,791,966 |
| 75 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | . 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 535960 | - | 940,922 | - | 940,922 |
| 76 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | . 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | 540000 | - | 277,505 | - | 277,505 |
| 77 | Self Sup Tis | 207915 | - 207921 | . 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 |  | 17582 | :549250 | - | 2,100 | - | 2,100 |
| 78 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486020 | 252,194 | $(252,194)$ | 252,194 | $(252,194)$ |
| 79 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | - 207921 | :207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486030 | 64,360 | $(64,360)$ | 64,360 | $(64,360)$ |
| 80 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486050 | 30;719 | $(30,719)$ | 30,719 | $(30,719)$ |
| 81 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486070 | 21,267 | $(21,267)$ | 21,267 | $(21,267)$ |
| 82 | Self Sup TIS | :207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | :10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486090 | 3,349 | (3,349): | 3,349 | $(3,349)$ |
| 83 | Self Sup.TTS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | :486110 | 1,191,488 | (1,191,488) | 1,191,488 | $(1,191,488)$ |
| 84 | Self Sup TIS | ;207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486190 | 43,132 | $(43,132)$ | 43,132 | $(43,132)$ |
| 85 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486220 | 126,389 | $(126,389)$ | 126,389 | $(126,389)$ |
| 86 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486230 | 282,404 | $(282,404)$ | 282,404 | $(282,404)$ |
| 87 | Self SupiTh | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486250 | 24,578 | $(24,578)$ | 24,578 | $(24,578)$ |
| 88 | Self SuptTIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486270 | 29,887 | (29,887) | 29,887 | $(29,887)$ |
| 89 | Self Sup:TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486280 | 1,901 | $(1,901)$ | 1,901 | ( 1,901 ) |
| 90 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | ;207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | I 1 |  | 17608 | 486310 | 52,369 | $(52,369)$ | 52,369 | $(52,369)$ |
| 91 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | :486340 | 108,572 | $(108,572)$ | 108,572 | $(108,572)$ |
| 92 | Self Supilis | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486350 | 70,377 | (70,377) | 70,377 | (70,377) |
| 93 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486370 | 521,620 | (521,620) | 521,620 | $(521,620)$ |
| 94 | Self SupTIS | 207915 | - 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486410 | 18,598 | $(18,598)$ | 18,598 | $(18,598)$ |
| 95 | Self Sup:TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | $486420$ |  |  |  |  |
| 96 | Self Sup:TIS | 207915 | :207921 | 207921 | :28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486430 | 211,101 | (211,101) | 211,101 | $(211,101)$ |
| 97 | Self Sup:TIS | 207915 | - 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486440 | 8,046 | $(8,046)$ | 8,046 | $(8,046)$ |
| 98 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486460 | 33,158 | $(33,158)$ ) | 33,155 | $(33,155)$ |
| 99 | Self Sup TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486470 | 10,000 : | $(10,000)$ | 10,000 | $(10,000)$ |
| 100 | Self SupTIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | : 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486490 | 1,587 | (1,587) | 1,587 | (1,587) |
| 101 | Self Sup 715 | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486500 | 105,259 | $(105,259)$ | 105,259 | $(105,259)$ |
| 102 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486510 | 4,623 | $(4,623)$ | 4,623 | $(4,623)$ |
| 103 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486530 | 189,954 | $(189,954)$ | 189,954 | $(189,954)$ |
| 104 | Self Supitis | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | $1$ |  | 17608 | 486560 | 104,487 | (104,487) | 104,487 | $(104,487)$ |
| 105 | Self SuptIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486570 | 2,500: | $(2,500)$ | 2,500 | $(2,500)$ |
| 106 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | : 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486580 | 5,842 | $(5,842)$ | 5,842 | $(5,842)$ |
| 107 | Self Sup TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486590 | 20,021 | (20,021) | 20,021 | $(20,021)$ |
| 108 | Self Sup Tis | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 |  | 17608 | 486630 | 136,745 | $(136,745)$ | 136,745 | $(136,745)$ |



|  | GFS Type | Dept | ${ }_{\text {Dept }}^{\text {Depision }}$ | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | ProjectID | Activi  <br> ADIty  <br>  Type <br> Numb  | .ority ID | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Account } \\ & I D \end{aligned}\right.$ | BY Should Be Amount | Savings/(Cost) | $B Y+1$ Should Be Amount | $\begin{gathered} B Y+1 \\ \text { Savings/(CLar) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 1 | 14514 | :475415 | - | 2,214,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 1 | 14514 | 567000 |  | 2,214,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 1 | 14517 | 475415 |  | 150,000 |  | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 1 | 14517 | 567000 | - | 150,000 |  | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | -10860 | 10032767 | 38 | 14514 | :475415 | 2,214,000 | (2,214,000) | - | - |
|  | Self Sup |  | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 110860 | 10032767 | 38 | 14514 | 567000 | 2,214,000 | $(2,214,000)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 39 | 14517 | 475415 | 150,000 | $(150,000)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 39 | 14517 | 567000 | 150,000 | (150,000) | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10031891 | 20 | 17341 | 506070 | - | 200,000 | - | 50,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | :229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10031891 | 20 | 20387 | 506070 | 200,000 | (200,000) | 50,000 | $(50,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup. |  | 207988 | : 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031390 | 55 | 10008 | 444931 | - | 9,060,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031390 | 66 | 10008 | 444931 | 9,060,000 | $(9,060,000)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031502 | 55 | 10008 | 444931 | $\sim$ | 5,580,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | - 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031502 | 60 | 10008 | 444931 | 5,580,000 | $(5,580,000)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | :10880 | 10031523 | 55 | 14517 | 475415 | - | 2,000,000 | - |  |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10031523 | 58 | 14517 | 475415 | 2,000,000 | (2,000,000) | - |  |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032120 | 18 | 17333 | 506070 | - | 90,000 | - | 90,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | :207956 | 10020 | 10032120 | 18 | 20342 | "506070 | 90,000 | $(90,000)$ | 90,000 | (90,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | ;229863 | :229840 | 10020 | 10032121 | 18 | 17333 | 506070 | - | 140,000 | - | 140,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | . 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032122 | 18 | 17334 | \$506070 | - | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032123 | 18 | 17415 | 506070 | - | 124,000 | - | 124,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032121 | 18 | 20342 | 506070 | 140,000 | (140,000) | 140,000 | $(140,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032122 | 18 | 20343 | 506070 | 200,000 | (200,000) | 200,000 | (200,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | . 10020 | 10032123 | 18 | 20344 | 506070 | 124,000 | (124,000) | 124,000 | (124,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | - 229840 | 10020 | 10032127 | 18 | 17341 | 506070 | - | 38,000 | - | 38,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032127 | 18 | 20351 | 506070 | 38,000 | $(38,000)$ | 38,000 | $(38,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032128 | 18 | 17334 | 506070 | - | 30,000 | - | 30,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032128 | 18 | 20346 | 506070 | 30,000 | $(30,000)$ | 30,000 | $(30,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032375 | 5 | 17344 | 506070 | - | 30,000 : | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 207959 | :10020 | 10032375 | 5 | 20345 | -506070 | 30,000 | $(30,000)$ |  | - |
|  | GFS | DPW | . 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032510 | 1 | 17333 | 506070 | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | - 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032510 | 1 | 20342 | [506070 | 100,000 | (100,000): | 100,000 | $(100,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229822 | 207951 | 10020 | 10032113 | 18 | 17343 | 506070 | - | 15,000 | - | 15,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229822 | 207951 | 10020 | 10032113 | 18 | 17344 | 506070 | 15,000 | (15,000) | 15,000 | (15,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | , 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 21 | 14522 | 584030 |  | 21,824,000 | - | 27,078,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 446213 | - | 5,800,807 | - | 3,135,110 |


| Item \# | Type | Dept | Dept Division $\qquad$ | Section | Deptip |  | Project ID |  | Activl type numb |  | Account | BY Should Be Amount |  | $\mathrm{BY}+1$ Should Be Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Savings } /(\text { Cost }) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | -229863 | 207954 | 12760 | . 10032767 | 22 |  | 14522 | 584030 |  | 5,800,807 |  | 3,135,110 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 14522 | 446214 | - | 3,183,193 |  | 1,718,546 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 14522 | 584030 |  | 3,183,193 | - | 1,718,546 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 12 |  | 14522 | 446213 |  | 14,883,000 | - | 15,210,426 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 14522. | 584030 | - | 14,883,000 : | - | 15,210,426 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 14522 | 460198 |  | 8,139,000 |  | 8,318,058 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 114522 | 584030 | - | 8,139,000 | - | 8,318,058 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 21 |  | 20273 | 584030 | 21,824,000 | ( $21,824,000$ ) | 27,078,000 | (27,078,000): |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 20273 | 446213 | 5,800,807 | (5,800,807) | 3,135,110 | $(3,135,110)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 2 |  | 20273 | 584030 | 5,800,807 | ( $5,800,807)$ | 3,135,110 | $(3,135,110)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 |  | 20273 | 446214 | 3,183,193 | (3,183,193) | 1,718,546 | (1,718,546) |
|  | GFF | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 1207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 |  | :20273 | 584030 | 3,183,193 | (3,183,193) | 1,718,546 : | $(1,718,546)$ |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | :207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 122 |  | 120273 | 446213 | 14,883,000 | ( $14,883,000$ ) | 15,210,426 | ( $15,210,426$ ) |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | . 10032767 | 12 |  | 20273 | \%584030 | 14,883,000 | (14,883,000) | 15,210,426 | $(15,210,426)$ |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | . 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 12 |  | 20273 | 460198 | 8,139,000 | (8,139,000) | 8,318,058 | ( $8,318,058$ ) |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207988 | :229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 122 |  | 20273 | \%584030 | 8,139,000 | (8,139,000) | 8,318,058 | $(8,318,058)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 24 |  | . 10006 | 457000 |  | 2,552,560 |  | 2,860,188 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 24 |  | 20272 | 557000 | 2,552,560 | $(2,552,560)$ | 2,860,188 | $(2,860,188)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | :229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 11 |  | 14485 | 567000 |  | 6,063,750 | - : | 6,366,940 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | :10032767 | 11 |  | 20269 | 567000 | 6,063,750. | (6,063,750) | 6,366,940 | $(6,366,940)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 23 |  | 17027 | 557000 |  | 294,760 | - | 309,498 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 23 |  | 20270 | 567000 | 294,760 | (294,760) | 309,498 | (309,498) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 10 |  | 17348 | 567000 |  | 877,176 | - | 921,035; |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | :229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 110 |  | 20271 | 5567000 | 877,176 | $(877,176)$ | 921,035 : | (921,035) |
|  | Self Sup | Puc | 232429 | 232426 | 232425 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 |  | :10000 | 581077 | 175,000 |  | 66,000 | 109,000 |
|  | Self Sup | PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25940 | 10029994 | 2 |  | 10000 | 499999 | 4,634,985 | - | 11,841,061 | (109,000) |
|  | Self Sup | Multiple | Multiple |  |  | Multiple | Multiple |  |  |  | $515610$ | (3,550,360) | 3,560,360 | ( $7,328,530$ ) | 7,328,530 |
|  | Self Sup | Multiple | Multiple |  |  | Multiple | Multiple |  |  |  |  | 3,560,360 | $(3,560,360)$ | 7,328,530 | (7,328,530): |
|  | Self Sup |  | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 12 |  | 10001 | 567000 |  | 1,200,000 | - |  |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 12 |  | 20407 | 567000 | 1,200,000 | $(1,200,000)$ | - : |  |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | - 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | \%20 |  | 10001 | 567000 | - | 200,000 | - |  |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262658 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 20 |  | 20409 | 567000 | 200,000 | (200,000) | - |  |
|  | Self Sup | REC | :262668 | ! 262676 | 262676 | .16930 | 10027635 | 19 |  | 10001 | 567000 | - | 148,204: | - |  |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 19 |  | 20410 | 567000 | 148,204 | (148,204) | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | 262676 | -262676 | 16940 | 10027635 | 122 |  | 10001 | 567000 |  | 4,988,600 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16940 | 10027635 | 22 |  | 20408 | 567000 | 4,988,600 | $(4,988,600)$ | - : |  |


| Ttem \# | GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division $\qquad$ | Dept, Section, | Dept ID | Fund | ProjectID | SActivity | Actlv! ty Type Numb | . 10 rity <br> ID | Account ID | BY Should Be Amount | Savings/(Cost) | BY +1 should Be Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BY }+ \\ & \text { Savings/( } 2-\alpha) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Self Sup: | REC | 262668 | 262676 | . 262676 | 16950 | 10013222 | 20 |  | 10001 | 567000 | - | 250,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Sup: |  | 262668 | :262676 | 262675 | 16950 | 10013222 | 20 |  | 20405 | 567000 | 250,000 | (250,000) | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | REC | ;262668 | - 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013410 | 14 |  | 10001 | 567000 | - | 375,255 | - | $\cdots$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013410 | 14 |  | 20406 | 567000 | 375,255 | $(375,255)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | -16950 | 10032997 | 4 |  | 10001 | 567000 |  | 250,000 | - | - ' |
|  | Self Sup |  | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10032997 | 4 |  | 20411 | 567000 | 250,000 | (250,000) | - |  |
|  | GFS | DPH | 207705 | 162643 | 162643 | 10020 | 10032899 | 1 |  | 20031 | 585020 | - | 23,980,000 | - | 23,980,000 |
|  | GFS | DPH | 207705 | 162643 | 162643 | 10020 | -10032899 | 1 |  | 20031 | 506070 | 23,980,000 | $(23,980,000)$ | 23,980,000 | $(23,980,000)$ |
|  | GFS | WOM |  |  | 232395 | 10000 | 10026801 | 001 |  | 10000 | 538000 | 6,198,197 | (237,688) | 6,198,197 | $(237,688)$ |
|  | Self Sup; |  | 207672 |  | 207672 | ,10801 | 10001644 | 1 |  | 20285 | 411221 | - | $(10,000)$ | - | $(10,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 207672 |  | 207672 | 10801 | 10001644 | 1 |  | 20285 | 506070 | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
|  | Self Sup | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10801 | 10026733 | 1 |  | 20285 | 411221 | - | $(1,500,000)$ | - | $(3,000,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10801 | - 10026733 | 1 |  | 20285 | 591060 | - | 1,500,000 | - | 3,000,000 |
|  | Self Sup: | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | -10801 | -10033286 | 1 |  | 20281 | 411221 | - | $(13,437,000)$ | - | $(27,162,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup: | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20281 | 506070 | - | 13,437,000 | - | 26,218,938 |
|  | Self Sup | HOM | :203646 |  | 203646 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20281 | 581670 | - | - | - | 943,062 |
|  | Self Sup: |  | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20282 | 411221 | - | $(2,986,000)$ | - | $(6,036,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup: |  | 232065 |  | 232065 | . 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20282 | 506070 | - | 2,986,000 | - | 6,036,000 |
|  | Self Sup | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20283 | 411221 | - | $(10,451,000)$ | - | $(21,126,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20283 | 506070 | - | 10,451,000 | - | 21,126,000 |
|  | Self Sup |  | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20284 | $411221$ | - | $(2,986,000)$ | - | $(6,036,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 |  | 20284 | 506070 | - | 2,986,000 | - | 6,036,000 : |
|  | Self Sup: | TTX | 232360 | 232352 | 232352 | $10801$ | 10001751 | 1 |  | 20285 | 411221 | - | (630,000): | - | (630,000) |
|  | Self Sup |  | 232360 | 232352 | 232352 | 10801 | 10001751 | 1 |  | 20285 | 506070 | - | 630,000 | - | 630,000. |
|  | GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10000 | 10026733 | 1 |  | 10000 | 493066 | - | $(1,500,000)$ | - | $(1,500,000)$; |
|  | GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10020 | 10026734 | 1 |  | 10000 | 506070 | - | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 |
|  | Self Sup: | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12920 | 10033635 | 1 |  | 10001 | 506070 | 27,671,628 | $(27,671,628)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Sup | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12920 | 10033635 | 1 |  | 10001 | 448999 | 27,671,628 | 27,671,628 | - |  |
|  | Self Sup: | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12920 | 10033635 | 1 |  | 10001 | 506070 | 2,000,000 | (2,000,000) | 3,000,000 | $(3,000,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup | HOM | :203646 |  | 203646 | -12920 | - 10033635 | 1 |  | 10001 | 448999 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10033287 | 1 |  | 10000 | 538010 | 7,760,000 | 860,000 : | 9,256,938 | $(9,256,938)$ |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10033396 | 1 |  | 10000 | 538010 | 250,000 | - | 500,000 | $(500,000)$ |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026740 | 1 |  | 10000 | 581670 | 8,057,825 | - | 9,403,664 | (943,062) |
|  | GFS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026737 | 1 | 8 | 10000 | 538010 | - |  | 600,000 | $(600,000)$ |
|  | GFS | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10010 | 10023915 | 1 |  | 17198 | 538010 | 22,964,575 | $(1,400,000)$ | 24,814,575 | (3,400,000) |
| 枹 | GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | :10000 | 10026733 | 1 |  | 10000 | 499999 | 186,600,702 | (4,302,958) | 217,332,842. | 4,302,958 |



| Item * | GFs, Dept | Dept Division Section | Dept ID | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fund } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Project:ID | Activity ID. | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { Activiv } \\ \text { ty } \\ \text { Type } \\ \text { Numb } \end{array}\right]$ | $15$ | $\|$Account <br> $\square I D$ | BY Should Be Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { BY } Y \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | BY+1 Should Be Amount | Savings/(LL-L) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Self Sup ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581050 | 496,229 | (496,229) | 496,229 | (496,229) |
|  | Self Sup ADM | 296645 267664 | :267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581062 | 18,954 | $(18,954)$ | 18,954 | (18,954) |
|  | Self Sup ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581170 | 41,723 | (41,723) | 43,484 | $(43,484)$ |
|  | Self Sup ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581270 | 7,500 | $(7,500)$ ) | 7,500 | $(7,500)$ |
|  | Self Sup ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581330 | 400,000 | $(400,000)$ | 400,000 | $(400,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup:ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | :581790 | 5,298 | $(5,298)$ | 5,298 | $(5,298)$ |
|  | Self Sup ADM | 296645 267664 | 267654 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581820 | 9,619 | $(9,619)$ | 9,619 | $(9,619)$ |
|  | Self Sup ADM | $296645 \quad 267664$ | 267664 | 11802 | . 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 581880 | 80,000 | $(80,000)$ | 80,000 | $(80,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup ADM | 296645 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 |  | 20451 | 493001 | 7,090,000 | 7,090,000 |  |  |
|  | Self Sup MYR | 232065 | 232065 | 11801 | 10033289 | 1 |  | 20290 | 412210 |  | (1,500,000) |  | (3,100,000) |
|  | Self Sup MYR | 232065 | 232065 | 11801 | 10033289 | 1 |  | 20290 | 506070 |  | 1,500,000 | - | 3,100,000 : |
|  | Self Sup:MYR | 232065 | 1232065 | 11802 | 10033289 | 1 |  | 20290 | 412210 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 3,100,000 | 3,100,000 |
|  | Self Sup MYR | 232065 | 232065 | 11802 | 10033289 | 1 |  | 20290 | 506070 | 1,500,000 | $(1,500,000)$ | 3,100,000 | $(3,100,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 |  | 16612 | 412210 |  | $(3,200,000)$ |  | (6,900,000) |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 |  | 16612 | 493001 |  | (4,230,000) | - | : |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 33 |  | 16612 | 506070 |  |  | - |  |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 |  | 16612 | 538010 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 |  | 16612 | 486150 | - | $(441,229)$ | - | (441,229) |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 |  | 16612 | :506070 | - |  |  |  |
|  | Self Sup'ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 |  | 16612 | 538010 |  | 2,395,669 | - | 2,395,669 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 |  | 16612 | :486150 |  | $(30,000)$ |  | (30,000) |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | ;187644 | . 11800 | 10031167 | 46 |  | 16612 | 506070 |  | 1,640,553 | - | 2,698,535 : |
|  | Self Sup AR'T | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 |  | 16612 | 527990 |  | 35,391: | - | 35,391; |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 |  | . 16612 | 535990 | - | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 |  | 16612 | 538010 |  | 3,671,816 |  | 3,671,816 |
|  | Self Sup ART | :229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10016794 | 1 |  | 15761 | 500010 |  | 134,921. |  | 141,667 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | -10031168 | 1 |  | 16613 | 412210 | - | (1,900,000) |  | $(3,930,000)$ |
|  | Self Sup.ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 |  | 16613 | 506070 |  | 656,911 | - | 1,078,274 |
|  | Self Sup:ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 |  | 16613 | 535990 |  | 162,917 | - | 162,917 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 |  | 16613 | 581065 | - | 78,878 | - | 82,432 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 |  | 16613 | 581410 | - | 70,704 |  | 69,041. |
|  | Self Sup:ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10033364 | 1 |  | 20331 | 412210 |  | $(1,300,000)$ |  | $(2,690,000)$ |
|  | Self sup ART | 229000 | 229000 | 11800 | 10033364 | 1 |  | 20331 | 506070 | - | 1,300,000 | - | 2,690,000 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 412210 | 3,200,000 | 3,200,000 | 6,900,000 | 6,900,000 |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 493001 | 2,630,000 | 2,630,000 | - |  |
|  | Self Sup ART | 187644 | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 493001 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | - |  |


| Item \# | GFS <br> Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID $\qquad$ | Project ID | Activity ID | Activl ty Type Numb | Authority <br> ID | Account ID | BY:Should Be Amount | Savings/(cost) | $B Y+1$ should $B e$ Amount | $\begin{gathered} B Y+1 \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | . 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 506070 | - | - |  |  |
|  | Self Su | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | '10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 538010 | - | - |  |  |
|  | Self Sup | ART | 187644 | - | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 486150 | 441,229 | 441,229 | 441,229 | 441,229 |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 506070 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Self Su |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | -10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 538010 | 2,395,669 | $(2,395,669)$ | 2,395,669 | (2,395,669) |
|  | Self Su |  | 187644 |  | :187644 | 11802 | 10031167 |  |  | 20450 | 486150 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | -187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 506070 | 1,640,553 | $(1,640,553)$ | 2,698,535 | $(2,698,535)$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 527990 | 35,391 | $(35,391)$ | 35,391 | $(35,391)$ ) |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | :187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 535990 | 3,000 | $(3,000)$ | 3,000 | $(3,000)$ |
|  | Self Su |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 | 538010 | 3,671,816 | $(3,671,816)$ | 3,671,816 | $(3,671,816)$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 500010 | 134,921 | (134,921) | 141,667 | (141,667) |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 412210 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 3,930,000 | 3,930,000 |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | . 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | , 20449 | 506070 | 656,911 | (656,911) | 1,078,274 | $(1,078,274)$; |
|  | Self Sup |  | :187644 |  | . 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | \%335990 | 162,917 | (162,917) | 162,917 | $(162,917)$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20449 | 581065 | 78,878 | $(78,878)$ | 82,432 | $(82,432)$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | 187644. | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | :20449 | 581410 | 70,704 | $(70,704)$ | 69,041 | (69,041). |
|  | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  | :187644 | 11802 | ,10031167 | 44 |  | . 20331 | 412210 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 2,690,000 | 2,690,000 |
|  | Self Su |  | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20331 | \%506070 | 1,300,000 | $(1,300,000)$ | 2,690,000 | $(2,690,000)$ : |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10031044 | 1 |  | 15160 | 591100 | - | 1,599,795 : | - | 1,417,395. |
|  | Self Sup | REC | 207912 | 207914 | '150727 | 11900 | 10013710 | \% |  | 15164 | 495005 | 1,514,407 | 1,412,921 | 1,417,682 | 1,417,395 : |
|  | Self Sup |  | [207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11902 | 10001737 | 1 |  | 10000 | 499999 | - | $(186,874)$ |  | - |
|  | Self Su |  | 207912 | 207914 | . 150727 | :11902 | 10001737 | 1 |  | 10000 | "595050 | 1,514,407 | (1,412,921) | 1,417,682 | (1,417,395) |
|  | Self Sup |  | 262668 | . 262676 | 262676 | 11900 | 10001737 | 1 |  | 10000 | 558040 | - | 186,874 | - | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | Self Sup |  | 262668 | - 262676 | 262676 | 11900 | 10031044 | 1 |  | 15160 | 493001 | - | $(1,599,795)$ | - | $(1,417,395)$ |
|  | GFS | REC | 232199 | 232197 | 232197 | 10020 | 10013710 | 51 |  | 15164 | 591100 | 1,599,795 | (1,599,795) | 1,417,395 | $(1,417,395)$ |
|  | Self Su | REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727. | 11902 | 10013710 | 51 |  | 10000 | 493001 | 1,599,795 | 1,599,795 | 1,417,395 | 1,417,395 : |
|  | GFS |  | :axamex: |  | 230018 | 10000 | 10026734 - | 1 | :: | 10000 | $597110$ |  | 2,500,000 | - - \% | 2,500,000 : |
|  | GFS |  |  |  | 230018 | '10000 | 10026733 | 1 |  | 10000 | 499999 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 492001 | - | 19,770,000 | - : | 20,100,000 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | :207990 | 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 520190 | - | 1,412,950 | - | 1,422,889 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 249641 | : 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 520290 | - | 977,507 | - | 937,777: |
| * | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | :249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 522000 | - | 26,701 | - | 26,701: |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | , 249541 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 527000 | - | 6,705,813 | - | 7,051,817 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 527610 | - | 230,000 | - : | 230,000 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 540000 | - | 382,920 | - | 382,920 |
|  | Self Sup | DPW | 207990 | ; 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 |  | 10000 | 549210 | - | - | - | - |



| gistree eept |  |  |  |  | Proiectio |  | 隹 | Eounto | Tenhant | Syter | 5ewememe | mit | Treh |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\text {ofs }}$ art | 22900 |  | 22000 |  | 1002687 |  | 10000 | 5.5510 | 21274 |  |  |  |  |  |
| grs ofs ors $\substack{\text { boat } \\ \text { cat }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{232076 \\ 22092}}^{\substack{2}}$ | 10000 | （1002677 |  | （1000 | $\underbrace{\text { siskio }}_{\substack{5155610}}$ |  |  |  | Stias |  |  |
| ers con | 278611 | 27562 | 27562 | 10060 | 1002 |  | 10002 | 515510 | 235 | ， 423 | ${ }^{3308522}$ | 108． |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{229335}$ | 251982 | ${ }_{2}^{22933}$ | ${ }^{12000}$ |  | 1 |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { S156510 } \\ \text { Siscio }}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ |  |  |  | ［i．50， |  |  |
| $\mathrm{grs}^{\text {dph }}$ | 228541 | 25196 | 21065 | 21080 | 10003138 | 22 | 10000 | 515610 | 18，3515，616 | 24779，202？ |  | 19，964，012 | 18，63，7，14 | （1340307\％ |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{251667 \\ 13064}}^{\substack{2162}}$ | 20080 | （1003 |  | （1000 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Sisbio } \\ \text { Sis6io }}}$ | 55,30 | ，180 |  | 55，130 | 120 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {ars }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1000 | 5156 | 66，320， |  | 64：488 |  |  |  |
|  | 149855 | 12965 | ${ }_{2}^{199654}$ | 10000 | （1000 | 1 | （1000 | ${ }_{5156}^{5156}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58，24 |  |
|  |  | 22883 |  | 11940 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sels |  | ${ }^{228835}$ | ${ }_{228}^{238}$ | 13850 | 1000 |  |  | Siskid | 330，420 |  |  | 99， |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22837 | 13350 | 1000 | 23 |  |  |  | 443 |  | 88. |  |  |
| Ster | 296a4d | ${ }^{228875}$ 22855 | ${ }^{2288}$ | 14350 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seffupa $\times$ aim |  | ${ }^{2888}$ |  | 23310 | 1003088 |  |  |  | 1517,7 | 139.064 |  | ${ }_{165,195}$ |  |  |
| Sef Supramin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | （22837 |  | $\xrightarrow{223932}$ | ${ }^{17860}$ | （1026898 |  | （1000 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Sisbio } \\ \text { S1510 }}}$ |  | ， |  |  | cismex | ， |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{3,415}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {co，} 123}$ | 241 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22909 | 111000 | ${ }^{10022906}$ | ${ }^{10}$ | 11621 | ${ }_{5156}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seff sipx |  |  | 22094 | 1100 | 10223 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{2 \\ 22049 \\ 22047}}^{230}$ | ${ }_{11202}^{11020}$ | 边 | 9998 | （1022 | ${ }_{51515}^{515}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{11190}$ | （100） | 7000 | coseo | $\substack{5155 \\ 515}_{\substack{\text { che }}}$ | 4，018 |  |  |  | ${ }^{227,169}$ |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{2} 22326$ | 11300 | 1000 |  | 12000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{22364}$ | ${ }_{\text {1300 }}^{11300}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22318 | 22931 |  | 1098 | 100 |  | 1000 | ${ }_{515}$ | 1，700，57 | 1，83， 6,6 | （is， a $24^{\text {a }}$ | 2，88，122 |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{239}$ |  | 20735 | 13320 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{8}^{8,0959}$ | ${ }^{7} 4712,280$ |  |  | 込 |  |
|  |  |  | 22 | 13998 |  |  | 1000 | 515610 | ${ }_{302}^{20,085}$ | 303，344 |  | 233 | 18， 1205 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1199 |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{81,482}$ |  |  | ，730 |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{1306}}^{1306}$ |  |  | ${ }^{173680}$ |  |  | （1000 | ${ }_{5}^{515610}$ | 97， $0^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1246 |  |  |  |  | 23，24 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 515650 515610 | 5，939，1］ |  |  |  | 294，25 |  |


| GFS Type Dept | Dept Division | Dept <br> Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account ID | Tech Amt | BY TECH SHOULD BE | BY BPMS Change | BY+1 Tech Amt | $\mathrm{BY}+1$ TECH <br> SHOULD BE | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{BY}+1 \mathrm{BPM} \\ \text { change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Suppe MTA | 139648 | 208656 | 208656 | 22870 | 10001723 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 4,539,413 | 4,358,669 | 7, (180/744) | 4,947,961 | 4,565,706 | W 4 (382,255) |
| Self Supp MTA | 139648 | 208657 | 208657 | 22265 | 10001719 | 23 | 10000 | 515610 | 29,910,917 |  | T. 429,9101817$)$ | 32,602,900 |  | 4 32602900$)$ |
| Self Suppc MTA | 139648 | 208657 | 208657 | 22770 | 10001719 | 23 | 10002 | 515610 | - | 28,719,961 | - 428219961 | - | 30,084,159 | 54 ${ }^{4}+30,084,159$ |
| Self Suppe MTA | 175658 | 175656 | 175656 | 22870 | 10001728 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 63,488 | 60,961 | -t+ + (2,527) | 69,202 | 63,856 | Lt+er (5,346) |
| Self Suppe POL | 232104 |  | 232104 | 17960 | 10001907 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 2,133,529 | 2,111,299 | +. $\quad$, (22,230) | 2,325,562 | 2,211,585 | +, (113,977) |
| Self Suppr PRT | 232112 | 109754 | 109754 | 23680 | 10026768 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 1,482,189 | 1,398,086 | Wers ${ }^{(84,103)}$ | 1,615,586 | 1,464,495 | ¢ $\quad(151,091)$ |
| Self Suppi PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 24,911 | $\cdots$ | $(24,911)$ | 27,153 |  | - , 27,153$)$ |
| Self Suppi PUC | 229309 | 229271 | 229267 | 20160 | 10030000 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 2,652,993 | 2,783,800 | W, 130,807 | 2,891,762 | 2,916,030 | +124268 |
| Self Suppr PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298647 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 | 515610. | 1,762,434 | 1,843,494 | H+Y) 81,060 | 1,921,053 | 1,931,060 | T CO 07 |
| Self Supp PUC | 232176 | 232130 | 232127 | 27180 | 10026772 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 3,967,034 | 3,909,693 | C, - 157,841 | 4,324,067 | 4,095,403 | 4 ${ }^{4}$ |
| Self Supp PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25940 | 10029994 | 10 | 10000 | 515610 | 4,041,766 | 3,922,064 | - $\quad(119702)$ | 4,405,525 | 4,108,362 | W4 4 4 277163$)$ |
| Self Suppr REC | 207912 | 150705 | 150705 | 13370 | 10001737 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 1,546,451 | 1,435;516 | ,ter (190935) | 1,689,830 | 1,503,703 | $(186,127)$ |
| Self Supp REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11902 | 10001737 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 89,622 | 83,193 |  | 97,931 | 87,144 | Tx, ${ }^{2}+(10,787)$ |
| Self Suppr RET | 232318 |  | 232318 | 31330 | 10026788 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 610,313 | 612,436 | $\text { ,ruthe } 2123$ | 665,241 | 641,527. | W, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (23,714) |
| Self Suppr RNT |  |  | 232325 | 10850 | 10026789 | 1 | 10000 | 515610 | 211,741 | 210,331 | 14+64 4 (1,40) | 230,798 | 220,322 | Hettrt(10,476) |
| Self Suppe TiS | 207915 | 232341 | 232341 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 515610 | 1,525,782 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,478,507 \\ 186 ; 877,555 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4(47,275) \\ (9,263,318) \end{array}$ | 1,663,103 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,548,736 \\ 195,754,239 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 4 \\ \hline \end{array}(18,033,594)$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore(5,702,958)$ |  |  | $(10,705 ; 064)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NGFS: | - $(3,560,360)$ |  |  | $(7,328,530)$ |
| Balancing Entri |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GFS CON | 275641 | 275642 | 275642 | 10060 | 10022950 | 1 | 10002 | 486990 | 19143342 | 18,812,530 | $(330,812)$ | 19,032,760 | 18,649,493 | $(52455)$ |
| GFS GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10000 | 10026734 | 1 | 10000 | 581130 | 5,136,142 | 4,805,330 | Wayter 330,812$)$ | 5,213,534 | 4,830,267 | $\pm \pm 4 \pm(52453)$ |


|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { GFs } \\ \text { Typa } \end{array}$ | ．Dept | Dept Division | Dept＇Section | Section： Description | Departmenty | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { Fund xo } \\ \text { For } \end{array}\right]$ |  |  |  | Nactiver |  |  | Job Clais．Tttle | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 5 \text { statu } \\ \text { si } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Fifict <br> IVan <br> Yar． | End Yaar | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Eniti: } \\ \text { payperiod } \end{array}\right\|$ | BYFTE Shauld ＂Be＂ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ̈уү Амт } \\ \text { 5hould' } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{BY} \\ \text { Savings } \\ \text { (Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | 垶 Should Be | CBY＋1． Should Re Amt | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \mathrm{BY}+1 . \\ \text { suvngs/ic } \\ \left.\therefore \mathrm{ost}^{2}\right) \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | DPFH | 2242541 | 251185 | PGF Mental hee | 25174 | 22080 | 100001862 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | ${ }^{2328 \mathrm{C}}$ | Nurse Pracitioner |  |  |  |  |  |  | 407，242 |  |  | 533，251： |
|  |  | орн＂ | 242641 | $251985^{\circ}$ | HGË M M M | 251673 | $210{ }^{2} 6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ＂1000日建 |  | 110000 |  | 501010 | ${ }^{2328} C^{C}$ | Numse Pracelilioner |  | GY |  |  | i． 38 | 407，242： | （407，242）： | 1.8 | 533，251 | （533，251） |
| 攽 |  | His | 210653 |  |  | 22067 | 10020 | 100223312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | 5051010 | 09412 | Manager $\mathrm{V}^{\text {a }}$ |  | By |  |  |  |  | 191，366： |  | ． | 191，3i6 |
| 选4 |  | Tis | 210657 |  |  | 2067 | 10020 | 10022312 |  | 10000 | 10000 | 501010 | 1043 C | 15 Engineer－Senior | A | －y |  |  | － | － | 149，593 | － |  | 149，593 ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ |
| 5 | Gis＂${ }^{\text {c }}$ | กis | 2io6̈5 |  |  | －210657 | 10020 | ${ }^{106223312}$ | 1 | 10000＇ | 10000 | $501010^{\circ}$ | 10053．c is | Is Buisiness Analys－Senlor | A | －iy |  |  |  |  | 126，107 |  |  | 126，107 |
| 6 | GFs＂ |  | 21065 |  |  | 12065 | 10020 | 10223312 |  | 10000 | 170000 | 501010 | H054－C | IS Buisiness Analyst－Principal |  | Br |  |  | － | － | 438，014 |  |  | 438，014 |
| － | gis | TIS | 2106si |  |  | 210657 | 410020＂ | 100223i2 |  | 10000 | ：10000 | $5010100^{\circ}$ | 1064C |  |  | GY |  |  | ． | － | 133，097 ： | －－ |  | 133，097 |
| E 8 | GFs． | \＃is | 21065 |  |  | 1212065 | ${ }^{10020}{ }^{\circ}$ | 20022312 |  | 10060 | ${ }^{1000000}$ | ． 501010 | 1070 | is Project birector |  | 时 |  |  | － | ： | 160，948 |  |  | 16,0949 |
| 6 | GFs | TS | 21065 |  |  | 21055 | 20020 | （10023312 |  | $1 / 155$ | 1000 | 501010 | 991＿c | Manager vi |  | BY |  |  | 1.00 | 191，816 | （191，316） | 1．00＇ | 1si，316 | （191，3i6） |
| －100 |  | Tis | －2i2657 |  |  | 12065 | 180320 | 11032332 | 1 | （10534 | 110000 | 501000 | 1048 | is Enghear－Sesior | A | BY |  |  | 1.00 | 149，593 | ＂$(149,593)$ | 1.00 | 149，593 | （149，593） |
| 41. | GFs | Tis | 21065 |  |  | 12065 | ＂10020＂ | 10022312 |  | 176 | 10000 | 501010 | \％033－6 | is business Analisatsentor | A | EY |  |  | 1.00 | 126，107 | （126， 1075 | 1．00 | 126，107 | （126， 107 ） |
| 12 | Gis＇ | דis | 212653 |  |  | 21065 | $1{ }^{10020}$ | \％0032312 |  | 1155 | 10000 | 501010 | H1054c ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | A | $\mathrm{BY}^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | 3.00 | 438，014 | （438，044）． | 3.00 | 438，014． | （438，014） |
| \％ 43 |  | त̄ड | 21065 |  |  | 210657 | 110020 | ：10023132 |  | ${ }^{16524}$ | 170000 | $508100^{\circ}$ | H064c | fis arourainmer Analysterindoual ： |  | BY |  |  | 1．00 | 133，097 | （i33，097）： |  | 133，097 |  |
| 514 | \％${ }^{\text {Grs }}$ | iss | 22065 |  |  | 210637 | $10020^{\circ}$ | （10022312 |  | 116524. | 10000 | －43195 | Hozoc | Is Projelet Difector | ${ }^{\text {A }}$－ | 日ir |  |  | O | 100，948： | ${ }^{(160,949)}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.00 | 166，99̈d | （160，948） |
| 近 |  | Poit | 22206 |  |  | 232066 | 130000 | 71006isoa | ＋ | 10000 |  |  | 8235 | FForensicictatent Examineer II | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 669，618 ： |  |  | 迫6，414： |
| \％ 16 | Giss | P | 232091 |  |  | 232086 | i10000 | 120001909 | 1. | 10000 |  |  | 8233－ | Orensic litent xaminer Iil |  |  |  |  | 4.62 | 669，618 | （659，619）． | 6.0 | 880，414 | （880，4i4）${ }^{\text {a }}$ ） |
| 57 | Gf | ：TiR | 173651 |  |  | 130651 | Sioboà | ；100001963 | 0001 | $]^{100000}$ |  |  | S2215＿ct | Fifre protection Eingnerer－ | A | by |  |  | 00 | 155，913 | （155，913） | 1.00 | 155，913 | （155，913） |
| 418 | 的 | คṘR | 13065 |  |  | ${ }^{130651}$ | 10000 | 40601963 | 0001 | 10000 |  |  | 52i5＿c | Pre Proteruat Engineer |  | ay |  |  |  | 55，296． |  |  | ＂56，390 | （ 56,390$)^{\text {a }}$ ） |
| 49 |  | ：${ }^{\text {R }}$ | ${ }^{1306551}$ |  |  | ${ }^{1306551}$ | H0000 | 10001963 | ：8001 | 110000 |  |  | H004．F | finseector，Bür of frie Preventuon |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 145，549 | （145，549）． | 1.00 | 149，915 | （ 449,915 ） |
| 29020 | GFs | － T | 130651 |  |  | $1{ }^{1306551}$ | 10000 | 11000196 | \％oior | ；10600 |  |  | H004－F | Tispector，Buroffrite Prevenition ： |  | UY |  |  |  | 46，685 | （46，665） |  | $48,465{ }^{\circ}$ | （ 88,4655 ） |
| 27 19 | Ges | ； PD |  |  |  | 332082 | 10000 | 10001889 | M | 110000 |  |  | 617\％ | Attomey（cuiliciminial |  |  | $8 \mathrm{~B}+1$ | Payperiod 1 | 200 | 598，894 | （274，477） |  |  |  |
| \％ | GFs | ． $\mathrm{F}_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {\％}}$ |  |  |  | 2320082 | 17000 | 10001869 |  | 10000 |  |  | 8142 |  |  | OY | BY＋1 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 1.00 | 148，1236． | ${ }^{146,126}$ |  |  |  |
| 23 | GFs |  |  |  |  | 1323082 | 110000 | 10000189 | 1．．．． | 10000 |  |  | STPM－2 | ：Tep Adistmens，Miscelioneous ： | A |  |  |  |  | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃， | 126，32i． |  |  |  |
| 亚要 | Self Sup |  | 130680 | 207942 | bractient st | ¢207942 | 838970 | 1002477 | 1 \％ | $17582^{\circ}$ |  | 501010 | 1452 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Execulve Se Secreiary if | A |  |  |  |  |  | 91，588 ： | ：－ | － | 91，588 |
| 25． | Silif sip |  | 20715 | 233341 | ADPAdm Adminil | 23234i | 28070 | 12024977 | i ．－．． | ${ }^{125882}$ |  | 5010010 | ${ }^{14542}$ C | Excaitle Secretayil |  |  |  |  | 1．00 | \＄1，588． |  |  | 91，599＂ | （9i，588）： |
|  | Gfs ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | 232034 |  |  | 1232039 | \＃10000 ${ }^{\circ}$ | ：1600iz10 | $\ddot{4}$ | Hooóo |  |  | STEPM＿2 | Step Äduistienens，Miscellanexis： |  |  |  |  |  | $(651,756)$ |  |  | （637，694） | 34，000 |
| 52 | $\mathrm{S}^{\text {a }}$ | ذuv | 23304040 |  |  | 133040 | Hoino | 1060077io |  | 10000 |  |  | （0is ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Dieputy iriector iil |  |  |  |  |  | 258，614 | （259， 619$)$ | 1.00 | 260，021 | （260，02i） |
| 123 |  | Tiv | 2323040 |  |  | \％ 332040 | 170010 | 10001719 |  | T0000 |  |  | 8582］ |  |  | BY |  |  |  |  | ＇250，096 ${ }^{\text {］}}$ |  | ．．．． | 25i，150 |
| 23 |  | uviv | 1233272040 |  |  | 132040 | 10010 | H000izio | 3 | $10^{10000}$ |  |  | 0963 5 | Depaitmént Heead ini | A | BY |  |  | 1.00 | 309，418 | （309，418）： | 1.00 | 319，815 | （319，815） |
| 388 | Gfs | 北 | 232040 |  |  | ${ }^{1332040}$ | 120010 | ． 10.0017170 | 3 | Lioboo |  |  | 8418 －5 |  |  | BY |  |  |  | － | 300，4418 | $\cdots$－ |  | 319，45 |
| 3 |  | 30v | \％323040 |  |  | ［232040 | \％10010 | ${ }^{1000007710}$ | B | 10000 |  |  | 1024C | Tis Aldministatior－Superis or | ${ }^{-}$ | BY＇ |  |  | 1.00 | 178，362 | （178，362）： | $\because \quad 1.00$ | 179，130 | （179，130）： |
| 462 |  | $\mathrm{jCV}^{\text {a }}$ | 232040 |  |  | 233040 | 110010 | ＂100073io＇ |  | 106000 |  |  | 1052 C | TS Buiness andisist | A |  |  |  |  |  | 153，569： | $\cdots \cdots$ | $\cdots \cdot \cdots$ | 154，356 |
| S 8 | Gfs | juv | 232090＇ |  |  | 232006 | 1000 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  |  | 8444 | Deputy Probaton oficer |  |  |  |  | 2.00 | 327，376 | （327，376）： | 200 | 338，596 | （338，596） |
| 484 |  | 3ivivivis | 232040 |  |  |  | \％obio | －1000173io |  | $10000{ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{T}^{1244}$ | Seinior personne Analis | A |  |  |  |  |  | 166，114． |  |  | 16，426 |
| 85 | GFs | Jiv | 2322640 |  |  | 332006 | 110010 | ． 106001730 | 3 3 | H000 |  |  | ＂1823－＇c＇ | Senior Administaide Analist |  |  |  |  |  |  | i80，939 |  |  | 161，6818 |
| \％ | $\mathrm{Cl}_{6} \mathrm{~F}^{\prime}$ | 300 | 232035 |  |  | ［320035 | H1000 | 1000i7io |  | 10000 |  |  | \％0923 5 | Mänàer ii | A | By |  |  | 1.00 | 209，769 | （209，769） | 1.00 | 217，018 | （ 217,018 ） |
| 431 | ${ }^{6}$ | 3 iv | ${ }^{23223935}$ |  |  | 1232035 | 110000 | 10001730 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 8344－5 | birecori，Juvenile hail | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | BY |  |  | － |  | 209，769 ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | 217，018 |
| 4is | siel Sup |  | ：229015 |  |  | $22^{2} 2001$ | $\square_{12820}$ | H0022469 |  | 10000 |  |  | T1322＿c |  | A |  |  |  | － |  | 69，832 | － | － | 74，110 |
| \％9 | Self Sip |  | ${ }^{2} 270015$ |  |  | ［220015 | －1230 | －10022869 | ＋ | 16672 |  |  | 1822 | Maminisiailive | \％ | ¢ |  |  | 0.50 | 6¢， 832 | （ $6,8,832)$ | 0.5 | 74，110 | （ 74,110 ） |
| 40 | Self Sup | ASR | ． 222015 |  |  | 1229015 | 121510 | 10024404 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 4215－c | Assessor－Recorder Senior office s． |  | 㐫 |  |  |  |  | 121，4099 | ．．$\because$ | － | 122，195 |
| $4{ }^{42}$ | Selr sup | ASR | 22015 |  |  | 229295 | H2510 | 10024409 | 1 | 17809 |  |  | 8 | Assessor－Recorder Senlor ömee |  | 日 |  |  | 1.00 | 121，409 | （121，409）： | 1，00 | 122，195 | （122，195） |
| 42 | sear sup | ASR | 223015 |  |  | 220015 | 112i0 | ：10032313 | ，1 | 110000 |  |  | 4215－c | Assessor－Recorder Senior office $\underline{\text { ch }}$ |  | 旳 |  |  |  |  | 122，409 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ． |  | ．．．．－． | ［122，195 |
| 448 | Seif Sup |  | 229015 |  |  | 228015 | 12610 | 10033513 | i $\quad \cdots$ | \％1989 |  |  | 44215 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 1.09 | 121，409 | （121，409）： | 1.00 | 122，195 | $(122,195)$ |
| dex | ges | Sjuiv | 2322035 |  |  | ［232033 | 1100000 | ：1000 $1810{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1 | 110000 |  |  | 9993M ${ }^{2}$ | AAtilibion Saunigs－Miscelaneous |  |  |  |  |  | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 33，739 |  | （ $\mathrm{i}_{2} \mathbf{2} 79,571$ ） | －${ }^{43,1935}$ |
|  | Seff Sup | DPW | 207990 | 24696 | OpWU UTzan नor | 2149641 | 113985 | 10031233 | 1 | 10000 | Multiple |  | Mutitie | Muttple |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5，514，559 |  |  | 5，525，405： |
| $4{ }^{46}$ | Seff Sop | DPW | 207996 | 224642 | Opuwioban for | Cizi464i | － 1385 | 10631233 | 1 | 200748 |  |  | Mиitipieia | Mimutile |  |  |  |  | 40．83 | 5，514，559 | （5，514，559） | 40.33 | 5，525，405 | （5，525，405） |
| －972 | Seif Sup | ：ADM | 29696 | 268684 | AOMM Grater for | r2\％6］64 | 11840 | ：1000307\％ | 1 | 10000 |  |  | O922－6 | Manager I＇ |  | 日Y |  | Payperiod 27\％ |  |  | 55，431 |  |  | 56，601． |
| 4 4 | Seff Śup | ADM | 236645 | 286864 | ：ADM Grantis for | ${ }^{1} 288664^{-1}$ | 711940 | 1000303i | 1 | 10000\％ |  |  | －922＿c | Manager i | A | ay |  | Pajueriod 27. | － | － | 132，999 | －－ | － | 132，989 |
| 4－4in | Serstip |  | 220654 | 206664 | AOM Garait for | riziob 6 | \％iziaio | ＂10003079 |  | H0000̈ |  |  | 00932 | ，Manageel IV＇ |  |  |  | Pa⿱亠乂口阝⿱⿱亠䒑日\zh20 | － |  | －61，996 |  |  | 63，433 |
| 589 | Sefr sup | ADM | 226845 | 26i66 | AbM Grant pir | 27864 | Ti840 | $1100030 z^{\circ}$ |  | 10000 |  |  | 10932C | MManagè iv |  | 时 |  | Payperoid 27 | － |  | 165，259 |  |  | 165，259 |
| 5 5 | Seifsip | －äM | $1{ }^{286645}$ | 267664 | AbM Grant For | 726764 | 11880 | स10003078 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | ${ }^{1823} \mathrm{C}$ | Seatior Adminisfraive Analise | dincold | 站 |  | Pa⿱亠䒑⿱日十 |  |  | 46，2i6 |  |  | 4，000 |


|  | ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{\text {crspo }}$ | Dept | Dept tolvislon | Deptsection： | Secton | Dopatmentid： | Fund xD | PProjectid | Actuvtry ID | ${ }^{\text {Authorlt }}$ ID | Actulty type Number | Accountid | class ${ }^{\text {＂}}$ | 2 dag clasa Trite | statu | $\left.\begin{aligned} & \text { Ertect } \\ & \text { ver } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | End Yeser | PayPerlod | BY FIE Shóvid Should BS | GiY AMT Should 8 Ba | $\begin{gathered} \text { sivinserf: } \\ \text { (Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{BY}+1 \mathrm{FTE}$ Should Be | shoutal Be | ay＋1 Savyngs／cc ost） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | Self 5 Lip |  | 228645 | 267654 | ADM Granis for | 267664 | ：11840 | ．1000307 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | ：1823＿C | ：Serior Adminilstratve Analyst | A | BY |  | Payperiod 27 | － | － | 114，618 | － |  | 114，618． |
| 8 | Seif Siup |  | 266645 | 267664 | Abm crinis F | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 100000 |  |  | $3{ }^{3} 49$ | Anto Progimmassisian | A | BY |  | Prapeeioide 27 | － | － | 36，190 | － | － | 3，982： |
| 58 | Self Sip |  | 296645 | 268654 | ADM Grane for | 8ibibe | 11960 | 10000307\％ | 1 | 10600 |  |  | 3649 | A ATt Program Assisiont | A | 旳 |  | Pجypetiod 27 | － | － | 79,724 | － |  | ： |
| 55 | Sef Sup |  | ${ }^{266645}$ | 2664 | Abm Grans for | 285664 | ：118\％\％ | 10003038 | 1 | $10000{ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | $9774{ }^{\text {c／C }}$ | Senicor Communly Devi Specialit | A | br |  | Prayperiod 27 | － | － | 43，900 | － |  | 44，662 |
| 55 | Selif sup |  | 236645 | 267664 | ADM Ganit | 166864 | ：11840 | 100030079 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1 | $10000{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  | 974.6 |  |  | ： $\mathrm{EX}^{\prime}$ |  | ，Payperiod 27 |  | － | 107，843． |  |  | 107， 1833 ． |
| 57 | Self Sup |  | 2206645 | $2{ }^{2 \times 1669}$ | $A O M$ Grans for | 207664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 9991 c 2 | One Day Adus interit－MIse | A | 8 |  | Payperlod 27 | － | － | － | － |  | 1，226 ： |
| S8 | Self suip |  | 20866 | 28664 |  | 12664 | 118840 |  | 1 | 100600 |  |  | 9991 M － | One Day वdisisment－mise | A |  |  |  | － | － |  | $\because$ |  | $6:$ |
| 59 | Self Sup |  | 226645 | 206664 | ADM Gran | 2666 | 11840 | 10003038 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 9991M z | One cay adussment－Misc | A | By |  | Payperiod 27 | － | － | － | － | － | 4，619 |
| 60 | Seif sup |  | 296645 | 267664 | \％ DMM Grans for | 26765 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 9991M2 | One Day Adusisment－Msc | A |  |  |  | － |  | － | － |  | 38 |
| 61 | Self Sup |  | ：206645 | 267664 | ADM Granit for | 267664 | 11890 | ：10003078 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | $9994 \mathrm{M}^{\text {－}}$ | MCcp offer－Mise | $A$ |  |  |  | ． |  | 4，791 |  |  | 4，765 ： |
| 6 | Self sup |  | 2306645 | 267664 | ADM Giranis | 26i664 | ：11840 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 10003073 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | 9594in＿z | ＇MCCP Ofset－Misc | A |  |  |  | － | － | 17，993 | － |  | 17，993 |
| 63 | Self sup |  | 236645 | 256664 | ADMM Ginitis | 126669 | 11i862 |  | 1 | 20453 |  |  |  | Mañöger ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $A^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |  | ． | 55，431 | （55，431） | － | 56，601 | （55，601） |
| cs | Seff Sup |  | 236645 | ．267864 | ALMM Grant fo | ［27664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20951 |  |  | 0922 c | Managee I | A |  |  |  | 1.08 | 132，969 | （132，989） | 1 | 132，989 | （332，989）： |
| 65 | Seif Sup |  | 209655 | 267664 | ADM Gnais For | 26866 | 11882 | 10003078 | i | 20651 |  |  | 0332 6 | Màãage iv | A |  |  |  | － | $6_{1,996}$ | （61，996） | － | 63，433 | （63，433）： |
| 66 | Self sup |  | 236645 | 267664 | ADM Grans for | 127664 | ：11802 | 100003078 |  | 20451 |  |  | 0932 C． | Manager iv | A |  |  |  | 00 | 165，259 | （165，259） | 1 | i65，259 | （165，259）． |
| 6 | Self Sup |  | 236645 | 256669 | ADM Grants Fo | 226964 | ${ }^{11802}$ | 10003078 | 1 | 20951 |  |  | ${ }^{12233} \mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ | Sentor Admistratue Analyst | A |  |  |  | － | 46,216 | （46，216） |  | 47，000 | （47，000）： |
| $6{ }^{68}$ | Self suip |  | －296645＇ | 267769 | AOM Grant | －285664 | ${ }^{11180}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 100003078 | 1 | 20451 |  |  |  | Senior Adiditilisfative Ädijust | A |  |  |  | 1.00 | 114，618 | （114，618） | 1 | 114，618 | （114，618）： |
| 69 | Self Sup |  | ＇236645＇${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 268664 | ADM G Graisis | ${ }^{2} 85854^{-}$ | ${ }^{11802}$ | ：100003078 | i | 20451 |  |  | 3549＿c | Att Program Asistent | A |  |  |  | － | 36，290 | （36，190）． | － | 36，982 | （36，982）： |
| 20 | siers sup |  | 2296695 | 26864 |  | 20664 | 118002 | ＂100003078 | 1 | 20451 |  |  | 3349－C | Ats Provam Assisiona | A |  |  |  | 0 | 79，724 | （79，724） | 1 | 79，724 | （79，724） |
| 2 | Self Sup |  | 2266645 | 266764 | AOM GIant fo | 267664 | 11862 | 10000078 | 1 | 20451 |  |  | 9744 | Senico Communaty Dew Spedaist |  |  |  |  | － | 43，900 | （43，900） | － | 44，662 | （44，662）： |
| 22 | Seff Sup |  | ＇296645 | $268664^{\circ}$ | AOM Granis fo | $22{ }^{2} 664$ | 11802 | 10003073 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1 | 20951 |  |  | 9774 | Senior Coinimunty Devl Speciallst |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 107，843 | （107，843） | 1 | 107，843 | （107，843）： |
| 73 | Self sup |  | 206664 | 2 \％й64 | ADMM Gratis for |  | 102 | 10003078 | 1 | 20951 |  |  | 999 MZ | One Day | A |  |  |  | $\therefore$ | ． | － |  | 1，226 | （1，226） |
| 74 | Self Sup |  | 236845 | 268764 | ADM Giants Fó | 288664 | 802 | ＂10003078 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1 | 20451 |  |  | 9991M＿2 | One Day didusment－Misc | A |  |  |  | － | － | － | － |  | （36）： |
| 25 | telf Sup |  | 2906695 | 267566 | RACM Grant fo | 277664 | 11802 | 10003078 |  | $20451^{\prime}$ |  |  | 999imiz＇ | Cone day idustrient－Mise |  |  |  |  | － | － | － | － | 4，619 | $(4,619)$ ： |
| 78 | Teif Sup |  | 296645 | 2578664 | ADM Grans For | 278664 | 11802 | 101003079 | 1 | 20651 |  |  | 999Mz | One cay Adujement－misc | A |  |  |  | － | － | － | － | 138 | （138）${ }^{\circ}$ |
| 72 | Self sup |  | 296645 | 258564 | AbM Gianis fo | 26764 | 11602 |  | 1 | $20651^{\circ}$ |  |  | 99940 | Mçat ofimee－Misc | A |  |  |  | － | 4，791 | （4，791） |  | 4，785 | （4，709）： |
| 78 | Self sup |  | 296645 | 267864 | ADM Grant | ：207664 | 11802 | 10003073］＇ | 1 | 20451 |  |  | 9994M 2 | Mccar orisel－misc | A |  |  |  | － | 17，993 | （17，993） | － | 17，993 | （17，993） |
| 9. | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  |  | 197544 | ${ }^{118000}$ | 10031157 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | ：1824＿C | Principal Adininstradve Analyst | A | ： $\mathrm{BY}^{\text {P }}$ |  |  | － | － | 50，485 |  | － | 51，283 |
| 880 | Séfer sip |  | 187644 |  |  | ：197644 | 11880 | 100331167 | $44^{4}$ | 16612 |  |  | 1942 C | Managememinasisisatic |  | ： $\mathrm{YY}^{\text {－}}$ |  |  | － | － | 117，448 | － | － | 119，788 |
| 2 S | Seff sup |  | ：187644 |  |  | 187544 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | $1844 . \mathrm{C}$ | Serilor Managementit Assistant | A | \％${ }^{\text {BY }}$ |  |  | － | $\cdots$ | 42，70 |  |  | 43，535 ： |
| 83 | Self suip |  | 18664 |  |  | 178364 | H11000 | 106311ib\％ | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 3549 － | Atis progam asistint | A | ¢Y |  |  | － |  | 22，381 |  |  | 73，964 ： |
| 83 | Seff sup |  | 188649 |  |  | 18764 | 1180 | 0031167 | 4 | 16612 |  |  | 9991M | Cne Day Adjustment－Misc | A | ¢ BY |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | 274 |
| B4 | Seif sup |  | 187644 |  |  | 187644 | 11800 | 1003167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 9991 Mz | One Day Adustment－Msc | A | ：BY |  |  | － | － |  |  | － | 571 |
| （\％5 | Seff sup |  | 188649 |  |  |  | 11800 | $100311^{\prime} 7$ | 4 | 1661 |  |  | 99910～ | One day adjusment－Misc | A | ：${ }^{\text {Y }}$ |  |  | － | － | － | － | － |  |
| \％${ }^{81}$ | Seff sup |  | 187544 |  |  | 1717644 | 11480 | 10031167 | 44 | 16512 |  |  | 999imz | Ponē Day adusument－Misc | A | ： BY |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | 35 |
| 87 | Self sup |  | ：187644 |  |  | 1897644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 1924．c |  | A＂ | By |  |  | － | － | 132，668 | － |  | 132，668 |
| 38． | Self sup |  | 187864 |  |  | 187544 | 11880 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 1142 | Management Ässisbast | A | 时 |  |  | － | － | 271，949 | － | － | 271，548 |
| 89 | Seff sup |  | 18764 |  |  | 187644 | 11800 | $110031167^{\circ}$ | 44 | 16612 |  |  | ：1644＿c | Sender Maniogemenit Assistat | A | 日 |  |  | － | － | 103，719 | － | － | 103，719 |
| co | Seif sup |  | 187649 |  |  | 187844 | 1i800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | $354{ }^{\text {c／c }}$ c | Adis Prociram Ȧsisitenit | A | By |  |  | － | － | 159，448 | － | － | 159，9 |
| ${ }^{81}$ | Seff Sup |  | 18764 |  |  | 187644 | 11880 | 10031167 | 44 | 16512 |  |  | 9991Mz | Cne day Adjusiment－MIsc | A | 8y |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | ，021 |
| S2 | Sêf Siup |  | 1178644 |  |  | ＂187̆74＂ | 淮意 ${ }^{\text {＂}}$ | 100311197 | $4{ }^{4}$ | 16612 |  |  | 9991mz |  | $A^{\prime \prime}$ | ay |  |  | － | － | － | － |  | 2，099 |
| ${ }^{03}$ | Serf Sup |  | ：187644 |  |  | ：19̈644 | 11600 | ： 10031167 ． | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 9991M | ：One Day Adusiminent－Misc | $A^{-1}$ | ${ }^{\text {ex }}$ |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | 798 |
| 944 | Self suị |  | 187844 |  |  | 187844 | Hizoó | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 |  |  | 994 M 2 | One bay Mdulusimient－Misc | A | 时 |  |  | － | $\cdot$ | － | － | － | 1，227 |
| 98 | Seff Sup |  | 18764 |  |  |  | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 |  |  | 1824 －${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Princiopal Adminisfaive Analyet | A | OY |  |  | － | 50，485 | （50，466） | － | 51，283 | （51，283） |
| des | Self Sup |  | Fib764 |  |  | 197644 | ${ }_{11} 1802$ | 10031167 | $44^{4}$ | 20450 |  |  | ；842C＂ | MMañagement Asssisma | A | \％${ }^{\text {Y }}$ |  |  | － | 117，498 | （117，448） | － | 119，788 | （119，788） |
| 97 | Seif Siup |  | ［187644 |  |  | 1178644 | （1800＇2 | 10003i16\％ | 44 | 209450 |  |  | 1844 | Senior Meniagemeñit Assisitant | A＊ | © $\mathrm{EY}^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | － | 42，70 | （42，70） |  | 43，535 | （43，535）： |
| 98 | Seff Sup |  | 1196649 |  |  | 197544 | 11802 | 10031157 | 44 | 20950 |  |  | $3549 . C$ | ：Atts Progran Assistant | A | 时 |  |  | － | 72，361 | （72，31） | － | 73，964 | $(73,964)$ ： |
| 99 | Self Sup |  | 183644 |  |  | ［19876̈44 |  | 100̈3i19 |  | $209450^{-}$ |  |  | 999im | ＂One Day dadustment－MISC＂ | A | 旳 |  |  | － | － | － |  | 274 | （274） |
| 200 | Seff Sup |  | ：18764 |  |  | ${ }^{187544}$ | ：11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 |  |  | 9991M＿2 | One day ddustment－MIse | A | 日Y |  |  | － | － | － | － | － 571 | （51） |
| 8182 | Seff sup |  | 188649 |  |  | 18864 | 11802 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 10631167 |  |  |  |  | 9991 M Z | One Day Adusurment：M Misc | A |  |  |  | － | － | － |  | 218 | （218） |
| 102 | Self Sup |  | 187849 |  |  | ${ }^{187644}$ | 118802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 |  |  | 9991M2 | One day Adulumment Misc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 335 | （335） |


| teme | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{GFs} \\ \mathrm{rype} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Dopt， | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Dept pivision } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Dept Section－： | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } \\ & \text { Description } \end{aligned}$ | Departrientipe |  | Prodectio |  | Activty ID | Authority ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Activity } \\ & \text { Typmber } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Job Class Ttue | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { stati } \\ \text { E. } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Efrect } \\ \text { vivear } \end{array}\right\|$ |  | Pnd | $\begin{gathered} \text { By Fite } \\ \text { should. } \\ \text { Be } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BY AMT } \\ & \text { Shoutd Ba } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{BY} \\ \text { Savings/ } \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \text { Coset } \end{array}\right. \end{gathered}$ | EYTIFTE | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { BY+1 } \\ \text { Should Be } \\ \hdashline \text { Amt } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{BY}+\mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{savingss/(c)} \\ \hline \mathrm{cst}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103 | Self Sip |  | 118754 |  |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | ：20450 |  |  | ${ }^{1824 . C}$ | Princpal Adminstratue Analyst | A | ${ }^{\text {EY }}$ |  |  | 1.00 | 132，669： | （132，668） | 1 | 132，668 | （132，669） |
| 104 | Self Sup | הit | 186849 |  |  | 18864 | $\mathrm{HiBO}^{\circ}$ | 1033117 | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 1862 C． | Mañigementinasisian it | A | 8 Br |  |  | 3.00 | 271，549 | （271，549） | $\cdots$ | 271，549． | （271，549）： |
| 105 | Self Sup |  | 187644 |  |  | 1878649 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 1644C | Sentor Manageement Assistant | A | By |  |  | 1.00 | 103719 | （103，719）： | $\cdots 1$ | 103，719 | （103，719） |
| 105 | Salf Sup |  | 187644 |  |  | 18764 | 11802 | 10031167 | 14 |  | 20450 |  |  | $3549 \_$ | Ants Prosram Assistant | A ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8Y |  |  | 2.00 | 159，448 | （159，448）： | 2 | 159，448 | （159，488） |
| 307 | Self sup |  | 13i864 |  |  | 188644 | 18182 | －1003115\％ | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 9999im＿z＇ |  | A | 险 |  |  | － | $\bigcirc$ |  | ．． | 1，021 | （1，021） |
| 108 | Salf Sup |  | ：187644 |  |  | 187864 | ＇11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 9991M＿z | One Diay Aduisment－MISC | A | 日Y |  |  | － | － |  |  | 2，099 | （2，089） |
| 109 | seif Sup |  | （18744 |  |  | 188844 | 181802 | ：10031137 | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 9991M | One bay adjuitumen－misisc | ${ }_{\text {A }}$ | 日Y |  |  |  |  |  |  | 798 | （788） |
| 130 | self Sup |  | ${ }^{187644}$ |  |  | 1176644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 |  | 20450 |  |  | 999 Mz z | One day adjusment－Misc | A | 日Y |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1，227 | $(1,227)$ |




|  |  | Sub-Category | Program |  | Description | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  | 2019-20 |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\ddagger$ | Policy Area |  |  | DEPT |  | GFS |  | Fs $\because$ Total |  |  | GFS |  | Total |  |  | grs |  | non-GF5: |  | total |  |
| 19 | Housing | Affordable Housing Access | Barrier Removal | MOHCD | Potentially including: Navigation, Langauge access, application support | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 300,000 |  | , | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 600,000 |
| 20 | Public Safety | Restorative Justice | Pre-Trial Diversion | SHF |  | \$ | 515,000 | \$ | - | \$515,000 | \$ | 515,000 |  |  | \$515,000 | \$ | 1,030,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,030,000 |
| 21 |  |  | Detention Diversion Advocacy | CHF |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$0 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$100,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| 22-a | Clean Streets | Community Services | Neighborhood Clean and Green . | DPW |  | \$ | 255,578 | \$ | - | \$255,578 | \$ | 255,578 |  |  | \$255,578 | \$ | 511,156 |  |  | \$ | 511,156 |
| 22-b |  |  |  | DPW |  | (Remaining \$ after the position entries) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  | Pit stop expansion | DPW |  | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | \$100,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$100,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 200,000 |
| 24 | Rec \& Park | Open Space | Activation of Mclaren Park | RPD |  | \$ | 50,000 |  |  | \$50,000 | \$ | 50,000 |  |  | \$50,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| 25 | Public Health | Sexual Violence | Sexual Assault response and prevention | HRC | Policy and <br> mediation manager | \$ | 168,000 | \$ | - | \$168,000 | \$ | 168,000 |  |  | \$168,000 | \$ | 336,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 336,000 |
| 26 |  | Domestic Violence | Child Abuse Prevention | WOM |  | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | - | \$250,000 | \$ | 250,000 |  |  | \$250,000 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 |
| 27 |  |  | Violence Against Women and Families | DOSW |  | \$ | 980,246 | \$ | - | \$980,246 | \$ | 980,246 |  |  | \$980,246 | \$ | 1,960,492 |  |  | \$ | 1,960,492 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 88 \end{aligned}$ |  | Mental Health services | State cut backfill | DPH |  | \$ | 83,500 | \$ | - | \$83,500 | \$ | 167,000 |  |  | \$167,000 | \$ | 250,500 |  |  | \$ | 250,500 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 89 \\ \hline 29 \end{array}$ |  |  | Mental Health Services for homeless families | DPH |  | \$ | 335,000 | \$ | - | \$335,000 | \$ | 335,000 |  |  | \$335,000 | \$ | 670,000 |  |  | \$ | 670,000 |
| 30 |  | AIDS/ HIV Services | Integrated behavioral health Services | DPH |  | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 500,000 |  |  | \$ | 500,000 |
| 31 |  |  | Ryan White CARE Act Grant | DPH |  | \$ | 333,000 | \$ | - | \$333,000 | \$ | 333,000 |  |  | \$333,000 | \$ | 666,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 666,000 |
| 32 |  | Outpatient Services | Outpatient Services and Support network for Cancer survivors | DPH |  | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 300,000 |  |  | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 |  |  | \$ | 600,000 |
| 33 | Arts | Cultural Services | Arts Programming | GEN |  | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$200,000 | \$. | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 400,000 |
| 34 | Seniors and People wth Disabillities | Food Security | In-Home Grocery delivery | DAAS |  | \$ | 683,000 | \$ | - | \$683,000 | \$ | 683,000 | \$ | - | \$683,000 | \$ | 1,365,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,366,000 |
| 35 |  |  | Congregate Meals | DAAS |  | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | \$100,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$100,000 | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$ | 200,000 |
| 36 |  |  | In Home Meal Delivery | DAAS |  | \$ | 400,000 | \$ | - | \$400,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | \$400,000 | \$ | 800,000 |  |  | \$ | 800,000 |
| 37 |  | Housing | Residential Care Facilities | DAAS |  | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$. | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 600,000 |
| ${ }^{38}$ |  | Asing in Place | Health and Care and Activity Programming | HSA |  | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  | . | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$ | 200,000 |
| 39 |  | immigrant <br> Protection <br> Educaton | Voting Registry education outreach | OCEIA |  | \$ | 375,000 | \$ | - | \$375,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$0 | \$ | 375,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 375,000 |
| 40 |  |  | LBGTQ Service programming | MOHCD |  | \$ | 175,000 | \$ | * | \$175,000. | \$ | 175,000 | \$ | - | \$175,000 | \$ | 350,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 350,000 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{*}$ | Policy Area. | Sub-Category | Program | DEPT | Description |  |  | GFS |  | non-GFs |  | Total | , | GFS |  | non-grs |  | Total |  | GFS |  | non-gFs |  | total |
| 41 | Community Services | LGBTQ Services | Transgender Violence Prevention | ADM / HRC |  |  | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - |  | \$200,000 |  | 200,000 | \$ | - |  | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | \$ | 400,000 |
| 42 |  | Family Services | Family Resource Centers, with a focus on the Latino Community | OECE |  |  |  | 200,000 |  |  |  | \$200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  |  | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | \$ | 400,000 |
| 43 | Elections | Open Source Voting Pilot | Eligible for State matching funds | REG |  |  | \$ | 660,000 | \$ | 5 - |  | \$660,000 | \$ | 595,000 | \$ | - |  | \$595,000 | \$ | 1,255,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,255,000 |
| 44 | Public Health | Mental Health. services | Assisted Outpatient Treatment Program | PDR |  |  |  | 103,486 |  |  |  | \$103,486 |  | 135,185 |  |  |  | \$135,185 | \$ | 238,671 |  |  | \$ | 238,671 |
| 45 | District Specific | District Specific Priorities | \$1M per district over two years | GEN | . |  | \$ | 9,684,500 | \$ |  |  | \$9,684,500 |  | 1,308,500 | \$ | - |  | \$1,308,500 | \$ | 10,993,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,993,000 |
| 46 | Public Utility | Neighborhood Sewardship Program | Community Engagement | PUC |  |  | \$ | - |  | 1,115,000 |  | \$1,115,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 805,000 |  | \$805,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,920,000 | \$ | 1,920,000 |
| 47 |  |  | Workforce Development | PUC |  |  | \$ | - |  | 1,570,000 |  | \$1,570,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,260,115 |  | \$1,260,115 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,830,115 | \$ | 2,830,115 |
| 48 |  |  | Water Investments | puc |  |  | \$ | - |  | 1,025,000 |  | \$1,025,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 250,000 |  | \$250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,275,000 | \$ | 1,275,000 |
| 49 |  |  | Wastewater Investments | PUC |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | \% 625,000 |  | \$625,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 325,000 |  | \$325,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 950,000 | \$ | 950,000 |
| $\stackrel{50}{1}$ |  |  | Drinking Water Enhancements | PUC |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | 3 325,000 |  | \$325,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 165,000 |  | \$165,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 490,000 | \$ | 490,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 27,091,415 |  |  |  |  |  | 31,751,415 |  | 14,540,614 | \$ | $2,805,115$ |  | $17,345,729$ |  |  |  | Fund Total Total | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41,632,029 \\ & 49,097,144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |



| Item \# | District | Policy Area | Dept | Description | GFS 18-19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } \\ 18-19 . \end{gathered}$ | Total 18-19 | GFS 19-20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } \\ 19-20 \end{gathered}$ | Total 19-20 | TOTAL GFS BOTH YEARS | total non-GFS BOTH YEARS | TOTAL ALL SOURCES BOTH YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 1 | Environment | PW | Tree-planting in District 1 | 47,000 |  | 47,000 |  |  |  | 47,000 | - | 47,000 |
| 23 | 2 | Clean Streets | ECN | Lombard Gardener - Gardener services for Crooked Lombard | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |  |  | - | 45,000 ${ }^{\circ}$ | - | 45,000 |
| 24 | 2 | Public Safety | ECN | Lombard Ambassadors - Ambassador program on Lombard St | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | , |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 25 | 2 | Merchant Outreach | ECN | Merchant Outreach/Planning | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 26 | . 2 | Public Safety | SFFD | Marine Rescue Unit/Safety | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  | - | 250,000 | - | 250,000 |
| 27 | 2 | Community | RPD | Capital projects and family services/events | 175,000 |  | 175,000 |  |  | - | 175,000 | - | 175,000 |
| 28 | 2 | Utilities | RPD | Francisco Park - Utility connections | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  | - | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 29 | 2 | Senior Services | DAAS | Senior services programing | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 30 | 2 | Utilities | DPW | Utility Undergrounding Master | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 31 | 3 | Small Business Support | OEWD | Chinatown Construction Mitigation Fund for Stockton Merchants | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |  |  | - | 45,000 | - | 45,000 |
| 32 | 3 | Senior Services | DAAS | Village model support services for lowincome independent seniors in District 3 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 33 | 3 | Behavioral Health Services | DCYF | API behavioral health services in Visitacion Valley and Chinatown serving newcomer, school-age children and adults. Funding for licensed eligible staff to build capacity \& provide behavioral health direct services to API SFUSD families/kids impacted by trauma and enrolled in counseling | 100,000 | . | $100,000$ | . | . | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 34 | 3 | Workforce Development | OEWD | Japanese cooking Class w/ 20 guaranteed placements after training | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 35 | 3 | Youth Education \& Career Training | DCYF | Family in Transition (FIT) program, youthled program that directs low-income, limited English proficient API youth to educational, life skills \& career opportunities | 56,000 |  | 56,000 | 56,000 |  | 56,000 | 112,000 | - | 112,000 |
| 36 | 3 | Tenants Rights | MOHCD | API Tenants Rights counseling, particularly monolingual Chinese seniors at risk of unlawful evictions. Capacity to serve 215 residents. | 97,500. |  | 97,500 | 97,500 |  | 97,500 | 195,000 | - | 195,000 |



| District | Policy Area | Dept | Description | GFS 18-19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } \\ 18-19 \end{gathered}$ | Total 18-19 | GFS 19-20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-GFS } \\ & 19-20 . \end{aligned}$ | Total 19-20 | TOTAL GFS BOTH YEARS | TOTAL non-GFs вотн yEARS | TOTAL ALL SOURCES BOTH YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Community Services | oewd | Activation of underutized space | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 5 | Community Services | DCYF | TAY workforce and Mental health services | 91,000 |  | 91,000 |  |  | - | 91,000 | - | 91,000 |
| 5 | Youth Services | DCYF | Community programming | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 5 | Economic Development | ECN | Community programming | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 5 | Community Services | dCYF | TAY youth service | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  | - | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 5 | Workforce Development | ECN | Workforce development/ barrier removal | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 5 | Economic Development | ECN | Neighborhood activation | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  | - | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 5 | Economic Development | GFTA-ADM | Grant writer / technical assistance | 60,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 60,000 | - | 60,000 |
| 6 | Senior Services | DAAS | Program Advocate/Navigator for Seniors and Adults with Disabilities | $15,000$ |  | 15,000 |  |  |  | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |
| 6 | Street Cleanliness, Public Health | DPW | SMART receptacles for Yerba Buena/Mission Bay/Rincon Hill neighborhoods | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| 6 |  | MOHCD | Violence against women | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |
| 6 | Housing | MOHCD | Eviction Prevention | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |  |  |  | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |
| 6 | Street Cleanliness | OEWD | Micro-neighborhood cleaning: create 6 clean teams | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |
| 6 | Community Development | MOHCD | Community Support to Fillipinos in SOMA | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  |  |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |
| 6 | Public Safety | OEWD | Nightime Security Support | 165,000 |  | 165,000 |  |  |  | 165,000 |  | 165,000 |
| 6 | Public Safety/street Cleanliness | RPD | Sergeant Macauley Playground Bathroom Renovation | 213,000 |  | 213,000 |  |  |  | 213,000 |  | 213,000 |
| 6 | Trans Community | MOHCD | TLGB Cultural District | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |
| 6 | Small Business | MOHCD | 101 Hyde Street Project | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | - |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 7 | Youth Services | DCYF | Youth arts education programming and job training in District 7 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 7 | Pedestrian Safety | MTA | Grants for Vision Zero participatory budgeting program in District 7 to support democratically elected projects to benefit the community. | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  | - | 250,000 | - | 250,000 |




| Item \# | District | Policy Area | Dept | Description | GFS 18-19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } \\ 18-19 \end{gathered}$ | Total 18-19 | GFS 19-20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } \\ 19-20 \end{gathered}$ | Total 19-20 | TOTAL GFS BOTH YEARS | TOTAL non-GFS BOTH YEARS | total all SOURCES BOTH YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 105 | 9 | Arts \& Culture | Arts Commission | Transgender arts programming in the Mission | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 106 | 9 | Arts \& Culture | DPW | Murals, street pole banners, and signs in the Portola | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  | - | 30,000 | - | 30,000 |
| 107 | 9 | Youth Literacy | DCYF | Early Literacy Education to low-income and immigrant children in Portola | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  | - | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 108 | 9 | Arts \& Culture | OEWD | Staffing for Calle 24 cultural district | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 109 | 9 | Homeless workforce development | OEWD | Workforce development street cleaning program in the mission for homeless people | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 110 | 9 | Street beautification | DPW | Beautification of Mission Street between 14th and 16th Streets | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 111 | 9 | Street beautification | DPW | Greening of problematic areas of the Cesar Chavez corridor in D9 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  | - | 5,000 | - | 5,000 |
| 112 | 9 | Arts \& Culture | Arts Commission | Facilities maintenance for historic theatre space in the Mission | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 113 | 10 | Arts | ARTS | Capital Improvements @ BVOH | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 114 | 10 | Youth Arts | SFUSD | Arts enrichment program for Bayview elementary students | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
| 115 | 10 | Parks and Open Space | DPW | Mini Park Improvements capital improvements | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 115 | 10 | Parks and Open Space | RPD | McLaren Park Activation | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 117 | 10 | Community Gardens | DPW | Lighting in Carolina Green Space | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 118 | 10 | Youth Services | DCYF | Program mentoring for high risk pacific islander TAY | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
| 119 | 10.2692 | Arts \& Culture | DPW | Murals, street pole banners, and signs in the Portola | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 120 | 10 | Family Services | OCEIA | Child Resource and Referral Services for SF immigrant families | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 121 | 10 | Legal Services | MOHCD | Pro bono legal support serving the Bayview community | 85,000 |  | 85,000 | 85,000 |  | 85,000 | 170,000 | - | 170,000 |






|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  | 530110 | Property Rent |  |  | 1,000,000 | 825,000. | 175,000 |  |  |  |  | \$1,500,000 | \$575,000 | 925,000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | O923 Manager II | 0.77 | 0.00 | 109,929 |  | 109,929 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$142,764 |  | 142,764 |  |  |
|  | PUC. | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Frince Benefits |  |  | 44,466 |  | 44,466 |  |  |  |  | \$ $\$ 59,533$ |  | 59,533 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | 1825 Principal Administrat | 0.00 | 0.77 |  | 111,908 | (111,908) |  |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | \$145,337 | (145,337) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | 41,086 | $(41,086)$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$54,429 | (54,429) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Attrition Savings |  |  | - | (180,627) | 180,627. |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$180,627) | 180,627 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | $(72,251)$ | 72,251 |  |  |  |  |  | (\$72,251) | 72,251 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  | - | $(150,000)$ | 150,000 |  |  |  |  |  | : $=(\$ 150,000)$ | 150,000 |  |  |
|  | PUC | -198644 |  | 198644 | 24750 | 10026777 | 1 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (60,000) | 60,000 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( $\$ 60,000$ ) | 60,000 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298648 | 24970 | 10029992 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Attrition Savings | (3.11) | (4.22) | (393,571) | $(533,863)$ | 140,292 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298648 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (155,044) | (210,311) | 55,267 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {PUC }}$ | 231637 | 298651 | 298648 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 |  | 527000 | Professional 8 Specialized | ervices. |  | 4,682,082 | 4,582,082 | 100,000 |  |  |  |  | \$2,932,082 | \$2,832,082 | 100,000 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298648 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  | - | (29,470) | 29,470 |  |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 29,470$ ) | 29,470. |  |  |
| 3 | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298648 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | $(7,826)$ | 7,826 |  |  |  |  | 50 | ( $\$ 7,826)$ | 7,826 |  |  |
|  | Puc | 231637 | 298651 | 298649 | 24970 | 10029986 | 12 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  |  | (143,775) | 143,775 |  |  |  |  | 10 | (\$143,775) | 143,775 |  |  |
| 3 | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298649 | 24970 | 10029986 | 12 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Frince Benefits |  |  |  | (38, 393$)$ | 38,393 |  |  |  |  | 40 | $\cdots(438,393)$ | 38,393 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298647 | 24970 | 10029992 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  |  | (29,541) | 29,541 |  |  |  |  | \$0. | (\$29,541) | 29,541 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298651 | 298647 | 24970 | 10029992 | 4 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | $(7,823)$ | 7,823 |  |  |  |  | \$0. | $\cdots(\$ 7,823)$ | 7,823 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298646 | 298646 | 24970 | 10029992 | 22 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Aitrition Savings | (17.32) | (18.40) | (1,887, $\mathbf{1}$ (7) | ( $2,005,873$ ) | 118,116 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | PUC | 231637 | 298646 | 298546 | 24970 | 10029992 | 22 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (791;898) | (841;446) | 49,548 |  | x. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PUC | -231637 | 298646 | 298646 | 24970 | 10029992 | 22 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  |  | (278,972) | 278,972 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$278,972) | 278,972 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 231637 | 298646 | 298646 | 24970 | 10029992 | 22 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (75,550) | 75,550 |  |  |  |  | 10 | ( 775,550 ) | 75,550 |  |  |
|  | PUC | $\underline{231637}$ | 231621 | 231621 | 24980 | 10025208 | 1 | 17682 |  | 500010 | Facilites Maintenance |  |  | 971,200 | 921,200 | 50,000 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{8}{9}$ | PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25950 | 10025208 |  | 17682 |  | 500010 | Faclities Maintenance |  |  | 5,277,000 | 4,627,000 | 650,000 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25940 | 10029994 | 10 | 1.0000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  |  | (10, 265) | 10,266 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$10,266) | 10,266 |  |  |
| 0 | PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25940 | 10029994 | 10 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Frince Benefits |  |  |  | (2,572) | 2,672 |  |  |  |  | 90. | (\$2,672) | 2,672 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 1.0000 | UW1918 | 560290 | Automotive \& Other vehicle |  |  | 133,492. | 75,600 | 57,892 109,396 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | PUC | $\begin{array}{r}232429 \\ \hline 23249 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 7345 Electrician | 3.00 | 2.00 | 328,189 142,750 | 218,793 | 109,396 |  |  | 3.00 | 2:00 | $\$ 328,189$ $\$ 146,430$ | $\begin{array}{r}\$ 218,793 \\ \hline 97,520\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}109,396 \\ \hline 48,810\end{array}$ |  |  |
|  | PUC | -232429 | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 9993 Attrition - |  |  | ( 361,089 ) | (251,693) | (109,396) |  |  |  |  | (\$373,113) | ( $\$ 263,717)$ | (109,396) |  |  |
| 5 | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Ftince Benefits |  |  | (156,832) | (109,245) | $(47,587)$ |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 166,470)$ | (\$117,660) | (48,810) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  | - | (46,046) | 46,046 |  |  |  |  | 40 | ( $\$ 46,046$ ) | 46,046 |  |  |
| 7 | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232403 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (12,574) | 12,574 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( 512,574 ) | 12,574 |  |  |
|  | Helich | 232429 | 232413 | 232404 | 25940 | 10029998 | , | 10000 |  | 501010 | 0941 Manager VI | 1.00 | 0.00 | 191,315 |  | 191,316 |  |  |  |  | \$191,316. |  | 191,316 |  |  |
|  | dy | 232429 | 232413 | 232404 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Eringe Benefits |  |  | 67,625 |  | 67,625 |  |  |  |  | \$69,359 | 50 | 69,359 |  |  |
|  | Qf | 2324299 | 2324413 | 232404 | 25940 | 1002999988 |  | 10000 10000 |  | 501010 | 10933 Manager V | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 178,221 64,960 | $(1788,221)$ $(64,960)$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\text { \$178,221 }}{\$ 66,708}$ | (178,221) |  |  |
| 2 | PUE | 232429 | 232413 | 232404 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 | UW1984 | 560290 | Automotive \& O Other Venicle |  |  | 61,375 | 28,992 | 32,383 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232405 | 25940 | 10029997 | 32 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  | - | (2,184) | 2,184 |  |  |  |  | f0 | ( 52,184 ) | 2,184 |  |  |
| 4 | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232405 | 25940 | 10029997 | 32 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Frince Benefits |  |  |  | (596) | 596 |  |  |  |  | \$0. | (\$596) | 596 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232406 | 25940 | 10029998 |  | 10000 | UW1962 | 560290 | Automotive \& other vehicle |  |  | 32,383 |  | 32,383 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232406 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  |  | (203,138) | 203,138 |  |  |  |  | 40 | ( $\$ 203,138)$ | 203,138 |  |  |
| 7 | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232406 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatony Fringe Benefits |  |  | - | (55,472) | 55,472 |  |  |  |  | 50 | (\$55,472) | 55,472 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232411 | 25940 | 10029998 | 5 | 10000 | UW1931, UW | 560290 | Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | 3,007,030 | 2,971,647 | 35,383 |  | X |  | 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | PUC | $\frac{232429}{}$ | 232413 | 232411 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 7514 General Laborer | 21.00 | 20.00 | 1,507, 178 | 1,435,408 | 71,770 |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | \$1,507,178 | \$1,435,408 | 71,770 |  |  |
| 1 | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232411 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | 715;714 | 681,632 | 34,082 |  |  |  |  | . 9737,216 | \$702,110 | 35,106 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232411 | 25940 | 10029998 | 6 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 9993 Attrition |  |  | (2,484, 703 ) | ( $2,412,933$ ) | (71,770) |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | (\$2,567,444) | ( $\$ 2,495,674$ ) | (71, 770) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232413 | 232411 | 25940 | 10029998 |  | 10000 |  |  | Manditory Fringe Benefits) |  |  | (1,079,071) | (1,044,989) | (34,082) |  |  |  |  | (\$1,145,279) | (\$1,110,173) | $(35,106)$ |  |  |
| 3 | PUC | 232429 | 232420 | 232416 | 25940 | 10029996 |  | 10000 | UW1902 | 560290 | Automotive \& Other Vehicle |  |  | 26,651 | - | 26,661 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | PUC | $\underline{23429}$ | 232420 | 232417 | 25940 | 10029996 |  | 10000 | UW2005 | 560290 | Automotive \& Other Vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$37,605 | \$0. | 37,605 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232420 | 232415 | 25940 | 10029996 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  | - | (3,924) | 3,924 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( 43,924 ) | 3,924 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232420 | 232415 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Frinqe Benefits |  |  |  | (1,058) | 1,058 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$1,058) | 1,058 |  |  |
| 7 | PUC | 232429 | 232420 | 232418 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  | - | $(16,287)$ | 16,287 |  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ | (\$16,287) | 16,287 |  |  |
| 8 | PUC | ${ }^{232429}$ | 232420 | 232418 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (4,387) | 4,387 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$4,387) | 4,387 |  |  |
| 星 | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232421 | 25940 | 10029997 | 2 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  | - | (23.683) | 23,683 |  |  |  |  | 40 | (\$23,683) | 23,683 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232421 | 25940 | 10029997 | 2 | 10000 |  |  | Mandator Frinqe Benefits |  |  |  | (6,336) | 6,336 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$6,336) | 6,336 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 242422 | 25940 | 10029997 |  | 10000 | UW1946 | 560290 | Autamotive \& Other Vehicle |  |  | 438,244 | 350,142 | 88,102 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232422 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 | UW2009 | 560290 | Automotive \& Other vehide | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$113,954. | \$85,341 | 28,613 |  | $x$ |
| 3 | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232422 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  |  | (29,835) | 29,835 |  |  |  | \% | $\$ 0$. | (\$29,835) | 29,835 |  |  |
| 4 | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232422 | 25940 | 10029997 | 20 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (8,157) | 8,167 |  |  |  |  | 40 | ( 58,167 ) | 8,167. |  |  |
|  | PUC | -232429 | 232426 | 232423 | 25940 | 10029997 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adjustments |  |  |  | (78,006) | 78,006 |  |  |  |  | 40 | ( 778,006 ) | 78,006 |  |  |
|  | PUC | -232429 | 232426 | 232423 | 25940 | 10029997 | 2 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | - | (21:145) | 21,146 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( $\$ 21,145$ ) | 21,146 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232425 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments. |  |  |  | (34,917) | .34,917 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( $\$ 34,917$ ) | 34,917 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232425 | 25940 | 10029996 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | (9,464) | 9,464 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( 49,454 ) | 9,464 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292651 | 292648 | $\underline{2590}$ | 10029995 | 40 | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  | - | (55, 235) | 55,235 |  |  |  |  | \$0. | (\$55,235) | 55,235 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292651 | 292648 | 25940 | 10029995 | 40 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Finqe Benefits. |  |  |  | (14,793) | 14,793 |  |  |  |  | 50. | ( $\$ 14,793)$ | 14,793. |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292655 | 25940 | 10029995 | 36 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 1842 Management Assista | 1.00 | 0.00 | 90,516 | $\cdots$ | 90,516 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$90,516 | \$0. | 90,516 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 259401 | 10029995 | 36 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | 39,391 |  | 39,391 |  |  |  |  | \$39,391 | \$0 | 39,391. |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 | 36 | 10000 |  | 501010 | 9993 Atrition |  |  | (499,399) | (408,883) | (90,516) |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | (\$499,399) | (\$408,883) | (90,516) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Eenefits |  |  | (207; 553) | (168,162) | (39,391) |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 212,904$ ) | (5173,513) | (39,391) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | 2483 Biologist | 15.00 | 15.00 | 1,764,481 | 1,654,201 | 110,280 |  |  | 16.00 | 15.00 | \$1,764,481. | \$1,654,201 | 110,280 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 |  | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Eenefits. |  |  | 724,480 | 679,200 | 45,280 |  |  |  |  | \$741,055. | \$694,739 | 46,316 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 259401 | 10029995 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | 9993 Atrition |  |  | (499,399) | (389,119) | (110,280) |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | ( $\$ 499,399$ ) | ( $\$ 389,119$ ) | (110,280) |  |  |
|  | PUC | ${ }^{232429}$ | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 | 36 | 10000 |  |  | Mandatory Fringe Benefits. |  |  | (207,553) | (162,273) | (45; 280 ) |  |  |  |  | (\$207,553) | (\$161,237) | (46,316) |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 |  | 10000 |  | 501010 | Step Adiustments |  |  |  | (185,031) | 185,031 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$185,031) | 185,031 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 232429 | 292656 | 292656 | 25940 | 10029995 | 36 | 10000 |  |  | Mandator/ Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | ( 50,104 ) | 50,104 |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | ( $\$ 50,104)$ | 50,104 |  |  |
|  | PUC | 229309 | 229281. | 229281 | 201601 | 10030002 |  | 10000 | WP1928 | 560290 | Ford F350 Super Cab Long |  |  | 373,021 | 305,574 | 67,447 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |








City and County of San Francisco

## CATHERINE STEFANI

Dear Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee,
Thank you for all the work you and your staff have done on this year's budget. Your efforts to create an open and transparent process have allowed our communities to become part of the budget discussions, and I commend you for your leadership.

After review of the spending plan, I am happy to see priority policy areas such as homelessness and public health addressed in the draft. There are many more areas I would like to support, but I understand that there are limited available funds. As we discuss these matters in Committee, I would like to address policies I believe should receive more support.

- San Francisco is fortunate to have accessible open space in each supervisorial district. A number of these spaces enjoy support from their communities, but many more are underutilized and unkempt. These free public spaces can create stronger and safer communities - but only by working in partnership with City departments and organizations to reactivate and reengage the neighborhoods around them.
- We have historically taken care of our veterans and provided them with proper support to make sure that they are cared for in San Francisco. Unfortunately, many of our honored veterans are homeless and lack access to appropriate care. In funding veterans' services, we can provide care to those who have served our country.
- The recent difficulty of securing grants from the DCYF's Five-Year Cycle has led to a number of organizations' being underfunded. Many of these community organizations rely on the DCYF grants. I hope the Committee considers funding organizations that provide needed support to early childhood education in underserved communities.
- The Board of Supervisors has recently taken action to support those who have been victims of sexual assault and domestic violence, but City government can't take the lead on these issues alone. We are blessed to have community-based organizations who have been working on these issues for years, and we need the additional support so that one day these hateful crimes never happen again.
- Since 1976 we have funded the Pretrial Diversion Program under the San Francisco Sheriff's Department. The Program is critical to our criminal justice system and needs additional funds to expand in light of recent court decisions that have placed a more substantial burden on the current staff load.

Again, Chair Cohen, I want to thank you for your leadership during this process and I look forward to a robust discussion with my colleagues on the Budget and Finance Committee, as well as the full Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,


Supervisor Catherine Stefani
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
District 2

# JEFF SHEEHY 

史義

June 20, 2018
Dear Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee,
After reviewing the initial spending plan I am advocating to allocate funding for the following program areas at the following levels:
1.) Transgender Resources and Programs: $\$ 800,000$
2.) Support for Cancer Patients: $\$ 400,000$
3.) Public School Family Partnership Programs: $\$ 200,000$
4.) Capital improvements for Behavioral Health Service Center: $\$ 500,000$

My office appreciates all of the work you have been doing on this budget process and look forward to discussing further in committee.

## Sincerely,



JEFF SHEEHY
Supervisor for District 8


| Justification |
| :--- | :--- |
| Transgender Resources and Programming at $\$ 800,000$ |
|  |
| by $\$ 200,000$ for parental support during the school application process |
| Women's Cancer Support at $\$ 400,000$ |
| Capital improvements for Behavioral Health Service Centerat $\$ 500,000$ |
|  |

City and County of San Francisco
District 7

NORMAN YEE

DATE: $\quad 6 / 21 / 2018$
TO: Supervisor Malia Cohen
Chair, Budget \& Finance Committee
FROM: Supervisor Norman Yee
RE: $\quad$ Response to Chair Malia Cohen's Spending Plan Draft dated June 15, 2018

Dear Supervisor Cohen:
Thank you for your leadership as Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee and for sharing a preliminary spending plan on behalf of the Board of Supervisors. I commend you for your vision and willingness to create a more transparent, collaborative approach to our City's budgeting process.

I believe that the preliminary spending plan highlighted a number of core funding priorities of the Board of Supervisors including more services for youth, expansion of summertime educational opportunities, investment in workforce development, housing subsidies for our most vulnerable populations, support for seniors, and improved response and prevention of sexual assault and child abuse. However, there are a growing number of needs that continue to call for more attention that were not included that I want to ensure teceive considetation. The preliminary spending plan was confined due to the unknown amount of funding that will be made available for re-allocation after Department savings and other revenue updates. As we identify the actual amount of funding available for discretionary allocation, I urge the Board of Supervisors to re-evaluate the City's growing needs. I believe that the Board will need to be prudent, but pliable as we try to most effectively and efficiently expend our taxpayers' dollats.

As the spending plan is further refined, I hope you will take into consideration the following recommendations. I also attached an addendum to this memo indicating the budget areas that I believe should be further defined in order to directly serve high-needs populations; and other priorities that I believe will not be sufficiently funded by the draft proposal set forward.

## Spending Plan Priorities Requiring Further Expansion

- Early Care and Education - Last year, the Board of Supervisors allocated funding of $\$ 4$ million to support early care and education, specifically for infant and toddler subsidies. Infant and toddlers has the least amount of resources in the field. This one-time funding supported families, but in order to continue making an impact on the growing needs for this population, additional investment is required. As of May $31^{\text {st }}$ there were 3,334 low income children on the subsidized child care waitlist. More than half of the waitlist $55 \%$ are infants and toddlers. The waitlist continues to grow with infants and toddlers from nearly every zip code throughout San Francisco--the highest number of infants and toddlers live in the
following zip codes: 94112 (Outer Mission, Excelsior, Ingleside), 94124(Bayview/Hunter's Point), and 94134 (Visitation Valley, Sunnydale, Portola). Quality early care and education is essential for these working families and vital for the successful development of these young children.
- Youth Services and Out of School Time - There is a vast diversity within the San Francisco youth community that require culturally competent programming and services. We received dozens of requests for more programming and I would like to see a more comprehensive approach so that we can ensure adequate funding that is specified for different needs and populations. One of the areas I see specifically lacking is additional funding for court appointed advocates for youth in the foster care system. With foster youth forced to move out of the city, there is a pressing need for court appointed advocates to receive the resources needed to continue serving their mentees. These adult advocates are often the only lifelines for these foster youth who often get lost in the system.
- Immigrant Protection and Voting Registration Education Outreach should be fully and adequately funded to implement voter-mandated Prop N passed in 2016, which was also unanimously supported by the Board of Supervisots through Ordinance No. 128-18. Given the threats from the current Federal administration, it is our duty to ensure that we expeditiously implement the program while providing resources for our immigrant population on their rights and the risks.
- Food Security Programs - There are currently 2,000 individuals on the waitlist for homedelivered groceries. We can do more to support these isolated seniors and people with disabilities. I also believe we should invest in home delivered hot meals and congregate lunch meals to continue providing nutritional and social support for this increasing population.
- Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool for Families and Transitional Aged Youth is an important preventative investment to ensure that families and at-risk transitional aged youth are provided an added safety net to keep them off the streets and moved into safe, stable, and sustainable living conditions. I also believe there should be more subsidies for seniors and people with disabilities that are often on fixed incomes and at-tisk of housing displacement.


## Spending Plan Priorities to Include

- Workforce Development and Employment Opportunities for Seniors - The Department of Aging and Adult Services and Human Services Agency both have indicated the efficacy of senior-based employment training and workforce opportunities. These jobs allow seniors to become financially stable and allow them the ability to age in place.
- Gap Funding for Seniors in Residential Care Facilities - The astronomical costs of running residential care facilities is forcing many to shutter or move out of the city entirely. Currently, residential care facility operators are absorbing the costs that are not covered by Social Security payments and patients' out-of-pocket contributions. By offsetting some of
these costs, we will be able to keep more seniors in these facilities allowing them dignified care and the ability to stay within their communities.
- Ed's Neighborhood - Vision Zero Youth Education Program - In honor and memory of our honorable Mayor Edwin Lee, Ed's Neighborhood is a life-sized, transportable set replicating city streets that engages school-aged youth on pedestrian and traffic safety. The movable Ed's Neighborhood set is already built and will be visiting schools across the city, but there is currently no funding to provide the educational program support to implement the curticulum and the pedestrian safety exercises.

I hope that this feedback is helpful to you as we enter the next phase of deliberations. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. I earnestly look forward to working with you on passing a balanced and thoughtful budget for San Francisco.

Sincerely,


Supervisor Norman Yee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
District 7



|  | Mental health services for homeless families | Public Health | Family Homelessness | No (New) | Add New |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Need-based subsidies for families | Housing | Flexible Subsidies | Yes (Funded) | Expand |
|  | Flexible housing subsidies for seniors \& people with disabilities | Housing | Flexible Subsidies | No (New) | Add New |
|  | Voting Registry Education Outreach | Community Services | Voting Rights | Yes (Funded) | Expand |
|  | Navigation Center for Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) | Homelessness | Affordable Housing Access | No (New) | Add New |
|  | Ed's Neighborhood | Youth Services | Vision Zero | No (New) | Add New |

## Amount Suggested/Justification

Expand to $\$ 4,000,000$ to continue supporting early care and education, especially for famlies with infants and toddlers. There is a growing unmet need with 3,334 low-income children on the waitlist. The funding will support the Infant Toddler Scholarship Fund providing more child care provider subsidies to increase access to infant \& toddler care for low-income families.
$\$ 774,000$ to serve the 202 seniors and adults with disabilities on the waitlist providing them with nutritious meals and social support to prevent isolation and health conditions.

Expand to fund the total amount of $\$ 1,000,000$ to serve over 1,000 seniors and adults with disabilities. The waitlist currently has 2,000 individuals.
$\$ 500,000$ to support congregate lunch meals to provide additoinal support to existing services. Currently, there are over 1,000 incidences where eligible clients are turned away from a hot meal.

Over $80 \%$ of SRO tenants are without a secure source of food. Many who receive SSI are not eligible for CalFresh and have high risk for nutritional deficiencies. Any funding would make a difference in creating pilot programs to provide meals to SRO tenants that have extreme needs to prevent further health risks.

Given the complex diversity of San Francisco's population, we should invest in culturally competant and relevant youth programming to best serve the different needs. Overall, the youth out of school time category should be looked at comprehensively to ensure that there is enough funding and that target populations are served equitably.
$\$ 75,000$ to support programming to increase leadership development, civic engagemen,t and empowerment of Asian Pacific Islander high school youth
$\$ 100,000$ to provide resource \& referral services to low-income immigrant families. Lowincome, immigrant families face barriers in receiving high-quality access to affordable, quality early care and education. Culturally competant bilingual support is critical to reach this population.
$\$ 80,000$. Due to cultural and language barriers, Asian Pacific Islander seniors are least likely to report financial and physical abuse. Legal services for this population is underfunded and unsupported, which leads to further abuse due to lack of enforcement of protections. This funding will support legal services to better educate this population and represent them in elder abuse cases.
$\$ 100,000$ to continue sustaining court appointed advocates that represent and mentor foster youth. Foster youth are being moved away from the City because of the scarcity of resources and court-appointed advocates are often the only lifeline/connection to the communities they grew up in. Foster youth are at high risk due to the lack of institutional and social support.
This program is critical in ensuring that these youth are provided the wrap-around services needed to thrive.
$\$ 500,000$ to allow more seniors the ability to age in place in residential care facilities. Due to the rising cost of operation, residential care facilities are shuttering or moving out of San Francisco leaving many seniors without care. This gap funding will help offset the cost currently being absorbed by operators because of the discrepancy between social security payments and patients' out of pocket contributions.

Add $\$ 1,000,000$ to support programs that focus on workforce development and employment opportunities for seniors. Seniors who are able to work struggle with job placement. By providing job opportunities, seniors are able to serve their communities and earn supplemental income allowing them to age in place.
$\$ 887,375$ to restore funding mental health services for families experiencing homelessness. This area is grossly unmet. The level of trauma that homelessness and instability can leave a lasting impact on families, especially those with young children. These services could prove critical in helping to stabilize families and ensuring healthier outcomes for these at-risk youth.

Expand to fund $\$ 450,104.00$ specifically for homeless families. This would backfill funding that was previously allocated. Families at risk of homelessness need this safety net to prevent them from losing their homes. We should be investing in preventative measures to combat homelessness.

Add $\$ 3,000,000$ to support flexible housing subsidies for seniors and people with disabilities. There is an expiring source of funds that is inadaquate to sustain this vulnerable population. The elderly and people with disabilities have fixed incomes making them at risk of losing their homes. To prevent homelessness, we neeed to invest in ways to keep people housed.

Expand to fully fund the $\$ 375,000$ required to properly implement immigrant protection and voting registration outreach. Given that this initiative is fully supported by the voters and the Board of Supervisors, we should provide the adaquate funding to ensure that immigrant voters are fully informed about their rights, the risks, and what protections are involved.

Support for transitional aged youth should be considered its own priority area. Transitional aged youth are a significant portion of our homeless population and deserve targeted attention to break the cycle of poverty. A dedicated navigation center would create an access point for these young people to receive housing and social support services.

Ed's Neighborhood, named after the late Mayor Edwin Lee, is a life-size set that is used to teach students pedestrian and traffic safety. The set is already built, but the program to teach the curriculum is currently unfunded. The program requires $\$ 50,000$ to bring this educational program to schools across the city. Vision Zero is a City priority and the best way to develop a culture of pedestrian and traffic safety is to start with our school-aged youth who often have to navigate our dangerous city streets.

Member, Board of Supervisors District 9


City and County of San Francisco

## HILLARY RONEN

June 21, 2018.

Supervisor Malia Cohen<br>Chair, Budget and Finance Committee

## Dear Chair Cohen,

Thank you for your leadership as Chair of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee, and for putting together an initial spending plan for review. I truly appreciate the transparency you have brought to the process and also commend your legislative aide Sophia Kittler for her responsiveness, clarity and accessibility throughout this entire budget process.

As per your request, here is my response to your initial spending plan, based on the anticipated increase in revenue.

First, I would like to see the Board of Supervisors work together to further invest in addressing homelessness and mental health needs. Once we have received an updated budget from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, I look forward to partnering with our colleagues to identify what additional services we can include to respond to these two critical issues.

Furthermore, there are other critical program areas that I hope we can include in this budget as well, such as increased funding for domestic violence and sexual assault community-based programming.

I hope to partner with you and the Budget Committee members in your efforts to identify cost savings in City Departments.

Respectfully yours,


Supervisor Hillary Ronen<br>San Francisco Board of Supervisors

## Wong, Linda (BOS)

Subject:
FW: District 3 response to $\mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{~F}$ initial spending plan

From: Angulo, Sunny (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 9:43 AM
To: Kittler, Sophia (BOS) [sophia.kittler@sfgov.org](mailto:sophia.kittler@sfgov.org)
Subject: District 3 response to B\&F initial spending plan

June 25, 2018

Sophia,
Thank you for keeping our office updated on the work of the Budget and Finance Committee over the past month of hearings. Having been through this process many times, I know you and the Chair have been putting in the hours, and it's no small task! Apologies I wasn't able to review everything before this weekend, so just getting you these thoughts now.

As Supervisor Peskin does not sit on the Budget and Finance Committee, our office has generally deferred to the expertise of the Budget and Finance Committee members, including the leadership of the Chair and Vice-Chair. After reviewing Chair Cohen's spending proposal, I think that we are generally in alignment on the budget priorities that deserve further investment. My main piece of feedback is that the initial $\$ 24.8$ million over two years is too conservative, but I also recognize that this is just an estimated starting point from the Chair. (By comparison, the Board approved a spending plan of $\$ 45.4$ million last year, and I imagine that the Budget and Finance Committee will be working to ensure equitable coverage in an amount closer to that number in the days ahead.)

As you know, our District "add-back" list has been a work in progress, and Supervisor Peskin has been reticent to support new funding requests without first clarifying the existing needs and cuts to basic direct services to our most vulnerable populations, including our growing population of seniors, homeless families and housing-insecure residents. We've tried to pare down our district asks in an effort to offer more support for citywide requests, and will continue to work with your office and the office of the Vice-Chair as the process continues.

In general, we've discussed the following office priorities to consider in a $\$ 40$ million + spending proposal:

- Housing \& Homelessness - A closer look at the Budget Justice Coalition's proposal for subsidized \& supportive housing, rental subsidies, mental health services and workforce development for our homeless population
- Higher Education - "Free City College" summer course coverage + reserve funding (Supervisor Peskin was a cosponsor of the Free City College proposal, and offers support for the request to keep it successful)
- Senior Services, including patch gap funding to keep seniors in their homes in an increasingly outrageous and speculative housing market
- Public Safety - As you saw in our initial district list, Supervisor Peskin is championing child abuse prevention services ( $\$ 250$ k in both years) and Pre-Trial Diversion (at $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ ) as a proven public safety tool.

We will continue to monitor the budget proceedings and make ourselves available to answer questions and work through outstanding issues. Thank you for the strong work you've been doing, including reaching out to every office and advocating for transparency throughout this entire process. I have really enjoyed working with you, and I hope it continues!

Best,
Sunny

Sunny Angulo
cupervisor Aaron Peskin, Chief of Staff
.nny.Angulo@sfgov.org
415.554.7451 DIRECT
415.554.7450 VOICE
415.430.7091 CELL

District 3 Website

|  | Program Description | Pollcy Area | Sub Category | June 15 Funded? | Suggested Action? | Justification |  | 8-2019 |  | -2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YF | Program mentoring Pacific Islander Youth In culturally appropriate program. Serving high risk TAY, either currently involved in the criminal Justice system at risk. | Youth Services | Violence Prevention | no | Include in DCYF, unlque culturally competent program serving at risk, Pacific Island Youth | Program is the only one that specifically focused on seving Pacific Islander youth in this manner. | \$ | 75,000.00 | \$ | 75,000,00 |
| st 5 | Serves 150 people Behavioral Health Services draws clients citywide to centers in chinatown and Vis Valley serving newcomer school age children and adults. DPH work ordered to First 5 . Fudning for licensed eligible staff to bulld capacity and a model to provide behavioral and mental helath services for API children, youth\& familles enrolled at SFJUSD affected by trauma and to enroll them In counselling | Public Health | Parent Engagement and Education | no | Include in DPH funding. Program will be cut and serves some of the most vulnerable children. | Chlldren and farilies who have experienced trauma are already engaged in the program and It will stop without funding. This program is being moved from department to department, no one can figure out who should fund the program - only that it needs to be funded because it has been effective. | \$ | 100,000.00 | \$ | 100,000.00 |
| :WD | Computer coding and Internships for disadvantaged TAY. | Workforce Development | Out of School Time | no | Add to the Citywide addbacks. This was not included because the entity did not caucus with another larger entity. | Provides tech training to soctoeconomically disadvantaged students throughout San Francisco, focused on serving disenfranchised African American and Latinx students. The program has worked and students are being hired out of high school. | \$ | 186,000.00 | \$ | 186,000.00 |
| :CE | Providing information on public school enrollment and parent engagement | Education | Other ! | no | Add to OECE | This program is the only of its type, hirling community members to engage preK parents, with culturai competency in the language spoken at home and in familiar comfortable spaces, on the importance of public school enrollment and how to enroll in SFUSD. | \$ | 112,000.00 | \$ | 200,000.00 |
|  | Providing in school and out of school job tralning for pregnant teens, training in early childhood development to either run famlly child care homes or work for family child care centers. | Workforce Development | Barrier Removal | no | Add to workforce development OEWD. Did not caucus with a larger group. | Program training TAY mothers on Early Chlld Education. Graduates from this program can go onto Jobs in Early Child Education or run their own Family Child Care Centers. | \$ | 200,000.00 | \$ | 200,000.00 |
| , AS | Adult choirs located throughout the city. | Senior Services | Aging In Place | no | Unique program popular throughout San Francisco | Learning new languages and memorizing songs is proven to improve cognitive function in senlors. The cholrs celebrate many different cultures sung in different languages. | \$ | 234,000,00 | \$ | 234,000.00 |
| OHCD | Help Latinx famlles connect to a continuum of resources to ensure the academic achlevement of Latins students, including housing, health, mental health, financlal capablity, and more. | Public Health | Parent Engagement/Education/Barrier Removal | no | MOHCD or DPH. Not sure which because it's a combnation of seviles. | This ts a way to provide families access to culturally and linguistically approprate services, helping them remove barriers to access mental health, houslng, physcal health and financial training. | \$ | 300,000.00 | \$ | 300,000.00 |
| \%F/DA | Volunteer program providing court appointed advocates to aide foster youth. Currently provide One-on-one mentorship for 330 foster youth and would llike to maintain current services. | Youth Services |  |  |  | This program 15 the standard bearer to provlding supportive services to Foster Youth. | \$ | 100,000.00 | \$ | 100,000.00 |
| WD | Incubator kitchen run for and by wormen of color. | Economic and Workforce Development | Sartier Removal | no | One time ask to support the expansion of a program into the Northeast corridor of San Franciseo | Not only does the program allow women to bulld cullinary skills AND learn how the restaruant industry functions so they can build their own businesses. | \$ | 500,000.00 |  |  |
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Dear Members of the Budget \& Finance Committee;
San Francisco is experiencing a homelessness and housing crisis. With the failure of Proposition D earlier this month a proposed $\$ 40$ Million investment in homelessness and housing was left unfunded, jeopardizing critical investments and new programs focused on reducing and preventing homelessness. Additionally, in this past election San Francisco voters passed Proposition F calling for legal services to support tenants facing eviction in our city, but no funding source was identified in that measure. In partnership with the Mayor's Budget Office, we are pleased to jointly present a plan to fund these critical housing intervention and homeless prevention services in the upcoming two-year budget with three newly available sources.

Proposition D was expected to generate revenues of $\$ 32$ million in FY 2018-19 and $\$ 64$ million in FY 2019-20; of which $\$ 13.4$ million and $\$ 27.2$ million would have been allocated to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH). The remainder of the programmatic funds would have been allocated to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD).

This plan draws on new resources included in the State's proposed budget, currently under the Governor's consideration, to support housing and homeless services from the State of California, coupled with newly identified recent reduction in retiree health costs approved by the Health Service System Board on June 15, 2018. With these sources, we are able to expand, fortify, and enhance services to prevent displacement, provide exits from street homeless, and add permanent housing units. Additionally, this rebalancing proposal includes an additional new investment which will provide funding for full scope legal services and representation to tenants facing eviction in our city.

This proposed rebalancing plan includes: 1) financial support in FY 2019-20 for the ongoing homelessness programs previously funded in FY 2018-19; 2) new homeless programs in the FY" 2018-19 budget which were contingent on Proposition D revenues which are no longer available (rapid rehousing, TAY Navigation Center, and flexible housing subsidy pool); and 3) significantly increases and expands legal assistance funding for tenants facing eviction through MOHCD. Details on the program expansions and funding sources are available below.

We look forward to continuing to work together with the Budget and Finance Committee and the full Board of Supervisors to finalize the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 budget and ensure these critical programs and investments are funded.


London Breed
President, Board of Supervisors
Mayor-Elect


Maia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee

## Rebalancing Plan: Allocated Uses and Identified Sources

|  | FY 2018-19 <br> (\$ millions) | FY 2019-20 <br> (\$ millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USES |  |  |
| Extend Critical Programs (Housing, Navigation Centers, Prevention) |  | (13.4) |
| Rapid Rehousing - Adult \& TAY | (5.0) | (6.0) |
| TAY Navigation Center | (1.0) | (3.4) |
| Capital for Replacement Shelter/TAY Nav Center Capital | (4.7) |  |
| Flex Housing Subsidy Pool | (2.0) | (3.0) |
| Eviction Legal Representation for Tenants (MOHCD) | (1.4) | (3.4) |
| Total Uses | (14.1) | (29.2) |
| SOURCES* |  |  |
| State Emergency Homelessness Funds - Onetime | 10.7 | 11.5 |
| State Emergency Solutions Grànt - On-going | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| General Fund - Retiree Health Savings | 1.4 | 14.7 |
| Total Sources | 14.1 | 29.2 |
| Surplus/(Gap) | 0.0 | 0.0 |

*Adjustments to fund balance have been made to match sources to uses in compliance with the State grant funding requirements and timelines.

## Expand and Continue Critical Homeless Services

The City's homelessness crisis, and the conditions that exist on streets every day are not acceptable. We cannot continue to allow people to live in tents or doorways, nor endure illness and addiction alone on our streets. These investments will help provide meaningful change for those struggling with homelessness.

This rebalancing plan will ensure critical programs which had been dependent on Proposition D's revenue, beginning in FY 2018-19 will move forward, and the programs initiated in the first year of the budget will receive continued support in the second year of the budget. These are shared priorities for critical service expenditures including expanded navigation and shelter capacity, permanent exits from homelessness, and interventions that target families and youth experiencing homelessness.

- Extending Critical Homeless Services Programs: This plan provides funding in FY 2019-20 for new and continued programming including:
- Doubling Homeward Bound to expand capacity to reunite persons experiencing homelessness with families or loved ones.
- New units of permanent supportive housing in newly constructed affordable housing and continued support for master leased units.
- Enhanced services in existing permanent supportive housing to better meet the acute needs of residents.
- Operations of four navigation centers opening in the next year, including one serving women who are pregnant.
- Expansion of shelter capacity and funding to replace closing shelters.
- Rapid Rehousing: Expanding the rapid rehousing voucher program for adults and TAYa program provides a declining rent subsidy and income stabilization supports so that clients can find and maintain housing.
- Navigation Centers: Funding a new Navigation Center tailored for the needs of transitional aged youth (TAY) and one-time capital for the replacement of existing shelters or construction of the new TAY Navigation Center.
- New Housing Exits: Funding the Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool to create new permanent exits from homelessness


## Funding for Eviction Legal Representation for Tenants

No tenant should face eviction alone in San Francisco. The voters of San Francisco agree, and approved Proposition F on June 5, 2018. However, this measure did not include any identified funding. Keeping San Franciscans in their homes is one of the most cost effective ways to prevent homelessness and help residents maintain access to affordable housing. We know that tenants who have legal support through the eviction process are much more likely to maintain their housing.

This rebalancing plan includes a ramp up to $\$ 3.4$ million in additional annual funding to support free legal counsel for tenants facing eviction. This amount builds off of the $\$ 2$ million in existing full scope legal representation currently available and anticipates the $\$ 0.5$ million the Board of Supervisors has indicated it will be allocating to this program area. This additional funding will allow the City to provide full scope legal representation to tenants facing eviction beginning January 1, 2019. This funding level assumes that a majority of tenants facing eviction will take advantage of the services available to them and that legal service providers will focus on households earning 120\% of the Area Median Income and below.

## New Revenue Sources

After the introduction of the June 1 Proposed Budget, three funding sources have become available.

The first is a reduction in retiree health costs per the rates approved by the Health Service System Board at their June 15, 2018 meeting. These final approved rates are lower than the assumed rates included in the proposed budget and will generate $\$ 16.1$ million in General Fund savings over the two-year budget to be allocated to this plan.

The State's proposed budget, currently under the Governor's consideration, includes additional support for housing and homeless services. It creates the Homeless Emergency Aid Program to provide one-time grants to address homelessness, and augments the existing Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) to provide on-going funding for housing and homeless services. The anticipated one-time allocation to San Francisco is $\$ 27.7$ million and must be fully encumbered by June 2021. This rebalancing plan assumes the utilization of $\$ 22.2$ million in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, with a final allocation of $\$ 5.5$ million to continue programming in FY 2020-21. This rebalancing plan assumes $\$ 2$ million growing to $\$ 3$ million of the on-going support through the ESG program.



# DRAFT 2 YEAR SPENDING PLAN ALLOCATION <br> FY 18-19 / 19-20 





nesmumitle $6 / 27 / 18$

| Board of Supervisors Bu....cr Spending Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Receum' 's Comret |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2018-19 |  |  |  |  | 2019-20 |  |  |  |  | GFs |  | TOTAL |  | $\frac{12 \uparrow 50 p}{12 T a l}$ |  |
|  | Poilcy Area | Sub-Category | Program | DEPT | Description |  | grs |  | n-6fs | Total |  | GFs |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Education | Edicatlon Access | Caty college expiansion | DCrF | Summertime expansion | s | 1,200,000 | \$ | - | \$1,200,000 | s | 1,200,000 | s | - | \$1,200,000 | \$ | 2,400,000 | \$ |  | \$ | 2,400,000 |
| 2 |  |  | Clty College Reserve | ocrf |  | s | 1,000,000 |  |  | S1,00, ,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$0 | s | 1,000,000 |  |  | \$ | 1,000,000 |
| 3 | Youth Serices | Out of school time | After school and summer school programming, with focus on API and homeless youth |  |  | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$600,000 | \$ | 600,000 | ; | - | \$600,000 | \$ | 1,200,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,200,000 |
| 4 |  | Foster Youth | Court Appointed Advocate / Mentor | dCYF |  | \$ | 75,000 | \$ | - | 575,000 | \$ | 75,000 | \$ | - | 575,000 | \$ | 150,000 |  |  | \$ | 150,000 |
| 5 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Early Care and } \\ & \text { Education } \end{aligned}$ | Supporting early chlld hood education programming | OECE |  | \$ | 2,000,000 | \$ | - | \$2,000,000 | \$ | - | \% | - | so | \$ | 2,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,000,000 |
| 5 |  | Parent Engagement | Public School Advocacy | oEwd |  | \$ | 115,000 |  |  | \$115,000 | \$ | 115,000 |  | . | \$115,000 | \$ | 230,000 |  |  | \$ | 230,000 |
| 7 |  | Pedestrian Safety | Ed's Neighborhood | sfusd |  | \$ | 50,000 | s. | .- | \$55,000 | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | - | \$50,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| 8 |  | Youth Organizing | Youth Advocacy and Organizing | DCYF |  | \$ | 225,000 |  |  | \$225,000 | s | 225,000 |  |  | \$225,000 | s | 450,000 |  |  | \$ | 450,000 |
| 9 | Economic Development | WorkforceDevelopment | Skll and capacity bullding | OEWD. | Vulnerable Populations | 5 | 1,000,000 | S | - | ${ }_{51,000,000}$. | 5 | 1,000,000 | 5 |  | 51,00,000 | 5 | 2,000,000 | S |  | 5 | 2,000,000 |
| ${ }^{10}$ |  |  |  | MOHCD | At Risk populatlons, with a focus on African Americans | s | 150,000 | \$ | - | \$150,000 | \$ | 150,000 |  |  | \$150,000 | \$ | 300,000 |  |  | \$ | 300,000 |
| 11 |  |  |  | daAs | Seniors and People with Disablitles | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$500,000 | \$ | 600,000 |  |  | \$600,000 | \$ | 1,200,000 |  |  | \$ | 1,200,000 |
| 12 |  |  | Workforce Development for Youth |  | Job tralning for Pregnant Teens | 5 | 100,000 |  | . | \$100,000 | 5 | 100,000 |  |  | 5100,000 | S | 200,000 |  |  | , | 200,000 |
| 13 |  |  | , | OEND | Computer tranling for TAY | s | 150,000 |  |  | \$150,000 | 5 | 150,000 |  |  | \$155,000 | S | 300,000 |  |  | , | 300,000 |
| 14 | Nelghborhood Services | Cultural Districts | Cultural District Stafing central coordinator | MOHCD |  | \$ | 175,000 | \$ | - | \$175,000 | \$ | 175,000 | \$ | - | \$175,000 | \$ | 350,000 | \$ |  | \$ | 350,000 |
| 15 | Homelessness | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prevention and } \\ & \text { Diversion } \end{aligned}$ | Flexible Houshn Subsldy Pool | HSH | Famlly Subsldes | s | 450,105 |  |  | \$450, 105 | 5 | 450,105 |  |  | \$450,105 | 5 | 900,210 |  |  | 5 | 900,210 |
| 12 |  |  |  | MOHCD | Seniors and People with Disabliltes eprimarly | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | - | \$1,000,000 | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | - | \$1,00,000 | \$ | 2,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,000,000 |
| 17 |  | Prevention and Diversion | Eviction prevention-Legal Defense | MOHCD |  | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$500,000 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$500,000 | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,000,000 |
| 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Housing } \\ & \hline \stackrel{5}{5} \end{aligned}$ | Affordable HousingAccess | Veterans Housing Serices | MOHCD |  | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | - | \$250,000 | \$ | - |  |  | so | \$ | 250,000 |  |  | \$ | 250,000 |
| 19 |  |  | Barrier Removal | MOHCD | Potentlally including: Navleation, Langauge access, application support | \$ | 300,000 | s | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 600,000 |
| 20 | $N$ | Restorative Justice | Pre-Tral Diversion : | SHF |  | \$ | 515,000 | \$s. | - | \$515,000 | \$ | 515,000 | \$ | - | \$515,000 | \% | 1,030,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,030,000 |
| 21 |  |  | Detention Diverslon Advocacy | CRT/JUV |  | \$ | - |  |  | ¢0 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$100,000 | s | 100,000 |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| 22 | Clean Streets | Cormmunty Services | Nelghborhood Clean and Green | DPW |  | \$ | 255,578 | \$ | - | \$255,578 | \$ | 255,578 | \$ | - | \$255,578 | \$ | 511,156 |  |  | \$ | 511,156 |
| ${ }_{2}$ |  |  | Plt stop expansion | DPW |  | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | \$100,000 | \$ | 100,000 | s | - | \$100,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 200,000. |
| 24 | Ree \& Park | Open Space | Actlvation of Mclaren Park | RPD |  | \$ | 50,000 |  |  | \$50,000 | \$ | 50,000 |  |  | \$50,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$ | 100,000 |
| 25 | Public Health | Sexual Viotence | Sexual Assault response and prevention | HRC | Pollcy and medation manager | \$ | 168,000 | \$ | - | \$168,000 | \$ | 168,000 | s | - | \$168,000 | \$ | 336,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 336,000 |
| 26 |  | Domestic VIolence | Child Abuse Prevention | cFC |  | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | - | \$250,000 | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | - | \$250,000 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 |
| 27. |  |  | VIolence Agalnst Women and Familles | dosw |  | \$ | 980,246 | \$ | - | .9980,246 | \$ | 980,246 | \$ | - | \$980,245 | \$ | 1,960,492 |  |  | \$ | 1,960,492 |
| ${ }_{28}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { mental Health. } \\ & \text { senvices } \end{aligned}\right.$ | State cut backill | DPH |  | \$ | 83,500 | \$ | - | \$33,500 | \$ | 167,000 | \$ | - | \$167,000 | \$ | 250,500 |  |  | \$ | 250,500 |
| 29 |  |  | Mental Heath Services for homeless | DPH |  | \$ | 335,000 | \$ | - | \$335,000 | \$ | 335,000 | \$ | - | \$335,000 | \$ | 670,000 |  |  | \$ | 670,000 |
| 30 |  | AIDS/HIV Services | Integrated behavioral health Services | DPH |  | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$500,000 |  | , |  |  |  | \$ | 500,000 |  |  | \$ | 500,000 |
| 31 |  |  | Ryan White CARE Act Erant | DPH |  | \$ | 33,000 | \$ | - | :\$333,000 | \$ | 333,000 | \$ | - | \$333,000 | \$ | 656,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 666,000 |
| 32 |  | Outpatient Services | Outpatlent Services'and Support network for Cancer survivors | DPH |  | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 300,000 |  |  | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 |  |  | \$ | 600,000 |
| ${ }^{33}$ | Arts | Cultural Serices | Arts Programming | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { ARTIT/ } \\ \text { GTFAA } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | \$ | 200,000 | s | .- | \$200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | s | - | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 400,000 |
| 34 | Sembors and People wth Disabilities | Food Securty | In-Home Grocery delivery | das | . | \$ | 683,000 | \$ | - | \$683,000 | \$ | 683,000 | \$ | - | \$683,000 | \$ | 1,366,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,366,000 |
| 35 |  |  | Congregate Meals | dAas |  | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | \$100,000 | \$ | 100,000 |  |  | \$100,000 | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$ | 200,000 |
| 36 |  |  | In Home Meal Dellvery | dAAS |  | \$ | 400,000 | \$ | - | \$400,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | \$400,000 | \$ | 800,000 |  |  | \$ | 800,000 |
| 37 |  | Housing | Residentalal Care Faclilites | daAs |  |  | 300,000 | \$ | - | \$300,000 | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$300,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 |
| 38 |  | Aging in Place | Health and Care and Activty Programming | DPH |  |  | 200,000 |  |  | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 |  | Immigrant Protection Educaton | Voting Registry education outreach | oceia |  | \$ | 375,000 | \$ | - | \$775,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$0 | \$ | 375,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 375,000 |


| Board of Supenkisors Budget Spending Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Policy Area Community Services | Sub-Category | Program | DEPT | Description | . | 2018-19 |  |  |  | 2019-20 |  |  |  |  | total |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | GFs | non-GFs |  | Total |  | gfs | non-GFs |  | Total | Gfs ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | non-ais |  | total |  |
| 40 |  |  | LBGTQ Serice programming | MOHCD |  | \$ | 175,000 | \$ | - | \$175,000 | \$ | 175,000 | 5 | - | \$175,000 | \$ | 350,000 | § | - | \$ | 350,000 |
| 41 |  | LgBta Services | Transgender Violence Prevention | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ADM / } \\ & \text { HRC } \end{aligned}$ |  | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | s | 400,000 |
| 42 |  | Family Services | Family Resource Centars, with a focus on the Latino Communlty | OECE |  | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$200,000 | \$ | 200,000 |  |  | \$200,000 | \$ | 400,000 |  |  | \$ | 400,000 |
| 43 | Electlons | Open Source Voting Pllot | Eligible for State matching funds | REG |  | \$ | 660,000 | \$ | - | \$660,000 | \$ | 595,000 | \$ | - | \$595,000 | \$ | 1,255,000 | \$ | - - | \$ | 1,255,000 |
| 44 | Public Health | Mental Health services | Assisted Outpatient Treatment Program | PDR |  | \$ | 103,486 |  |  | \$103,486 | \$ | 135,185 |  |  | \$135,185 | \$ | 238,671 |  |  | \$ | 238,671 |
| 45 | District Speeffic | District 5pecific Priorities | \$1M per district over two years | GEN |  | \$ | 8,000,000 | \$ | - | \$8,000,000 | \$ | 3,000,000 | \$ | ${ }^{-}$ | \$3,000,000 | \$ | 11,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 11,000,000 |
| 46 | Public Utility | Nelghborhood Sewardship Program | Community Engagemant | pue |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,115,000 | \$1,115,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 805,000 | \$805,000 | \$ | - |  | 1,920,000 | \$ | 1,920,000 |
| 47 |  |  | Workförce Development | PUC |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,570,000 | \$1,570,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,260,115 | \$1,260,115 | \$ | - |  | 2,830,115 | \$ | 2,830,115 |
| 48 |  |  | Water Investments | puc |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,025,000 | \$1,025,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 250,000 | \$250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,275,000 | \$ | 1,275,000 |
| 49 |  |  | Wastewater Investments | Puc. |  | \$ | - | \$ | 625,000 | \$625,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 325,000 | \$325,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 950,000 | \$ | 950,000 |
| 50 |  |  | Drinking Water Enhancements. | puc |  | \$ | - | \$ | 325,000 | \$325,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 165,000 | \$165,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 490,000 | \$ | 490,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30,066,915 |  |  |  |  | 19,037,229 |  | Gene | ral | und Total Total | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 41,439,029 \\ & 48,904,144 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |


*This reflects Police Department's reduction of $\$ 500,000$ in Furniture, Fixtures $\&$ other Equipment in lieu of reduction in professional services.

| Item \# | District | $t$ Policy Area | Sub Category | Dept | Description | $\text { GFS } 18-19$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFS } 18 \\ \hdashline 19 \\ \hdashline: \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total 18-19 | GF5 19-20 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { nomi-GFs } \\ 19-20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total 19-20 | totalges BOTH ÝEARS |  | total all: șoukices BOTH.YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | OECE | Eariy Head Start conversion and expectant family education | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  |  | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 2 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | OCYF | Youth development services at Washington High School Beacon Center | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 3 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | OECE | Expansion of Richmond District family resource center | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 4 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | Academy of Sc | Scil Youth sclence education programs | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  |  | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 5 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | DCYF | Public school support in district | 35,000 |  | 35,000 |  |  |  | 35,000 | - | 35,000 |
| 6 | 1 | Youth \& family services |  | dCYF | Youth wellness academy | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 7 | 1 | Senior services |  | MOHCD | Senior tablet class | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 8 | ¢ 1 | Senior services |  | dAAS | Expansion of senlor programming and activities | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
|  | $51$ | Sentior services |  | DAAS | Expand capacity of physieal therapy and support services for seniors | 120,000 |  | 120,000 |  |  |  | 120,000 | - | 120,000 |
| 10 | 1 | Senior services |  | MOHCD | Senior services collaborative for community engagement | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  |  | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 11 | 1 | Senior services |  | dAAS | Expansion of Russian speaking outreach to seniors | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |
| 12 | 1 | Senior services |  | DAAS | Richmond District Village Model | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |  |  |  | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |
| 13 | 1 | Senior services |  | das | Senior Friendship line | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |  |  |  | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |
| 14 | 1 | Parks |  | RPD | Heron Watch and Nature Walks | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  |  | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| 15 | 1 | Parks |  | RPD | New water fountain for Angler's Lodge | 8,000 |  | 8,000 |  |  |  | 8,000 | - | 8,000 |
| 16 | 1 | Housing \& Homelessness |  | HSH | Mobile homeless services for District 1 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 17 | 1 | Housing \& Homelessness |  | MOHCD | Capacty bulding for westside tenant counselling services | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |  |  |  | 20,000 | - | 20,000 |
| 18 | 1 | Public safery |  | SFPD | Support for National Night out | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  | 5,000 | - | 5,000 |
| 19 | 1 | Small business support |  | oewd | Richmond Distriet Cuitural \& Historical Projects | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  |  | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 20 | 1 | Small business support |  | OEND | One Richmond Initative | 110,000 |  | 110,000 |  |  |  | 110,000 | - | 110,000 |
| $\underline{21}$ | 1 | Small business support |  | oswo | Capacity building for Richmond District Small Business | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  | 30,000 | $\cdots$ | 30,000 |
| 22 | 1 E | Environment |  | PW | Tree-planting in District 1 | 47,000 |  | 47,000 |  |  |  | 47,000 | $-$ | 47,000 |
| 23 | 2 C | Clean Streets |  | ECN | Lombard Gardener - Gardener services for Crooked Lombard | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |  |  | - | 45,000 | - | 45,000 |
| 24 | 2 | Public Safety |  | ECN | Lombard Ambassadors - Ambassador program on Lombard St | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | $-$ | 100,000 |
| $\underline{25}$ | M | Merchant Outreach |  | ECN | Merchant Outreach/Planning | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 26 | 2 P | Public Safety |  | SFFD | Marine Rescue Unit/Safety | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  | - | 250,000 | - | 250,000 |
| 27 | 2 C | Community |  | RPD | Capital projects and family services/events | 175,000 |  | 175,000 |  |  | - | 175,000 | - | 175,000 |
| 28 | 2 | tillites |  | RPD/DPW | Francisco Park-Utility connections | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  | - | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 29 | 2 S | Senior Services |  | DAAS | Senlor services programing | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | $-$ | 50,000 |
| 30 | U | Utilities |  | DPW | Utlity Undergrounding Master | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 32 | 3 S | mall Business Support |  | oewo | Chinatown Construction Mititation Fund for Stockion Merchants | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |  |  | - | 45,000 | - | 45,000 |
| 32 | 3 S | enior Services |  | DAAS V | Village model support services for low-income independent seniors in Dlstrict 3 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |


| Hem ${ }^{\text {H }}$ | District | Pollcy Area | Sub Category | Dept | Description | . GFS 18-19 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { non-GFs 18- } \\ 19 \end{array}$ | Total 18:19 | GFS 19-20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-GF5 } \\ & 19-20 \end{aligned}$ | Total 19-20 | total gFs Bothyears | TOTAL BOTH YEAR'S | totalall SOURCES BOTHYEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 3 | Behavioral Health Services |  | First Five | APTBehavoral healin services in Vistiacion Valley and chinatown serving newcomer, school-age chidren and adults. Funding for licensed ellgible staff to build capacit, provide behavioral health direct services to API SFUSD families/kids impacted by trauma and enroiled in counseling | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  | . | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 34 | 3 | Workforce Development |  | OEWD | lapanese Cooking class w/ 20 guaranteed placements after traling | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 35 | 3 | Youth Education \& Career Training |  | DCYF | Family In Transition (FIT) program, youth-led program that directs low-Income, flimited English proficient Apl youth to educational, life skills \& career opportunities | 56,000 |  | 56,000 | 56,000 |  | 56,000 | 112,000 | - | 112,000 |
| 36. | 3 | Tenants Rights |  | MOHCD | API Tenants Rights counseling, particularly monolingual Chinese seniors at risk of unlawful evictions. Capacity to serve 215 residents. | 97,500 |  | 97,500 | 97,500 |  | 97,500 | 195,000 | - | 195,000 |
| 37 | 3 | Workforce Development |  | MOHCD | Neighborhood Access Point for low-income immigrant families w/ young chlldren | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  |  | - | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
| 38 | 3 | Historic Preservation |  | CPC | Deposit to Historic Preservation Fund | 198,000 |  | -198,000 |  |  | - | 198,000 | - | 198,000 |
| 39 | 4 | Schools |  | SFUSD | STEAM grants to all 9 public schools in District 4-540,000 per school each year | 360,000 |  | 360,000 | 360,000 |  | 360,000 | 720,000 | - | 720,000 |
| 40 | 4 | Neighborhood Services |  | CPC | Playland programming \& re-location | 25,000 |  | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 41 | 4 | Nelghborhood Services |  | oewd | Movies in McCoppin - continue for next 4 years ( $\$ 10,000$ per year). | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 42 | 4 | Nelghborhood Services |  | DCYF | Staffing for after-school and summer programming at Robert Louls Stevenson Elementary, Francls Scott Key Elementary, Ulloa Elementary, Sunset Eiementary | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 43 | 4 | Neighborhood Services |  | OEWD | Communlty Festivals in District 4 (Sunset Community Festival $\$ 15,000$, Autumn Moon Festival $\$ 5,000$, irving Fish Fest $\$ 5,000$, Noriega Festlval $\$ 5,000$, Taraval $\$ 5,000$ ) (funds listed are annual divislon of funding per year) | 35,000 |  | 35,000 | 35,000 |  | 35,000 | 70,000 | - | 70,000 |
| 44 | 4 | Small Business |  | oewd | Facade grants for District 4 small businesses | 40,000 |  | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |
| 45 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 5 | Senior Services |  | DAAS | Exercise program for Senlors in Cole Valley, Inner Sunset, and Sunset Heights. | 23,000 |  | 23,000 |  |  | - | 23,000 | - | 23,000 |
| 9 | 5 | Neighborhood Services |  | DCYF | Mental health/ substance abuse supoprt | 93,000 |  | 93,000 |  |  | - | 93,000 | - | 93,000 |
|  | 5 | Arts |  | MOHCD | Administrative support | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 30,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 49 | 5 | Economic Development |  | DPW | Asking for $\$ 19,000$ to fund additional outreach, the remainder to be released if deemed appropriate to move forward with project. | 19,000 |  | 19,000 | - |  | - | 19,000 | - | 19,000 |
| 50 | 5 | Economic Development |  | SFMTA | Iscort funds - continuation of last year | 60,000 |  | 60,000 |  |  | - | 60,000 | - | 60,000 |
| 51 | 5 | Arts |  | ARTS | Operating expenses for HVAW | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 52 | 5 | Ecionomic Developmant |  | OEWD | API Council | 12,000 |  | 12,000 |  |  | - | 12,000 | - | 12,000 |
| 53 | 5 | Economic Development |  | SFMTA | Cliy Fees and Permits, non-iscom | 22,000 |  | 22,000 |  |  | - | 22,000 | - | 22,000 |
| 54 | 5 | Economic Development |  | GFTA | API Council | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| 55 | 5 | Community Services |  | OEWD | Activation of underutized space | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 56 | 5 | Community Services |  | DCYF | TAY workforce and Mental heal th services | 91,000 |  | 91,000 |  |  | - | 91,000 | - | 91,000 |
| 57 | 5 | Youth Services |  | MOHCD | Community programming | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 58 | 5 | Economic Development |  | ECN | Community programming | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |

District Specific Allocation Details by District.

| tem\# | District | t. Policy Area | Sub Category | Dept | Description | GFS' $18.10^{\circ}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { non-GFs is- } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | Total 18-19 | GFs 19-20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-GFS } \\ & 19-20 \end{aligned}$ | Total 19-20 | TOTAL GFS Both Years | TOTAL <br> non-GFS <br> BOTH <br> YEARS | total ali sOURCES BOTH YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | 5 | Community Services |  | MOHCD | TAY youth service | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  | - | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 60 | 5 | Workforce Development |  | ECN | Workforce development/ barrier removal | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 61 | 5 | Economic Development |  | ECN | neighborhood activation | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |  |  | - | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 62 | 5 | Economic Development |  | GFTA | Grant writer/technical assistance | 60,000 |  | 60,000 |  |  | - | 60,000 | - | 60,000 |
| 63 | 6 | Senior Services |  | dAAS | Program Advocate/Navigator for Seniors and Adults with Disabilities | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |  |  |  | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |
| 64 | 6 | Street Cleanliness, Public Health |  | DPW | SMART receptacles for Yerba Buena/Mission Bay/R/ncon Hill neighborhoods | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  |  | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |
| 65 | 6 |  |  | MOHCD | Violence against women | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |
|  | ${ }^{1} 6$ | Housing |  | MOHCD | Eviction Prevention | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |  |  |  | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |
| 67 | ${ }^{6}$ | Street Cleanlinass |  | OEWD | Micro-neighborhood cleaning: create 6 clean teams | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |
| 68 | $\mathrm{J}_{6}$ | Community Development |  | MOHCD | Coummnity Support to filipinos in SOMA | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  |  |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |
| 69 | 6 | Public Safety |  | OEWD | Nighttime Security Support | 165,000 |  | 165,000 |  |  |  | 165,000 |  | 155,000 |
| 70 | 6 | Public Safety/street Cleanliness |  | RPD | Sergeant Maczuley Playground Bathroom Renovation | 213,000 |  | 213,000 |  |  |  | 213,000 |  | 213,000 |
| 71 | 6 | Trans Community |  | MOHCD | TLGs Cultural District. | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |
| 72 | 6 | Small Business |  | OEWD | 101 Hyde Street Project | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | - |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 73 | 7 | Youth Services |  | DCYF | Youth arts education programming and job training in District 7 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 74 | 7 | Pedestrian Safety |  | CON | Grants for Vision Zero participatory budgeting programi in District 7 to support democratically elected projects to benefit the community. | 250,000 |  | 250,000 |  |  | - | 250,000 | - | 250,000 |
| 75 | 7 | Youth Services |  | DCYF | Community-based, leadership development programming for District 7 Youth Council | 25,000 |  | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 25,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000, |
| 76 | 7 | Neighborhood Services |  | REC | Support to organize outdoor movie nights in District 7. | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 20,000 |  | 20,000 | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 77 | 7 | Neighborhood Services |  | REC | Renovation of the West Portal Playground | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 78 | 7 | Community Services/Senior Servic | ces/\%outh Services | REC | Recreational programming for the Sunnyside Clubhouse | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 79 | 7 | Neighborhood Services |  | CON | Disaster preparedness grants for participatory budgeting program in District 7 to support demorratically alected projects to benefit the community. | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
| 30 | Y | Youth Services |  |  | Supportyouth after-school programming on Ocean Avenue serving Ocean-Merced- | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 150,000 | . | 150,000 |
| 31 | E | Economic Develapment/Commun | nity Services | OEWD | Ocean Avenue Corridor Neighborhood Planning | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | . | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 32 | S | Senior Services | - . | dAAS | Capitallmprovements to a service provider that primarily serves youth and adults with disabilites. | 60,000 |  | 60,000 |  |  | . | 60,000 | - | 60,000 |
| 33 | 8 A | Arts | District 8 Senior Choirs | ART | Senior Choir support - 45 seniors participating in the Castro and Noe Valley | 20,000 |  | 20,000 |  |  | - | 20,000 | - | 20,000 |
| 34 | 8 W | Workforce Development | Skills and Capacity Building. | OEWD | Program offering lob Training and skill Building with goals of 20 clents in recovery in the Castro | 65,000 |  | 65,000 |  |  | - | 65,000 | - | 65,000 |
| 15 | LG | LGBTO Services | Support for Longterm HiV Suryivors | DPH. | Demonstration Pliot with Mental health Services, provider training, and community education for long term HIV survivors | 500,000 |  | 500,000 |  |  | . | 500,000 | - | 500,000 |
| 16 | $8{ }_{8}$ | Youth Services | LGBTO Services | DCYF | Program engeging vulnerable middle school $Q$ groups and fostering safe learning enviornments | 175,000 |  | 175,000 |  |  |  | 175,000 | - | 175,000 |



District Specific Allocation Details by District

| Item \# | District | ct Policy Area | Sub Category | Dept | Description | GFS 18-19 |  | Total 18-19 | GFs 19-20 | non-GFs 19-20. | Totatig-20 | totál grs BOTH YEARS |  | totalali SOURCES both years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112 | 9 | Arts \& Culture |  | Commission | Facilities maintenance for historic theatre space in the Mission | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  |  | - | 40,000 | - | 40,000 |
| 113 | 10 | Arts |  | ARTS | Capital lmprovements @ EVOH | 100,000 |  | 1.00,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 114 | 10 | Youth Arts |  | SFUSD | Arts enrichment program for Bayview elementary students | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
| 115 | 10 | Parks and Open Space |  | DPW | Mini Park Improvements capital improvements | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - | 25,000 | - | 25,000 |
| 116 | 10 | Parks and Open Space |  | RPD | McLaren Park Activation | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 117 | 10 | Community Gardens |  | DPW | Lighting in Carolina Green Space | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 118 | - 10 | Youth Services |  | DCYF | Program mentoring for high risk pacific islander TAY | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 | 150,000 | - | 150,000 |
|  |  | Street Improvements |  | DPW | Higting Improvements along egbert Avenue between 3rd and Jennings | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| 120 C | 10 | Family Services |  | OCEAA | Child Resource and Referral Services for 5 If Immigrant familles | 100,000-1 |  | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 100,000 | 200,000 | - | 200,000 |
| 121 | 10 | Legal Services |  | MOHCD | Pro bono legal support serving the Bayview community | 85,000 |  | 85,000 | 85,000 |  | 85,000 | 170,000 | - | 170,000 |
| 122 | 11 | Senior Services | Food Security | das | Monday through Friday meal site in OM1 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |  |  | - | 75,000 | - | 75,000 |
| 123 | 11. | Senior Services | Aging in place | DAAS | Welliness program and services on Saturdays | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 124 | 11 | Education | Academic Enrichment | DCYF | Enrichment in multiple stes | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| $\underline{125}$ | 11 | Workforce Development | Transitional Age Youth | DCYF | Culinary and Green Job training for youth ages 13-26 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| $\underline{126}$ | 11 | Education | Out of School Time | DCYF | DCYF Supplemental funding for summer to serve low-income, under achieving students during summer months. | 56,000 |  | 56,000 |  |  | - | 56,000 | - | 56,000 |
| 127 | 11 | Education | Out of School Time | DCYF | After school support for Balboa High School | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 128 | 11 | Education | Out of School 7 Time | ocyp | Afterschool enrichment teachers $=3$ classrooms | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |  |  | - | 70,000 | - | 70,000 |
| 129 | 11 | Education | Out of School Time | DCYF | 35 field trips $=\$ 17,500 \quad 7$ Drop in Programs $\$ 5,700$ | 24,000 |  | 24,000 |  |  | - | 24,000 | - | 24,000 |
| 130 | 11 | Workforce Development | Transitional Age Youth | DCYF | Internship 30 youth and after school 60 youth | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 131 | 11 | Public Health | Parent Engagement and <br> Education | DPH | family planning and women's heath services | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |  |  | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| $\underline{132}$ | 11 | Public Heaith | Parent Engagement and Education | DPH | . 5 FEE staff. The program would provide (in order of priority): basic Information and Referral, parent-child interactive groups, parent consultations, and parent leadership development. | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  |  | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
| 133 | 11 | District Specific | Clean Streets | DPW | Expand area power washed. Focus dumping on hotspot areas in the OMI and Outer Mission where less reporting happens | 120,000 |  | 120,000 |  |  | - | 120,000 | - | 120,000 |
| 134 | 11 | District Specific | Beautification | DPW | Greenling and mainteanance of large medians and parklets | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | - | 100,000 | - | 100,000 |
| 135 | 11 | Public Sefety | Emergency Preparedness | MOHCD | Funding for training, community coordịnation on a block by block besis, block parties, and emergency supplies to store. | 30,000 |  | 30,000 |  |  | - | 30,000 | - | 30,000 |
| 136 | 11 | Economic Development | Small Business Development | OEWD | Merchant Capacity Buldding and Marketing, Real Estate and Business Attraction | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  |  | - | 80,000 | - | 80,000 |
| 137 | 11. | Economic Development | Small Business Development | OEWD | Staff support for Better Street plan and business outreach | 40,000 |  | 40,000 | - | - | - | 40,000 | $\stackrel{+}{ }$ | 40,000 |


| Item \# | District |  | Sub Category . ..... | Dept | Description | ..GFs 18-19 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { non-GFS 18- } \\ -19 \\ -\cdots-. \end{array}\right\|$ | . Total 18:19. | :GF5 19-20. | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { non-GFS } \\ 19-2 \sigma^{\circ} \end{array}\right\|$ |  | TOTAL GFS BOTH YEARS | TOTAL nOD-GFS $\cdots$ BOTH YEARS $^{-}$ | TOTALALL . SOURCES BOTH YEARS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 138 | 11 | Housing | Affordable Housing | OEWD | Partnering with a housing rights agency to educate and support tenant rights, referrals to participants who are in jeopardy of being displaced or have already been evicted. | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | \$ | - | 50,000 | . | 50,000 |
| 139 | 11 | Parks and Recreation |  | REC | Bocce ball court | 10,000 |  | 10,000 | - | \$ - | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| 140 | 11 | Parks and Recreation |  | REC | Lakeview min! park | 10,000 |  | 10,000 | - | \$ - | - | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| 141 | 11 | Parks and Recreation | Arts Access | Rec | Jerry Garcla Amphetheater | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |  |  | - | 15,000 | - | 15,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 9,684,500 | $\cdot$ | 9,684,500 | 1,308,500 | - | 1,308,500. | 10,968;000 | - | 10,968,000 |
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Mark Farrell
MAYOR

June 25, 2018
Supervisor Maia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

## Re: Technical Adjustments Round 1 to the Mayor's Proposed Budget

Dear Chair Cohen,
Per Charter Section 9.101, I am submitting the attached round one adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed Budget for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. Significant changes include:

- Correcting entry to meet debt service obligations in the Housing Trust Fund;
- Correcting entries in the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to recognize on-going expenditures that were marked as one-time, and to correct duplicate entries;
- Correcting position entries in the Fire Department, Juvenile Probation Department, and Public Defender's Office;
- Balancing overhead entries and moving departmental work orders to appropriate cost centers in the Department of Technology;
- Correcting work orders in the Fire Department and Public Utilities Commission;
- Accurately reflecting state grant revenue and expenditures at Juvenile Probation Department;
- Completing transfer of contract from Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to Department on the Status of Women;
- Moving expenditure and position authority between departmental divisions, project codes, authority codes, and/or account codes at the Assessor-Recorder's Office, Department of Public Health, Department of Public Works, Department of Technology, Recreation and Parks Department, Police Department, Port, and Sheriff's Department.

I am also submitting clarification to the Transfer of Function letter that was submitted on June 1. The letter noted that fourteen positions were transferred from the Department of Technology (DT) to the City Administrator's (ADM) Digital Services Program, when in fact seventeen positions were transferred, including 1.0 FTE 0923 Manager II, 1.0 FTE 1053 IS Business Analyst - Senior and 1.0 FTE 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst.

Note that this set of technical adjustments result in General Fund savings of $\$ 1,083,469$ in FY 2018-19 and a General Fund cost of $\$ 1,326,497$ in FY 2019-20 (net cost of $\$ 243,028$ over the two years). This cost will be funded from the technical adjustment reserve. The attached tables detail these changes. Please contact me at $554-6125$ with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst Ben Rosenfield, Controller

|  | GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account ID | FY 2018-19 Change | FY 2018-19 Savings/(Cost) | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | ```FY. 2019-20 Savings/(Cost) Cumulative``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GFS | CRT |  |  | 229259 | 10000 | 10001770 | 1 | 10000 | 526510 | - | - | $(20,000)$ | 20,000 |
|  | GFS | DPH | 251961 | 251912 | 251912 | 10020 | 10030928 | 1 | 11159 | 506070 | - | - | (2,900,000) | 2,900,000 |
|  | GFS | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | 207982 | 10020 | 10009105 | 2 | 11187 | 506070 | - | -- | 2,900,000 | (2,900,000) |
|  | GFS | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | 207982 | 10020 | 10033381 | 1 | New - TBD | 567000 | 5,000,000 | (5,000,000) | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPH | 240642 | 207982 | 207982 | 10020 | 10033381 | 1 | 11193 | 567000 | $(5,000,000)$ | 5,000,000 | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPH | 207705 | 162643 | 162643 | 10020 | 10032899 | 1 | 20031 | 585020 | $(23,980,000)$ | 23,980,000 | (23,980,000) | 23,980,000 |
|  | GFS | DPH | 207705 | 162643 | 162643 | 10020 | 10032899 | 1 | 20031 | 506070 | 23,980,000 | $(23,980,000)$ | 23,980,000 | $(23,980,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10031891 | 20 | 17341 | 506070 | (200,000) | 200,000 | $(50,000)$ | 50,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10031891 | 20 | 20387 | 506070 | 200,000 | (200,000) | 50,000 | (50,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032120 | 18 | 17333 | 506070 | (90,000) | 90,000 | (90,000) | 90,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032120 | 18 | 20342 | 506070 | 90,000 | $(90,000)$ | 90,000 | (90,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032121 | 18 | 17333 | 506070 | (140,000) | 140,000 | (140,000) | 140,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032122 | 18 | 17334 | 506070 | (200,000) | 200,000 | (200,000) | 200,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032123 | 18 | 17415 | 506070 | (124,000) | 124,000 | (124,000) | 124,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032121 | 18 | 20342 | 506070 | 140,000 | (140,000) | 140,000 | (140,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032122 | 18 | 20343 | 506070 | 200,000 | (200,000) | 200,000 | (200,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032123 | 18 | 20344 | 506070 | 124,000 | (124,000) | 124,000 | $(124,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032127 | 18 | 17341 | 506070 | $(38,000)$ | 38,000 | $(38,000)$ | 38,000 |
| $\sigma$ | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032127 | 18 | 20351 | 506070 | 38,000 | $(38,000)$ | 38,000 | $(38,000)$ |
| $\omega$ | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032128 | 18 | 17334 | 506070 | (30,000) | 30,000 | $(30,000)$ | 30,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032128 | 18 | 20346 | 506070 | 30,000 | (30,000) | 30,000 | (30,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 229840 | 10020 | 10032375 | 5 | 17344 | 506070 | $(30,000)$ | 30,000 | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 207959 | 10020 | 10032375 | 5 | 20345 | 506070 | 30,000 | (30,000) | - | - |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032510 | 1 | 17333 | 506070 | (100,000) | 100,000 | (100,000) | 100,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229897 | 207956 | 10020 | 10032510 | 1 | 20342 | 506070 | 100,000 | (100,000) | 100,000 | (100,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229822 | 207951 | 10020 | 10032113 | 18 | 17343 | 506070 | $(15,000)$ | 15,000 | $(15,000)$ | 15,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207990 | 229822 | 207951 | 10020 | 10032113 | 18 | 17344 | 506070 | 15,000 | (15,000) | 15,000 | (15,000) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 21 | 14522 | 584030 | $(21,824,000)$ | 21,824,000 | (27,078,000) | 27,078,000 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 446213 | $(5,800,807)$ | 5,800,807 | $(3,135,110)$ | 3,135,110 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 584030 | $(5,800,807)$ | 5,800,807 | $(3,135,110)$ | 3,135,110 |
| . | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 446214 | $(3,183,193)$ | 3,183,193 | $(1,718,546)$ | 1,718,546 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 584030 | $(3,183,193)$ | 3,183,193 | $(1,718,546)$ | 1,718,546 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 21 | 20273 | 584030 | 21,824,000 | $(21,824,000)$ | 27,078,000 | $(27,078,000)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 446213 | 5,800,807 | $(5,800,807)$ | 3,135,110 | $(3,135,110)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12760 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 584030 | 5,800,807 | $(5,800,807)$ | 3,135,110 | $(3,135,110)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 446214 | 3,183,193 | $(3,183,193)$ | 1,718,546 | $(1,718,546)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12780 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 584030 | 3,183,193 | $(3,183,193)$ | 1,718,546 | $(1,718,546)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 24 | 10006 | 567000 | $(2,552,560)$ | 2,552,560 | (2,860,188) | 2,860,188 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 24 | 20272 | 567000 | 2,552,560 | $(2,552,560)$ | 2,860,188 | $(2,860,188)$ |

Non-Position Adjustments
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|  | GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2018-19 <br> Savings/(Cost) | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2019-20 Savings/(Cost) Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 11 | 14485 | 567000 | (6,063,750) | 6,063,750 | (6,366,940) | 6,366,940 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 11 | 20269 | 567000 | 6,063,750 | (6,063,750) | 6,366,940 | (6,366,940) |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 23 | 17027 | 567000 | (294,760) | 294,760 | (309,498) | 309,498 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 23 | 20270 | 567000 | 294,760 | (294,760) | 309,498 | $(309,498)$ |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 10 | 17348 | 567000 | (877, 176) | 877,176 | (921,035) | 921,035 |
|  | GFS | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10020 | 10032767 | 10 | 20271 | 567000 | 877,176 | (877,176) | 921,035 | (921,035) |
|  | GFS | ECN | 229991 |  | 229991 | 10010 | 10022531 | 9 | 16652 | 538000 | 25,000 | $(25,000)$ | - |  |
|  | GFS | FIR | 130647 |  | 130647 | 10060 | 10033290 | 0001 | 10002 | 581063 | 3,643 | $(3,643)$ |  | $(3,643)$ |
|  | GFS | FIR | 130647 |  | 130647 | 10060 | 10033290 | 0001 | 10002 | 581064 | 3,199 | $(3,199)$ | - | $(3,199)$ |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026740 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | (3,207,791) | 3,207,791 | - | 3,207,791 |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026737 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | - | - | 691,947 | (691,947) |
|  | GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026740 | 1 | 10000 | 487110 | $(1,451,347)$ | (1,451,347) |  | (1,451,347) |
|  | GFS | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | 10020 | 10024340 | 1 | 17369 | 506070 | 175,000 | $(175,000)$ |  |  |
|  | GFS | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | 10020 | 10024341 | 1 | 10005 | 506070 | $(300,000)$ | 300,000 | - | - |
|  | GFS | HRD | 232022 |  | 232022 | 10020 | 10033390 | 1 | 20357 | 506070 | 125,000 | $(125,000)$ | - |  |
|  | GFS | JUV | 232034 |  | 232034 | 10000 | 10001710 | 6 | 10000 | 460699 | - | - | 34,000 | $(34,000)$ |
|  | GFS | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10020 | 10023900 | 131 | 17182 | 591270 | - | - | 1,755,781 | (1,755,781) |
|  | GFS | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10000 | 10001910 | 1 | 10000 | 560000 | (2,000,000) | 2,000,000 |  |  |
| $\overline{0}$ | GFS | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10020 | 10032880 | 1 | 20034 | 506070 | 2,000,000 | (2,000,000) | 1,000,000 | (1,000,000) |
| $\omega$ | GFS | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10000 | 10001903 | 1 | 10000 | 560000 | $(4,574,360)$ | 4,574,360 | (4,079,600) | 4,079,600 |
|  | GFS | POL | 232086 |  | 232086 | 10000 | 10001903 | 1 | 10000 | 560000 | 4,574,360 | $(4,574,360)$ | 3,079,600 | $(3,079,600)$ |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10032174 | 6 | 19701 | 567000 | $(1,712,000)$ | 1,712,000 | - |  |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10033490 | 2 | 19701 | 567000 | 50,000 | $(50,000)$ | - | - |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10013441 | 6 | 19701 | 567000 | 1,000,000 | (1,000,000) | - | - |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10013423 | 6 | 19701 | 567000 | 412,000 | $(412,000)$ | - | - |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10033554 | 2 | 19701 | 567000 | 250,000 | $(250,000)$ | - |  |
|  | GFS | WOM |  |  | 232395 | 10000 | 10026801 | 001 | 10000 | 538000 | 237,688 | $(237,688)$ | - | $(237,688)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 1 | 14514 | 475415 | (2,214,000) | 2,214,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 1 | 14514 | 567000 | $(2,214,000)$ | 2,214,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 1 | 14517 | 475415 | $(150,000)$ | 150,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 1 - | 14517 | 567000 | (150,000) | 150,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 38 | 14514 | 475415 | 2,214,000 | ( $2,214,000$ ) | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10860 | 10032767 | 38 | 14514 | 567000 | 2,214,000 | ( $2,214,000$ ) | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 39 | 14517 | 475415 | 150,000 | $(150,000)$ | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10032767 | 39 | 14517 | 567000 | 150,000 | (150,000) | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031390 | 55 | 10008 | 444931 | (9,060,000) | 9,060,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031390 | 66 | 10008 | 444931 | 9,060,000 | (9,060,000) | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031502 | 55 | 10008 | 444931 | (5,580,000) | 5,580,000 | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 17210 | 10031502 | 60 | 10008 | 444931 | 5,580,000 | (5,580,000) | - | - |

Non-Position Adjustments
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| GESTYPe | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section |  | Fund ID | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account, | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2018-19 <br> Savings / Cost) | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \\ \text { Cumulative } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seif Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10031523 | 55 | 14517 | 475415 | (2,000,000) | 2,000,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 10880 | 10031523 | 58 | 14517 | 475415 | 2,000,000 | $(2,000,000)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting. | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 446213 | (14,883,000) | 14,883,000 | $(15,210,426)$ | 15,210,426 |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 584030 | (14,883,000) | 14,883,000 | $(15,210,426)$ | 15,210,426 |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 460198 | $(8,139,000)$ | 8,139,000 | $(8,318,058)$ | 8,318,058 |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 | 14522 | 584030 | $(8,139,000)$ | 8,139,000 | $(8,318,058)$ | 8,318,058 |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 446213 | 14,883,000 | $(14,883,000)$ | 15,210,426 | $(15,210,426)$ |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12775 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 584030 | 14,883,000 | $(14,883,000)$ | 15,210,426 | $(15,210,426)$ |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 460198 | 8,139,000 | $(8,139,000)$ | 8,318,058 | $(8,318,058)$ |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207988 | 229863 | 207954 | 12785 | 10032767 | 22 | 20273 | 584030 | 8,139,000 | $(8,139,000)$ | 8,318,058 | $(8,318,058)$ |
| Self Supporting | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 17380 | 10026734 | 1 | 10000 | 493001 | - - | - | 1,755,781 | 1,755,781 |
| Self Supporting | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 17380 | 10026734 | 1 | 10000 | 570000 | - | - | 1,755,781 | (1,755,781) |
| Self Supporting | JUV | 232034 |  |  | 13550 | 10033432 | 1 | 10001 | 448999 | - | - | 22,615 | 22,615 |
| Self Supporting | JUV | 232034 |  |  | 13550 | 10033432 | 1 | 10001 | 527990 | - | - | 22,615 | $(22,615)$ |
| Self Supporting | PRT | 232116 |  | 232116 | 23700 | 10033239 | 1 | 20276 | 581078 | (250,000) | 250,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | PRT | 232116 |  | 232116 | 23700 | 10033525 | 1 | 12735. | 567000 | 250,000 | (250,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | PRT | 232116 |  | 232116 | 23700 | 10033239 | 1 | 12677 | 581390 | (211,000) | 211,000 | $(6,000)$ | 6,000 |
| Self Supporting | PRT | 232116 |  | 232116 | 23700 | 10030093 | 1 | 12677 | 581390 | 211,000 | (211,000) | 6,000 | $(6,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | PUC | 232429 | 232426 | 232425 | 25940 | 10029996 | 4 | 10000 | 581077 | - | - | 109,000 | 109,000 |
| Self Supporting | PUC | 232429 | 232396 | 232396 | 25940 | 10029994 | 2 | 10000 | 499999 | - | - | 109,000 | $(109,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 21 | 10001 | 567000 | $(1,200,000)$ | 1,200,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 21 | 20407 | 567000 | 1,200,000 | (1,200,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 20 | 10001 | 567000 | (200,000) | 200,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 20 | 20409 | 567000 | 200,000 | (200,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 19 | 10001 | 567000 | $(148,204)$ | 148,204 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16930 | 10027635 | 19 | 20410 | 567000 | 148,204 | $(148,204)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16940 | 10027635 | 22 | 10001 | 567000 | $(4,988,600)$ | 4,988,600 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16940 | 10027635 | 22 | 20408 | 567000 | 4,988,600 | $(4,988,600)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013222 | 20 | 10001 | 567000 | (250,000) | 250,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013222 | 20 | 20405 | 567000 | 250,000 | (250,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013410 | 14 | 10001 | 567000 | $(375,255)$ | 375,255 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10013410 | 14 | 20406 | 567000 | 375,255 | $(375,255)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10032997 | 4 | 10001 | 567000 | (250,000) | 250,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 16950 | 10032997 | 4 | 20411 | 567000 | 250,000 | (250,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | SHF |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10016951 | 4 | 15808 | 499998 | $(1,260,000)$ | 1,260,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | SHF |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 | 15230 | 500010 | $(1,260,000)$ | 1,260,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | SHF |  | . | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 | 15230 | 499998 | 1,260,000 | $(1,260,000)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | SHF |  |  | 232331 | 15680 | 10033416 | 1 | 15230 | 567000 | 1,260,000 | $(1,260,000)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207917 | 207917 | 28100 | 10024777 | 1 | 10000 | 532310 | $(1,000,000)$ | 1,000,000 | - | - |


| GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fund } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \\ \text { Cumulative } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207917 | 207917 | 28100 | 10024777 | 1 | 10000 | 540000 | 1,000,000 | $(1,000,000)$ | (1,000,000) | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 232337 | 207922 | 207922 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 535960 | (220,000) | 220,000 | - | (220,000) |
| Self Supporting | TS | 232337 | 207922 | 207922 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 527610 | 220,000 | (220,000) | - | 220,000 |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 232341 | 232341 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 487230 | $(1,487,134)$ | $(1,487,134)$ | $(1,487,134)$ | $(1,487,134)$ |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 232341 | 232341 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 520190 | $(1,276,737)$ | 1,276,737 | 9,140 | 1,267,597 |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486020 | (252,194) | 252,194 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486030 | $(64,360)$ | 64,360 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486050 | $(30,719)$ | 30,719 | - | - - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486070 | $(21,267)$ | 21,267 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486090 | $(3,349)$ | 3,349 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486100 | . - | - - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486110 | $(1,191,488)$ | 1,191,488 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486190 | $(43,132)$ | 43,132 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486220 | $(126,389)$ | 126,389 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486230 | (282,404) | 282,404 | -- | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486250 | $(24,578)$ | 24,578 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486270 | $(29,887)$ | 29,887 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486280 | (1,901) | 1,901 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486310 | $(52,369)$ | 52,369 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486340 | $(108,572)$ | 108,572 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486350 | $(70,377)$ | 70,377 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486370 | $(521,620)$ | 521,620 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486410 | $(18,598)$ | 18,598 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486430 | $(211,101)$ | 211,101 | - | - |
| Self Supporting. | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486440 | $(8,046)$ | 8,046 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486460 | $(33,158)$ | 33,158 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486470 | (10,000) | 10,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486490 | $(1,587)$ | 1,587 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486500 | $(105,259)$ | 105,259 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486510 | $(4,623)$ | 4,623 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486530 | $(189,954)$ | 189,954 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486560 | $(104,487)$ | 104,487 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486570 | $(2,500)$ | 2,500 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486580 | $(5,842)$ | 5,842 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486590 | $(20,021)$ | 20,021 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | T.IS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486630 | $(136,745)$ | 136,745 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486640 | $(17,076)$ | 17,076 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486670 | $(19,095)$ | 19,095 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 ] | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486690 | $(485,906)$ | 485,906 | - | - |


| GFSTYpe | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund | Project ID | Activity | Authority ID | Account | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ & \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486710 | $(37,730)$ | 37,730 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486720 | $(23,819)$ | 23,819 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486740 | (81,079) | 81,079 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486750 | (7,200) | 7,200 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486760 | $(5,000)$ | 5,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486790 | (937) | 937 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | IIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 486800 | $(3,600)$ | 3,600 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 527000 | $(39,087)$ | 39,087 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 527610 | $(797,645)$ | 797,645 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 529110 | $(508,323)$ | 508,323 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 530000 | (420) | 420 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 535000 | (1,791,966) | 1,791,966 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 535960 | $(940,922)$ | 940,922 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 540000 | $(277,505)$ | 277,505 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024777 | 1 | 17582 | 549250 | $(2,100)$ | 2,100 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486020 | 252,194 | $(252,194)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486030 | 64,360 | $(64,360)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486050 | 30,719 | $(30,719)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486070 | 21,267 | $(21,267)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486090 | 3,349 | $(3,349)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486110 | 1,191,488 | $(1,191,488)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486190 | 43,132 | $(43,132)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486220 | 126,389 | $(126,389)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486230 | 282,404 | $(282,404)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486250 | 24,578 | (24,578) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486270 | 29,887 | (29,887) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486280 | 1,901 | (1,901) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486310 | 52,369 | $(52,369)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486340 | 108,572 | $(108,572)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486350 | 70,377 | $(70,377)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486370 | 521,620 | (521,620) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486410 | 18,598 | $(18,598)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486420 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486430 | 211,101 | (211,101) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486440 | 8,046 | $(8,046)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486460 | 33,158 | $(33,158)$ | (3) | 3 |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486470 | 10,000 | (10,000) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486490 | 1,587 | $(1,587)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486500 | 105,259 | $(105,259)$ | - | - |


| GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund: ID | Project ID | Activity ID | Authority ID | Account ID | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2018-19 Savingss/(Cost) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) - } \\ \text { Cumulative } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486510 | 4,623 | $(4,623)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486530 | 189,954 | $(189,954)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486560 | 104,487 | $(104,487)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486570 | 2,500 | $(2,500)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486580 | 5,842 | $(5,842)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486590 | 20,021 | $(20,021)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486630 | 136,745 | (136,745) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486640 | 17,076 | $(17,076)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486670 | 19,095 | $(19,095)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486690 | 485,906 | (485,906) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486710 | 37,730 | $(37,730)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486720 | 23,819 | $(23,819)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486740 | 81,079 | $(81,079)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486750 | 7,200 | (7,200) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486760 | 5,000 | $(5,000)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486790 | 937 | (937) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 486800 | 3,600 | (3,600) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 527000 | 39,087 | $(39,087)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 527610 | 797,645 | (797,645) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 529110 | 508,323 | $(508,323)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 530000 | 420 | (420) | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 535000 | 1,791,966 | $(1,791,966)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 535960 | 940,922 | $(940,922)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 540000 | 277,505 | (277,505) | . - | - |
| Self Supporting | TIS | 207915 | 207921 | 207921 | 28070 | 10024810 | 1 | 17608 | 549250 | 2,100 | (2,100) | - | - |


| GFSType | Ropt |  | Wipert | Dept ID | Fund ID | Projectid | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Activity } \\ & \hline 10 \end{aligned}$ | Authority | $\begin{gathered} \text { Acivity } \\ \text { Typres } \\ \text { Number } \end{gathered}$ | Account LVI | Class | Job Class Tu | staus | Action | Ret No: | FY 2018-19 FTE Change | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} \text { FY } 2018-19 \\ \left.\begin{array}{r} \text { Amount } \\ \text { Chänge } \end{array} \right\rvert\, \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Fr 2018-19 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { FY } 2019-20 \text { FTE }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Amount } \\ \text { Change } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GFS | DPF | 242641 | 251985 | 251674 | 21030 | 10001862 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/gen | 2328_C | Nurse Pratilioner | A | N |  | (1.39) | (407, 242) | 407,242 | (1.80) | (533,251) | 533,251 |
| GFs | DPH | 242641 | 251985 | 251673 | 21080 | 10001835 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/3en | 12328-C | Nurse Practitoner | A | N |  | 1.38 | 407,242 | (407,242) | 1.80 | 533,251 | (533,251) |
| Grs | Frir | 130551 |  | 130651 | 10000 | 10001963 | 1 | 10000 |  | Salary | 5215-C | Fire Protection Engineer | A | R |  | 1.00 | 155,913 | (155,913) | 1.00 | 155,913 | (155,913) |
| GFS | Fir | 130651 |  | 130651 | 10000 | 10001963 | 1 | 10000 |  | Benefits | 5215 C | Fire Protection Engineer | A |  |  |  | 55,298 | ( 51,298 ) |  | 56,390 | (56,390) |
| GFs | FrR | 130651 |  | 130651 | 10000 | 10001963 | 1 | 10000 |  | Salary | H004_F | Inspector, Bur of fre Prevention \& Pubi | A | R |  | 1.00 | 245,549 | (145,599) | 1.00 | 149,915 | (149,915) |
| Gfs | FR | 130651 |  | 130651 | 10000 | 10001963 | 1 | 10000 |  | Beneft | H004. 5 | Inspector, Bur of fre Preverition \& Pubi | A | R |  |  | 46,685 | (46,685) |  | 48,465 | (48,455) |
| GFS | 3VV | 232034 |  | 232034 | 10000 | 10001710 | 4 | 10000 |  | Step | STEPM. 2 | Step Adjustments, M1scellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (34,000) | 34,000 |
| GFS | JV | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sal/ben | C953-C | Deputy Director III | A | S | Jv03 | 1.00 | 259,614 | (258,614) | 1.00 | 266,021 | (260,021) |
|  | JW | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10030 |  | Sal/ben | 8582. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | ACPO, Juve, Juv Prob (SFERS) | A | s | Jv03 | (1.00) | (250,096) | 250,096 | (1.00) | (251,150) | 251,150 |
| GFS | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sa//3en | 0063.5 | Department Head III | A |  | 3 V 05 | 1.00 | 309,418 | (309,418) | 1.00 | 319,815 | (319,815) |
| GFS. | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sal/ben | 8418 S 5 | Chief Probation Offlcer, Juvenile Court | A | 5 | Jvos | (1.00] | (309,488) | 309,418 | (1.00) | (3i9,815) | 319,815 |
| GFs | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Saliben | 1024.C | Is Administrator-Supervisor | A | 5 | JV11 | 1.00 | 178,362 | (178,362) | 1.00 | 179,130 | (179,130) |
| GFS | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10007710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sal/Ben | 1052_C | Iis Business Analyst | A | 5 | ${ }^{3} 11$ | (1.00) | (153,569) | 153,569 | (1.00) | (154,358) | 154,358 |
| GFS | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sal/ben | 8444_S | Deputy Probation Officer | A | 5 | JV21 | 2.00 | 327,376 | (327,376) | 2.00 | 338,595 | (338,596) |
| GFS | Juv | 232040 |  | 232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sa/]Ben | 1244C | Senior Persomel Analyst | A | 5 | JV21 | (1.00) | (156,114) | 166,114 | (1.00) | (167,426) | 167,426 |
| GF5 | Juv | 1232040 |  | 1232040 | 10010 | 10001710 | 3 | 10000 |  | Sa/Ben | 1823-C | Senior Administrative Analyst | A | 5 | JV21 | (1.00) | (160,834) | 160,834 |  | (161, 618) | 161,618 |
| GFS | JUV | 232335 |  | 232035 | 10000 | 10001710 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/Ben | 0923.5 | Manager II |  |  | jvso | 1.00 | 209,769 | (209,759) | 1.00 | 217,018 | (217,018) |
| GFS | Juv | 232035 |  | 232035 | 10000 | 10001710 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/ben | 8344_5 | Director, Juvenle Hall | A | 5 | JV50 | (1.00) | (209,769) | 209, 769 | (1.00) | (217,018) | 217,018 |
| GFS | 3uv | 232035 |  | 232035 | 10000 | 10001710 | 1 | 10000 |  | Attrition | 1993M Z | Atutition Savins - Miscelaneous | A. |  |  |  | (33,739) | 33,739 |  | (43, 195) | 43,195 |
| GFS | PDR |  |  | 232092 | 10000 | 10008889 | 1 | 10000 |  | Saljeen | B177-C | Attorney (Civil/Criminal) | - | N |  | 1.00 | 274,447 | (274,479) |  |  |  |
| GFS | POR |  |  | 232082 | 10000 | 10001889 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/3en | 8142_C | Pubic Dofender's Investigator |  | N |  | (1.00) | (148, 126) | 148,126 |  |  |  |
| Gfes | PDR |  |  | 232082 | 10000 | 10001889 | 1 | 10000 |  | step | STEPM 2 | Step Adjustment, M\|scellineous | A |  |  |  | [126,321) | 126,321 |  |  |  |
| Gfs | POL | 232086 |  | 23288 | 10000 | 10001909 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/Ben | ${ }^{8253}$ C | Forensic Latent Examiner II | A | N | POL23 | (4.62) | (669,688) | 659,618 | (6.00) | (880,414) | 880,414 |
| GFS | PoL | 232091 |  | 232086 | 10000 | 10001909 |  | 10000 |  | Saljeen | ${ }^{8253-6}$ | Forensic Latent Examiner II | A | $N$ | POL23 | 4.62 | 669,518 | (669,618) | 6.00 | 880,414 | (880,414) |
| GFS | TS | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10023312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/gen | -941.C | Manager VI | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | R | ADM39 | (1.00) | (191,316) | 191,316 | (1.00) | (191,316) | 191,316 |
| GFs | Tis | 210657 |  | 21065 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/en | $1043{ }^{\text {C }}$ | Is Engineer-Senior | A | R | ADM35 | (1.00) | (149,593) | 149,593 | (1.00) | (149,593) | 149,593, |
| GFS | Tis | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/ben | $12053 . \mathrm{C}$ | is Bushess Analyst-Sentor | A | R | ADM36 | (1.00) | (126,107) | 126,107 | (1.00) | (126,107) | 126,107 |
| GFS | Tis | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/Ben | 1054-C | Is Bushess Analyst-princlpat | A | R | ADM37 | (3,00) | (438,014) | 438,014 | (3.00) | (438,014) | 438,014 |
| GFS | Tis | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/ben | 1064 C | IS Programmer Analyst-pricicipal | A | R | ADM38 | (1,00) | (133,097) | 133,097 | (1.00) | (133,097) | 133,097 |
| GFs | Tis | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 - | 10000 | 10000 | Sal/Ben | 1070-C | Is Project Drector | A | R | ADM39 | (1.00) | (160,948) | 160,948 | (1.00) | (160,948) | 160,948 |
| GFS | IIS | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 16524 | 10000 | Sal/ben | 10941-C | Manager VI | A | R | ADM34 | 1.00 | 191,316 | (191,316) | 1.00 | 191,316 | (191,316) |
| GFS | Tis | 210657 |  | 21055 | 10020 | 10022312 |  | 16524 | 10000 | Sal/Ben | 1043 C | 1 IS Engineer-Senlor | A | R | ADM35 | 1.00 | 149,593 | [149,593) | 1.00 | 149,593 | (149,593) |
| GFs | TIS | 210657 |  | 2120657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 16524 | 10000 | Saly ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{1053}$ | IS Bushess Analyst-Senlor | A | R | 40, 35 | 1.00 | 126,107 | (126,107) | 1.00 | 126,407 | (126,107) |
| GFS | TIS | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 16524 | 10000 | Salben | $1054 . \mathrm{C}$ | IS Business Aralyst-Pinicipal | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | R | A0, M37 | 3.00 | 438,014 | (438,044) | 3.00 | 438,014 | (438,014) |
| GFS | TIS | 210657 |  | 210657 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 16524 | 10000 | Salygen | 1064 C | IS Programmer Analyst-principat | A | R | ADM38 | 1.00 | 133,097 | (133,097) | 1.00 | 133,097 | (133,097) |
| GFS | Tis | 210657 |  | 210557 | 10020 | 10022312 | 1 | 16524 | 10000 | Saljeen | 1070 C | Iis Project Difector | A | R | ADM39 | 1.00 | 160,948 | (160,948) | 1.00 | 160,948 | (160,948) |
| Selif Supporting | ASR | 229015 |  | 229015 | 12610 | 10022469 | 1 - | 10000 |  | Saliben | 1822 C | Administratue Analyst | A | R | AS04 | (0.50) | (69,832) | 69,832 | (0.50) | (74,110) | 74,1 |
| Self Supporthin | ASR | 222015 |  | 229015 | 12610 | 10022459 | 1 - | 16627 |  | Sal/ben | 1822 C | Administratve Analyst | ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | R | A504 | 0.50 | 69,832 | (69,832) | 0.50 | 74,110 | (74,110) |
| Selif Supporting | ASR | 229015 |  | 229015 | 12610 | 10024404 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/Ben | 14225.6 | Assessor-Recorder Senior Office Special | A | R | AS1.1 | (1.00) | (121,409) | 121,409 | (1.00) | (122,195) | 122,195 |
| Self Supporting | ASR | 229015 |  | 229015 | 12610 | 10024904 |  | 17409 |  | Salyeen | ${ }^{4215-C}$ | Assessor-Recordier Senior office Speciall | A | R | ASSII | 1.00 | 121,409 | (121,409) | 1.00 | 122,195 | (122,195) |
| Self Supporting | ASR | 229015 |  | 229015 | 12510 | 10032513 | 1 | 10000 |  | Sal/ben | 4215-C | Assessor-Recorder Senior Office Soeciall | A | R | ASII | (1.00) | (121,409) | 121,409 | (1.00) | (122, 195] | 122,105 |
| Self Supporting | ASR | 229015 |  | 122915 | 12610 | 10032513 | 1. | 19830 |  | Salisen | 4215-C | Assessor-Recorder Seniof Office Speciall | A | R | AStio | 1.00 | 121,403 | (121,499) | 1.00 | 122,195 | (122,195) |
| Selif Supporing | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 249641 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 | 10000 | Muitple | Saliben | mutitole | Multeple |  |  |  | (40.83) | (5,514,559) | 5,514,559 | (40.33) | (5,525,405) | 5,525,405 |
| Self Supporting | DPW | 207990 | 249642 | 299541 | 13985 | 10031233 | 1 | 20448 | Multple | Sal/ben | Multiple | Multpie |  |  |  | 40.83 | 5,514,559 | ( $5,514,559)$ | 40.33 | 5,525,405 | (5,525,405) |
| Self Supporiting | TIS | 133680 | 207942 | 207942 | 28070 | 1002477 | 1 | 17582 |  | Saluben | 1452.C | Executive Serretary II | A |  |  | (1.00) | (91, 588) | 91,588 | (1.00) | (91,588) | 91,588 |
| Self Supparting | IIS | 207915 | 232341 | 232341 | 28070 | 1002477 | 1 | 17582 |  | Sal/fen | $11452-6$ | Execuitive Secretary | A |  |  | 1.001 | 91,588 | (91,588) | 1.00 | 91,588 | (19,588) |

Received beminitte

June 27, 2018
Supervisor Maia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

## Re: Technical Adjustments Round 2 to the Mayor's Proposed Budget

Dear Chair Cohen,
Per Charter Section 9.101, I am submitting the attached round two technical adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed Budget for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. These adjustments technically implement the rebalancing plan homelessness and housing services submitted to the Budget and Finance Committee on Monday, June $25^{\text {th }}$. Significant changes include:

- Removing all revenue and expenditure items related to Proposition D in General City Responsibility, the Controller's Office, the Office of the Treasurer-Tax Collector, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing;
- Reflecting updated State revenue and corresponding expenditures in the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing;
- Reflecting updated retiree health rates in General Fund departments;
- Adjusting expenditures in the Departinent of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to fund critical homeless services and legal assistance for tenants facing eviction;
- Redistributing fund balance over the two years to match expenditures to revenues.

Note that this set of technical adjustments result is neutral to the General Fund in FY 2018-19 and in FY 2019-20. The attached tables detail these changes. The figures may change slightly once they are entered into the budget system. Please contact me at 554-6125 with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,


Kelly Kirkpatrick<br>Acting Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst Ben Rosenfield, Controller

| GFSTYpe | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | Project | Activity ID | Authoity ID | Account ID | FY 2018-19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ & \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fy 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10000 | 10026733 | 1 | 10000 | 493066 | $(1,500,000)$ | $(1,500,000)$ | - | $(1,500,000)$ |
| GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10020 | 10026734 | 1 | 10000 | 506070 | $(1,500,000)$ | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 |
| GFS | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10000 | 10026733 | 1 | 10000 | 499999 | $(4,302,958)$ | $(4,302,958)$ | 8,605,916 | 4,302,958 |
| GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10033287 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | - | - | 9,256,938 | $(9,256,938)$ |
| GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10033396 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | - | - | 500,000 | $(500,000)$ |
| GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026740 | 1 | 10000 | 581670 | - | - | 943,062 | $(943,062)$ |
| GFS | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10000 | 10026737 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | - | - | 600,000 | (600,000) |
| GFS | Multiple | Multiple |  | Multiple | Multiple | Multiple |  | Multiple | 515610 | (5,702,958) | 5,702,958 | (4,694,084) | 10,397,042 |
| GFS | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10010 | 10023915 | 1 | 17198 | 538010 | 1,400,000 | (1,400,000) | 2,000,000 | $(3,400,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | CON | 207672 |  | 207672 | 10801 | 10001644 | 1 | 20285 | 411221 | $(10,000)$ | $(10,000)$ | - | $(10,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | CON | 207672 |  | 207672 | 10801 | 10001644 | 1 | 20285 | 506070 | $(10,000)$ | 10,000 | - | 10,000 |
| Self Supporting | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10801 | 10026733 | 1 | 20285 | 411221 | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | $(3,000,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | GEN |  |  | 230018 | 10801 | 10026733 | 1 | 20285 | 591060 | $(1,500,000)$ | 1,500,000 | (1,500,000) | 3,000,000 |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20281 | 411221 | $(13,437,000)$ | $(13,437,000)$ | $(13,725,000)$ | (27,162,000) |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20281 | 506070 | $(13,437,000)$ | 13,437,000 | $(12,781,938)$ | 26,218,938 |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20281 | 581670 | - | $\cdots$ | $(943,062)$ | 943,062 |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12960 | tbd | 1 | 10001 | 506070 | 27,671,628 | $(27,671,628)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12960 | tbd | 1 | 10001 | tbd | 27,671,628 | 27,671,628 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12960 | tbd | 1 | 10001 | 506070 | 2,000,000 | $(2,000,000)$ | 1,000,000 | (3,000,000) |
| Self Supporting | HOM | 203646 |  | 203646 | 12960 | tod | 1 | 10001 | tbd | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20282 | 411221 | $(2,986,000)$ | $(2,986,000)$ | (3,050,000) | (6,036,000) |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20282 | 506070 | $(2,986,000)$ | 2,986,000 | $(3,050,000)$ | 6,036,000 |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20283 | 411221 | $(10,451,000)$ | (10,451,000) | $(10,675,000)$ | (21,126,000) |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20283 | 506070 | $(10,451,000)$ | 10,451,000 | $(10,675,000)$ | 21,126,000 |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20284 | 411221 | $(2,986,000)$ | $(2,986,000)$ | $(3,050,000)$ | $(6,036,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 10801 | 10033286 | 1 | 20284 | 506070 | $(2,986,000)$ | 2,986;000 | $(3,050,000)$ | 6,036,000 |
| Self Supporting | TIX | 232360 | 232352 | 232352 | 10801 | 10001751 | 1 | 20285 | 411221 | $(630,000)$ | $(630,000)$ | - | (630,000) |
| Self Supporting | TTX | 232360 | 232352 | 232352 | 10801 | 10001751 | 1 | 20285 | 506070 | $(630,000)$ | 630,000 | - | 630,000 |


one

June 27, 2018

Supervisor Maia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

## Re: Technical Adjustments Round 3 to the Mayor's Proposed Budget

Dear Chair Cohen,
Per Charter Section 9.101, I am submitting the attached round three adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed Budget for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. This set of technical adjustments is cost neutral. Changes include:

- Creating a new Hotel Tax Fund and moving associated revenue and expenditures in the Arts Commission, City Administrator's Office, and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to align with language in the proposed initiative ordinance to dedicate hotel tax to arts and culture programming. Expenditures remain on Controller's reserve contingent upon the measure's passage in November 2018;
- Reflecting updated retiree health rates in non-General Fund departments; and,
- Balancing revenue transfers and associated expenditures in the Recreation and Parks Department.

The attached tables detail these changes. Please contact me at $554-6125$ with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,


Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

|  | GES Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept | Dept ID | Fund ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Project } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Activity } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Authority | $\begin{gathered} \text { Account } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { FY } 2019-20$ | FY2019-20 Savings/(Cost) Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GFS | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 10020 | 10031044 | 1 | 15160 | 591100 | (1,599,795) | 1,599,795 | 182,400 | 1,417,395 |
|  | GFS | REC | 232199 | 232197 | 232197 | 10020 | 10013710 | 51 | 15164 | 591100 | 1,599,795 | (1,599,795) | 1,417,395 | (1,417,395) |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 412210 | (8,170,000) | ( $8,170,000$ ) | (8,440,000) | $(16,610,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 486100 | $(50,000)$ | $(50,000)$ |  | $(50,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 486190 | (75,000) | $(75,000)$ |  | $(75,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 522010 | $(1,000)$ | 1,000 | - | 1,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 524010 | $(3,800)$ | 3,800 |  | 3,800 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 527990 | $(10,500)$ | 10,500 | - | 10,500 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 535000 | $(2,400)$ | 2,400 |  | 2,400 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 535510 | $(3,500)$ | 3,500 | - | 3,500 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 535710 | $(1,000)$ | 1,000 |  | 1,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 538000 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 538010 | $(13,430,527)$ | 13,430,527 | $(1,337,281)$ | 14,767,808 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 549510 | $(4,000)$ | 4,000 | - | 4,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 549990 | $(2,000)$ | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581050 | $(496,229)$ | 496,229 | - | 496,229 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581062 | $(18,954)$ | 18,954 | - | 18,954 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581170 | $(41,723)$ | 41,723 | (1,761) | 43,484 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581270 | $(7,500)$ | 7,500 |  | 7,500 |
| It | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581330 | $(400,000)$ | 400,000 |  | 400,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581790 | $(5,298)$ | 5,298 |  | 5,298 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581820 | $(9,619)$ | 9,619 | - | 9,619 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | 581880 | $(80,000)$ | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10026661 | 1 | 10000 | 493001 | (7,090,000) | (7,090,000) | - | - |
|  | Seif Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 412210 | 8,170,000 | 8,170,000 | 8,440,000 | 16,610,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 486100 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 486190 | 75,000 | 75,000 |  | 75,000 |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 522010 | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ | - | $(1,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 524010 | 3,800 | $(3,800)$ |  | $(3,800)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 527990 | 10,500 | $(10,500)$ | - | $(10,500)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 535000 | 2,400 | $(2,400)$ |  | $(2,400)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1. | 20451 | 535510 | 3,500 | $(3,500)$ | - | $(3,500)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 535710 | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ |  | $(1,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 538000 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1. | 20451 | 538010 | 13,430,527 | $(13,430,527)$ | 1,337,281 | $(14,767,808)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 549510 | 4,000 | $(4,000)$ | - | $(4,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 549990 | 2,000 | $(2,000)$ | - | $(2,000)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 - | 20451 | 581050 | 496,229 | $(496,229)$ | - | $(496,229)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581062 | 18,954 | $(18,954)$ | - | $(18,954)$ |
|  | Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581170 | 41,723 | $(41,723)$ | 1,761 | $(43,484)$ |


| GFS Type | Dept | Dept Division | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | Project ID | Activity | Authority | Account | FY 2018-19 | FY 2018-19 Savings/(Cost) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | FY 2019-20 <br> Savings/(Cost) <br> Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581270 | 7,500 | (7,500) | - | $(7,500)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581330 | 400,000 | (400,000) | - | (400,000) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581790 | 5,298 | $(5,298)$ | - | $(5,298)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581820 | 9,619 | $(9,619)$ | - | (9,619) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 581880 | 80,000 | $(80,000)$ | - | (80,000) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | 493001 | 7,090,000 | 7,090,000 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 | 16612 | 412210 | $(3,200,000)$ | $(3,200,000)$ | $(3,700,000)$ | (6,900,000) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 | 16612 | 493001 | (4,230,000) | $(4,230,000)$ | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 | 16612 | 506070 | . - | - - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10022451 | 35 | 16612 | 538010 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 | 16612 | 486150 | (441,229) | (441,229) | - | (441,229) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 | 16612 | 506070 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 45 | 16612 | 538010 | $(2,395,669)$ | 2,395,669 | - | 2,395,669 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 | 16612 | 486150 | $(30,000)$ | $(30,000)$ | - | (30,000) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 | 16612 | 506070 | $(1,640,553)$ | 1,640,553 | $(1,057,982)$ | 2,698,535 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 | 16612 | 527990 | $(35,391)$ | 35,391 | - | 35,391 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 | 16612 | 535990 | $(3,000)$ | 3,000 | - | 3,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 46 | 16612 | 538010 | (3,671,816) | 3,671,816 | - | 3,671,816 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10016794 | 1 | 15761 | 500010 | (134,921) | 134,921 | $(6,746)$ | 141,667 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 | 16613 | 412210 | $(1,900,000)$ | $(1,900,000)$ | (2,030,000) | $(3,930,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 | 16613 | 506070 | $(656,911)$ | 656,911 | $(421,363)$ | 1,078,274 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 | 16613 | 535990 | $(162,917)$ | 162,917 | - | 162,917 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 | 16613 | 581065 | $(78,878)$ | 78,878 | $(3,554)$ | 82,432 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10031168 | 1 | 16613 | 581410 | $(70,704)$ | 70,704 | 1,663 | 69,041 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10033364 | 1 | 20331 | 412210 | $(1,300,000)$ | $(1,300,000)$ | $(1,390,000)$ | (2,690,000) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 229000 |  | 229000 | 11800 | 10033364 | 1 | 20331 | 506070 | $(1,300,000)$ | 1,300,000 | (1,390,000) | 2,690,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 412210 | 3,200,000 | 3,200,000 | 3,700,000 | 6,900,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 493001 | 2,630,000 | 2,630,000 | (2,630,000) | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 493001 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | (1,600,000) | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 506070 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 538010 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 486150 | 441,229 | 441,229 | - | 441,229 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 506070 | - | - | - | - |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 538010 | 2,395,669 | $(2,395,669)$ | - | (2,395,669) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 486150 | 30,000 | 30,000 | - ${ }^{-}$ | 30,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 506070 | 1,640,553 | $(1,640,553)$ | 1,057,982 | (2,698,535) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 527990 | 35,391 | $(35,391)$ | - | $(35,391)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 535990 | 3,000 | $(3,000)$ | - | $(3,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | 538010 | 3,671,816 | $(3,671,816)$ | - | $(3,671,816)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 500010 | 134,921 | $(134,921)$ | 6,746 | $(141,667)$ |


| GFS TYPE | Dept | Dept | Dept Section | Dept ID | Fund ID | Project ID |  | Authority | Account | FY 2018-19 Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2018-19. } \\ & \text { Savings/ (Cost) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2019-20 Savings/(Cost) Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 412210 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 2,030,000 | 3,930,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 506070 | 656,911 | (656,911) | 421,363 | (1,078,274) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 535990 | 162,917 | $(162,917)$ |  | (162,917) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 581065 | 78,878 | $(78,878)$ | 3,554 | $(82,432)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20449 | 581410 | 70,704 | $(70,704)$ | $(1,663)$ | (69,041) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20331 | 412210 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,390,000 | 2,690,000 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20331 | 506070 | 1,300,000 | (1,300,000) | 1,390,000 | (2,690,000) |
| Self Supporting | Multiple | Multiple |  |  | Multiple | Multiple |  |  | 515610 | (3,560,360) | 3,560,360 | (7,328,530) | 7,328,530 |
| Self Supporting | Multiple | Multiple |  |  | Multiple | Multiple |  |  |  | 3,560,360 | $(3,560,360)$ | 7,328,530 | (7,328,530) |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 11801 | 10033289 | 1 | 20290 | 412210 | (1,500,000) | (1,500,000) | (1,600,000) | (3,100,000) |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 11801 | 10033289 | 1 | 20290 | 506070 | $(1,500,000)$ | 1,500,000 | (1,600,000) | 3,100,000 |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 11802 | 10033289 | 1 | 20290 | 412210 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,600,000 | 3,100,000. |
| Self Supporting | MYR | 232065 |  | 232065 | 11802 | 10033289 | 1 | 20290 | 506070 | 1,500,000 | (1,500,000) | 1,600,000 | $(3,100,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11900 | 10013710 | 5 | 15164 | 495005 | 1,412,921 | 1,412,921 | 4,474 | 1,417,395 |
| Self Supporting | REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11902 | 10001737 | 1 | 10000 | 499999 | $(186,874)$ | $(186,874)$ | - |  |
| Self Supporting | REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11902 | 10001737 | 1 | 10000 | 595050 | 1,412,921 | (1,412,921) | 4,474 | (1,417,395) |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 11900 | 10001737 | 1 | 10000 | 598040 | $(186,874)$ | 186,874 | - | - |
| Self Supporting | REC | 262668 | 262676 | 262676 | 11900 | 10031044 | 1 | 15160 | 493001 | (1,599,795) | (1,599,795) | 182,400 | (1,417,395) |
| Self Supporting | REC | 207912 | 207914 | 150727 | 11902 | 10013710 | 51 | 10000 | 493001 | 1,599,795 | 1,599,795 | 1,417,395 | 1,417,395 |


| GFSType | Dept | Dept | Sept | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dept } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Fund <br> ID | $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Activity | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Authórity } \\ \hline \text { ID } \end{array}$ | Account | Class | Job Class Title | Status | Action | Ref No. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { FTE Change } \end{gathered}\right.$ | FY. 2018-19. $\$$ $\because$ Amount Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2018-19 } \\ \text { Savings/(Cost) } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2019-20 FIE Change | FY 2019-20 $\$$ Amount Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Savings/ (Cost) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267654 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 0922_C | Manager I | A |  |  |  | (55,431) | 55,431 |  | $(56,501)$ | 56,601 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salarles | 0922_C | Manager I | A |  |  | (1.00) | $(132,989)$ | 132,989 | (1.00) | (132,989) | 132,889 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 0932_C | Manager IV | A |  |  | - | (61,996) | 61,996 | - | $(63,433)$ | 63,433 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salaries | 0932_C | Manager IV | A |  |  | (1.00) | (165,259) | 165,259 | (1.00) | $(165,259)$ | 165,259 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 1823_C | Senior Administrative Analyst | A |  |  |  | $(46,216)$ | 46,216 |  | (47,000) | 47,000 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296545 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | - | 10000 | Salaries | 1823 C | Senior Administrative Analyst | A |  |  | (1.00) | (114,618) | 114,618 | (1,00) | (114,618) | 114,518 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 3549_C | Arts Program Assistant | A |  |  | - | $(36,190)$ | 36,190 |  | $(36,982)$ | 36,982 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 |  | 10000 | Salaries | 3549_C | Aits Program Assistant | A |  |  | (1.00) | (79,724) | 79,724 | (1.00) | (79,724) | 79,724 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 9774_C | Senior Community Devl Specialist I | A |  |  |  | $(43,900)$ | 43,900 |  | $(44,662)$ | 44,662 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salaries | 9774_C | Senior Community Devl Speciallis I | A |  |  | (1.00) | $(107,843)$ | 107,843 | (1.00) | $(107,843)$ | 107,843 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  | - | - | - | - | (1,226) | 1,226 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | (36) | 36 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salaries | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Mise | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | (4,619) | 4,619 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salaries | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | (138) | 138 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Benefits | 9994M Z 2 | MCCP Offset - Misc | A |  |  |  | (4,791) | 4,791 |  | (4,785) | 4,785 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11840 | 10003078 | 1 | 10000 | Salaries | 9994M_Z | MCCP Offset - Misc | A |  |  |  | (17,993) | 17,993 |  | (17,993) | 17,993 |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 0922_C | Manager I | A |  |  |  | 55,431 | (55,431) | - | 56,601 | $(56,601)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 0922_C | Manager I | A |  |  | 1.00 | 132,989 | (132,989) | 1.00 | 132,989 | $(132,989)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefts | 0932_C | Manager IV | A |  |  |  | 61,996 | (61, 996) |  | 63,433 | $(63,433)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 0932_C | Manager IV | A |  |  | 1.00 | 165,259 | $(165,259)$ | 1.00 | 165,259 | $(165,259)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 1823_C | Senior Administrative Analyst | A |  |  | - | 46,216 | $(46,216)$ |  | 47,000 | $(47,000)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 1823_C | Senior Administrative Analyst | A |  |  | 1.00 | 114,618 | (114,618) | 1.00 | 114,618 | (114,618) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 110003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 3549_C | Arts Program Assistant | A |  |  | - | 36,190 | $(36,190)$ |  | 36,982 | (36,982) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 3549_C | Arts Program Assistant | A |  |  | 1.00 | 79,724 | (79,724) | 1.00 | 79,724 | (79,724) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 |  | 20451 | Benefits | 9774_C | Senior Community Devl Specialist I | A |  |  | - | 43,900 | $(43,900)$ | - | 44,662 | $(44,662)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 9774_C | Senlor Community Devi Speciallis I | A |  |  | 1.00 | 107,843 | $(107,843)$ | 1.00 | 107,843 | $(107,843)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  | - | - | - |  | 1,226 | $(1,226)$ |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  | - |  |  |  | 36 | (36) |
| gef Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries. | 9991 M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,619 | $(4,619)$ |
| Beff Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | 138 | (138) |
| 3eff Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Benefits | 9994M_Z | MCCP Offset - Misc | A |  |  |  | 4,791 | (4,791) |  | 4,785 | (4,785) |
| Self Supporting | ADM | 296645 | 267664 | 267664 | 11802 | 10003078 | 1 | 20451 | Salaries | 9994M_ | MCCP Offset - MIsc | A |  |  |  | 17,993 | $(17,993)$ |  | 17,993 | $(17,993)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 1824_C | Principal Administrative Analyst | A | R | HOTELO1 |  | $(50,486)$ | 50,486 |  | $(51,283)$ | 51,283 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 1842_C | Managernent Assistant | A | R | HOTELO2 | -- | $(117,448)$ | 117,448 |  | (119,788) | 119,788 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 1844.C | Senior Management Assistant | A | R | HOTEL03 |  | (42,770) | 42,770 |  | $(43,535)$ | 43,535 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 3549_C | Arts Program Assistant | A | R | HOTELO4 |  | (72,381) | 72,381 |  | (73,964) | 73,964 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Mise | A | R | HOTEL01 | - | - |  |  | (274) | 274 |
| Seif Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTELO2 | - |  |  |  | (571) | 571 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL03 |  | - |  |  | (218) | 218 |
| Seif Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Benefits | 9991M_ | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL04 | - | - | - |  | (335) | 335 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16512 | Salaries | 1824_C | Principal Administrative Analyst | A | R | HOTELOS | (1.00) | (132,668) | 132,668 | (1.00) | (132,668) | 132,668 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 1842_C | Management Assistant | A | R | HOTELO2 | (3.00) | (271,549) | 271,549 | (3.00) | (271,549) | 271,549 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 1844_C | Senlor Management Assistant | A | R | HOTEL03 | (1.00) | (103,719) | 103,719 | (1.00) | (103,719) | 103,719 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 3549_C | Arts Program Assistant | A | R | HOTELO4 | (2.00) | $(159,448)$ | 159,448 | (2.00) | (159,448) | 159,448 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 9991MZ | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTELO1 | - - | - |  |  | $(1,021)$ | 1,021 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16512 | Salaries | 9991 M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTELO2 | - | - | - |  | $(2,089)$ | 2,089 |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL03 | - | - |  |  | (798) | 798 |
| Self Supparting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11800 | 10031167 | 44 | 16612 | Salaries | 9991M_ Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL04 | - | - | - | - | $(1,227)$ | 1,227 |
| Self Supporting. | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 1824_C | Principai Administrative Analyst | A | R | HOTELOL | - | 50,486 | (50,486) |  | 51,283 | (51,283) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 1842 C | Management Assistant | A | R | HOTELO2 | - | 117,448 | (117,448) | - | 119,788 | (119,788) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 1844_C | Senior Management Assistant | A | R | HOTEL03 | - | 42,770 | $(42,770)$ | - | 43,535 | $(43,535)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 3549C | Arts Program Assistant | A | R | HOTELO4 |  | 72,381 | $(72,381)$ |  | 73,964 | $(73,964)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benėfits | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL01 | - |  | - | - | 274 | (274) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 9991M_ | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTELO2 |  |  | - | - | 571 | (571) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTELO3 | - | - | - | - | 218 | (218) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Benefits | 9991 M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL04 | - | - | - | - | 335 | (335) |
| Seif Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 1824 C | Principal Administrative Analyst | A | R | HOTELO1 | 1.00 | 132,668 | (132,668) | 1.00 | 132,668 | (132,668) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 1842_C | Management Assistant | A | R | HOTEL02 | 3.00 | 271,549 | (271,549) | 3.00 | 271,549 | (271,549) |


| GFS Type | Dept | Division | Dept Saction | Dept TD. | Fund 1 xb | Project ID | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Activity } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Authority } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Account } \\ \text { Lve } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Class | Jab Class Title | Status | Action | Refinio. | FY. 2018-19 FTE Change | FY 2018-19.5 Amount Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2018-19, } \\ & \text { Savings /(Cost) } \end{aligned}$ | FY 2019-20 FTE:Change | FY 2019-20 Amount Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ & \text { Savings / (Cost }) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 1844_C | Senior Management Assistant' | A | R | HOTELO3 | 1.00 | 103,719 | (103,719) | 1.00 | 103,719 | (103,719) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 3549_C | Aits Program Assistant | A | R | HOTEL04 | 2.00 | 159,448 | (159,448) | 2.00 | 159,448 | (159,448) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187544 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTE 01 |  | - | - | - | 1,021 | (1,021) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187544 |  | 187544 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 9991 M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL02 | - | - | - | - | 2,089 | $(2,089)$ |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 9991M Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL03 | - | - | - |  | 798 | (798) |
| Self Supporting | ART | 187644 |  | 187644 | 11802 | 10031167 | 44 | 20450 | Salaries | 9991M_Z | One Day Adjustment - Misc | A | R | HOTEL 04 |  | - |  |  | 1,227 | $(1,227)$ |

June 28, 2018
Supervisor Maia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

## Re: Technical Adjustments Round 4 to the Mayor's Proposed Budget

Dear Chair Cohen,
Per Charter Section 9.101, I am submitting the attached round four adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed Budget for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. These technical adjustments increase the size of the City's budget due to:

- Revenue changes driven by increased FY 2017-18 transfer tax receipts, partially offset by contributions to baselines and reduced sales tax in the budget years, allocating \$3,592,970 of this onetime increase; and,
- Additional year-end savings identified by the Budget and Legislative Analyst totaling $\$ 2,562,316$, inclusive of the Police project closeout identified on June $27^{\text {th }}$ in committee.

In addition, the balance of the Mayor's Technical Adjustment Reserve, $\$ 4,756,972$ million, is available for appropriation. Therefore, over the next two years, there is an additional $\$ 10,912,258$ in General Fund for the Board of Supervisors to appropriate over the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 budget. Please contact me at 554-6125 with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,


Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee -Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Ben Rosenfield, Controller


# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO <br> BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST <br> 1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-9292 <br> FAX (415) 252-0461 

May 22, 2018

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { TO: } & \text { Budget and Finance Committee } \\
\text { FROM: } & \text { Budget and Legislative Analyst } \\
\text { SUBJECT: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst for Amendment of the } \\
\text { Mayor's Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Budget. }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$
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## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,112,872,807$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 125,086,930$ or . $12.7 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 987,785,877$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 1598.70 FTEs, which are 12.75 FTEs more than the 1,585.95 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.8 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 1,112,872,807$ in FY $2018-19$ are $\$ 125,086,930$ or $12.7 \%$ more than the FY 2017-18 estimated revenues of $\$ 987,785,877$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,223,801,702$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 110,928,895$ or $10 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 1,112,872,807$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 1598.56 FTEs, which are 0.14 FTEs less than the 1598.70 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.01 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 1,223,801,7,02$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 110,928,895$ or $10 \%$ more than the FY 2018-19 estimated revenue of $\$ 1,112,872,807$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
AIR-AIRPORT

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport | $868,059,481$ | $956,887,475$ | $925,831,985$ | $964,158,240$ | $987,785,877 \cdot 1,112,872,807$ |  |
| FTE Count | $1,459.9$ | $1,472.66$ | $1,492.61$ | $1,540.77$ | $1,585.95$ | $1,598.7$ |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 244,813,326$ or $28.2 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 138.80 or $9.5 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 125,086,930$ largely due to:
The Airport has sustained successive years of passenger traffic growth. From FY 2013-14 through FY 2017-18 (projection), the number of enplaned passengers at the Airport has grown by 19.3 percent, from 22.3 million to 28.5 million. The Airport is attempting to meet the increased passenger traffic demands on the Airport's facilities by investing $\$ 21.4$ million in FY 2018-19. The Airport is also significantly investing in safety and security, including 130 Academy cadets, by spending $\$ 22.6$ million in FY 2018-19. The Airport is also addressing curbside congestion ( $\$ 0.6$ million in FY 2018-19), enhancing sustainability efforts ( $\$ 1.9$ million in FY 2018-19) and supporting the capital program ( $\$ 24.8$ million).

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 110,928,895$ largely due to:
The Airport will spend $\$ 47$ million in FY 2019-20 on capital projects, which will be used to support operating services associated with new facilities projects in FY 2018-19. The Airport will be continuing efforts to meet the increased passenger traffic demands on the Airport's facilities, and will start implementing the fingerprinting and aviation worker biometric checks required to meet TSA mandates. The Airport will also continue supporting safety and security by investing $\$ 15.4$ million in FY 2019-20 for 108 new public Safety positions and upgrading the Law Enforcement Automated Data System. Finally, the Airport will expand its sustainability efforts by $\$ 1.7$ million in order to help achieve its Zero Waste target.

## Airport Police Bureau

The Airport increased its work order with the San Francisco Police Department by $\$ 9.2$ million in FY 2018-19 and $\$ 9.7$ million in FY 2019-20 to fund additional slots in the San Francisco Police Department's police academies in order to increase police staffing at the Airport. According to Airport staff, the increased police staffing support increase visibility of police patrols at the

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 
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Airport, aid in traffic management, and provide special services including dignitary protection, cargo theft investigation, narcotics interdiction, and explosives detection. Under the Airport's proposal, the increase in police officers would be deployed across the patrol, traffic management, and special services units based on need, with the majority of new officers supporting patrol.

Under the Airport's proposal, the number of sworn police positions at the Airport would increase by 39 percent, from 184 to 255.69 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions ${ }^{1}$, with the largest increase among police officers, as shown below.

|  | Existing <br> FTEs | Proposed <br> FTEs | Increase in <br> FTEs | Percent <br> Increase |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deputy Chief | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | $0 \%$ |
| Commander | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | $0 \%$ |
| Captains | 3.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | $0 \%$ |
| Lieutenants | 10.00 | 11.54 | 1.54 | $15 \%$ |
| Sergeants | 27.00 | 37.77 | 10.77 | $40 \%$ |
| Police Officers | 142.00 | 201.38 | 59.38 | $42 \%$ |
| Total | 184.00 | 255.69 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 6 9}$ | $39 \%$ |

The ratio of police officers to lieutenants would decrease from $14: 1$ to $18: 1$, and the ratio of police officers to sergeants would increase slightly, but still be approximately 5:1.

According to the Airport, the increase in police staffing is necessary to accommodate the growth in terminal space ${ }^{2}$ and passengers, improve patrol functions (higher visibility, decreased response time), improve traffic management (particularly in regards to transportation network companies), increase the canine unit, add staffing for dignitary protection, and implement taser and body camera management.

In FY 2017-18, the Airport budget included $\$ 2,494,724$ to fund 20 slots in a police academy class of approximately 50 recruits.

In FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, the Airport's proposed budget includes $\$ 11,722,383$ and $\$ 12,218,666$ respectively to fund 120 slots in three police academies and 10 lateral police officer hires, for 130 new police hires.

In FY 2018-19, the Airport plans to fund:
(a) 20 of 50 slots in a police academy scheduled to begin in June 2018;

[^0]
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(b) 50 slots in each of two academies estimated to begin in August 2018 and January 2019 (totaling 100 slots); and
(c) 10 lateral police hires in a lateral academy class estimated to begin in March 2019.

In FY 2019-20, the Airport plans to fund a similar number of slots in police academy classes for new recruits and lateral police hires but the dates of the academy classes are not yet known.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 
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## RECOMMENDATIONS

YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 3,416,184$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 3,416,184$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 2,407,158$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 1,009,026$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 121,670,746$ or $12.3 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

Permanent police positions at the Airport are included in the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) budget, funded by Airport funds; these position's will be subject to Board of Supervisors approval during the June 2018 review of the SFPD budget. Therefore, approval of the increase in the Airport's work order with the San Francisco Police Department to fund additional slots in the police academies in order to increase police staffing at the Airport is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.

## YEAR TwO: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 2,672,299$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 2,672,299$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 2,438,089$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 234,210$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 108,256,596$ or $9.7 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the $B, ~ t$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | $1 T$ |
|  | Chief Operating Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Professional Services |  |  | \$100,000 | \$75,000 | \$25,000 |  |  |  |  | \$100,000 | - \$75,000 | \$25,000 |  |  |
|  | The Department underspent in Non-Professionalized Services by approximately $\$ 141,406$ by the end of FY 2017-18. The recommended budget of $\$ 75,000$ for Other Professional Services will provide sufficient flexibility for increased costs for FY 2018-19. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Custodial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings |  |  | (\$1,076,083) | (\$1,276,083) | \$200,000 |  | X |  |  | (\$1,418,776) | (\$1,418,776) | \$0 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits. |  |  | (\$541,399) | $(\$ 642,023)$ | \$100,624 |  | x |  |  | (736,969) | \$ $(736,969)$ | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\$ 300,624$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | Increase Attrition Savings in FY 2018-19 due to delays in hiring custodians. There are currently 34 vacant custodian positions, and the Facilities Manager plans on hiring a few at a time. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Custodial Assistant Supervisor | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$69,869 | \$0 | \$69,869 |  |  | 2.00 | 0.0 | \$69,869 | \$0 | \$69,869 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$33,731 | \$0 | \$33,731 |  |  |  |  | \$34,771 | \$0 | \$34,771 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\$ 103,600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$104,640 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Delete 1.00 FTE Custodial Assistant Supervisor position that is vacant. The Airport no longer needs this position. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings |  |  | (\$431,203) | (\$631,203) | \$200,000 |  | X |  |  | (\$179,229) | (\$179,229) | \$0 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$160,167) | $(\$ 235,167)$ | \$65,447 |  | X |  |  | $(68,370)$ | \$ $\quad(68,370)$ | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 265,447$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 0$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition Savings in FY 2018-19 due to delays in hiring one Deputy Director V. The position has been vacant since 2016 and the Airport is still in the planning stages. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GF = General Fund <br> $1 \mathrm{~T}=$ One Time . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Budget and Finance Committee, May 24, 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Recommendations of the BL i and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

$\infty_{G F}=$ General Fund $1 \mathrm{~T}=$ One Time
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For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
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## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
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Recommendations of the $\mathrm{BL} \quad$ and Legislative Analyst
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Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
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Recommendations of the Bu . and Legislative Analyst
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## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget



Recommendations of the Bu . . and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
AIR-Airport


FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$1,009,026 | \$2,407,158 | \$3,416,184 |
| Total | \$1,009,026 | \$2,407,158 | \$3,416,184 |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | On'e-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | Non-General Fund | $\$ 234,210$ | $\$ 2,438,089$ |
| Total | $\$ 2,672,299$ |  |  |
|  | $\$ 234,210$ | $\$ 2,438,089$ | $\$ 2,672,299$ |

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 77,782,063$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 1,248,364$ or $1.6 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 76,533,699$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 301.00 FTEs, which are 25.20 FTEs more than the 275.80 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $9.1 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 77,782,063$ in FY $2018-19$, are $\$ 1,248,364$ or $1.6 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 76,533,699$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 76,547,087$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 1,234,976$ or $1.6 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \$77,782,063.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 301.00 FTEs, which is the same as the 301.00 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents no change in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 76,547,087$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 1,234,976$ or $1.6 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \$77,782,063.

## SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |       <br> Department of Building      <br> Inspection      | $78,833,726$ | $92,447,756$ | $72,065,853$ | $70,236,047$ | $76,533,699$ | $77,782,063$ |
| FIE Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The Department's budget decreased by $\$ 1,051,663$ or $1.3 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 16.50 or $5.8 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \$1,248,364 largely due to an increase in funding for outreach for the Accessible Business Entrance (ABE) program and Tall Building Peer Review, as well as an increase in a work order with the City Attorney's Office.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 1,234,976$ largely due to the termination of a work order with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development's Code Enforcement Loan Program to address violations.

# Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 
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## RECOMMENDATIONS

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 803,327$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 803,327$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 494,734$ is ongoing savings and $\$ 308,593$ is one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 445,037$ or $0.6 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## YEAR TwO: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 498,013$ in FY 2019-20. All of the $\$ 498,013$ in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

Recommendations of the $\mathrm{t} \quad \mathrm{t}$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
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Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
DBI - Department of Building Inspection


## Recommendations of the Bu and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

DBI - Department of Building Inspection

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | $1 T$ |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
| 6321 Permit Technician ! | 1.00 | 0.77 | \$63,094 | \$48,582 | \$14,512 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$31,873 | \$24,542 | \$7,331 |  | x |  |  |  | 10 \$0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\$ 21,843$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce 1.0 FTE 6321 Permit Technician I by 0.23 FTE to reflect anticipated delays in hiring. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One time savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | \$35,000 | 50 | \$35,000 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$35,000 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 70,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce the number of replacement vehicles by two. Since 2004, one replacement vehicle has been driven 19,879 miles (approximately 6 miles per work day). Since 2005, one replacement vehicle has been driven 25,526 (approximately 9 miles per work day). DBI will still be able to replace eight Honda Civic CNG with over 50,000 miles. The Department has not shown sufficient justification for replacement vehicles and the City is trying to "right size" its fleet of vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | One-Time |  | Ongoing |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Non-General Fund | $\$ 308,593$ | $\$ 494,734$ |
| Total | $\$ 308,593$ | $\$ 494,734$ | $\$ 803,327$ |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | One-Time |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Non-General Fund | Ongoing | Total |
|  | Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 498,013$ |
|  |  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 498,013$ |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 21,965,767$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 1,115,671$ or $4.8 \%$ less than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \$23,081,438.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 66.00 FTEs, which are 0.90 FTEs less than the 66.90 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $1.3 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 21,965,767$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 1,115,671$ or $4.8 \%$ less than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 23,081,438$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 22,045,518$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 79,751$ or $0.4 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 21,965,767$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 66.00 FTEs, which is the same as the 66.00 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents no change in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 22,045,518$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 79,751$ or $0.4 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 21,965,767$.

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
ENV - DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department of the $17,366,898$ $15,979,636$ $17,368,744$ $18,598,247$ $23,081,438$ | $21,965,767$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 4,598,869$ or $26.5 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 6.91 or 11.7\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has decreased by $\$ 1,115,671$ largely due to fluctuations in federal and state grant awards. According to the Department, this is a regular occurrence and there are no material differences in the grant cycle from federal or state agencies.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \$79,751 largely due to a Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase to the Solid Waste Impound funding.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 194,754$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 194,754$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 94,300$ is ongoing savings and $\$ 100,454$ is one-time savings.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 94,300$ in FY 2019-20. All of the $\$ 94,300$ in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

## Recommendations of the Bu and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## ENV - Department of the Environment



FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reduction

|  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 100,454$ | $\$ 94,300$ | $\$ 194,754$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 100,454$ | $\$ 94,300$ | $\$ 194,754$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2019-20

## Total Recommended Reductions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |  |
| General Fund | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
|  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 94,300$ | $\$ 94,300$ |  |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 94,300$ | $\$ 94,300$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Year One: Fy 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 174,354,417$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 41,152,390$ or $30.9 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 133,202,027$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 246.51 FTEs, which are 0.87 FTEs more than the 245.64 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.4 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 174,354,417$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 41,152,390$ or $30.9 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 133,202,027$.

## YEAR TwO: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 147,698,264$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 26,656,153$ or $15.3 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 174,354,417$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 246.95 FTEs, which are 0.44 FTEs more than the 246.51 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 147,698,264$ in FY $2019-20$, are $\$ 26,656,153$ or $15.3 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 174,354,417$.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget ITEMS
FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
PRT - PORT

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Port. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FTE Count | $91,674,259$ | $109,885,192$ | $109,731,648$ | $141,159,032$ | $133,202,027$ | $174,354,417$ |
|  | 236.79 | 241.34 | 241.29 | 244.19 | 245.64 | 246.51 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 82,680,158$ or $90.2 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 9.72 or 4.1\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 41,152,390$ largely due to increases of $\$ 15,016,678$ in Buildings, Structures, and Improvement Projects, $\$ 13,688,448$ in Programmatic Projects, $\$ 5,256,847$ in work orders to other departments, and $\$ 5,063,020$ in anticipated reserve balance to fund future capital projects. The largest project budget increases are $\$ 11,000,000$ for the Mission Bay Ferry Terminal, $\$ 8,000,000$ for waterfront developments and $\$ 5,000,000$ for the Seawall Resiliency Project.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 26,656,153$ largely due to a decrease of $\$ 30,305,184$ in Buildings, Structures, and Improvement Projects. This decrease in FY 2019-20 is largely due to the anticipated completion of projects budgeted in FY 2018-19.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
PRT-PORT

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 581,336$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 581,336$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 270,228$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 311,108$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 40,571,055$ or $30.5 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 576,483$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 576,483$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 392,853$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 183,360$ are one-time savings.

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF $\quad 1 \mathrm{1T}$ |  |
|  | From | To | From | To |  | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equipment Purchase-Budget |  |  | \$99,496 | \$65,408 | \$34,088 |  | x |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Eliminate 1 replacement Ford Transit. The vehicle proposed for replacement, Ford E350 Van, has been driven only 16,843 miles since 1997, an average of 842 miles per year. The Port does not need this replacement vehicle, and the City is trying to "right size" its fleet of vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equipment Purchase-Budget |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$57,504 | \$37,000 | \$20,504 |  | X |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  | Substitute 2 replacement Toyota Priuses with 1 Chevy Bolt. The vehicles proposed for replacement, 2001 and 2002 Toyota Priuses, have only been driven 35,320 and 28,185 miles, respectively; these vehicles average only 2,208 and 1,762 miles per year. The Chevy Bolt will help the Port reach its electrical vehicle goal by 2022. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equipment Púrchase-Budget |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$315,434 | \$217,558 | \$97,876 |  | x |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eliminate 2 replacement Ford F250s. The vehicles proposed for replacement, 2001 Ford F250s, have only been driven 48,104 and 47,618 miles, respectively; these vehicles average only 2,832 and 2,801 miles per year. The Port does not need these replacement vehicles and the City is trying to "right size" its fleet of vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equipment Purchase-Budget |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$181,613 | \$116,363 | \$65,250 |  | X |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eliminate Cisco server equipment. The Port listed this as a "Iow priority" equipment request. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dp-Wp Equipment Maint |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$289,000 | \$279,000 | \$10,000 |  |  |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reduce the Equipment Maintenance budget to reflect savings associated with purchasing new equipment. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition |  |  | (\$33,870) | (37,655) | \$3,785 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$12,832) | (13,615) | \$783 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 4,568$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
PRT - Port


## GF = General Fund

iT = One Time
Budget and Finance Committee, May 24, 2018

Recommendations of the Bu and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | $1 T$ | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |
| 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | \$132,668 | $(\$ 132,668)$ |  |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | 132,668 | (\$132,668) |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | \$50,737 | (\$50,737) |  |  |  |  | \$0 | 51,782 | (\$51,782) |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 15,288$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 15,596$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . | Deny substitution of 1.00 FTE 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst to 1825 Principal Administrative Analyst II. This position oversees two clerk positions and is appropriate at the 1824 level. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment \& PromotionBdgt |  |  | \$95,400 | \$70,400 | \$25,000 |  |  |  |  | \$97,400 | \$72,400 | \$25,000 |  |  |
|  | Reduce the Maritime Promotional budget by $\$ 25,000$ to reflect the Port's needs, |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Current Expenses Bdgt |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$76,775 | \$63,775 | \$13,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reduce Other Current Expenses by $\$ 13,000$ to account for a 3 -year cyclical expense incorrectly applied to FY 2019-20. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capital Investment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition |  |  | (\$1,265,298) | $(\$ 1,303,504)$ | \$38,206 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$504,935) | (\$520,424) | \$15,489 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$ $\$ 53,695$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Adjust attrition savings to account for delay in hiring Senior Administrative Analyst position |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 24,406)$ | \$24,406 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | (\$11,493) | \$11,493 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 35,898$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Adjust attrition savings to account for delay in hiring Asphalt Worker |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overtime 0.00 0.00 $\$ 500,385$ $\$ 470,385$ $\$ 30,000$ |  | 0.00 | \$500,385 | \$470,385 | \$30,000 |  |  |  |  | \$500,385 | \$470,385 | \$30,000 |  |  |
| 1 T O One Time ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( Budget and Finance Committee, May 24, 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

PRT - Port

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce the Overtime budget by $\$ 30,000$. The Port increased Overtime in Capital investment from $\$ 270,385$ in FY 2017-18 to $\$ 500,385$ in FY 2018-19 to account for additional cleaning and maintenance of the waterfront. An increase to $\$ 470,385$ is sufficient to improve cleanliness and maintenance. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Current Expenses Bdgt |  |  | \$118,000 | \$113,000 | \$5,000 |  |  |  |  | \$75,782 | \$71,782 | \$4,000 |  |  |
|  | Reduce Other Current Expenses by $\$ 5,000$ to correct for inflation on expenses that was budgeted too aggressively. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Materials \& Supplies |  |  | \$90,000 | \$40,000 | \$50,000 |  |  |  |  | \$90,000 | \$40,000 | \$50,000 |  |  |
|  | The department-wide budget for materials \& supplies increased from $\$ 1,581,784$ in FY 2017-18 to $\$ 1,633,150$ in FY 2018-19. Actual department wide expenditures were $\$ 1333,432$ in FY 2015-16 and $\$ 1,419,321$ in FY 2016-17. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programmatic ProjectsBudget | Enterprise Technology Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$1,740,000 | \$1,640,000 | \$100,000 |  | X |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Reduce the Enterprise Technology Programmatic Projects budget by $\$ 100,000$ to reflect the Port's needs. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Waterfront Development Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programmatic ProjectsBudget |  |  | \$8,000,000 | \$7,900,000 | \$100,000 |  |  |  | . | \$10,100,000 | \$9,900,000 | \$200,000 |  |  |
|  | Reduce the Waterfront Development Programmatic Projects budget by $\$ 100,000$ to reflect the Port's needs. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FY 2018-19 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
|  One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 311,108$ | $\$ 270,228$ | $\$ 581,336$ |
| Total | $\$ 311,108$ | $\$ 270,228$ | $\$ 581,336$ |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 183,630$ | $\$ 392,853$ | $\$ 576,483$ |
| Total | $\$ 183,630$ | $\$ 392,853$ | $\$ 576,483$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 159,376,732$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 21,525,907$ or $15.6 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 137,850,825$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 697.14 FTEs, which are 0.46 FTEs less than the 697.60 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.1 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 159,376,732$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 21,525,907$ or $15.6 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 137,850,825$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 150,509,345$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 8,867,387$ or $5.6 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \$159,509,345.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 694.57 FTEs, which are 2.57 FTEs less than the 697.14 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.4 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 150,509,345$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 8,867,387$ or $5.6 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 159,256,732$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 <br> LIB - Public Library 

DEPARTMENT:

## Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Budget | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 |  |
|  |  |  | Budget | Budget | Budget | Proposed |
| Budget | $\$ 100,531,375$ | $\$ 109,483,373$ | $\$ 117,128,318$ | $\$ 126,008,847$ | $\$ 137,850,825$ | $\$ 159,376,732$ |
| FTE Count | 652.22 | 660.70 | 662.28 | 682.99 | 697.60 | 697.14 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 58,845,357$ or $58.5 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 44.92 or 6.9\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

FTE increases from FY 2015-16 to FY 2017-18 were driven by the expansion of service hours, the corresponding addition of custodial, security and engineering staff and the addition of youth librarians system wide. The primary driver of the budget increase from FY 2017-18 to FY 201819 is the capital funding for the Mission branch library, which fully funds the project.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's FY 2018-19 budget is proposed to increase by $\$ \$ 21,525,907$ largely due to large capital projects to be launched in FY 2018-19, notably the renovation of the Mission branch, additional roofing renewals and other projects.

The Library is proposing an expenditure of $\$ 2,992,772$ to deploy a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system in FY 2018-19. The RFID system will equip library books and audio/visual materials with radio communication tags in order to improve the Library's collection management and check out procedures. The budget for the RFID project includes funding for hardware, software licensing, and temporary salaries to backfill permanent staff redirected for the RFID implementation.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's FY 2019-20 budget is proposed to decrease by $\$ 8,867,387$ largely due to a decrease in capital project allocations.

The Library is proposing an expenditure of $\$ 384,984$ for the deployment of the Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system in FY 2019-20 (discussed above).

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
LIB - PUBLIC LIBRARY

## Recommendations

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 352,600$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 352,600$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 341,350$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 11,250$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 21,173,307$ or $15.4 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 641,350$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 641,350$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 341,350$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 300,000$ are one-time savings. These reductions would further reduce the Department's planned decrease of its FY 2019-20 budget, to a total decrease of \$9,508,737 or 6.0\% in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


# Recommendations of the BL and Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | To | From | To |  | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
| Bidgs.Struct\&imprv Pro-Budget | Capital Improvement Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$9,006,358 | \$8,706,358 | \$300,000 |  | X |
|  | Savings in FY 2019-20 only. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reduce Capital Improvement Project Non-BLIP Branch Remodel Costs. Department has revised spending plan downward. The Library will continue to work with Public Works to further develop the scope \& design work for the next phase of branch projects to refine the funding needs in FY 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | FY 2018-19 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2019-20 } \\ \text { Total Recommended Reductions } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  | General Fund Non-General Fund Total |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Non-Ge | Fund | \$11,250 | \$341,350 | \$352,600 |  |  |  |  | \$300,000 | \$341,350 | \$641,350 |  |  |
|  |  | Total | \$11,250 | \$341,350 | \$352,600 |  |  |  |  | \$300,000 | \$341,350 | \$641,350 |  |  |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,300,058,462$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 247,217,074$ or $23 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 1,052,841,388$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 1,684.39 FTEs, which are 36.26 FTEs more than the $1,648.13$ FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 1,300,058,462$ in FY 2018 - 19 , are $\$ 247,217,074$ or $23 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 1,052,841,388$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,402,330,591$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 102,272,129$ or $8 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 1,300,058,462$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 1,687.71 FTEs, which are 3.32 FTEs more than the 1,684.39 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 1,402,330,591$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 102,272,129$ or $8 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \$1,300,058,462.

```
Recommendations of the Budget & Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items
    FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT: PUC-PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
```

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED Budget Year Expenditures and FTE AuThority:

|  | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Proposed |
| SFPUC | $\$ 873,552,638$ | $\$ 939,577,779$ | $\$ 973,661,875$ | $\$ 993,383,879$ | $\$ 1,052,841,388$ | $\$ 1,300,058,462$ |
| FTE | $1,621.27$ | $1,618.25$ | $1,633.53$ | $1,636.96$ | $1,648.13$ | $1,684.39$ |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 426,505,824$ or $49 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 63.12 or 4\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased largely due to the proposed expansion of CleanPowerSF, San Francisco's Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) program. CleanPowerSF launched in 2016 and currently serves approximately 80,000 customer accounts. The next auto-enrollment phase in July 2018 is expected to add approximately 150,000 customers, and final citywide enrollment is expected to add approximately 125,000 customers by July 2019, for a total of approximately 350,000 customer accounts with average electricity demand of approximately 400 megawatts (MW).

CleanPowerSF program revenues and costs are estimated to increase from $\$ 38.0$ million in FY 2017-18 to \$128.3 million in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased largely due to the proposed final expansion of CleanPowerSF. CleanPowerSF program revenues and costs are estimated to increase from $\$ 128.3$ million in FY 2018-19 to $\$ 244.3$ million in FY 2019-20.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& LegisLative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> DEPARTMENT: PUC-PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 6,115,079$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 6,115,079$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 3,642,130$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 2,472,949$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 241,101,995$ or $23 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 4,460,467$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 4,460,477$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 4,394,249$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 66,218$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 97,311,662$ or $8 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

## Recommendations of the Bu and Legislative Analys

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | $1 T$ | From | то | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilities Maintenance |  |  | \$5,277,000 | \$4,627,000 | \$650,000 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SFPUC increased the budget for 525 Golden Gate operations and maintenance from $\$ 3,719,000$ in FY 2017-18 to $\$ 5,277,000$ in FY 2018-19 to fund one-time expenditures. Actual expenditures in FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 for ongoing operations and maintenance were $\$ 2.7$ million and $\$ 2.4$ million respectively. The proposed reduction of $\$ 650,000$ adjusts for annual expenditures that are less than the budget will allow for the one-time budget increase for special maintenance activities. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | 50 | (\$10,266) | \$10,266 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$10,266) | \$10,266 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 2,672)$ | \$2,672 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$2,672) | \$2,672 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$12,938 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$12,938 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce Step Adjustments to FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CDD Shops |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | \$133,492 | \$75,600 | \$57,892 |  | X |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
| 7345 Electrician <br> Mandatory Fringe Benefits <br> 9993 Attrition <br> Mandatory Fringe Benefits | Eliminate 2 new Chevy Colorado pickups. The Water Enterprise has 264 pick up trucks of various sizes, including 144 in CDD. The increase in CDD staff to do field work is minimal and could share existing vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.00 | 2.00 | \$ 328,189 | \$218,793 | \$109,396 |  |  | 3.00 | 2.00 | \$328,189 | \$218,793 | \$109,396 |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$142,760 | \$95,173 | \$47,587 |  |  |  |  | \$146,430 | \$97,620 | \$48,810 |  |  |
|  |  |  | (\$361,089) | (\$251,693) | (\$109,396) |  |  |  |  | ( 5373,113 ) | (\$263,717) | ( $\$ 109,396$ ) |  |  |
|  |  |  | (\$156,832) | [ $\$ 109,245$ ) | (\$47,587) |  |  |  |  | (\$166,470) | ( $\$ 117,660)$ | ( $\$ 48,810)$ |  |  |
|  | Total Savings . \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eliminate 1.00 FTE 7345 Electrician Position vacant since 07/01/2014. Department is not planning to fill the position. The Water Enterprise has 7 Electrician positions in the budget. Position reduction offset by a reduction in attrition savings to allow the department sufficient funds for salaries. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$46,046) | \$46,046 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$46,046) | \$46,046 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | (\$12,574)\| | \$12,574 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$12,574) | \$12,574 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 58,620$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\$ 58,620$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce Step Adjustments to FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## WTR - Water Enterprise



## Recommendations of the Bh and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## WTR - Water Enterprise

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | CDD Const \& Maint |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | \$3,007,030 | \$2,971,647 | \$35,383 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eliminate new Toyota Prius. The Water Enterprise budget has 5 new passenger vehicles. According to the explanation provided to the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office, three vehicles are needed to transport staff to sites within the city and to accommodate new staff. The other two vehicles are needed for the ClP (one in each fiscal year). The Water Enterprise has 47 vehicles for staff which should be shared in accordance with City policy to reduce vehicle use. |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7514 General Laborer | 21.00 | 20.00 | \$1,507,178 | \$1,435,408 | \$71,770 |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | \$1,507,178 | \$1,435,408 | \$71,770 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$715,714 | \$681,632 | \$34,082 |  |  |  |  | \$737,216 | \$702,110 | \$35,106 |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition |  |  | (\$2,484,703) | ( $\$ 2,412,933$ ) | (\$71,770) |  |  | 21.00 | 20.00 | (\$2,567,444) | (\$2,495,674) | (\$71,770) |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$1,079,071) | (\$1,044,989) | (\$34,082) |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 1,145,279)$ | (\$1,110,173) | ( $\$ 35,106$ ) |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eliminate 1.00 FTE 7514 General Laborer Positions vacant since 01/16/2016. Department does not plan to fill position. The Water Enterprise has 50 General Laborer positions, of which 2 were new in FY 2017-18 and never hired. Position reduction offset by a reduction in attrition savings to allow the department sufficient funds for salaries. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WOD Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles |  |  | \$26,661 | \$0. | \$26,661 |  | x |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Eliminate 1 replacement Ford Escape. The Water Enterprise states that this vehicle is to comply with HACTO, but the replacement is not energy/carbon efficient. City policy is to reduce overall vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automotive \& Other Vehicles | WQD Envnmtl Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |  |  |  | \$37,605 | \$0 | \$37,605 |  | $x$ |
|  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eliminate 1 replacement Ford Transit. The Water Enterprise states that this is to comply with HACTO but are replacing existing vehicles with new gaspowered vehicles. This vehicle is to replace a 2007 Toyota Prius which still has useful life. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
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Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## WWE - Wastewater Enterprise

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | Maintenance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ford F350 Super Cab Long Bed |  |  | \$373,021 | \$305,574 | \$67,447 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Deny request for new truck for Green Infrastructure maintenance crew that has not yet been hired. Wastewater Enterprise has 24 F350s. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5207 Associate Engineer (A) | 8.00 | 7.00 | \$1,051,704 | \$920,241 | \$131,463 |  |  | 8.00 | 7.00 | \$1,051,704 | \$920,241 | \$131,463 |  |  |
| 5207 Associate Engineer (0) | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$403,565 | \$353,119 | \$50,446 |  |  |  |  | \$411,672 | \$360,213 | \$51,459 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$181,909 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 182,922$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Move 1.00 FTE 5207 Associate Engineer position that has been vacant since May 2016 off budget to support capital program. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$162,059) | \$162,059 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$162,059) | \$162,059 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | (\$44,323) | \$44,323 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$44,323) | \$44,323 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 206,382$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 206,382$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Source Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (3.16) | (4.08) | (\$346,286) | (\$446,653) | \$100,367 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$145,352) | (\$187,480) | \$42,128 |  | x | [1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$142,495 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase attrition savings to account for delays in hiring. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 63,292)$ | \$63,292 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( $\$ 63,292)$ | \$63,292 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 17,249)$ | \$17,249 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$17,249) | \$17,249 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 80,541$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 80,541$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sewer Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$5,678) | \$5,678 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$5,678) | \$5,678 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 1,546)$ \| | \$1,546 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$1,546) | \$1,546 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 7,224$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 7,224$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the B. $c$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
WWE - Wastewater Enterprise


FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund $\$ 0$ <br> Non-General Fund $\$ 0$ <br> Total $\$ 867,122$ <br>  $\$ 867,122$ | $\$ 681,948$ | $\$ 1,549,070$ |  |
|  |  | $\$ 681,948$ | $\$ 1,549,070$ |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$682,961 | \$682,961 |
| Total | \$0 | \$682,961 | \$682,961 |

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## HHWP - Hetch Hetchy Water \& Power

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | To | From | To |  | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Energy Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (3.11) | (4.22) | (\$393,571) | (\$533,863) | \$140,292 |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | ( $\$ 155,044$ ) | (\$210,311) | \$55,267 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$195,559 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase attrition savings to account for delays in hiring. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional \& Specialized Services |  |  | \$4,682,082 | \$4,582,082 | \$100,000 |  |  |  |  | \$2,932,082 | \$2,832,082 | \$100,000 |  |  |
|  | Reduce the proposed, to-be-determined contract amount for business plan development from $\$ 700,000$ to $\$ 600,000$ in each year. Professional services budget increased from $\$ 1.1$ million in FY 2017-18 to $\$ 4.7$ million in FY 2018-19. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$29,470) | \$29,470 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$29,470) | \$29,470 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 7,826)$ | \$7,826 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$7,826) | \$7,826 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 37,296$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 37,296$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to the budget equal to the FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments <br> Mandatory Fringe Benefits | Hetchy Power - Long Range Planning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$0 | (\$143,775) | \$143,775 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$143,775) | \$143,775 |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$0 | (\$38,393) | \$38,393 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$38,393) | \$38,393 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 182,168$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$182,168 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to the budget equal to the FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Power Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$29,541) | \$29,541 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$29,541) | \$29,541 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | (\$7,823) | \$7,823 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 7,823)$ | \$7,823 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 37,364$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 37,364$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to the budget equal to the FY 2017-18 amount. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the $B$, and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget



[^2]| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Business Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | (\$169,680) | (\$ $\$ 69,680)$ | \$100,000 |  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$45,163) | ( $\$ 18,546)$ | \$26,617 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$26,617 | \$26,617 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\$ 126,617$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 126,617$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amounts. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$120,000) | \$120,000 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | ( $\$ 120,000)$ | \$120,000 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 31,940)$ | \$31,940 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$31,939.89) | \$31,940 |  |  |
| - | Total Savings \$151,940 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 151,940$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amounts. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | General Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$55,363) | \$55,363 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$55,363) | \$55,363 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 14,937)$ | \$14,937 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 14,937)$ | \$14,937 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 70,300$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 70,300$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amounts. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | (\$19,132) | (\$62,870) | \$43,738 |  |  |  |  | (\$19,132) | (\$62,870) | \$43,738 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | $(\$ 5,096)$ | (\$16,964) | \$11,868 |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 5,106$ ) | $(\$ 16,964)$ | \$11,858 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 55,606$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 55,596$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce step adjustments to FY 2017-18 amounts. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$718,472 | \$718,472 |
| Total | \$0 | \$718,472 | \$718,472 |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 718,462$ | $\$ 718,462$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 718,462$ | $\$ 718,462$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Budget and Finance Committee, May 24, 2018

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
CLP - CleanPowerSF

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | CleanPowersF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Temporary Salaries | 26.27 | 23.79 | \$2,645,369 | \$2,395,369 | \$250,000 |  | x | 26.94 | 26.94 | \$2,803,849 | \$2,803,849 | \$0 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$209,513 | \$189,713 | \$19,800 |  | x |  |  | \$222,063 | \$222,063 | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings . $\$ 269,800$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | This recommendation accounts for delays of approximately 2 months in hiring 10 of the 23 new positions. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property Rent |  |  | \$1,000,000 | \$825,000 | \$175,000 |  |  |  |  | \$1,500,000 | \$575,000 | \$925,000 |  |  |
|  | CleanPowerSF budgeted \$1 million in FY 2018-19 and \$1.5 million in FY 2019-20 for rent for space for an additional 26 to 33 staff. This reduction should provide sufficient funds for rent (est. $\$ 66 / s f$ ), tenant improvements, and operating expenses. |  |  |  |  |  |  | This reduction should provide sufficient funds for rent and operating expenses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0923 Manager Il | 0.77 | 0.00 | \$109,929 |  | \$109,929 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$142,764 |  | \$142,764 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$44,466 |  | \$44,466 |  |  |  |  | \$59,533 |  | \$59,533 |  |  |
| 1825 Principal Administrative Analyst II | 0.00 | 0.77 | . | \$111,908 | (\$111,908) |  |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | \$145,337 | (\$145,337) |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  | \$41,086 | (\$41,086) |  |  |  |  |  | \$54,429 | (\$54,429) |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$1,401 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 2,531$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce new 0923 Manager II position to 1825 Principal Administrative Analyst II. The position would manage up to 2 staff who have not yet been hired. The 1825 job class has necessary qualifications to supervise staff. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 180,627)$ | \$180,627 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$180,627) | \$180,627 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | S0 | $(\$ 72,251)$ | \$72,251 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 72,251)$ | \$72,251 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 252,878$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 252,878$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition Savings equivalent to 4\% of salaries and fringe benefits. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step Adjustments |  |  | \$0 | (\$150,000) | \$150,000 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | (\$150,000) | \$150,000 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | (\$60,000) | \$60,000 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | $(\$ 60,000)$ | \$60,000 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 210,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 210,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce Step Adjustments equivalent to approximately $5 \%$ of salaries and fringe benefits. |  |  |  |  |  |  | On-going savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | Non-General Fund |  |  |
| Total | $\$ 269,800$ | $\$ 639,279$ | $\$ 909,079$ |
|  | $\$ 269,800$ | $\$ 639,279$ | $\$ 909,079$ |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | Ongoing | Total |  |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,390,409$ | $\$ 1,390,409$ |  |
|  |  | $\$ 1,390,409$ | $\$ 1,390,409$ |  |

Recommendations of the Bun_t and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
SFPUC - Public Utilities Commission

|  | FY 2018-19 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  | FY 2019-20 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| Water Enterprise | \$922,804 | \$891,081 | \$1,813,885 | \$66,218 | \$891,067 | \$957,285 |
| Wastewater Enterprise | \$867,122 | \$681,948 | \$1,549,070 | \$0 | \$682,961 | \$682,961 |
| Hetch Hetchy Water \& Power | \$413,223 | \$711,350 | \$1,124,573 | \$0 | \$711,350 | \$711,350 |
| PUC Bureaus | \$0 | \$718,472 | \$718,472 | \$0 | \$718,462 | \$718,462 |
| CleanPowerSF | \$269,800 | \$639,279 | \$909,079 | \$0 | \$1,390,409 | \$1,390,409 |
| Total | \$2,472,949 | \$3,642,130 | \$6,115,079 | \$66,218 | \$4,394,249 | \$4,460,467 |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 112,141,309$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 14,518,482$ or $14.9 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 97,622,827$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 107.96 FTEs, which are 1.99 FTEs more than the 105.97 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $1.9 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 112,141,309$ in FY 2018-19 are $\$ 14,518,482$ or $14.9 \%$ more than the FY 2017-18 estimated revenues of $\$ 97,622,827$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 124,166,473$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 12,025,164$ or $10.7 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 112,141,309$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 108.18 FTEs, which are 0.22 FTEs more than the 107.96 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 124,166,473$ in FY $2019-20$ are $\$ 12,025,164$ or $10.7 \%$ more than the FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 112,141,309$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
RET-RETIREMENT

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retirement | $22,406,764$ | $27,520,551$ | $26,669,227$ | $28,408,930$ | $97,622,827$ | $112,141,309$ |
| FTE Count | 97.49 | 103.14 | 105.43 | 106.51 | 105.97 | 107.96 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 89,734,545$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. This increase is largely due to the shift of the Retirement Health Care Trust Fund from General City Responsibility to the Retirement System in FY 201718. This change is budget neutral on a city-wide basis. The Department's FTE count increased by 10.47 or 11\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 14,518,482$ largely due to the Department's integration of environmental, social, and governance considerations, including engagement activities, into investment decisions. This has led to an increase in professional and personalized services.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 12,025,164$ largely due to the Department's integration of environmental, social, and governance considerations, including engagement activities, into investment decisions. This has led to an increase in professional and personalized services.

# Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> RET-RETIREMENT 

DEPARTMENT:

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 410,332$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 410,332$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 50,782$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 359,550$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 14,108,150$ or 14.5\% in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## YeAr Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 45,180$ in FY 2019-20. All of the $\$ 45,180$ in recommended reductions would be ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 11,979,984$ or $10.7 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

## Recommendations of the B, and Legislative Analys

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
RET - Retirement

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 17 | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | то | From | To |  |  |  | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
| Air Travel-Employees |  |  | \$3,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |  |  |  |  | \$3,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |  |  |
|  | Reduce Travel to reflect historical underspending and actual need. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0^{\circ}$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $\$ 359,550$ | $\$ 50,782$ | $\$ 410,332$ |
|  | $\$ 359,550$ | $\$ 50,782$ | $\$ 410,332$ |

## FY 2019-20

Total Recommended Reductions ne-Time Ongoing
$\$ 0$

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 45,180$ | $\$ 45,180$ |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 45,180$ | $\$ 45,180$ |
|  |  |  |  |

# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO <br> BOARD OF SUPERVISORS <br> BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST 

1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 552-9292 FAX (415) 252-0461

## Budget Overview Report

| To: | Budget and Finance Committee |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office |
| Re: | Overview of the Mayor's Proposed FY 2018-20 Budget |
| Date: | June 11, 2018 |

## Growth in the City's Budget

## Budget Growth Outstrips Population Growth and Inflation

The City's budget has grown by 29.1 percent over the past five years from $\$ 8.6$ billion in FY 2014-15 to $\$ 11.1$ billion in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget, as shown in Table 1 below. The average annual growth rate in total budgeted expenditures during this period was 6.5 percent:

At the same time, as seen in Table 1 below, the City's population increased at a much slower rate of 3.6 percent from 853,258 as of July 1,2014 to 884,363 as of July 1, 2017. Similarly, the consumer price index for the San Francisco area averaged 2.9 percent per year from 2014 to 2017.

General Fund Growth also Faster than Population Growth and Inflation
The City's General Fund budget has grown by 28.8 percent over the past five years from $\$ 4.3$ billion in FY 2014-15 to $\$ 5.5$ billion in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget, as shown in Table 1 below. This average annual growth rate in General Fund budgeted expenditures during this period was 6.6 percent.

Table 1: Comparison of Growth in City Budget to Population Growth and Inflation - FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19

|  | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | , FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed | \% Increase FY <br> 2014-15 to FY <br> 2018-19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund <br> Expenditures | $4,270,953,200$ | $4,587,552,026$ | $4,859,781,042$ | $5,147,557,828$ | $5,515,883,850$ | $29.1 \%$ |
| Annual Growth Rate | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $7.4 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |  |
| Non General Fund <br> Expenditures | $4,310,878,712$ | $4,351,222,057$ | $4,727,695,408$ | $4,971,520,172$ | $5,537,804,290$ | $28.5 \%$ |
| Total Expenditures | $8,581,831,912$ | $8,938,774,083$ | $9,587,476,450$ | $10,119,078,000$ | $11,053,688,140$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 8 \%}$ |
| Annual Growth Rate |  | $4.2 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |  |
| City Population ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 853,258 | 866,320 | 876,103 | 884,363 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 3.6 |
| Annual Growth Rate | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |
| Annual CPI Increase ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |

Expenditures Source: Approved Annual Appropriation Ordinances (FY 2014-15 \& 2015-16 through FY 2017-18 \& 2018-19) and FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Mayor's Budget Book.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Source: U.S. Census Bureau https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/demo/popest/counties-total.html ; population as of July 1
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Consumer Price Index (CPI) Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Historical CPI report (San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward): https://www.bls.gov/regions/west/data/consumerpriceindex_sanfranciscó_table.pdf

## Position Growth

The City's budgeted full time equivalent (FTE) positions ${ }^{1}$ have grown by 10.1 percent over the past five years from 28,435.37 in FY 2014-15 to 31,320.62 in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget as shown in Table 2 below. The average annual rate of growth in positions over this period was 2.5 percent.

Table 2: Growth in Citywide Positions - FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19 ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| - | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 Budget | FY 2017-18 Budget | FY 2018-19 Proposed | \% Increase <br> FY 2014-15 <br> to FY 2018- <br> 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position Count | 28,435.37 | 29,552.57 | 30,626,47 | 30,834.61 | 31,320.62 | 10.1\% |
| Annual Increase | n/a | 1,117.20 | 1,073.90 | 208.14 | 486.01 |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | n/a | 3.9\% | 3.6\% | 0.7\% | 1.6\% |  |

Source: Approved Annual Appropriation Ordinances (FY 2014-15 \& 2015-16 through FY 2017-18 \& 2018-19) and FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Mayor's Budget Book
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Positions include all authorized FTEs in the operating budget, less attrition due to turnover and vacancies. These positions do not include off-budget positions allocated to capital and other off-budget projects.

[^3]
## Total Salary and Fringe Benefit Growth

Budgeted salaries and mandatory fringe benefits have grown at a higher rate than the total positions. Total budgeted salary and mandatory fringe benefits have grown by 20.8 percent over the last five years from $\$ 4.3$ billion in FY 2014-15 to $\$ 5.2$ billion in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget, shown in Table 3 below, compared to 10.1 percent growth in positions. The average annual growth rate of citywide salary and fringe costs over this period was 4.9 percent.

Table 3: Growth in Citywide Salary and Fringe Benefit Budgets - FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19

|  | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2015-16 } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2016-17 } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2017-18 } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { Increase } \\ \text { FY 2014-15 } \\ \text { to FY } \\ 2018-19 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | 2,928,402,763 | 3,125,339,766 | 3,334,097,142 | 3,456,800,600 | 3,618,115,010 | 23.6\% |
| Annual Growth Rate | - $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 6.7\% | 6.7\% | 3.7\% | 4.7\% | n/a |
| Mandatory <br> Fringe Benefits | 1,381,094,290 | 1,330,216,698 | 1,408,839,584 | 1,506,639,742 | 1,589,661,330 | 15.1\% |
| Annual Growth Rate | n/a | -3.7\% | 5.9\% | 6.9\% | 5.5\% | n/a |
| Total | 4,309,497,053 | 4,455,556,464 | 4,742,936,726 | 4,963,440,342 | 5,207,776,340 | 20.8\% |
| Total Growth Rate | n/a | 3.4\% | 6.4\% | 4.6\% | 4.9\% | n/a |

Source: Approved Annual Appropriation Ordinances (FY 2014-15 \& 2015-16 through FY 2017-18 \& 2018-19); FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Mayor's Budget Book; FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Proposed Annual Appropriation Ordinance

## General Fund Salary and Fringe Benefit Growth

General Fund budgeted salary and mandatory fringe benefits have grown at a higher rate over five years than overall budgeted salary and mandatory fringe benefits: 24.1 percent compared to 20.8 percent. The average annual growth rate of citywide General Fund salary and fringe costs over this period was 5.6 percent. Table 4 below shows budgets and growth rates for General Fund salaries and mandatory fringe benefits.

Table 4: Growth in Citywide General Fund Salary and Mandatory Fringe Benefit Budgets - FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY 2014-15 } \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | FY 2015-16 Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2016-17 } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | FY 2017-18 Budget | FY 2018-19 Proposed | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Increase } \\ \text { FY } 2014- \\ 15 \text { to FY } \\ 2018-19 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | 1,399,701,082 | 1,493,905,280 | 1,611,668,310 | 1,658,267,335 | 1,746,812,281 | 24.8\% |
| Annual Growth Rate | N/A | 6.7\% | 7.9\% | 2.9\% | 5.3\% | N/A |
| Mandatory <br> Fringe <br> Benefits | 596,536,295 | 586,289,616 | 634,090,122 | 679,078,064 | 729,844,299 | 22.3\% |
| Annual Growth Rate | N/A | -1.7\% | 8.2\% | 7.1\% | 7.5\% | N/A |
| General Fund Total | 1,996,237,377 | 2,080,194,896 | 2,245,758,432 | 2,337,345,399 | 2,476,656,580 | 24.1\% |
| Total Growth Rate | N/A | 4.2\% | 8.0\% | 4.1\% | 6.0\% | N/A |

Source: Approved Annual Appropriation Ordinances (FY 2014-15 \& 2015-16 through FY 2017-18 \& 2018-19); FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Mayor's Budget Book; FY 2018-19 \& 2019-20 Proposed Annual Appropriation Ordinance

## General Fund Position Growth in FY 2018-19

The Mayor's proposed budget in FY 2018-19 increases the number of General Fund positions by 2 percent, from 19,462 FTE positions in FY 2017-18 to 19,816 FTE positions in FY 2018-19. Almost all of the City's General Fund departments increased the number of FTE positions in the FY 2018-19 budget, either through adding new positions or reducing the amount of budgeted attrition. ${ }^{2}$ The City departments with the largest increase in positions in FY 2018-19 were Police (100 positions), and Public Health (97 positions).

## Salary Savings

City departments spend from 2 percent to 3 percent less in General Fund salaries and mandatory fringe benefits than budgeted each year. These salary savings ranged from $\$ 60.5$ million in FY 2014-15 to $\$ 47.2$ million in FY 2016-17. Projected salary savings in •FY 2017-18 are $\$ 48.2$ million, shown in Table 5 below. Some salary savings are offset by reductions in federal, state, or other reimbursements.

[^4]Table 5: General Fund Salary and Fringe Benefit Savings - FY 2014-15 to FY 2017-
18

|  | FY 2014-15 <br> Actual | FY 2015-16 <br> Actual | FY 2016-17 <br> Actual | FY 2017-18 <br> Projected |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salary and Fringe Benefit <br> Savings | $\$ 60,461,626$ | $\$ 54,986,426$ | $\$ 47,244,894$ | $\$ 48,247,475$ |

Source: FY 2014-15 to FY 2016-17 Controller's High Level Monthly Financial Report; FY 2017-18 Controller's Labor Budget vs. Projection Report

## Discretionary General Fund

The Citywide General Fund budget increased by 7.2 percent from $\$ 5.1$ billion in $F Y$ 2017-18 to $\$ 5.5$ billion in FY 2018-19, as noted above. Not all General Fund revenues are discretionary. Some General Fund revenues have been set aside for specific uses by the voters. ${ }^{3}$ After subtracting General Fund revenues set aside for specific General Fund purposes, the Mayor's proposed budget includes $\$ 2.2$ billion in discretionary General Fund revenues in FY 2018-19.

## Budgetary Reserves

The City's Administrative Code sets policies for budgetary reserves. These include:

- Rainy Day Reserve, in which General Fund revenues in the budget year exceeding 5 percent of prior year General Fund revenue are deposited; 75 percent of these excess revenues go to the City and 25 percent go to the San Francisco Unified School District.
- General Reserve, which equals 2.5 percent of General Fund revenues in FY 2018-19.
- Budget Stabilization Reserve, which augments the Rainy Day Reserve, and receives deposits of real property transfer taxes in excess of average annual receipts for the prior five fiscal years and unassigned General Fund balances in a given fiscal year.

According to the Controller's FY 2017-18 Nine-Month Budget Status Report, these reserves are expected to total $\$ 448.9$ million at the end of the fiscal year, equal to 9.2 percent of General Fund revenues. The Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 continues this level of reserves.

## Impact of June 2018 Ballot Propositions

The Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 budget includes programs in the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to be funded by Proposition D, which would impose a 1.7 percent gross receipts tax on commercial leases to fund homeless services and housing for extremely low to middle income households. The proposed FY 2018-19 budget includes $\$ 13.4$ million for 100 new

[^5]rapid rehousing slots, a navigation center for transitional age youth, and a flexible housing subsidy pool. As of the writing of this report, this ballot proposition did not receive the required $2 / 3$ approval by voters in the June 2018 election.

## Use of One-time Funds to Balance the Budget

The Five Year Financial Plan Update for General Fund Supported Operations FY 2018-19 through FY 2021-22 ${ }^{4}$ noted that projected revenue growth over the next five years is insufficient to match the projected growth in expenditures. In order to balance the budget in FY 2018-19, the Mayor has allocated $\$ 190.9$ million in prior year fund balance as a source of funds. While the use of one-time fund balance allows the City to avoid short-term budget deficits, over the long-term the City's structural deficit is increasing.

## The Board's Budget Priority Areas and the Proposed Budget

In April and May 2018 the Board of Supervisors adopted three resolutions, which urged the Mayor to incorporate budget priority issues in the proposed budget. The citywide budget priorities adopted by the Board are:
(1) Street cleaning (Resolution 125-18), including

- expansion of the Pit Stop program, a one-time increase in City grant funding to non-profit organizations to provide localized manual cleaning $n$ neighborhoods and commercial corridors; and investment in steam cleaners to assist in localized cleanup of potentially hazardous materials;
m' implementing the updated public trash can redesign program in the FY 2019-20 budget;
- identifying opportunities for staff retention in street cleaning programs (Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Human Services Agency, and Department of Public Works); and
- considering geographic equity and citywide cleanliness demands a central tenant of any street cleaning program expansion.
(2) Homelessness (Resolution 134-18), including
- prioritizing prevention, problem solving, and speedy exits from homelessness;
- resources for eviction defense legal services;
- prioritizing the creation of a navigation center for transitional age youth and other resources/funding for transitional age youth;
m increasing outreach and treatment beds for chronically homeless individuals with mental illness or substance use disorders; and
- plans for reducing street encampments.

[^6](3) Other cross-departmental budget priorities (Resolution 150-18), including

* workforce development programs for transitional aged youth, and homeless and formerly homeless adults;
* planning for use of existing workforce development infrastructure to develop a pipeline to City employment;
- emphasizing programs for senior pedestrian safety and transportation;
- hiring plan for school crossing guards;
r out of school programs for youth, including summer and workforce development programs; and
- support for cultural districts.

We will provide a separate report to the Board of Supervisors, identifying how these programs have been included in the Mayor's FY 2018-19 budget.

# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO <br> BOARD OF SUPERVISORS <br> BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST 

1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-9292
FAX (415) 252-0461

June 11, 2018
TO: Budget and Finance Committee
FROM: Budget and Legislative Analyst
SUBJECT: June 13, 2018 Special Budget and Finance Committee Meeting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item
File
Page
$\begin{array}{ccl}5 \text { \& } 6 & \text { 18-0574 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Departments - FYs } \\ \text { 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 }\end{array} \\ & \text { 18-0575 } & \text { Annual Salary Ordinance - FYs 2018-2019 and 2019-2020...................... } 1\end{array}$

| Items 5 and 6 <br> Files $18-0574$ and 18-0575 | Controller |
| :--- | :--- |

## MANDATE STATEMENT/ DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Annual Appropriation Ordinance (File 18-0574) and Annual Salary Ordinance (File 18-0575) contain the administrative provisions governing these ordinances.

## Administrative Provisions of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Major revisions recommended by the Controller to the Administrative Provisions of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO) are as follows:

- Section 12.14 -. CleanPowerSF: Under the existing provision, customer payments and other CleanPowerSF revenues are deposited into a special revenue fund and appropriated to pay for power purchase obligations and CleanPowerSF operating expenses. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission projects disbursement of $\$ 40.8$ million in CleanPowerSF revenues in FY 2017-18 and $\$ 1.5$ million to be carried forward to FY 2018-19, totaling $\$ 42.3$ million.

The revised provision (a) allows for the Controller to disburse prior years' unspent revenues as well revenues appropriated in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to pay for Clean PowerSF power purchase obligations and operating, and (b) estimates the amount of such revenues to be $\$ 112,415,632$ in FY 2018-19 and $\$ 156,864,143$ in FY 2019-20.

- Section 32 - Labor Cost Contingency Reserve: The FY 2017-18 AAO allocated $\$ 50,000,000$ to a budget contingency reserve designated for the Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Operating Fund for the purpose of managing cost and revenue uncertainty related to federal and state changes to the administration and funding of the Affordable Care Act during the term of proposed budget. No funds were drawn from this reserve in FY 2017-18.

The FY 2018-19 AAO allocates $\$ 70,000,000$ of prior year unassigned fund balance to a new budget contingency reserve to pay for wage and salary provisions to be negotiated in the City's labor contracts in FY 2019-20 and increases in health and pension costs.

- Section 33 - State and Federal Revenue Risk Reserve: Under the existing provision $\$ 10,000,000$ of unassigned fund balance from FY 2016-17 was allocated to a budget contingency reserve in FY 2018-19 (the second year of the two-year FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 budget) for the purpose of managing state and federal revenue uncertainty. This reserve was depleted in FY 2017-18.

The proposed FY 2018-19 AAO creates a budget contingency reserve in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-10 of $\$ 40,000,000$ to manage federal, state, and other revenue uncertainty.

This allocation is not included in the calculations of deposits to the Budget Stabilization Reserve as required in Administrative Code Section 10.60 (c).

- Section 34-Transbay Joint Powers Authority Financing: The existing provision provides for the assignment of property tax increment to repay the bridge loan to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority approved by the Board of Supervisors in May 2017. As of May 2018, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority had drawn $\$ 103$ million of the authorized $\$ 260$ million loan.

The revised provision provides for the appropriation of funds from "sources received for purposes of payment of debt service" (which includes but is not limited to property tax increment) to pay debt service on Transbay Community Facilities District special tax bonds as well as the City's bridge loan.

- Section 35 - Implementation of Proposed November 2018 Ballot Measure to Dedicate Hotel Tax Proceeds: A motion is pending before the Board of Supervisors (File 18-0122) to submit an ordinance to the voters in November 2018 to allocate a portion of hotel tax revenues to arts and cultural purposes. This ballot measure, if approved by the Board of Supervisors and the voters, would allocate $\$ 34$ million in hotel tax revenues each year to Grants for the Arts, Cultural Equity Endowment, Cultural Centers, and other arts and culture programs. This new Section 35 would allow the Controller to transfer funds from the General Fund to the respective arts programs if the ballot measure were to fail.


## Administrative Provisions of the Annual Salary Ordinance

The Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO) administrative provisions revise several provisions for stipends to City employees to increase the stipend amount reflecting cost of living increases and collective bargaining agreements.

## Recommendation

- Approval of the new Section 35 of the administrative provisions to the Annual Appropriation Ordinance (File 18-0574) is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors because the Board has not yet approved the underlying legislation (File 18-0122) to submit a ballot measure to the voters in November 2018. The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends approving the other administrative provisions to the AAO and the administrative provisions to the ASO.


# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO <br> BOARD OF SUPERVISORS <br> BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST <br> 1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-9292 <br> FAX (415) 252-0461 

June 19, 2018
TO: $\quad$ Budget and Finance Committee
FROM: $\quad$ Budget and Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst for Amendment of the Mayor's Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Budget.
Page
Descriptions for Departmental Budget Hearing, June 21, 2018 Meeting, 10:00 a.m.
HSS Health Service System ..... 1
ASS Assessor-Recorder, Office of the ..... 6
CON Controller, Office of ..... 12
GEN , General City Responsibility ..... 17
CAT City Attorney, Office of the ..... 21
MYR Mayor, Office of the ..... 26
REG Elections, Department of ..... 32
HRD Human Resources, Department of ..... 37
FAM Fine Arts Museum ..... 43
AAM Asian Art Museum ..... 47
ADM City Administrator, Office of the ..... 51
TIS Technology, Department of ..... 59
DPW Public Works ..... 63
REC Recreation and Park Department ..... 69
FIR Fire Department ..... 77
DEM Emergency Management, Department of ..... 83
POL Police Department ..... 88
DPA Police Accountability, Department of ..... 97
CRT Superior Court ..... 101
ADP Adult Probation Department ..... 105
JUV Juvenile Probation Department ..... 110
PDR Public Defender, Office of the ..... 114
DAT District Attorney, Office of the ..... 119
SHF Sheriff's Department. ..... 123
TTX Treasurer/Tax Collector, Office of the ..... 127
ECN Economic and Workforce Development, Office of ..... 133
CPC City Planning ..... 139
ART Arts Commission ..... 145
WAR War Memorial ..... 149
CHF Children, Youth and Their Families, Department of ..... 153
DPH Public Health, Department of ..... 157
HSA Human Services Agency ..... 165
HOM Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Department of. ..... 172
BOS Board of Supervisors ..... 179

## Year One: Fy 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 11,721,172$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 276,917$ or $2.4 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 11,444,255$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 51.15 FTEs, which are 0.16 FTEs more than the 50.99 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.3 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 11,721,172$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 220,077$ or $1.9 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 11,501,095$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 12,018,314$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 297,142$ or $2.5 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 11,721,172$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 51.15 FTEs, which are the same number of FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents no change in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 12,018,314$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 297,142$ or $2.5 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 11,721,172$.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> HSS - HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM

DEPARTMENT:

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health Service System | $8,899,536$ | $9,974,731$ | $10,726,620$ | $10,918,665$ | $11,444,255$ | $11,721,172$ |
| FTE Count | 43.83 | 48.64 | 50.8 | 51.36 | 50.99 | 51.15 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 2,821,636$ or $31.71 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 7.32 or 16.70\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

FY 2018-19
The Department's proposed. FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 276,917$ largely due to salary and benefit cost increases.

FY 2019-20
The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 297,142$ largely due to salary and benefit cost increases.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> HSS - HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM 

DEPARTMENT:

## Recommendations

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 87,035$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 87,035$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 87,035$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 189,882$ or $1.7 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 1,755$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 88,790$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 87,558$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 87,558$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 87,558$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 209,584$ or $1.8 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HSS - Health Service System

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | HSS Health Service System |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1.61) ${ }^{\text {(2.19) }}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} (\$ 171,113) \\ \hline(\$ 71,937) \end{array}$ | $\frac{(\$ 232,756)}{(\$ 97,852)}$ | $\$ 61,643$$\$ 25,915$ |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition Sapings | (1.61) | (2.19) | (5171,144) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline(\$ 232,798) \\ \hline(\$ 95,832) \end{array}$ | \$61,654 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$70,452) |  | \$25,380 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings |  |  | \$87,035 |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  | \$87,558 |  |  |  |
|  | Tncrease Attrition Savings to reflect anticipated delays in hiring and vacancies. The Department had salary surpluses in FY 2014-15, FY 2015-16, and FY 2016-17. The Department has a projected salary surplus of approximately $\$ 305,000$ in FY201718. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 87,035$ | $\$ 87,035$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ \mathbf{\$ 0}$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 87,035$ |
|  |  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 87,035$ |

FY 2019-20


| Year | Department <br> Code | Fund <br> Code | Supplier <br> No | Supplier Name | Project Code <br> Balance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7 / 6 / 2016$ | 291644 | 1000 | 18125 | IRON MOUNTAIN OFF-SITE <br> DATA PROTECTION | 10001707 | $\$ 176.50$ |
| $6 / 22 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 11040 | SHRED WORKS | 10001707 | $\$ 108.00$ |
| $7 / 21 / 2016$ | 291644 | 10000 | 16221 | LINK2GOV CORP | 10001707 | $\$ 186.13$ |
| $5 / 8 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 10525 | STAPLES BUSINESS ADVANTAGE | 10001707 | $\$ 195.53$ |
| $6 / 9 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 10525 | STAPLES BUSINESS ADVANTAGE | 10001707 | $\$ 12.74$ |
| $1 / 30 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 19209 | GRM INFORMATION <br> MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 10001707 | $\$ 351.94$ |
| $7 / 5 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 13856 | OPENCOPY | 10001707 | $\$ 704.84$ |
| $7 / 28 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10001707 | $\$ 0.01$ |
| $7 / 28 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10001707 | $\$ 0.01$ |
| $10 / 27 / 2017$ | 291644 | 10000 | 21375 | DIGITAL ROOM INC DBA <br> UPRINTING.COM | 10001707 | $\$ 14.87$ |
| $3 / 12 / 2018$ | 291644 | 10000 | 8003 | XTECH | 10001707 | $\$ 5.02$ |

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 44,959,965$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 5,541,664$ or $14.1 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 39,418,301$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 174.10 FTEs, which are 3.85 FTEs more than the 170.25 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $2.3 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 10,734,741$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 2,286,939$ or $27.1 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 8,447,802$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 43,666,805$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 1,293,160$ or $2.9 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 44,959,965$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 175.81 FTEs, which are 1.71 FTEs more than the 174.10 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $1 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 9,168,364$ in FY $2019-20$, are $\$ 1,566,377$ or $14.6 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \$10,734,741.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst

## FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS

FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT: ASR - ASSESSOR

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor-Recorder | $21,594,580$ | $23,857,168$ | $24,145,354$ | $31,180,269$ | $39,418,301$ | $44,959,965$ |
| FTE Count | 152.08 | 147.07 | 162.08 | 171.88 | 170.25 | 174.10 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 23,365,385$ or $108.2 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 22.02 or $14.48 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 5,541,664$ largely driven by investments in the Department's technology systems, particularly the Property Assessment and Tax System (PATS) and the replacement of the Recorder system. The increase is also driven by investments in staff to streamline and improve internal processes, continue to work through the Department's property appraisal backlog, and modernize recorder processes.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 1,293,160$ largely driven by the end of one-time expenditures in the Recorder modernization project.

# RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LegisLative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT: ASR-ASSESSOR

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 1,017,829$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 1,017,829$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 215,508$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 802,321$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 4,523,835$ or 11.5\% in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 384,988$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 384,988$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 384,988$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings. These reductions would allow a decrease of $\$ 1,678,148$ or $3.7 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

## Recommendations of the BuL. and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
ASR - Assessor-Recorder


Recommendations of the Bu . and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
ASR - Assessor-Recorder

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | From | To | From | To |  |  | 17 | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | ASR Real Property |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4267 Principal Real Property Appraiser | 0.50 | 0.00 | \$65,357 | \$0 | \$65,357 | $x$ |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$130,713 | \$0 | \$130,713 | x |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$24,996 | \$0 | \$24,996 | x |  |  |  | \$51,258 | \$0 | \$51,258 | $\times$ |  |
|  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The Department has requested two new positions for the Standards and Mapping Units - one new 0931 Manager Ill to oversee the unit and one new 4267 Principal Real Property Appraiser. Under this proposal, the unit will have 14 positions, including two Principal Real Property Appraisers, four Senior Real Property Appraisers (of which two are dedicated to DBI), and three Real Property Appraisers (of which one is vacant). The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends approval of the new Manager ill position to oversee the unit but considers the unit to have sufficient appraiser and administrative staffing and therefore does not recommend approval of the new Principal Real Property Appraiser position. The Department has added 22 new positions in the past five years, many of which are management and analytical positions that can oversee and facilitate implementation of new projects within their division. This is one of four new positions requested by the Department in the operating budget in FY 2018-19, of which the Budget and Legislative Analyst is recommending approval of one. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Departmentwide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings |  |  | (\$1,675,528) | ( $\$ 2,060,000)$ | \$384,472 | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | $(\$ 700,980)$ ) | (\$ 8861,829$)$ | \$160,849 | - | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$545,321 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition Savings to reflect anticipated delays in hiring and vacancies. The Department had salary surpluses of approximately $\$ 900,000$ to $\$ 1$ million in FY 201415, FY 2015-16, and FY 2016-17, reduced to an estimated $\$ 809,000$ in FY 2017-18. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FY 2018-19

Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$802,321 | \$215,508 | \$1,017,829 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$802,321 | \$215,508 | \$1,017,829 |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 68,284,289$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 1,000,002$ or $1.5 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 67,284,287$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 251.61 FTEs, which are 5.50 FTEs less than the 257.11 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $2.1 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 57,620,219$ in FY $2018-19$, are $\$ 546,257$ or $1.0 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 57,073,962$.

YEAR TwO: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 67,598,829$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 685,460$ or $1.0 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 68,284,289$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 252.13 FTEs, which are 0.52 FTEs more than the 251.61 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 56,482,161$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 1,138,058$ or $2.0 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 57,620,219$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
CON-CONTROLLER

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Proposed |
| Controller | $43,980,897$ | $53,637,306$ | $62,453,126$ | $69,223,402$ | $67,284,287$ | $68,284,289$ |
| FTE Count | 204.11 | 218.51 | 252.58 | 263.44 | 257.11 | 251.61 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 24,303,392$ or $55.3 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 47.50 or 23.3\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 1,000,002$ largely due to three new positions in the City Services Auditor division.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 685,460$ largely due to close out of projects related to the financial system replacement.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
CON - CONTROLLER

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 120,000$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 120,000$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 100,000$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 20,000$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 880,002$ or $1.3 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 75,126$, and one-time FY 2017-18 savings of $\$ 125,000$ for total General Fund savings of $\$ 320,126$.

## YEAR TWO: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 100,000$ in FY 2019-20. All of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would contribute to the decrease of $\$ 785,460$ or $1.2 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the $B_{2} \quad t$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## CON - Controller

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | To | From | To |  |  | $1 T$ | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
|  | Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data Processing Supplies |  |  | \$85,000 | \$65,000 | \$20,000 | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce budgeted amount for Data Processing Supplies due to historical underspending. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Accounting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (4.71) | (5.02) | (\$769,367) | (\$819,367) | \$50,000 | $\times$ |  | (4.71) | (5.01) | (\$773,423) | $(\$ 823,423)$ | \$50,000 | x |  |
|  | Increase attrition savings to reflect rate of hire. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Payroll |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (1.03) | (1.40) | (\$139,477)] | (\$189,477) | \$50,000 | $\times$ |  | (1.03) | (1.40) | (\$140,443) | (\$190,443) | \$50,000 | x |  |
|  | Increase attrition savings to reflect rate of hire. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FY 2018-19

Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 120,000$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 120,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |


| Year | Department <br> Code | Fund <br> Code | Supplier <br> No | Supplier Name | Project <br> Code | Remaining <br> Balance |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2017 | 229222 | 10000 | 20671 | EN POINTE TECHNOLOGIES SALES LLC | 10001643 | 9,500 |
| 2015 | 229227 | 10000 | 16036 | LUX CONSULTING | 10001644 | 6,000 |
| 2014 | 229227 | 10000 | 8155 | WILLIAMS ADLEY \& COMPANY CA LLP | 10001644 | 7,633 |
| 2017 | 229222 | 10020 | 12749 | PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INC | 10001643 | 5,449 |
| 2014 | 229227 | 10000 | 8155 | WILLIAMS ADLEY \& COMPANY CA LLP | 10001644 | 18,979 |
| 2014 | 229222 | 10000 | 9675 | THE MARTINET.GROUP LLC | 10001643 | 27,565 |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,399,223,023$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 136,043,833$ or $10.8 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 1,263,179,190$.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 4,868,235,185$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 356,118,824$ or $7.9 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 4,512,116,361$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 1,280,878,196$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 118,344,827$ or $8.5 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \$1,399,223,023.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 4,844,887,294$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 23,347,891$ or $0.5 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 4,868,235,185$.

## For Amendment of Budget Items

FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT: GEN - GENERAL CITY RESPONSIBILITY

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 200,000$ in FY 2018-19. All of the $\$ 200,000$ in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 135,843,833$ or $10.8 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst has not proposed any reductions for FY 2019-20.

Recommendations of the Bu , and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
GEN- General City Responsibility

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | $1 T$ | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | GEN General City-Unallocated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Judgements- Claims |  |  | \$3,100,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$100,000 | x | x |  |  | \$3,100,000 | \$3,100,000 | \$0 | $x$ |  |
|  | Reduce Judgements-Claims to reflect actual need in the City's reserve for judgements and claims. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reserve for Litigation |  |  | \$11,000,000 | \$10,900,000 | \$100,000 | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | \$11,000,000 | \$11,000,000 | \$0 | $x$ |  |
|  | Reduce Reserve for Litigation to reflect actual need in the City's litigation reserve. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FY 2018-19 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
|  | General Fund | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$200,000 | General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| $\sim$ | Total | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$200,000 | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

[^7]Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
GEN-General City Responsibility

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | $1 T$ |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
| Policy Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | GEN General City-Unallocated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programmatic Projects- <br> Budget |  |  | \$250,000 |  | \$250,000 | $x$. | x |  |  | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |
|  | The proposed budget includes $\$ 250,000$ for participatory budgeting in District 8 . Reprogramming these funds is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| $\square$ | General Fund | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$250,000 | General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| + | Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| O) | Total | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$250,000 | Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 86,006,153$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 3,650,766$ or $4.4 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 82,355,387$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 312.66 FTEs, which are 3.71 FTEs more than the 308.95 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $1.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 66,370,195$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 837,629$ or $1.3 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 65,532,566$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 87,982,476$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 1,976,323$ or $2.3 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 86,006,153$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 313.64 FTEs, which are 0.98 FTEs more than the 312.66 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.3 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 65,901,454$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 468,741$ or $0.7 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 66,370,195$.

| SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED | BUDGET YEAR | EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 |
|  | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Proposed |
| City Attorney | $73,004,864$ | $75,751,194$ | $76,189,394$ | $78,780,781$ | $82,355,387$ | $86,006,153$ |
| FTE Count | 308.14 | 308.19 | 306.39 | 306.82 | 308.95 | 312.66 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 13,001,289$ or $17.8 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 4.52 or 1.5\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 3,650,766$ largely due to mandated increases in salaries and fringe benefits, and the addition of new positions to handle civil conservatorship cases, which are currently handled by the District Attorney's Office and will transfer to the Department on January 1, 2019.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 1,976,323$ largely due to cost of living adjustments.

```
RECOMmmendATIONS OF THE BudgeT & LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
    For Amendment of Budget Items
        FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
    CAT - CITY ATTORNEY
```

DEPARTMENT:

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 269,578$ in FY 2018-19. All of the recommended reductions are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 3,381,188$ or $4.1 \%$ in the Department's FY 201819 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 275,576$ in FY 2019-20. All of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 1,700,747$ or $2.0 \%$ in the Department's FY 201920 budget.

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | City Attorney |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8177 Attorney |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$207,117 | \$0 | \$207,117 | x |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$68,459 | \$0.00 | \$68,459 | $x$ |  |
|  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 275,576$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | Deny 1.00 FTE new 8177 Attorney position proposed for handling civil conservatorship proceedings. The Board of Supervisors approved an ordinance designating the City Attorney rather than the District Attorney to institute proceedings under the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act to appoint conservators for persons with mental health disorders and compel participation in assisted outpatient treatment (Ord. 117-18, File 18-0156). Approximately 491 cases will be transferred from the District Attorney to the City Attorney on January 1, 2019. <br> The District Attorney's Office had assigned 0.5 FTE 8177 Attorney and 0.4 FTE 8132 Investigative Assistant to handle such conservatorships, or a total of 0.9 FTE. The City Attorney's Office is now proposing 2.0 FTE Attorneys and 1.0 FTE 8173 Legal Assistant to handle such conservatorhips, or a total of 3.0 FTE or over a 233 percent increase from the previously budgeted staffing in the District Attorney's Office. The City Attorney considered the 233 percent increase in staffing to be necessary because of the (1) increase in homelessness and associated referrals, and (b) pending State legislation that could expand Lanterman-Petris-Short Act conservatorships. <br> Instead of three new positions, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends approval of two of the requested new positions, one Attorney and one Claims Investigator, as of January 2019 in the City Attorney's Office to handle such conservatorships. The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommendations would still provide an increase of 1.1 FTE or over 122 percent as compared to the current staffing in the District Attorney's Office. The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends disapproval of the second 8177 Attorney position in FY 2019-20. It should be noted that State legislation has not yet been adopted expanding Lanterman-Petris-Short Act conservatorships. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (18.86) | (20.08) | (\$3,103,699) | (\$3,303,699) | \$200,000 | $x$ | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$1,079,742) | (\$1,149,320) | \$69,578 | x | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 269,578$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition Savings to reflect expected hiring dates for vacant positions. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the $B, \quad t$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
CAT - City Attorney


## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 172,773,702$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 47,281,822$ or $37.7 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 125,491,880$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 62.55 FTEs, which are 4.54 FTEs more than the 58.01 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $7.8 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 136,286,281$ in $F Y 2018-19$, are $\$ 42,539,032$ or $45.4 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 93,747,249$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 151,691,425$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 21,082,277$ or $12.2 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 172,77 \overline{3}, 702$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 59.10 FTEs, which are 3.45 FTEs less than the 62.55 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 5.5\% decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 117,891,507$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 18,394,774$ or $13.5 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 136,286,281$.

# ReCommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> MYR - MAYOR 

DEPARTMENT:

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | FY 2017-18 | FY 2018-19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Budget | Proposed |
|  | Mayor | $52,089,662$ | $90,168,352$ | $112,238,807$ | $166,845,498$ | $125,491,880$ |
| FTE Count | 49.45 | 50.21 | 54.68 | 56.00 | 58.01 | 62.55 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 120,684,040$ or $23.2 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 13.10 or $26 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

The vast majority of this growth is driven by non-General Fund sources for housing development and the mandated growth in the Housing Trust Fund, approved by voters as Proposition C in 2012. Additional investments in immigration services and eviction prevention through nonprofit grants have also been made during this time period.

The FY 2018-19 budget also reflects expenditures on reserve pending the outcome of ballot measures, notably $\$ 16.4$ million that will not move forward due to the failure of Proposition D in June 2018.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 47,281,822$ largely due to a $\$ 2.8$ million annual increase in the Housing Trust Fund and one-time appropriation of $\$ 40,000,000$ of fee revenue to the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund (Oceanwide Center at 50 First Street) for affordable housing.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 21,082,277$ largely due to the elimination of the one-time appropriation related to the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund.

# RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> MYR-MAYOR 

DEPARTMENT:

## Recommendations

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 75,000$ in FY 2018-19. All of the recommended reductions are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 47,206,822$ or $37.6 \%$ in the Department's $F Y$ 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 154,688$ and one-time FY 2017-18 savings of $\$ 200,000$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 429,688$.

In addition, we recommend placing $\$ 1,500,000$ on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending the results of a November 2018 ballot initiative which, if passed, would dedicate funding to supporting the implementation of Cultural Districts.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst does not recommend reductions to the proposed budget in FY 2019-20. We recommend placing $\$ 3,100,000$ on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending the results of a November 2018 ballot initiative which, if passed, would dedicate funding to supporting the implementation of Cultural Districts.

## Recommendations of the $\mathrm{BL} \quad$ and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget



FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |

## FY 2019-20

Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## MYR - Mayor's Office

|  | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
| Account Title | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |

## Budget and Finance Committee Reserve Recommendation



FY 2018-19
Total Reserve Recommendation

|  | Total Reserve Recommendation |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund  <br>  One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ |
|  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ |

## FY 2019-20

## Total Reserve Recommendation

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$3,100,000 | \$3,100,000 |
| Total | \$0 | \$3,100,000 | \$3,100,000 |


| Year | Department <br> Code | Fund <br> Code | Supplier <br> No | Supplier Name | Project <br> Code | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 18,735,746$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 3,888,514$ or $26.2 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 14,847,232$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 49.04 FTEs, which are 1.54 FTEs more than the 47.50 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $3.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 975,465$ in FY 2018 -19, are $\$ 828,640$ or $564.4 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 146,825$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 22,015,020$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 3,279,274$ or $17.5 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 18,735,746$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 61.40 FTEs, which are 12.36 FTEs more than the 49.04 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 25.2\% increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 125,402$ in FY $2019-20$, are $\$ 850,063$ or $87.1 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 975,465$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
REG-Elections

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department of <br> Elections | $16,696,145$ | $16,341,790$ | $18,841,748$ | $14,413,993$ | $14,847,232$ | $18,735,746$ |
| FTE Count | 52.17 | 48.51 | 57.01 | 47.9 | 47.50 | 49.04 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 2,039,601$ or $12.22 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count decreased by 3.13 or 6\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 3,888,514$ largely primarily related to growth in salary and benefit costs, the cost of leasing a new voting system, and cost increases related to election material printing.

FY 2019-20
The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 3,279,274$ largely due to the fact that the City and County will hold two elections during the fiscal year.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
REG-ELECTIONS

## Recommendations

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 115,000$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 115,000$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 70,000$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 45,000$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 3,773,514$ or $25.4 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 135,044$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 250,044$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 175,000$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 175,000$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 175,000$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 3,104,274$ or $16.6 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

## Recommendations of the BL . and Legislative Analyst

 For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Year | Department Code | Fund Code | Supplier No | Supplier Name | Project Code | Remaining Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6/20/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 18466 | IMPARK | 10026787 | \$ 98,000.00 |
| 6/20/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 10525 | STAPLES BUSINESS ADVANTAGE | 10026787 | \$ 21,284.12 |
| 6/5/2017 | 246641 | 10000 | 10525 | STAPLES BUSINESS ADVANTAGE | 10026787 | \$ 5,000.00 |
| 7/28/2016 | 232302. | 10000 | 26079 | AGURTO CORPORATION DBA PESTEC | 10026787 | \$ 2,232.36 |
| 7/14/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 19315 | GRAINGER | 10026787 | \$ 2,037.05 |
| 8/17/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10026787 | \$ 1,000.00 |
| 8/3/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18466 | IMPARK | 10026787 | \$ 914.00 |
| 6/12/2017. | 232302 | 10000 | 21253 | DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC | 10026787 | \$ 875.00 |
| 8/24/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18871 | HERC RENTALS INC | 10026787 | \$ 495.27 |
| 8/24/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 9046 | U S PURE WATER CORP | 10026787 | \$ 485.00 |
| 8/17/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10026787 | \$ 462.05 |
| 8/31/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18871 | HERC RENTALS INC | 10026787 | \$ 413.26 |
| 10/31/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18871 | HERC RENTALS INC | 10026787 | \$ 338.24 |
| 9/21/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 8698 | VERIZON WIRELESS | 10026787 | \$ 264.42 |
| 10/31/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18871 | HERC RENTALS INC | 10026787 | \$ 221.46 |
| 12/19/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10026787 | \$ 202.00 |
| 6/5/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 17230 | K \& H INTEGRATED PRINT SOLUTIONS | 10026787 | \$ 189.08 |
| 6/20/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 8698 | VERIZON WIRELESS | 10026787 | \$ 155.24 |
| 8/24/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 9046 | U S PURE WATER CORP | 10026787 | \$ 135.12 |
| 10/3/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 13298 | PENSKE TRUCK LEASING CO LP | 10026787 | \$ 103.61 |
| 5/22/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 13966 | OFFICE RELIEF INC | 10026787 | \$ 61.77 |
| 12/19/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10026787 | \$ 61.72 |
| 12/7/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 12182 | RICOH USA INC | 10026787 | \$ 59.02 |
| 10/4/2016 | 232302 | 10000 | 18871 | HERC RENTALS INC | 10026787 | \$ 38.49 |
| 2/8/2017 | 232302 | 10000 | 19209 | GRM INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 10026787 | \$ 16.00 |
| Total \$135,044.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 101,319,776$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 8,023,554$ or $8.6 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 93,269,222$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 168.45 FTEs, which are 20.67 FTEs more than the 147.78 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $14 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 82,319,827$ in FY 2018-19 are $\$ 4,752,142$ or $6.1 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 77,594,685$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 99,142,538$ budget for FY $2019-20$ is $\$ 2,177,238$ or $2.1 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 101,319,776$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 160.55 FTEs, which are 7.90 FTEs less than the 168.45 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 4.7\% decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 82,911,694$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 591,867$ or $0.7 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 82,319,827$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
HRD - HUMAN RESOURCES

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUdgET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department of Human Resources | $77,898,019$ | $81,400,546$ | $87,992,304$ | $95,016,164$ | $93,296,222$ | $101,319,776$ |
| FTE Count | 135.32 | 143.28 | 152.41 | 154.88 | 147.78 | 168.45 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 101,319,776$ or $30.1 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 33.13 or $24.5 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \$8,023,554 largely due to:
One time funding for upcoming labor negotiations. In addition, the Department made increases in Workers Compensation and the Equal Opportunity and Client Services divisions have added staff due to increased demand for services. Finally, the budget includes one-time funds for hiring modernization projects.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \$2,177,238 largely due to:
The expiration of one time funds for labor negotiations.

## Recommendations of the budget \& Legistative analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT: HRD - HUMAN RESOURCES

Recommendations

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 330,568$ in FY 2018-19. All of the $\$ 330,568$ in recommended reductions are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 7,692,986$ or $8.2 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 19,788$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 350,356$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst does not propose any reductions in FY 2019-20.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## -HRD - Human Resources



FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| General Fund | $\$ 330,568$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 330,568$ |  |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 330,568$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 330,568$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FY 2019-20Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Recommendations of the BL $\quad i$ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HRD - Human Resources


## FY 2018-19

Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

FY 2019-20

|  | Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |


| Year | Department <br> Code | Fund <br> Code | Supplier <br> No | Supplier Name | Project <br> Code | Remaining <br> Balance |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2016 | 232025 | 10000 | 20223 | FIELDS CONSULTING GROUP INC | 10026742 | 6,300 |
| 2016 | 232025 | 10020 | 10486 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA / DEPT OF JUSTICE | 10024337 | 13,488 |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 22,536,444$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 264,820$ or $1.2 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 22,271,624$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 110.06 FTEs, which are 0.74 FTEs less than the 110.80 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.7 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 4,266,650$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 560,850$ or $11.6 \%$ less than $F Y$ 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 4,827,500$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 23,152,264$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 615,820$ or $2.7 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 22,536,444$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 109.97 FTEs, which are 0.09 FTEs less than the 110.06 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.1 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 4,348,403$ in FY $2019-20$ are $\$ 81,753$ or $1.9 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 4,266,650$.

|  | Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 And FY 2019-20 |
| :---: | :---: |
| DEPARTMENT: |  |

SUMMARY OF 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fine Arts Museum | $17,107,968$ | $17,602,878$ | $18,262,298$ | $19,361,422$ | $22,271,624$ | $22,536,444$ |
| FTE Count | 111.14 | 112.53 | 113.58 | 108.70 | 110.80 | 110.06 |

FY 2018-19
The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 264,820$ largely due to:
COLA adjustments and new and increased spending for two capital projects: a masonry repair project at the Legion of Honor and a project to replace security doors at the entrance to special exhibition galleries in the de Young Museum.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 615,820$ largely due to:
Four capital projects: A tower drainage project at the de Young Museum and skylight structure, clearstory window, and sump pump replacement projects at the Legion of Honor.

# Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
FAM - FIne Arts MUSEUM

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 15,703$ in FY 2018-19. All of the $\$ 15,703$ in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 249,117$ or $1.1 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 50,000$ in FY 2019-20. All of the. $\$ 50,000$ in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 565,820$ or $2.5 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
FAM - Fine Arts Museum

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1T |
|  | FA Public Art and Culture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attrition Savings | (8.69) | (8.84) | (\$676,465) | (\$687,102) | \$10,637 | $x$ | x | (8.69) | (8.69) | (\$676,465) | (\$676,465) | \$0 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | $(\$ 316,323)$ | (\$321,389) | \$5,066 | $x$ | x |  |  | (\$323,700) | (\$323,700) | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 15,703$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase attrition savings by 0.15 FTEs to account for hiring process for 1.0 FTE vacant 8226 Museum Guard. A requisition has been sent to Mayor's Office. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Renewal Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$500,000 | \$450,000 | \$50,000 | $x$ | x |
|  | One-time saving in FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Decrease expenditure on de Young Tower Drainage Project by $10 \%$ due to lack of detailed cost estimate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ZLLL

|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | \$15,703 | \$0 | \$15,703 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$15,703 | \$0 | \$15,703 |


|  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50,000$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 12,014,112$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 1,051,715$ or $9.6 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 10,962,397$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 58.30 FTEs, which are 0.48 FTEs more than the 57.82 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.8 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 695,000$ in FY 2018-19, are the same as FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 695,000$.

## YEAR TwO: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 11,484,312$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 529,800$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \$12,014,112

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 58.18 FTEs, which are 0.12 FTEs less than the 58.30 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 0.2\% decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 695,000$ in FY 2019-20, are the same as FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 695,000$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
AAM-ASIAN ART MUSEUM

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTe Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Asian Art Museum | $8,744,439$ | $9,456,379$ | $10,289,633$ | $10,856,486$ | $10,962,397$ | $12,014,112$ |
| FTE Count | 57.83 | 57.76 | 57.15 | 57.14 | 57.82 | 58.30 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 3,269,673$ or $37.4 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 0.47 or 0.81\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 1,051,715$ largely due to changes primarily driven by capital projects.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 529,800$ largely due to changes primarily driven by capital projects.

## Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20

DEPARTMENT:
AAM-ASIAN ART MUSEUM

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 16,119$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 16,119$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 16,119$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 1,035,596$ or $9.4 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 16,230$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 16,230$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 16,230$ are ongoing savings and none are one-time savings.

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## AAM - Asian Art Museum

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 |
|  | AAM Asian Art Museum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition Savings | (2.00) | (2.12) | (\$185,695) | (\$196,837) | \$11,142 | x |  | (2.00) | (2.12) | (\$185,695) | (\$196,837) | \$11,142 | x |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | $(\$ 82,955)$ | $(\$ 87,932)$ | \$4,977 | x |  |  |  | ( $\$ 84,808)$ | $(\$ 89,896)$ | \$5,088 | x |  |
|  | Total Savings |  |  | \$16,119 |  |  |  | . Total Savings |  |  | \$16,230 |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition Savings to reflect anticipated delays in hiring and vacancies. The Department has a projected salary surplus of approximately $\$ 43,000$ in FY201718. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 16,119$ | $\$ 16,119$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 16,119$ |
|  |  | $\$ 16,119$ |  |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 16,230$ | $\$ 16,230$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 16,230$ | $\$ 16,230$ |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 460,532,499$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 69,225,596$ or $17.7 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 391,306,903$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 884.23 FTEs, which are 39.22 FTEs more than the 845.01 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $4.6 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 390,652,811$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 65,089,744$ or $20.0 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 325,563,067$.

Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 452,753,784$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 7,778,715$ or $1.7 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 460,532,499$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 895.41 FTEs, which are 11.18 FTEs more than the 884.23 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $1.3 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 365,794,200$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 24,858,611$ or $6.4 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 390,652,811$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> DEPARTMENT: ADM-CITY ADMINISTRATOR 

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Budy Administrative <br> Services | $294,559,401$ | $309,169,005$ | $372,101,195$ | $364,813,180$ | $391,306,903$ | $460,532,499$ |
| FTE Count | 716.24 | 749.61 | 802.64 | 829.52 | 845.01 | 884.23 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 165,973,098$ or $56.3 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 167.99 or $23.5 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 69,225,596$ largely due to costs related to the Hall of Justice Exit, budget growth in the Digital Services program due to a transfer of staff from the Department of Technology to the City Administrator, and a program promoting the count for 2020 census.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 7,778,715$ largely due to expiration of one-time capital projects budgeted in FY 2018-19.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20

DEPARTMENT:
ADM-CITY ADMINISTRATOR

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 420,713$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 420,713$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 296,576$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 124,137$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 68,804,883$ or $17.6 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, we have identified $\$ 13,334,310$ to be placed on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending detailed cost expenditures for the exit from the Hall of Justice. We have also identified $\$ 71,991$ in reductions that are policy recommendations for the Committee's consideration.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 229,063$ in FY 2019-20. All the recommended reductions are ongoing. These reductions would still allow a decrease of $\$ 8,007,778$ or $1.7 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

In addition, we have identified $\$ 8,000,000$ to be placed on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending detailed cost expenditures for the exit from the Hall of Justice.

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget



[^8]$1 T=$ One Time

## Recommendations of the BuL, and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

ADM - City Administrator


[^9]Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## ADM - City Administrator

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1T | From | To | From | To |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$53,990 | \$46,431 | \$7,559 | X | X |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Total Savings \$28,502 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Deny interim exception and reduce 1.00 FTE 1043 IS Engineer-Senior to 0.86 FTE to reflect hiring timeline. According to the Mayor, this position is funded through the General Fund. |  |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FY 2018-19

Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 124,137$ | $\$ 68,199$ | $\$ 192,336$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 228,377$ | $\$ 228,377$ |
| Total | $\$ 124,137$ | $\$ 296,576$ | $\$ 420,713$ |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | \$0 | \$45,996 | \$45,996 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$183,067 | \$183,067 |
| Total | \$0 | \$229,063 | \$229,063 |

Policy Recommendation
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## Recommendations of the BuG. and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## ADM - City Administrator



## Reserve Recommendations

|  | Real Estate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Programmatic Budgets |  | \$5,400,000 |  | \$5,400,000 | X | X |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Place $\$ 5,400,000$ in Programmatic Budgets on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve. According to the Department, these funds are for furnishings, fixtures and equipment related to the Justice Facilities Improvement Program, which encompasses the exit from the Hall of Justice and relocations within the Hall of Justice. The Department has not provided sufficient documentation of these costs. The Board of Supervisors should place these funds on B\&F Committee Reserve until the Department can provide sufficiently detailed cost plans for the expenditures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildings, Structure and Improvement |  | \$7,934,310 | \$0 | \$7,934,310 | X | X |  |  | \$8,000,000 | \$0 | \$8,000,000 | X | X |
| Place $\$ 7,934,310$ in Buildings, Structure and Improvement on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve. According to the Department, these funds are for new leases to begin the process of relocating staff from the Hall of Justice. The Department has not provided sufficient documentation of these costs. The Board of Supervisors should place these funds on B\&F Committee Reserve until the Department is able to provide sufficient detail regarding these expenditures. <br> The Board of Supervisors previously appropriated $\$ 8$ million for FY 2017-18, and as of May, no funds have been expended. In addition to the programmatic budget above, and the $\$ 15.9$ million in the current proposed budget, the total allocated funds for the Justice Facilities Project would be $\$ 29.3$ million from FY 2016-17 through FY 2019-20. | Place $\$ 7,934,310$ in Buildings, Structure and Improvement on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve. According to the Department, these funds are for new leases to begin the process of relocating staff from the Hall of Justice. The Department has not provided sufficient documentation of these costs. The Board of Supervisors should place these funds on B\&F Committee Reserve until the Department is able to provide sufficient detail regarding these expenditures. <br> The Board of Supervisors previously appropriated $\$ 8$ million for FY 2017-18, and as of May, no funds have been expended. In addition to the programmatic budget above, and the $\$ 15.9$ million in the current proposed budget, the total allocated funds for the Justice Facilities Project would be $\$ 29.3$ million from FY 2016-17 through FY 2019-20. |  |  |  |  |  | Place $\$ 8,000,000$ in Buildings, Structure and Improvement on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve. According to the Department, these funds are for new leases to begin the process of relocating staff from the Hall of Justice. The Department has not provided sufficient documentation of these costs. The Board of Supervisors should place these funds on B\&F Committee Reserve until the Department is able to provide sufficient detail regarding these expenditures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | \$13,334,310 | \$71,991 | \$0 |
| Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | \$13,334,310 | \$71,991 | 13,406,301 |


|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
|  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 8,000,000$ |

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 128,185,113$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 11,481,035$ or $9.8 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 116,704,078$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 225.29 FTEs, which are 6.69 FTEs less than the 231.98 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $2.9 \%$ decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 116,584,627$ in FY 2018-19, are $\$ 3,439,851$ or $3.0 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 113,144,776$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 125,272,763$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 2,912,350$ or $2.3 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 128,185,113$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 225.59 FTEs, which are 0.30 FTEs more than the 225.29 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.1 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 117,909,272$ in FY 2019-20, are $\$ 1,324,645$ or $1.1 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 116,584,627$.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20

DEPARTMENT:
TIS-GSA - TECHNOLOGY

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GSA - Technology | $82,746,946$ | $93,483,133$ | $96,741,403$ | $113,191,513$ | $116,704,078$ | $128,185,113$ |
| FTE Count | 215.64 | 209.44 | 220.60 | 227.80 | 231.98 | 225.29 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 45,438,167$ or $54.9 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 9.65 or 4.5\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 11,481,035$ largely due to increases of $\$ 5,521,480$ in programmatic projects, $\$ 3,167,353$ in services of other departments, and $\$ 2,244,905$ in non-personnel services.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 2,912,350$ largely due to reductions of $\$ 1,742,251$ in capital outlay, $\$ 1,572,274$ in non-personnel services, and $\$ 472,000$ in programmatic projects.

# Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
TIS-GSA - TECHNOLOGY

## Recommendations

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 1,927,361$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 1,927,361$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 26,732$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 1,900,629$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 9,553,674$ or $8.2 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 26,709$ in FY 2019-20. All $\$ 26,709$ of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## TIS- GSA-Technology

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 17 | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |
|  | DT SD Service Delivery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5504 Project Manager II | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$163,171 | \$0 | \$163,171 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$163,171 | \$ 0 | \$163,171 |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$56,799 | \$0 | \$56,799 |  |  |  |  | \$57,885 | \$0 | \$57,885 |  |  |
| 5502 Project Manager I | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | \$141,023 | (\$141,023) |  |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | \$141,023 | (\$141,023) |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | \$52,215 | (\$52,215) |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$53,324 | $(\$ 53,324)$ |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 26,732$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 26,709$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Deny upward substitution of 1.0 FTE 1042 IS Engineer-Journey position to 5504 Project Manager II, and approve substitution to 5502 Project Manager I instead. 5502 classification is sufficient to carry out the duties of this position. |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ongoing savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DT Public Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition |  |  | (\$297,796) | (\$342,170) | \$44,374 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$127,134) | (\$146,467) | \$19,333 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings $\$ 63,707$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 8234 Fire Alarm Dispatcher position. Position has been vacant since $3 / 18 / 16$ and RTF has not yet been approved by DHR. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DT Chief Technology Officer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9993 Attrition |  |  | ( $\$ 33,664$ ) | (\$59,971) | \$26,307 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | (\$11,561) | $(\$ 22,176)$ | \$10,615 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Savings _ $\quad$ S 36,922 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad$ S0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increase Attrition to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 1063 IS Programmer Analyst position. Position has been vacant since $7 / 28 / 17$. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DT Communications |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bldgs,Struct \& Imprv ProjBudget |  |  | \$3,350,000 | \$1,550,000 | \$1,800,000 | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reduce budget for FiberSF project to reflect revised project scope. Additional analysis is needed and RFP will not be issued in FY 2018-19. |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | FY 2018-19 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 <br> Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |  | Ongoing | Total |
| Genera! Fund | \$1,864,201 | \$17,055 | \$1,881,256 | General Fund | \$0 | \$17,040 | \$17,040 |
| Non-General Fund | \$36,428 | \$9,677 | \$46,105 | Non-General Fund | \$0 | \$9,669 | \$9,669 |
| Total | \$1,900,629 | \$26,732 | \$1,927;361 | Total | \$0 | \$26,709 | \$26,709 |

*Fund 28070 (for personnel expenditures) is derived $63.8 \%$ from the General Fund and $36.2 \%$ from Non-General Fund sources.

## Year One: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 374,255,101$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 18,803,092$ or $5.3 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 355,452,009$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 1,060.66 FTEs, which are 34.14 FTEs more than the 1,026.52 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $3.3 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 257,250,203$ in FY 2018-19 are $\$ 24,519,718$ or $10.5 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 232,730,485$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 306,355,688$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 67,899,413$ or $18.1 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 374,255,101$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 1,064.68 FTEs, which are 4.02 FTEs more than the 1,060.66 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.4 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 189,009,688$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 68,240,515$ or $26.5 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 257,250,203$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
DPW - PUBLIC WORKS

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Works | $159,380,342$ | $220,180,380$ | $260,213,596$ | $290,244,640$ | $355,452,009$ | $374,255,101$ |
| FTE Count | 825.03 | 852.17 | 924.94 | 981.44 | $1,026.52$ | $1,060.66$ |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 214,874,759$ or $135 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 235.63 or $29 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 18,803,092$ largely due to:
An expansion of funding for street cleaning and the Pit Stop program, as well as additional capital expenditures, such as street resurfacing.

In April 2018, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution urging the Mayor to fund specific city-wide street cleaning as a priority in the FY 2018-19 budget, including the Pit Stop program expansion, non-profit partner funding expansion, and equipment purchases (File 18-0390). The proposed budget has $\$ 1,530,814$ for General Fund equipment expenditures. In addition, the proposed budget has approximately $\$ 3.3$ million per year for 44 new temporary street cleaning staff for the Community Corridors Program. Finally, the proposed budget includes $\$ 885,000$ annually to create new Pit Stops and $\$ 165,000$ annually to expand operating hours at existing Pit Stop locations.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 67,899,413$ largely due to the expiration of one time capital expenditures.

## Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> DPW - PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT:

## Recommendations

## Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 1,386,262$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 1,386,262$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 926,554$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 459,708$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 17,416,830$ or $4.9 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 990,277$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 990,277$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 941,331$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 48,946$ are one-time savings.

## DPW- Public Works


$\sigma$

## Recommendations of the Buno-c and Legislative Analys

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget



## Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

## For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

DPW- Public Works

| Account Title | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
|  | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |


|  | FY 2018-19Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | \$90,802 | \$545,914 | \$636,715 |
| Non-General Fund | \$368,906 | \$380,640 | \$749,547 |
| Total | \$459,708 | \$926,554 | \$1,386,262 |


|  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | $\$ 5,306$ | $\$ 558,333$ | $\$ 563,639$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 43,640$ | $\$ 382,998$ | $\$ 426,638$ |
|  | $\$ 48,946$ | $\$ 941,331$ | $\$ 990,277$ |
|  |  |  |  |


$\infty$
GF = General Fund

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes.

The Department's proposed $\$ 231,324,667$ budget for FY 2018-19 is $\$ 9,779,314$ or $4.4 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 221,545,353$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 934.79 FTEs, which are 0.55 FTEs more than the 934.24 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $0.1 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 154,185,286$ in FY 2018-19 are $\$ 6,062,068$ or $4.1 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 148,123,218$.

## YEAR TWO: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 207,471,781$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 23,852,886$ or $10.3 \%$ less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 231,324,667$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 936.54 FTEs, which are 1.75 FTEs more than the 934.79 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a $0.2 \%$ increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 129,025,418$ in FY $2019-20$ are $\$ 25,159,868$ or $16.3 \%$ less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \$154,185,286.
RECOMMENDATíINS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT: $\quad$ REC-RECREATION AND PARKS

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recreation and Parks | $160,938,278$ | $163,224,442$ | $178,699,938$ | $208,806,728$ | $221,545,353$ | $231,324,667$ |
| FTE Count | 870.27 | 893.18 | 916.35 | 935.45 | 934.24 | 934.79 |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 70,386,389$ or $41.1 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 64.52 or $7.4 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 9,779,314$ largely due to onetime capital projects such as Sargent John Macaulay Park, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Indian Basin, and the Geneva Car Barn.

FY 2019-20
The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by $\$ 23,852,886$ largely due to expiration of one-time capital expenditures.

# RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST 

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
REC - RECREATION AND PARKS

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 1,024,489$ in FY 2018-19. All of the $\$ 1,024,489$ in recommended reductions are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 8,754,825$ or $4.0 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 56,749$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 996,987$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 55,755$ in FY 2019-20. All of the $\$ 55,755$ in recommended reductions are one-time savings.

# Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst 

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


[^11]
## REC - Recreation and Parks



Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

## REC - Recreation and Parks



FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions

|  | Total Recommended Reductions |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| General Fund | $\$ 940,238$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 940,238$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 84,251$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 84,251$ |
|  | $\$ 1,024,489$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,024,489$ |
|  |  |  |  |

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions

Ongoing

|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 55,755$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 55,755$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 55,755$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 55,755$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| Policy Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1204 Senior Personnel Clerk | CD Administration |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0,00 | \$78,358 | \$0 | \$78,358 | $x$ |  |
|  | 1.00 | 0.00 | \$78,358 | \$0 | \$78,358 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$35,816 | \$0 | \$35,816 | X |  |  | \$36,609 | \$0 | \$36,609 | X |  |
| 2708 Custodian | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | \$63,522 | (\$63,522) | X | 0.00 | 1.00 | \$0 | \$63,522 | ( 563,522 ) | X |  |
| Mandatory Fringe Benefits |  |  | \$0 | \$31,748 | (\$31,748) | X |  |  | \$0 | \$32,557 | (\$32,557) | X |  |
|  | Total Savings \$18,904 |  |  |  |  |  | Total Savings $\quad \$ 18,888$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Approval of the proposed upward substitution 1.00 FTE 2708 Custodian to 1.00 FTE 1204 Senior Personnel Clerk was done prior to Board approval. Board approva for this upward subsitution for the FY 2018-19 budget is a policy matter for the Board. Human Resources currently has 2.00 FTE Personnel Clerk and 2.001204 Senior Personnel Clerk. The Department reports that there is a temprorary employee currently in the position. |  |  |  |  |  | On going savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Golden Gate Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ford F250 Extended Cab |  |  | \$50,097 | \$0 | \$50,097 | X |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | Delete one replacement Ford 250 Extended Cab. The vehicle has only 72,591 miles and still has remaining useful life. This reduction would still allow Recreation and Parks to replace one Ford F250. The Department currently has 99 Ford F250s. |  |  |  |  |  | One-time savings |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations of the BuL_ and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
REC - Recreation and Parks

|  | FY 2018-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | FY 2019-20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  | FTE |  | Amount |  |  |  |  |
| Account Title | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T | From | To | From | To | Savings | GF | 1 T |

FY 2018-19
Total Policy Recommendations

|  | One-Time |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 18,904$ | Ongoing | Total |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
|  |  | $\$ 50,097$ | $\$ 18,904$ | $\$ 69,001$ |

FY 2019-20

|  | Total Policy Recommendations |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | One-Time | Ongoing | Total |  |
|  | General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Non-General Fund | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 18,888$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Year | Department <br> Code | Fund <br> Code | Supplier <br> No | Supplier Name | Project <br> Code. | Remaining <br> Balance |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2014 | 262676 | 10020 | 16829 | KOFFLER ELEC MECH APPARATUS REPAIR <br> INC | 10013617 | 6,124 |
| 2015 | 262692 | 10080 | 22814 | CПY CARSHARE | 10001739 | 9,404 |
| 2015 | 262676 | 10010 | 11535 | SAN FRANCISCO PARKS ALLIANCE | 10016945 | 7,000 |
| 2015 | 150705 | 10000 | 15706 | MARIPOSA LEADERSHIP INC | 10001737 | 9,800 |
| 2016 | 262684 | 10080 | 13773 | OTIS ELEVATOR CO | 10001738 | 10,000 |
| 2016 | 262684 | 10080 | 14394 | NEOFUNDS BY NEOPOST | 10001738 | 5,809 |
| 2016 | 262692 | 10080 | 25188 | ARC | 10001739 | 8,612 |

## YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 398,429,004$ budget for FY $2018-19$ is $\$ 16,871,294$ or $4.42 \%$ more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of $\$ 381,557,710$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 1,665.42 FTEs, which are 19.86 FTEs more than the 1,645.56 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a $1.21 \%$ increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 143,055,460$ in FY 2018-19 are $\$ 7,388,095$ or $5.45 \%$ more than FY 2017-18 revenues of $\$ 135,667,365$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

## Budget Changes

The Department's proposed $\$ 409,250,154$ budget for FY 2019-20 is $\$ 10,821,150$ or $2.72 \%$ more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of $\$ 398,429,004$.

## Personnel Changes

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 1,666.04 FTEs, which are 0.62 FTEs more than the 1,665.42 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 0.04\% increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

## Revenue Changes

The Department's revenues of $\$ 144,453,523$ in FY 2019-20 are $\$ 1,398,063$ or $0.98 \%$ more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of $\$ 143,055,460$.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 

DEPARTMENT:
FIR - FIRE DEPARTMENT

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:

|  | FY 2013-14 <br> Budget | FY 2014-15 <br> Budget | FY 2015-16 <br> Budget | FY 2016-17 <br> Budget | FY 2017-18 <br> Budget | FY 2018-19 <br> Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Department | $333,614,911$ | $343,967,112$ | $355,800,902$ | $373,728,683$ | $381,557,710$ | $398,429,004$ |
| FTE Count | $1,463.99$ | $1,493.61$ | $1,575.39$ | $1,619.78$ | $1,645.56$ | $1,665.42$ |

The Department's budget increased by $\$ 64,814,093$ or $19.43 \%$ from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 201.43 or 13.76\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 201819.

## FY 2018-19

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by $\$ 16,871,294$ largely due to continuations of multi-year hiring and fleet/equipment replacement initiatives and the recently agreed-upon Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the firefighters' union. Under the hiring plan the Department has been allocated funding for three firefighter academies during FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, and the Department is also absorbing the costs related to the expiration of federal FEMA grant funding that funded the salaries and benefits of 72 newly-hired employees. The proposed FY 2018-19 budget also expands the Department's multi-year equipment plan. The new Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the firefighters' union will take effect July 1, 2018 and results in salary and benefit cost increases, including a 3 percent wage increase effective July 1, 2018 and increases related to premium pays for training and education and special assignments.

## FY 2019-20

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by $\$ 10,821,150$ largely due to continuations of multi-year hiring and fleet/equipment replacement initiatives and the recently agreed-upon Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the firefighters' union. Under the hiring plan the Department has been allocated funding for three firefighter academies during FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, and the proposed FY 2019-20 budget also continues the Department's multi-year fleet/equipment replacement plan. The Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the firefighters' union will take effect July 1, 2018 and will result in salary and benefit cost increases during FY 2019-20, including a 3 percent wage increase effective July 1, 2019 and increases related to premium pays for training and education and special assignments.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget ITEMS <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> DEPARTMENT: FIR - FIRE DEPARTMENT 

## Staffing Levels

In November 2005, San Francisco voters passed Proposition F - Neighborhood Firehouses, which requires the City to maintain and operate neighborhood firehouses and emergency apparatus at the same locations and to the same extent as existed on January 1, 2004. Although modern fire prevention systems and better equipment have likely reduced the need for on-duty firefighters since 2004 and analyses that show that coverage areas and travel times would not be negatively impacted by closures of certain stations, the Fire Department is required to maintain 2004 staffing levels. As a result, Fire Department management is unable to adjust staffing levels and work schedules in response to changing conditions in the most cost-effective manner, and the Budget and Legislative Analyst is unable to recommend adjustments to firefighter staffing levels at the Department.

# Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst <br> For Amendment of Budget Items <br> FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 <br> FIR - FIRE DEPARTMENT 

DEPARTMENT:

## RECOMMENDATIONS

YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 1,135,096$ in FY 2018-19. Of the $\$ 1,135,096$ in recommended reductions, all are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 15,736,198$ or $4.12 \%$ in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of $\$ 45,707.61$, for total General Fund savings of $\$ 45,707.61$.

## Year Two: FY 2019-20

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total $\$ 796,634$ in FY 2019-20. Of the $\$ 796,634$ in recommended reductions, $\$ 96,634$ are ongoing savings and $\$ 700,000$ are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of $\$ 10,024,516$ or $2.52 \%$ in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

## Recommendations of the Bh . and Legislative Analyst

For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


```
\(\infty\)

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

FIR - Fire Department
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Operations} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Overtime - Uniform & & & \$28,206,103 & \$27,904,619 & \$301,484 & x & X & & & \$28,206,103 & \$28,111,103 & \$95,000 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$485,145 & \$479,959 & \$5,186 & X & X & & & \$485,145 & \$483,511 & \$1,634 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Total Savings} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\$306,670} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Total Savings \$96,634} & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Decrease budgeted Overtime amount to (1) reflect anticipated overtime expenditures for staffing the Quick Response Vehicle, and (2) reflect an adjustment to the relief factor in the Department's staffing model, which has increased from 18.96\% in FY 2016-17 to 19.59\% in FY 2018-19. Using the one-year relief factor average from CY 2017 of \(19.49 \%\) rather than a two-year average of \(19.59 \%\) results in a savings of \(\$ 206,484\), plus mandatory fringe benefits. In general, because the Department has held several new recruit academies in recent years, the relief factor should decrease rather than increase, as newer firefighters have accrued less sick time and vacation time.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings based on anticipated overtime expenditures for staffing the Quick Response Vehicle.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{FY 2018-19}

Total Recommended Reductions

\section*{FY 2019-20}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } Non-General Fund & \(\$ 700,000\) & \(\$ 96,634\) & \(\$ 796,634\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \(\$ 700,000\) & \(\$ 96,634\) & \(\$ 796,634\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 95,653,856\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 7,803,775\) or \(8.9 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 87,850,081\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 270.41 FTEs, which are 13.19 FTEs more than the 257.22 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(5.1 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 28,084,811\) in FY 2018-19 are \(\$ 650,205\) or \(2.4 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 27,434,606\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 92,456,938\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 3,196,918\) or \(3.3 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 95,653,856\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 279.22 FTEs, which are 8.81 FTEs more than the 270.41 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 3.3\% increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 27,508,428\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 576,383\) or \(2.1 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 28,084,811\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst For Amendment of Budget ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20}

DEPARTMENT:
DEM - DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Department of \\
Emergency Management
\end{tabular} & \(69,492,934\) & \(76,100,127\) & \(82,869,070\) & \(93,693,797\) & \(87,850,081\) & \(95,653,856\) \\
FTE Count & 243.55 & 253.31 & 258.10 & 251.43 & 257.22 & 270.41
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 26,160,922\) or \(37.7 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 26.86 or \(11.0 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 7,803,775\) largely due to capital and information technology projects and additional funding for emergency dispatchers to offset dispatcher attrition and to meet increasing service demands. Capital and information technology continuing projects include a multi-year project to replace the City's 800 MHz radio system and a project funding infrastructure improvements to expand the 9-1-1 Operations floor. New projects funded in the proposed FY 2018-19 budget include initiatives to automate fire station dispatching and to scope the replacement of the City's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System. The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget also includes funding for three new dispatcher academies for a total of 45 new recruits, in order to offset dispatcher attrition and meet increasing service demands.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 3,196,918\) largely due to expirations of one-time capital and information technology projects in the proposed FY 201819 budget. The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget includes funding for three new dispatcher academies for a total of 45 new recruits, in order to offset dispatcher attrition and meet increasing service demands.

\title{
Recommendations of the budget \& Legislative Anaiyst
}

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
DEM - DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

\section*{ReCOMMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 427,999\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 427,999\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 75,197\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 352,802\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 7,375,776\) or \(8.4 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 7,038.62\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 435,038\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 82,937\) in FY 2019-20. All of the \(\$ 82,937\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{DEM Administration} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Programmatic Projects & & & \$850,000 & \$827,492 & \$22,508 & X & & & & \$800,000 & \$770,795 & \$29,205 & X & \\
\hline Manager V & 0.77 & 0.00 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & X & & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & X & \\
\hline Manager III & 0.00 & 0.77 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & X & & 0.00 & 1.00 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Replace proposed 0.77 FTE 0933 Manager \(V\) funded for Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) Replacement Scoping to 0.77 FTE 0931 Manager III. The 0931 Manager III classification is more appropriate for the responsibilities and duties of the proposed position. The proposed position will manage the CAD Replacement Scoping project funded by the Committee on Information Technology for the first time in FY 2018-19. The responsibilities of a Manager V position, as outlined by the Department of Human Resources, include division-wide responsibility for multiple functional or complex program areas, and individuals in Manager \(V\) positions typically manage a division of a medium or large Department. The other Manager V positions in the DEM Information Technology unit are the Chief Information Officer, who will supervise the proposed position, and a project manager, who supervises a Manager II project manager. For comparison purposes, the supervisory responsibility of the proposed Manager \(V\) position would be to manage a single project and to supervise one project analyst (1054 IS Business Analyst - Principal) and one subject matter expert ( 8240 Public Safety Communications Coordinator).} & Ongoing & saving & & & & & \\
\hline Attrition Savings & & & (\$125,249) & (\$156,299) & \$31,050 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & ( \(\$ 48,905\) ) & \((\$ 60,627)\) & \$11,722 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings . \(\$ 42,772\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Adjust attrition savings by 0.23 FTE to account for hiring delay of 1.00 FTE 1042 IS Engineer - Journey position to 0.77 FTE in conformance with the Department's hiring plan.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Step Adjustments & & & (\$67,564)| & (\$92,178) & \$24,614 & X & & & & (\$57,464) & (\$82,894) & \$25,430 & X & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \((\$ 17,818)\) | & (\$24,309) & \$6,491 & X & & & & (\$15,181) & \((\$ 21,899)\) & \$6,718 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$31,105} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 32,148\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Step Adjustments to correct an omission in the Department's step adjustment calculations.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Recommendations of the \(\mathrm{Bi} \quad\) and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
DEM - Emergency Management


\section*{Year One: Fy 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 635,300,430\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 47,023,946\) or \(8.0 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 588,276,484\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 3,064.83 FTEs, which are 93.78 FTEs more than the 2,971.05 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(3.2 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 145,317,355\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 17,010,875\) or \(13.3 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 128,306,480\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 676,179,530\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 40,879,100\) or \(6.4 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 201.8-19 budget of \(\$ 635,300,430\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 3,197.42 FTEs, which are 132.59 FTEs more than the \(3,064.83\) FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 201819 budget. This represents a \(4.3 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 161,075,334\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 15,757,979\) or \(10.8 \%\) more. than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 145,317,355\).

\title{
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
}

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
POL-POLICE DEPARTMENT

\section*{SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUdGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrr} 
& \begin{tabular}{r} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{rl} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Police & \(526,936,867\) & \(528,843,173\) & \(544,721,549\) & \(577,745,503\) & \(588,276,484\) & \(635,300,430\) \\
& & & & & & & \\
FTE Count & \(2,727.26\) & \(2,783.70\) & \(2,870.79\) & \(3,013.38\) & \(2,971.05\) & \(3,064.83\)
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 108,363,563\) or \(20.6 \%\) from the adopted budget in \(F Y\) 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 337.57 or \(12.4 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2017-18}

The Department has a General Fund salary savings of approximately \(\$ 6,174,381\) (after à supplement appropriation in March 2018 of \(\$ 1,176,768\) salary savings) and has introduced legislation to re-appropriate these funds to pay for one-time workers compensation costs.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 47,023,946\) largely due to:
- \(\$ 4.5\) million for an additional 50 sworn staff to be assigned within the City: 39 Police Officers, 10 sergeants, and 1 Lieutenant.
- \(\$ 889,423\) for the creation of six civilian management and analyst positions to staff the new Strategic Management Division.
- \(\$ 2.4\) million for 25 additional civilian positions to civilianize positions in the Property, Crime Scene Investigations, Background Investigations, and Professional Standards \& Principled Policing divisions currently occupied by sworn staff.
- \(\$ 4.5\) million for 82 replacement vehicles for marked and unmarked police cars.
- \(\$ 2\) million for the purchase of electronic control weapons (Tasers). In addition, the Department plans to request that the Budget and Finance committee release \(\$ 500,000\) from reserve in order to fund data integration services between body worn cameras and electronic control weapons.
- \(\$ 4.4\) million for furniture and equipment for the new Crime Lab and Traffic Company building.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ POL-POLICE DEPARTMENT
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 40,879,100\) largely due to:
- \(\$ 13.3\) million to fund the annualization of 50 sworn staff created in FY 2018-19 and for an additional 50 sworn staff created in FY 2019-20 to be assigned within the City: 39 Police Officers, 10 sergeants, and 1 Lieutenant (totaling 78 new Officers, 20 new Sergeants, and 2 Lieutenants created in years FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20.)
- \(\$ 4.1\) million for 71 replacement vehicles for marked and unmarked police cars.
- Note: the Department intends to make a technical adjustment after the Board phase of the budget review to reduce the number of replacement vehicles in FY 2019-20 from 70 to 50 and re-allocate \(\$ 1\) million currently proposed for replacement vehicles for the purchase of electronic control weapons (Tasers), for a total of \(\$ 3.5\) million for electronic control weapons in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20.

The mayor's proposed budget does not have sufficient funds to pay for the complete implementation of electronic control weapons, which our office estimates will cost \$7.2 million in one-time costs and \(\$ 2.6\) million in annual ongoing costs. As a result, the Police Department will have to request additional funding for these weapons in subsequent appropriations.
- \$4.6 million for the annualization of civilian positions created in FY 2018-19.
- \(\$ 7\) million for furniture and equipment the new Crime Lab and Traffic Company building.

\title{
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
}

For Amendment of Budget Items
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
POL-POLICE DEPARTMENT

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 2,967,921\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 2,967,921\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 2,567,921\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 400,000\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 44,056,025\) or \(7.5 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 69,447\) for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 3,037,368\).

Our policy recommendations total \(\$ 4,508,272\) in FY 2018-19, all of which are ongoing savings.

\section*{YeAR Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 600,000\) in FY 2019-20. Of the \(\$ 600,000\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 400,000\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 200,000\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(40,279,100\) or \(6.3 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Our policy recommendations total \(\$ 13,337,353\) in FY 2019-20, all of which are ongoing savings.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

\section*{POL - Police Department}


\title{
Recommendations of the BL and Legislative Analyst
}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

\section*{POL - Police Department}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF \(\quad 1 \mathrm{~T}\)}} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce FTE counts of new positions to account for expected delays in hiring.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings in FY 2018-19.} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Crime Lab} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \\
\hline Forensic Latent Examiner II & 4.62 & 1.65 & \$471,882 & \$153,208 & \$318,674 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & 0.00 & 0.00 & \$197,736 & \$64,200 & \$133,536 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 452,210\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce FTE counts of new new positions to account for expected delays in hiring.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings in FY 2018-19.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Recommended Reductions
\end{tabular}} & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions} \\
\hline & & One-Time & Ongoing & Total & & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline & General Fund & \$2,567,921 & \$400,000 & \$2,967,921 & General Fund & \$200,000 & \$400,000 & \$600,000 \\
\hline & Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline & Total & \$2,567,921 & \$400,000 & \$2,967,921 & Total & \$200,000 & \$400,000 & \$600,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{} & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 4,508,272\) & \(\$ 4,508,272\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 4,508,272\) & \(\$ 4,508,272\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations One-Time Ongoing Total
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 13,337,353\) & \(\$ 13,337,353\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 13,337,353\) & \(\$ 13,337,353\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|l|r|l|l|l|l|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|l|}{ Year } & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Department \\
Code
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Fund \\
Code
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Supplier \\
No
\end{tabular} & Supplier Name & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Project \\
Code
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Remaining \\
Balance
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Reduction \\
Amount
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 11131 & SHANNON LAYER & 10001893 & \(\$ 25,083.33\) & \(\$ 10,000.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 12765 & PSYCHEMEDICS CORPORATION & 10001893 & \(\$ 21,688.00\) & \(\$ 10,000.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 16333 & LEVEL II INC & 10001893 & \(\$ 19,560.00\) & \(\$ 19,560.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 11648 & SAN BRUNO PET HOSPITAL & 10001911 & \(\$ 17,488.59\) & \(\$ 5,000.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 18543 & IBARRA BROTHERS PRINTING & 10001893 & \(\$ 13,746.92\) & \(\$ 4,590.00\) \\
\hline 2018 & POL & 10000 & 9476 & THOMSON REUTERS/BARCLAYS & 10001893 & \(\$ 10,000.00\) & \(\$ 10,000.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 24164 & BODE CELLMARK FORENSICS INC & 10001909 & \(\$ 8,500.00\) & \(\$ 2,660.00\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 18543 & IBARRA BROTHERS PRINTING & 10001893 & \(\$ 6,450.32\) & \(\$ 5,636.57\) \\
\hline 2017 & POL & 10000 & 10729 & SOUNDS GOOD SOUND & 10001893 & \(\$ 5,820.00\) & \(\$ 2,000.00\) \\
\hline & & & Total & & \(\$ 69,446.57\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 8,588,576\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 1,388,438\) or \(19.3 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 7,200,138\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 46.31 FTEs, which are 3.89 FTEs more than the 42.42 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(9.2 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department has no revenues in FY 2018-19 but had \(\$ 8,000\) in revenues in \(F Y\) 2017-18.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 8,698,769\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 110,193\) or \(1.3 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 8,588,576\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 47.23 FTEs, which are 0.92 FTEs more than the 46.31 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(2.0 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department has no revenues in FY 2019-20.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ DPA - Department of Police Accountability}

DEPARTMENT:

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fie authority:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & FY 2013-14 Budget & FY 2014-15 Budget & FY 2015-16 Budget & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & FY 2017-18 Budget & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\hline OCC/DPA & \$4,829,125 & \$5,135,411 & \$5,570,081 & \$6,870,659 & \$7,200,138 & \$8,588,576 \\
\hline FTE Count & 34.64 & 34.76 & 37.20 & 42.41 & 42.42 & 46.31 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 3,759,451\) or \(77.8 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 11.67 or \(33.7 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. Prior to FY 2017-18, the Department's functions were carried out by the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), which was included in the Police Department's budget.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \$1,388,438 largely due to:
- \(\$ 640,510\) in salaries and benefits for 4 new positions to staff the newly created Audit Division.
- \(\$ 320,000\) for contract expert witnesses to support investigations of officer involved shootings.
- \(\$ 100,000\) for training to support officer involved shooting investigations.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 110,193\) largely due to:
- Annualization of 4 new positions created in FY 2018-19 to staff the Department's Audit Division.

\title{
Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst
}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items}

FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
DPA - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

\section*{RECOMIMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 225,000\) in FY \(2018-19\), all of which are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 1,163,438\) or \(16.2 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst does not have recommended budget reductions for FY 2019-20.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

\section*{DPA - Department of Police Accountability}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings}} & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & GF & T \\
\hline \multicolumn{16}{|c|}{Division Description (Dept. ID Description if No Division)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Attrition Savings - Miscellaneous} & & \((\$ 90,319)\) & ( \(\$ 265,319\) ) & \$175,000 & X & X & & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Attrition Savings - Miscellaneous} & & \((\$ 35,863)\) & \((\$ 85,863)\) & \$50,000 & X & X & & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 225,000\)} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Total Savings} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings to account for delays in filling positions and vacancies. The Department is projected to have a salary surplus of approximately \(\$ 850,000\) this year, currently has seven vacancies, and is creating four new positions in FY 2018-19.} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{One-time savings in FY 2018-19.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 225,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 225,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline Total & \(\$ 225,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 225,000\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions


\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 34,384,417\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 264,274\) or \(0.8 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 34,120,153\).

Revenue Changes
The Department's revenues of \(\$ 2,804,850\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 8,606\) or \(0.3 \%\) more than \(F Y\) 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 2,796,244\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 34,385,196\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 769\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 34,384,427\).

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 2,803,600\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 1,250\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 2,804,850\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 CRT- SUPERIOR COURT
}

DEPARTMENT:
Summary of 5-Year historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Superior Court & \(37,323,115\) & \(35,058,716\) & \(34,764,617\) & \(33,685,324\) & \(34,400,153\) & \(34,384,417\) \\
FTE Count & - & - & - &. & - & - & -
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget decreased by \(\$ 2,938,698\) or \(7.9 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

FY 2018-19
The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 264,274\) largely due to:
Increase in salary and benefit growth associated with civil and criminal grand jury programs administered on behalf of the City.

FY 2019-20
The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has no significant changes from FY 2018-19.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ CRT- SUPERIOR COURT
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \$21,000 in FY 2018-19. All of the \$ 21,000 in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 243,274\) or \(0.7 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 21,000\) in FY 2019-20. All of the \(\$ 21,000\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
CRT- Superior Court
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{CRT Superior Court} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Other Fees & & & \$7,381,949 & \$7,360,949 & \$21,000 & x & & & & \$7,381,949 & \$7,360,949 & \$21,000 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Decrease Funding for the Indigent Defense and Foster Care programs to reflect actual expenditures. The funds have a combined projected surplus of \(\$ 88,529\).} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{On-going savings.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{FY 2018-19}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Total Recommended Reductio} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$0 & \$21,000 & \$21,000 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$0 & \$21,000 & \$21,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$0 & \$21,000 & \$21,000 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$0 & \$21,000 & \$21,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 41,233,225\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 6,058,551\) or \(17.22 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 35,174,674\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 155.25 FTEs, which are 6.17 FTEs more than the 149.08FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a 4.14 \% increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 17,298,660\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 1,346,631\) or \(7.22 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \$ 18,645,291.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 44,091,803\) budget for \(\mathrm{FY} 2019-20\) is \(\$ 2,858,578\) or \(6.93 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 41,233,225\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 155.15 FTEs, which are 0.1 FTEs more than the 155.25 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0 \%\) change in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 18,025,641\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 726,981\) or \(4.2 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 17,298,660\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Iteins \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
ADP-ADULT PROBATION

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Adult Probation & \(26,608,644\) & \(30,756,242\) & \(33,546,031\) & \(34,019,907\) & \(35,174,674\) & \(41,233,225\) \\
FTE Count & 138.10 & 142.75 & 148.52 & 146.34 & 149.08 & 155.25
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 14,624,581\), or \(55 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 10.98, or 7.95\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 6,058,551\) largely due to an increase in property rent of \(\$ 1,506,984\); an increase in Community Based Org Services of \(\$ 1,435,715\), and an increase in Other Current Expenses of \(\$ 599,396\).

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 2,858,578\) largely due to the second year increase in property rents of \(\$ 1,823,374\), and Other Current Expenses - Budget of \(\$ 224,670\).

For Amendment of Budget Items

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 828,904\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 828,904\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 750,998\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 77,906\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 5,229,647\) or \(14.9 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 1,200\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 1,200\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 750,998\) in FY 2019-20, which are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 2,107,580\) or \(5 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Titie.} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{14}{|l|}{Realignment Services} \\
\hline Professional \& Specialized Services & & & \$2,836,475 & \$2,700,475 & \$136,000 & X & & & & \$2,836,475 & \$2,700,475 & \$136,000 & \(x\) & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Department has consistently underspent for these services by the amounts of \(\$ 102,378 \mathrm{~m} \$ 516,394\), and \(\$ 159,385\) for \(\mathrm{FYs} 16,17\), and 18. \\
The Department currently has \(\$ 2.3\) million in prior years' appropriations for Professional \& Specialized Services that have been encumbered but not spent. Of this total, \(\$ 215,239\) represnts enbracnes for the period piro to 2017.
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Realignment Services} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Attrition Savings & & & \$0 & (\$196, 227) & \$196,227 & X & & & & \$0 & (\$196,227) & \$196,227 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$0 & \((\$ 145,037)\) & \$145,037 & X & & & & \$0 & (\$145,037) & \$145,037 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$341,264} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$341,264} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department does not budget attrition savings in Realignment Services. Overall, over the past three fiscal years the Department has had \(\$ 939,675, \$ 694,256\), and \(\$ 613,952\) in salary savings. Our total recommendations for attrition savings and step adjustments equal \(\$ 613,536\), which is less than the Department's annual average salary savings over this 3 year period.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{14}{|l|}{Realignment Services} \\
\hline Step Adjustment & & & \$0 & (\$164,864) & \$164,864 & X & & & & \$0 & (\$164,864) & \$164,864 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$0 & \((\$ 47,811)\) & \$47,811 & X & & & & \$0 & (\$47,811) & \$47,811 & X & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$212,675} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$212,675} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department does not budget step adjustments in Realignment Services. Over the past three fiscal years, the Department has had \(\$ 939,675, \$ 694,256\), and \(\$ 613,952\) in salary savings. Our total recommendations for attrition savings and step adjustments equal \(\$ 613,536\), which is less than the Department's annual average salary savings over this 3 year period.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Recommendations of the Bu, et and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
ADP - Adult Probation


FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 77,906\) & \(\$ 750,998\) & \(\$ 828,904\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 77,906\) & \(\$ 750,998\) & \(\$ 828,904\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & &
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l|}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 750,998\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 750,998\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \(\$ 750,998\) & \(\$ 750,998\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 41,264,202\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 419,716\) or \(1 \%\) less than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 41,683,918\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 219.65 FTEs, which are 13.28 FTEs less than the 232.93 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(5.7 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 8,596,113\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 226,289\) or \(2.7 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 8,369,824\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 48,824,199\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 7,559,997\) or \(18.3 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \$41,264,202.

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 217.41 FTEs, which are 2.24 FTEs less than the 219.65 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.0 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 8,676,113\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 80,000\) or \(0.93 \%\) more than \(F Y\) 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 8,596,113\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT: JUV - JUVENILE PROBATION

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Juvenile Probation & \(36,815,789\) & \(38,619,911\) & \(42,159,630\) & \(41,866,035\) & \(41,683,918\) & \(\$ 41,264,202\) \\
FTE Count & 236.02 & 238.12 & 240.95 & 238.60 & 232.93 & 219.65
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 4,448,413\) or \(12.1 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count decreased by 16.37 or \(-6.92 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has decreased by \(\$ 419,716\) largely due to the reduction in FTE by -13.28 , as this has reduced base salary and fringe benefits. There has also been a reduction in the Facilities maintenance budget of \(-\$ 421,376\). The effects of these reductions are partially offset by an increase in non-personnel services of \(\$ 500,297\).

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budgets has increased by \(\$ 7,559,997\) largely due to increase in fringe benefits driven by Retirement Non-City (Pers), and dependent coverage, and \(\$ 7,173,306\) in debt service.

\title{
Recommendations of the budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT: JUV - JUVENILE PROBATION

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 159,830\) in FY 2018-19, which are one-time recommendations. These reductions would still allow a decrease of - \(\$ 579,546\) or \(1.39 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst does not have recommendations for FY 2019-20.

\section*{Recommendations of the Buds- and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

\section*{JUV - Juvenile Probation}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 18-19 & & & & & & & 19-20 & & & \\
\hline & FT & & Am & & & & & FT & & & & & & \\
\hline Account Title & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T \\
\hline & Probation & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Attrition Savings & 0.00 & 0.35 & \((1,135,534)\) & \((1,217,500)\) & 81,966 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & 10.60 & 10.25 & \((451,229)\) & \((480,879)\) & 29,650 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & otal Savings & \$111,616 & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & Adjust att Officer an Departme & ion savi 8414 Sp expect & s to account for ialty Deputy Pro o fill these positio & \begin{tabular}{l}
ays in hiring for 85 On Officer that ar \\
by December 201
\end{tabular} & Deputy Prob eing reclassifi
\(\qquad\) & d. & & One tim & sav & & & & & \\
\hline & Juvenile H & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Attrition Savings & 18.60 & 18.25 & (1,499,026.00) & \((1,466,549.40)\) & \$32,477 & x & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (734,281.00) & \((750,018.12)\) & \$15,737 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & otal Savings & \$48,214 & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \\
& \omega \\
& \omega \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Adjust attr being recl & ion savi sified. D & to account for partment expects & ys in hiring for 83 fill these position & \begin{tabular}{l}
Counselor Il \\
December
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { that } \\
& 018
\end{aligned}
\] & & One tim & savi & & & . & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$159,830 & \$0 & \$159,830 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$159,830 & \$0 & \$159,830 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Y 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|cccc|} 
& \multicolumn{4}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 0\) & &
\end{tabular}
\(1 \mathrm{~T}=\) One Time

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 38,956,522\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 2,313,053\) or \(6.3 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 36,643,469\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 187.08 FTEs, which are 8.44 FTEs more than the 178.64 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(4.7 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 877,166\) in FY 2018 -19 are \(\$ 55,659\) or \(6.0 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 932,825\).

YEAR Two: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 39,115,470\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 158,948\) or \(0.4 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 38,956,522\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 184.23 FTEs, which are 2.85 FTEs less than the 187.08 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.5 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 927,166\) in FY \(2019-20\) are \(\$ 50,000\) or \(5.7 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 877,166\).

\title{
ReCommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
PDR - PUBLIC DEFENDER

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Public Defender & \(28,819,705\) & \(30,433,821\) & \(31,961,511\) & \(34,015,988\) & \(36,643,469\) & \(39,115,470\) \\
FTE Count & 157.87 & 157.47 & 162.19 & 170.9 & 178.64 & 187.08
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 10,295,756\) or \(35.7 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 29.21 or \(18.5 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 2,313,053\) largely due to:
The expansion of legal representation and assistance for detained immigrants, continuation of the pre-trial release unit, and addition of paralegal support for the assisted outpatient treatment program.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 158,948\) largely due to:
Increases in salary and fringe costs.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ PDR - PUBLIC DEFENDER
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 253,704\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 253,704\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 176,698\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 77,006\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 2,059,349\) or 5.6\% in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 2,760\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 256,464\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 208,554\) in FY 2019-20. All of the \(\$ 208,554\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the B. \(t\) and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

PDR- Public Defender


Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018－19 and FY 2019－20 Two－Year Budget
PDR－Public Defender


FY 2018－19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One－Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 77,006\) & \(\$ 176,698\) & \(\$ 253,704\) \\
Non－General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & Total & \(\$ 77,006\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 253,704\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{FY 2019－20}

\section*{Total Recommended Reduction}
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One－Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 208,644\) & \(\$ 208,644\) \\
Non－General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 208,644\) & \(\$ 208,644\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 0\) & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{YeAR ONE: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 68,863,546\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 5,722,537\) or \(9.1 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 63,141,009\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 278.44 FTEs, which are 0.30 FTEs more than the 278.14 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.1 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 8,406,593\) in FY 2018-19 are \(\$ 869,877\) or \(9.4 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 9,276,470\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 67,777,797\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 1,085,749\) or \(1.6 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 68,863,546\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 274.41 FTEs, which are 4.03 FTEs less than the 278.44 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.4 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 8,449,339\) in FY \(2019-20\), are \(\$ 42,746\) or \(0.5 \%\) more than \(F Y\) 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 8,406,593\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ DAT- DISTRICT ATTORNEY}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:}
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
District Attorney & \(46,716,897\) & \(48,581,611\) & \(51,844,781\) & \(58,255,036\) & \(62,861,009\) & \(68,863,546\) \\
FTE Count & 253.39 & 256.87 & 267.35 & 273.53 & 278.14 & 278.44
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 22,146,649\) or \(47.4 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 25.05 or \(9.9 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 5,722,537\) largely due to:
Real estate costs related to the Department's move from the Hall of Justice, and salary and benefits increases across the Department.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 1,085,749\) largely due to:
An expiration of one time funding allocated for an upgrade to the Department's case management system and Weekend Rebooking pilot.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ DAT-DISTRICT ATTORNEY
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{Recommendations}

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 419,234\) in FY 2018-19. All of the \(\$ 419,234\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 5,303,303\) or \(8.4 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 11,264\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 430,498\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's has no recommended reductions in FY 2019-20.

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


FY 2018-19
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Recommended Reductions
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$419,234 & \$0 & \$419,234 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$419,234 & \$0 & \$419,234 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{r|rcr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ FY 2019-20 } \\
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 0\) &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 248,086,015\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 16,251,046\) or \(7.0 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 231,834,969\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 1,019.73 FTEs, which are 19.2 FTEs more than the \(1,000.53\) FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(1.92 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 55,972,397\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 208,353\) or \(0.37 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 55,764,044\).

YeAR TWO: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 248,326,390\) budget for \(F Y\) 2019-20 is \(\$ 240,375\) or approximately \(1 / 10^{\text {th }}\) of \(1 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 248,086,015\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 1,021.21 FTEs, which are 1.48 FTEs more than the \(1,019.73\) FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.14 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 55,694,147\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 278,250\) or \(0.5 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 55,972,397\).

\title{
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE Budget \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
SHF-SHERIFF

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{lccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Sheriff & \(179,368,715\) & \(192,594,114\) & \(205,975,205\) & \(221,236,892\) & \(231,834,969\) & \(248,086,015\) \\
& - & & & & & & \\
FTE Count & \(1,013.20\) & \(1,014.92\) & \(1,005.76\) & \(1,056.16\) & \(1,000.53\) & \(1,019.73\)
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 68,717,300\) or \(38.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 6.53 or 0.6\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 16,251,046\) largely due to salary and benefit cost related to the increase in 19.2 FTE, increased budgeted expenditures for CBO services, and increased Capital Renewal Projects.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 240,375\) that represents a negligible change from the prior budget year. Factors reducing the budget include a fall in CBO services, a reduction in Capital Renewal Projects, and a smaller increase in salary costs due to \(0.14 \%\) proposed increase in FTE.

\section*{ReCOMMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 424,621\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 424,621\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 424,621\) are onetime savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 15,826,425\) or \(6.8 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst does not have recommended reductions to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{Recommendations of the B....set and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}


\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


\footnotetext{
\(G=\) General Fund
}

1T = One Time
Budget and Finance Committee, June 21, 2018

\section*{YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 40,434,682\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 667,573\) or \(1.6 \%\) less than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 41,102,255\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 210.08 FTEs, which are 2.66 FTEs more than the 207.42 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a 1.3\% increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 16,461,680\) in FY 2018-19; are \(\$ 644,189\) or \(3.8 \%\) less than \(F Y\) 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 17,105,869\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 40,391,795\) budget for \(F Y 2019-20\) is \(\$ 42,887\) or \(0.1 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 40,434,682\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 209.61 FTEs, which are 0.47 FTEs less than the 210.08 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 0.2\% decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 16,347,276\) in FY 2019-20; are \(\$ 114,404\) or \(0.7 \%\) less than \(F Y\) 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 16,461,680\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ TTX-Treasurer/TAX COLLECTOR}

DEPARTMENT:

SUMmARY OF 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Treasurer/Tax Collector & \(35,085,239\) & \(40,193,704\) & \(39,243,067\) & \(42,206,966\) & \(41,102,255\) & \(40,434,682\) \\
FTE Count & & 211.19 & 225.76 & 218.81 & 218.64 & 207.42
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 5,349 ; 443\) or \(15.2 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 1.11 or 0.5\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has decreased by \(\$ 667,573\) largely due to reductions of \(\$ 2,094,989\) in non-personnel services, particularly a reduction of \(\$ 1,997,756\) in financial services. These savings are partially offset by increases in programmatic projects, salaries, and fringe benefits.

FY 2019-20
The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 42,887\) largely due to reductions in non-personnel services, programmatic projects, and community grants. These savings are partially offset by increases in salaries and fringe benefits.

\title{
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUDGET \& LEGISLATIVE ANALYST \\ For AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ TTX-TREASURER/TAX COLLECTOR
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 389,969\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 389,969\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 25,000\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 364,969\) are one-time savings.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 254,559\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 619,528\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 25,000\) in FY 2019-20. All of the \(\$ 25,000\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & GF & 1 T & Ḟrom & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{TTX Collection} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$657,758) & (\$770,689) & \$112,931 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$274,558) & (\$320,313) & \$45,755 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$158,686} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect ongoing vacancies of 2.0 FTE 4222 Senior Personal Property Auditor positions. Positions have been vacant since 7/1/15.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$657,758) & (\$687,822) & \$30,064 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & (\$274,558) & (\$286,056) & \$11,498 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$41,562} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$ \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 4224 Principal Personal Property Auditor position. Position has been vacant since 7/1/10.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$1,317,374)| & (\$1,333,679) & \$16,305 & X & \(x\) & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \((\$ 562,386)\) & \((\$ 570,156)\) & \$7,770 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$24,075} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 4310 Commercial Division Assistant Supervisor position. Position has been vacant since 9/26/15.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & \((\$ 657,758)\) & (\$691,608) & \$33,850 & X & \(x\) & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$274,558) & (\$291,005) & \$16,447 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 50,297\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect ongoing vacancy of 4321 Cashier !| position. Position has been vacant since 5/14/15.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline Temporary-Miscellaneous & 1.09 & 0.84 & \$109,873 & \$86,708 & \$23,165 & X & & 1.06 & 0.81 & \$109,873 & \$86,708 & \$23,165 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$8,702 & \$6,867 & \$1,835 & X & & & & \$8,702 & \$6,867.00 & \$1,835 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\$ 25,000\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 25,000\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce temporary salaries to reflect historical underspending in this area.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$657,758) & -(\$695,590) & \$37,832 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$274,558) & (\$289,184) & \$14,626 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 52,458\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 1053 IS Business Analyst-Senior position. Position has been vacant since \(6 / 7 / 14\), and RTF has not yet been issued.} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

GF = General Fund
\(1 T=\) One Time

Recommendations of the Buc. and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
TTX-Treasurer/Tax Collector
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & \$0 & \((\$ 9,437)\) & \$9,437 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$0 & \((\$ 4,379)\) & \$4,379 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 13,815\)} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Total Savings} & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 1632 Senior Account Clerk position. RTF was recently approved.} & & & & & & & \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & \$0 & (\$16,305) & \$16,305 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & & (\$7,770) & \$7,770 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$ \(\quad\) 24,075} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 4310 Commercial Division Assistant Supervisor position. Position has been vacant since 2/25/17 and has not been posted.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19

\section*{Total Recommended Reductions}
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 364,969\) & \(\$ 25,000\) & \(\$ 389,969\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 364,969\) & \(\$ 25,000\) & \(\$ 389,969\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & &
\end{tabular}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 25,000\) & \(\$ 25,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 25,000\) & \(\$ 25,000\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Year & Department Code & Fund Code & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Supplier } \\
& \text { No } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Supplier Name & Project Code & Remaining Balance \\
\hline 2015 & 232348 & 10000 & 16585 & Laserlink International Inc & 10001751 & 39.07 \\
\hline 2015 & 232349 & 10000 & 16585 & Laserlink International Inc & 10001751 & 50.02 \\
\hline 2015 & 232351 & 10000 & 16585 & Laserlink International Inc & 10001751 & 478.49 \\
\hline 2016 & 232356 & 10000 & 26268 & ACS - Enterprises Solutions LLC & 10001751 & 1,200.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 232356 & 10000 & 22538 & Columbia Ultimate Inc & 10001751 & 150,558.00 \\
\hline 2015 & \[
232349
\] & 10000 & 19474 & Global Payments Advisors Inc & 10001751 & 97,250.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 232352 & 10000 & 18125 & Iron Mountain Off-Site Data Protection & 10001751 & 1,860.88 \\
\hline 2016 & 232352 & 10000 & 16611 & Languageline Solutions(SM) & 10001750 & 39.96 \\
\hline 2016 & 232344 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001748 & 279.10 \\
\hline 2016 & 232348 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 236.11 \\
\hline 2016 & 232349 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 279.10 \\
\hline 2016 & 232356 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 218.36 \\
\hline 2016 & 232348 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 174.37 \\
\hline 2016 & 232351 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 174.37 \\
\hline 2016 & 232352 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001750 & 174.37 \\
\hline 2016 & 232352 & 10000 & 11040 & Shred Works & 10001751 & 174.37 \\
\hline 2014 & 232348 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 150.00 \\
\hline 2014 & 232351 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 150.00 \\
\hline 2014 & 232352 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 150.00 \\
\hline 2014 & 232356 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 150.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 232348 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 85.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 232348 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 8.16 \\
\hline 2015 & 232344 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001748 & 220.39 \\
\hline 2015 & 232351 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 176.93 \\
\hline 2015 & 232356 & 10000 & 9046 & U S Pure Water Corp & 10001751 & 176.94 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|r|}{Total 254,559} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 64,318,284\) budget for \(F Y 2018-19\) is \(\$ 1,976,325\) or \(3.2 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 62,341,959\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) buidgeted for FY 2018-19 are 103.79 FTEs, which are . 70 FTEs less than the 104.49 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.7 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 27,051,927\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 1,361,758\) or \(4.8 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 28,413,685\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 63,228,554\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 1,089,730\) or \(1.7 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 64,318,284\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 103.43 FTEs, which are 0.36 FTEs less than the 103.79 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.3 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 27,025,222\) in FY \(2019-20\), are \(\$ 26,705\) or \(0.1 \%\) less than \(F Y\) 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 27,051,927\).

Summary of 5-Year historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Economic and Workforce \\
Development
\end{tabular} & \(39,155,612\) & \(36,821,413\) & \(41,022,912\) & \(58,162,818\) & \(62,341,959\) & \(64,318,284\) \\
FTE Count & 85.58 & 91.86 & 97,94 & 105,91 & 104.49 & 103.79
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 25,162,672\) or \(64.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 18.21 or \(21.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 1,976,325\) largely due to increases of \(\$ 8,637,269\) in services of other departments and \(\$ 422,881\) in grant programs. These increases are partially offset by reductions of \(\$ 6,086,330\) in programmatic projects, \(\$ 1,244,889\) in carryforward grants, and \(\$ 244,502\) in non-professional services.

The Board of Supervisors approved a resolution identifying street cleaning as a budget priority for FY 2018-19 and urging the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to identify opportunities for staff retention in street cleaning programs (File 18-0390, Resolution 125-18). The Board of Supervisors also submitted a resolution identifying workforce development and the pipeline to city jobs as a budget priority for FY 2018-19 and urging OEWD to develop a plan for using its existing workforce development infrastructure to develop a pipeline for city employment (File 18-0484, Resolution 150-18).

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \$1,089,730 largely due to reductions of \(\$ 910,186\) in programmatic projects and \(\$ 274,063\) in grant programs.

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 303,799\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 303,799\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 20,000\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 283,799\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 1,672,526\) or \(2.7 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget. In addition, The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends placing \(\$ 787,245\) on Budget and Finance Committee reserve in FY 2018-19.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 333,782\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 637,581\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 20,000\) in FY 2019-20. All \$20,000 of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

\section*{ECN-Economic and Workforce Development}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{ECN Economic and Workforce Dev} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$97,238) & \((\$ 133,058)\) & \$35,820 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \((\$ 39,025)\) & \((\$ 52,656)\) & \$13,631 & . X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$49,451} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrtion Savings to reflect hiring timeline for new 1824 Prinicpal Administrative Analyst position.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & \((\$ 87,718)\) & (\$183,376) & \$95,658 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \((\$ 35,209)\) & \((\$ 68,858)\) & \$33,649 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$129,307} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition Savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 0953 Deputy Director position. Position has been vacant since 10/21/17 (previously as 0941 Manager VI) and has not yet received Mayor approval. Controller's Office report shows that management positions take approximately 6 months to fill.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & \((\$ 62,708)\) & (\$91,363) & \$28,655 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \((\$ 25,125)\) & (\$36,679) & \$11,554 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$40,209} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\$ 0\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition Savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst position. Position has been vacant since \(1 / 10 / 18\) and RTF has not yet been submitted.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition & & & (\$74,732) & (\$119,990) & \$45,258 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & (\$29,913) & (\$49,488) & \$19,575 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings '} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition Savings to reflect hiring timeline for vacant 1842 Management Analyst position. Position has been vacant since \(8 / 28 / 17\) and will take time to fill.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{N/A} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Prof \& Specialized Svcs-Bdgt} & & & \$50,000 & \$30,000 & \$20,000 & X & & & & \$50,000 & \$30,000 & \$20,000 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce funding for Beacon Economics contract by \(\$ 20,000\) to reflect historical underspending in this area.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Recommendations of the Bua. and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
ECN-Economic and Workforce Development
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$283,799 & \$20,000 & \$303,799 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$283,799 & \$20,000 & \$303,799 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 20,000\) & \(\$ 20,000\) \\
& Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 20,000\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Policy/Reserve Recommendations}


FY 2018-19
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 787,245\) & \(\$ 787,245\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 787,245\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & \(\$ 787,245\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{rrrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 1,042,245\) & \(\$ 1,042,245\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 1,042,245\) & \(\$ 1,042,245\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
\(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}\)
\(G F=\) General Fund
\(1 \mathrm{~T}=\) One Time
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Year & Department Code & Fund Code & \begin{tabular}{l}
Supplier \\
No
\end{tabular} & Supplier Name & Project Code & Remaining Balance \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 25444 & Anders \& Anders Foundation & 10022546 & 13,594.74 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 24506 & Beacon Economics LLC & 10022531 & 1,411.34 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 23107 & Century Urban LLC & 10022531 & 120,622.50 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 23054 & Charity Cultural Services Center & 10022546 & 7,656.38 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 20196 & Finalize Office Furniture Service & 10022546 & 1,107.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 18227 & International Effectiveness Centers & 10022546 & 5,000.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 16585 & Laserlink International Inc & 10022531 & 500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 16585 & Laserlink International Inc & 10022546 & 500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 16148 & Local Initiatives Support Corp & 10022531 & 41,500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 15829 & Manpowergroup US Inc & 10022546 & 2,763.21 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 14957 & Mission Economic Development Agency & 10022546 & 25,000.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 14954 & Mission Hiring Hall & 10022546 & 11,282.92 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 14954 & Mission Hiring Hall & 10022546 & 7,576.34 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 14954 & Mission Hiring Hall & 10022546 & 11.20 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 12690 & QB3 Incubator Management LLC & 10022531 & 6,714.98 \\
\hline 2015 & 229991 & 10010 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10022531 & 5,500.16 \\
\hline 2015 & 229991 & 10000 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10001692 & 2,606.61 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10022531 & 738.63 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10022531 & 500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10000 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10001692 & 453.71 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 12182 & Ricoh USA Inc & 10022546 & 500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 10525 & Staples Business Advantage & 10022546 & 4,615.88 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 10294 & Success Center San Francisco & 10022546 & 5,003.19 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 9346 & Top of Broadway Comm Benefit District & 10022531 & 4,500.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8882 & Urban Solutions & 10022531 & 3,447.27 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8882 & Urban Solutions & 10022531 & 23,300.00 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8648 & Vietnamese Youth Development Center & 10022546 & 1,554.05 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8648 & Vietnamese Youth Development Center & 10022546 & 13,321.69 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8648 & Vietnamese Youth Development Center & 10022546 & 8,603.02 \\
\hline 2016 & 229991 & 10010 & 8648 & Vietnamese Youth Development Center & 10022546 & 13,897.16 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|r|}{Total 333,782} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 53,782,681\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 718,680\) or \(1.3 \%\) less than the FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 54,501,361\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 220.85 FTEs, which are 4.00 FTEs more than the 216.85 FTEs in the FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a 1.8\% increase in FTEs from the FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 49,507,257\) in FY 2018-19 are \(\$ 2,410,060\) or \(4.6 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 51,917,317\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 52,786,217\) budget for \(F Y 2019-20\) is \(\$ 996,464\) or \(1.9 \%\) less than the Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 53,782,681\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 220.91 FTEs, which are 0.06 FTEs more than the 220.85 FTEs in the Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a no change in FTEs from the Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 48,639,079\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 868,178\) or \(1.8 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 49,507,257\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ CPC - CITY PLANNING}

DEPARTMENT:

SUMMARY OF 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
City Planning & \(29,981,797\) & \(38,351,612\) & \(41,259,124\) & \(51,284,076\) & \(54,501,361\) & \(53,782,681\) \\
FTE Count & 156.52 & 170.26 & 181.78 & 213.75 & 216.08 & 220.85
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 23,800,884\) or \(79.4 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 64.33 or \(41.1 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. Driven by the economic recovery, this five year increase reflects steady year over year increases in the volume of permit applications and planning cases as well as the revenue associated with that workload volume.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has decreased by \((\$ 718,680)\) due to minor reductions in fees for services and caseload volume. Three of the 4.00 new FTEs in FY 2018-19 are from the transfer of the Office of Short Term Rentals from the Office of the City Administrator to City Planning. The FTE position budgeted at 0.77FTE is new and was added to focus on CPC's increased demand for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) work given the recent changes in ADU legislation.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 996,464\) due to a decrease in one-time project expenditures, partially offset by the cost of moving to a new office.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ CPC-CITY PLANNING}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{Recommendations}

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 356,148\) in FY 2018-19. All of the \(\$ 356,148\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's has no recommended reductions to the FY 2019-20 proposed budget.

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}


Recommendations of the Bu and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Mayor's proposed \(\$ 22,596,699\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 4,621,124\) or \(25.7 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 17,975,575\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 30.54 FTEs, which are 0.26 FTEs more than the 30.28 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.9 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 15,332,785\) in FY \(2018-19\) are \(\$ 8,482,506\) or \(123.8 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 6,850,279\).

\section*{YEAR Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Mayor's proposed \(\$ 25,695,546\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 3,098,847\) or \(13.7 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 22,596,669\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 30.60 FTEs, which are 0.06 FTEs more than the 30.54 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.2 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 18,247,274\) in FY \(2019-20\) are \(\$ 2,914,489\) or \(19.0 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 15,332,785\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ ART-ARTS COMMIISSION}

DEPARTMENT:

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fte authority:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Arts Commission & \(14,150,397\) & \(14,068,845\) & \(15,524,681\) & \(16,173,305\) & \(17,975,575\) & \(22,596,699\) \\
FTE Count & 28.43 & 28.77 & 28.49 & 30.48 & 30.28 & 30.54
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 8,446,302\) or \(59.7 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 2.11 or 7.4\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 4,621,124\) largely due to work on the Treasure Island Arts Master Plan, growth in salary and fringe benefit costs, capital costs, and increases from the assumed passage of the proposed November ballot measure to restore the dedication of a portion of hotel tax to new and existing arts and culture programming.

FY 2019-20
The Mayor's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 3,098,847\) largely due to the assumed passage of the proposed November ballot measure. Beginning in January 2019, hotel tax revenue would increase grant funding for the City's cultural centers, the cultural equity endowment, and a new arts impact endowment, to be guided by a cultural services allocation plan.

\title{
Recomimendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ ART - ARTS COMMISSION
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{Recommendations}

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 33,324\) in FY 2018-19. All of the \(\$ 33,324\) in recommended reductions are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 4,587,800\) or \(25.5 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 2,513\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 35,837\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommends no reductions to the proposed budget in FY 2019-20.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

\section*{ART-Arts Commission}


FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& \multicolumn{1}{l}{ One-Time } & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 33,324\) & \(\$ 33,324\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 33,324\) & \(\$ 33,324\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr|} 
& \multicolumn{1}{c}{ One-Time } & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 27,530,968\) budget for \(\mathrm{FY} 2018-19\) is \(\$ 620,326\) or \(2.3 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 26,910,642\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 70.92 FTEs, which are 1.46 FTEs more than the 69.46 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(2.1 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 18,249,383\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 613,677\) or \(3.5 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 17,635,706\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 30,900,046\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 3,369,078\) or \(12.2 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 27,530,968\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 70.96 FTEs, which are 0.04 FTEs more than the 70.92 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.1 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 21,615,047\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 3,365,664\) or \(18.4 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 18,249,383\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20}

DEPARTMENT:
WAR-War Memorial

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
War Memorial & \(11,934,740\) & \(13,536,389\) & \(24,388,543\) & \(25,621,236\) & \(26,910,642\) & \(27,530,968\) \\
FTE Count & 56.55 & 57.91 & 64.70 & 68.46 & 69.46 & 70.92
\end{tabular}

In FY 2015-16, the Department began budgeting and paying annual debt service for the Veterans Building Seismic Renovation. The Department also funded six positions in FY 2015-16 that were not funded during the 2013-2015 Veterans Building Seismic Renovation.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 620,326\) largely due to:
An increase in salaries and fringes totaling \(\$ 525,157\), the majority of which are due to COLAs and fringe benefit changes, the addition of an 1822 Administrative Analyst, and the start of the Opera House Renewal Project's mansard roof replacement project budgeted in the fiscal year at \(\$ 400,000\).

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 3,369,078\) largely due to:
Completion of the Opera House Mansard roof replacement begun in FY 2018-19 and budgeted at \(\$ 4,200,000\) in FY 2019-20.

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 36,174\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 36,174\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 3,720\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 32,454\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 584,152\) or \(2.2 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 4,970\) in FY 2019-20. Of the \(\$ 4,970\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 3,720\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 1,250\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 3,364,108\) or \(12.2 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 239,378,359\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 25,524,630\) or \(11.9 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 213,853,729\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 54.97 FTEs, which are 1.74 FTEs more than the 53.23 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(3.3 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 198,718,718\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 24,700,796\) or \(14.2 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 174,017,922\).

\section*{YEAR Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 244,534,510\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 5,156,151\) or \(2.2 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 239,378,359\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 54.97 FTEs, which is the same number of FTEs as in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 199,050,629\) in FY \(2019-20\) are \(\$ 331,911\) or \(0.2 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 198,718,718\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ CHF-CHILDREN, YOUTH \& THEIR FAMILIES}

DEPARTMENT:

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Children, Youth \& Their Families & \(145,658,643\) & \(161,975,244\) & \(170,705,287\) & \(192,706,623\) & \(213,853,729\) & \(239,378,359\) \\
FTE Count & 37.42 & 38.20 & 41.86 & 52.19 & 53.23 & 54.97
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 93,719,716\) or \(64.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 17.55 or \(46.9 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

FY 2018-19
The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 25,524,630\) largely due to increases in the Children and Youth Fund and baseline spending requirements for children and transitional aged youth.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 5,156,151\) largely due to additional increases in the Children and Youth Fund and baseline spending requirements for children and transitional aged youth.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ CHF-CHILDREN, YOUTH \& THEIR FAMILIES}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{Recommendations}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 88,017\) in FY 2018-19. All of the \(\$ 88,017\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 25,436,613\) or \(11.9 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 0\) in FY 2019-20. Without reductions the Department's budget will increase of \(\$ 5 ; 156,151\) or 2.2\% in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

\section*{CHF- Children, Youth, and their Families}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Children; Youth \& Families} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Attrition Savings & & & \$0 & \$50,000 & \$50,000 & x & x & & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition savings to more realistically reflect turnover and delays in hiring. Estimated savings are based on FY 2017-18 projected savings per the Controller's Labor Report.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings.} \\
\hline Manager II & 1.00 & 0.91 & \$142,764 & (\$129,915) & \$12,849 & x & x & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$57,420 & ( \(\$ 52,252)\) & \$5,168 & x & x & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 18,017\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce 1.0 FTE 0923 Manager II tö 0.91 FTE due to one month delay in hiring Manager II based on current hiring status. Position has been vacant for over a year, was budgeted at 0.5 FTE for FY2017-18, but went unfilled.} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{One-time savings.}} & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Prof \& Specialized Svcs-Bdgt} & & & \$432,667 & \$412,667 & \$20,000 & x & x & & & & & \$0 & \(x\) & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Professional \& Specialized Services under the Our Children Our Families Authority by \(\$ 20,000\) to reflect the actual need of the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings.} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Recommended Reductions One-Time Ongoing Total
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2019-20 \\
Total Recommended Reductions
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & & & & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{4}{*}{General Fund
Non-General Fund
Total}} & One-Time & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Ongoing Total} & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{General Fund
Non-General Fund
Total}} & \$88,017 & \$0 & \$88,017 & & & & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & \\
\hline & & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & & & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & \\
\hline & & & \$88,017 & \$0 & \$88,017 & & & & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{YEAR ONE: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 2,371,591,858\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 173,410,671\) or \(7.9 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 2,198,181,187\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 6,874.84 FTEs, which are 17.6 FTEs more than the 6,857.24 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.3 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 1,631,449,236\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 148,746,805\) or \(10.0 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 1,482,702,431\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 2,275,361,169\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 96,230,689\) or \(4.1 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 2,371,591,858\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 6,876.41 FTEs, which is 1.57 FTEs more than the 6,874.84 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.02 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 1,521,868,434\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 109,580,802\) or \(6.7 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 1,631,449,236\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 \\ DPH - Department of Public Health}

DEPARTMENT:

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fTE Authority:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Public Health & \(1,908,611,827\) & \(1,984,261,187\) & \(2,033,997,389\) & \(2,058,876,439\) & \(2,198,181,187\) & \(2,371,591,858\) \\
FTE Count & \(6,125.91\) & \(6,284.17\) & \(6,601.99\) & \(6,806.30\) & \(6,857.24\) & \(6,874.84\)
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 462,980,031\) or \(24.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 748.93 or 12.2\% from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 173,410,671\) largely due to changes in citywide salary and fringe benefit costs, one-time capital projects and investments in technology, new investments in chronic disease prevention, and other operational increases at the Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. The proposed budget also includes a one-time \(\$ 56,000,000\) repayment of federal reimbursement for costs associated with the rebuild of Laguna Honda Hospital.

The Department has begun development and implementation of its new Electronic Health Records Project with estimated total implementation and maintenance costs of \$383,312,000 over ten years, including \(\$ 74,796,694\) in FY 2018-19. In November 2017, the Board of Supervisors approved a ten-year contract between the Department and Epic City Government, LLC, the project vendor, of \(\$ 167,387,597\). The project budget and ongoing operating costs will be subject to future Board of Supervisors approval.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 96,230,689\) compared to FY 2018-19 but still includes an increase of \(\$ 77,179,982\) compared to the current year. The decline in FY 2019-20 is largely due to reductions in one-time capital and other non-operating expenditures from the previous fiscal year. Despite the year over year reduction in the proposed budgets, the Department's overall services will either be maintained at the same levels or grow over the course of the two-year budget.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 DPH - Department of Pubuc Health
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{Recommendations}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 3,016,433\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 3,016,433\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 1,651,712\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 1,364,721\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 170,394,238\) or \(7.8 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 1,769,153\) in FY 2019-20. Of the \(\$ 1,769,153\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 1,669,153\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 100,000\) are one-time savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

DPH - Department of Public Health

```

O
GF = General Fund
1T = One Time

```

\section*{Recommendations of the BL . and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

DPH - Department of Public Health
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline 2587 Health Worker III & 0.75 & 0.00 & \$56,620 & \$0 & \$56,620 & \(x\) & & 0.75 & 0.00 & \$56,620 & \$0 & \$56,620 & \(x\) & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$26,273 & 50 & \$26,273 & x & & & & \$26,870 & \$0 & \$26,870 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 82,893\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 83,490\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete 0.75 FTE 2587 Health Worker III position to address long-standing vacancies in the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline 2320 Registered Nurse & 0.09 & 0.00 & \$15,081 & \$0 & \$15,081 & x & & 0.09 & 0.00 & \$15,081 & \$0 & \$15,081 & \(x\) & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$5,379 & \$0 & \$5,379 & \(x\) & & & & \$5,488 & \$0 & \$5,488 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 20,460\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 20,569\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete 0.09 FTE 2320 Registered Nurse position to address long-standing vacancies in the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline 2586 Health Worker II & 0.07 & 0.00 & \$4,831 & \$0 & \$4,831 & x & & 0.07 & 0.00 & \$4,831 & \$0 & \$4,831 & x & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$2,328 & \$0 & \$2,328 & x & & & & \$2,384 & \$0 & \$2,384 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 7,159\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 7,215\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete 0.07 FTE 2586 Health Worker II position to address long-standing vacancies in the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Materials \& Supplies-Budget} & & & \$6,722,649 & \$6,647,649 & \$75,000 & x & & & & \$6,722,649 & \$6,647,649 & \$75,000 & \(\times\) & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the budget allocated for materials and supplies by \(\$ 75,000\) to reflect projected underspending. This reduction still allows for an increase of \(\$ 325,314\) for materials and supplies in Behavioral Health.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Prof \& Specialized Svcs-Bdgt} & & & \$59,481,233 & \$59,131,233 & \$350,000 & \(x\) & & & & \$59,472,209 & \$59,122,209 & \$350,000 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the budget allocated for professional and specialized services by \(\$ 350,000\) to reflect projected underspending. This reduction still allows for an increase of \(\$ 14,503,451\) for materials and supplies in Behavioral Health.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
DPH - Department of Public Health
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{HGH Zuckerberg SF General} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Capital Renewal Projects & & & \$13,300,000 & \$13,100,000 & \$200,000 & x & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the Capital Renewal Project Budget amount for chiller replacement at Zuckerberg SF General Hospital by \(\$ 200,000\) to reflect the estimated costs in FY 2018-. 19.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Equipment Purchase-Budget} & & & & & & & & & & \$1,455,356 & \$1,355,356 & \$100,000 & \(x\) & x \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One time savings} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the equipment purchase budget at Zuckerberg SF General Hospital by \(\$ 100,000\).} \\
\hline 2105 Patient Services Finance & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$69,548 & \$0 & \$69,548 & \(x\) & & 1.00 & & \$69,548. & \$0 & \$69,548 & x & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$33,400 & \$0 & \$33,400 & \(x\) & & 0.00 & & \$34,202 & \$0 & \$34,202 & x & \\
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{-} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 103,750\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete one.vacant 2105 Patient Services Finance Technician to address long-standing vacancies in the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{HLH Laguna Honda Hospital} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Polaris EUV} & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$32,063 & \$0 & \$32,063 & x & \(x\) & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Deny the request for new Polaris EV Li-ion vehicle for gardening staff at Laguna Honda Hospital. Gardening staff has two utility vehicles, which are sufficient to meet existing needs.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{HNS Health Network Services} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Prof \& Specialized Svcs-Bdgt & & & \$13,267,110 & \$13,017,110 & \$250,000 & x & & & & \$13,267,110 & \$13,117,110 & \$150,000 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the budget allocated for professional and specialized services by \(\$ 250,000\) to reflect projected underspending.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
\(\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}\)
\(\mathrm{GF}=\) General Fund
IT = One Time
}

\section*{DPH - Department of Public Health}


Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
DPH - Department of Public Health
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(1 T\)} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline 2587 Health Worker III & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$75,493 & \$0 & \$75,493 & \(x\) & & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$75,493 & \$0 & \$75,493 & x & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$35,030 & \$0 & \$35,030 & \(x\) & & & & \$35,826 & \$0 & \$35,826 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 110,523\)} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Total Savings} & \$111,319 & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete one 2587 Health Worker Ill position to address long standing vacancies in the Department.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 100,000\) & \(\$ 1,669,153\) & \(\$ 1,769,153\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 100,000\) & \(\$ 1,669,153\) & \(\$ 1,769,153\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 968,405,098\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 54,621,841\) or \(6.0 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 913,783,257\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 2,100.68 FTEs, which are 1.32 FTEs more than the 2,099.36 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.06 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 698,110,836\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 26,016,132\) or \(3.9 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 672,094,704\).

\section*{Year Two: fy 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 990,894,608\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 22,489,510\) or \(2.3 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 968,405,098\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 2,097.31 FTEs, which are 3.37 FTEs less than the 2,100.68 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.16 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 704,126,963\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 6,016,127\) or \(0.9 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 698,110,836\).

\author{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ hSA - Human Services Agency
}

DEPARTMENT:

SUMMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
Human Services Agency & \(737,923,441\) & \(835,703,903\) & \(937,931,970\) & \(862,944,407\) & \(913,783,257\) & \(968,405,098\) \\
FTE Count & \(1,855.40\) & \(1,964.41\) & \(2,045.57\) & \(2,067.89\) & \(2,099.366\) & \(2,100.68\)
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 230,481,657\) or \(31.2 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 245 or 13.2\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 54,621,841\) largely due to:
Two major costs account for the majority of the \(6.0 \%\) increase in the FY 2018-19 proposed budget. First, the State of California shifted costs for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program from to the counties by revising the program's maintenance of effort funding requirement. The Department anticipates additional increases in the City's Maintenance of Effort cost share in FY 2018-19 of \(\$ 29.8\) million. Second, there is \(\$ 8.2\) million in additional funding budgeted as the result of increased developer impact fee revenue for child care facilities

Other increases include \(\$ 3\) million in funding for the Dignity Fund, approved in the 2016 general elections, to expand services for seniors, as well as negotiated salaries and benefits.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\mathbf{\$ 2 2 , 4 8 9 , 5 1 0}\) largely due to:
The Department anticipates additional increases in the City's Maintenance of Effort cost share for the IHSS program in FY 2019-20 of \(\$ 26\) million The voter-mandated Dignity Fund allocation of an additional \(\$ 3\) million above FY 2018-19 along with benefits cost increases account for the majority of the increase in the FY 2019-20 proposed budget. These increases are partially offset by \(\$ 5.4\) million a reduction due in projected developer fee revenue for child care facilities and other one-time expenses budgeted only in FY 2018-19.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
HSA - HumAn Services Agency

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 1,701,295\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 1,701,295\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 1,601,295\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 100,000\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 52,920,546\) or \(5.8 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018 -19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 320,026\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 1,132,334\) in FY 2019-20. Of the \(\$ 1,132,334\) in recommended reductions, all are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 21,357,276\) or \(2.2 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}


\section*{Recommendations of the B. .t and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

\section*{HSA - Human Services Agency}


\section*{Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst}

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline TEMPM_E Temporary Miscellaneous & 12.29 & 9.31 & \$1,238,359 & \$938,359 & \$300,000 & x & & 43.94 & 38.62 & \$1,238,359 & \$1,088,359 & \$150,000 & x & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$66,398 & \$34,718 & \$31,680 & x & & & & \$98,078 & \$66,398 & \$31,680 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$331,680} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$181,680} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the salaries budget in General Fund Continuing Projects to reflect historical actual expenditures. Average expenditures in this category over the past four years are at \(\$ 7\) million. However, the proposed FY 2018-19 budget increased this budget to \(\$ 8.8\) million. This reduction leaves the overall salaries in this area with a budget of \(\$ 8.3\) million.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings.} \\
\hline 2913 Program Specialist & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$95,953 & \$0 & \$95,953 & x & & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$95,953 & \$0 & \$95,953 & \(x\) & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$41,152 & \$0 & \$41,152 & x & & & & \$41,959 & \$0 & \$41,959 & x & \\
\hline 1426 Senior Clerk Typist & (1.00) & 1.00 & ( \(\$ 69,333\) ) & \$69,333 & (\$69,333) & x & & (1.00) & 1.00 & (\$69,333) & \$69,333 & ( \(\$ 69,333\) ) & x & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & (\$33,341) & \$33,341 & (\$33,341) & x & & & & (\$34,145) & \$34,145 & (\$34,145) & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$34,431} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 34,434\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Deny the request for an upward substitution of 1.00 FTE 1426 Senior Clerk Typist to 1.00 FTE 2913 Program Specialist. The Department currently has seven vacant positions in this job classification. The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends that the Department fill their existing vacant positions before expanding their staffing resources.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ FY 2018-19 } \\
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 100,000\) & \(\$ 1,242,645\) & \(\$ 1,342,645\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 358,650\) & \(\$ 358,650\) \\
Total & \(\$ 100,000\) & \(\$ 1,601,295\) & \(\$ 1,701,295\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ FY 2019-20 } \\
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 877,138\) & \(\$ 877,138\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 255,196\) & \(\$ 255,196\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 1,132,334\) & \(\$ 1,132,334\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Recommendations of the B. \(t\) and Legislative Analyst} For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget

HSA - Human Services Agency
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Policy/Reserve Recommendations}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Division Description & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Dignity Fund & \begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|r|r|} 
\\
\(\$ 3,000,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 3,000,000\) & x & x \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & & \$6,000,000 & \$0 & \$6,000,000 & \(x\) & \(\times\) \\
\hline & Total Savings \(\$ 3,000,000\) & & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Total Savings \(\$ 6,000,000\)} \\
\hline & Place \(\$ 3,000,0000\) of the appropriation from the Dignity Fund on Budget and Finance Reserve, as the Department still requires Board of Supervisor approval for the service allocation plan for FY 2018-19. The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends that the Department present their proposed budget to the Board of Supervisors prior to accessing these funds. & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{\(\infty\) \(\infty\)}

\section*{FY 2018-19}

Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{} & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ One-Time } & Ongoing \\
General Fund & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & \(\$ 3,000,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 3,000,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 3,000,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 3,000,000\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & & &
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 6,000,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 6,000,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 6,000,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 6,000,000\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & & & \\
& & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{\(\xrightarrow[\rightharpoonup]{\rightharpoonup}\)}

GF = General Fund
\(1 T=\) One Time

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 271,426,796\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 21,042,322\) or \(8.4 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 250,384,474\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 124.43 FTEs, which are 9.76 FTEs more than the 114.67 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents an \(8.5 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 93,245,927\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 8,407,171\) or \(9.9 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 84,838,756\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 271,246,511\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 180,285\) or \(0.1 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 271,426,796\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 125.68 FTEs, which are 1.25 FTEs more than the 124.43 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.0 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 107,160,899\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 13,914,972\) or \(14.9 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 93,245,927\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
HOM - HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

SUMMARY OF 3-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2019-20 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Homelessness and \\
Supportive Housing
\end{tabular} & \(224,153,460\) & \(250,384,474\) & \(271,426,796\) & \(271,246,511\) \\
FTE Count & 108.91 & 114.67 & 124.43 & 125.68
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 47,273,336\) or \(21.1 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 15.52 or \(14.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\mathbf{\$ 2 1 , 0 4 2 , 3 2 2}\) largely due to:
Through Resolution No. 134-18 (File 18-0427), the Board of Supervisors urged the Mayor to prioritize the prevention of homelessness, exits into housing, and increased funding for transitional-aged youth, and individuals with chronic mental illness in the proposed budgets for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20.

The increase in the FY 2018-19 proposed budget is primarily due to investments in homeless services and programs, including opening new navigation centers, expansion of traditional shelters, increasing the supply of Permanent Supportive Housing beds, and new Access Points, which will connect adults, youth and families to services. The FY 2018-19 proposed budget also includes additional staffing resources to support this expansion in services.

In the FY 2018-19 proposed budget, \(\$ 13,437,000\) of the total funding was contingent on the passage of Measure D during the June 2018 elections. San Francisco voters did not approve Measure D. Funding from Measure D was planned to finance a navigation center for transitional-aged youth, 100 new slots for adults to receive rapid rehousing benefits, and an increase in the flexible housing pool budget. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing must now rebalance their budget to account for the absence of Measure D funds.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed budget for FY 2019-20 is a \(0.1 \%\) decrease from the proposed budget for FY 2018-19.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
HOM - HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 425,349\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 425,349\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 61,869\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 363,480\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 20,616,973\) or \(8.23 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 375,000\), and \(\$ 390,225\) on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve, for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 765,225\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 291,697\) in FY 2019-20. Of the \(\$ 291,697\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 61,869\) are ongoing savings and \$229,828 are one-time savings.

\section*{Recommendations of the BL : and Legislative Analyst}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing


Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(1 T\)} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & & 1T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{203645 - HOM Administration} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Rents-Leases-Bldgs\&Struct-Bdgt} & & & & & & & & & & \$4,708,136 & \$4,478,308 & \$229,828 & x & x \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings in FY 2019-20.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce the rent, leases, buildings, and structures budget to reflect projected annual expenditures.} \\
\hline 9993M_Z Attrition Savings & (1.45) & (2.42) & \((\$ 171,242)\) & (\$571,242) & \$60,000 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \((\$ 68,112)\) & (\$91,992) & \$23,880 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$83,880} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings to account for the project \(\$ 1.1\) million in salary savings for FY 2017-18. During FY 2017-18, the Department budgeted an attrition rate of 6.0 percent. The Department decreased their budgeted attrition rate to 3.4 percent for the two upcoming fiscal years despite the projected salary savings in FY 2017-18, addition of 6.16 FTE new positions, and several upward position substitutions. The Department also removed all step adjustments for positions that fall under HOM Administration.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings in FY 2018-19.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Recommendations of the B, \(t\) and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline Account Title & From & To & From & To & & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{15}{|c|}{Recommended Close Out of Prior Year Appropriations} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{203646 - HOM Programs} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & \$390,225 & \$0 & \$390,225 & & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\$ 390,225\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{.}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Board of Supervisors placed \(\$ 390,225\) on Budget and Finance Committee reserve to purchase furniture, fixtures, and equipment for 440 Turk Street that is not needed. Therefore the Budget and Finance Committee should request the Controller to close-out \(\$ 390,225\) and make these funds available to the Board of Supervisors.} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & \$375,000 & \$0 & \$375,000 & x & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 375,000\)} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Request the Controller to close out \(\$ 375,000\) in prior year encumbrances and make these funds available to the Board of Supervisors.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 765,225\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 765,225\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 765,225\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 765,225\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & &
\end{tabular}
```

~ N
1T = One Time

```

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing


FY 2018-19
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$13,437,000 & \$0 & \$13,437,000 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$13,437,000 & \$0 & \$13,437,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 27,162,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 27,162,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & \(\$ 27,162,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 27,162,000\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}
```

\rightharpoonup
1 T = One Time

```

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 16,060,046\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 332,239\) or \(2.1 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 15,727,807\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 76.41 FTEs, which are 0.72 FTEs less than the 77.13 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(0.9 \%\) decrease in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 379,146\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 3,010\) or \(0.8 \%\) less than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 382,156\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 16,106,866\) budget for \(F Y\) 2019-20 is \(\$ 46,820\) or \(0.3 \%\) more than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 16,060,046\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 76.38 FTEs, which are 0.03 FTEs less than the 76.94 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(0.0 \%\) change in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \$379,146 in FY 2019-20 are the same as the FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \$379,146.
```

Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
BOS - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

```

DEPARTMENT:

SUMIMARY OF 5-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& FY 2013-14 & FY 2014-15 & FY 2015-16 & FY 2016-17 & FY 2017-18 & FY 2018-19 \\
& Budget & Budget & Budget & Budget & Budget & Proposed \\
BOS & \(\$ 12,890,477\) & \(\$ 13,485,197\) & \(\$ 14,685,074\) & \(\$ 14,647,983\) & \(\$ 15,727,807\) & \(\$ 16,060,046\) \\
FTE & 79.00 & 79.16 & 79.91 & 79.00 & 77.13 & 76.41
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 3,169,569\) or \(24.6 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count decreased by 2.59 or 3.3\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 332,239\) largely due to procurement of a new Constituent Management System. The Department's proposed budget includes one-time expenses of \(\$ 110,000\) in FY 2018-19 for a contractor to customize and configure the new system, and ongoing expenses of \(\$ 75,000\) per year in licensing fees for the Salesforce product.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has increased by \(\$ 46,820\) largely due to cost of living adjustments.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst
}

FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
BOS - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 53,778\) in FY 2018-19. All of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 278,461\) or \(1.8 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 12,822\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 66,600\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 23,636\) in FY 2019-20. All of the recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 23,184\) or \(0.1 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
BOS - Board of Supervisors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{BOS Supervisors} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Attrition Savings & & & \$0 & \((\$ 26,850)\) & \$26,850 & x & & & & \$0 & \((\$ 9,174)\) & \$9,174 & x & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$0 & (\$10,740) & \$10,740 & x & & & & \$0 & (\$3,670) & \$3,670 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 37,590\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 12,844\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition Savings for expected employee turnover due to elections.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase Attrition Savings for expected vacancies.} \\
\hline Premium Pay & & & \$69,369 & \$54,369 & \$15,000 & x & & & & \$69,369 & \$59,369 & \$10,000 & x & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \$5,494 & \$4,306 & \$1,188 & \(x\) & & & & \$5,494 & \$4,702 & \$792 & \(\times\) & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 16,188\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 10,792\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Premium Pay based on analysis of legislative aide's longevity premium eligibility.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Premium Pay based on analysis of legislative aide's longevity premium eligibility.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{} & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 53,778\) & \(\$ 53,778\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 3,778\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & & \(\$ 53,778\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 23,636\) & \(\$ 23,636\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 23,636\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & \(\$ 23,636\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{Year ONe: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 95,653,856\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 7,803,775\) or \(8.9 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 87,850,081\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 270.41 FTEs, which are 13.19 FTEs more than the 257.22 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(5.1 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 28,084,811\) in FY \(2018-19\) are \(\$ 650,205\) or \(2.4 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 27,434,606\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 92,456,938\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 3,196,918\) or \(3.3 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 95,653,856\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 279.22 FTEs, which are 8:81 FTEs more than the 270.41 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a 3.3\% increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 27,508,428\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 576,383\) or \(2.1 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 28,084,811\).

\section*{Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20}

DEPARTMENT:
DEM - DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

\section*{SUMMARY OF 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and FTE Authority:}
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Department of \\
Emergency Management
\end{tabular} & \(69,492,934\) & \(76,100,127\) & \(82,869,070\) & \(93,693,797\) & \(87,850,081\) & \(95,653,856\) \\
FTE Count & 243.55 & 253.31 & 258.10 & 251.43 & 257.22 & 270.41
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 26,160,922\) or \(37.7 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 26.86 or 11.0\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 7,803,775\) largely due to capital and information technology projects and additional funding for emergency dispatchers to offset dispatcher attrition and to meet increasing service demands. Capital and information technology continuing projects include a multi-year project to replace the City's 800 MHz radio system and a project funding infrastructure improvements to expand the 9-1-1 Operations floor. New projects funded in the proposed FY 2018-19 budget include initiatives to automate fire station dispatching and to scope the replacement of the City's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System. The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget also includes funding for three new dispatcher academies for a total of 45 new recruits, in order to offset dispatcher attrition and meet increasing service demands.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 3,196,918\) largely due to expirations of one-time capital and information technology projects in the proposed FY 2018-19 budget. The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget includes funding for three new dispatcher academies for a total of 45 new recruits, in order to offset dispatcher attrition and meet increasing service demands.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst
}

FOR AMENDMENT OF BUDGET ITEMS
FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
DEPARTMENT:
DEM - DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 405,491\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 405,491\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 52,689\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 352,802\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 7,398,284\) or \(8.4 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 7,038.62\), for total General Fund savings of \(\$ 412,529.62\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 53,732\) in FY 2019-20. All of the \(\$ 53,732\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings.

DEM－Emergency Management


DEM - Emergency Management


\footnotetext{
\(\stackrel{\infty}{-}\)
\(\mathrm{V}_{\text {GF }}=\) General Fund \(1 T=\) One Time
}

REC - Recreation and Parks

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF 1 1T}} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Support of Parks \& Open Space} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition Savings & (5.89) & & (\$435,677) & (\$494,109) & \$58,432 & X & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$204,626) & ( \(\$ 233,842\) ) & \$29,216 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 87,648\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings due to delayed hiring of 2.00 FTE 2708 Custodian positions. The Department currently has 16 vacant custodian positions.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Chevrolet Colorado} & & & \$46,235 & \$0 & \$46,235 & X & X & & & & & \(\$ 0\) & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Delete one replacement Chevrolet Colorado. The vehicle to be replaced, a Ford Ranger, only has 47,747 miles and still has remaining useful life. This deletion would still allow Recreation and Parks to replace another Ford Ranger with a Chevrolet Colorado. The Department currently has 51 Ford Rangers and 17 Chevrolet Colorados.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Park Patrol} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition Savings & (4.33) & & (\$318,653) & ( 5507,132 ) & \$188,479 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$149,827) & (\$244,067) & \$94,240 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad\) S282,719} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings due to delayed hiring of 7.00 FTE 8208 Park Ranger positions. The Department currently has 10 vacant Park Patrol positions.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Support of Recreation} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$1,000,000 & \$966,576 & \$33,424 & X & X & & & \$1,000,000 & \$975,000 & \$25,000 & X & X \\
\hline & Reduce M & erials & upplies to refle & istorical spend & & & & Reduce & Mater & d Supplies to & ct future ne & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Non Professional Services} & & & \$160,000 & \$105,000 | & \$55,000 & X & X & & & \$160,000 & \$129,245 & \$30,755 & x & X \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Non Professiona! Services to reflect historical spending.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Non Professional Services to reflect anticipated need} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition Savings & (9.37) & & (\$687,556) & \((\$ 880,183)\) & \$192,627 & x & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & (\$325,693) & ( \(\$ 422,006\) ) & \$96,313 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 288,940\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings due to delayed hiring of 6.00 FTE 3286 Recreation Coordinator positions. The Department as a whole currently has 29 vacant Recreation Coordinator positions.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{REC - Recreation and Parks}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{17} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{17} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & & & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{CD Administration} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition Savings & (0.10) & & \((\$ 12,292)\) & \((\$ 68,459)\) & \$56,167 & & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & (\$4,792) & (\$32,876) & \$28,084 & & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\$ 84,251\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{So} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings due to delayed hiring of 1.00 FTE 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst position.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One time savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 940,238\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 940,238\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 84,251\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 84,251\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & Total & \(\$ 1,024,489\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & & \(\$ 1,024,489\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 55,755\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 55,755\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 55,755\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 55,755\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{14}{|c|}{Policy Recommendations} \\
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1204 Senior Personnel Clerk} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{CD Administration} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$78,358 & \$0 & \$78,358 & X & 1.00 & 0,00 & \$78,358 & \$0 & \$78,358 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$35,816 & \$0 & \$35,816 & X & & & \$36,609 & 50 & \$36,609 & X & \\
\hline 2708 Custodian & 0.00 & 1.00 & \$0 & \$63,522 & (\$63,522) & X & 0.00 & 1.00 & \$0 & \$63,522 & \((\$ 63,522)\) & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$0 & \$31,748 & (\$31,748) & X & & & \$0 & \$32,557 & (\$32,557) & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Total Savings \$18,904} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 18,888\)} & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Approval of the proposed upward substitution 1.00 FTE 2708 Custodian to 1.00 FTE 1204 Senior Personnel Clerk was done prior to Board approval. Board approval for this upward substitution for the FY 2018-19 budget is a policy matter for the Board. Human Resources currently has 2.00 FTE Personnel Clerk and 2.00 1204 Senior Personnel Clerk. The Department reports that there is a permanent employee currently in the position.} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{On going savings} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Golden Gate Park} & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Ford F250 Extended Cab} & & & \$50,097 & 50 & \$50,097 & \(X\) & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Delete one replacement Ford 250 Extended Cab. The vehicle has only 72,591 miles and still has remaining useful life. This reduction would still allow Recreation and Parks to replace one Ford F250. The Department currently has 99 Ford F250s.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

$$
\stackrel{N}{N}
$$

GF = General Fund

$$
I T=\text { One Time }
$$

```

\section*{For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

REC - Recreation and Parks
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Policy Recommendations
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$0 & \$18,904 & \$0 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$50,097 & \$18,904 & \$69,001 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Total Policy Recommendations} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$0 & \$18,888 & \$ 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{REC - Recreation and Parks}



\section*{REC - Recreation and Parks}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF \({ }^{\text {IT }}\)}} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{CD Administration} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 9993 Attrition Savings & (0.10) & & (\$12,292) & (\$68,459) & \$56,167 & & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Mandatory Fringe Benefits} & & & \((\$ 4,792)\) & ( 532,876\()\) & \$28,084 & & X & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\quad \$ 84,251\)} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\$0} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Increase attrition savings due to delayed hiring of 1.00 FTE 1824 Principal Administrative Analyst position.} & & One tim & sav & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\footnotetext{
\(\underset{N}{N}\)
GF = General Fund
\(1 T=\) One Time
}

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
}

\section*{for Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget}

REC - Recreation and Parks
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Policy Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{1}{l}{} \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 18,904\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \(\$ 50,097\) & \(\$ 18,904\) & \(\$ 69,001\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Total Policy Recommendations}
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & Total & \(\$ 18,888\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ADP - Adult Probation
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & Ta & & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reentry Services} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Step Adjustment & & & \$0 & \((\$ 47,333)\) & \$47,333 & X & & & & \$0 & (\$47,333) & \$47,333 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$0 & \((\$ 13,727)\) & \$13,727 & \(x\) & & & & \$0 & \((\$ 13,727)\) & \$13,727 & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$61,060} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \(\$ 61,060\)} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department does not budget step adjustments in Reentry Services.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Information Management} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$235,000 & \$200,000 & \$35,000 & X & \(\times\) & & & & & & & \\
\hline - & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Department currently has \(\$ 360,000\) in prior years' appropriations for materials and supplies that have been encumbered but not spent.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{HS PA IPO} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline City Grants & & & \$1,435,715 & \$1,392,809 & \$42,906 & X & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department has added \(\$ 1.4\) million for new grants to community based organizations in FY 2018-19, for which not all grantees have been determined.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19


FY 2019-20
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 750,998\) & \(\$ 750,998\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 750,998\) & \(\$ 750,998\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & & & \\
& & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: Fy 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 460,532,499\) budget for FY \(2018-19\) is \(\$ 69,225,596\) or \(17.7 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 391,306,903\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018 -19 are 884.23 FTEs, which are 39.22 FTEs more than the 845.01 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents a \(4.6 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 390,652,811\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 65,089,744\) or \(20.0 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 325,563,067\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 452,753,784\) budget for \(\mathrm{FY} 2019-20\) is \(\$ 7,778,715\) or \(1.7 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 460,532,499\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 895.41 FTEs, which are 11.18 FTEs more than the 884.23 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.3 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 365,794,200\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 24,858,611\) or \(6.4 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 390,652,811\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
ADM- CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Summary of 5-Year Historical \& Proposed Budget Year Expenditures and fte authority:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2013-14 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2014-15 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2015-16 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2016-17 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2017-18 \\
Budget
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
FY 2018-19 \\
Proposed
\end{tabular} \\
\begin{tabular}{c} 
City Administrative \\
Services
\end{tabular} & \(294,559,401\) & \(309,169,005\) & \(372,101,195\) & \(364,813,180\) & \(391,305,903\) & \(460,532,499\) \\
FTE Count & 716.24 & 749.61 & 802.64 & 829.52 & 845.01 & 884.23
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 165,973,098\) or \(56.3 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 167.99 or 23.5\% from the adopted budget in FY 2013-14 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 69,225,596\) largely due to costs related to the Hall of Justice Exit, budget growth in the Digital Services program due to a transfer of staff from the Department of Technology to the City Administrator, and a program promoting the count for 2020 census.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed FY 2019-20 budget has decreased by \(\$ 7,778,715\) largely due to expiration of one-time capital projects budgeted in FY 2018-19.

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20 \\ ADM-CITY ADMINISTRATOR
}

DEPARTMENT:

\section*{RECOMMENDATIONS}

Year One: FY 2018-19
The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 420,713\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 420,713\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 274,059\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 146,654\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 68,804,883\) or \(17.6 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

In addition, we have identified \(\$ 13,334,310\) to be placed on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending detailed cost expenditures for the exit from the Hall of Justice. We have also identified \(\$ 71,991\) in reductions that are policy recommendations for the Committee's consideration.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 229,063\) in FY 2019-20. All the recommended reductions are ongoing. These reductions would still allow a decrease of \(\$ 8,007,778\) or \(1.7 \%\) in the Department's FY 2019-20 budget.

In addition, we have identified \(\$ 8,000,000\) to be placed on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve pending detailed cost expenditures for the exit from the Hall of Justice.

ADM - City Administrator


ADM - City Administrator


\section*{ADM - City Administrator}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1053 IS Business Analyst- \\
Senior
\end{tabular} & 1.00 & 0.00 & \$126,107 & & \$126,107 & X & & & & \$126,107 & & \$126,107 & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$48,754 & & \$48,754 & X & & & & \$49,525 & & \$49,525 & X & \\
\hline 105215 Business Analyst & 0.00 & 1.00 & & \$108,914 & (\$108,914) & X & & & & & \$108,914 & (\$108,914) & X & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & & \$44,655 & \((\$ 44,655)\) & X & & & & & \$45,444 & (\$45,444) & X & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Total Savings} & \$21,292 & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Total Savings \$21,274} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Deny proposed upward substitution of 1.00 FTE 1052 IS Business Analyst to 1.00 FTE 1053 IS Business Analyst-Senior due to inadequate justification. The Department of Technology is transferring Digital Services to ADM in order to "streamline operations." Denying this upward substitution will still result in a net gain of 1.00 FTE IS Business Analyst to this project in FY 2018-19. Digital Services is also adding 5.00 FTE positions in FY 2019-20, including 1.00 FTE IS Business Analyst-Principal.} & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Ongoing savings} \\
\hline 1043 IS Engineer-Senior & 1.00 & 0.86 & \$149,593 & \$128,650 & \$20,943 & \(x\) & x & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline Mandatory Fringe Benefits & & & \$53,990 & \$46,431 & \$7,559 & X & X & & & & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$28,502} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Total Savings \$0} & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Deny interim exception and reduce 1.00 FTE 1043 IS Engineer-Senior to 0.86 FTE to reflect hiring timeline. According to the Mayor, this position is funded through the General Fund.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{FY 2018-19}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Recommended Reductions
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$146,654 & \$45,682 & \$192,336 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$228,377 & \$228,377 \\
\hline Total & \$146,654 & \$274,059 & \$420,713 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{FY 2019-20}

Total Recommended Reductions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$0 & \$45,996 & \$45,996 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$183,067 & \$183,067 \\
\hline Total & \$0 & \$229,063 & \$229,063 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ADM - City Administrator
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1T \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ADM - City Administrator
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From. & To & Savings & GF & 17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Reserve Recommendations}


\section*{FY 2018-19}

Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{rrrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 13,334,310\) & \(\$ 71,991\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
& Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 13,334,310\) \\
& & \(\$ 71,991\) & \(\$ 13,406,301\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & &
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & \(\$ 8,000,000\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 1,399,223,023\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 136,043,833\) or \(10.8 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 1,263,179,190\).

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 4,868,235,185\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 356,118,824\) or \(7.9 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 4,512,116,361\).

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 1,280,878,196\) budget for FY 2019-20 is \(\$ 118,344,827\) or \(8.5 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 1,399,223,023\).

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 4,844,887,294\) in FY 2019-20 are \(\$ 23,347,891\) or \(0.5 \%\) less than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 4,868,235,185\).

\section*{Recommendations}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 200,000\) in FY 2018-19. All of the \(\$ 200,000\) in recommended reductions are ongoing savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 135,843,833\) or \(10.8 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 budget.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst has also noted that reprogramming of \$250,000 allocated in FY 2018-19 for participatory budgeting in District 8 is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.

Year Two: FY 2019-20
The Budget and Legislative Analyst has noted that reprogramming of \$250,000 allocated in FY 2019-20 for participatory budgeting in District 8 is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.

\title{
Recommendations of the \(\quad\) et and Legislative Analyst
}

REVISE \(\quad\) 20/18
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF \({ }^{\text {IT }}\)}} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 17 & From & To & & From & To & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{GEN General City- Unallocated} & \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Judgements-Claims & & & \$3,100,000 & \$3,000,000 & \$100,000 & \(\times\) & \(\times\) & & & & \$3,100,000 & \$3,100,000 & & \$0 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Judgements-Claims to reflect actual need in the City's reserve for judgements and claims.} & \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{One-time savings} \\
\hline Reserve for Litigation & & & \$11,000,000 & \$10,900,000 & \$100,000 & \(\times\) & x & & & & 11,000,000 & \$11,000,000 & & \$0 & x & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Reduce Reserve for Litigation to reflect actual need in the City's litigation reserve.} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Orıe-time savings} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018-19 \\
Total Recommended Reductions
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{FY 2019-20
Total Recommended Reductions} \\
\hline & One-Time & Ongaing & Total & & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$200,000 & \$0 & \$200,000 & General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$200,000 & \$0 & \$200,000 & Total & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Recommendations of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
GEN- General City Responsibility
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1 T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & 1 T & From & To & From & To & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Policy Recomrriendations} & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & & & & \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & Savings & GF & \(1 T\) & From & T0 & From & To & Savings & & GF & 1T \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{GEN General City- Unallocated} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Programmatic ProjectsBudget & & & \$250,000 & & \$250,000 & \(x\) & x & & & \$250,000 & \$250,000 & & \$0 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The proposed budget includes \(\$ 250,000\) for participatory budgeting in District 8 . Reprogramming these funds is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{One-time savings.} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Policy Recommendations } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } General Fund & \(\$ 250,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 250,000\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & Total & \(\$ 250,000\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 250,000\) \\
\cline { 2 - 5 } & & & &
\end{tabular}
\(1 T\) = One Time
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & & & FTE & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(1 T\)} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & GF & 1 T & From Ta & From & To & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Various} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$273,506 & \$256,506 & \$17,000 & X & x & & & & & & \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$47,620 & \$40,000 & \$7,620 & x & x & & & & & & \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$1,023,126 & \$1,003,126 & \$20,000 & & x & & & & & & \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$501,481 & \$451,481 & \$50,000 & & X & & & & & & \\
\hline Materials and Supplies & & & \$3,269,501 & \$3,200,000 & \$69,501 & & x & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department has \(\$ 2.5\) million in prior years' appropriations that were encumbered for materials and supplies but not yet spent; of the \(\$ 2.5\) million, \(\$ 220,000\) was encumbered more than two years ago. Of the \(\$ 2.5\) million in prior years' encumbrances, \(\$ 500,000\) is for miscellaneous office and building supplies. The Department's total materials and supplies budget in FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 5.4\) million; our recommended reduction of \(\$ 164,121\) will still give the Department \(\$ 5.26\). million for materials and supplies.} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{One time savings} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Various} & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Maint Servcies - Bldgs \&improvement & & & \$170,219 & \$167,719 & \$2,500 & X & X & & & & & & \\
\hline Copy Machine & & & \$52,999 & \$47,999 & \$5,000 & x & x & & & & & & \\
\hline Other Current Expenses - Budget & & & \$225,259 & \$220,259 & \$5,000 & \(x\) & X & & & & & & \\
\hline Membership & & & \$8,000 & \$0 & \$8,000 & x & x & & & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Software Licensing Fees} & & & \$126,293 & \$121,293 & \$5,000 & X & x & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Department has \(\$ 535,648\) in prior years' appropriations that have not yet been spent; of this amount, \(\$ 124,013\) was encumbered more than two years ago. The Department's budget in FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 595,400\) for the services noted above; our recommended reductions of \(\$ 25,500\) will still leave the Department with \(\$ 569,000\) for these specific services. (The Department's total budget for nonpersonnel services is \(\$ 12.9\) million).} & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{One time savings} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{Year One: Fy 2018-19}

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 271,426,796\) budget for FY 2018-19 is \(\$ 21,042,322\) or \(8.4 \%\) more than the original FY 2017-18 budget of \(\$ 250,384,474\).

\section*{Personnel Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2018-19 are 124.43 FTEs, which are 9.76 FTEs more than the 114.67 FTEs in the original FY 2017-18 budget. This represents an \(8.5 \%\) increase in FTEs from the original FY 2017-18 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 93,245,927\) in FY 2018-19, are \(\$ 8,407,171\) or \(9.9 \%\) more than FY 2017-18 revenues of \(\$ 84,838,756\).

Year Two: FY 2019-20

\section*{Budget Changes}

The Department's proposed \(\$ 271,246,511\) budget for FY \(2019-20\) is \(\$ 180,285\) or \(0.1 \%\) less than the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget of \(\$ 271,426,796\).

\section*{Personnei Changes}

The number of full-time equivalent positions (FTE) budgeted for FY 2019-20 are 125.68 FTES, which are 1.25 FTEs more than the 124.43 FTEs in the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget. This represents a \(1.0 \%\) increase in FTEs from the Mayor's proposed FY 2018-19 budget.

\section*{Revenue Changes}

The Department's revenues of \(\$ 107,160,899\) in FY 2019-20, are \(\$ 13,914,972\) or \(14.9 \%\) more than FY 2018-19 estimated revenues of \(\$ 93,245,927\).

\title{
Recommendations of the Budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget Items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
HOM - HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
SUMMARY OF 3-YEAR HISTORICAL \& PROPOSED & BUDGET YEAR EXPENDITURES AND FTE AUTHORITY:
\end{tabular}

The Department's budget increased by \(\$ 47,273,336\) or \(21.1 \%\) from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19. The Department's FTE count increased by 15.52 or 14.3\% from the adopted budget in FY 2016-17 to the proposed budget in FY 2018-19.

\section*{FY 2018-19}

The Department's proposed FY 2018-19 budget has increased by \(\$ 21,042,322\) largely due to:
Through Resolution No. 134-18 (File 18-0427), the Board of Supervisors urged the Mayor to prioritize the prevention of homelessness, exits into housing, and increased funding for transitional-aged youth, and individuals with chronic mental illness in the proposed budgets for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20.

The increase in the FY 2018-19 proposed budget is primarily due to investments in homeless services and programs, including opening new navigation centers, expansion of traditional shelters, increasing the supply of Permanent Supportive Housing beds, and new Access Points, which will connect adults, youth and families to services. The FY 2018-19 proposed budget also includes additional staffing resources to support this expansion in services.

In the FY 2018-19 proposed budget, \(\$ 13,437,000\) of the total funding was contingent on the passage of Measure D during the June 2018 elections. San Francisco voters did not approve Measure D. Funding from Measure \(D\) was planned to finance a navigation center for transitional-aged youth, 100 new slots for adults to receive rapid rehousing benefits, and an increase in the flexible housing pool budget. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing must now rebalance their budget to account for the absence of Measure D funds.

\section*{FY 2019-20}

The Department's proposed budget for FY 2019-20 is a \(0.1 \%\) decrease from the proposed budget for FY 2018-19.

\title{
Recommendations of the budget \& Legislative Analyst \\ For Amendment of Budget items \\ FY 2018-19 AND FY 2019-20
}

DEPARTMENT:
HOM - HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

\section*{Recommendations}

\section*{Year One: FY 2018-19}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions total \(\$ 1,190,574\), including reductions to the proposed FY 2018-19 budget as well as closing out unexpended encumbrances and funds on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \(\$ 425,349\) in FY 2018-19. Of the \(\$ 425,349\) in recommended reductions, \(\$ 61,869\) are ongoing savings and \(\$ 363,480\) are one-time savings. These reductions would still allow an increase of \(\$ 20,616,973\) or \(8.23 \%\) in the Department's FY 2018-19 proposed budget.

In addition, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends closing out prior year unexpended encumbrances of \(\$ 375,000\), and \(\$ 390,225\) on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve, for additional General Fund savings of \(\$ 765,225\).

The Budget and Legislative Analyst also recommends that \(\$ 13,437,000\) of the FY 2018-19 proposed budget be put on Budget and Finance Committee Reserve, as this funding was contingent on the passage of Measure D of the June 2018 elections, which was not approved by San Francisco voters. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing must now rebalance their budget to account for the absence of Measure \(D\) funds.

\section*{Year Two: FY 2019-20}

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's recommended reductions to the proposed budget total \$291,697 in FY 2019-20. Of the \$291,697 in recommended reductions, \$61,869 are ongoing savings and \(\$ 229,828\) are one-time savings.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst also recommends that \(\$ 27,162,000\) of the FY 2019-20 proposed budget be put on Budget and Finance Reserve, as this funding was contingent on the passage of Measure D of the June 2018 elections, which was not approved by San Francisco voters.

\section*{HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing}


Recommendations of the , et and Legislative Analyst
For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing


FY 2018-19
Total Recommended Redúctions
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\hline General Fund & \$363,480 & \$61,869 & \$425,349 \\
\hline Non-General Fund & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 \\
\hline Total & \$363,480 & \$61,869 & \$425,349 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Total Recommended Reductions } \\
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 229,828\) & \(\$ 61,869\) & \(\$ 291,697\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \(\$ 229,828\) & \(\$ 61,869\) & \(\$ 291,697\) \\
\hline & & & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}

For Amendment of Budget Items in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget
HOM - Homelessness and Supportive Housing
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Account Title} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{FTE} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Amount} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Savings} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{GF} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1T} \\
\hline & From & To & From & To & & & 17 & From & To & From & To & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{15}{|c|}{Recommended Close Out of Prior Year Appropriations} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{203646 - HOM Programs} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & \$390,225 & \$0 & \$390,225 & & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$390,225} & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{The Board of Supervisors placed \(\$ 390,225\) on Budget and Finance Committee reserve to purchase furniture, fixtures, and equipment for 440 Turk Street that is not needed. Therefore the Budget and Finance Committee should request the Controller to close-out \(\$ 390,225\) and make these funds available to the Board of Supervisors.} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & \$375,000 & \$0 & \$375,000 & \(\times\) & x & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Total Savings \$375,000} & & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Request the Controller to close out \(\$ 375,000\) in prior year encumbrances and make these funds available to the Board of Supervisors.} & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

FY 2018-19
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Total } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 765,225\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 765,225\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \(\$ 765,225\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 765,225\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & \(\$ 765\)
\end{tabular}

FY 2019-20
Total Policy/Reserve Recommendations
\begin{tabular}{r|rrr|} 
& One-Time & Ongoing & Total \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
Non-General Fund & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\hline Total & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) & \(\$ 0\) \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & & &
\end{tabular}

For Amendment of Budget ltems in the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Two-Year Budget


Mark Farrell MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors \(\qquad\)
From: Kelly Kirkpatrick, Acting Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1,2018
Re: Mayor's FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Budget Submission

\section*{Madam Clerk,}

In accordance with City and County of San Francisco Charter, Article IX, Section 9.100, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the Mayor's proposed budget by June \(1^{\text {st }}\), corresponding legislation, and related materials for Fiscal Year 2018-19 and Fiscal Year 2019-20.

In addition to the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, Annual Salary Ordinance, and Mayor's Proposed FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Budget Book, the following items are included in the Mayor's submission:
- The budget for the Treasure Island Development Authority for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20
- The budget for the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure for FY 2018-19
- 15 separate pieces of legislation (see list attached)
- A Transfer of Function letter detailing the transfer of positions from one City department to another. See letter for more details.
- An Interim Exception letter
- A memo highlighting technical adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed May 1st Budget
- A letter addressing funding levels for consumer price index increases for nonprofit corporations or public entities for the coming two fiscal years

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 554-6125.


Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Harvey Rose
Controller
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline DEPT & Budget \& Finance Committee Calendar Date & Description or Title of Legislation & Type of Legislation \\
\hline ADM & 14-Jun & Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Celling & Ordinance \\
\hline CON & 14-Jun & Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2018 & Resolution \\
\hline CON & 14-Jun & Proposition J Contract Certification Specified Contracted-Out Services Previously Approved & Resolution \\
\hline REC & 14-Jun & Park Code - Tennis Center Fees & Ordinance \\
\hline REC & 14-Jun & Park Code - Golf Course Fees & Ordinance \\
\hline CPC & 15-Jun & Administrative Code - Planning Code Enforcement Fund & Ordinance \\
\hline CPC & 15-Jun & Planning Code - Fees for Certain Permits and Transportation Analysis & Ordinance \\
\hline DAT & 15-Jun & Administrative Code - Cash Revolving Fund for District Attorney's Office & Ordinance \\
\hline DAT & 15-Jun & Accept and Expend Grant - California Victim Compensation Board Compensation for Crime Victims - \(\$ 2,164,014\) & Resolution \\
\hline DPH & 15-Jun & Health Code - Patient Rates 2017-2020 & Ordinance \\
\hline DPH & 15-Jun & California Mental Health Services Authority - Participation Agreement Presumptive Transfer & Resolution \\
\hline DPH & 15-Jun & Accept and Expend Grants- Recurring State Grant Funds - Department of Public Health- FY2018-2019 & Resolution \\
\hline HOM & 15-Jun & Administrative Code - Mayor's Fund for the Homeless and Navigation Partnerships Fund & Ordinance \\
\hline HOM & 15-Jun & Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund - FYs 2018-2019 and 20192020 Expenditure Plans & Resolution \\
\hline POL & 12-Jul & De-Appropriation and Re-Appropriation - Expenditures of \(\$ 6,174,381\) Supporting Increased Workers' Compensation Expenditures - Police Department - FY 2017-2018 & Ordinance \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Kelly Kirkpatrick, Acting Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2018
Re: Notice of Transfer of Functions under Charter Section 4.132
This memorandum constitutes notice to the Board of Supervisors under Charter Section 4.132 of transfers of functions between departments within the Executive Branch. All positions are regular positions unless otherwise specified. The positions include the following:
- Fourteen positions (1.0 FTE 0941 Manager VI, 2.0 FTE 1044 IS Engineer - Principal, 3.0 FTE 1043 IS Engineer - Senior, 1.0 FTE 1054 IS Business Analyst - Principal, 1.0 FTE 1042 IS Engineer - Journey, 1.0 FTE 1064 IS Programmer Analyst - Principal, 2.0 FTE 1053 IS Büsiness Analyst - Senior, 1.0 FTE 1063 IS Programmer Analyst - Senior, 2.0 FTE 1052 IS Business Analyst) to be transferred from the Department of Technology (DT) to the City Administrator's (ADM) Digital Services Program. Currently, the Digital Services team is made up of both DT and ADM employees under ADM management. The program's consolidation within ADM will streamline efforts to improve the City's online service delivery.
- Eight positions (1.0 FTE 0941 Manager VI, 1.0 FTE 1043 IS Engineer - Senior, 1.0 FTE 1053 IS Business Analyst - Senior, 3.0 FTE 1054 IS Business Analyst - Principal, 1.0 FTE 1064 IS Programmer Analyst - Principal, and 1.0 FTE 1070 IS Project Director) to be transferred from the City Administrator's (ADM) JUSTIS program to the Department of Technology (DT). Currently, the JUSTIS program provides technical resources to integrate department case management systems and provide centralized maintenance and hosting to the JUSTIS Governance Council agencies. These technical functions will move to DT while the City Administrator continues to serve as Chair of the JUSTIS Governance Council.
- Three positions (1.0 FTE 0923 Manager II and 2.0 FTE 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst) to be transferred from the City Administrator's (ADM) Office of Short-Term Rentals to City Planning (CPC). Currently, the Office of Short-Term Rentals team-is made up of both CPC and ADM employees under ADM management. The program's consolidation with City Planning will place both policy and enforcement activities in the same department.
- One position (1.0 FTE 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst) will transfer from the Human Services Agency (HSA) to the Department of Technology (DT) in order to centralize the Open Data team positions within DT.
- Twoo positions (1.0 FTE 1632 Senior Account Clerk and 1.0 FTE 2905 Senior Eligibility Worker) to be transferred from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). These positions relate to the federal HOPWA (Housing Opportunities for People with

\footnotetext{
1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett pláce, Room 200
San Francisco, California 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141
}

AIDS) program. The positions are moving into MOHCD because MOHCD manages the HOPWA Federal grant program for the City, and the positions are HOPWA-funded.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact my office.
Sincerely,


Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee Harvey Rose Controller

Office of the Mayor San Francisco

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Kelly Kirkpatrick, Acting Mayor's Budget Director
Date: June 1, 2018
Re: Interim Exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance
I herein present exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO) for consideration by the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors. The City's standard practice is to budget new positions beginning in pay period 7 , at 0.77 FTE. Where there is justification for expedited hiring, however, the Board may authorize exceptions to the Interim ASO, which allow new positions to be filled in the first quarter of the fiscal year, prior to final adoption of the budget.

Exceptions are being requested for the following positions:

\section*{General Fund Positions (49.0 FTE)}
- City Administrator (9.0 FTE)

0922 Manager I (1.0 FTE): This position is off budget and funded by the Committee on Information Technology to lead the Digital Equity program. This would be a continuation of an expiring project-based position. This position will continue to serve as the central coordinator for City agencies and non-profits to close the digital divide by improving access and digital skills.

2992 Contract Compliance Officer I (2.0 FTE): These positions at the Contract Monitoring Division are funded by a work order from the Airport and will provide contract compliance services for critical capital projects currently underway at the Airport. Any delays in hiring these staff will result in delays to the capital projects at the Airport, resulting in further financial and operational losses.

1042 IS Engineer-Journey (1.0 FTE); 1043 IS Engineer-Senior (2.0 FTE); 1053 IS Business Analyst-Senior (1.0 FTE); 1054 IS Business Analyst-Principal (1.0 FTE): These positions in the Digital Services program are funded by a work order from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to develop the DAHLIA affordable housing portal. The work order was established mid-year during FY 2017-18 and the positions are currently being filled. Once filled, these hires will replace contractors currently developing the necessary functionalities of DAHLIA.

1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (1.0 FTE): This position at the Office of Citizen Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) will do community outreach ahead of the 2020 Census, ensuring an accurate census count and the financial resources and legislative representation that come with an accurate census count. It is critical this position be filled at the beginning of the fiscal year in order to ensure adequate time for planning and outreach ahead of the 2020 Census.
- Adult Probation (6.0 FTE)

8529 Probation Assistant (1.0 FTE): This Probation Assistant was hired using temporary salary funds in the current year to relieve the Pretrial Diversion Project of some of its restitution-related duties. This interim exception represents the continuation of these crucial duties.

8434 Supervising Deputy Probation Officer (1.0 FTE) and 8530 Deputy Probation Officer (4.0 FTE): These five Probation Officers are being added to the budget in order to comply with new duties of the department since the passage of Prop 63, which requires Probation to actively investigate firearms possession among of subset of convicted individuals. The new law went into effect in January of 2018, and these Officers were hired in the spring; thus, an interim exception is necessary as to avoid interruption of these state-mandated services.
- Assessor-Recorder (1.0 FTE)

0933 Manager 5 (1.0 FTE): The replacement of the Property Assessment system is a major IT project that has been funded by the Committee of Information Technology (COIT). In order to negotiate a scope of work and project schedule with the selected Property Assessment vendor, the department needed to hire a Project Director to avoid project delays. The department used temporary salary funds to fill the position, and plans to make the position PEX in July 2018. In the coming months, the Project Director will also be responsible for hiring and on-boarding all project staff in order to kick off the project in October 2018, once the system integrator and software contract has been fully executed.
- Controller (6.0 FTE)

1052 IS Business Analyst (1.00 FTE); 1053 Senior IS Business Analyst (1.00 FTE); 1054 Principal IS Business Analyst (1.00 FTE); 1823 Senior Administrative Analyst (2.00 FTE); 1825 Principal Administrative Analyst II (1.00 FTE): These positions represent a continuation of the Strategic Sourcing team that manages the City's new Financial System and which is being made part of the Controller's Systems Division. These positions support procurement and work with the Office of Contract Administration, and will also support new modules in the financial system. These positions are proposed as limited term and these functions are currently staffed with members of the \(\mathrm{F} \$ \mathrm{P}\) project team on expiring project positions.
- District Attorney (4.0 FTE)

8132 District Attorney's Investigative Assist (1.0 FTE); 8133 Victim/Witness Investigator III (1.0 FTE); 8177 Attorney, Civil/Criminal (1.0 FTE); 8182 Head Attorney, Civil And Criminal (1.0 FTE): These positions support the continuation of the District Attorney's jail diversion pilot started in FY17-18, extending Weekend Rebooking for one more year as the Controller's Office collects more data on the pilot's effectiveness. These roles are currently performed by staff on expiring requisitions.
- Public Health (10.0 FTE)

2230 Physician Specialist (1.5 FTE); 2320 Registered Nurse (1.5 FTE); 2409 Pharmacy Technician ( 0.5 FTE); 2454 Clinical Pharmacist (1.0 FTE); 2586 Health Worker II ( 3.0 FTE); 2589 Health Program Coordinator I (1.0 FTE); 2930 Psychiatric Social Worker (1.5 FTE): These positions support the continuation and expansion of the buprenorphine pilot program at the Department of Public Health.
- Fire Department (2.0 FTE)

H004 Inspector, Bureau of Fire Prevention \& Public Safety (1.0 FTE) and H022 Lieutenant, Bureau of Fire Prevention \& Public Safety ( 1.0 FTE ). These off budget positions are funded through a work order with MTA for MUNI and currently filled as temporary requisitions.
- Human Resources (1.0 FTE)

8141 Workers Compensation Adjuster (1.0 FTE): This position supports workers compensation claims for the Recreation and Parks Department. This position is being brought in house, previously it was performed by a consultant. The transition is happening in June 2018, so the position will be filled as a temporary requisition in the current year.
- Public Defender ( 10.0 FIE)

8142 Public Defender's Investigator (3.0 FTE); 8177 Attorney, Civil/Criminal (5.0 FTE); 8446 Court Alternative Specialist I ( 2.0 FTE ): Three of these positions ( 2 Investigators and 1 Attorney) support the continuation of the Public Defender's jail diversion pilot started in FY17-18, extending the Pretrial Release Unit for one more year as the Controller's Office collects more data on the pilot's effectiveness. The other 7 positions represent the FY17-18 mid-year supplemental of 7 additional positions to the Immigration Defense unit, including 1 Investigator, 4 Attorneys, and 2 Court Alternative Specialists.

\section*{Non-General Fund Positions (2.5 FTE)}
- City Administrator (2.0 FTE)

0933 Manager V (1.0 FTE): This position at the Real Estate Division will oversee the reorganization of the City's permitting functions at the new one-stop permit center to be located in the new City office building at 49 South Van Ness. Position needs to be filled at the beginning of the fiscal year to ensure adequate time for planning and design of permit function process integration ahead of opening of the facility.

1404 Clerk (1.0 FTE): This position at Repro Mail is funded by a work order from PUC and will handle significantly increased PUC mailings for the expansion of CleanPowerSF needed in the beginning of the fiscal year. Prompt hiring is imperative to ensure comprehensive communication to CleanPowerSF enrollees.
- Port (0.5 FTE)

7327 Apprentice Maintenance Machinist 1 ( 0.5 FTE): This position completes the second year of a two year apprenticeship program. The role is currently filled and is required to convert to a new PEX requisition per a labor agreement.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the requested interim exceptions to the Annual Salary Ordinance.


Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose
Controller


Mark Farrell
MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Kelly Kirkpatrick, Acting Mayor's Budget Director
Date: Jane 1, 2018
Re: Minimum Compensation Ordinance and the Mayor's FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20
Proposed Budget

\section*{Madam.Clerk,}

Pursuant to Proposition J, the Minimum Wage Ordinance, passed by the voters of San Francisco in November 2014, the minimum wage effective July 1, 2018 will exceed the value of minimum compensation as defined in San Francisco Administrative Code, SEC 12P.3. This letter provides notice to the Board of Supervisors that the Mayor's Proposed Budget for Fiscal Years (FY) 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 contains funding to support minimum wage for nonprofit corporations and public entities in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. Therefore, the FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 budget contains funding to support the minimum compensation at the level of the minimum wage for nonprofit corporations and public entities.

If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,



Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Harvey Rose
Controller

Mark Farrell
MAYOR

June 1, 2018
Supervisor Malia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, 1 Dr, Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

\section*{Re: Technical adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed May 1 Budget}

\section*{Dear Chair Cohen,}

Per Charter Section 9.101, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the following technical adjustments to the Mayor's Proposed May 1 Budget for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20. The May 1 budget is now part of the June 1 Mayor's proposed budget, however, since the Board of Supervisors has already reviewed these budgets, attached is a summary of the changes to these departments since the May 1 submission.

These adjustments include:
- Changes to salary and beneefitis, specifically changes to health and dental rates;
- Changes to citywide work orders;
- Balanicing entries and transfers;
- Changes to revenues and subsequent baselines;
- Changes related to departmental capital budgets; and,
- Oṭher small miscellaneous expenditure changes.

Please contact me at 554-6125 with any questions or concerns.
Sincerely,


Kelly Kirkpatrick
Acting Mayor's Budget Director
cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose
Controller


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GFSType & [Dept & Dept Division & Dept Section & Deptili & Fund & Projectip & Activitipl & Authority IT & Accoumtiol & Atrount tile & FF.i18.18 Start & FY18-19 End. & Fr 18-19 Change & FY 19020.5 trit & FY/13-20.End & Fr 19-20 Chanze & Notes \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA: & 103745 & 189644 & 207819 & 22870 & 20001725 & : 1 & 10000 & 520190 & bepartment Overhead & 4,108,336. & 4;324,357 & 14.079. & 4;27.6,003. & 4;452,539 & 15,138; & Balancinix.entrles:and transfers \\
\hline Self Suppioting. & MTA. & 103745 & 180654 & 207813 & 22870 & 10001725 & & 10000 & 545990 & Other Sitegi. Expenses. & 2,6510. & 1,242 & (368) & 1,610 & 12,228 & (382) & Bazaing entries and trinifers \\
\hline Self Supportlige & MTA & 203745 & 180644 & 207813 & 22870 & 10001725 & - 1 & 20000 & 581230 & GF-Con-litermal Audits & 78,498 & 87,946 & 368. & 74,167 & 92,291 & 382, & Changestactivyide Workordets, \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 10373 & 103759 & 103760 & 22265 & 10001739 & 23. & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service.City Mistch. & 45,073. & 52,37 & (48) & 48,044 & 55,886 & (1200) & Changesto Health and Dennal Rates \\
\hline Self Supportine & MTA & 103773 & 103759 & 103750 & 22265 & 10001719 & 23 & 10000 & 515710 & Depeindent Coverife & 118,505 & 138,423 & (130) & 126,302 & 147,688 & (274) 0 & Chinges to Hieath and Dental fates \\
\hline Self Supporting & mia & 103773 & 103759 & 103760 & 22265 & 10001719. & 23 & 100000 & 515010 & Dintal Coverase & 15,986 & 18,667 & 173 & 15,914] & 18,667 & (125) & Chinges to Healich ind Dentral Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 103773 & 103759 & 138710 & 22305 & 10001719 & 23 & 10000 & 511130 & GECCon-internal-Audits & 270,565 & 303,129 & 1.268. & 235,637 & 318;105 & 1:316: & Chenges to Clipulde Workiorders \\
\hline Self Supporing. & MTA & 103773 & 103769 & 138725 & 22260 & 10001719 & 23 & 10000 & 515010 & Health:Standee-City Match. & (146,483) & 151,801 & (1,933) & (15,58,310) & 161,958 & (4,0994) & Cranges. to Health and Dantil Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 103773 & 103769 & 138725 & 22260 & 10001719 & 23 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverize & (476,595) & 490,135 & \((6,348)\) & (5:15,123] & 522,970 & (13:265) & Changes to. Health and Dentai. ates \(^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline Self. Sypparting & MTA & 103773 & 103769 & 138725 & 22250 & 10001719 & 23 & 10009 & 516016 & Dental Caverise & (64,109) & 63,277 & (3,460) & ( 66,533\()\) & 63,277 & (5;884) & Changes to Heaith and Dentral hates \\
\hline Self Supporting & Mta. & 103773. & 139649 & 139650 & 22870 & 10001723 & 1 & 10000 . & 581710 & 1s:Purch-Genitrl Shop-AutoMaint & 3,779 & 2,183 & (132) & 3,723 & 2,239 & (12) & Changes to Clitw ide Workorders \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 103773 & 139649 & 139651 & 22250 & 10001729 & 23 & 100nd & 515010 & Heasth Service-cliy Match & 271,885 & 264,582 & 48 & 250, 336 & 282,294 & 100. & Changes to \(H\) Health mnd Dental gates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 10373 & 139649 & 139551 & 22260 & 10007719 & 23 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependenit Coverize. & 586,404 & 566,485 & 110 & 625,318. & 604,432 & 274; \({ }^{\text {2 }}\) & Changes to Health. and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 103773 & 139649 & 139551 & 22260 & 10001719 & 23. & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coversis & 82,585 & 79,884 & 73 & 82,337 & 79,884 & 125 & Changesfo Health and Dennal Raties \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 103773 & 175646 & 207786 & 22260 & 10001719. & 9 & 10.000 & 515010 & Heeilth Serwieecity Match & 170,814 & 211,946 & (266) & 176,666 & 231,302 & (696) \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & Changes ta Health,and Denneal Rates \\
\hline Self Supportine. & MIA & 103773 & 173646 & 207786 & 22260 & 10001719 & 9 & 10008 & 515710 & Dependent Coveraie & 366,718 & 453,304 & (563) & 377,533 & 494,547 & [1;4720] & Changes to Health and. Deintal Rates. \\
\hline Salf Supporting & MIA & 103773 & 175645 & 207786 & 22260 & 10001719 & 9 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverare & 51,209 & 63,683 & (340) & 49,396 & 65,122 & [714] & Changes to Health and Dentri hroses. \\
\hline Self Suipporthe & MTA & 103773 & 175646 & 207787 & 22260 & 10001719 & - 9 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Servicectry Matich & 6,954 & [1,527] & 55 & 7.476 & (1,630] & 116 & Chunges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self:Supportling & MTA & 109773 & 175646 & 207787 & 22260 & 120001719 & , & 16000 & 515710 & bependent Coveraze & 16,136 & (1,777) & 117 & 17,337. & [1,832] & 245 & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Siupporting & MTA & 203773 & 175646 & 207787 & 22360 & 20001719 & 9 & 10000 & 516010 & Diental Coverige & 2,274 & (298) & 70 & 2,323 & [298] & 115 & Chinges to Heilth and. Dental Ratos. \\
\hline Self Suppoithe & MTA & 103773 & 17564, & 207780 & 22305 & 10001719 & 23 & 10000 & 579030 & MTA Divsion OH Costrecouvin & (353;217] & (355,749) & (1,268) & (345,807) & (363,207) & [11,316] & Isfancing entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Suppartling & MTA & 138672 & 138678 & 138578 & 22420 & 10031008 & 1 & 14421 & 475415 & Communtty improvementimpactee & [ \(2,224,0003\) & 2,550,000 & 326;000 & (2,575,000) & 2,555,000 & & Brancing enules and ransfers \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138672 & 13.8678 & 138678 & 22420 & 10031008 & 1 & 14421. & 567000 & 191d 5 s, Structalmpru Prof-Budget. & [2; 224,000] & 2,550,000 & 326,000 & ( \(2,575,000\) ) & 2,575,000 & \(\because\) & Balancins entiles and transfers \\
\hline Self Suppoither. & MTA & 138672 & 138678 & 138678 & 22455 & 10011915 & & 14351 & 412601 &  & 35,520,000 & 38,190,000 & 2,570,000: & 38,650.000 & 41,520,000 & 2,870,000 & Revenue and Basellhe Changes \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138672 & 138678 & \({ }^{138578}\) & 2245 & 10031004 & 1 & 14352 & 567000 &  & [35,620,000] & 38,150,000 & 2,570,000. & (38,650,000] & 41,520,000 & 2,870;000 & Balancing entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Supparthg & MTA & 138672 & 19.6678 & 138678 & 22460 & 10011844 & 2 & 14153 & 567000 &  & & 2,370,000 & 2,370,000 & & & - & Ealancins, entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Supporthing & mita. & 138672 & 138678 & 138578 & 22460 & 10011944 & 2 & 14153 & 598040 & Designated Far Generl Restrve & 2,372,000 & - & (2,370,000) & - & - & & Ealanclinz entrie'sand trönsfers \\
\hline Self Suppariling & MTA & 138672 & 138680 & 138680 & 22305 & 10001721 & 23 & 10000 & 579030 & MTA. Division OH Cost Recovery & (3,450,605) & [3,537,476) & [47; 521] & [2, 2 , 20,064 ) & (3,599,973) & [ 25,4141\(]\) & Balancinz entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Supporthe & MTA & 198672 & 138686 & 138588 & 22305 & 10001721 & 23 & 10000 & 581210 & Dif Tech nology infrastructure: & 310,999 & 140,204 & 4,043 & 111,775 & 138,899 & 3;514: & Changesto Citywide Workorders \\
\hline Self supporing. & MTA & 138672 & 138686 & 138.588 & 22305 & 10001721 & 23 & 10000 & 58:360 & DTTelecomminications Services & 180,138 & 150,736 & (996) & 175,587 & 1.50,479 & (5,794) & Changes ta citwide. Workerders \\
\hline Self Supporthis & MTA & 138672 & 138686 & 138688 & 22305 & 10001721 & 23 & 10000 & 581890 & GFFRent FFald To Real Estate: & 1,313:882 & 1.395,052 & 44,464. & 1,263,764 & 1,434,397 & 27,691 & Changes to ctivwide Workoricrs \\
\hline Self. Supporting & mTa & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22266 & 10901724 & 16 & 10000 & ;501010 & Perm Salaties-Misc-hezgular & 6,295,986 & 1,878,859 & :95;551 & 6,301,125 & 1,937,605 & 96,285 & Coirrected stalay entries \\
\hline Self Supporting & mita & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16. & 10000 & 513010 & Redre Clity Misc & 1,199,197 & 357,403 & 18,256 & 1,195,807 & 367,922 & 18,295 & Chanses to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22250. & 110001724 & 16 & 10000 & 514010 & Socla Security (baydia Hil) & :419,046 & 145,126 & 5,924 & 419,253 & 148,711 & 5:970:1 & Changes to Health ond Dental Ratas. \\
\hline Self Supporting. & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 514020 &  & 97,941 & 33,880 & 1,385. & 98,001 & 34,729 & 1.396 & Changes to Heal hand Dentri Rates \\
\hline Self Supportinis & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Heath Sery & 184,257 & 52,299 & 3,404 & 196,226 & 57,039 & 4,518 & Changes to Heelth and Dental Rates. \\
\hline Self Supportine & MTA & 138753 & 13 B 773 & 207854 & 22286 & 10001724 & \(\pm\) & 10009 & 515720 & Diependeisit Coverite & 804,349 & 236,037 & 15,758. & 855,117 & 257,711 & 20,552 & Changesto Health and Deital Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22250 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516010 & DenitilCovergic & 100, 810 & 29,319 & 3,463 & 101,451 & 30,000 & 4,785 & Chaniges to Heailth anid Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 20785 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 517019 & Unemplovment insurance & 18,242 & 6,364 & 258 & 18,249 & 6,467 & 260.1 & Changes to Healthand Denfial Rates \\
\hline Self Suppartling & Mta & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 519120 & Lons Term Dilsabllity Insurnce & 24,237; & 5,967 & 374 & 24, 250 & 7,196 & 376 & Chanesesto Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supponing & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service-Cly March & - & \(\cdots\) & \(\cdots\) & (51,734) & 60,179 & [1.5551] & Changes top Healch and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self.Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 119773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10033400 & 21 & 10000 & 515710 & Dejendent Coverrase & & & - & (152,287) & 148,443 & (3:844) & Changes-ta'Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 238753 & 138773 & 207854 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21 & 10000. & 516920 & Dental Coverage & , & \(\therefore\) & & [20,799] & 18,996 & [1,8031) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 139753 & 138773 & 207855 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515020 & Health Service Cly Match & 27,684 & 39,862 & (80)] & 27,467 & 44,447 & [220] & Chanzesto Hedith and Dencal Rates \\
\hline Self Supporating. & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207855 & 22260 & 10003724 & 16 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coveraze & 210,443 & 295,648 & [561] & 210,442 & 328,954 & [1,516] & Chanizes to Health and Dencal Rates \\
\hline Self Supponting & mta & 138753 & 138773 & 20785 & 22260 & 110001724 & 1.1 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverage & 23,965 & 34,039 & [274] & :22,171 & 35,503 & (504) & Changos to Health ani Dentul Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207855 & 22260 & 10033100 & 23 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service-Gty Match & - & - & - & (3,311) & 3,226 & (85) & Chanzes to Healith and Dentril Rates \\
\hline Self Suppoiting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207855 & 22260 & 110033100 & 21 & 10000 & 515710 & Dipendent Coverase & - & - & & [23,163] & 22;579 & (584) & Changesto Heilth and Denmi Rztas. \\
\hline Self Supporting. & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207855 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21 & 10006 & 516010 & Dentil. Coyerse. & - & \(\cdots\) & - & (2,683) & 2,450 & (233) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138753 & 这8773 & 2078.56 & 22260 & 10001724 & 15 & 10080 & 515910 & Heath Service-ciry Match: & 45,310 & 73,710 & [180] & 44,754 & 82,959 & [495] & Chanses to. Healthand. Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporaing & mita & .138753 & 138i73 & 207856 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515720 & Dē̈endent Covererage. & .388,573 & 580,285 & [12:261) & 382,202 & . 649,529 & [3;411) & Changes to Health and. Bentril Rates \\
\hline Self Supporiting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207856 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coyerage & 43,785 & 66,453 & [618] & 397;70 & 69,747 & (1, 359 ) & Cionges to Health and Dennul Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporthing. & MTA & 138753 & 138733 & 207856 & 22260 & 10633100 & 21 & 10000 & 515010 & Heilith Seraice-Cl|y-Match & - & , & - & [15,556] & 16,231 & (425) & Changes to-Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Suppurting & mta & 138753 & 138773 & 207856 & 22260 & 10333100 & 21 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverate: & & & & [215;816) & 212,897 & [2,919] & Chanzes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supportinz & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207856 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverza & - & & - & [13,414] & 12,250] & [1,164) & Changesto Health and Dentri Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 138973 & 207858 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Hoalth Service-clivMitch & 281,415 & 120,276- & 1,045 & 301,341. & 128,327 & 2,204. & Changesto Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthg & MTA & 138733] & 138773 & 207858 & 22760 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverize & 565,818 & 226,511 & 2,223 & 606,000 & 241,789 & 4,555 & Changes to Heedth and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & Mita & .138753. & 13873 & 207858 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000. & 516019 & Denal Coverse & 81,768. & 32,900 & 1.330 & 82,699 & 32,900 & 2:261 & Chanzes so.Health and Dennol Raters \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207860 & 22260 & 10001724 & 21 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Sevice-cily Match & 138,150 & 184,732 & (302) & 139,529 & 209,491 & [830]] & Changesto Healliland Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthe & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207860 & 22260 & 10001724 & 21 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependént Coveraze. & 452,944 & 589,417 & [897] & 460,224 & 650,528 & [2,430] & Ghanges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753. & 138773 & 207860 & 22260 & 10001724 & 21 & 10000 & 515610 & Dental Coverize & 57,855 & 76,212. & (503) & . \(54,586\). & 78,879 & [12103] & Chamges to Heallh .and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Siupporting & MTA & 138753 & 138773 & 207860 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21. & 100000 & 515010 & Healith Service-Cuty Match & - & - & - & [13,719] & 23,372 & (347) & Changes to. Hesilh rand Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Suppoting & MTA & 138753. & 138773 & 207860 & 22260 & 10033100 & 21 & 10000 & 515710 & Depandent Coverage: & & , & - & (42,315] & 41,248 & (19067) & Chabges to Heilth and Dennai Ratos \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA. & 238753 & 138773 & 207860 & \(22260{ }^{\circ}\) & 10033100 & 21 & 10000 & 516910 & Dental Coyerize & & & & ( 5,524\()\) & 15,044 & (4801] & Changes to Health and dentel Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthim & MTA & 138753 & 149697 & 14is99 & 22250 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 515020 & Health Service-cliy Match & 32,085 & 38,775 & (41) & 33,278 & 42,263 & (115) & Changes to Healith and Dental Rates \\
\hline Seff Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149697 & 149599 & 22260 & 120091724 & 2 & \(10000 \mid\) & 515710 & Dependent Coverise & 75;472. & 85,452 & \(\square(64)\) & 77,961 & 93,597 & [2001] & Chaniges to Healthand Dentel Rates \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GESTYPE & Dapt & Dept Di & Dept Section & Deptit & Fundip & Projectiol & Activitiol & Authortiy ID & Accountio & Accountrite & Fr 18.19 Stat & FY 18.19 End & FY 18-19 Change & Fris-20 Start & Fr19-20 End & M19-20 Chance & Notes \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149657 & 249699 & 22250 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverage & 10,430 & 11,964 & (40) & 10,068 & 12,265 & [100] & Res fo Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149597 & 149699 & 22260 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 519110 & Hexibie Eemefit Packrare & 9,124 & 8,485 & 5 & 9,737 & 9,052 & & Changes to Heath and Dennal Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & [MFA] & 138753 & 149697 & 149699 & 22260 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 549990 & Other Materalis \& Supplis & 37,180 & 50,429 & (6,751) & 27,180 & 60,171 & 17,0061 & Balancing entries and transfers: \\
\hline Self Supparing & MTA & 138753 & 149697 & 149701 & 22250 & 10001724 & 23 & 10000 & 581130 & GF-Con-Internal Audis & 1,460.199 & 1,613,536 & 6,751 & 2,360,740 & 1,693,250 & 7,006: & Changes to Citwwide Workardars \\
\hline Self Supperiting & inta & 138753 & 149697 & 207893 & 22260 & 10001724 & - \({ }^{2}\) & 10000 & 515010 & Health Serulc-City Match & 39,044 & 43,113 & (27) & 40,970 & 46,645 & (73) & Changes to Health end Dental fates \\
\hline Self Supporting & mta & 138753 & 149697 & 207893 & 22250 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage & 94,384 & 113,111 & (123) & 97,537 & 123,651 & (334) & Changes sot Health oind Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149597 & 207893 & 22260 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 516010 & Dentral Coverage & 12,907 & 15,310 & (65) & 12,479 & 15,659 & (144) & Changes to Heatith and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Supherths & MTA. & 138753 & 149702 & 149708 & . 22250 & 10001724 & - 6 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Servece-Ety Match & (9,893] & 45,712 & [1361) & [19,966] & 57,576 & (1992) & Chengesto Health and Dennal Rates. \\
\hline Salf Supporing & mita & 138753 & 149702 & 149708 & 22250 & 10001724 & - 6 & 10000 & 515710 & despendent Coverase & [57, 242] & 1277387 & (1,209) & (92,308) & 165,251 & (3,231) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149709 & 22260 & 10001724 & - 6 & 10000 & 516010 & Sental Coverase & (7,565) & 17,298 & (679) & (11,992) & 20.911 & (1,433] & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149708. & 22260 & 12001724 & & 10000 & 519110 & Fiexible Bensfif Packaze & (401) & 15,137 & [102) & (3,057) & 18,669 & (278) & Changes to Heelch and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22250 & 10001724 & - 7 & 10000 & 501010 & Perm Salaries-M1sc-RELular & 624,984 & 2,446,857 & 1:821,913 & 629.792 & 4,168,730 & 3,578,938. & Corrcted salary entries. \\
\hline Salf Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22250 & 20001724 & -7 & 10000 & 513010 & Rethe City M Mise & 116,890 & 464,994 & 348,104 & 216,9816 & 789,328 & 672/12: & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporring & MTA & \(\underline{58253}\) & 249702 & 149712 & 22260 & 10001724 & & 10000 & 514010 & Soalal Securiv ( O & 39,511 & 152,570 & 112,959 & 40,857 & 260,272 & 219,415 & Changes to Herith and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthg & MA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22250 & 20001724 & - 7 & 10000 & 514020 &  & 9,876 & 36,294 & 26:418 & 9,947 & 61;261 & 51,316. & Changes.to Health and Denral Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22260 & 10001724 & -7 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service.city Match: & [ 60,262 ) & 97,407 & (1,025) & [14,5,597] & 182,129 & (4,196) & Chinges to Healch and Dental fates \\
\hline Self Supporing. & mta & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22260 & 10001724 & -7 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage & [285,941] & 380,992 & (4,393) & (648,992) & 737,310 & [17,690] & Chantes to Healthand Dental Rates \\
\hline Salf Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22250 & 10001724 & -7 & 10000 & 516010 & Dentilil Coveraze & [38,111] & 49,613 & (12,372) & [83,500] & 89,549 & (7,825) & Changes to Health and Dental hates \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149712 & 22280 & 10001724 & -7 & 10000 & 517010 & Unemployment Insurance & 1,840 & 6,759 & 4.919 & 1,853 & 11,408 & 9,555 & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149716 & 50 & 10033100 & - 7 & 10000 & 503010 & Perm Salaries-Mils-Rerular & . & - & & \(\cdots\) & 384,477 & 384,477 & Corrected salary entrics \\
\hline 5 Sllf Supporting & mita & 138753 & 14972 & 249726 & 22250 & 10033100 & -7 & 10000 & 513010 & Retre Cily Mise & & & & & 73,052 & 73,052: & Changes to Health and Dennail Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149716 & 22260 & 10033100 & - 7 & 10000 & 514010 & Sactial Sectirly (Oassid \& Hil) & & & & & 23,838 & 23,838 & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthe & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149716 & 22250 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 514020 & Sodilil Sec-Mcellarel(il only) & - & - & & & 5.575 & 5,575 & Chenges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & mTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149715 & 22260 & 10033100 & -7 & 10000 & 515010 & Heallh Serviceectiv Match & & & & (18,030) & 17.574 & 14561 & Changes ta Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149716 & 22280 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage & & & & (76,261) & 74,339 & [1,922] & Chenges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Solf Supporting & Imta & 138753 & 149702 & 149716 & 22250 & 10033100 & --7 & 10000 & 515010 & Dental Coverage & . & . & & (9,825) & 8.975 & (1850) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 149715 & 22250 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 517810 & Unemployment instrance & & & & - & 1.038 & 1.038. & Chariges to Health and Dentul Rates \\
\hline Sell Supparting & MTA. & 138753 & 149702 & 208670 & 22260 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service-cliy March & & & & (13,278) & 12,941 & (337) & Changes to Healch and Dental Rates \\
\hline Salf Supporttin & MTA & 138753 & 149702 & 288670 & 22280 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverse & - & & & [ 61,095 ) & 59,552 & (1,543) & Changes to Healthand Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporitis & mita & 138753 & 149702 & 208670 & 22260 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515010 & Dentral coverase & & & & (7, 678) & 7,013 & (665) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supparing & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 14972: & 22260 & 10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Serdce City Match & 187,162 & 239,44] & [343] & 192,054 & 262,610 & (906) & Chanees to Health and Denmal Rates \\
\hline Salf Supporing & MTA & 138759 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & 10001724 & & 10000 & 515710 & pependent Coverage & 805,972 & 1,033,007 & [1,487] & 824,782 & 1,134,981 & (3,965) & Chenges to. Heal /th and Dental Rates \\
\hline Sell S Lipporting & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & 10001724 & & 10000 & 516010 & Denmal Coverage & 101,519 & 130,627 & [790) & 96,884 & . 334,449 & (1.703) & Changes to Health ond Dennal Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & -10001724 & - 2 & 10000 & 519110 & Hexible Penefil Patkage & 10,558 & 18,627 & [51] & 10,269 & 21,102 & 1239 & Changes to Health and Dental hates \\
\hline Self Supparing & MTA & 138759 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & 10033100 & - 7 & 10000 & 515010 & Healch Service-Cly Match & & & & (8,8552) & 8,627 & (225) & Chinges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138759 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverate & - & & & (40,730) & 39,703 & [1,029] & Changes no Healch and Dennal Rates \\
\hline Self Supporring & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 149725 & 22260 & 10033100 & - 7 & 20000 & 516010 & Dental Coverase & & & & (5,119) & 4,675 & (444) & Crunges to Healch and Dentalifates \\
\hline Self Suppoiting & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 207976 & 22250 & 10033100 & - 7 & 10000 & 515010 & Healich Service.City Match & - & . & & [42,560] & 41,489 & (1, 1271 ) & Chanees to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & mita & 138753 & 149724 & 207976 & 222 20 & 10033100 & - 7 & 10009 & 515710 & Dependont Coverage & & & & (89,596) & 87,339 & (12,262) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138753 & 149724 & 207976 & 22260 & 10033100 & & 10000 & 515010 & Dental Coverabs & & & & (122,645) & 11:547 & & Changes to. Health and Dennal Rates \\
\hline Self Supparthg & MTA & 238753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22260 & .10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 501010 & Pemm Salurics-Misc-Regular & 2.888.585 & 2,402,248 & [95,551) & 1,811,425 & 2,512,413 & 196,286] & Corrected salary encrios \\
\hline Self Supportite & MTA. & 138753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22260 & 10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 513010 & Hestre Clty Misc & 360,319. & 458,453 & (18,255) & 344,184 & 477,375 & (188,295) & Changes to. Health and Dennal Rates \\
\hline Sell supporting & MTA & 138753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22260 & 10009724 & 18 & 100006 & 514010 & Sacial secuity (0asdil HH & 153,410 & 185.258 & ( 5,924 ) & 148,610 & 192,072 & (5;970) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Solf Supportige & MTA & 138753 & 186547 & 207850 & 22250 & 12001724 & 18 & 10000 & 514020 & Soclal Sec-Medicarsf(H) Only). & 35,867 & 43,315 & [1,385) & 34,750 & 44,914 & (2;396) & Changes ro Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Suppartinz & MTA & 138753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22280 & 10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service-ciky Match & 46,026 & 59,172 & (2, 630 & 45,450 & 65,609 & (2,977) & Cnanges to Health and Dennol Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & MTA & 138759 & 186647 & 207850 & 22230 & 10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage & 237,020. & 299,138 & [12,430) & 240,373 & 330,901 & (14,064) & Changes to Health and Dennal hates \\
\hline self supporing & MTA & 138753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22250 & 10007724 & 18. & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverag: & 28;603 & 36,992 & (1,733) & 25,934 & 37,854 & [2,040) & Changes to Healthand Dental Rates \\
\hline Soll Supporting & MTA & 138759 & 18664 & 207850 & 22250 & 10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 517010 & Unemplavinent lissiratice & 6,679 & 8,065 & [259] & 6.471 & 8,363 & (1200) & Chances to Helith and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA. & 138753 & 186647 & 207850 & 22250. & 10001724 & 18 & 10000 & 519120 & Long Term Disabilivy insurance & 5,94B & 7,956 & (374) & 5,637 & 8,379 & (376) & Changesto Health and Denral fates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 205660 & 22250 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Heath Service-Cliy Matah & 13,290. & 28,954 & (102) & 11,531 & 33,372 & (281) & Changes to Health ind Dential Rates \\
\hline Self Supperitint- & MTA & 138759 & 202644 & 205660 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515710 & Degendent Coverage & 79,785 & 157,435 & (510) & 72,000 & 380,278 & [13:382) & Changes to Heal /h and. Dentaligates \\
\hline Self Supportins & MTA & 138753 & 202544 & 205660 & 22250 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverres & 9,243 & 18,779 & [760) & 7,545 & 20,165 & (572) & Changes to Health and Dentol Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 205650 & 32260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 581710 & Is-purch-Centr Shop-Auto Malint & (8,105) & 67,046 & (357) & [9,832] & 68,754 & (365) & Changes to crywde Workorders \\
\hline Self Suppoitins & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207881 & 22260 & 10001724. & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service cliy Match & 4.791 & 10.881 & (40) & 4,080 & 12.570 & (110) & Changes to Heath and denal Rotes \\
\hline Self Suppartine & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207881 & 22250 & 16001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage & 33,523 & 76.125 & (280) & 28,566 & 87,972 & (758) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202544 & 207881 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverase & 3,777 & 8,814 & [137] & 2,880 & 9,546 & (302) & Changes to Health and Dennel Rates \\
\hline Self Supportinz & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207882 & 22260. & .10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Healch Servier Cliy Mateh & 863. & 6,953 & (40) & (110) & 8,380 & (120) & Changes to Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202844 & 207882 & 22260 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coveraze & 6,943 & 48,643 & (280) & (758) & 58,648 & (758) & Changes to Healch ond Derinil Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207882 & 22250 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverags: & 595 & 5,632 & (137) & (302) & 6,364 & (902) & Changes to fiealth and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA & 138753 & 202544 & 207883 & 22260 & 100017.24 & 16 & 10000 & 515010 & Healch Sernlee-Giv.Match & 16,575 & 22,665 & (40) & 16,650 & 25,140 & (110) & Chanzes to. H ealth and Diental Rates \\
\hline Selif Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207889 & 22260 & 1000:1724 & 16 & 10000 & 515720 & Dependent Coverase & 115,969 & 158,571 & (280) & 116,538 & 175,944 & 1758) & Chanzesto Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Supparting & MTA. & 138753 & 202644 & 207883 & 22250 & 10001724 & 16 & 10000 & 516090 & Dental Coverays & 13,323 & 18360 & (1377) & 12,426 & 19.092 & (302) & Cranges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Salf Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202844 & 207884 & 22260 & 10001724 & 27 & 10000 & 515010 & Heralth Service-cliy Match & 50,498 & 61,575 & (7) & 64,525 & 65,682 & \(\cdots\) & Chanzes to. Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Suppoiting & MTA & 198759 & 202664 & 207884 & 22260 & 10001724 & - 21 & 10009 & 515720 & Dependant Coveraze & 432,422 & 429,656 & 18 & 451,423 & 458,464 & - & Chanzes to Heal hand Dental Rates \\
\hline Solf Supporting & MTA & 138753 & 202644 & 207884 & 22260 & 10001724 & 21. & 10000 & 516010 & Dentan Coveraze & 49,944 & 49,771 & S. & 49,947 & 49,771 & \(B\) & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Suppartine & MTA & 138753 & 205644 & 205645 & 22260 & 10001724 & & 10000 & 515010 & cealth Servicectiy Mareh & 422,596 & 468,308 & (296) & 443,152 & 506,894 & & hanges wo Health and Dento \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GFS Typr & Dept & Deprebivision & Deptstetion & Deptip & Fund 1 |l & Projectio] & |Activity & Authorify 1 If & ArcountiD & Acrountitile & Fris.19 Stant & Fr 18 B -19 End & :Fr 18-19 Change & FY, 19:20.5tart & FY 19.20 End & Frisazachange] & Notes \\
\hline Self s.upportinz & Puc & 229309 & 292647 & 292649 & 20150 & 10030002 & 2 & 10.600 & 515710 & Dapendent coyerage & 305,792 & 305,792 & - & 323,533 & 326,258 & (135) & Changes to Haath and Eemeal Rates \\
\hline Self Supaortine & PUC & 229309 & 292647 & 292649 & 20160 & 10030002 & 2 - 8 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverase & 40,869 & 40,869 & & 40,542 & 40,969 & [15] & Changes to Heaith and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthis & puc & 229309 & 292667 & 292649 & 20150. & 10030002 & 2 - 8 & 100006 & 581710 & Is-Purch-Center 5 hop-Auto Maint: & 70,851 & 67,227 & (358) & 69,119 & 68,949 & [368) & Changes to ctryw/de. Workorders \\
\hline Self supporting & PUC & 229309 & 292647 & 292657. & 20169 & 10030001 & 1 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Scrive-City Match & 131,838: & 131,838 & & 140,209 & 140,655 & (5) & Changes to Health and Dentral Ratcs \\
\hline Self supporting & puc & 229309 & 292647 & 292657 & 20160 & 10030001 & 1 & 16000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverase & 612,518 & 612;618 & & 651, 227 & .653,651 & [22) & Changes to Healch ond.Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & Puc & 229309 & 292647 & 2926 & 20150 & 10036901 & 1 & 180008 & 516610 & Dentral Coveraze: & 72,846 & 72,845 & & 72,638 & 72,845 & [10) & Changesto Heal (hard Dennal Rates \\
\hline Solf Supporiting & PIUC & 229309 & 292647 & 292657 & 20150 & 10030002 & 2 & 10000 & 581710 & |s-Puich-Centrl Shop-AutoMaint & 441,505 & 423,562 & (2, 253) & 430,595 & 434,414 & [2;310] & Changes to Citywide Workorders \\
\hline Self Supportins & puc & 229309 & 295544 & 295644 & 20160 & 10030002 & 2 & 100000 & 515010 & Health 5ervile-cliy Match & 101,076. & 101,076 & & 107,454 & 107,847 & (5) & Changes to Heath and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & puc & 229309 & 295544 & 295644 & 20160 & 10030002 & 2 & 10000 & 515710 & Detendent Coverase & 275,647 & 275,647 & & 293, 1220 & 294,090 & [14) & Changes to. Health ind Dental fates \\
\hline 5 self Supporting & PBC & 229309 & 295644 & 295644 & 20150 & 10030002 & 2 & 10000 & 516010 & Dentil Coveraze & 36,608 & 36,608 & & 36,470 & 36,508 & & Changes to Seith and Dental Razes \\
\hline Self Supporting & Puc & 231637 & 231627 & 231621 & 24970 & 10029992 & 2 - 4 & 19000 & 478990 & Entemprise Fed Bondinsubsldy & 568,138 & 579,920 & 11.782. & 537,816 & 537,849 & 33. & Bazancing entries and transfers \\
\hline Sell supporting & PJC & 231637 & 231621 & 231621 & 24970 & 10029992 & 2 & 10000 & 499999 & Beg Fund Briance - Budete only & (11, 510,510\()\) & 14,234,592 & [2,277,918] & [ \(15,963,3811\) & 5,214,803 & (1.748,578) & Balanding entries and transfers \\
\hline Selif Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298646 & 298645 & 24970 & 10029992 & - 22 & 10000 & 515010 & Hezath Sevice city Match & 547,173. & 529,577 & 114 & 602,131 & :565,125 & 474. & Changes to.Health ind Dental Rotes \\
\hline Self Supporiling & puc & 231637 & 298646 & 298645 & 24970 & 10029992 & -22 & 120000 & 51.5710 & Dependent coverage & 2,116,937 & 2,047,515 & 456 & 2,331,540 & 2;184,697 & 1,875 & Changes so:Heaich and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & puc & 231637 & 298546 & 298645 & 24970 & 10029992 & 22 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverase & 265,657 & 256,806 & 241 & 274,574 & 256,806 & B06 & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Salf Supporthg & puc & 231637 & 298646 & 298645 & 24970 & 10029992 & 22 & 10000 & 519110 & Flexble Benefitipackaze & 57,229. & 55,669 & 10 & 62,590. & 59,390 & 42 & Chanzes to Health.and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298646 & 298845 & 24970 & 10029992 & 22 & 10000 & 520190 & Department Overhead & 9,297,410 & 9,200,258 & (13,716) & 9,790, 641. & 9,409,701 & [33;572) & Balancing entries znd fransfers \\
\hline Selif Supporting & puc & 231537 & 298646 & 298646 & 24970 & 10029982 & 2 \(\quad 22\) & 10000 & 581120 & GF-Con-Financial sistems & 97,821 & 78,937 & & 94,792. & 81,965 & (1) & Changes to Civwlide Workorders \\
\hline Selif Supportine & PUC & 231637 & 298646 & 288645 & 24970 & 10029992 & 22 & 10600 & 581210 & Dr Technology Infrastructure & 326,452 & 358,404 & 9,384. & 327,656. & 355,753 & 7,937 & Changes to Clyw/de Workorders \\
\hline Self Supporting & PuC & 231637 & 298646 & 298645 & 24970 & 10029992 & 22 & 10000 & 581360 & Dit Telecormmunlations Services & 314,359 & 274,128 & (843) & 306, 110 & 287,447 & 4,227 & Changes to Cirywide Workorders \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298646 & 298648 & 24970 & 10029892 & 22 & 10000 & 581710 & IS-Purch h-Centri Shop-Auto Mallit & 30,758 & 14,784 & (78) & 30,377 & 15,163 & [80] & Changes to Citywide Workorders \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & 2 & 16000 & 486030 &  & 1,832,250 & 1,804,550 & [277710] & 1,832,260 & 1,843,332 & 11,072. & Changes to Citpwide Workorders \\
\hline Sell Supporting & puc & 231637 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & & 10000 & 5150:0 & Health Service-Clyy Match & 49,684 & 49,684 & \(\cdots\) & 52,488 & 53,013 & & Chanses to Health and Denmal Rates \\
\hline Self Suppofing & PUCC & 231537 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10039992 & 2 & 10000. & 51.5710 & bependent Coverage & 122,341 & 122,341 & & 128,969 & 130,533 & [20] & Changes to H Health and Dentril Rates \\
\hline 5 self supporting & puc & 231637 & 238651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & 4 & 10000 & 515010 & Dental Coverage. & 16,928. & 16,928 & & 16,727 & 16,923 & & Changes to Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & \(2-4\) & 10000 & 519110 & Flexible Bemefit Packase & 18,018 & 18,018 & & 19,080 & 19,222 & & Chinges to Healch and Dentil Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & 4 & 10000 & 520190 & 包partmerit Ceverhead & 7,992,970 & 7,807,763 & [19,707] & 8,374,842 & 7,942,590 & (30;206) & 8aluncing entries and trensfers \\
\hline Self Supporting & Puc & 231637 & 298659 & 298647 & 29970 & 1.0029992 & 2 - 4 & 10000 & 581210 & DT Tecthology Inf fratructure & 191,122 & 209,828 & 5.4949 & 191,827 & 208,276 & 4,647 & Changes to cithwide Workorders \\
\hline Sclf Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298647 & 24970 & 10029992 & & 16000 & 581360 & DTTelecommunications Services & 62,854. & 54,819 & (169) & 61,215 & 57,482 & 845. & Changes to clipwlde Workorders \\
\hline Self supportinz & PUS & 231637 & 298651 & 298648 & 24970 & 10029992 & - 4 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Sevice-cliy Match & 99,314. & 99,314. & & 105,229 & 105,969 & (10) & Chenges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & PUC. & 231637 & 298651 & 298648 & 24970 & 10029992 & - 4 & 100000 & 515710 & Bependent Coverage & 264,345 & 264,345 & & 279,806-1 & 282,039 & & Changes to Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self supporing & Puc & 231637 & 298651 & 298648 & 24970 & 10029992 & & 10000 & 516010 & Pental Coverage & 35,760 & 35,760 & & 35,475 & 35,760 & (13) & Changes fo Healch and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthe & PUC & 231537 & 298651 & 298648 & 24970 & 10029892 & - 4 & 10000 & 519110 & Fiexble Emafil Package & 27,162 & 27,162 & & 28,776 & 28,978 & & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298551 & 298649 & 24970 & 10020337 & & 10000 & 574110 & giond interest-Expenst. & 3,203,694 & 3,210,034 & 6,340 & 3,096,857 & 3,103,198 & 6,341 & Salaming entries and transfers, \\
\hline Self supporting. & puc & 231,637 & 298651 & 298649 & 24970 & 10029986 & - 12 & 10000 & 515010 & Health Serite-clity Match & 27,33,2 & 27,332 & & 28:939 & 29,164 & & Changes to Health and Diental Rates \\
\hline 5 Self Sipporting & pue & 231637 & 298651 & 298649 & 24470 & 10029886 & [-12 & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coveinse & 67,980 & .67,980 & & 72,863 & 72,533 & & Chonges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & Puc, & 231637 & 298651 & 298669 & 249270 & 10029886 & - 12 & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coverage & 9,45.5 & 9,455 & & 9,369 & 9,455 & & Changes to Hepleh and dental Rotes. \\
\hline Self Supararting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298649 & 24970 & 10029886 & - 12 & 10000 & 519110 & Hexible Benefit Packare. & 14,194 & 14,194 & & 15,082 & 15,243 & & Changesto Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporthe & Puc & 231537 & 298651 & 298650 & 24970 & 10029985 & - 6 & 10060 & 485690 & Exp Reci fr Human Serolices \(\mathrm{MaO}^{\text {O }}\) & 907,224 & 698,670 & & 872,900 & 732,904 & (90) & Changes to Clibwide Workorders \\
\hline 5 Self supporitin & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24970 & 10.029985 & & 10000 & 515010 & |Bealth Serviese city Mitch & 70,098 & 55,991 & 93. & 96,927. & 59,735 & 474: & Chanzes to.f.fealth ind Denral Rates \\
\hline Self supporitin & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24979 & 10.029985 & & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coverite & 296,919 & 254,902 & 275 & 382,758 & 271,981 & 1:417. & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Salf supporting & PUC & 231637. & 298652 & 298650 & 24990 & 10029885 & - 6 & 10000 & 525610 & Dental Coverage & 36,790 & 31,222 & 154 & 45,305 & 31,122 & 645 & Chranges to Heilth and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporing & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24978 & 10029985 & 6 & 10000 & 519110 & Flexlible Beneflt Package & 7,984 & 4,179 & 25 & 14,489. & 4,459 & 128. & Changes to Heath and Dental Rates. \\
\hline Self Supporthn & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24970 & 1002998,5 & 6 & 10000 & 533130 & Ressle Of Gas & 10,171,579 & 8,548,202 & (1,523,377) & 10,171,579 & 9,274,147 & [897;432) & Revised gas/steam costs \\
\hline Self Supporthin & PULC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24970 & 10029985 & - 6 & 10000 & 533140 & Resale of fteam & 2, 285,217 & 1,599,213 & [686,004) & 2,285,217. & 1,622,557 & (652;660) & Rewsed \(\mathrm{gas} / \mathrm{steam}\) costs \\
\hline 5 self Supporting & PUC & 231637 & 298651 & 298650 & 24970 & 10029985 & - 6 & 10000 & 581410 & GE-GSA-FE-Eillites Mgmtsves & 33,249 & 82,500 & (695) & 29,589 & 83,895 & [2,860] & Chan eses to Citw wide Workorders \\
\hline Self supporiting & PUC & 231637. & 298651 & 298650. & 24970 & 10029885 & - \(\quad 6\) & 10000 & 561710 & Ifs-Purch-Centil Shop-Auto Malnt & 148,035 & 172,754 & 1919) & 143,585 & 177,180 & (943) & Changes to ctivwide Workorders \\
\hline Self supporting & puc & 2321.76 & 232130 & 232127 & 27180 & 1002677. & & 10000 & 528100 & loverhead Recovery & [96,962,903] & [ \(94,746,570)\) & 129;1019 & (101,988, 101) & [96,577,160) & 312,691: & Balincing entries and transfers \\
\hline Self supportinz & PUC & 232176 & 232130 & 232227 & 27180 & 1002672 & \(2-1\) & 10000 & 581130 & GF-Con-İternal Audits & .608;090 & 1,140,879 & (22,433) & \(425 ; 788\) & 1,256,849 & (8B,765) & Changes to Cltywide Workorders \\
\hline 5 self Supporting & pue & 232176 & 232130 & . 292644 & 27180 & 10026i72 & \(2-6\) & 10000 & 515010 & Health Service-cliy Match & 196;285 & 189,337 & 45. & 209,946 & 202,485 & 95. & Changes to Health and Dental fates. \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & z32176 & 232130 & . 292544 & 27189] & 10025772 & & 10000 & 515710 & Dependent Coveras & 134,460 & 418,259 & 107 & 464,754 & 447,359 & 223. & Changes to Healch and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Sellf Supporthis & puc & 232176 & 232130 & 292644 & 27880 & 1002672 & \(2-6\) & 10000 & 516010 & Dental Coveraze & 60,912 & 58,616 & 62. & S12,097 & 58,757 & 106: & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUSC & 232176 & 232130 & 292544 & 27180 & 10026772 & - 6 & 10000 & 519110 & Flexible. Benfflt Paskaze & 24,410 & 23,001 & & 26,145 & 24,632 & 19. & Changes to Health and Dental Rates. \\
\hline Self supporting & PUC & 232176 & 232149 & 232145 & 27190 & 10025778 & - 5 & 10002 & 515010 & Health Service-cliy Match & [2,319) & 1,406 & 3,725. & (2,488) & 1,507 & 3,975. & Changes to Healch and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporing & Puc & 232176 & 232149 & 232245. & 27190 & 10026778 & - 5 & 10002 & 515710 & Pependent Coverage & (8,644) & 1,105 & 9,749 & (9,206) & 1,196 & 10,402 & Changes so Meath and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & PUC & 232176 & 232149 & 232145 & 27190 & 1002678 & - 5 & 10002 & 526010 & Iental Coverage & & 1,309 & 1:313 & & 1;309 & 1,313 & Chanpes to Health oind dientil Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & Puc & 232176 & 232149 & 232145 & 27190 & 10026778 & . & 10002 & 519110 & Hexible Benefit Paskzace & 62,097 & 62,501 & 404 & 66,247 & 66:678 & 431 & Changes to' Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporting & puc & 232176 & 232149 & . 232145 . & 27150 & ,10026778 & - 5 & 10002 & 520100 & Ioverhead Recovery & [4,283,6599] & (4,201, 841) & [14,554] & [4, 5 , 98,550\(]\) & (4,239,694) & (14;7710) & Balancing entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Sipporting. & PUS & 232176 & 232149 & 232146 & 27190 & 10025778 & - 3 & 10002 & 515010 & Healith Servec-clity Match & (10,910) & [3,459] & 7,451. & (11,641) & (3,591) & 7,950; & Changes to Heath and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self Supporting & PUC & 232176 & 232149 & . 232146 & 27190 & 10026778 & 3 & 10002 & 515710 & Dependent Coverage. & (14,2S9) & 5,200 & 19,499. & (155,254) & 5,540 & 20,804. & Changes to Health and Dentral Rates \\
\hline Self supporitine & puc & 232176 & 232149 & 232146 & 27189 & 10026i78 & - 3 & 10002 & 516010 & Dental Coverare & [2,569) & 58 & 2;627, & (2,559] & 58 & 2;627 & Changes to Healch:and Demnal Rates \\
\hline Scll Supporting & PUC & 232176 & 232149 & 232145 & 27190 & 10026778 & 8 - \({ }^{3}\) & 10002 & 519110 & Flexible Benefit Packope & [ 13,617 & [12,810] & 807. & [14,527] & (13,666) & 861 & Changes to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Selif Supporting & puc & 232176 & 232149 & 232146. & 27190 & 10026778 & - 3 & 16002 & 520100 & Overthedd kecovery & (112,404,470) & [12,155,929) & [11:043) & [13,314,579].] & [12,251,304) & [33,555)] & Balancing entries and transfers \\
\hline Self Supporting & Puc & 232176 & 232149 & 23244 & 27190 & 10026778 & - 4 & 10092 & 520100 & Overh cad Rectivery & (15,199,651] & (14,884,983) & (428) & [16,310, 171) & [14, 772,644\()\) & (873) & Bzanaling entries and tranisfers \\
\hline Self supporing & Puc & 232176 & 232149 & . 232148 & 27189 & 10026778. & - 2 & 10002 & 515010 & Healch Servitecity Match & (15,496) & [9,045) & 7,451. & (12,501) & ( 9,651 & 7,950. & Chaniges to Health and Dental Rates \\
\hline Self supporing & puc & 232178 & 232149 & 232148 & 27130 & 10026788 & 8. & 10002 & 515710 & Dependerit Coverase & [6,251) & 13,248 & 19,499] & [ 6,699\(]\) & 14,113 & 20,804. & Chazges to Health and Diental Rates \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



\section*{SECTION 3. General Authority.}

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to set up appropriate accounts for the items of receipts and expenditures appropriated herein.

\section*{SECTION 3.1 Two-Year Budget.}

For departments for which the Board of Supervisors has authorized, or the Charter requires, a fixed two-year budget appropriations in this ordinance shall be available for allotment by the Controller on July 1st of the fiscal year in which appropriations have been approved. The Controller is authorized to adjust the two year budget to reflect transfers and substitutions consistent with City's policies and restrictions for such transfers. The Controller is further authorized to make adjustments to the second year budgets consistent with Citywide estimates for salaries, fringe benefits, and work orders.

\section*{SECTION 4. Interim Budget Próvisions.}

All funds for equipment and new capital improvements shall be held in reserve until final action by the Board of Supervisors. No new equipment or capital improvements shall be authorized during the interim period other than equipment or capital improvements that, in the discretion of the Controller, is reasonably required for the continued operation of existing programs or projects previously approved by the Board of Supervisors. Authorization for the purchase of such equipment may be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

During the period of the interim annual appropriation ordinance and interim annual salary ordinance, no transfer of funds within a department shall be permitted without approval of the Controller, Mayor's Budget Director and the Budget Analyst of the Board of Supervisors.

When the Budget Committee reserves selected expenditure items pending receipt of additional information from departments, upon receipt of the required information to the satisfaction of a financial committee, the Controller may release the previously reserved funds with no further action required by the Board of Supervisors.

If the Budget Committee of the Board of Supervisors recommends a budget that increases funding that was deleted in the Mayor's Budget, the Controller shall have the authority to continue to pay these expenses until final passage of the budget by the Board of Supervisors, and approval of the budget by the Mayor.

\section*{SECTION 4.1 Interim Budget - Positions.}

No new position may be filled in the interim period with the exception of those positions which in the discretion of the Controller are critical for the operation of existing programs or for projects previously approved by the Board of Supervisors or are required for emergency operations or where such positions would result in a net increase in revenues or where such positions are required to comply with law. New positions shall be defined as those positions that are enumerated in the Mayor's budget for the current fiscal year but were not enumerated in the appropriation and salary ordinances for the prior fiscal year, as amended, through June 30 of the prior fiscal year. In the event the Mayor has approved the reclassification of a position in the department's budget for the current fiscal
year, the Controller shall process a temporary or "tx" requisition at the request of the department and subject to approval of the Human Resources Director. Such action will allow for the continued employment of the incumbent in his or her former position pending action by the Board of Supervisors on the proposed reclassifications.

If the Budget Committee of the Board of Supervisors recommends a budget that reinstates positions that were deleted in the Mayor's Budget, the Controller and the Director of Human Resources shall have the authority to continue to employ and pay the salaries of the reinstated positions until final passage of the budget by the Board of Supervisors, and approval of the budget by the Mayor.

\section*{SECTION 5. Transfers of Functions and Duties.}

Where revenues for any fund or department are herein provided by transfer from any other fund or department, or where a duty or a performance has been transferred from one department to another, the Controller is authorized and directed to make the related transfer of funds, provided further, that where revenues for any fund or department are herein provided by transfer from any other fund or department in consideration of departmental services to be rendered, in no event shall such transfer of revenue be made in excess of the actual cost of such service.

Where a duty or performance has been transferred from one department to another or departmental reorganization is effected as provided in the Charter, in addition to any required transfer of funds, the Controller and Human Resources Director are authorized to make any personnel transfers or reassignments between the affected departments and appointing officers at a mutually convenient time, not to exceed 100 days from the effective date of the ordinance transferring the duty or function. The Controller, Director of Human Resources and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, with assistance of the City Attorney, are hereby authorized and directed to make such changes as may be necessary to conform all applicable ordinances to reflect said reorganization, transfer of duty or performance between departments.

\section*{SECTION 5.1 Agencies Organized under One Department.}

Where one or more departments or agencies are organized under a single appointing officer or department head, the component units can continue to be shown as separate agencies for budgeting and accounting purposes to facilitate reporting. However, the entity shall be considered a single department for purposes of employee assignment and seniority, position transfers, and transfers of monies among funds within the Department of Public Health, and reappropriation of funds.

\section*{SECTION 5.2 Continuing Funds Appropriated.}

In addition to the amount provided from taxes, the Controller shall make available for expenditure the amount of actual receipts from special funds whose receipts are continuously appropriated as provided in the Administrative and Municipal Codes.

\section*{SECTION 5.3 Multi-Year Revenues.}

In connection with money received in one fiscal year for departmental services to be performed in a subsequent year, the Controller is authorized to establish an account for
depositing revenues which are applicable to the ensuing fiscal year, said revenue shall be carried forward and become a part of the funds available for appropriation in said ensuing fiscal year.

\section*{SECTION 5.4 Contracting Funds.}

All money received in connection with contracts under which a portion of the moneys received is to be paid to the contractors and the remainder of the moneys received inures to the City and County shall be deposited in the Treasury.
(a) That portion of the money received that under the terms of the contract inures to the City and County shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriate fund.
(b) That portion of the money received that under the terms of the contracts is to be paid to the contractor shall be deposited in special accounts and is hereby appropriated for said purposes.

\section*{SECTION 5.5 Real Estate Services.}

Rents received from properties acquired or held in trust for specific purposes are hereby appropriated to the extent necessary for maintenance of said properties, including services of the General Services Agency.

Moneys received from lessees, tenants or operators of City-owned property for the specific purpose of real estate services relative to such leases or operating agreements are hereby appropriated to the extent necessary to provide such services.

\section*{SECTION 5.6 Collection Services.}

In any contracts for the collection of unpaid bills for services rendered to clients, patients or both by the Department of Public Health in which said unpaid bills have not become delinquent pursuant to the provisions of Administrative Code Section 10.37 and 10.38, the Controller is hereby authorized to adjust the estimated revenues and expenditures of the various divisions and institutions of the Department of Public Health to record such recoveries. Any percentage of the amounts, not to exceed 25 percent, recovered from such unpaid bills by a contractor is hereby appropriated to pay the costs of said contract. The Controller is authorized and is hereby directed to establish appropriate accounts to record total collections and contract payments relating to such unpaid bills.

\section*{SECTION 5.7 Contract Amounts Based on Savings.}

When the terms of a contract provide for payment amounts to be determined by a percentage of cost savings or previously unrecognized revenues, such amounts as are actually realized from either said cost savings or unrecognized revenues are hereby appropriated to the extent necessary to pay contract amounts due. The Controller is authorized and is hereby directed to establish appropriate accounts to record such transactions.

\section*{SECTION 5.8 Collection and Legal Services.}

In any contracts between the City Attorney's Office and outside counsel for legal services in connection with the prosecution of actions filed on behalf of the City or for assistance in
the prosecution of actions that the City Attorney files in the name of the People, where the fee to outside counsel is contingent on the recovery of a judgment or other monies by the City through such action, the Controller is hereby authorized to adjust the estimated revenues and expenditures of the City Attorney's Office to record such recoveries. A percentage of such recoveries, not to exceed 25 percent plus the amount of any out-ofpocket costs the Controller determines were actually incurred to prosecute such action, is hereby appropriated from the amount of such recoveries to pay the contingent fee due to such outside counsel under said contract and any costs incurred by the City or outside counsel in prosecuting the action. The Controller is authorized and hereby directed to establish appropriate accounts to record total collections and contingent fee and cost payments relating to such actions. The City Attorney as verified by the Controller shall report to the Board of Supervisors annually on the collections and costs incurred under this provision, including the case name, amount of judgment, the fund which the judgment was deposited, and the total cost of and funding source for the legal action.

\section*{SECTION 6. Bond Interest and Redemption.}

In the event that estimated receipts from other than utility revenues, but including amounts from ad-valorem, taxes shall exceed the actual requirements for bond interest and redemption, said excess shall be transferred to a General Bond Interest and Redemption Reserve account. The Bond Interest and Redemption Reserve is hereby appropriated to meet debt service requirements including printing of bonds, cost of bond rating services and the legal opinions approving the validity of bonds authorized to be sold not otherwise provided for herein:

Issuance, legal and financial advisory service costs, including the reimbursement of departmental services in connection therewith, for debt instruments issued by the City and County, to the extent approved by the Board of Supervisors in authorizing the debt, may be paid from the proceeds of such debt and are hereby appropriated for said purposes.

\section*{SECTION 7. Allotment Controls.}

Since several items of expenditures herein appropriated are based on estimated receipts, income or revenues which may not be fully realized, it shall be incumbent upon the Controller to establish a schedule of allotments, of such duration as the Controller may determine, under which the sums appropriated to the several departments shall be expended. The Controller shall revise such revenue estimates periodically. If such revised estimates indicate a shortage, the Controller shall hold in reserve an equivalent amount of the corresponding expenditure appropriations set forth herein until the collection of the amounts as originally estimated is assured, and in all cases where it is provided by the Charter that a specified or minimum tax shall be levied for any department the amount of appropriation herein provided derived from taxes shall not exceed the amount actually produced by the levy made for such department.

The Controller in issuing payments or in certifying contracts, purchase orders or other encumbrances pursuant to Section 3.105 of the Charter, shall consider only the allotted portions of appropriation items to be available for encumbrance or expenditure and shall not approve the incurring of liability under any allotment in excess of the amount of such
allotment. In case of emergency or unusual circumstances which could not be anticipated at the time of allotment, an additional allotment for a period may be made on the recommendation of the department head and the approval of the Controller. After the allotment schedule has been established or fixed, as heretofore provided, it shall be unlawful for any department or officer to expend or cause to be expended a sum greater than the amount set forth for the particular activity in the said allotment schedule so established, unless an additional allotment is made, as herein provided.

Allotments, liabilities incurred and expenditures made under expenditure appropriations herein enumerated shall in no case exceed the amount of each such appropriation, unless the same shall have been increased by transfers or supplemental appropriations made in the manner provided by Section 9.105 of the Charter.

\section*{SECTION 7.1 Prior Year Encumbrances.}

The Controller is hereby authorized to establish reserves for the purpose of providing funds for adjustments in. connection with liquidation of encumbrances and other obligations of prior years.

\section*{SECTION 7.2 Equipment Defined.}

Funds for the purchase of items of equipment having a significant value of over \(\$ 5,000\) and a useful life of three years and over shall only be purchased from appropriations specifically provided for equipment or lease-purchased equipment, including equipment from capital projects. Departments may purchase additional or replacement equipment from previous equipment or lease-purchase appropriations, or from citywide equipment and other non-salary appropriations, with approval of the Mayor's Office and the Controller.

Where appropriations are made herein for the purpose of replacing automotive and other equipment, the equipment replaced shall be surrendered to the Department of Administrative Services and shall be withdrawn from service on or before delivery to departments of the new automotive equipment. When the replaced equipment is sold, in lieu of being traded-in, the proceeds shall be deposited to a revenue account of the related fund. Provided, however, that so much of said proceeds as may be required to affect the purchase of the new equipment is hereby appropriated for the purpose. Funds herein appropriated for automotive equipment shall not be used to buy a replacement of any automobile superior in class to the one being replaced unless it has been specifically authorized by the Board of Supervisors in the making of the original appropriation.

Appropriations of equipment from current funds shall be construed to be annual appropriations and unencumbered balances shall lapse at the close of the fiscal year.

\section*{SECTION 7.3 Enterprise Deficits.}

Funds appropriated herein to meet estimated enterprise deficits shall be made available to each such enterprise only to the extent that an actual deficit shall exist and not to exceed the amount herein provided. Any amount not required for the purpose of meeting an enterprise fund deficit shall be transferred back to the General Fund at the end of each fiscal year. Provided, however, that the Board of Supervisors, in the annual budget, may
approve appropriating such amounts to fund the activities of the enterprise in the succeeding fiscal year.

\section*{SECTION 8. Expenditure Estimates.}

Where appropriations are made for specific projects or purposes which may involve the payment of salaries or wages, the head of the department to which such appropriations are made, or the head of the department authorized by contract or interdepartmental order to make expenditures from each such appropriation, shall file with the Controller, when requested, an estimate of the amount of any such expenditures to be made during the ensuing period.

\section*{SECTION 8.1 State and Federal Funds.}

The Controller is authorized to increase Federal and State funds that may be claimed due to new General Fund expenditures appropriated by the Board of Supervisors. The Director of Human Resources is authorized to add civil service positions required to implement the programs authorized by these funds. The Controller and the Director of Human Resources shall report to the Board of Supervisors any actions taken under this authorization before the Board acts on the Annual Appropriation and Annual Salary Ordinances.

SECTION 8.2 State and Federal Funding Restorations.
If additional State or Federal funds are allocated to the City and County of San Francisco to backfill State reductions, the Controller shall backfill any funds appropriated to any program to the General Reserve.

\section*{SECTION 8.3 Process for Addressing General Fund Revenue Shortfalls}

Upon receiving Controller estimates of revenue shortfalls that exceed the value of the General Reserve and any other allowances for revenue shortfalls in the adopted City budget, the Mayor shall inform the Board of Supervisors of actions to address this shortfall. The Board of Supervisors may adopt an ordinance to reflect the Mayor's proposal or alternative proposals in order to balance the budget.

SECTION 9. Interdepartmental Services.
The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe the method to be used in making payments for interdepartmental services in accordanice with the provisions of Section 3.105 of the Charter, and to provide for the establishment of interdepartmental reserves which may be required to pay for future obligations which result from current performances. Whenever in the judgment of the Controller, the amounts which have been set aside for such purposes are no longer required or are in excess of the amount which is then currently estimated to be required, the Controller shall transfer the amount no longer required to the fund balance of the particular fund of which the reserve is a part. Provided further that no expenditure shall be made for personnel services, rent, equipment and capital outlay purposes from any interdepartmental reserve or work order fund without specific appropriation by the Board of Supervisors.

The amount detailed in departmental budgets for services of other City departments cannot be transferred to other spending categories without prior agreement from both the requesting and performing departments.

The Controller, pursuant to the provisions of Charter Section 3.105, shall review and may adjust charges or fees for services that may be authorized by the Board of Supervisors for the administration of the Computer Store. Such fees are hereby appropriated for that purpose.

\section*{SECTION 10. Positions in the City Service.}

Department heads shall not make appointments to any office or position until the Controller shall certify that funds are available.

Funds provided herein for salaries or wages may, with the approval of the Controller, be used to provide for temporary employment when it becomes necessary to replace the occupant of a position while on extended leave without pay, or for the temporary filling of a vacancy in a budgeted position. The Controller is authorized to approve the use of existing salary appropriations within departments to fund permanent appointments of up to six months to backfill anticipated vacancies to ensure implementation of successful succession plans and to facilitate the transfer of mission critical knowledge. The Controller shall provide a report to the Board of Supervisors every six months enumerating permanent positions created under this authority.

Appointments to seasonal or temporary positions shall not exceed the term for which the Controller has certified the availability of funds.

The Controller shall be immediately notified of a vacancy occurring in any position.

\section*{SECTION 10.1 Positions, Funds, and Transfers for Specific Purposes.}

Funds for personnel services may be transferred from any legally available source on the recommendation of the department head and approval by the Director of Administrative Services, Board or Commission, for departments under their respective jurisdiction, and on authorization of the Controller with the prior approval of the Human Resources Director for:
(a) Lump sum payments to officers, employees, police officers and fire fighters other than elective officers and members of boards and commissions upon death or retirement or separation caused by industrial accident for accumulated sick leave benefits in accordance with Civil Service Commission rules.
(b) Payment of the supervisory differential adjustment, out of class pay or other negotiated premium to employees who qualify for such adjustment provided that the transfer of funds must be made from funds currently available in departmental personal service appropriations.
(c) Payment of any legal salary or fringe benefit obligations of the City and County including amounts required to fund arbitration awards.
(d) The Controller is hereby authorized to adjust salary appropriations for positions administratively reclassified or temporarily exchanged by the Human Resources Director provided that the reclassified position and the former position are in the same functional area.
(e) Positions may be substituted or exchanged between the various salary appropriations or position classifications when approved by the Human Resources Director as long as said transfers do not increase total departmental personnel service appropriations.
(f) The Controller is hereby authorized and directed upon the request of a department head and the approval by the Mayor's Office to transfer from any legally available funds amounts needed to fund legally mandated salaries, fringe benefits and other costs of City employees. Such funds are hereby appropriated for the purpose set forth herein.
(g) The Controller is hereby authorized to transfer any legally available funds to adjust salary and fringe benefit appropriations as required under reclassifications recommended by the Human Resources Director and approved by the Board of Supervisors in implementing the Management Compensation and Classification Plan.

Amounts transferred shall not exceed the actual amount required including the cost to the City and County of mandatory fringe benefits.
(h) Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 4850.4, the Controller is authorized to make advance payments from departments' salary accounts to employees participating in CaIPERS who apply for disability retirement. Repayment of these advanced disability retirement payments from CaIPERS and from employees are hereby appropriated to the departments' salary account.
(i) For purposes of defining terms in Administrative Code Section 3.18, the Controller is authorized to process transfers where such transfers are required to administer the budget through the following certification process: In cases where expenditures are reduced at the level of appropriation control during the Board of Supervisors phase of the budget process, the Chair of the Budget Committee, on recommendation of the Controller, may certify that such a reduction does not reflect a deliberate policy reduction adopted by the Board. The Mayor's Budget Director may similarly provide such a certification regarding reductions during the Mayor's phase of the budget process.

\section*{SECTION 10.2 Professional Services Contracts.}

Funds appropriated for professional service contracts may be transferred to the account for salaries on the recommendation of the department head for the specific purpose of using City personnel in lieu of private contractors with the approval of the Human Resources Director and the Mayor and the certification by the Controller that such transfer of funds would not increase the cost of government.

\section*{SECTION 10.3 Surety Bond Fund Administration.}

The Controller is hereby authorized to allocate funds from capital project appropriations to the San Francisco Self-Insurance Surety Bond Fund, as governed by Administrative Code Section 10.100-317 and in accordance with amounts determined pursuant to Administrative Code Section 14B.16.

SECTION 10.4 Salary Adjustments, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
The Controller is authorized and directed to transfer from the Salary and Benefits Reserve, or any legally available funds, amounts necessary to adjust appropriations for salaries and related mandatory fringe benefits of employees whose compensation is pursuant to Charter Sections A8.403 (Registered Nurses), A8.404 (Transit Operators), A8.409 (Miscellaneous Employees), A8.405 and A8.590-1 through A8.590-5 (Police and Firefighters), revisions to State Law, and/or collective bargaining agreements adopted pursuant to the Charter or arbitration award. The Controller and Director of Human Resources are further authorized and directed to adjust the rates of compensation to reflect current pay rates for any positions affected by the foregoing provisions.

Adjustments made pursuant to this section shall reflect only the percentage increase required to adjust appropriations to reflect revised salary and premium pay requirements above the funding level established in the adopted budget of the respective departments.

The Controller is authorized and directed to transfer from reserves or any legally available funds amounts necessary to provide costs of non-salary benefits in ratified Memoranda of Understanding or arbitration awards. The Controller's Office shall report to the Budget and Finance Committee on the status of the Salary and Benefits Reserve, including amounts transferred to individual City Departments and remaining Reserve balances, following the first quarter of FY 2009-10 and as part of the Controller's Six and Nine Month Budget Status Reports.

\section*{SECTION 10.5 MOUs to be Reflected in Department Budgets.}

Should the City and County adopt an MOU with a recognized employee bargaining organization during the fiscal year which has fiscal effects, the Controller is authorized and directed to reflect the budgetary impact of said MOU in departmental appropriations by transferring amounts to or from the Salary and Benefits Reserve, or, for self-supporting or restricted funds, to or from the respective unappropriated fund balance account. All amounts transferred pursuant to this section are hereby appropriated for the purpose.

SECTION 10.6 Funding Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
Whenever the Board of Supervisors has ratified by ordinance or resolution Memoranda of Understanding or has not contested an arbitration award with recognized employee organizations and said memoranda or award contains provisions requiring the expenditure of funds, the Controller, on the recommendation of the Human Resources Director, shall reserve sufficient funds to comply with such provisions and such funds are hereby appropriated for such purposes. The Controller is hereby authorized to make such transfers from funds hereby reserved or legally available as may be required to make funds available to departments to carry out the purposes required by the Memoranda of Understanding or arbitration award.

\section*{SECTION 10.7 Fringe Benefit Rate Adjustments.}

Appropriations herein made for fringe benefits may be adjusted by the Controller to reflect revised amounts required to support adopted or required contribution rates. The Controller is authorized and is hereby directed to transfer between departmental appropriations and the General Reserve or other unappropriated balance of funds any amounts resulting from adopted or required contribution rates and such amounts are hereby appropriated to said accounts.

When the Controller determines that prepayment of the employer share of pension contributions is likely to be fiscally advantageous, the Controller is authorized to adjust appropriations and transfers in order to make and reconcile such prepayments.

\section*{SECTION 10.8 Police Department Uniformed Positions.}

Positions in the Police Department for each of the various ranks that are filled based on the educational attainment of individual officers may be filled interchangeably at any level within the rank (e.g., Patrol Officer Q2, Q3 or Q4, Sergeant Q50, Q51, Q52). The Controller and Director of Human Resources are hereby authorized to adjust payrolls, salary ordinances and other documents, where necessary, to reflect the current status of individual employees; provided however, that nothing in this section shall authorize an increase in the total number of positions allocated to any one rank or to the Police Department.

\section*{SECTION 10.9 Holidays, Special Provisions.}

Whenever any day is declared to be a holiday by proclamation of the Mayor after such day has heretofore been declared a holiday by the Governor of the State of California or the President of the United States, the Controller, with the approval of the Mayor's Office, is hereby authorized to make such transfer of funds not to exceed the actual cost of said holiday from any legally available funds.

\section*{SECTION 10.10 Litigation Reserve, Payments.}

The Controller is authorized and directed to transfer from the Reserve for Litigation Account for General Fund supported departments or from any other legally available funds for other funds, amounts required to make payments required to settle litigation against the City and County of San Francisco that has been recommended by the City Attorney and approved by the Board of Supervisors in the manner provided in the Charter. Such funds are hereby appropriated for the purposes set forth herein.

\section*{SECTION 10.11 Changes in Health Services Eligibility.}

Should the Board of Supervisors amend Administrative Code Section 16.700 to change the eligibility in the City's Health Service System, the Controller is authorized and directed to transfer from any legally available funds or the Salary and Fringe Reserve for the amount necessary to provide health benefit coverage not already reflected in the departmental budgets.

SECTION 11. Funds Received for Special Purposes, Trust Funds.
The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to continue the existing special and trust funds, revolving funds, and reserves and the receipts in and expenditures from each such
fund are hereby appropriated in accordance with law and the conditions under which each such fund was established.

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to set up additional special and trust funds and reserves as may be created by either additional grants and bequests or under other conditions and the receipts in each fund are hereby appropriated in accordance with law for the purposes and subject to the conditions under which each such fund was established.

\section*{SECTION 11.1 Special and Trust Funds Appropriated.}

Whenever the City and County of San Francisco shall receive for a special purpose from the United States of America, the State of California, or from any public or semi-public agency, or from any private person, firm or corporation, any moneys, or property to be converted into money, the Controller shall establish a special fund or account evidencing the said moneys so received and specifying the special purposes for which they have been received and for which they are held, which said account or fund shall be maintained by the Controller as long as any portion of said moneys or property remains.

Recurring grant funds which are detailed in departmental budget submissions and approved by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors in the annual budget shall be deemed to have met the requirements of Administrative Code Section 10.170 for the approval to apply for, receive and expend said funds and shall be construed to be funds received for a specific purpose as set forth in this section. Positions specifically approved by granting agencies in said grant awards may be filled as though said positions were included in the annual budget and Annual Salary Ordinance, provided however that the tenure of such positions shall be contingent on the continued receipt of said grant funds. Individual grants may be adjusted by the Controller to reflect actual awards made if granting agencies increase or decrease the grant award amounts estimated in budget submissions.

The expenditures necessary from said funds or said accounts as created herein, in order to carry out the purpose for which said moneys or orders have been received or for which said accounts are being maintained, shall be approved by the Controller and said expenditures are hereby appropriated in accordance with the terms and conditions under which said moneys or orders have been received by the City and County of San Francisco, and in accordance with the conditions under which said funds are maintained.

The Controller is authorized to adjust transfers to the San Francisco Capital Planning Fund, established by Administrative Code Section 10.100-286, to account for final capital project planning expenditures reimbursed from approved sale of bonds and other long term financing instruments.

\section*{SECTION 11.2 Insurance Recoveries.}

Any moneys received by the City and County of San Francisco pursuant to the terms and conditions of any insurance policy are hereby appropriated and made available to the general city or specific departments for associated costs or claims.

\section*{SECTION 11.3 Bond Premiums.}

Premiums received from the sale of bonds are hereby appropriated for bond interest and redemption purposes of the issue upon which it was received.

\section*{SECTION 11.4 Ballot Arguments.}

Receipts in and expenditures for payment for the printing of ballot arguments, are hereby appropriated in accordance with law and the conditions under which this appropriation is established.

\section*{SECTION 11.5 Tenant Overtime.}

Whenever employees of departments are required to work overtime on account of services required by renters, lessees or tenants of City-owned or occupied properties, or recipients of services from City departments, in connection with such properties the cost of such overtime employment shall be collected by the departments from the requesters of said services and shall be deposited with the Treasurer to the credit of departmental appropriations. All moneys deposited therein are hereby appropriated for such purpose.

\section*{SECTION 11.6 Refunds.}

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to set up appropriations for refunding amounts deposited in the Treasury in excess of amounts due, and the receipts and expenditures from each are hereby appropriated in accordance with law. Whereby State statute, local ordinance or court order, interest is payable on amounts to be refunded, in the absence of appropriation therefore, such interest is herewith appropriated from the unappropriated interest fund or interest earnings of the fund involved. The Controller is authorized, and funds are hereby appropriated, to refund overpayments and any mandated interest or penalties from State, Federal and local agencies when audits or other financial analyses determine that the City has received payments in excess of amounts due.

\section*{SECTION 11.7 Arbitrage.}

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to refund excess interest earnings on bond proceeds (arbitrage) when such amounts have been determined to be due and payable under applicable Internal Revenue Service regulations. Such arbitrage refunds shall be charged in the various bond funds in which the arbitrage earnings were recorded and such funds are hereby appropriated for the purpose.

\section*{SECTION 11.8 Damage Recoveries.}

Moneys received as payment for damage to City-owned property and equipment are hereby appropriated to the department concerned to pay the cost of repairing such equipment or property. Moneys received as payment for liquidated damages in a Cityfunded project are appropriated to the department incurring costs of repairing or abating the damages. Any excess funds, and any amount received for damaged property or equipment which is not to be repaired shall be credited to a related fund.

\section*{SECTION 11.9 Purchasing Damage Recoveries.}

That portion of funds received pursuant to the provisions of Administrative Code Section 21.33 - failure to deliver article contracted for - as may be needed to affect the required
procurement are hereby appropriated for that purpose and the balance, if any, shall be credited the related fund.

\section*{SECTION 11.10 Off-Street Parking Guarantees.}

Whenever the Board of Supervisors has authorized the execution of agreements with corporations for the construction of off-street parking and other facilities under which the City and County of San Francisco guarantees the payment of the corporations' debt service or other payments for operation of the facility, it shall be incumbent upon the Controller to reserve from parking meter or other designated revenues sufficient funds to provide for such guarantees. The Controller is hereby authorized to make payments as previously guaranteed to the extent necessary and the reserves approved in each Annual Appropriation Ordinance are hereby appropriated for the purpose. The Controller shall notify the Board of Supervisors annually of any payments made pursuant to this Section.

SECTION 11.11 Hotel Tax - Special Situations.
The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to make such interfund transfers or other adjustments as may be necessary to conform budget allocations to the requirements of the agreements and indentures of the 1994 Lease Revenue and/or San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Hotel Tax Revenue Bond issues.

\section*{SECTION 11.12 Local Transportation Agency Fund. \\ Local transportation funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to the Government Code.}

SECTION 11.13 Insurance.
The Controller is hereby authorized to transfer to the City Risk Manager any amounts indicated in the budget estimate and appropriated hereby for the purchase of insurance or the payment of insurance premiums.

\section*{SECTION 11.14 Grants to Commission on Aging and Child Support Services.}

The Commission on Aging and the Department of Child Support Services are authorized to receive and expend available federal and state contributions and grant awards for their target populations. The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to. make the appropriate entries to reflect the receipt and expenditure of said grant award funds and contributions.

\section*{SECTION 11.15 FEMA, OES, Other Reimbursements.}

Whenever the City and County recovers funds from any federal or state agency as reimbursement for the cost of damages resulting from earthquakes and other disasters for which the Mayor has declared a state of emergency, such funds are hereby appropriated for the purpose. The Controller is authorized to transfer such funds to the credit of the departmental appropriation which initially incurred the cost, or, if the fiscal year in which the expenses were charged has ended, to the credit of the fund which incurred the expenses. Revenues received from other governments as reimbursement for mutual aid provided by City departments are hereby appropriated for services provided.

SECTION 11.16 Interest on Grant Funds.

Whenever the City and County earns interest on funds received from the State of California or the federal government and said interest is specifically required to be expended for the purpose for which the funds have been received, said interest is hereby appropriated in accordance with the terms under which the principal is received and appropriated.

\section*{SECTION 11.17 Treasurer - Banking Agreements.}

Whenever the Treasurer finds that it is in the best interest of the City and County to use either a compensating balance or fee for service agreement to secure banking services that benefit all participants of the pool, any funds necessary to be paid for such agreement are to be charged against interest earnings and such funds are hereby appropriated for the purpose.

The Treasurer may offset banking charges that benefit all participants of the investment pool against interest earned by the pool. The Treasurer shall allocate other bank charges and credit card processing to Departments or pool participants that benefit from those services. The Controller may transfer funds appropriated in the budget to general fund Departments as necessary to support allocated charges.

SECTION 11.18 City Buildings-Acquisition with Certificates of Participation (COPs). Receipts in and expenditures from accounts set up for the acquisition and operation of City-owned buildings including, but not limited to 25 Van Ness Avenue and 1660 Mission Street, are hereby appropriated for the purposes set forth in the various bond indentures through which said properties were acquired.

SECTION 11.19 Generally Accepted Principles of Financial Statement Presentation. The Controller is hereby authorized to make adjustments to departmental budgets as part of the year-end closing process to conform amounts to the Charter provisions and generally accepted principles of financial statement presentation.

\section*{SECTION 11.20 Fund Balance Reporting and Government Fund Type Definitions.} The Controller is authorized to establish or adjust fund type definitions for restricted, committed or assigned revenues and expenditures, in accordance with the requirements of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement 54. These changes will be designed to enhance the usefulness of fund balance information by providing clearer fund balance classifications that can be more consistently applied and by clarifying the existing governmental fund type definitions. Reclassification of funds shall be reviewed by the City's outside auditors during their audit of the City's financial statements.

\section*{SECTION 11.21 State Local Public Safety Fund.}

Amounts received from the State Local Public Safety Fund (Sales Taxes) for deposit to the Public Safety Augmentation Fund shall be transferred to the General Fund for use in meeting eligible costs of public safety as provided by State law and said funds are appropriated for said purposes.

Said funds shall be allocated to support public safety department budgets, but not specific appropriation accounts, and shall be deemed to be expended at a rate of \(75 \%\) of eligible
departmental expenditures up to the full amount received. The Controller is hereby directed to establish procedures to comply with state reporting requirements.

\section*{SECTION 11.22 Laguna Honda Employee Development Account.}

The Controller is authorized and directed to set up special funds as may be required to receive employee, corporate and private donations made for the purpose of funding employee training and development. Donated funds for employee development will be automatically appropriated for such purpose, and shall be maintained in the City's financial systems.

\section*{SECTION 11.23 Affordable Housing Loan Repayments and Interest Earnings.} Loan repayments, proceeds of property sales in cases of defaulted loans, and interest earnings in special revenue funds designated for affordable housing are hereby appropriated for affordable housing program expenditures, including payments from loans made by the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and transferred to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, the designated the housing successor agency. Expenditures shall be subject to the conditions under which each such fund was established.

\section*{SECTION 11.24 Developer Agreement Implementation Costs.}

The Controller is hereby authorized to appropriate reimbursements of City costs incurred to implement development agreements approved by the Board of Supervisors, including but not limited to City staff time, consultant services and associated overhead costs to conduct plan review, inspection, and contract monitoring, and to draft, negotiate, and administer such agreements. This provision does not apply to development impact fees or developer exactions, which shall be appropriated by the Board of Supervisors.

\section*{SECTION 12. Special Situations.}

\section*{SECTION 12.1 Revolving Funds.}

Surplus funds remaining in departmental appropriations may be transferred to fund increases in revolving funds up to the amount authorized by the Board of Supervisors if said Board, by ordinance, has authorized an increase in said revolving fund amounts.

\section*{SECTION 12.2 Interest Allocations.}

Interest shall not be allocated to any special, enterprise, or trust fund or account unless said allocation is required by Charter, state law or specific provision in the legislation that created said fund. Any interest earnings not allocated to special, enterprise or trust funds or accounts shall be credited, by the Controller, to General Fund Unallocated Revenues.

\section*{SECTION 12.3 Property Tax.}

Consistent with the State Teeter Plan requirements, the Board of Supervisors elects to continue the alternative method of distribution of tax levies and collections in accordance with Revenue and Taxation Code Section 4701. The Board of Supervisors directs the Controller to maintain the Teeter Tax Losses Reserve Fund at an amount not less than \(1 \%\) of the total of all taxes and assessments levied on the secured roll for that year for participating entities in the county as provided by Revenue and Taxation Code Section
4703. The Board of Supervisors authorizes the Controller to make timely property tax distributions to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Treasure Island Development Authority, and City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure Financing Districts as approved by the Board of Supervisors through the budget, through development pass-through contracts, through tax increment allocation pledge agreements and ordinances, and as mandated by State law.

The Controller is authorized to adjust the budget to conform to assumptions in final approved property tax rates and to make debt service payments for approved general obligation bonds accordingly.

The Controller is authorized and directed to recover costs from the levy, collection and administration of property taxes.

\section*{SECTION 12.4 New Project Reserves.}

Where this Board has set aside a portion of the General Reserve for a new project or program approved by a supplemental appropriation, any funds not required for the approved supplemental appropriation shall be returned to the General Fund General Reserve by the Controller.

\section*{SECTION 12.5 Aid Payments.}

Aid paid from funds herein provided and refunded during the fiscal year hereof shall be credited to, and made available in, the appropriation from which said aid was provided.

SECTION 12.6 Department of Public Health Transfer Payments, Indigent Health Revenues, and Realignment Funding to Offset for Low Income Health Programs.
To more accurately reflect the total net budget of the Department of Public Health, this ordinance shows net revenues received from certain State and Federal health programs. Funds necessary to participate in such programs that require transfer payments are hereby appropriated. The Controller is authorized to defer surplus transfer payments, indigent health revenues, and Realignment funding to offset future reductions or audit adjustments associated with funding allocations for health services for low income individuals.

\section*{SECTION 12.7 Municipal Transportation Agency.}

Consistent with the provisions of Proposition E and Proposition A creating the Municipal Transportation Agency and including the Parking and Traffic function as a part of the Municipal Transportation Agency, the Controller is authorized to make such transfers and reclassification of accounts necessary to properly reflect the provision of central services to the Municipal Transportation Agency in the books and accounts of the City. No change can increase or decrease the overall level of the City's budget.

\section*{SECTION 12.8 Treasure Island Authority.}

Should the Treasure Island property be conveyed and deed transferred from the Federal Government, the Controller is hereby authorized to make budgetary adjustments necessary to ensure that there is no General Fund impact from this conveyance.

\section*{SECTION 12.9 Hetch Hetchy Power Stabilization Fund.}

Hetch Hetchy has entered into a long-term agreement to purchase a fixed amount of power. Any excess power from this contract will be sold back to the power market.

To limit Hetch Hetchy's risk from adverse market conditions in the future years of the contract, the Controller is authorized to establish a power stabilization account that reserves any excess revenues from power sales in the early years of the contract. These funds may be used to offset potential losses in the later years of the contract. The balance in this fund may be reviewed and adjusted annually.

The power purchase amount reflected in the department's expenditure budget is the net amount of the cost of power purchased for Hetch Hetchy use. Power purchase appropriations may be increased by the Controller to reflect the pass through costs of power purchased for resale under long-term fixed contracts previously approved by the Board of Supervisors.

\section*{SECTION 12.10 Closure of Special Funds, Projects, and Accounts}

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.100-1(d), if there has been no expenditure activity for the past two fiscal years, a special fund or project can be closed and repealed. The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to reconcile and balance funds, projects and accounts. The Controller is directed to create a clearing account for the purpose of balancing surpluses and deficits in such funds, projects and accounts, and funding administrative costs incurred to perform such reconciliations.

\section*{SECTION 12.11 Charter-Mandated Baseline Appropriations.}

The Controller is authorized to increase or reduce budgetary appropriations as required by the Charter for baseline allocations to align allocations to the amounts required by formula based on actual revenues received during the fiscal year. Departments must obtain Board of Supervisors' approval prior to any expenditure supported by increasing baseline allocations as required under the Charter and the Municipal Code.

\section*{SECTION 12.12 Parking Tax Allocation.}

The Controller is authorized to increase or decrease final budgetary allocation of parking tax in-lieu transfers to reflect actual collections to the Municipal Transportation Agency. The Municipal Transportation Agency must obtain Board of Supervisors' approval prior to any expenditure supported by allocations that accrue to the Agencies that are greater than those already appropriated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance.

\section*{SECTION 12.13 Former Redevelopment Agency Funds.}

Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Ordinance 215-12, the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (also known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, or OClI ) is a separate legal entity from the City and its budget is subject to separate approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. The Controller is authorized to transfer funds and appropriation authority between and within accounts related to former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency fund balances to serve the accounting requirements of the OCII, the Port, the Mayor's Office of Housing and the City

Administrator's office and to comply with State requirements and applicable bond covenants.

The Purchaser is authorized to allow the OCII and Departments to follow applicable contracting and purchasing procedures of the former SFRA and waive inconsistent provisions of the San Francisco Administrative Code when managing contracts and purchasing transactions related to programs formerly administered by the SFRA.

If during the course of the budget period, the OCII requests Departments to provide additional services beyond budgeted amounts and the Controller determines that the Succesșor Agency has sufficient additional funds available to reimburse Departments for such additional services, the Departmental expenditure authority to provide such services is hereby appropriated.

When \(100 \%\) of property tax increment revenues for a redevelopment project area are pledged based on an agreement that constitutes an enforceable obligation, the Controller will increase or decrease appropriations to match actual revenues realized for the project area.

The Mayor's Office of Housing is authorized to act as the fiscal agent for the Public Initiatives Development Corporation (PIDC) and receive and disburse PIDC funds as authorized by the PIDC bylaws and the PIDC Board of Directors.

\section*{SECTION 12.14 CleanPowerSF.}

CleanPowerSF customer payments and all other associated revenues deposited in the CleanPowerSF special revenue fund are hereby appropriated for fiscal years 2018-19 and 2019-20 in the amounts actually received by the City and County in such fiscal year. Estimated amounts of those appropriations are provided for information only. The Controller is authorized to disburse the revenues appropriated by this section as well as those appropriated yet unspent from prior fiscal years to pay power purchase obligations and other operating costs as provided in the program plans and annual budgets, as approved by the Board of Supervisors for the purposes authorized therein. Estimated customer revenues are \(\$ 112,415,632\) in fiscal year 2018-19 and \(\$ 156,864,143\) in fiscal year 2019-20.

\section*{SECTION 13. Treasure Island Development Authority.}

The budget for the Treasure Island Development Authority is subject to separate approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Work performed by City departments for the Treasure Island Development Authority may also be reflected in the City's budget. Administrative support to the Treasure Island Development Authority shall be performed by the General Services Agency. The General Services Agency may include required positions and operating costs in its annual budget, funded by the Treasure Island Development Authority.

\section*{SECTION 14. Departments.}

The term department as used in this ordinance shall mean department, bureau, office, utility, agency, board or commission, as the case may be. The term department head as
used herein shall be the chief executive duly appointed and acting as provided in the Charter. When one or more departments are reorganized or consolidated, the former entities may be displayed as separate units, if, in the opinion of the Controller, this will facilitate accounting or reporting.
(a) The Public Utilities Commission shall be considered one entity for budget purposes and for disbursement of funds within each of the enterprises. The entity shall retain its enterprises, including Water, Hetch Hetchy, Wastewater, and the Public Utilities Commission, as separate utility fund enterprises under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission and with the authority provided by the Charter. This section shall not be construed as a merger or completion of the Hetch Hetchy Project, which shall not be deemed completed until a specific finding of completion has been made by the Public Utilities Commission. The consolidated agency will be recognized for purposes of determining employee seniority, position transfers, budgetary authority and transfers or reappropriation of funds.
(b) There shall be a General Services Agency, headed by the City Administrator, including the Department of Public Works, the Department of Telecommunication and Information Services, and the Department of Administrative Services

The City Administrator shall be considered one entity for budget purposes and for disbursement of funds. This budgetary structure does not affect the separate legal status of the departments placed within the entity: Administrative Services, Medical Examiner, Convention and Facilities Management, and Animal Care and Control. Each of these departments shall retain the duties and responsibilities of departments as provided in the Charter and the Administrative Code, including but not limited to appointing and contracting authority.
(c) There shall be a Human Services Agency, which shall be considered one entity for budget purposes and for disbursement of funds. Within the Human Services Agency shall be two departments: (1) the Department of Human Services, under the Human Services Commission, and (2) the Department of Aging and Adult Services ("DAAS"), under the Mayor, includes Adult Protective Services, the Public Administrator/Public Guardian, the Mental Health Conservator, the Office on Aging, the County Veterans' Service Officer, and the In-Home Supportive Services Program. This budgetary structure does not affect the legal status or structure of the two departments, unless reorganized under Charter Section 4.132. The Director of Human Resources and the Controller are authorized to transfer employees, positions, and funding in order to effectuate the transfer of the program from one department to the other. The consolidated agency will be recognized for purposes of determining employee seniority, position transfers, budgetary authority and transfers or reappropriation of funds.

The departments within the Human Services Agency shall coordinate with each other and with the Commission on Aging to improve delivery of services, increase administrative efficiencies and eliminate duplication of efforts. To this end, they may share staff and facilities. The Commission on Aging shall remain the Area Agency on Aging. This
coordination is not intended to diminish the authority of the Commission on Aging over matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The Director of the Commission on Aging also may serve as the department head for DAAS, and/or as a deputy director for the Department of Human Services, but shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of an additional appointment. If an additional appointment is made, it shall not diminish the authority of the Commission on Aging over matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HOM) is an office of the City until the Board of Supervisors adopts an ordinance authorizing the creation of a separate department. The appropriation summary contained herein referring to HOM is for display purposes only.

\section*{SECTION 15. Travel Reimbursement and Cell Phone Stipends.}

The Controller shall establish rules for the payment of all amounts payable for travel for officers and employees, and for the presentation of such vouchers as he shall deem proper in connection with expenditures made pursuant to said Section. No allowance shall be made for traveling expenses provided for in this ordinance unless funds have been appropriated or set aside for such expenses in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

The Controller may advance the sums necessary for traveling expenses, but proper account and return must be made of said sums so advanced by the person receiving the same within ten days after said person returns to duty in the City and County of San Francisco, and failure on the part of the person involved to make such accounting shall be sufficient cause for the Controller to withhold from such persons pay check or checks in a sum equivalent to the amount to be accounted.

In consultation with the Director of Human Resources, the Controller shall establish rules and parameters for the payment of monthly stipends to officers and employees who use their own cells phones to maintain continuous communication with their workplace, and who participate in a Citywide program that reduces costs of City-owned cell phones.

SECTION 16. Contributed Revenue Reserve and Audit and Adjustment Reserve.
The Controller is hereby authorized to establish a Contributed Revenue and Adjustment Reserve to accumulate receipts in excess of those estimated revenues or unexpended appropriations stated herein. Said reserve is established for the purpose of funding the budget of the subsequent year, and the receipts in this reserve are hereby appropriated for said purpose. The Controller is authorized to maintain an Audit and Adjustment Reserve to offset audit adjustments, and to balance expenditure accounts to conform to year-end balancing and year-end close requirements.

\section*{SECTION 17. Airport Service Payment.}

The moneys received from the Airport's revenue fund as the Annual Service Payment provided in the Airline-Airport Lease and Use Agreement are in satisfaction of all obligations of the Airport Commission for indirect services provided by the City and

County of San Francisco to the Commission and San Francisco International Airport and constitute the total transfer to the City's General Fund.

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the City's General Fund from the Airport revenue fund with the approval of the Airport Commission funds that constitute the annual service payment provided in the Airline - Airport Lease and Use Agreement in addition to the amount stated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance.

On the last business day of the fiscal year, unless otherwise directed by the Airports Commission, the Controller is hereby authorized and directed to transfer all moneys remaining in the Airport's Contingency Account to the Airport's Revenue Fund. The Controller is further authorized and directed to return such amounts as were transferred from the Contingency Account, back to the Contingency Account from the Revenue Fund Unappropriated Surplus on the first business day of the succeeding fiscal year, unless otherwise directed by the Airports Commission.

\section*{SECTION 18. Pooled Cash, Investments.}

The Treasurer and Controller are hereby authorized to transfer available fund balances within pooled cash accounts to meet the cash management of the City, provided that special and non-subsidized enterprise funds shall be credited interest earnings on any funds temporarily borrowed there from at the rate of interest earned on the City Pooled Cash Fund. No such cash transfers shall be allowed where the investment of said funds in investments such as the pooled funds of the City and County is restricted by law.

\section*{SECTION 19. Matching Funds for Federal or State Programs.}

Funds contributed to meet operating deficits and/or to provide matching funds for federal or State aid (e.g. Medicaid under SB 855 or similar legislation for San Francisco General Hospital) are specifically deemed to be made exclusively from local property and business tax sources.

SECTION 20. Advance Funding of Bond Projects - City Departments.
Whenever the City and County has authorized appropriations for the advance funding of projects which may at a future time be funded from the proceeds of general obligation, revenue, or lease revenue bond issues or other legal obligations of the City and County, the Controller shall recover from bond proceeds or other available sources, when they become available, the amount of any interest earnings foregone by the General Fund as a result of such cash advance to disbursements made pursuant to said appropriations. The Controller shall use the monthly rate of return earned by the Treasurer on City Pooled Cash Fund during the period or periods covered by the advance as the basis for computing the amount of interest foregone which is to be credited to the General Fund.

\section*{SECTION 21. Advance Funding of Projects - Transportation Authority.}

Whenever the San Francisco County Transportation Authority requests advance funding of the costs of administration or the costs of projects specified in the City and County of San Francisco Transportation Expenditure Plan which will be funded from proceeds of the transactions and use tax as set forth in Article 14 of Part III of the Municipal Code of the City and County of San Francisco, the Controller is hereby authorized to make such
advance. The Controller shall recover from the proceeds of the transactions and use tax when they become available, the amount of the advance and any interest earnings foregone by the City and County General Fund as a result of such cash advance funding. The Controller shall use the monthly rate of return earned by the Treasurer on General City Pooled Cash funds during the period or periods covered by the advance as the basis for computing the amount of interest foregone which is to be credited to the General Fund.

\section*{SECTION 22. Controller to Correct Clerical Errors.}

The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to adjust interdepartmental appropriations, make transfers to correct objects of expenditures classifications and to correct clerical or computational errors as may be ascertained by the Controller to exist in the Annual Budget as adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The Controller shall file with the Clerk of the Board a list of such adjustments, transfers and corrections made pursuant to this Section.

The Controller is hereby authorized to make the necessary transfers to correct objects of expenditure classifications, and corrections in classifications made necessary by changes in the proposed method of expenditure.

\section*{SECTION 22.1 Controller to Implement New Financial System.}

In order to complete implementation of the Financial System Replacement Project, the Controller shall have the authority to reclassify departments' appropriations to conform to the accounting structures established in the new system.

\section*{SECTION 23. Transfer of State Revenues.}

The Controller is authorized to transfer revenues among City departments to comply with provisions in the State budget.

SECTION 24. Use of Permit Revenues from the Department of Building Inspection. Permit revenue funds from the Department of Building Inspection that are transferred to other departments as shown in this budget shall be used only to fund the planning, regulatory, enforcement and building design activities that have a demonstrated nexus with the projects that produce the fee revenues.

\section*{SECTION 25. Board of Supervisors Official Advertising Charges.}

The Board of Supervisors is authorized to collect funds from enterprise departments to place official advertising. The funds collected are automatically appropriated in the budget of the Board of Supervisors as they are received.

\section*{SECTION 26. Work Order Appropriations.}

The Board of Supervisors directs the Controller to establish work orders pursuant to Board-approved appropriations, including positions needed to perform work order services, and corresponding recoveries for services that are fully cost covered, including but not limited to services provided by one City department to another City department, as well as services provided by City departments to external agencies, including but not limited to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Treasure Island

Development Authority, the School District, and the Community College. Revenues for services from external agencies shall be appropriated by the Controller in accordance with the terms and conditions established to perform the service.

It is the policy of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to allocate costs associated with the replacement of the City's financial and purchasing system to all City Departments proportional to the departments' costs and financial requirements. In order to minimize new General Fund appropriations to complete the project, the Controller is authorized and directed to work with departments to identify efficiencies and savings in their financial and administrative operations to be applied to offset their share of the costs of this project, and is authorized to apply said savings to the project.

\section*{SECTION 26.1 Property Tax System}

In order to minimize new appropriations to the property tax system replacement project, the Controller is authorized and directed to apply operational savings from the offices of the Tax Collector, Assessor, and Controller to the project. No later than June 1, 2018 the Controller shall report to the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office and Budget and Finance Committee on the specific amount of operational savings, including details on the source of such savings, in the budgets of Tax Collector, Assessor, and Controller that are re-allocated to the Property Tax System Replacement Project

\section*{SECTION 27. Fee Reserves and Deferrals.}

The Controller is authorized to establish fee reserve allocations for a given program to the extent that the cost of service exceeds the revenue received in a given fiscal year, including establishment of deferred revenue or reserve accounts.

\section*{SECTION 28. Close-Out of Reserved Appropriations.}

On an annual basis, the Controller shall report the status of all reserves, their remaining balances, and departments' explanations of why funding has not been requested for release. Continuation of reserves will be subject to consideration and action by the Budget and Finance Committee. The Controller shall close out reserved appropriations that are no longer required by the department for the purposes for which they were appropriated.

\section*{SECTION 28.1. Reserves Placed on Expenditures by Controller.}

Consistent with Charter Section 3.105(d), the Controller is authorized to reserve expenditures in the City's budget equal to uncertain revenues, as deemed appropriate by the Controller. The Controller is authorized to remove, transfer, and update reserves to expenditures in the budget as revenue estimates are updated and received in order to maintain City operations.

SECTION 29. Appropriation Control of Capital Improvement Projects and Equipment. Unless otherwise exempted in another section of the Administrative Code or Annual Appropriation Ordinance, and in accordance with Administrative Code Section 3.18, departments may transfer funds from one Board-approved capital project to another Board-approved capital project. The Controller shall approve transfers only if they do not materially change the size or scope of the original project. Annually, the Controller shall
report to the Board of Supervisors on transfers of funds that exceed \(10 \%\) of the original appropriation to which the transfer is made.

The Controller is authorized to approve substitutions within equipment items purchased to equip capital facilities providing that the total cost is within the Board-approved capital project appropriation.

The Controller is authorized to transfer approved appropriations between departments to correctly account for capitalization of fixed assets.

\section*{SECTION 30. Business Improvement Districts.}

Proceeds from all special assessments levied on real property included in the propertybased business improvement districts in the City and County of San Francisco are hereby appropriated for fiscal years 2018-19 and 2019-20 in the respective amounts actually received by the City and County in such fiscal year for each such district. Estimated amounts of those appropriations for the business improvement districts identified are summarized in the chart below for information only.

The Controller is authorized to disburse the assessment revenues appropriated by this section to the respective Owners' Associations (as defined in Section 36614.5 of the Streets and Highways Code) for such districts as provided in the management district plans, resolutions establishing the districts, annual budgets and management agreements, as approved by the Board of Supervisors for each such district, for the purposes authorized therein. The Tourism Improvement District and Moscone Expansion Business Improvement District assessments are levied on gross hotel room revenue, not real property, and are collected and distributed by the Tax Collector's Office.
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|}
\hline District/Resolution No./Special Asssessment No. & FY 2018-19 & FY 2019-20 \\
\hline Castro/Upper Market Community Benefit District, 582-05, 63 & \(\$ 498,133\) & \(\$ 498,133\) \\
Central Market Community Benefit District, 631-06, 66 & \(\$ 1,458,969\) & \(\$ 1,458,969\) \\
Civic Center Community Benefit District, 021-11, 31 & \(\$ 828,893\) & \(\$ 828,893\) \\
Dogpatch \& Northwest Potrero Hill Green Benefit District, 301-15, 33 & \(\$ 584,753\) & \(\$ 584,753\) \\
Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District, 540-05, 64 & \(\$ 695,045\) & \(\$ 695,045\) \\
Fisherman's Wharf Portside, 539-05, F-107 & \(\$ 230,818\) & \(\$ 230,818\) \\
Greater Rincon Hill CBD, 299-15, 32 & \(\$ 3,287,636\) & \(\$ 3,287,636\) \\
Greater Union Square Business Improvement District, 550-10, 57 & \(\$ 3,551,533\) & \(\$ 3,551,533\) \\
Japantown Community Benefit District, 302-17, 47 & \(\$ 393,701\) & \(\$ 393,701\) \\
Lower Polk Community Benefit District, 314-14, 74 & \(\$ 839,148\) & \(\$ 839,148\) \\
Moscone Expansion Business Improvement District, 26-13 & \(\$ 30,300,000\) & \(\$ 31,300,000\) \\
Noe Valley Community Benefit District, 583-05, 61 & \(\$ 265,123\) & \(\$ 265,123\) \\
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit District, 584-05, 62 & \(\$ 1,089,904\) & \(\$ 1,089,904\) \\
Ocean Avenue, 587-10, 73 & \(\$ 311,579\) & \(\$ 311,579\) \\
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, Measure AA, June 2016 & \(\$ 2,377,296\) & \(\$ 2,377,296\) \\
Top of Broadway, 263-13, 76 & \(\$ 108,178\) & \(\$ 108,178\) \\
Tourism Improvement District, 504-08, 75 & \(\$ 25,200,000\) & \(\$ 26,100,000\) \\
Yerba Buena Community Benefit District, 330-08, 96, & \(\$ 3,009,910\) & \(\$ 3,009,910\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{SECTION 31. Infrastructure Financing and Infrastructure Revitalization Financing} Districts.
Pursuant to California Government Code Section 53395 et seq. (IFD Law), the Board of Supervisors has formed Infrastructure Financing (IFD) and Infrastructure Revitalization Financing (IRFD) Districts within the City and County of San Francisco. The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the Controller to transfer funds and appropriation authority between and within accounts related to City and County of San Francisco IFDs and IRFDs to serve accounting and State requirements, the latest approved Infrastructure Financing Plan for a District, and applicable bond covenants.

When \(100 \%\) of the portion of property tax increment normally appropriated to the City and County of San Francisco's General Fund or Special Revenue Fund or to the County's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) is instead pledged, based on Board of Supervisors Ordinance, the Controller may increase or decrease appropriations to match
actual revenues realized for the IFD or IRFD. Any increases to appropriations would be consistent with the Financing Plan previously approved by the Board of Supervisors.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline IFD/IRFD No / Title & Ordinance & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Estimated Tax Increment} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FY 2018-19} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{FY 2019-20} \\
\hline IFD 2 Port Infrastructure Financing District Subproject Area Pier 70 G-1 Historic Core & 27-16 & & 539,000 & \$ & \\
\hline IFD 2 Port Infrastructure Financing District Project Area I (Mission Rock) & 34-18 & \$ & - & \$ & - \\
\hline IRFD 1 Treasure Island Infrastructure Revitalization Financing District & 21-17 & \$ & 148,000 & & 1,066,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SECTION 32. Labor Cost Contingency Reserve.
Notwithstanding Section 7.3 of these provisions, seventy million dollars ( \(\$ 70,000,000\) ) of unassigned fund balance from fiscal year 2017-18 is hereby assigned to a budget contingency reserve for the purpose of managing costs related to wage and salary provisions negotiated in the City's labor contracts in fiscal year 2019-20, and to manage volatility in employee health and pension benefit costs. This assignment shall not be included in the calculations of deposits to the Budget Stabilization Reserve as required in Administrative Code Section 10.60 (c).

\section*{SECTION 33. State and Federal Revenue Risk Reserve.}

Forty million dollars ( \(\$ 40,000,000\) ) of unassigned fund balance from fiscal year 2017-18 is hereby assigned to a budget contingency reserve for the purpose of managing state, federal and other revenue uncertainty during the term of the proposed budget. This assignment shall not be included in the calculations of deposits to the Budget Stabilization Reserve as required in Administrative Code Section 10.60 (c).

SECTION 34. Transbay Joint Powers Authority Financing.
Sources received for purposes of payment of debt service for the approved and issued Transbay Community Facilities District special tax bonds and the approved and drawn City bridge loan to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority are hereby appropriated.

SECTION 35. Implementation of Proposed November 2018 Ballot Measure to Dedicate Hotel Tax Proceeds.
This ordinance assumes hotel tax revenue allocations and expenditures necessary to conform with the provisions contained in Board of Supervisors File No. 180122 titled "Initiative Ordinance - Business and Tax Regulations and Administrative Codes - Hotel Tax Allocations," which is proposed to be placed on the November 2018 ballot and would, if approved, dedicate hotel taxes for the purposes stated in the measure effective January 1, 2019. Should the measure fail, the Controller is directed to adjust the budget to increase transfers from the General Fund to the Grants for the Arts, the Cultural Equity Endowment and Cultural Centers to support existing expenditures in the second half of fiscal year 2018-19.
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THOMAS MAZZUCCO
Vice President
PETRA DeJESUS Commissioner

June 7, 2018
ROBERT M. HIRSCH Commissioner

JOHN HAMASAKI
Commissioner
CINDY ELIAS Commissioner
Honorable Board of Supervisors City Hall, Room 244
\#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Sergeant Rachael Kilshaw Secretary

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, June 6, 2018, the following resolution was adopted:

\section*{RESOLUTION NO. 18-37}

APPROVAL TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A BUDGET MODIFICATION REALLOCATING \(\$ 6,174,380.23\) IN SALARIES BUDGET TO INTERDEPARTMENTAL SERVICES FOR WORKER'S COMPENSATION

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission hereby recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a budget modification reallocating \(\$ 6,174,380.23\) in salaries budget to interdepartmental services for worker's compensation.

AYES: Commissioners Mazzucco, DeJesus, Kirsch, Hamasaki, Elias
Very truly yours,


Sergeant Rachael Kilshaw
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

949/rct
cc: Director C. McGuire/Fiscal

Wong, Linda (BOS)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Cassandra Costello <cassandra@sftravel.com> \\
Sent: & Friday, June 08, 2018 4:07 PM \\
To: & Calvillo, Angela (BOS) \\
Cc: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Subject: & Please Distribute \\
Attachments: & Thank you from Clean Safe Coalition to.pdf
\end{tabular}

Good Afternoon Angela,
I hope you are well!
Can you please deliver the attached letter to each member of the board of supervisors? It is should go on file with correspondence for the FY 18/19 budget process.

Let me know if you prefer that I send it to them directly.
Thanks,
Cassandra


Cassandra Costello | VP, Public Policy \& Executive Programs
E cassandra@sftravel.com | T 415.227.2655 | F 415.227.2631
San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900. | San Francisco, CA 94111
sftravel.com | Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

Never the Same. Always San Francisco.
June 23-24 SF Pride | July 20-22 Rugby World Cup Sevens

Got Meetings? Check Out Our Pick Two Promotion!


June 8, 2018

\author{
Mayor Mark Farrell \\ San Francisco City Hall \\ 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place \\ San Francisco, CA 94102
}

Dear Mayor Farrell:
As committed business and neighborhood leaders of the Clean and Safe Coalition, we would like to thank you for your proposed investments to keep San Francisco clean and safe, while supporting our unsheltered neighbors and those suffering on our streets every day.

Thank you for your proposed investments in FY 2018-2019 budget to address homelessness, street cleanliness, and public safety. Thank you for listening to our concerns and committing the following investments:
- \(\$ 4\) million for permanent supportive housing.
- \(\$ 1.2\) million for the Homeward Bound program
- \(\$ 15.2\) million for four new Navigation Center facilities
- \(\$ 1\) million for rapid rehousing programs for Transitional Age Youth
- \(\$ 6\) million for a dedicated drug addiction street team
- \(\$ 13\) million for a comprehensive street cleaning program and staffed public toilets
- \(\$ 3.4\) million for new street cleaning vehicles
- 250 additional sworn police officers
- \(\$ 8\) million for 90 new 911 dispatcher recruits
- \(\$ 304\) million for long-term improvement projects, including street resurfacing, sidewalk repair, and improvements to our park system

These investments will provide the much needed support to our neighbors in need, while addressing the serious concerns of our residents and visitors. On behalf of San Francisco businesses and residents, we thank you for your proposed investments in keeping San Francisco clean and safe for everyone.

Sincerely,

Joe D'Alessandro | President and CEO, San Francisco Travel Association


Kevin Carroll | Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco


Jim Lazarus | Senior Vice President of Public Policy, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce


Gwyneth Borden | Executive Director, Golden Gate Restaurant Association


John Bozeman | Director, Government and Industry Affairs, Building Owners and Managers Association


Cathy Maupin | Executive Director, Yerba Buena Community Benefit District


Tracy Everwine |Executive Director, Civic Center Community Benefit District


Troy Campbell |Executive Director, Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District


Chris Wright | Executive Director, Committee on Jobs

CC: District 1 Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
District 2 Supervisor Catherine Stefani
District 3 Supervisor Aaron Peskin
District 4 Supervisor Katy Tang
District 5 Supervisor London Breed
District 6 Supervisor Jane Kim
District 7 Supervisor Norman Xe
District 8 Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen
District 10 Supervisor Maia Cohen
District 11 Supervisor Ahsha Safai

Wong, Linda (BOS)
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Jessica Lum <jessical@sftravel.com> \\
-ent: & Friday, June 22, 2018 4:26 PM \\
To: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Cc: & DPH - cassandra \\
Subject: & Letter of Support for Police Staffing Levels - SF Travel \\
Attachments: & SF Travel - Letter of Support for Increase Police Staffing.pdf
\end{tabular}

Hello Linda,
I hope you are well. San Francisco Travel would like to submit the attached letter of support urging the Budget and Finance Committee to approve the proposed increase of 250 uniformed police officers to the Police Department.

Could you please distribute the attached letter to the board and put it on file?
Thank you!


Jessica Lum | Director, Public Policy \& Executive Office Programs
E jessical@sftravel.com | T 415.227.2623 | F 415.227.2668
an Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 | San Francisco, CA 94111
travel.com | Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

Never the Same. Always San Francisco.
June 23-24 SF Pride | July 20-22 Rugby World Cup Sevens

Got Meetings? Check Out Our Pick Two Promotion!

June 22, 2018

The Honorable Malia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, \#244
San Francisco, CA 94012
Re: Police Department Staffing Budget

Dear Supervisor Cohen,
On behalf of the San Francisco Travel Association, which represents over 1,300 businesses, I am urging the Budget and Finance Committee to approve the Police Department's funding request to increase staffing levels to meet the City's growing needs.

The Charter "minimum" police staffing levels, set by voters in 1994, was fixed at a time when the population was approximately \(724,000,20 \%\) lower than it is today. In 2017, San Francisco welcomed over 25 million visitors, compared to only 16 million visitors in 1999. This is an increase of approximately 25,000 more visitors per day from when the staffing levels were established.

There is a clear need for increased staffing. We believe the best way to deter crime and threatening street behavior is to put more officers on the beat in popular tourist attractions, neighborhood commercial districts, and transit hubs. We must also ensure that the City remains ahead of the curve with retirements and assure that response times to all crimes in progress are met. Our growing city needs to increase police staffing levels.

San Francisco Travel urges the Board of Supervisors to approve Mayor Farrell's four-year plan to increase the Police Department's uniformed force by 250 officers.

Sincerely,

Joe D'Alessandro
President and CEO
sent:
To:
Subject:

Tuesday, June 19, 2018 1:51 PM
Wong, Linda (BOS)
FW: Comment and requests for the Budget Approval of the SFPD and Office of the District Attorney

From: Justice for Luis Góngora Pat [mailto:justice4luis@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 6:49 AM
To: Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS)
<norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS)
<jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>
Cc: TeaboMaya@gmail.com; Luis Poot <luisapoot@yahoo.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comment and requests for the Budget Approval of the SFPD and Office of the District Attorney
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Yee and Sheehy,
My name is Adriana Camarena and I am writing on behalf of the family of Luis Góngora Pat and our grassroots organization Justice and Honor for Luís Góngora Pat. We send our public comment to support the following requests with regards to the budgets of San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the District Attorney.

\section*{, FPD}

In the context of racists texts, corruption scandals and a spike in police murders, the City ordered a reform of the SFPD in 2016. Since the reform began, no system of measurable outcomes and goals has been established for any of the substantive areas of reform since the process began. Except for community policing, there has been no progress towards even establishing a strategic plan for reform. As a result, neither the Supervisors nor the public (not even SFPD) know whether or not SFPD is making any progress in reforming its culture and conduct regarding intrinsic bias, community policing, use of force, hiring and recruiting practices or accountability.

We respectfully ask the Supervisors to please place a significant hold on the SFPD budget-we suggest holding \(25 \%\) of the budget and denying approval of a taser acquisition budget-until such a system for establishing and continuously monitoring and evaluating measurable outcomes and goals for the SFPD reform process is established. The understanding is of course that this system will be established through community oriented processes to reflect community concerns that sparked the reform process to begin with. Once established, we request that the Supervisors continue to hold a significant percentage of the SFPD budget until there is demonstrable and significant progress towards meeting measurable goals and outcomes of reform.

We commend Sup. Yee's resolution for a study to determine the correct department size and budget for SFPD, asking that this effort align to the recommendations and process of reform mentioned above.

\section*{District Attorney}

In regards to the Office of the District Attorney, in 2016, also in the context of community demands for reform and accountability, the Board of Supervisors approved a \(\$ 1.8\) million (later \(\$ 1.5\) million) dollar budget to establish the Bureau of Independent Investigations with the primary purpose of:
1. Investigating and reviewing all officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths.
2. Investigating and reviewing all other excessive use of force cases.
3. Conviction review: assessing and remedying individual colorable claims of innocence and broadly examine cases of misconduct discovered through a proactive, internal lookback process

Since the BII was established there has not been one single OIS fatal or non-fatal of the 54 incidents that took place from 2011-2017 (or any other incident of excessive use of force for that matter) for which the D.A. has pursued criminal charges. We invite you to look at our online report on D.A. George Gascon's Scorecard on Charging SFPD Killings from 2011-March 2018: A 100\% Police Impunity Rate!

As the Public Defender Jeff Adachi made clear after the D.A. announced his non-charging decision in the OIS cases of Mario Woods and Luis Góngora Pat a few weeks back, the D.A. has the evidence to pursue criminal charges against officers who kill unlawfully, but declines to do so on his own discretion. The D.A. Gascón has argued that the law makes supporting findings difficult, but what he is really doing by never pressing charges is impeding a full evidentiary case to be built and brought before a jury to decide on the merits of the case.

There are many cases in which on the basis of little evidence D.A. Gascón presses charges against citizens on a daily bases; cases that are later dropped or that he loses in court for lack of evidence, such as in the Kate Steiner tragedy. But we substantiate our doubt that the D.A. has no intention to pursue charges in OIS or other excessive use of force cases-thus mismanaging the BII and undermining its independence-when we realize that in all cases of non fatal OIS, D.A. Gascón always presses charges against the victim in a police shooting (e.g. Sean Moore, Randall Dunklin, and currently Oliver Barcenas to just name a few salient cases).

We believe that the D.A. is mismanaging the BII so that it never fulfills its purpose. We support Sup. Cohen's call to audit the Office of the D.A., and specifically request that an exhaustive audit of the BII be carried out to understand how its budget has been used to meet its purpose. Until results are given by the BII (aligned also to the Blue Ribbon Panel and DOJ recommendations), we ask that quarterly audits be carried out with regards to how the BII is meeting its primary purpose of INDEPENDENTLY reviewing SFPD excessive use of force cases and conviction reviews.

We also request that the results of such an audit be reviewed with the D.A. present in a committee of the whole of the BOS or at least of the B\&F Committee, allowing for public comment.

Without decisive oversight from the Budget and Finance Committee of the BOS, regarding the use of public monies to finance the SFPD and the BII of the D.A., the reform process will be a complete failure and waste of taxpayer dollars.

Thank you for your consideration,
Adriana Camarena with José Góngora Pat, brother of Luis Góngora Pat killed by SFPD, and his cousins Carlos Poot Pat and Luis Poot Pat
--
Justice and Honor for Luís Góngora Pat
Justicia y Honor para Luís Demetrio Góngora Pat
www.justice4luis.org

\title{
SAN FRANCISCO \\ PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE
}


1370 Masonic Ave., San Francisco, CA 94117•415-290-5718 • info@sfpublicgolf.org
June 20, 2018
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget and Finance Committee
Supervisor Malia Cohen, Chair
City Hall, Room 210
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett PI.
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

> Re: Budget \& Finance Committee Hearing, June 21, 2018, 10 a.m. File \#180574 / San Francisco Recreation and Park Department Budget

> San Francisco Public Golf Alliance supports the Rec \& Park Budget, Including its fee Increase package for the City's municipal golf courses.

Dear Chairperson Cohen and Supervisors,
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance is a pro-bono, non-profit public benefit organization with 6,500-plus members - men, women, seniors and juniors, across the full spectrum of race, preference, and socio-economy, who use and care deeply about golf and San Francisco's city-owned public courses. Our members include residents of every neighborhood and players at every public course in the city. Since 2007 we have closely followed, and on numerous occasions we and our members have appeared in large numbers in person and in writing before Your Board and several other local, state, and federal governmental agencies, in support of public golf and the public courses.

We come now to Your Board in support of the Rec \& Park Department's proposed 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 Budget, and specifically the fee increases reflected in the proposed amendments to Park Code Sections 12.12 and 12.20 , including an extension of "flexible pricing," increase in tournament fees, super-twilight rates, and imposition of a \$2-per-9-hole "Special Projects Maintenance Fee," as spelled-out at Section.12.12(f) of the proposed revised Park Code. \({ }^{1}\) Taken together these will mean the golfers will pay more and the City will gain substantial increased revenues from the golf courses, as projected at pages 3-4 of the Department's May 17, 2018 Staff Memo to the Rec \& Park Commission. \({ }^{2}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{1}\) The draft code changes are at https://drive.google.com/open?id=1-pJ1f5y1tGw7vUV9YxYA0GlpvIJwYGxn, where revised Park Code Section 12.12(f), which established the Special Projects Maintenance Fee, reads:
(f) Special Projects Maintenance Fee. The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \(\$ 2\) per nine holes, which the Department shall set aside in a separate fund for that Golf Course to pay for special maintenance repairs or course improvements.
\({ }^{2}\) The Staff Memo to the Rec \& Park Commission, dated May 17, 2018, is found at this link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PFuYugN sv7ZfxN1iwgTUEkVU5G35uMy
}

On behalf of our members, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance supports this fee increase proposal because of the Department's commitment to now create a "Special Projects Maintenance Fee" and set-aside fund to address long-deferred maintenance and deteriorating infrastructure, which have been particularly problematic at Sharp, Lincoln, and Golden Gate. Deferred maintenance and deteriorating infrastructure at the city's recreational facilities have for years been identified by city residents, RPD staff, and the city's outside consultants as a major chronic problem. \({ }^{3}\)

Even after application of the Special Maintenance Fee, the proposed new resident rates are very reasonable - in fact, significantly lower at all courses; except Harding, than at the surrounding public courses. \({ }^{4}\) And the Special Projects Maintenance Fee and setaside represents a beginning step by the Department to finally address the longstanding deferred maintenance and infrastructure deterioration problems at the golf courses. So the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance is pleased to support the Department's 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 Budget, including the golf fee increase proposals and revision of Park Code Sections 12.12 and 12.20.

\author{
Very truly yours, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance \\  \\ Richard Harris and Bo Links, Co-Founders
}
cc:
Phil Ginsburg, Mark Buell, Dana Ketcham, Lyn Nelson, Dan Burke, Tom Smith, Mike Ippolito, Bob Downing, Lauren Elliot, Lisa Villasenor, Mark Duane, Lance Wong, Tom Hsieh

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{3}\) Recreation Assessment Report, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, Leon Younger \& PROS, LLC, Aug., 2004: https://www.slideshare.net/SFOceanEdge/leon-younger-recreation-assessment-report-san-francisco "Department Weaknesses. Facility Conditions. Although there is a benefit to the community to have a good number of recreation facilities and program space, it is equally important to assure the facilities are kept in good condition and inviting. Many [citizen focus group] comments were made about the deteriorating conditions found at the recreation facilities. These conditions were cited as a reason recreation facilities are not used. . . The Department is at a point where it can no longer reduce maintenance. . . repairs needed to be made to keep the faiclities inviting. . . The City does not have an on-going capital improvement budget to address deferred maintenance needs. . . . Staff Focus Group Results Summary. The general perception expressed by staff is that recreation facilities are run down and not maintained well." Id., at pages 5-6. ...
"Section 6. Implementation Approach. ... The public desires access to quality recreation... facilities. . . The five major moves the Department must incorporate . . . [include] . . Recreational facilities will be valued Community assets by upgrading and maintaining all indoor and outdoor facilities in need of major repair \(\qquad\) ." Id., at page 42.
\({ }^{4}\) See, e.g., the published rates at San Mateo's municipal Poplar Creek Golf Course: http://www.poplarcreekgolf.com/course/rates/
}

\title{
FACT SHEET: NUHW and Richmond Area Multi-Services (RAMS)
}

In October of 2017, mental health providers at RAMS voted by more than a \(90 \%\) margin to join the National Union of Healthcare Workers (NUHW). Caregivers are now negotiating a labor contract with RAMS administrators.

\section*{About RAMS:}

RAMS is a non-profit mental health agency offering over 30 clinical programs at over 130 sites across San Francisco. According to RAMS, it offers "comprehensive services that aim to meet the behavioral health, social, vocation, and education needs of the diverse community of the San Francisco Area." Included among the RAMS's programs is its Broderick Street Adult Residential Facility, where it provides board \& care, mental health, and medical support services to adult residents who would otherwise be at risk for homelessness. The organization aims to provide culturally competent care with a special focus on Asian \& Pacific Islander American and Russian-speaking populations, and serves around 18,000 adults, children, youth and families annually.

\section*{NUHW's Members at RAMS:}
- NUHW represents 107 mental health clinicians at RAMS. These clinicians care for children, adolescents, and adults, and represent over 30 job classifications, including Mental Health Counselors and Consultants, Behavioral Health Counselors, Clinical Supervisors, Psychiatric Nurse Practitioners, among others.
- \(65 \%\) of NUHW's RAMS members live in San Francisco, with the largest concentration living in the 94121 ZIP code (Richmond/Outer Richmond). Nearly 10\% of members live in Oakland, with others commuting to San Francisco from as far away as Richmond and San Jose.
- On average, NUHW's RAMS members have worked at the organization for 3.5 years, with four employees having worked at RAMS for over 20 years.
- Workers' median hourly wage rate is \(\$ 24.04\). The lowest wage rate is \(\$ 18.00\) (a Case Manager/Outreach Worker). At RAMS, the average hourly rate earned by licensed mental health clinicians is \(\$ 24.46\), significantly lower than the City and County of San Francisco start rate of \(\$ 40.25\) for similar classifications (MFTs), nearly 45 percent below the comparable start rate of \(\$ 44.95\) for MFTs working at Kaiser Permanente, and \(\$ 3\) to \(\$ 12\) lower than the start rate at local mental health nonprofits, including La Clinica de la Raza and Asian Health Services.
- Nearly one-third of NUHW's RAMS members have active licensure in a psychology or mental health profession (i.e., MFT, LCSW, PsyD, among others).

\section*{RAMS' Finances:}

RAMS receives the majority of its funding from ongoing contracts with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH). For the year ended June 30, 2016, RAMS received \(\$ 18\) million in government grants and contracts. For the year ended June 30, 2017, RAMS reported \(\$ 19.94\) million in total revenues and \(\$ 369,702\) in net income. In 2018, RAMS contracted with a new third-party administrator for health benefits. As part of this arrangement, the health plans being offered to employees are now different. For example, the 2018 Kaiser plan offered to employees is a high deductible plan instead of a traditional Kaiser HMO plan as was offered in prior years. This new arrangement is expected to save RAMS a significant amount in the coming years.

RAMS's Financial Performance (Source: Audited Financial Statements)
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline & FYE June 30, 2017 & FYE June 30, 2016 \\
\hline Net Income/(Loss) & \(\$ 369,702\) & \(\$ 421,097\) \\
\hline Net Income Margin & \(1.85 \%\) & \(2.19 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Additionally, at the end of June 2017, RAMS held \(\$ 5.89\) million in cash and investments and reported total net assets of \(\$ 4.39\) million.

\section*{RAMS's Funding:}

RAMS has an annual operating budget of approximately \(\$ 24\) million and receives the majority of its funding from the SFDPH's Community Behavioral Health Services (BHS). BHS funds RAMS to provide a range of services, including residential mental health treatment, adult outpatient care, child outpatient care, prevention and early intervention services for children age \(0-5\), and numerous workforce development programs. RAMS is the primary community partner for San Francisco's Wellness Initiative which implements wellness programs at a variety of SFUSD schools. This particular initiative is jointly funded by SFDPH, SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, and the San Francisco Unified School District. About 20\% of RAMS members work for the Wellness Centers. RAMS also receives funding from SFDPH Housing \& Urban Health, the California Department of Rehabilitation, fee-for-service programs, and private contributions.

\section*{NUHW's Proposal:}

The cost of NUHW's first-year proposal is \(\$ 602,751\) - this amount factors in the planned 2.5 percent cost-of-living adjustment. NUHW is requesting that \(\$ 602,751\) be allocated to RAMS during the budget add-back process. The below table provides an overview of how this amount was derived.

The majority of RAMS's NUHW members live in the San Francisco Bay Area, and face high costs of living. Negotiating improved wages and benefits is a priority for RAMS clinicians--and this would also improve RAMS's abjlity to attract and retain a stable, qualified, and experienced workforce.

NUHW's proposal would enable RAMS workers to earn sustainable, market-rate wages, and continue to provide consistent, high-quality care to the community.

\section*{Estimated Costs of NUHW's Proposal:}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline & Annual Increase - Year 1 \\
\hline NUHW Proposal Cost: Wage Increase & \(\$ 678,199\) \\
\hline NUHW Proposal Cost: Retirement/Health Insurance Contribution (\$350/month) & \(\$ 324,552\) \\
\hline City of San Francisco: Nonprofit 2.5\% Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) & \((\$ 400,000)\) \\
\hline & TOTAL: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes: (1) Estimated costs are based on NUHW's 107 bargaining unit members at RAMS and (2) estimated revenues from a \(2.5 \%\) COLA, pending final approval by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

\section*{About NUHW:}

Founded in 2009, NUHW is the nation's fastest growing healthcare union, representing 14,000 mental health clinicians, nurses, nursing assistants, medical technicians, clerks, and service workers. NUHW mental health clinicians are leading the fight to end the stigma surrounding mental illness, provide better access to care, and enforce mental health parity rules so that patients get the treatment they need when they need it.
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\section*{Yeterce Against Momen Preventon and interention MAW) Growa Program Froi6-2017 Year-knd Peromatae stmmary}








\section*{Ethmitity Gender and Age}
 many indinduds served are unkowth Whe even ethonit made to colect the age and ethicivy of
 Agencies served 23,489 indinhals. No demogrophe informathon based on ethiovy or age was
 inctudime trose who dechmed be cepore any demographe infomation.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Xindun my & 94-5 & & & T-59 \\
\hline Asian Pacific liander & 2,883 & 1,306 & 13 & 4,202 \\
\hline Hispanic Latinalo & 2072 & 159 & 63 & 2,295 \\
\hline White & 2084 & 243 & 47 & 2,274 \\
\hline Africam Americati & 1.23 & 90 & 49 & 1,352 \\
\hline Miciole Eastem & 212 & 8 & 1. & 221 \\
\hline Bi/Multi-Ethnic & 205 & 62 & 35 & 302 \\
\hline Native American & 24. & 4 & 1 & 29 \\
\hline Unknown on Cther & 8,404 & 147 & 40 & 3,981 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{No mitmmaton avelable} & 4,423 \\
\hline Total & 16.898 & 1,919 & 249 & 23,489 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 9, & & & \\
\hline 0 y 7 & 1,368 & 827 & 43 & 2208 \\
\hline 18.64 & 15,105 & 980 & 255 & \(2{ }^{2}\), 50 \\
\hline \(65+\) & 367 & 182 & 1 & 550 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Nue hromation avalable} & 4,423 \\
\hline Totas & 16.898 & 1.919 & 349 & 23,489 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Additional Characteristics}

The stength of the Parther fgencles prouidng serwes is in their capactu to serve such a brad array of conmonty menters. What tollous is a sumary of the difablicy status, sexul crientation ard languages spoken by chents sewed by the Volence Agant worten fraventon and mervention Grans Program.
 Engish. The feft tahe helow presems the mosk frequenty spoken languages. A total spe induiduals identifed as Leshian, Guy, Elsexali, Queer, Ouertoning, or Other, representing 3\% of all indiviuais served. A torat of 12774 cases of disabifty were reported by individuats served, thothgh it possible that some hetividuals may possess multiple disatihties, and ofter disabilities were thedeclared.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline  & L 5 & 19.5y \\
\hline Veetramsse & 45 & \(1 \%\) \\
\hline Tagalog & H & 2, \\
\hline Mandeatin & 128 & \(3{ }^{36}\) \\
\hline Alcbic & 137 & 38 \\
\hline Otherdentrown* & 222 & \(5 \%\) \\
\hline Samonn & 395 & 3\% \\
\hline Camboulina & 494 & \(\underline{3}\) \\
\hline Laotan & 720 & 17\% \\
\hline Cantonese & 936 & 20\% \\
\hline Satrish & 1,237 & 298 \\
\hline Total Non-Engish speakera 1890 & &  \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{* fass man defotat ather languages} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Whemaglish langtages Most Freatently Spoken ey Clionts Serted}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline Spanich & Wewnemmina & catara & 1,237 \\
\hline Cantotrese &  & 836 & \\
\hline fromat & -matasim & 720 & \\
\hline Camketian & - & & \\
\hline Smmon & waw 3 3g & & \\
\hline Outherfinknow & 222 & & \\
\hline Arsbic & W 137 & & \\
\hline Mfactarit & - 128 & & \\
\hline Tacaict & - 77 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Wemambese} & - 第 & . & \\
\hline & 500 & 3,000 & 2,500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline WgingMymin & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Lesbian & 125 & \(22 \%\) \\
\hline Gay & 12 & 2096 \\
\hline Dicemal & 124 & 20\% \\
\hline Oucer & 143 & \(24 \%\) \\
\hline Custioning & 19 & 39 \\
\hline Other & 60 & 15\% \\
\hline Total LGBQC-tdentified maividuabs (3\%) & & 596 \\
\hline Straighthetmrosental & & 72158 \\
\hline Uibmown Decilied to State & & 15,635 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline  & & byisy \\
\hline mu/ATS & 21 & \(2 \%\) \\
\hline Wiguel mmpenthect & 23 & 2\% \\
\hline Deathtearing tmpaiment & 34 & \(3 \%\) \\
\hline Seubiomental Diabilizy & 38 & 牫 \\
\hline Chenticalperendercy & 131 & 10 E \\
\hline Phasial Lisubity & 338 & \(26 \%\) \\
\hline Memal Disabilty & 351 & \(27 \%\) \\
\hline Other ar Urknown & 341 & 29\% \\
\hline Tatal indeuduais whth Drsability ( \(5 \%\) ) & & 1.277 \\
\hline Nouemographe intomation asalabie & & 2,222 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Wember or Mon Exghta gombers

\section*{Description of Servites prwided}

In F 16677 , the Deparment furded 39 prograns operated hy 27 Pamer Agences through our
 provides funding for six cou sevice areas: Crisis bees, merventon and Advocacy Sewices, Prevenhor and Education Services, Legal Sewices, Emergency Sheltar and Trantitonal Housing.

 funded by the beparment can twolve fours of htervention services, includng phone counseling and
 13,632 of these wera crisis cats.

Folowng cisc, clent may cophre long-tem conselng and case management to gan stabluy in

 provided a total of 10047 hours of case managenent Advocates of these programs provided accompanment, case mahagement, sfety planms, counseling, intomation, referals, and suppri to empouer sutwory in baving and heaing from the wolence they experienced.

The Deparment abo fmos 44 programs to provid prevention and education services, inciuding workshogs to survors, youths and those at risk in the communty. Among the services provided are seffesteem dra heathy refationship workhous for youth and young acthts, seff-defense tranng sessions for women, life-skits and sughart groups for survivors of abuse, and tranthe on elder aduse For heath and soctal sevice provists. Attough these Partner Agencies pmbariv wous on prevention and outreath phen surviors and those at-isk come forward in teed of crisis intervention and enotonal stuport. in totai, the VAW Partner Agencies provided prevention sevices, edfational worksops and traing to 11,029 hedividuals.

The Deparmen funded fre thegal serves agencos in \(16-17\) that provided 13,259 fours of fegal and supertye services. A few examber of legal services provided w these agemies helude assistance with applyng for restraming orters, advecsey and cour accompanment curny chidd custody cases or durce procedings, pubic beneftis and support whith inmigration procedues.
 bed nghts to when and ther ctilden escapits doneetir volence. The Department also funded




 includes tranide other communty service providers or whoteers about worko with a specific

 year van Patter Ageries pronded techuen assistance 537 sewe provier of ont agences.

\section*{}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { VALVGRATTPGOGRAM } \\
& \text { F2016.201790ヶ0ms }
\end{aligned}
\]


The Deparment on che Stur of Wonen distrifutes grats to fud vilence aganst women prevention ard interenton services. The above graph represents eath savice area that was funded
 Agencies provitie wese services are displayed subsequenty.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Partner Agencies} \\
\hline Exitheraygsex &  \\
\hline S.F. Wonen Aginst Rape & Sexualissuut Crisis bine \\
\hline Wo.masue.fe. & Domestic Velence crisis Line \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline AbA Family Support Servicas & Home Visitation \\
\hline Asian Whemen's Sheler & Sam Frandzo Options for Comprehmave Action for Vath \\
\hline Asian Womer's Sheleer & Trans Senices \\
\hline Donatho Cameron House & Asian Donestic Volenos Advocecy \\
\hline La Casa de ias Madres & Sate Housing - Crios intervention tor SF. Hounige Authorty \\
\hline Mupres Undias y Actitas & Samando et Alma \\
\hline Not For Sale & Petmyent, Eay Area \\
\hline San Francisco Netweth Minteries & Sun bancisco Stie fousc \\
\hline SF. Women Agsinst Rape & Sexual Assaut Adrocagy \\
\hline St. James infimary & Violence Preventon and theryendon for Sen workers \\
\hline W.O.MA.f.es inc. & Therapy and Latma Case Management Progatm \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Asian Pacfic lsfuder Latim Outreach & Asian Anturaxficking collaboratye \\
\hline Astan Womens Sheber & Arab Women's Services \\
\hline Communty intiatues & E/La Para Tran Lathas \\
\hline Communty Unted Aganst Viciente & Communty Eubling Semices \\
\hline Community United Agamst Velemce & LST Women's Prevention \& EducationProfect \\
\hline Communty Youth Center & Young Asiam Women Aganst Votence \\
\hline Fhipino Community Csuter & Eabae Domestic violence Program \\
\hline Clice Foundation & Clide Wemert Center \\
\hline Horizons Untmited of San Francisco & Fenales Aganst Volence Feer Leadership Progun \\
\hline LVRIC & Queer and Trans Youth Overcoming Volence \\
\hline Mission Meighbethood Cemers, me. & Realabsing lsues Crating Empowered surdave \\
\hline SF, Women Agamst Erpe & Serud Assaut Education \\
\hline SF. Womet Agamst Repe & Studente Takmg About Nonviolem Daning (STANO) \\
\hline Women in Dialogue & In Detence of Prostitute woments Sutev \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Asian Pactit inlander tegaloutrach & Asian Pacifi lsiander Domestic Vidence Projec \\
\hline Bay Area lesal Aid & Domestic Violence Lagal Sentes \\
\hline Legal Aid Soctety - Employment Lau & Prgect SURVUE \\
\hline San Franciso Sar Association & Cooperave festraning orier ©linc \\
\hline San Prancisco Etar Association & lustice Q Diversity Center Legel Sefvoes Programs \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Astan Woments Shetery & Donestic Whatme sheltar Progrant \\
\hline La Casa de las Madres & Domestic violence Shebter Sermes \\
\hline Sc, Vront depeut - Rtey Cemiar & Rosult House - Domestu Votence Shetter gevices \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Gum Moon Whomens Eesidence & Trambtional Housing for manigran ruy surnuors \\
\hline  & Bram House \\
\hline Msn Elazabethim & mmprask \\
\hline St. Vromet depau- Piey Center & cremnen house \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Lets Hear fron Those Doing the Work.
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APA Family Support Services

According to the 2010 Bay Area Census, Asians and Pacific Islanders represents \(34 \%\) of San Francisco's population. Citywide, \(50 \%\) of San Francisco's API residents have limited English skills and 61\% are immigrants, Only 38\% of Asians in San Francisco have attained a college degree (Census 2004), and Asians' per-capita income in San Francisco is 48\% that of whites (SF 2010-14 Consolidated Plan). API children represent the largest number of children living in poverty in the city. In Chinatown alone, a remarkable 81\% of households have incomes of less than \(\$ 45,000\). Low-income immigrant API parents usually are unaware on how to achieve financial stability in the U.S; how to access online information for jobs, benefit and banking; and how to build their family assets as they are unfamiliar with the workings of the US system. Additionally, they often find it hard to adjust in the new environment and need assistance accessing resources in the community. Financial instability can also cause strain in a family's relationship, which may in turn lead to arguments, unhealthy relationships and even domestic abuse.

Many of our clients refuse to acknowledge abuse because of the shame, stigma and because they don't have the financial resources to break free. Our staff plays a crucial role in helping our clients overcome the barriers they face as new immigrants-monolingual, lack of self-sufficiency, limited education, and conditional or no legal residency status. The increasing high cost of living and affordable housing shortages makes it challenging for our clients to find options to transition from an abusive environment and collocated to a safe and healthy home. During this political time, the attitude and response to immigrants are unfavorable adding on to the fear that traps victims in an abusive relationship. A \(20 \%\) increase will help with staff retention so that we can continue to sustain and output quality services in the prevention of domestic violence and child abuse, and promotion of. family economic success. Investing in staff retention is an investment in preserving our families and SF communities. Our staff has bult rapport with our clients and the community. Because we cannot address the long-term housing situation, the 20\% increase to help retain our staffing, provide our clients a sense of security and reassurance to have staff support to be informed, protect themselves and navigate community resources. A \(20 \%\) increase will help us to continue to help our clients find their voice, be empowered and seek justice for their abuse by their significant other, a family member and or by the system.

The key to preventing domestic violence is to stop it from happening before it begins. With the \(20 \%\) increase, we can continue to provide our clients with strategies that promote healthy behaviors in relationships. Our home visitation program provides preventive services to families and young children. Due to language barrier, disability, and fear that prevent them from leaving home and visiting our center or any service centers, our bilingual, trained staff brings information, resources and support to the families. During the home visits, we assess needs and identify goals with the clients and followup on progress to achieve goals. We provide information and support, including accompanying them to doctor visits, school appointments and other community events to help them be familiar with their environment and build confidence to go on their own. We connect them to counseling support and other services in our FRC programs as well as other community events opportunity that may benefit the family in their neighborhood. Depending on the level of need and readiness of clients, our case managers provide individualized service plan for each client that includes ESL tutoring, financial literacy and management information, skills and resources; as well as employment, vocational and education assistance. Essentially to help clients build confidence, skills and knowledge to be self-sufficient. Any cuts to our VAW funding and program, will affect our ability to protect our clients, SF families and communities already living in the City's shadows.

Vignette:
Sally is a 26 years old, who came to USA from Thailand as a student four years ago. A year later, she went to live with her boyfriend, a Thai-American who promised to sponsor her to become a US resident through marriage. After two years living with the boyfriend, she found out that he had a lot of debt from gambling. She quit school, lost her legal status in USA, and started to work because he said he needed more income to pay off the debts. Then they could marry and she could get her green card. She helped him pay off his first big debt but there were more. She became stressed out and complained to him that he must stop gambling. He increased his drinking and started verbally and physically to abuse her. She went to the Thai temple and a temple member referred her to Lao Seri Association for help. Lao Seri offered to refer her to legal advice but she refused to go because she had heard about the crackdown on undocumented aliens. She started to come to the Domestic Violence workshop. After individual counseling, she receives help in relocating to another place with a roommate so she could stay away from the boyfriend.

Family advocate continues to work with Sally on personal safety - not to tell the boyfriend where she lives and to be sure to have a mobile phone handy to call the Hotline for emotional support and if he does bother her to call 911 if she feels unsafe. Family advocate is working with her to be informed and build up her confidence, so she can further protect herself by going to a lawyer and get legal advice on her options.

\section*{Fomery Mhomachi Legal Outreach}
"I'm not formally educafed, and I can't read or write. I have always thed to be a good person though. My husband promised me he would stop hurting me once we got to America. I have no family, friends, or support here, and I have iwo children to raise. He beat me like I wasn't even human, like I was a dog. I had nowhere to go. The police referred me to API Legal Outreach. They spent the time to explain to me the laws in America and my rights and options. They helped me get custody of my children, which is the most important thing, and I am so thankful for that."

A \(20 \%\) increase in Department on the Status of Women Violence Against Women Program Funding will sustain the provision of legal services to the underserved, low-income immigrant women and children, in the languages and cultural contexts these populations are most familiar with. We are a survivorcentered organization, working to empower survivors so they can empower themselves.

Since 1975, we have dedicated ourselves to serving survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and trafficking. We are an active member of San Francisco collaboratives and consortiums, working closely with other local community-based organizations to provide legal and social services to survivors of violence against women and human trafficking.

Our services are holistic-all survivor needs are met through coordinated services from API Legal Oufreach and partner organizations, including: counseling, fransitional housing, protection orders, and more. If a survivor requires assistance with immigration, housing, public benefits, or another legal issue, they are represented in those areas as well. To truly promote the safety and well-being of survivors, we acknowledge that their widespread needs are interconnected and must therefore all be addressed. Our holistic service model is effective, but can weigh heavily on our funding.

\section*{A \(20 \%\) increase in funds will:}
* Enable us to enhance holistic services through access to additional resources such as psych evaluations for disability waivers for VAW survivors with disabilifies.
* Help build capacity such as through potential partnerships with court reporters who can assist with depositions and direct subpoenas to gain critical information from perpetrators of violence.
* Alleviate pressures stemming from costs for parking, phone, legal printing and paper supplies, and other necessary fees that accumulate quickly and are often overlooked by available public and private funding.

The survivors we serve face innumerable barriers due to language, differing cultures, cultural stigma, economic status, and more. We confront their daily struggles with them by working directly in the community, as a part of the community. Our clients often express relief at finding an agency that speaks their language. It is crucial that we continue to strengthen our capacity, so our services remain accessible to these survivors.


AWS has provided comprehensive programs and services for survivors of domestic wiolence and human trafficking for nearly 30 years. Having grown from a shelter program designed to support Asian immigrant women in establishing lives free from violence, AWS's current programs span residential and non-residential services and communitybased education and empowerment programs. AWS serves primarily immigrant and refugee, limited English proficient (LEP) survivors across the gender spectrum. The foundation for of AWS's programs and services is the AWS Multilingual Access Model (MLAM), through which AWS trains \(40-50\) volunteers, bilingual advocates and interpreters each year. These trained language advocates provide \(D V\)-specific interpretation and culturally appropriate emotional support in 42 languages for all residential services and non-residential programs and advocacy efforts. AWS's language access model program also extends to the Citywide MLAM Program-a membership language access program through which four other domestic violence programs have direct access to AWS's trained language advocates, thereby expanding language and cultural access to their services. AWS is nationally recognized for its language access model and interpreter training, and technical assistance on both to other agencies statewide and nationally. AWS is also deeply rooted in its local work, sustaining collaborations, partnerships, and shared funding that build a stronger safery net for San Francisco communities. AWS currently shares funding with WOMAN Inc., LYRIC, and APILO; we regularly share clients and provide complementary services with LYRIC, APILO, CUAV, Cameron House, Riley Center, La Casa, CROC, MUA, BALA, SF WAR, SF Bar Association, Gum Moon, and APA Family Services.

Thanks to recognition by the Major and the Department on the Status of Women, AWS has expanded its programs for survivors over the last several years, paying special attention to heightened vulnerabilities of Arab and Muslim survivors, sex-trafficked youth, and transgender survivors of violence. However, in part because of growing community needs in response to the housing crisis in the city, we continue to depend on individual fundraising and unrestricted funding to cover important agency and program needs, including:
- Full funding of administrative positions, including Executive Director, Associate Director, Data and Reporting Officer, and Finance team. The importance of each of these staff positions cannot be overstated, as they relate to agency leadership, representation, quality control, and impeccable financial management.
- Sustainable program staff positions: We currently supplement government funding with unrestricted funds to maintain, but not increase, salaries. San Francisco needs a safety net staffed by strong advocates who can actually afford to live in the areas in which they work. More so than ever before, sustainable staff salaries and modest salary growth are critical for our agencies' sustainability.
- Full funding to meet case management and mental health reeds of Arab and Muslim survivors through AWS's Arab Women's Services Program.
- Technical needs, including upgrading of computer equipment, purchasing of software and training in the use of up-to-date documentation and reporting programs, and ongoing IT maintenance for modern and smooth organizational operation. With the rising demands from federal and state funders for hour by hour reporting of staff time, this has become a major task for the agency.
- Unfunded needs of survivors: We also use donations and unrestricted foundation funds to try to support needs of survivors including move-in support to independent stable housing, emergency food, transportation, language support, and activities that increase community building for survivors.

A \(\mathbf{2 0 \%}\) increase in DOSW Violence Against Women program funding will sustain AWS's four current programs fiwnded by DOSW (AWS Shelter Services, AWS Trans Services, AWS Arab Women's Services, and AWS San Francisco Options for Comprehensive Action for Youth) and heip AWS addness the funding shortfalls listed above.

We would be very happy to provide additional information on our services, funding needs, and program successes. Please contact: Orchid Pusey, Acting Executive Director, 415-751-7110, orchid@sfaws.org.

The intensive, comprehensive representation Bay Legal provides survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault is dependent on suppot fforded through he Departhent on the Status of Women by the City and County of San Francisco. An increased investment by the City of \(20 \%\) of the current violence against wonen funds allocated to CEO would permit BayLegal to increase some services to clients, impove staff retertion, and expand some violence prevention efforts.

\section*{Tucreased Services:}
- Language Access: Stafin our office can assist clients in Spansh, Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese and Russian. However, given our clem volume, schedning conticts and occasional requirments for professional interpetation, additional funding focused on language access would permit us to serve more clients more expeditiously in a linguistically competem maner, and would include inemperation sevices for our deaf chents who require Anerican Siga Language interpetation of Communcation Access Realme Translation services.
- Targeted Outceach: Outreach effors targeted to populations that are not accessing services commensuate with the levels of donestic violeace they are experiencing could be increased. Previous effors have focused on the Affican-American and LGBTQ commuities, but should be expanded.

\section*{Vhonec Preventon Intianves:}
- Gun Relinquishment: Our regonal scope has allowed us to participate in innovative prevention efforts that can be replicated in San Francisco. BayLegal was instrumenal in the development of the San Mateo commy gun rehnquishent procol ahong with the San Mateo Commy Sherifts office. We can bring out experience witi the developnent and implenentation of this policy to assist San Francisco to create its own pollcy regarding those subject to restraining orders.

\section*{Sustanability:}
- Competive Salaries: This year alone, thee semor saff atomeys ter BayLegal to parsue higher paying opportumies in our commanty. Athough we rounely use law suden yolumeers to increase the volume of clints we serve and variey of services we can provide, we have yet to recult woluter law sudents or staff for our family law mithis year. In this economic chmate, we ned to provide compensation that allows haw students, suppor staff and atomeys to hye and work in San Francisco, or neaby.
- Commecial Rents In 2017 , the rent hour San Francisco of ice increased and we now pay \(50 \%\) more than wo did the pase. Mowng forward our San Fancise office ren will incease by \(3 \%\) sach year. These pressures on won-proft businesses must be factored into the equation of sustinablity and canot be offer by simple cost of hiven allowaine increases.

\section*{CAMERON}

HOUSE 金美扁堂

\section*{There Is A Cost To Saving Lives}

Donaldina Cameron House is a multi－service agency based in San Francisco Chinatown serving the needs of the community since 1874．We empower generations of Chinese American individuals and their families to fully participate in and contribute positively toward a healthy society．We put our Christian faith in action to help people learn，heal，and thrive．
＂Empowering and Saving Lives．＂Staff at Cameron House may not be wearing life jackets or bullet proof vests in the front line rescuing people each day，but we are truly saving lives．Each day，we are empowering and supporting domestic violence survivors to be safe and equipping them with knowledge and resources so that they can be self－sufficient．
＂Sustainability．＂Because Cameron House has multi－lingual and culturally competent staff who speak Cantonese，Mandarin，and Vietnamese，many in the Asian community may not be able to access these services if budget cuts were to occur．As a reminder， \(34 \%\) of the population in San Francisco is Asian，and the Chinese population is the largest Asian ethnic group in the city．Without these crucial services，families and the community as a whole will be in dire situations．Because San Francisco is such a diverse city and is a Sanctuary City，there may be more people who are in vulnerable and challenging situations coming into San Francisco for help in addition to people already living in the city．All of us need to be prepared for that．Therefore， there should be NO CUTS to our funding；rather，there should be consideration in increases．

Cameron House＇s Asian Domestic Violence Intervention and Advocacy Program provides holistic services to domestic violence survivors and their children．We provide case management and support services，such as，but not limited to，interpretation，information and referrals to shelters，health，welfare，educational，employment，and legal services，and accompaniment to court and the immigration bureau．Also we have a monthly support group for domestic violence survivors and their children so that they don＇t have to be isolated．Instead，they will have a sense of belonging to a community and network by meeting others who share similar experiences．Through the support group，survivors grow and heal together．For survivors who are not comfortable to be in groups，we offer individual and family counseling where the healing could be more individualized and tailored to their specific needs．

If Cameron House were to receive a \(20 \%\) increase to our Violence Against Women funding through the Department on the Status of Women（DOSW），this will help us build our capacity to provide deeper and more quality programming．The funding increase will help us improve our office technology，pay for staff development and training，offer a more competitive salary and healthcare benefits package to keep multi－lingual and skilled staff in this field of work． and compensate for transportation and parking costs when we accompany survivors to their appointments．Programs do not run on its own．Each day，staff are the ones who support，guide， and empower survivors．They are the ones who save and impacilives．Programs need to survive in order to help people survive．

Commmity Unted Aganst Folence (CUAV) has been workin to orede
 by violence for 3 y years. These suvivon receive her-saving and herfimming services CUAV, which help mitgate the oferes of donestichntinate pather violewe, antu-GRT Volence and hasment, police brubligy and state violence, At CUAV we wore bereate and mainain deep relationsibips sud strong ties with all service provider and organzations the vein of being part of a stong safey the for survivor of violence.

At CUAV we work to center those most affeted by voince, and the suppor of
 fund are cucial mestmens in how pople get heathy and ford satey, and buid safery
 friendship circles. Thanks to these funds on Preventon \& Education Progran creates oppotuntiec for survivors of violenee, their alies axi fierds, service providers and communty members to work together to cone up whe stategiss and practices that priontize healing from volence and satey in heir lives.

Ou ask agan this year if for a \(20 \%\) incerse to have a continuty of qually service provision, of essential services being minterupted, despie curent the political ctime and the economic haddsip brotght upon the city's nost marghalized and
 providing a conpettive salary nor our geff.

We canot stress enough the mperative role a city plays in the heatit and satety of its consthentits. But nothre says more han how the chty provides for those most
 We be Heve Gor Praciso and bs Mayor wat to co all that they cor to suppot and sustan the semices organzations mecuav provide. We ate a natet net, but also a shong panmer with Cuty Iall. That some of the connective tissue that makes our work passible and suramable.
 aganes women and how to address ti cud holp pople heal. The hudng is about investing in our communhes ad od shat, and about the parthening necesary to continue to be here for those we serve.

Thate yous


Impact Statenem: A 20 \% morease in funding from DOSW/VAW
El/a Para Transhathas started in 2006 and since then we have always fought for the rights of translathas. Elila fo an organiation for transgender latinas that work to butd collective vision and action to promote cur survival and mprove our equalty of tie in San Francisco.

A key issue facing the twandathas communty in San Francisco is trammatramas caused by tranphobia, inthate partner and/or ant-inmigrant volence. The hereasing criminaltation of immigrants under the
 movements.
 prevention education and healing for the transhatha communty whthin the undue safe space we have created. \(5 / /\) a utilizes ( \(1 /\) peer-th-peer sutrech and engagement and 2 ) parterships to mprove cultural competency and access as the primary strategies to engage members of the tranhatinas commentity. E/fa's outreach workers "meat their peers where they are aty" through street and bar outreach; morearng the tranlathas communty's awareness of the tange of programs avallable through Efha.
 space for transhathas to cutivate their leadership ant advocate for the safety and dififity of their conmunty. Facitated by guest praenters and Elta staff members, these groups addess such topics as Harm Reduction, Heathy tetationhtys, 5elf Esteem, and Non-Volent Communcation (Wvel, Each year, a minmum of 10 unduplicated tarsfathas partichates in the boSW-suppoted potion of TuYat
 space. Each womat who cones throbelour door ts welomed ike famliy, and then receives the tools and support to enhance fer healog processes. A 2 O\% incesse in fundig acualy has an erponentalimact ge gur capacty. We wort just seve \(20 \%\) more women, with mereased funding, effciencies are gined, and we can provide mone and figher qualiy services to trote indwiduals.

 honored to have the oppomity to incerse ous smaces here for Transhanas.

In Defense of Prostitute Women's Safety Project (IDPWS) provides a comprehensive prevention of violence program including community education, public awareness, and education on violence against sex workers. Through these activities, we aim to build public support for cify policies which prioritize protection over prosecution with a view to helping prevent rape and other violence including murder. Studies show that sex workers are 40 times more likely to be murdered than other women.

A 20\% increase would have a major impact on the work of the IDPWS, a group with one of the smaliest grants. Several years ago, we organized a successful campaign to change the rules governing compensation for sex workers so that sex workers who are victims of violence could get compensation. They had been previously denied. More work is needed to inform sex workers of this right and how to apply, and to inform agencies and others of this and other changes in access to compensation. A 20\% increase would enable us to strengthen our organizational capacity: by upgrading our technology and other resources to expand our public awareness, education and advocacy on violence against sex workers and allow for more service hours.

IDPWS is one of the few places victims can turn to for help with geiting justice and compensation for violence. We also prioritize outreach to immigrant sex workers who are one of the most vulnerable, underground and hidden sectors facing high levels of rape and other violence. Most don't report violence to the police for fear of arrest and deportation. A \(20 \%\) increase would enable us to print more of our project brochures in Spanish, and increase our outreach to the Latinx community. The more visible our public advocacy is against violence against sex workers, the more concern there is on the part of the public, City officials and others to address this problem. It is also harder for serial murderers and other violent men to operate with impunity with more public scrutiny. Many sex workers are mothers, so the impact of increased services would impact families. This money will help save women and girls' lives.

Mujeres Undas y Aclivas MUA is a grassrots organzation of Laina immioran women with a mal mission of pronoms personat trensfomation personal fransformation and buiding canmauly power for social and econonic justice. Since 1909 , WUA has crealed a sae haven for Latha mmigrat wonen suffering from domestic whence, prety, and explitation. We are a peer ted ogenierition ant as such all direct services siaff fexcepif for our superving psychotherapist) are fomer chents of our program. All our sevices are conduced in Spanish, with transiation sewices avaiabie for inmigram speakers of indigenous

 Distici office with cisis intervention and advocacy, inctudng:
- Dropin suppor gromene peer counseling
- Shor tempermoherapy (individal and grotp)
- Coacting and case management
- Intensye suppot to the police reports, take baterers to court, and retain child cusiody
- Help navigaing the bureaucracy to eccess additional services, holuding CalvCF
- Menal healliternations that are required to the for a UVisa
- Leaderthin taning prograns for survors to become stake-crified Domestic Vhonce Advocates
- Chithare for all sewices with aroviters traned to support children exposed to eary tatma.

We are a safely ne agency for women in crast who oten do nof recelve senices due to language baysurs or waing fists. For example, women who çatify for CavCP (statefunded victme compensaiton prograns) have to waile moths befoe they can begin to receve peychotherapy, and waing tiste at of er local agencies with Spanist speakng staff are wery torg.

A \(3 \%\) budgel cut would requite wis to signifanty cutback hours for our childcate program. Less childere wailable woud tnean tewer women can access our services. We esthate this could result in up wa \(\{5 \%\) drop in women recoiving services.

A \(20 \%\) budget increase wuld atiow to expand our psychothergy program, curenty in very high
 adust their inmieration siatus, geming work pemits and economic hdependence. We woul aso signticanty expand our gromp theropy and group coachng prograns, both of which we heep imited to to

 access to grater suppot, heping them gan hexienendenoe and stablity more quichy as they recower from the effects of violme.

\section*{Impact of 20\% Increase in Department on the Status of Women Violence Against Women Program Funding}

FY 18-19
Founded in 1973, San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR) is a community-based, anti-sexual assault, social justice organization. We provide support to sexual assault survivors, their families, andcommunities, and use education and community organizing as tools of prevention. We believe that ending all forms of oppression is integral to ending sexual assault. We are women of color-led and prioritize working with and for communities facing multiple forms of violence and oppression.

A \(20 \%\) increase in Department on the Status of Women Violence Against Women Program Funding will position SFWAR to sustain and expand our work with San Francisco's most marginalized populations and respond to the increasing cost of living in San Francisco City \&: County.

In 2006, SFWAR undertook an extensive community mapping project. Through that process we identified five groups that experience critically high rates of sexual violence. Those groups are youth, marginally housed and homeless women, Latina immigrants, queer/LBT women of color, and formerly incarcerated women. In addition, these groups are often very much underserved. Over the past twelve years, SFWAR has diligently worked to build services with and for these communities rooted in cultural humility. An increase in DOSW Violence Against Women Program funding will support SFWAR in enhancing our community specific direct service and prevention education efforts with these vulnerable populations. In addition, increased funding will allow SFWAR to continue to enhance and expand our newly launched Disability \& Deaf Services Program.

The current economic context continues to pose unique concems that impact the sustainability of our critical work with vulnerable populations. It is imperative that SFWAR continue to realign our salary situcture to ensure sexual assault survivors skilled staff and to ensure staff a just and living wage. COLA alone will not adequately address the extent of the salary structure realignment necessary. And, as our program work grows, we require additional office space to house our work; skyrocketing rents make this challenging to achieve.

At this time, increased funding with absolutely no cuts is critically necessary for all DOSW funded Violence Against! Women Program Partners. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and your support.

Most Respectfully


Janelle L. White, PhD.
Executive Director


\author{
26 Boardman Pl. \\ San Francisco, CA 94103 \\ Tel: 415.864 .4777 \\ Support Line: 415.864 .4722 \\ 877.DVHELPU \\ www.womaninc.org
}

Thank you for the opportunity to outline the benefits of a \(20 \%\) increase in funding for W.O.M.A.N, inc. Based in San Francisco's SOMA neighborhood, W.O.M.A.N., Inc.'s mission is to support those impacted by violence using an innovative approach to services and programs that build stronger, safer communities.

We serve all those impacted by domestic violence in San Francisco (including survivors, their friends and families) with a 24 -hour support line, drop-in support, individual and group therapy, support groups, Latinx-specific programming, volunteer programming, and community education and outreach activities. Our community education and empowerment efforts directly address domestic violence, violence against women, and discrimination that disproportionately impacts women (particularly lowincome women of color) and LGBTQ communities. Rooted in inclusion and intersectional feminism, our approach to empowerment meets each survivor "where they're at" as the expert of their situation. We provide resources and ongoing support to facilitate self-determination and independent decisionmaking affecting all facets of a survivor's individual and family life.
W.O.M.A.N., inc. seeks a model of sustainability for its operations, ensuring access to programs and services for the community. Attracting and retaining qualified trained staff and volunteers is integral in providing these services. In the last few years, the landscape in San Francisco has changed dramatically and W.O.M.A.N., Inc. is responding to those changes. Over half of the core staff have left the City within the last few years due to rising housing [living] costs. W.O.M.A.N., Inc. recognizes the need to compensate key personnel at sustainable levels and has raised salary levels for core staff \(57 \%\) since 2011; yet W.O.M.A.N., Inc. core staff compensation remains at \(2 / 3\) of the median income in San Francisco of \(\$ 80,700\); for program advocates [at minimum wage] the compensation falls at \(1 / 3\) of the median.
W.O.M.A.N., Inc. has adapted to the changing landscape by cutting operational costs where possible, such as moving into a paperless environment as well as ensuring key infrastructure is in place to allow staff to work remotely in serving the community. We remain committed to working collaboratively with funding agencies to enable W.O.M.A.N, inc. to attract and retain highly skilled trained staff and volunteers.

Cost of living increases in SF impact not only its non-profit organizations, of course. These cost of living increases make low cost/free services for survivors of trauma more important than ever. Many survivors who, at one time, may have been able to pay for expensive mental health services and programs find themselves without the funds needed to maintain these services. Funneling additional funds to VAWA grantees is pivotal during this time of change in the city and in the country. As a result of increased funding, W.O.M.A.N., inc. could serve more survivors, their family and friends. In addition, we could widen our scope of impact by increasing outreach not only by adding staff but by continuously engaging our Latinx leadership advocates who are trained DV advocates. We could also

\section*{Women Organized to Make Abuse Nonexistent, Inc.}
move closer to providing equitable compensation for our Latinx staff members who are bilingual/bicultural given that their added skills are vital to the work.

We hope to receive an increase in funding; VAWA grantees will ensure that not only is our funding base strengthened, but the survivors of violence in the city will reap the benefits of our increased capacity.

Thank you!

Our Proposal...
Increase to VAW Funding - \$1,260,493
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Agency by Service Category & Programs & FY 2017-2018 General Fund Base &  & Propeotidicos ficremolacios: theiscoind & \\
\hline Domestic Violerice Shelter Programs & & WIO MLFs & & & \\
\hline Asian Women's Shelter & Domestic Violence Shellor Program & 2,12,207 & & 254,648 & \\
\hline La Casa de las Madres & Domestic Violence Shelter Services & 512,176 & & 614,611 & \\
\hline St. Vincent de Paul (Riley Center) & Rasalie House & 235,503 & & 282,604 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for DV Shelters & 959,886 & & 1,151,863 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Crisis Line Services} & \\
\hline S.F. Women Agalnst Rape & Sexual Assault Crisis Line & 171.798 & & 206,158 & \\
\hline W.O.M.A.N., Inc. & Domestic Violence Crisis Line & 359,913 & & 431,896 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for Crlsis Line Services & 531,711 & & 630,053 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{} & \\
\hline Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach & Asian/Pacific Domestic Violence Project & 359,045 & & 403,854 & \\
\hline Bay Area Legal Aid & Domestic Violence Legal Services & 263,443 & & 316,132 & \\
\hline S.F. Bar Volunteer Legal Services & Juslice and Diversity Center (VLSP) & 272,550 & & 327,060 & \\
\hline S.F. Bar Volunteer Legal Services & Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC) & 322.059 & & 386,471 & \\
\hline Legal Aid Society - Employment Law Center & SURVIVE & 70,521 & & 846.252 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for Legal Services & 1,287,618 & & 1,545,142 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{} & \\
\hline Gum Moon Women's Residence & Transllional Housing for Immigrant Domeslic Violence Women & 106.406 & & 127.687 & \\
\hline Jewish Famlly and Children's Services & Dream House & 86,985 & & 104,382 & \\
\hline Mary Elizabeth inn & INNroads & 159,292 & & 191,150 & \\
\hline St. Vincent de Paul (Riley Center) & Breman House & 336,129 & & 403,355 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for Transitional Housing & 688,912 & & 826,574 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Interventian \& Advocacy Programs} & \\
\hline APA Family Support Services & Hame VIsiltation & 132,219 & & 158,663 & \\
\hline Aslan Women's Shelter & San Francisco Options for Comprehensive Action for Youth & 215,754 & & 258,905 & \\
\hline Aslan Women's Shelter & Trans Services & 38,700 & & 46,440 & \\
\hline Donaldina Cameron House & Asian Domestic Vliolence Advocacy & 225,900 & & 271,080 & \\
\hline La Casa de las Madres & Safe Housing Project - San Francisco Housing Authority & 141.903 & & 170,283 & \\
\hline Mujeres Unidas y Activas & Sanando el Alma & 215,121 & & 258,145 & \\
\hline Not For Sale & Reinvent: Bay Area & 70,521 & & 84.625 & \\
\hline San Franclsco Safe House & Sate House & 36,643 & & 439,716 & \\
\hline S.F. Women Against Rape & Sexual Assaull titervention and Advocacy & 232,925 & & 2,795,100 & \\
\hline St. James Infirmary & Vlolerce Prevention and Intervention for Sex Workers & 70,564 & & 84,677 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{W.O.M.A.N., Inc.} & Latina Program & 86,986 & & 104,383 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for Intervention \& Advocacy Programs & 1,467,236 & & 1,760,683 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Provention, Education \& Training} & \\
\hline Asian Women's Shelter & Arab \& Muslin Services & 86,001 & & 103,201 & \\
\hline Astan Pacific Islander Legal Outreach & Asian Anti-Trafficking Callaborative & 48,380 & & 58,056 & \\
\hline Comnlunlly United Against Violence & LBT Prevention and Educalion Services & 109,271 & & 131,126 & \\
\hline Communily United Against Violence & Community Building Services & 57,334 & & 68.800 & \\
\hline Communily Youth Center - S.F. & Young Asian Women Against Violence (YAWAV) Projeci & 203,855 & & 244,626 & \\
\hline El/L P Para Trans Latinas & El/Le Para Trans Latinas & 70,077 & & 84,092 & \\
\hline Fllipino Community Center & Babae Domestic Violence Program & 80,269 & & 96,323 & \\
\hline Glide Foundation & Glide Women's Center & 70.286 & & 93,943 & \\
\hline Horizons Unlimited of San Frencisco, Inc. & Females Against Violence Peer Leadershlp and Education Program & 59,927 & & 71,912 & \\
\hline Lavender Youth Recreation \& Information Center & Queer and Trans Youth Overcoming Violence & 130,920 & & 157,104 & \\
\hline Mission Neighborhood Centers, lnc. & Real Arising issues Creating Eripowered Students (RAICES) & 212,815 & & 255,378 & \\
\hline S.F. Women Against Rape & Sexual Assault Education & 54,907 & & 65,888. & \\
\hline S.F. Women Against Rape & Students Taiking About Non-Violent Dating (STAMD) & 128,839 & & 154,607 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Women in Dialogue} & In Defense of Prostitute Women's Sately & 46,319 & & 55,583 & \\
\hline & Subtotal for Prevention, Education, 2 Training & 1,367,200 & & 1,640,640 & \\
\hline & TOTAL & 6,302,463 & & 7,562,956 & \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{-} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Re: Add back request for the Japantown Task Force Visitor Learning Hello, my name is Kaori Tando from the Japantown Task Force, a member of the API Council. The Japantown Task Force's mission is to preserve and develop San Francisco Japantown, strengthen the ethnic diversity, and create an atmosphere of safety, beauty, vitality, and prosperity. San Francisco is one out of the three remaining Japantowns in the country, the other two being San Jose and Los Angeles. We work to ensure that San Francisco's Japantown will thrive as a culturally rich, authentic, and economically vibrant neighborhood that will serve as the cultural heart of the Japanese and Japanese American communities for generations to come.

Through our Japantown Visitor Kiosk project in 2016, the Japantown Task Force developed a mobile visitor center that provides Japantown visitors information on neighborhood businesses and activities. The mobile Japantown Visitor Kiosk funded by the MOEWD currently serves thousands of Japantown visitors and community members every year, and has been integral in improving visitor experience and providing economic support to the Japantown businesses. We are applying for an addback to fund the expansion of services that the Visitor Kiosk currently has, by opening a Visitor Learning Center. In addition to the current services that the Visitor Kiosk provides, we see the community need of supplying a larger space that acts as a community lounge, gallery, and learning center. Having this Visitor Learning Center would enhance the visitor's experience in Japantown, thus driving greater economic success to the neighborhood and increasing the overall neighborhood vitality.

\section*{Sincerely,}

Kauri (Coco) Tando
economic development, planning \& preservation of Japantown
Kaori "Coco" Tando
Community Aide

\author{
Keeping San Franciscans Housed and Housing San Franciscans: A Funding Proposal \\ Presented by the \\ Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association, San Francisco \\ April 2018
}

San Francisco is in the midst of a humanitarian crisis. According to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, over 20,000 people experience homelessness in our city each year. The City's Point in Time Count found over 7,000 people experiencing homelessness at any one time. However, we have only 1,400 shelter beds, causing our shelter wait list for single adults to exceed 1,000 shelter seekers. With only 800 housing exits anticipated this year, it is clear that the City and County of San Francisco must address this crisis. San Francisco only spends \(2.7 \%\) of its entire budget on homelessness, making it a low priority in spending decisions historically. The Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association (HESPA) recognizes this disastrous situation can be mitigated with wise policy decisions and prioritization by our civic leaders. This proposal is not meant to be the complete solution to homelessness - much more revenue over several years is needed to build the supportive housing necessary to end the crisis. However, this is an attempt to do as much as we can in the short term and within the restraints of a two-year budget to keep San Franciscans housed and house San Franciscans, while fortifying key components of our homeless response system.

\section*{History of HESPA Funding Proposals and Context for Ask}

Since 2012, HESPA has developed proposals to ensure safe and dignified emergency services, replace expired federal Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing grants, prevent homelessness among people at risk, and create additional exits out of homelessness through subsidies and vacant unit rehabilitation.

Since HESPA's advocacy began, San Francisco's homeless response system has benefited from the following funding allocations:
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline Fiscal year & Funding investment from HESPA budget proposals \(\quad\) 个 \\
\hline \(2012 / 13\) & \(\$ 3\) million \\
\hline \(2013 / 14\) & \(\$ 2.95\) million \\
\hline \(2014 / 15\) & \(\$ 6.5\) million \\
\hline \(2015 / 16\) & \(\$ 4.1\) million \\
\hline \(2016 / 17\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\$ 9.2\) million (\$2.5 million was funded in June and then removed due to \\
the failed sales tax initiative on the November 2016 ballot)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \(2017 / 18\) & \(\$ 6.7\) million \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

These investments have been indispensable as we strive to alleviate the housing crisis faced by low-income San Franciscans. As a result of these investments, by the end of this fiscal year, almost \(\mathbf{1 , 2 5 2}\) households will exit homelessness, thousands of households will maintain their housing, and thousands of homeless people will have received deeply enriched emergency services that enable safety and dignity.

\section*{Summary of Two-Year Budget Request}

The goals of HESPA's 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget proposal are to:
- Prevent homelessness among people who are at risk of eviction;
- Provide housing solutions to a greater number of homeless San Franciscans; and
- Respond to the emergency health and mental health and other basic needs of people who are on our streets due to the limited capacity of our current shelter and housing system.

Despite the successes enabled by the City's investments in the homeless service system, significant gaps persist that result in long waits for shelter and housing, visible street-based homelessness, unmet mental health needs among homeless people, and a lack of housing exits from the existing emergency shelter system. New initiatives and expanded programs are needed to keep pace with the scope of the crisis. Funding our proposal for 2018-19 and 201920 will provide the tools to halt preventable displacement of low-income San Franciscans from rent-controlled housing and relieve the burden on our city's shelters by both expanding shelter capacity and providing housing subsidies to some of our most vulnerable citizens.

This year, we can build on past successes through an infusion of \(\$ 14.8\) million in new and baseline funding for FY 2018-19 and \(\$ 15.7\) million in FY 2019-20 to assist an additional 3,000 homeless people and households. This budget proposal attempts to both prevent homelessness and create exits out of homelessness, while ensuring an adequate emergency services system for those forced to remain on the streets.

This proposal is the result of a careful, data-driven process to analyze our current housing and homeless system, identify service gaps, and tap into the experience and creativity of our providers to determine the most cost-effective solutions. Please see Attachment 1 for a detailed budget for our proposal.
- Private Market Housing Subsidies: Fund 257 new household subsidies to families, Transitional Age Youth (TAY), single adults, elderly, and people with disabilities to allow San Franciscans to move out of homelessness or retain permanent, rent-controlled housing.
- Homelessness Prevention and Right to Counsel: Even the playing field and ensure all San Franciscans have a Right to Counsel in eviction proceedings by adding 16 attorneys to serve approximately 600 more people annually who are at risk of eviction.
- Emergency Services: Expand emergency services to thousands of individual experiencing homelessness in severely underserved communities. This initiative would provide funding for a new adult shelter in the Bayview, replacement funding for a family shelter, and restore hotel vouchers to families turned away from shelter. It would also expand housing navigation services for homeless people in shelters and drop-in centers, maintain street outreach to homeless LGBTQ TAY and restore cuts, and expand an
emergency housing fund for TAY citywide. Finally, it would fund expanded bathroom services to those who are forced into street homelessness.
- Employment Services: Backfill cuts to homeless employment services that benefit 75 homeless job seekers annually.
- Critical Mental Health Services: Backfill State Mental Health Service Act (MHSA) funding cuts to programs that provide prevention and early intervention to 75 homeless adults and restore 10 units of supportive housing to TAY with mental illness and provide mental health services to 450 family members residing in shelter.

\section*{Part 1: Expansion of Private Market Housing Subsidies}

\section*{Background}

The limited creation of housing units affordable to homeless people in recent years has greatly restricted the available inventory for potential placement of destitute households, resulting in a stagnant shelter system and street homelessness. The lack of affordable units for homeless individuals and families has forced more homeless households to seek housing in the private market. Tenant-based subsidy programs allow homeless households to take advantage of units in new affordable developments that are priced above their income level, and can also allow homeless households to acquire housing in the private market.

Summary of Initiatives and Outcomes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Initiative & Amount requested & Department & Number of people served and outcome \\
\hline Expand graduated tenant-based subsidies for TAY & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FY 2018/19: } \$ 339,843 \\
& \text { FY } 2019 / 20: \$ 339,843
\end{aligned}
\] & DHSH & 20 new formerly homeless TAY will exit shelters, time-limited housing, or supportive housing into affordable or market-rate units. \\
\hline Baseline funding for needs-based housing subsidies for families & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FY 2018/19: } \$ 450,103 \\
& \text { FY 2019/20: } \$ 450,103
\end{aligned}
\] & DHSH & 12 formerly homeless high-need households will be housed in San Francisco. \\
\hline Expand needs-based housing subsidies for primarily seniors and people with disabilities & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018/19: \$3,000,000 \\
FY 2019/20: \$3,750,000
\end{tabular} & MOHCD & 225 households will either be prevented from becoming homeless, or will be able to exit homelessness into housing. Year 255 households from 2017 will be baselined. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Expand of Rapid Re-Housing Subsidies for Transition Age Youth (TAY)}

Youth under the age of 25 represent one out of every five individuals experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, and \(50 \%\) of the city's homeless individuals first experienced homelessness when they were under age 25 . Ending homelessness for TAY is critical to the city's larger efforts to prevent and end homelessness. In 2015, the city began a pilot to provide formerly homeless TAY with graduated rental subsidies in market rate units to divert youth from the shelter system, provide a "soft landing" out of time-limited youth housing, or create flow through the supportive housing system for those ready and able to live independently. The subsidies decrease over time so that the lease-holder eventually takes over the full amount of the lease. This funding request would expand the successful program (which provides up to 50 formerly homeless TAY with tenant-based subsidies) by an additional 20 TAY annually.

\section*{Baseline Funding for Need-Based Subsidy for Families}

The current rapid re-housing subsidy programs have been effective for a sliver of the population: 1) those who require only temporary help until they can cover market rent on their own, and 2) those for whom moving out of San Francisco is a viable option. Most rapid re-housing households, due to the housing crisis, are placed outside San Francisco, disrupting their community ties, employment, and schooling for their children. This system leaves behind those who are unable to increase their income in a relatively short period of time, and those who cannot move outside San Francisco, including families who have special needs children or health conditions, those paroled to San Francisco, or undocumented families with children who would be put at risk leaving San Francisco.

This subsidy is deep enough to enable households to rent in the bottom \(20 \%\) of the rental market, while contributing \(30 \%\) of their income toward the rent. Similarly, it is need-based, allowing households to use it as long as necessary. The program fills the gap for those who cannot demonstrate an ability to substantially increase their income, while keeping low-income people of color close to their communities in San Francisco. It also provides the flexibility to be used in non-profit owned buildings, master lease buildings, or in scattered sites.

This program has a track record of success, having moved 20 families with no other housing option into housing last year. The Board of Supervisors demonstrated its commitment to this project through the initial funding and its expansion last year, and yet, with only a single year of committed funding (which was then split over two years, minimizing its impact), its continued success can only be sustained through baseline funding. This funding would complete last year's ask and baseline the funding.

\section*{Expand Need-Based Subsidy for Primarily Seniors and People with Disabilities}

In 2014, the City funded a successful new pilot subsidy program for households with seniors and people with disabilities that fills a gaping hole in our system through a deep, need-based subsidy targeted at rent levels in San Francisco. Like the family subsidy described above, it is deep enough to enable households to rent in the bottom \(20 \%\) of the rental market; it is need-based
rather than time-limited; and it can be used in non-profit owned, master-lease buildings, and scattered sites.

This expanded subsidy program will serve the most vulnerable citizens with the highest barriers to stability. One example population is the aging disabled: the LGBT Aging Policy Task Force and the federally mandated Ryan White CARE Council have both identified an emerging crisis need for rental subsidies to keep disabled seniors in their homes when their employer-sponsored long-term disability policies expire as they reach retirement age. \(18.9 \%\) of aging people with HIV will lose access to their long-term disability programs when they reach retirement age and are no longer considered disabled. 1,700 older adults with disabling HIV/AIDS are in need of rental assistance to remain in their housing. In addition, according to the Human Services Agency Planning Division, 4,600 LGBT seniors need access to permanent rental assistance to remain in their homes. This program would serve those most at risk, keeping them in housing and preventing homelessness. Those served by this program are the most likely to become chronically homeless without intervention, making this both a fiscally sound and humanitarian response to the crisis. This funding in year 1 would complete the partially funded last year, and in year 2 baseline next and last year's funding.

\section*{Part 2: Keeping San Francisco Housed - Homeless Prevention}

\section*{Background}

As the Five-Year Strategic Framework for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) makes clear, preventing homelessness is a key component of achieving HSH's goals: "Expanding eviction prevention must be part of our efforts to reduce overall homelessness in San Francisco."

San Francisco's eviction crisis is not over, as the demand for eviction defense legal services continues to outpace the ability of service providers to respond. While the increase in the number of eviction defense attorneys has made a significant difference in the number of tenants who receive full representation, and who have as a result retained their housing, the need is far from fully met. As of October 19, 2017, 463 tenants have appeared at mandatory settlement conference without an attorney. In 2016, 624 clients appeared for settlement conference without an attorney. While most of these tenants have been provided with last-minute counsel through the Justice \& Diversity Center's Housing Negotiation Project (HNP), that representation lasts for only one afternoon, and must proceed without any investigation or discovery, and with the knowledge that if the case does not settle, the client will be on their own for trial. While this usually results in fairer outcomes for the tenant than if they were left completely on their own, it means that the options for the client are quite limited. In other words, there are still at least 50 clients per month being evicted in San Francisco who have no actual representation. Notably, there are likely many more, as these clients at least succeed in getting a response on file and asking for a jury trial, usually through the Eviction Defense Collaborative. It is unknown how many more tenants lose by default and never get into court.

\section*{Summary of Initiatives and Outcomes}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline Initiative & Amount requested & Department & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Number of people served and \\
outcome
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
New Eviction \\
Prevention \\
Legal Services
\end{tabular} & FY 2018/19: \(\$ 2,000,000\) & MOHCD & \begin{tabular}{l} 
600 people would receive \\
eviction prevention legal \\
services by 16 new staff \\
attorneys
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Justification of Funding Request}

Given the need and staff time required to represent an additional 50 clients per month, funding would support at least sixteen additional eviction defense staff attorneys in the community, with a particular focus on bilingual attorneys. Ancillary support services would further augment the staff attorneys' work. Experience has shown that the use of paralegal support - to conduct interviews, prepare paperwork, file and serve documents, engage in research and provide other support - enables the attorneys to focus on legal representation much more effectively, increasing both the number of clients served and the quality of the representation. In addition, the involvement of social workers and social service advocates makes a significant difference in the outcome of cases. Especially when the tenant is facing multiple issues that may be contributing to the eviction, a social worker - who can provide or secure ongoing treatment for physical, mental health or substance abuse issues, get a tenant help cleaning their unit, or help the client to obtain rental assistance - can mean the difference between tenants keeping or losing their housing.

Furthermore, the value of legal services cannot be over-stated as part of a system's larger homelessness strategy. First, legal services are effective. In fact, full scope representation doubles tenants' chances of staying in their homes (1). The provision of full scope representation by experienced litigators affords tenants the benefit of representation by attorneys who can utilize all the tools of litigation and ensure that their rights are protected. Without the knowledge or ability to propound discovery, properly gather and prepare supporting evidence, or prepare and argue key motions, tenants cannot begin to be adequately prepared for trial, let alone effectively prepare for and conduct their own trial. Even attorneys who step in at the last moment in these kinds of cases have limited options for success with little time to prepare.

Second, legal services are an efficient use of city resources. A social return on investment study determined that for every \(\$ 1\) invested in the Justice and Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco (JDC)'s housing legal services, the San Francisco community reaped \(\$ 11.74\) of immediate and long-term benefits by keeping people housed and preventing homelessness (2).

Third, fighting evictions is a critical strategy in reducing homelessness. The City cannot build its way out of the housing crisis. The City's Housing Balance Report showed that the City gained 6,559 affordable units between 2005 and 2014; however, landlords took at least 5,470 rentcontrolled apartments off the market, due to Ellis Act evictions, owner move-ins, and increased actions by landlords to vigorously pursue other types of evictions against tenants in rent-
controlled units. There are over 8,000 homeless San Franciscans, and new affordable housing alone cannot keep pace with the needs of low-income tenants. Keeping people housed stems the tide.

Finally, legal services preserve rent-controlled, affordable units. Each time a tenant is evicted from their rent-controlled home, the city loses yet another affordable unit. But for the work of eviction defense attorneys, hundreds more rent-controlled affordable housing units would be lost in San Francisco, and countless San Franciscans would be added to the ranks of the city's homeless population. Protecting private rent-controlled tenancies is a critically important affordable housing strategy.

1 Stanford Law School - John and Terry Center for Public Service and Public Interest- San Francisco Right to Civil Counsel Pilot Program Documentation Report p. 14.
2 Community Services Analysis LLC Social Return on Investment Analysis of JDC for year ended December 31, 2013.


\section*{Background}

It is unacceptable that anyone would have to sleep on the street, and yet the 2017 Point-in-Time count revealed that 4,353 San Franciscans are unsheltered on a given night. The city's outreach, drop-in center, and emergency shelter system is the safety net that individuals rely on to catch them before they reach the street, yet the system is overwhelmed, whole neighborhoods are grossly underserved, and the result is a persistent street homelessness crisis that is inhumane. The response must be multifaceted and targeted in order to fill gaps and make a measurable difference in street homelessness. HESPA's budget request reflects the diversity of needs to fill, including street-based outreach, flexible emergency housing funds, hotel vouchers, adult and family shelter funding, housing navigation services, and expanded bathroom access.

Summary of Initiatives and Outcomes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Initiative & Amount requested & Department & Number of people served and outcome \\
\hline Replace Adult Shelter in Bayview & FY 2018/19: \$2,628,498 FY 2019/20: \$2,628,498 & DHSH & Emergency shelter for 100 people at any one time \\
\hline Expand funds for Emergency Shelter for Families & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018/19: \$1,932,506 \\
FY 2019/20: \$1,932,506
\end{tabular} & DHSH & Emergency shelter for 100 people or 33 families at any one time \\
\hline Restore Hotel Vouchers for Turn Away Families & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018/19: \$101,194 \\
FY 2019/20: \$101,194
\end{tabular} & DHSH & Five hotel nights a month for families seeking emergency shelter who are turned away because First Friendship and Providence shelters are full \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
New Housing \\
Navigators in the \\
Single Adult Shelter \\
\& Resource Centers
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
FY 2018/19: \(\$ 1,009,967\) \\
FY 2019/20: \(\$ 1,009,967\)
\end{tabular} & DHSH & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Housing Navigation Services \\
for 400 people in drop-ins and \\
shelters
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Expand Emergency \\
Housing Assistance \\
Fund for TAY
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
FY 2018/19: \(\$ 1,106,603\) \\
FY 2019/20: \(\$ 1,105,603\)
\end{tabular} & DHSH & \begin{tabular}{l}
50 TAY experiencing \\
homelessness or at imminent \\
risk of homelessness
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Maintain and Backfill \\
Street Outreach \\
Services for TAY
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
FY 2018/19: \(\$ 321,255\) \\
FY 2019/20: \(\$ 321,255\) \\
(partially funded)
\end{tabular} & DHSH, & \begin{tabular}{l} 
450 TAY experiencing street- \\
based homelessness
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Expand Pit Stops & \begin{tabular}{l} 
FY 2018/19: \(\$ 500,000\) \\
FY 2019/20: \(\$ 500,000\)
\end{tabular} & DPW & 1,500 additional visits per day \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Replace Adult Shelter in Bayview}

Homelessness and racism are deeply and inextricably linked. African Americans are dramatically over-represented in the homeless population - they make up 40 to \(50 \%\) of people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco even though they represent only \(3-6 \%\) of the city's population. A legacy of racism, lack of accumulated wealth, real estate speculation, wholesale destruction of public housing, and mass incarceration have all led to this reality. Unfortunately, our homeless service infrastructure reflects these same racial disparities.

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is part of the Center for Social Innovation's SPARC Initiative to address the intersection of racism and homelessness. One of the key goals is to address the disparate funding of organizations centered in communities of color. The allocation of shelter funding is an especially egregious example in San Francisco, with programs serving neighborhoods historically dominated by people of color grossly underresourced. The Bayview, for example, has \(40 \%\) of our city's homeless population but only \(7 \%\) of homeless services.

Homeless and at-risk individuals in the Bayview must access shelter, emergency housing, and related support services outside of the district, putting many at an insurmountable disadvantage if they have mobility issues, lack of resources for transportation, or other circumstances that create barriers to accessing shelter services. The only current shelter is operated out of Providence Church - a site that was meant to be temporary and needs to be replaced. The need for a 100bed full-service shelter in the Bayview District is critical, as currently the community has only one emergency shelter, which is closed during the day, lacks adequate shower access, and is comprised of mats on the floor. There is also a drop-in center in the neighborhood, and each night elderly homeless people, mostly African Americans, are forced to sit in chairs all night, while their legs swell and they suffer from sleep deprivation.

The proposed 100 -bed shelter will be open 24 hours, and provide support services similar to those currently provided at the Next Door and Sanctuary shelter operated by Episcopal Community Services. These support services shall include but not be limited to case management, mental health counseling, life skills training, housing workshops, information and referral, and triage medical services.

According to community-based service providers in the Bayview District, while there is an absence of shelter beds, there are ample collateral services in the area inclusive of medical services through the Southeast Health Center and SFGH, as well as meals, food distribution, and other support services provided by Mother Brown's. The primary gaps that a new full-service adult shelter will fill are:
- Health Concerns: Many homeless Bayview residents present with severe and chronic health issues inclusive of hypertension, diabetes, respiratory disorders, and mobility issues. There is also a significant presence of severe and persistent mental illnesses as well as substance use disorders.
- Seniors: It has been suggested by Bayview providers that of the proposed 100 beds, \(40 \%\) should be dedicated to seniors, as there are an overwhelming number of homeless seniors residing the Bayview District; these individuals are most likely to present with complex medical and mobility issues. This fragile population is also most vulnerable to severe weather conditions. Bayview providers have also stated that this population includes frequent and historic users of available services, and are likely to qualify as Priority I for Coordinated Entry housing services.
- Laundry: Accessibility to laundry services for homeless people in the Bayview area is a critical need for both health and hygienic purposes.

We suggest using Voter Supported Capitol funds for the securing and rehabbing of an appropriate building.

\section*{Baseline Emergency Shelter for Families}

The City and County of San Francisco operates emergency shelters for families in two different churches. If the first church is full, families are sent to another church that also shelters single men and women with overflow beds. Families sleep in a relatively small space, on mats on the floor. There are no showers, and not enough bathrooms; babies in diapers have no access to baths. Furthermore, the facility is closed during the day forcing families to rise early, find a place to shower, often times across town at a women's drop-in center, and then get their children to school. They show up night after night, and must bring their belongings with them. This is an untenable situation for families in crisis and provides no foundation for stability. The City of San Francisco passed a bond in 2016 that creates capital funds for shelter. Last year, the Board of Supervisors allocated three months of services funding for a shelter for homeless families in order to give the city enough time to secure a facility. Now, ongoing funding is needed for years 1,2 and beyond. The facility would serve 100 people or 33 families at one time.

\section*{Restore Hotel Vouchers for Family Access Points}

When the access points for family shelter were reconfigured, a vital resource was lost. In the past, the City funded program budgets at each shelter access point that could be used for hotel vouchers in extreme situations. There are a variety of extreme cases that this flexible funding was used for in the past, including medical emergencies or a mother about to give birth with nowhere. In addition, the vouchers could be used when families were turned away with nowhere
to go. We propose a small amount of funds for five hotel nights a month be used for families seeking emergency shelter who are inappropriate placements or unable to be placed in congregate shelters, given out by access points. They would stay in a moderately-priced hotel for one night and then return to the emergency system. This was funded last year and was used for hotel rooms for pregnant women instead, also a critical need. We are asking for it again.

\section*{New Housing Navigators in the SF Single Adult Shelters and Resource Centers}

Currently, nearly 1,200 homeless people are languishing in San Francisco's single adult shelter system with little hope of a housing exit. Furthermore, other City systems of care such as hospitals frequently use shelters as a "catch-all" for those needing a higher leyel of care because they have nowhere else to go. The existing SF Single Adult Shelter System and Resource Centers do not currently have the tools, resources or housing opportunities to move people out of shelters into housing, and there is a huge problem of long-term shelter residents who, through no fault of their own, are caught having to stay in shelter for months to years without a housing exit. Homeless shelters were originally planned as a short-term, emergency housing intervention, and are not an appropriate, healthy long-term living environment for anyone. Yet, the shelter system as it currently exists cannot possibly meet housing outcomes without additional resources from HSH.

The existing shelter system for single adults is in need of housing placement services as many shelter users are unable to navigate systems of care on their own. Housing Navigator services are needed in shelter to move people with the most acute needs currently in shelter to appropriate placements. Housing Navigators will ensure HSH's goal of a streamlined Homelessness Response System that effectively identifies and houses those shelter-users with the highest need, opening up new shelter beds for those living out on the streets by providing the following:
- Standardized Assessments and prioritization tools
- Determination of a housing path based on the HSH-designated assessment tool
- Immediate, intensive, onsite Housing Navigator services to those assessed as the highest need, including:
- Housing-focused case management with development of an individualized housing plan tailored for each participant.
- Valid IDs, income documentation, benefits advocacy and documentation, credit repair, legal aid, IHSS enrollment, money management, and any other services and documentation required to move a participant into housing
- Assistance with completing housing applications
- Assistance with outstanding warrants and criminal records
- Transportation to property management meetings
- Advocacy and barrier removal related to prior evictions
- Move-in assistance (security deposits; furniture; household items, etc.)
- Follow-up services through leasing process
- Warm hand-offs to supportive housing case managers
- Linkages to external mental health, treatment, and primary health providers
- Input into the ONE system.

\section*{Expanded Emergency Housing Fund for TAY}

San Francisco currently funds one TAY-specific shelter with a capacity of 40 beds; the Lark-Inn for Youth operates at or near capacity nightly, and a small emergency housing fund has provided for \(1-2\) month stays in SROs for TAY when the shelter is full or when the shelter is not a viable option. Moreover, the Board of Supervisors funded a small flexible housing fund for LGBTQ TAY experiencing street homelessness last year; this fund is extremely flexible and can be used for rental assistance, utility assistance, or other costs that would either help retain housing or quickly obtain housing. This expansion would make this flexible funding pool available to TAY citywide.

\section*{Maintain and Backfill Street Outreach Services for TAY}

Among youth experiencing homelessness, those who identify as LGBTQ are dramatically overrepresented, accounting for a full \(50 \%\) of unsheltered homeless TAY in the most recent PIT count. This request would extend and baseline expanded street outreach services funded last year to target LGBTQ TAY experiencing street homelessness and link them quickly with housing resources (including the emergency housing fund described above) and other developmentally appropriate support services. It would also backfill cuts to TAY outreach made through DCYF. [Update: Funding to maintain outreach activities for LGBTQ youth has been baselined; cuts made through DCYF remain to be backfilled].

\section*{Expanded Bathroom Accessibility at Pit Stops}

There is a bathroom accessibility crisis in San Francisco. It is felt by tourists, shoppers, residents out for the day, and most acutely, those living on our streets. The last homeless Point-in-Time count recorded that 4,353 of our homeless neighbors are unsheltered. Assuming on average that each person needs to go to the bathroom 4 times a day, that means that those who are unsheltered need access to a bathroom 17,412 times a day. If we include those who are using shelters but need to leave during the day, and assume they need to use the bathroom twice while they are out, this number surpasses 20,000 .

Pit Stops have provided a much-needed response to San Francisco's bathroom access issue felt most significantly by those who are homeless and unsheltered. The Department of Public Works estimates that the 17 Pit Stop facilities are getting 1,700 uses a day. A preliminary survey of onethird of HESPA member agencies estimates that our combined bathroom usage is about 1,300 uses a day for both clients and the public. There remains a deficit of 17,000 bathroom uses every day. Libraries, unmanned JCDecaux toilets, and private institutions cannot make up for that deficit, and thus, people are using the street. This is a public health and humanitarian issue that has drawn attention, including a website on the homeless crisis by Jennifer Wong, which tracks human waste based on 311 calls, mochimachine.org/wasteland/\#. Adding more staff coverage to select Pit Stops to increase daily access, we would expect to see a ten-fold increase in their usage. By the Department of Public Works estimation, adding more staff coverage to select Pit Stops we would expect to see up to a ten-fold increase in their usage.

\section*{Part 4: Employment Services}

\section*{Background}

In alignment with the City's framework for preventing and ending homelessness, homeless job seekers require a continuum of employment supports that enables re-entry into the workforce at a living wage. Cuts to this HSA program will leave 75 job seekers without the support they need to secure employment, contribute to housing stability, and reduce street homelessness.

Summary of Initiatives and Outcomes
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline Initiative & Amount requested & Department & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Number of people \\
served and outcome
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Restore Homeless \\
Employment Collaborative
\end{tabular} & FY 2018/19: \(\$ 140,200\) & HSA & \begin{tabular}{l} 
75 individuals will \\
have access to an array \\
of employment \\
services
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Restore Homeless Employment Funds}

Homeless Employment Collaborative funding supports a range of employment and workforce development activities specifically targeted for homeless job seekers. For 20 years, the Homeless Employment Collaborative has provided a continuum of employment services, barrier remediation, resume and cover letter writing, interview preparation, employer matching, job coaching, and job placement. Job seekers have access to one-on-one support, barrier remediation such as obtaining documentation/birth certificates, transportation assistance, work-related fees and dues, work tools/supplies, etc. Funds support hiring fairs with a range of employers and assist homeless job seekers with employer outreach, job application, access to computers for tailored job search, mock interviews, interview clothing, composing resumes and cover letters. Funding will restore 1.75 FTE to provide barrier remediation and job seeking support.

\section*{Part 5: Critical Mental Health Services}

\section*{} , An


\section*{Background}

Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funding is a State funding source that supports a wide variety of services for people experiencing homelessness with behavioral health needs. Unfortunately, the funding is unstable and fluctuates depending on the State economy. This year, cuts to San Francisco's MHSA allocation translated to the end of critical prevention and early intervention services to adults who are homeless, and cut 10 units of housing and support services for TAY. In year's past, mental health services for families residing in shelter were also lost.

Summary of Initiatives and Outcomes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Initiative & Amount requested & Department & Number of people served and outcome \\
\hline Backfill mental health prevention and early intervention services for adults & FY 2018/19: \(\$ 83,500\)
FY 2019/20: \(\$ 167,000\) & DPH & 75 adults experiencing homelessness will access low-threshold, peer-based mental health support \\
\hline Restore housing and support services for TAY with mental illness & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018/19: \(\$ 354,813\) \\
FY 2019/20: \$354,813
\end{tabular} & HSH & 10 TAY with mental illness will receive housing and support services \\
\hline Restoration of Mental Health Services for Families Experiencing Homelessness & \begin{tabular}{l}
FY 2018/19: \$887,375 \\
FY 2019/20: \$887,375
\end{tabular} & DPH & \begin{tabular}{l}
5 FTE Clinical \\
Director to serve 450 Households / Families at 5 agencies
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Backfill Prevention and Early Intervention Services for Adults}

MHSA funding supports a range of prevention and early intervention services that are part of Hospitality House's low-threshold, peer-based, drop-in model. Unless restored, 75 people would lose access to case management, housing and benefits advocacy, individual and group therapy, wellness groups, and ancillary client services.

Hospitality House's approach combines harm reduction interventions with structured case management, individual and group therapy, support groups, civic engagement activities and strengths-based wellness recovery plans. All activities promote individual resilience, recovery from psychological trauma, and holistic wellness that reduces need for restrictive instructive and more expensive interventions. Funding would restore 2.5 FTE to provide these critical services.

\section*{Restore Ten Units of Supportive Housing for TAY with Mental Illness}

MHSA funding supports ten scattered site, master leased units for TAY with mental illness. We know that \(50 \%\) of all individuals who are homeless in San Francisco first experienced homelessness before they were 25 . Moreover, TAY with mental illness are among those most at risk of becoming chronically homeless adults if they do not engage early and deeply in housing and support services that are developmentally appropriate to their needs. Unless this funding is restored, these ten units will be lost to San Francisco's housing stock for TAY with mental illness.

\section*{Restoration of Mental Health Services for Families Experiencing Homelessness}

Increasing evidence shows that homelessness has a lasting and pervasive impact on all aspects of children's development - even after they transition to stable housing. Homeless children are twice as likely to experience hunger as other children, and they are sick four times more often. \({ }^{1}\) They are three times more likely than their peers to develop emotional behavioral problems, and four times more likely to show delayed development. \({ }^{2}\) Stress from frequent moves and housing instability has a deleterious effect on school attendance and academic outcomes: children who are homeless are more than twice as likely to repeat a school grade, be expelled or suspended, or drop out of school. \({ }^{3}\) Across the board, the stress of homelessness profoundly affects all dimensions of childhood development. Homeless mothers are also extremely likely to be impacted by major depressive episodes (50\%), Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder ( \(36 \%\), or triple the rate of the general population) and substance abuse disorders ( \(41 \%\), or double the rate of the general population).

However, research suggests that early intervention can minimize or even reverse the effects of trauma in homeless children and parents. A recent study from the University of Minnesota's Center for Urban and Regional Affairs demonstrated that homeless children's academic success correlates with parental closeness, quality relationships with teachers, and relationships with caring adults. \({ }^{4}\) Furthermore, early childhood mental health consultation in shelter settings has been found to be a central contributor to positive change in caregiver's behavior and children's experience. Mental health services help adult caregivers to attend to the needs of children experiencing homelessness and reduce the traumatic impact of the experience on both adult and child. \({ }^{5}\) Further, recommendations from Child Trends include ensuring mental health support for children, as well as incorporating play-based strategies to encourage healthy development.

This new body of research represents hope for children recovering from the experience of homelessness. With the necessary support and tools in place, children will be more likely to succeed in school, less likely to experience homelessness as adults, and the entire family will be more likely to recover from the traumatic impacts of homelessness.

Agencies serving families experiencing homelessness in San Francisco have seen funding that supports childhood and family mental health services cut severely during the past five years including cuts in funding from First 5, and DPH. With the growth in family homelessness due to the current housing crisis in San Francisco, families are finding it harder and taking longer to end the experience of homelessness in their lives - resulting in deeper effects on the mental health of children and their caregivers. The restoration of this funding will support approximately 450 households with on-site direct mental health support in family shelters, transitional housing, and housing subsidy programs - as well as mental health consultation and training for staff working within those programs.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{1}\) National Center on Family Homelessness. [http://www.familyhomelessness.org/children.php?p=ts]
\({ }^{2}\) lbid.
\({ }^{3}\) Child Trends. [http://www.childtrends.org/Rindicators=homeless-childrèn-a nd-youth]
\({ }^{4}\) Family Housing Fund. [http://www.fhfund.org/_dnld/reports/SupportiveChildren.pdf]
\({ }^{6}\) Charles F. Brinamen, Adriana N. Taranta and Kadija Johnston, Expanding Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation to New Venues: Serving Infants and Young Children in Domestic Violence and Homeless Shelters (Infant Mental Health Journal, Vol 33(3), 2012), 283 - 292.
}
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Keep San Franciscans Housed and House San Franclscans
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Exand,
Portable
Subsdies for
TAYY & \begin{tabular}{|c} 
Baseline and \\
Maintain Need- \\
based Subsitles \\
for Familles:
\end{tabular} & Expand Needt based flexlble subsidles for Elderly or ol sabled Adults & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { New Tenant Right } \\
\text { to Counsel }
\end{gathered}
\] & Replace Adult Shelter in Bayview & Baselline Family
Emergency
Shelter & Restore Hotel Vouchers for Families & New Housling Navigation In Adult Access Points & Expand Emergency Housing Fund for TAY & Malntain
Outreach for
LGBTQ ATY and
bachfill cuts & Expand Plit Stops &  & Backiil MHSA
Prevention \&
Early
Intervention
Funds & Backfill MHSA funding for TAY with Mental Illness & Restore Mental Health Services for Familles Experiencing Homelessness &  \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Request Fiscal Year } x^{\prime} \\
& 18 / 19
\end{aligned}
\] &  & W, &  &  & \[
52 ; 625,498
\] & \[
\text { 4, } 12,83,500
\] &  & \[
\text { R+54, oog, } 967
\] & \[
\text { Wi+1;105; } 6
\] & \[
\text { |ry } 3 \text {, } 2 \times 255
\] & \[
550
\] & \[
\text { Kity } \frac{140 ; 200}{}
\] &  &  & Whas &  \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Funded by Mayor } \\
& 18 / 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \$1,000,000 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$300,000 & \$300,000 & \$0 & & \$0 & \$160,000 & \$500,000 & \$0 & so & \$0 & \$0 & \$2,260,000 \\
\hline Funded by Bos 18/19 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Totai Funded 18/19 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Request fical year } \\
& 19 / 20
\end{aligned}
\] &  &  &  & Whe & \[
53,628,408
\] &  &  &  & \[
5
\] & K & \[
\$ 500,000
\] &  &  &  &  & 5y, \\
\hline Funded by Mayor 19/20 & \$2,100,000 & so & \$0 & \$0 & \$550,000 & \$550,000 & \$0 & & \$0 & \$150,000 & \$500,000 & \$0 & so & \$0 & \$0 & \$3,860,000 \\
\hline Funded by Bos 19/20 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Tftabeunded 19/20 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Torplanded over 2 yegr & \$3,100,000 & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & \$850,000 & \$850,000 & \$0 & & \$0 & \$320,000 & \$1,000,000 & 50 & so & so & \$0 & \$6,120,000 \\
\hline Not Funded & - \(\$ 2,420,314\) & \$900,208 & \$6,771,673 & \$4,000,000 & \$4,406,996 & \$3,015,012 & \$202,388 & & \$2,211,206 & \$322,510 & 50 & \$280,400 & \$250,500 & \$709,626 & \$1,774,750 & \$22,424,955 \\
\hline Not Yet Funded Year 1 & - 5660,157 & 5450,104 & \$2,999,999 & \$2,000,000 & \$2,328,498 & \$1,632,506 & \$101,194 & & \$1,105,603 & \$161,255 & \$0 & \$140,200 & \$83,500 & \$354,813 & \$887,375 & \$11,584,890 \\
\hline Not Yet Funded Year 2 & - \(\$ 1,760,157\) & 5450,104 & \$3,771,674 & \$2,000,000 & \$2,078,498 & \$1,382,506 & \$101,194 & & \$1,105,603 & \$161,255 & 50 & \$140,200 & \$167,000 & \$354,813 & \$887,375 & \$10,840,065 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2018-2019 Request & W紷 & Housing Subsidies & Smberiter & Prevention & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Emergency Services Needis} & fobtraining & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Mental Health Sercies} & 26tatata \\
\hline &  & Baseline and Maintaln Needbased Subsidies for Families & Exandongoing
Fexilifies
Subsidies
Primarly for
Elderly or
DisabledAdults & New Tenant Right to Counse & New Adult Shelter in Bawvew & Baseline Family
Emergency
Shelter & \begin{tabular}{l}
Restore Hotel \\
Vouchers for Families
\end{tabular} & New Housing Navigation in Adult Shelters/Drop ins &  & Maintain Outreach for LGBTQ TAY and Restore Cuts [Partally Funded] & Expand Pit Stops & Backfill Homeless Emplayment & Backfill MHSA Prevention \& Early Intervention Funds & Backfil MHSA funding for TAY with Mental Illness & Restore Mental Health Services for Families Experiencing Homelessness &  \\
\hline Personnel & \% & & & & & & & & & & & दो & & & & , \% 6 \\
\hline Program Directors & & & \(\bigcirc 544,000\) & & 5243,000 & \$222,000 & \$0 & \$0 & & \$45,000 & 25,000 & - \(\quad\) \$40,000 & \$7,200 & & & 4, 5636,200 \\
\hline Services 5taff & \$42,000 & \$30,566 & \$150,000 & & \$741,650 & \$707,600 & \$56,250 & \$484,744 & \$84,000 & \$150,000 & 204,400 & \$44,000 & \$40,000 & \$100,000 & \$425,000 & , 33,260,210 \\
\hline Staff Attorney & & & \(\therefore\) & \$1,200,000 & & & & & & & & & & & & 7, 51,200000 \\
\hline Nigibility Worker & \(\because \quad 50\) & & \(\because 50\) & & so & & & \$118,192 & \$0 & & & \(\therefore \quad\) \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & - 7 H \({ }^{118,182}\) \\
\hline Onant Counselor/Dutreach Workers & - 50 & & \(\because \$ 35,000\) & & & 50 & so & & \$0 & \$63,000 & so & & \$0 & \$0 & & 4-4s98,009 \\
\hline 7psal Personnel & \(\because 542,000\) & \$30,566 & \(\bigcirc \$ 239,000\) & \$1,200,000 & \$984,650 & \$929,600 & \$56,250 & \$602,936 & \$84,000 & \$258,000 & \$229,400 & \$84,000 & \$47,200 & \$100,000 & \$425,000 & S 5 5,312,602 \\
\hline Rayoll Taxes and Benefits & \(\therefore \$ 10,332\) & \$5,394 & \(\begin{array}{r}\$ 71,700 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \$300,000 & \$381,360 & \$371,840 & \$16,875 & \$200,979 & \$20,664 & \$26,568 & 45,880 & \$23,000 & \(\$ 12,800\)
\(\$ 60.000\) & \begin{tabular}{|c}
\(\$ 24,600\) \\
\(\$ 124,600\)
\end{tabular} & \(\$ 150,000\)
\(\$ 575000\) & \% 51,661,992 \\
\hline Total Personnel and Benefits & - \$52,332 & \$35,960 & \$310,700 & \$1,500,000 & \$1,366,010 & \$1,301,440 & \$73.125 & \$803,915 & \$104.664 & \$284,568 & 5275,280 & \$107,000 & \$60,000 & \$124,600 & \$575,000 & \[
\text { Y } 56,974,594
\] \\
\hline Client Financial Assitance & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & F\%er \\
\hline Client Support/Housing Barriers & & & \(\therefore \quad 10\) & & so & 50 & \$10,200 & \$18,54 & so & \$0 & \$0 & \$8,700 & \$6,900 & \$0 & & -4, 544,340 \\
\hline Furniture Grants & & \(\therefore \quad 33,000\) & \(\because\) \% & 50 & 50 & 50 & \$0 & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & & \$0 & \$0 & so & 42, 53,000 \\
\hline Movelin Assistance Grants & \$0 & & & \$0 & s0 & so & \$0 & & \$0 & & so & & \$0 & \$0 & \$0 & Yt, \\
\hline Subsidies & 25,160 & \$400,000 & \$2,585,000 & & 50 & so & 50 & S0 & \$960,000 & & 50 & & so & \$0 & \$0 & + \(54,199,160\) \\
\hline Total Client Financial Assistance & \$254,160 & \$403,000 & \$2,585,000 & & s0 & sof & \$10,200 & \$18,540 & \$960,000 & so & s0 & \$8,700 & \$6,900 & \$0 & S0 & , \(54.245 \cdot 5150\) \\
\hline Operating Expenses & & & \(\because\) & & & & & & & & & & & & & \[
\mid
\] \\
\hline Program Costs & \$22,500 & \$5,000 & \$50,169 & 285714 & \$919,540 & \$379,000 & \$6,000 & \$58,195 & \$22,500 & \$15,000 & 224,720 & \$14,500 & \$4,300 & \$185,280 & \$200,000 & H5 52392318 \\
\hline Construction Costs & & & \(\bigcirc\) & & & & & \$0 & & & & & & & & W6, +5so \\
\hline Total Operating Expenses & \(\because \underline{522,500}\) & \$5,000 & \$50,169 & \$285,714 & \$919,640 & \$379,000 & \$6,000 & \$58,195 & \$22,500 & \$15,000 & \$224,720 & \$14,50 & \$4,300 & \$185,280 & \$200,000 & 5 52392518 \\
\hline Indirect Costs & \$10,851 & \$ \(\$ 6,144\) & \$54,130 & \$214,286 & \$342,848 & \$252,066 & \$11,869 & \$129,317 & \$18,439 & \$21,687 & \$0 & \$10,000 & \$12,300 & \$44,933 & \$112,375 & 4.31241244 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & - \(0+2\) \\
\hline  & +3, \$ 5339,843 & < & 4,52;999;999 & \% 52,000,000 & 25 52,628,498 & 251;932;506 &  & \$1,009;967 & \$1,105,603 & TM, 5321,255 & \$500,000 &  & \%,4\% \(\$ 83,500\) & [ & 25k 5887375 & W \(\$ 14,854,856\) \\
\hline Cost/household: &  & 2\%at \$37,509 & 動 \(\cdot 513,333\) & 53,333 & 526,285 & \$19,325 & \$1,687 & \$2,525 & \$22,112 & 5714 & 51,667 &  & \$1,113 & \$35,481 & \$1,972 & 46tes \\
\hline Households Served: & 20 & & [4mex & 600 & 100 & 100 & 60 & 400 & 50 & 450 & 300 & Ware & 75 & 10 & 450 & , 5 - \(-2,2,927\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

2019－2020 Request
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 5－ & Housing Subsidies &  & Prevention & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Emergency Services Needs} & Job Training & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Mental Health Servcies} & STotal \\
\hline &  &  & \(|\)\begin{tabular}{c}
＂． \\
Baseline On－ \\
Bolng Flexible \\
Subsldies \\
Primarily for \\
Elderly or \\
Disabled \\
Adults
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\text { Expanded } \\
\text { Tenant Right } \\
\text { to Counsel }
\end{array}
\] & New Adult Shelter in Bayview & Baseline Family Emergency Shelter & Feel & New Housing Navigation In Adult Actess Points & Expand
Emergency
Howsing fund
for TAY & Maintaln Outreach for Lgbtatay and Restore Cuts ［Partially Funded］ & Expand Pit
Stops & \begin{tabular}{c} 
We． \\
Kín \\
\hdashline Backill \\
Homeless \\
Employment \\
Services
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Backill MHSA \\
Prevention \＆ \\
Early \\
Intervention \\
Funds \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Backfill MHSA \\
funding for \\
TAY with \\
Mental \\
lifness \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Restore \\
Mental \\
Health Services for Families Experiencing Homelessnes
\(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} &  \\
\hline Personnel & & 完 \(:\) & & & & & & & & & &  & & & &  \\
\hline Program Directors & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄54，000 & & \＄243，000 & \＄222，000 & \＄0 & \＄0 & & \＄45，000 & \＄25，000 & \％ 540,000 & \＄14，400 & & & \＄5643；400 \\
\hline Services Staff & \＄42，000 & \＄30，566 & \＄315，000 & －\(\$ 0\) & \＄741，650 & \＄707，600 & \＄56，250 & \＄484，744 & \＄84，000 & \＄150，000 & \＄204，400 & ：\＄44，000 & \＄92，300 & \＄100，000 & \＄425，000 & 3 53,477 ， 510 \\
\hline Staff Attorney & & & & \＄1，200，000 & & & & & & & & & & & & 551；200；000 \\
\hline Eligibility Worker & & 50 & & & \＄0 & & \＄0 & \＄118，192 & \＄0 & & & & 50 & & & 6isi18；192 \\
\hline Tenant Counselor／Outreach workers & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄35，000 & \＄0 & \＄0 & 50 & \＄0 & & \＄0 & \＄63，000 & \＄0 & & \＄0 & & & H4；998；000 \\
\hline Total Personnel & \＄42，000 & \＄30，566 & \＄404，000 & \＄1，200，000 & \＄984，650 & \＄929，600 & \＄56，250 & \＄602，936 & \＄84，000 & \＄258，000 & \＄229，400 & \＄84，000 & \＄106，700 & \％\＄100，000 & \＄425，000 & \＄55，537，102 \\
\hline Payroll Taxes and Benefits & \＄10，332 & \＄5，394 & \＄121，200 & \＄300，000 & \＄381，360 & \＄371，840 & \＄16，875 & \＄200，979 & \＄20，664 & \＄26，568 & \＄45，880 & \＄23，000 & \＄25，600 & \＄24，600 & \＄150，000 & 2351724，292 \\
\hline Total Personnel and Benefits & \＄52，332 & \＄35，960 & \＄525，200 & \＄1．500，000 & \＄1，366，010 & \＄1，301，440 & \＄73，125 & \＄803，915 & \＄104，664 & \＄284，568 & \＄275，280 & \＄107，000 & \＄132，300 & \＄124，600 & \＄575，000 & －56，561，794 \\
\hline Client Financial Assistance & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Wext \\
\hline Cllent Support／Housing Barriers & & \＄0 & \(\therefore\) & \＄0 & & \＄0 & \＄10，200 & \＄18，540 & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄8，700 & \＄13，800 & 50 & \＄0 & TEX 551,740 \\
\hline Furniture Grants & & ．\(\$ 3,000\) & －．\(\$ 0\) & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄0 & & & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄0 & \＄0 & so & & 29833，000 \\
\hline Movein Asslstance Grants & & ． 50 & & \＄0 & \＄0 & 50 & \＄0 & & \＄0 & \＄0 & 50 & & \＄0 & so & \＄0 & \％4ityMis \\
\hline Subsidies & \＄254，160 & \＄400，000 & \＄3，110，000 & & & \＄0 & & & \＄960，000 & \＄0 & & －\({ }^{\text {a }}\) & S0 & so & \＄0 & 754，724，160 \\
\hline Total Client Financial Assistance & \＄254，160 & \＄403，000 & \＄3，110，000 & \＄0 & so & s0 & \＄10，200 & \＄18，540 & \＄960，000 & so & 50 & \＄8，700 & \＄13，800 & s0 & so & \＄54，778，400 \\
\hline Operating Expenses & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Whtyen \\
\hline Program Costs & \＄22，500 & \＄5，000 & \＄50，169 & 285714 & \＄919，640 & \＄379，000 & \＄5，000 & \＄58，195 & \＄22，500 & \＄15，000 & \＄224，720 & \＄14，500 & \＄8，600 & \＄185，280 & \＄200，000 & 252，396，818 \\
\hline Construction Costs & & & & & & \＄0 & \＄0 & & & & & － 50 & \＄0 & & & Eatwriso \\
\hline Total Operating Expenses & 522，500 & 55，000 & \＄50，169 & \＄285，714 & 919，640 & \＄379，000 & \＄6，000 & \＄58，195 & \＄ \(\mathbf{2 2 , 5 0 0}\) & \＄15，000 & \＄224，720 & \＄114，500 & \＄8，600 & 紬 5185,280 & \＄200，000 & － 52.396 .818 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &  \\
\hline Indirect Costs & \＄10，851 & \＄6，144 & \＄86，305 & ：\＄214，286 & \＄342，848 & \＄252，066 & ．\({ }^{\text {\＄11，869 }}\) & \＄129，317 & \＄18，439 & \＄21，687 & \＄0 & －\＄10，000 & \＄12，300 & \＄44，933 & \＄112，375 & 351，273，419 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & Wx \％ \(17 \times 1{ }^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline Total Expenses & 2085339，843 & T2\＄\(\$ 450,104\) & 4 \(43,771,674\) & 352，000，000 & 52；628，498 & ［51，932，506 & － 515101,194 & 191，009，967 & 51，105；603 & \＄48321，253 & 23\％ 55000000 & 4 \＄ 1400,200 & 15\＄5167\％00 & St， 5354,813 &  & S15；710，031 \\
\hline Cost／household： & \＄16，992］ & ［5］\％\({ }^{\text {c }}\) & ［4at．515，395 & \＄3，333 & \＄26，285 & \＄19，325 & \＄1，687 & \＄2，525 & \＄22，112 & \＄714 & \＄1，667 & \(3 \quad \$ 1,869\) & \＄1，113 & \＄35，481 & \＄1，972 & \％ \\
\hline Households Served & 7 \(\because \cdot 20\) & ） 12 & 245 & 600 & 100 & 100 & 60 & 400 & 50 & 450 & 300 & 站 75 & 150 & 10 & 450 & －2， 413.3022 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{Employment, Wages and Public Safety October 1, 2007}

\section*{Introduction}

The United States currently leads the world in the number of people incarcerated in federal and state correctional facilities. There are currently more than 2 million people in American prisons or jails. \({ }^{1}\) Overall, individuals incarcerated in U.S. prisons and jails are more likely to report extended periods of unemployment and earning lower wages than people in the general population.
- In the most recent statistics provided by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), one-third of people in jail reported they were unemployed prior to arrest in 2002 . \(^{2}\) In comparison, 4.6 percent of the general population reported unemployment in July 2007. \({ }^{3}\)
- Eighty-ftree percent of people in jail reported income in the month prior to arrest of less than \(\$ 2,000\) in 2002, \({ }^{4}\) one-third lower than the average monthly wage of the general public. In 2003, the average monthly wage of the general U.S. population was slightly more than \(\$ 3,000\) per month. \({ }^{5}\)

Research has shown a relationship between employment, wages and crime rates and a relationship between the economic health of a community and incarceration rates. The impact of policies related to employment and wages is concentrated among people of color, who are more likely to experience unemployment, hold lower-paying jobs and be incarcerated.

The importance of this issue is apparent as the stability of the U.S. economy has recently come into question. Between July and August 2007 the country lost 4,000 jobs, ending a four-year growth. Despite a steady unemployment rate, empirical research has identified a net decrease in the percentage of employed adults, which suggests that the number of people who are neither working nor looking for work-considered neither employed nor unemployed by the

\section*{4-4}
\({ }^{\text {I }}\) Sabol, William J., Todd D. Minton and Paige M. Harrison. 2007. Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2006. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
\({ }^{2}\) James, Doris J. 2004. Profile of jail inmates, 2002. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
\({ }^{3}\) Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2007. Employment situation summary: July 2007. www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.n00.htm, accessed August 27, 2007.
\({ }^{4}\) James, Doris J. 2004.
\({ }^{5}\) Calculated using the mean annual wage of \(\$ 36,210\). Obtained at: Bureau of Labor Statistics. September 18, 2007. Online at http://www.bls.gov/oes/2003/may/oes_00Al.htm.
government-in August 2007. \({ }^{6}\) This job loss comes at a time when national statistics show a small uptick in the number of violent crimes. \({ }^{7}\)

This research brief will summarize recent findings on what is known about unemployment and wages as both relate to crime trends and public safety. The Justice Policy Institute (JPI) compared state-level employment rates with crime rates and found that, on average, those states with the highest levels of unemployment \({ }^{8}\) had higher violent crime rates than states with lower unemployment levels. While there is no single solution that will guarantee that a person will not be involved in criminal activity, and the literature is not conclusive on what single factor will solve every community's various challenges, the research suggests that increased investments in employment opportunities can have a positive public safety benefit. Significant findings from this brief include:
- Increased employment is associated with positive public safety outcomes. Researchers have found that from 1992 to 1997, a time when the unemployment rate dropped 33 percent, "slightly more than 40 percent of the decline [in overall property crime rate] can be attributed to the decline in unemployment."
- Increased wages are also associated with public safety benefits. Researchers have found that a 10 percent increase in wages would reduce the amount of hours young men spent participating in criminal activity by 1.4 percent.
- States that had higher levels of employment also had crime rates lower than the national average. Eight of the 10 states that had the lowest unemployment rates in the United States also had violent crime rates that were lower than the national average. In comparison, half of the 10 states with the highest unemployment rates had higher violent crime rates than the national average in 2005.
- The risks of incarceration, higher violent crime rates, high unemployment rates and low wages are concentrated among communities of color: Communities of color and African Americans, specifically, experience more unemployment and lower average wages than their white counterparts. At the same time, communities of color are more likely to experience higher rates of violence than are white communities, and African Americans are more likely to be incarcerated than are whites.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{6}\) Leonhardt, David and Jeremy W. Peters. 2007. Recession fear heightened as 4 -year growth in jobs ends. The New York Times, September 7. Online at www.nytimes.com/2007/09/07/business/07cnd-econ.html? r=1\&oref=slogin. \({ }^{7}\) FBI Uniform Crime Report, 2007. Crime in the United States. Online at www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm.
\({ }^{8}\) The unemployment rate includes those people who are collecting unemployment insurance per 100,000 in the population. To collect unemployment insurance, a person must meet three criteria: the person must be able and available to work, must not have worked in previous week and must have made an effort to find work. Wages are hourly earnings compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
}

\section*{1) Increases in employment and increases in wages are assocfatedwithoue sime rates.}

Researchers have conducted a variety of studies examining the relationship of unemployment and wages to crime. Some of the findings indicate that increased employment and wages can contribute to lower crime rates. Nationally, unemployment rates have shown a positive relationship with crime rates. Particularly since 1989 , violent crime rates followed a similar pattern to unemployment rates.

Violent crime rates and unemployment rates.

——Violent Crime Rate Per 100,000 Population National Unemployment Rate Sources: FBI Uniform Crime Report, Crime in the United States, 1980-2005; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980-2005

Although other factors may be acting to decrease crime rates, several researchers have found that increases in employment and wages contribute to specific decreases in certain types of crime, with property crimes and burglary decreasing the most.

A one percent decrease in the unemployment rate relates to the following decreases in crime rate.
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline Tyeer Crime & Percentage Decreasem Crime Rate \\
\hline Property Crime & \(-1.6-2.4 \%\) \\
\hline Violent Crime & \(-0.5 \%\) \\
\hline Burglary & \(-2 \%\) \\
\hline Larceny & \(-1.5 \%\) \\
\hline Auto Theft & \(-1 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Raphael, Steven and Rudolph Winter-Ebmer. 2001. Identifying the effects of unemployment and crime. Journal of Law and Economics Vol. XLIV.
- The Heritage Foundation found additional public safety benefits in increasing the civilian labor force. According to the report, a one percent increase in civilian labor force participation could be expected to decrease violent crime by 8.8 incidents per 100,000 people.
- A study published in the Journal of Law and Economics found that, the crime drop of the 1990s was associated with falling unemployment rates. \({ }^{10}\) From 1992 to 1997, during a time when the unemployment rate dropped 33 percent, the country also witnessed a 30 percent drop in the robbery rate, a 15 percent drop in auto theft and burglary rates and a 4 percent drop in larceny rates. The researchers found that "slightly more than 40 percent of the decline [in overall property crime rate] can be attributed to the decline in unemployment." The authors found the impact on violent crime was weaker, but that it varied for different crimes (such as homicide, and robberies).
- A study published in the Journal of Labor Economics indicates that for young men, a 10 percent increase in wages would reduce the amount of hours spent participating in criminal activity by 1.4 percent. \({ }^{11}\) Furthermore, this same study directly links the decline of property crime rates in the 1990s with the decline in the unemployment rate.
- A study published in the Journal of Quantitative Criminology found that youth involvement in crime seems to be especially affected by employment. This study has indicated that employed youth are less likely to be engaged in property crimes. \({ }^{12}\)
- A second study published in the Journal of Quantitative Criminology using Bureau of Labor Statistics data indicated that an increase in the number of people unemployed for 15 weeks or more, which is considered long-term unemployment, correlates with increased property crime. \({ }^{13}\)
- One 2002 study published in The Review of Economics and Statistics found that wage trends account for more than 50 percent of the change in both property and violent crime indices over the time period examined in the study. \({ }^{14}\)

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{9}\) Muhlhausen, David B. May 2001. Do Community Oriented Policing Services grants affect violent crime rates? Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation. Online at www.heritage.org.
\({ }^{10}\) Raphael, Steven and Rudolph Winter-Ebmer. 2001. Identifying the effects of unemployment and crime. Journal of Law and Economics Vol. XLIV.
\({ }^{11}\) Grogger, Jeff. 1998. Market wages and youth crime. Journal of Labor and Economics 16(4): 756-791.
\({ }^{12}\) Britt, Chester L. 1997. Reconsidering the unemployment and crime relationship: Variation by age group and historical period. Joumnal of Quantitative Criminology 13(4): 405-428.
\({ }^{13}\) Chamlin, Mitchell B. and John K. Cochran. 2000. Unemployment, economic theory, and property crime: A note on measurement. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 16(4): 443-455.
\({ }^{14}\) Gould, Eric D., Bruce A. Weinberg and David B. Mustard. 2002. Crime rates and local Labor market opportunities in the United States: 1979-1997. The Review of Economics and Statistics 84(1):45-61.
}

\section*{2) States that had higher levels of employment also hat crime rates fower than the national average:}

JPI examined the 10 states with the highest and lowest unemployment rates alongside the corresponding violent crime rates of those 10 states. Overall, states with unemployment rates that are higher than the national average also have higher violent crime rates than states with lower unemployment rates.

Of the 10 states with the lowest unemployment rates, eight had violent crime rates below the national average in 2005. Of the 10 states with the highest unemployment rates, half had violent crime rates above the national average.

On average, the states with the highest levels of unemployment also had the highest levels of violent crime.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Ten states with the lowest unemployment rates and the corresponding violent crime rates.} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Ten states with the highest unemployment rates and the corresponding violent crime rates.} \\
\hline State & Whermploymelt Rate &  & State
\(\qquad\) & Unemployment Rite &  \\
\hline United States & 5.1 & 469 & United States & 5.1 & 469 \\
\hline Montana & 3.9 & 287 & Mississippi & 7.8 & \(\rightarrow 525\) \\
\hline Nebraska & 3.9 & \(\rightarrow 607\) & Alaska & 6.9 & \(\rightarrow 632\) \\
\hline Florida & 3.8 & 449 & Michigan & 6.8 & 297 \\
\hline South Dakota & 3.7 & \(\rightarrow 753\) & Louisiana & 6.7 & 112 \\
\hline Wyoming & 3.7 & 230 & South Carolina & 6.7 & 176 \\
\hline New Hampshire & 3.6 & 355 & Oregon & 6.2 & 425 \\
\hline Virginia & 3.5 & 346 & Kentucky & 6 & \(\rightarrow 594\) \\
\hline North Dakota & 3.4 & 351 & Ohio & 5.9 & \(\rightarrow 509\) \\
\hline Vermont & 3.4 & 283 & Illinois & 5.7 & 324 \\
\hline Hawaii & 2.7 & 257 & Tennessee & 5.6 & \(\rightarrow 530\) \\
\hline Average & 3.56 & 391 & Average & 6.43 & 412 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics 2005; FBI Uniform Crime Report, Crime in the United States, 2005

\section*{3) Why might investments in employment opportunities have a public safety benefit?}

According to the available research and the analyses in this brief, jurisdictions with increased employment had positive public safety outcomes when compared with jurisdictions with more unemployment. Why may employment opportunities have a relationship with public safety?

\section*{Transforming communities}

Researchers have found a relationship between unemployment, crime and incarceration. Improving employment opportunities encourage reinvestments in oneself, as well as in the community, ostensibly creating an environment for improved public safety. A study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that places that rely most heavily on incarceration reduce the employment opportunities in their communities compared with places that rely on alternatives to incarceration. \({ }^{15}\) Areas with the most rapidly rising rates of incarceration were the areas in which youth, particularly African American youth, have had the worst earnings and employment experience. Other research indicates that neighborhoods with the highest levels of incarceration in one year had higher-than-expected crime rates the following year (compared with other neighborhoods, and controlling factors such as poverty, racial composition, and voluntary mobility). \({ }^{16}\)

\section*{Creating positive life outcomes for individuals and communities}

Unemployment, low wages, and incarceration have a cumulative effect that creates a cycle that prevents communities and individuals from improving their life outcomes and acquiring social capital. Individuals may have difficulty procuring work after incarceration, something that contributes to growing unemployment rates, thus increasing the unemployment rate in a community, which may further increase the crime rate and the incarceration rate.
- Incarceration impedes job growth, further precluding employment, and continues the cycle. Researchers at Princeton University have found that a formerly incarcerated youth experienced three weeks less work in a year (five weeks less for a formerly incarcerated African American youth) than a youth who had no history of incarceration. \({ }^{17}\)
- Many people who have been incarcerated face specific obstacles when attempting to find a job, regardless of job type. One researcher found that jail time reduced the probability of employment by between 15 and 30 percentage points. \({ }^{18}\) The impact of incarceration on

\footnotetext{
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}
employment was greater than for conviction or probation alone, which reduced employment probabilities by six to 10 percentage points.
- A 1996 study found that 65 percent of all employers in five major U.S. cities would not knowingly hire a person with a criminal record, regardless of the offense. \({ }^{19}\)
- Youth, in particular, may miss out on opportunities to learn important social and human skills that are necessary for the legal job market, thus making finding and keeping a job more difficult. \({ }^{20}\)
- Even if serving time in prison does not necessarily hinder employment prospects, it will diminish an individual's earnings. \({ }^{21}\)
- The negative impacts of incarceration appear to be greater for older individuals, including those with white-collar occupations. In a review of existing literature, researchers have found that even if employment prospects are not harmed by incarceration, a person with a history of incarceration could expect a 10 to 30 percent earnings penalty. \({ }^{22}\)
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\section*{4) The risks of incarceration, higher violent crime rates, high unemployment rates and low wages are concentrated among communities of color.}

Since the 1990s, employment rates have generally improved in the United States; however, people involved in the criminal justice system are far more likely to report unemployment than someone in the general public. Though 71 percent of people in jail in 2002 were employed in the month prior to arrest, more than one-quarter of the people held in jails were not employed. \({ }^{23}\) An additional quarter of those held in jail were employed part-time or occasionally. People unemployed or under-employed make up a significant portion of the jailed population. In comparison, the percentage of the U.S. population experiencing unemployment in 2005 was approximately 5 percent. \({ }^{24}\)


Source: James, Doris J. 2004. Profile of jail inmates, 2002. Washington, D.C: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Over the past 30 years, employment rates, wages and income have increased for people of color, particularly African Americans. \({ }^{25}\) However, people of color are far more likely to experience unemployment than their white counterparts. At the same time, people of color are overrepresented in U.S. prisons. Though unemployment is not a definite predictor of criminality or incarceration, research has shown that communities that experience more unemployment also experience higher crime rates and, as a result, are likely to also experience higher incarceration rates.

\footnotetext{
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In 2005, the unemployment rate of African Americans was more than twice that of whites.


Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005.

In 2005, African Americans were incarcerated more than five times as often as whites.


Source: Harrison, Paige M. and Allen J. Beck. 2006. Prison and jail inmates at midyear, 2005. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

People of color are also more likely to be paid less than their white counterparts. Though earning less money is not necessarily an indicator of criminal activity or incarceration, communities with lower wages are more likely to experience higher crime rates. Similarly, research has shown that wage inequalities do have a relationship with crime, particularly violent crime. \({ }^{26}\)

\footnotetext{
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}

In 2005, whites made more money than African Americans and Latinos.


Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005

\section*{Recommendations}

Investments in employment opportunities can provide important public safety benefits to communities. From 1997 to 2004, Washington, D.C. experienced evidence of the importance of employment opportunities for youth. As the unemployment rate for D.C. youth increased, the referral rate of youth to juvenile court also increased. Rather than focus on corrections, law enforcement and the judiciary when allocating funding, jurisdictions could turn their attention to employment resources, employability training and the availability of well-paying jobs.


Compared with people who face barriers to employment, people with enhanced employment opportunities and earning potential would be better able to make other investments in their communities, their families and themselves, including health care, housing, education and other factors that would further benefit public safety.

\section*{Research limitations}

Comparing unemployment and its relationship to crime presents some particular challenges. Because unemployment rates only capture those people collecting unemployment insurance from the government, many unemployed people may not be counted. Unemployment rates are also affected by the seasons.

Although investments in employment, education and other social factors have been shown to promote public safety and healthy communities, there is no single solution that will reduce the chance that a person will be involved in criminal activity. The research is not conclusive on what one factor will solve every community's public safety challenges, as different communities have differing needs and what works for one may not work for another. All of these social factors should be considered in the context of individual communities in order to establish policies that effectively ensure public safety.
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This summary is based on excerpts from Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40 (pp. 194-215), by Lawrence J. Schweinhart, Jeanne Montie, Zongping Kiang, W. Steven Barnett, Clive R. Belfield, \& Milagros Sores, 2005, Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press. © 2005 by High/Scope \({ }^{*}\) Educational Research Foundation.

The design and findings of the High/Scope Perry Preschool study and its conclusions are summarized here, along with answers to frequently asked questions, thereby taking advantage of the rich discussion that has surrounded the study over 4 decades. Complete information is available in the study's latest report, Lifetime Effects: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40.1

\section*{Summary}

The High/Scope Perry Preschool study is a scientific experiment that has identified both the short- and long-term effects of a highquality preschool education program for young children living in poverty. From 1962 through 1967, David Weikart and his colleagues in the Ypsilanti, Michigan, school district operated the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program for young children to help them avoid school failure and related problems. They identified a sample of 123 low-income African-American children who were assessed to be at high risk of school failure and randomly assigned 58 of them to a program group that received a high-quality preschool program at ages 3 and 4 and 65 to another group that received no preschool program. Because of the random assignment strategy, children's preschool experience remains the best explanation for subsequent group differences in their performance over the years. Project staff collected data annually on both groups from ages 3 through 11 and again at ages \(14,15,19,27\), and 40 , with a missing data rate of only. \(6 \%\) across all measures. After each period of data collection, staff analyzed the information and wrote a comprehensive official report.

The study has produced eight monographs over the years. The findings of program effects through age 40 span the domains
of education, economic performance, crime prevention, family relationships, and health. Key findings for education, economic performance, and crime prevention are summarized in Figure 1.

\section*{Education}

The program group significantly outperformed the no-program group on highest level of schooling completed ( \(77 \%\) vs. \(60 \%\) graduating from high school). Specifically, a much larger percentage of program than no-program females graduated from high school ( \(88 \%\) vs. \(46 \%\) ). This difference was related to earlier differences between program and no-program females in the rates of treatment for mental impairment ( \(8 \%\) vs. \(36 \%\) ) and grade repetition ( \(21 \%\) vs. \(41 \%\) ). The program group also significantly outperformed the no-program group on various intellectual and language tests from their preschool years up to age 7; on school achievement tests at ages 9,10 , and 14; and on literacy tests at ages 19 and 27. At ages 15 and 19, the progran group had significantly better attitudes toward school than the no-program group, and program-group parents had better attitudes toward their 15-year-old children's schooling than did no-program-group parents.

\section*{Economic Performance}

Significantly more of the program group than the no-program group were employed at age \(40(76 \%\) vs. \(62 \%)\), which continues the trend from age 27 ( \(69 \%\) vs. \(56 \%\) ). At age 40 , more program-group males than no-program group males were employed ( \(70 \%\) vs. \(50 \%\) ), although at age 27 more program-group females than no-program-group females were employed ( \(80 \%\) vs. \(55 \%\) ). The program group also had

\footnotetext{
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Figure 1
Major Findings: High/Scope Perry Preschool Study at 40

significantly higher median annual earnings than the no-program group at ages 27 and 40 ( \(\$ 12,000\) vs. \(\$ 10,000\) at age 27 and \(\$ 20,800\) vs. \(\$ 15,300\) at age 40 ) and higher median monthly incomes at both ages ( \(\$ 1,020\) vs. \(\$ 700\) at age 27 and \(\$ 1,856\) vs. \(\$ 1,308\) at age 40 ). There was a consistent tendency for a smaller percentage of the program group than the no-program. group to receive regular income from family or friends, which was statistically significant at age 27 ( \(2 \%\) vs. \(16 \%\) ).

Rather than paying rent, receiving a subsidy, living with others, or being incarcerated, the program group had significantly more stable dwelling arrangements at ages 27 and 40-that is, more of them owned their own homes ( \(27 \%\) vs. \(5 \%\) at age \(27,37 \%\) vs. \(28 \%\) at age 40). At age 40 , program males paid significantly more per month for their dwelling than did no-program males. Significantly more of the program group than the no-program group owned a car at age \(40(82 \%\) vs. \(60 \%)\), especially males ( \(80 \%\) vs. \(50 \%\) ), as they had at age 27 ( \(73 \%\) vs. \(59 \%\) ). Indeed, at age 27 , a significantly larger proportion of the program group than the no-program group had a
second car ( \(30 \%\) vs. \(13 \%\) ), especially males ( \(36 \%\) vs. \(15 \%\) ). At age 40 , significantly more of the program group than the no-program group had savings accounts ( \(76 \%\) vs. \(50 \%\) ), especially males ( \(73 \%\) vs. \(36 \%\) ).

While the evidence of less use of social services by the program group than by the noprogram group is strikingly consistent across various indicators of social services usage, the evidence of a significant group difference in use of social services on individual indicators is equivocal. By age 40 , fewer members of the program group than the no-program group reported receiving social services at some time in their lives ( \(71 \%\) vs. \(86 \%\) ), but this difference was not significant. At age 27, significantly fewer of the program group than the no-program group reported receiving social services at some time in the previous 10 years ( \(59 \%\) vs. \(80 \%\) ). Among the individual categories of social services, the only significant differences between the program group and the no-program group involved family counseling at ages 34 to 40 ( \(13 \%\) vs. \(24 \%\) ) and General Assistance from ages 23 to 27 ( \(10 \%\) vs. \(23 \%\) ).

\section*{Crime Prevention}

The study presents strong evidence that the Perry Preschool program played a significant role in reducing overall arrests and arrests for violent crimes as well as property and drug crimes and subsequent prison or jail sentences over study participants' lifetimes up to age 40. The program group had significantly fewer lifetime arrests than the no-program group ( \(36 \%\) vs. \(55 \%\) arrested 5 or more times) and significantly fewer arrests for violent crimes ( \(32 \%\) vs. \(48 \%\) ever arrested), property crimes ( \(36 \%\) vs. \(58 \%\) ever arrested), and drug crimes ( \(14 \%\) vs. \(34 \%\) ever arrested). Significant group differences in various types of crime occurred at various times of life-crimes other than violent, property, or drug crimes in adolescence ( \(3 \%\) vs. \(11 \%\) ); total arrests ( \(7 \%\) vs. \(29 \%\) with 5 or more arrests) and drug crimes ( \(9 \%\) vs. \(25 \%\) ) in early adulthood; and violent crimes ( \(14 \%\) vs. \(31 \%\) ) and property crimes ( \(15 \%\) vs. \(32 \%\) ) in midlife. Consider also that by age 40 , compared to the no-program group, the program group had significantly fewer arrests for property felonies ( \(19 \%\) vs. \(32 \%\) ever arrested), drug felonies ( \(7 \%\) vs. \(28 \%\) ), violent misdemeanors ( \(19 \%\) vs. \(37 \%\) ), and property misdemeanors ( \(24 \%\) vs. \(41 \%\) ); significantly fewer arrests for property felonies by age 27 ( \(14 \%\) vs. \(26 \%\) ); and significantly fewer arrests from ages 28 to 40 for violent felonies ( \(2 \%\) vs. \(12 \%\) ), drug felonies ( \(3 \%\) vs. \(15 \%\) ), and property misdemeanors ( \(10 \%\) vs. \(28 \%\) ). By age 40 , compared to the no-program group, the program group had participated in significantly fewer of 3 of the 78 types of crimes cited at arrest-dangerous drugs ( \(3 \%\) vs. \(20 \%\) ), assault and/or battery ( \(19 \%\) vs. \(37 \%\) ), and larceny under \(\$ 100(9 \%\) vs. \(22 \%\) ). These types of crimes had significant group differences by age 27; assault and/or battery also had a significant group difference at age 28 to 40 . Moreover, the program group was sentenced to significantly fewer months in prison or jail by age 40 ( \(28 \%\)
vs. \(52 \%\) ever sentenced), specifically from ages 28 to 40 ( \(19 \%\) vs. \(43 \%\) ). Also, from ages 28 to 40 , the program group was sentenced to significantly fewer months in prison for felonies ( \(7 \%\) vs. \(25 \%\) ) and had served significantly fewer months in prison overall ( \(9 \%\) vs. \(21 \%\) ever served).

\section*{Health, Family, and Children}

More program than no-program males raised their own children ( \(57 \%\) vs. \(30 \%\) ) and had second marriages ( \(29 \%\) vs. \(8 \%\) ). The two oldest children raised by program-group members did not differ significantly from the two oldest children raised by no-program group members in education, employment, arrests, or welfare status. At age 40, more of the program group than the no-program group said they were getting along very well with their families ( \(75 \%\) vs. \(64 \%\) ). Fewer program than no-program males reported using sedatives, sleeping pills, or tranquilizers ( \(17 \%\) vs. \(43 \%\) ), marijuana or hashish ( \(48 \%\) vs. \(71 \%\) ), or heroin ( \(0 \%\) vs. \(9 \%\) ).

\section*{Cost-Benefit Analysis}

In constant 2000 dollars discounted at \(3 \%\), the economic return to society of the Perry Preschool program was \(\$ 244,812\) per participant on an investment of \(\$ 15,166\) per participant- \(\$ 16.14\) per dollar invested. Of that return, \(\$ 195,621\) went to the general public- \(\$ 12.90\) per dollar invested (as compared to \(\$ 7.16\) in the age- 27 benefit-cost analysis), and \(\$ 49,190\) went to each par-ticipant- \(\$ 3.24\) per dollar invested. Of the public return (see Figure 2), 88\% ( \(\$ 171,473\) ) came from crime savings, \(4 \%\) ( \(\$ 7,303\) ) came from education savings, \(7 \%(\$ 14,078)\) came from increased taxes due to higher earnings, and \(1 \%\) ( \(\$ 2,768\) ) came from welfare savings. Preschool program participants earned \(14 \%\)
more per person than they would have otherwise- \(\$ 156,490\) more over their lifetimes in undiscounted 2000 dollars. Male program participants cost the public \(41 \%\) less in crime costs per person- \(\$ 732,894\) less in undiscounted 2000 dollars over their lifetimes.

Interestingly, \(93 \%\) of the public return was due to the performance of males and only \(7 \%\) to females. This difference is due to the fact that compared to females, males committed substantially more crimes, but program males committed substantially fewer crimes than no-program males. This finding stands in stark contrast to the earlier finding that \(84 \%\) of the program females, but only \(32 \%\) of the no-program females, graduated from regular high school. Because education is itself an investment, it is not surprising that education cost more for program females, but it is disconcerting that the greater educational attainment of program than no-program females did not have a larger impact on their earn-
ings, as compared to males for whom program and no-program high school graduation rates were not significantly different. The return to society on program investment due to earnings was \(\$ 70,615\) for females as compared to \(\$ 58,436\) for males, only \(21 \%\) more. We can surmise that program females did not earn more because wage growth for low-skilled jobs has been very low in recent decades; not all females participate in the labor market; and we omitted the benefits of education on household production and family behaviors.

The cost-benefit analysis is reasonably conservative in two respects. One is the omission of benefits that are hard to monetize, such as family, health, and wealth benefits. The other is the conservative assumptions about the earnings profiles and the unit costs of crimes; where multiple data sources were available, we typically chose the source that yielded smaller differences between program and no-program groups.

Figure 2
High/Scope Perry Preschool Program Public Costs and Benefits


\section*{Path Model}

A path model of the study (see Figure 3) suggests how preschool experience affects participants' success at age 40 . Beginning with preschool experience and children's preprogram intellectual performance, the model traces cause-effect paths to children's postprogram intellectual performance, then to their school achievement and commitment to schooling, then to their educational attainment, then to their adult earnings and lifetime arrests.

\section*{Conclusions}

The major conclusion of this midlife phase of the Perry Preschool research study is that high-quality preschool programs for young children living in poverty contribute to their intellectual and social development in child-
hood and their school success, economic performance, and reduced commission of crime in adulthood. This study confirms that these findings extend not only to young adults, but also to adults in midlife. It confirms that the long-term effects are lifetime effects. The Perry Preschool study indicates that the return to the public on its initial investment in such programs is not only substantial but larger than previously estimated.

The study draws these conclusions about a 2 -year preschool education program for 3 - and 4 -year-olds living in low-income families. Teachers had bachelor's degrees and certification in education, and each served 5-6 children. They used the High/Scope educational model in daily \(21 / 2\)-hour classes and visited families weekly. In this model, teachers arranged the classroom and daily schedule to support children's self-initiated learning activities, provided both small-group and large-group activities, and helped children

Figure 3
A Model of the Paths from Preschool Experience to Success at 40


Note. Path coefficients are standardized regression weights, all statistically significant at \(p<.01\); coefficients in each box are squared multiple correlations.
engage in key experiences in child development. Teachers studied and received regular training and support in their use of this educational model.

The most basic implication of this study is that all young children living in low-income families should have access to preschool programs that have features that are reasonably similar to those of the High/Scope Perry Preschool program. Findings from this longterm study and others reviewed in this report have motivated policymakers to invest more in preschool programs. But because policymakers practice the art of political compromise, these programs have seldom met the standard of reasonable similarity identified here. Recognizing this problem, more recent efforts, such as the Abbott court decision in New Jersey and the recent ballot initiative in Florida, have sought to require key program standards from the be-
ginning of a program. These are hopeful signs and models for the future.

The High/Scope Perry Preschool study serves as a symbol of what government programs can achieve. The High/Scope Perry Preschool study also offers a challenge, a kind of policy gauntlet, for decision makers at local, state, and national levels. It demonstrates what can be done, and the challenge is to do it. The High/Scope Perry Preschool, the Abecedarian, and the Chicago programs described in the latest Perry Preschool report all have significant benefits. Though they illuminate different aspects of the question of lasting effects of preschool education, they all reflect the same challenge of providing high-quality preschool programs that include low-income children so that these children get a fair chance to achieve their potential and contribute meaningfully to their families and to society.

\section*{Q \& A}

Because the long-term High/Scope Perry Preschool study is well known and respected and stands at the fulcrum of decisions about public investment in early childhood programs, it has attracted many questions over the years that deserve thoughtful answers. Many of the questions and answers that follow involve the study's internal and external validity. Its internal validity is the extent to which its two groups are the result of simple random assignment and thus accurately reflect the impact of a good preschool education experience against the impact of no preschool education experience. Its external validity is the extent to which its study participants and treatment resemble the children and programs to which it is generalized.

\section*{Don't the departures from random assignment challenge the internal validity of the findings?}

The internal validity of the High/Scope Perry Preschool study is very strong because its design is based on random assignment of children to program and no-program groups. For this very reason, its departures from strict random assignment have received intense scrutiny. These departures and their effects on major outcomes are examined at length in the age 40 report, Lifetime Effects (Schweinhart et al., 2005). First, the outcome analyses in this monograph are adjusted for seven background covariates: five that had statistically significant relationships with preschool experience and one or more of the key outcome variables; one (mother's employment) that had a statistically significant relationship with preschool experience due to the randomassignment departure of assigning some children of employed mothers to the no-program
group; and another variable (father at home) that had a nearly statistically significant relationship with monthly earnings at age 40 as well as general policy relevance. Second, because younger siblings were assigned to the same group as their older sibling, we analyzed major outcomes with subsamples that included only one sibling per family. Third, because the sample consisted of five classes of children, we analyzed major outcomes using classes as covariates. The findings for the major outcomes were the same regardless of which of these analyses were used.

\section*{Isn't the sample size too small to generate scientific confidence in the findings?}

Statistical significance testing takes sample size into account. To achieve statistical significance, group differences must become larger in magnitude as sample sizes become smaller. Indeed, a problem with very large samples is that educationally trivial group differences can achieve statistical significance. If the High/ Scope Perry Preschool study sample were truly too small, none of its findings would have achieved stațistical significance, and it would never have become influential.

\section*{How can the study be generalized to other programs?}

Because few programs are evaluated by longitudinal studies involving random assignment of study participants, it is desirable to be able to generalize the results of such studies as broadly as possible. The external validity or generalizability of the study findings extends to those programs that are reasonably
similar to the High/Scope Perry Preschool program. A reasonably similar program is a preschool education program run by teachers with bachelor's degrees and certification in education, each serving up to 8 children living in low-income families. The program runs 2 school years for children who are 3 and 4 years of age with daily classes of \(2^{1 / 2}\) hours or more, uses the High/Scope model or a similar participatory education approach, and has teachers visiting families at least every two weeks or scheduling regular parent events. Each term in this treatment definition is examined further below.
- A preschool education program-a care and education program that contributes to young children's development.
- Run by teachers with bachelor's degrees and certification in education-The teachers in the Perry Preschool study were certified to teach in elementary, early childhood, and special education; of all their education, the early childhood training was most relevant to their classroom practices.
- Each serving up to 8 children-The Perry Preschool program had 4 teachers for 20 to 25 children, typical for special education classes (Kakalik, Furry, Thomas, \& Carney, 1981). The equally successful classrooms in the subsequent High/Scope Preschool Curriculum Comparison study (Schweinhart \& Weikart, 1997a, 1997b) had 2 teachers for 16 children, a ratio of 1 to 8. In general practice, High/Scope preschool classrooms appear to run successfully with 2 adults and up to 20 children (Epstein, 1993).
- Children living in low-income familiesChildren were selected for the study because their parents had low educational attainment (high school graduation or less), low occupational status (unemployed or unskilled), and their homes
had fewer than 3 rooms per person. These families were of lower socioeconomic status than most U.S. residents at that time. The study does not suggest a sharp cutoff point for program eligibility.
- Offering 2 school years at 3 and 4 years of age-The study presents no evidence that the program would have had similar effects if it had served children at earlier (infancy-3 years) or later ages (elementary school years). Evidence shows children should attend a similar program for 2 school years (October through May for the Perry Preschool group); one year is enough only if one accepts a generalization from the 13 program-group members in the initial class, who attended the program for 1 school year and experienced the same effects as did the 45 programgroup members in the other classes, who attended the program for 2 school years. This study, by itself, offers only weak evidence to support the limitation of many state preschool programs to only serving 4 -year-old children. The better argument for this policy is the inequity inherent in serving some children for 2 school years when, as a result, other eligible children are not served at all, because the 3-yearolds served have taken the places of additional 4-year-olds.
- With daily classes of \(2^{1 / 2}\) hours or moreThe program runs at least \(21 / 2\) hours a day 5 days a week. A few minutes less should not matter, nor should hours more: Even a full, 9 -hour-a-day program, if it meets all the other standards of quality, should produce similar if not greater effects.
- Using the High/Scope educational model or a similar participatory education approach-The High/Scope educational model was developed and used in the program (Weikart, Deloria, Lawser, \& Wiegerink, 1970; Hohmann, Banet, \& Weikart, 1979; Hohmann \& Weikart,

1995, 2002). In this model, the classroom is arranged and the day is scheduled to support children's self-initiated learning activities along with small-group and large-group activities. Teachers help children as they plan, carry out, and review their own activities. Teachers plan ways to engage children in numerous key experiences in child development covering the areas of personal initiative, social relations, creative representation, movement and music, logic and mathematics, and language and literacy. Teachers study and receive regular training in the educational model and receive support in its use from a supervisor who knows the model and assists in its implementation.
- With teachers visiting families at least every 2 weeks-The program included weekly home visits, which might be reduced to every 2 weeks, or changed to an equivalent form of substantial outreach to parents, such as parent group meetings in which staff acknowledge and support parents as partners in the education of their children and model activelearning principles for them. The key is not to require meetings, but rather to ensure that the basic message and lessons of a strong partnership with parents are clearly and repeatedly communicated. Sometimes, issues including the safety of home visitors in the community call for creative solutions to this challenge.

The study provides scientific evidence that its findings apply to reasonably similar programs. Program similarities, however, are defined somewhat more liberally than the actual program characteristics to allow for necessary and reasonable variations-serving up to 8 children rather than 5 or 6 , serving children living in low-income families rather than only families living in poverty, home
visits every 2 weeks rather than every week (or regular parent meetings and events). These characteristics are structural, that is to say, they are relatively easy to name, count, legislate, regulate, and monitor. One of them, use of the High/Scope educational model, is structural in its simplest meaning, but encompasses process characteristics as well, that is, what actually happens in the classroom, such as the nature of teacher-child interaction. Programs with similar features, regardless of model used, can expect similar results. In curriculum provision, it's not what you say you do but what you actually do that counts.

\section*{Were the findings due to curriculum or other aspects of the program?}

The High/Scope Preschool Curriculum Comparison study (Schweinhart \& Weikart, 1997a, 1997b), which immediately followed the High/Scope Perry Preschool study, sug. gests that the curriculum had a lot to do with the findings. The comparison study found that young people born in poverty experienced fewer emotional problems and felony arrests if they attended a preschool program that used the High/Scope model or a traditional Nursery School model rather than a Direct Instruction model.

Since 1967, the study has followed the lives of 68 young people born in poverty who were randomly assigned at ages 3 and 4 to one of three groups, each experiencing a different curriculum model:
- In the Direct Instruction model, teachers followed a script to directly teach children academic skills, rewarding them for correct answers to the teacher's questions. \({ }^{2}\)
- In the High/Scope model, teachers set up the classroom and the daily routine so children could plan, do, and review

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) This 1960 s model has undergone subsequent development and current versions differ from the one in this study.
}
their own activities and engage in active learning key experiences in child development individually, in small groups, and in whole-class groups.
- In the traditional Nursery School model, teachers responded to children's selfinitiated play in a loosely structured, socially supportive setting.

Program staff implemented the curriculum models independently and to high standards, in \(2^{1 / 2}\)-hour classes held 5 days a week, and conducted \(11 / 2\)-hour home visits every 2 weeks, when children were 3 and 4 years old. Except for the curriculum model, all aspects of the programs were nearly identical. The findings presented here are corrected for differences in the gender makeup of the groups.

By age 23, the High/Scope and Nursery School groups had 10 significant advantages over the Direct Instruction group, and the High/Scope and Nursery School groups did not differ significantly from each other on any outcome variable (Schweinhart \& Weikart, 1997b). The High/Scope and Nursery School groups both had two significant advantages over the Direct Instruction group at age 23:
- Only 6\% of either group needed treatment for emotional impairment or disturbance during their schooling, as compared to \(47 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- More of the High/Scope group ( \(43 \%\) ) and the Nursery School group ( \(44 \%\) ) had done volunteer work, as compared to only \(11 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.

The High/Scope group had six additional significant advantages over the Direct Instruction group:
- Only \(10 \%\) had ever been arrested for a felony, as compared to \(39 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- None of the High/Scope group had ever been arrested for a property crime, as
compared to \(38 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- At age \(15,23 \%\) of the High/Scope group reported that they had engaged in 10 or more acts of misconduct, as compared to \(56 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- Fewer of the High/Scope group ( \(36 \%\) ) said that various kinds of people gave them a hard time, as compared to \(69 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- With regard to marriage, \(31 \%\) of the High/Scope group had married and were living with their spouses, as compared to none of the Direct Instruction group.
- Of the High/Scope group, 70\% planned to graduate from college, as compared to \(36 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.

The Nursery School group had two additional significant advantages over the Direct Instruction group:
- Only \(9 \%\) of the Nursery School group had been arrested for a felony at ages 22-23, as compared to \(34 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.
- None of the Nursery School group had ever been suspended from work, as compared to \(27 \%\) of the Direct Instruction group.

Through age 10, the main finding of the Preschool Curriculum Comparison study was that the overall average IQ of the three groups rose 27 points-from a borderline impairment level of 78 to a normal level of 105 after 1 year of their preschool program-and subsequently settled in at an average of 95 , still at the normal level. The only curriculum group difference through age 10 was measured as the preschool programs ended: the average IQ of the Direct Instruction group was significantly higher than the average IQ of the Nursery School group (103 vs. 93). Throughout their school years, curriculum groups did not
differ significantly in school achievement, nor did their high school graduation rates differ significantly. The conclusion at that time was that well-implemented preschool curriculum models, regardless of their theoretical orientation, had similar effects on children's intellectual and academic performance. However, time has proved otherwise. Tightly scripted teacher-directed instruction, touted by some as the surest path to school readiness, seems to purchase a temporary improvement in academic performance at the cost of a missed opportunity for long-term improvement in social behavior.

\section*{Does the High/Scope Perry Preschool study apply to Head Start and state preschool programs?}

Because of the demand for knowledge of the lasting benefits of preschool education programs, there has been a tendency to generalize the High/Scope Perry Preschool study's findings beyond reasonably similar programs. Several of these generalizations deserve discussion here.

The most common generalizations of the High/Scope Perry Preschool study findings relate to the national Head Start program. Indeed, news reports have often imprecisely referred to the Perry Preschool Program study as a Head Start program (see discussion by Woodhead, 1988). News reporters would argue that this conflation of terms is a useful convenience to simplify the story in that both the Perry Preschool program and Head Start serve young children living in poverty and began in the U.S. in the 1960s. Nonetheless, Head Start, as nationally defined by its Program Performance Standards (U. S. Administration for Children and Families, 2001), clearly does not meet the standard of reasonable similarity with the Perry Preschool program for generalization purposes:
- Most Head Start teachers do not have a bachelor's degree. In 2000, only \(28 \%\) of Head Start teachers had a bachelor's degree, while \(19 \%\) had an associate's degree, \(32 \%\) had some college experience but no degree, and 74\% had a Child Development Associate credential or state-awarded preschool certificate (Zill et al., 2003). Teacher salaries in Head Start average \(\$ 21,000\)-about half of the average of \(\$ 43,000\) for public school teacher salaries (National Institute for Early Education Research, 2003)-while teacher salaries in the High/Scope Perry Preschool program were at public school teacher salary levels at the time of the study, with a \(10 \%\) bonus for participation in a special program.
- Head Start serves most but not all participating children for 2 or more program years. In FY 2003, for example, \(34 \%\) of Head Start children were 3 years old, \(53 \%\) were 4 years old, \(5 \%\) were 5 or older, and \(8 \%\) were under 3 (U. S. Administration for Children and Families, 2004). In FY 2002, \(36 \%\) of Head Start children were 3 years old, and it is reasonable to assume that these children continued in Head Start as 4-year-olds in FY 2003, so that most of the 4 -year-olds in Head Start in FY 2003 ( \(36 \%\) among the \(53 \%\) ) had been in the program the previous year. We can therefore surmise that in FY 2003 only \(17 \%\) of Head Start 4-year-olds attended the program for only one year.
- Only \(20 \%\) of Head Start programs report using the High/Scope educational model, while \(39 \%\) report using the Creative Curriculum model, and \(41 \%\) report using some other curriculum approach (Zill et al., 2003). The Creative Curriculum model has goals similar to the High/Scope model, but emphasizes different practices to attain these goals (Dodge, Colker, \& Heroman, 2002).
- Head Start Program Performance Standards require only 2 home visits a year.

The Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) found that children gained 4 points in standard scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test during their Head Start year (Zill et al., 2003). Children in the High/Scope Perry Preschool study gained 8 points in their first year and a total of 14 points in 2 years. In other words, on average Head Start programs are achieving some success, but could be doing more to help children reach their potential.

Forty states have now invested in state preschool programs for young children living in poverty or otherwise at special risk of school failure (Barnett, Robin, Hustedt, \& Schulman, 2003; National Prekindergarten Center, 2003). As these programs have developed, especially in the past 2 decades, policymakers have paid attention to program quality, thereby acknowledging the argument from the High/Scope Perry Preschool study and similar studies that only high-quality preschool programs for poor children are known to have long-term benefits for participants and a strong return on public investment. However, politics is the art of compromise, and the high quality of the High/ Scope Perry Preschool program (as defined earlier) is seldom if ever achieved in state preschool programs (Gilliam \& Zigler, 2004).

The simple scientific conclusion is that the findings of the High/Scope Perry Preschool study do not apply to typical. Head Start or state preschool programs, but may apply to exemplary ones and could apply to typical ones if policymakers and administrators chose to implement the standards of high quality described here. It is important to get this point just right, neither overstating nor understating the Perry Preschool program study's generalizability. While the findings do not apply to typical Head Start programs as they exist today, it is not because the program studied was an unattainable ideal run by super-educators, the
likes of which will never be seen again. To borrow a phrase from Lisbeth Schorr, the programs and findings presented in the Рerry Preschool study monographs are completely and realistically "within our reach" (Schorr, 1989, p. i.).

\section*{Does the study apply to child care programs?}

Several studies of U.S. child care centers have concluded that their quality is unacceptably low (Cost, Quality, \& Child Outcomes Study Team, 1995; Whitebook, Phillips, \& Howes, 1993). In terms of the quality criteria listed here, child care programs have certain seemingly insurmountable financial problems. Unlike Head Start and state preschool programs, which are fully paid for by the government, an estimated \(60 \%\) of child care costs are borne by the participating families (Stoney \& Greenberg, 1996). While child care programs can certainly aspire to be genuine preschool education programs and maintain a ratio of no more than 8 children per teacher, the need for child care includes, but also extends well beyond, 3 - and 4-year-old children. By definition, these programs could serve all children whose parents are employed or in school outside the home, a definition that includes but is not limited to low-income children.

For the most part, the average pay for child care teachers is less than half that of public school teachers ( \(\$ 43,000\) ). The average annual wage for child care workers in 2002 was \(\$ 23,820\) in local-government programs, \(\$ 18,279\) in state and federal programs, \(\$ 15,155\) in private programs, and \(\$ 11,507\) for self-employed child care workers (National Child Care Information Center, 2004a). It should come as no surprise that only one state, Rhode Island, requires child care teachers to have bachelor's degrees, and only 15 states have any educational requirements at all for child care teachers (National Child Care Information Center, 2004b).

The High/Scope educational model widely influences teaching practices in child care programs; but the meager funds available for training in child care programs mean that few providers actually receive much training in the High/Scope model. Daily classes certainly do run more than \(21 / 2\) hours, and there is no reason to think that their additional duration per se prevents program staff from delivering as much or more quality education as briefer programs. Teachers do not provide regular home visits to families, but that would not be the correct standard to use in these cases. Rather, the child care programs' challenge is to develop teacher-parent relationships of mutual respect and understanding that are of the same quality as those that result from biweekly home visits or regularly scheduled parent meetings.

\section*{Does the study apply to openenrollment preschool programs?}

The relatively new open enrollment preschool programs have also been linked to. the High/ Scope Perry Preschool study findings. These programs are sometimes called universal and other than age and residence requirements, have no demographic restrictions (such as poverty) on program earollment. The findings of the High/Scope Perry Preschool study and similar studies would apply only to children served by these programs who are reasonably similar to children living in poverty or otherwise at risk of school failure.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that poverty is not an inherent trait of children but is rather a socioeconomic extreme of settings in which they live. A good preschool program offers a productive early childhood educational environment, while early childhood poverty by and large offers an unproductive early childhood educational environment. So the longitudinal preschool studies provide evidence that the
degree of educational productivity in early childhood settings has a large influence on young children's subsequent lives. All young children spend their time in settings that vary in their educational productivity, so the findings apply in this way to all children. But if it is a setting's educational productivity that matters, early childhood programs are not inherently more educationally productive than children's homes; nor are children's homes inherently more productive than early childhood programs. Young children from educationally productive homes who attend less educationally productive early childhood programs would suffer negative effects on their development. The survey of existing preschool settings in the previous paragraphs gives reason to be seriously concerned about this reverse application of the findings of the longitudinal preschool program studies.

\section*{Does the study apply to early childhood programs in other countries?}

As the characteristics of a country's children and programs diverge from the characteristics of the Perry Preschool study's children and programs, applications become less certain. Generalization of the study to other industrialized countries, such as Great Britain, seems probable, but generalization of the study to less industrialized countries requires greater caution. The challenge of such applications becomes clear as one considers the practical ranges of outcome variables in various countries. Improving the high school graduation rate, for example, is a reasonable goal in industrialized countries, but not in some less industrialized countries. One might reasonably argue, however, that a high-quality preschool program would improve children's educational performance in less industrialized countries, but that this effect would be expressed in ways other than an improved high school graduation rate. For example, the

Turkish Early Enrichment Project (Kagitcibasi, Sunar, \& Bekman, 2001) found evidence of long-term program effects on children's educational success and social adjustment in a very different culture. Cost-benefit analysis is particularly sensitive to such differences between countries.

\section*{Did the Perry Preschool program occur too long ago to apply to current programs?}

The Perry Preschool Project operated from 1962 through 1967. The rapid pace of technological change in modern society-including the advent of widespread use of computers, worldwide electronic communication, and increased transportation, among other advances-is unprecedented in history. But there is no compelling reason to assume that this rapid pace of technological change would alter basic principles of human behavior and education. Throughout most of the history of the world, few would have regarded half a century or even a century as a sufficient amount of time to permit profound changes in traditions, let alone profound changes in human nature that would affect how children respond to an educational program. Indeed, the education and social sciences in general are quests for timeless principles, not for principles that must be rediscovered once or twice a decade. The argument that the finding of such studies have limited applicability to the present because of rapid change is quite similar to a belief that because each human experience is unique, scientific generalization is impossible. A current manifestation of this belief is the postmodernism movement (Dahlberg, Moss, \& Pence, 1999). Postmodernism is essentially a nonscientific movement, even antiscientific. In contrast, the scientific approach adopted in the High/ Scope Perry Preschool study is the logical application of the principle that similar expe-
riences have similar effects on human devel-opment-what might be called the principle of external validity or generalizability.

\section*{Does the evidence of the effectiveness of the High/Scope educational model come only from programs run decades ago?}

No. The Head Start FACES study (Zill et al., 2003) is a nationally representative study of 2,800 children who entered Head Start in fall 2000. It found that 4 -year-olds in Head Start classes that used High/Scope improved from fall to spring in letter and word identification skills and cooperative classroom behavior and decreased their behavior problems:
- On a scale of letter and word recognition, children in High/Scope classes registered a highly significant gain ( \(p<.01\) ) of 12.6 scale points, significantly more ( \(p<.05\) ) than children in classes using Creative Curriculum or other curricula.
- On teacher ratings of cooperative classroom behavior, children in High/Scope classes experienced a highly significant gain ( \(p<.01\) ) of half a standard deviation, significantly more ( \(p<.05\) ) than children in classes using Creative Curriculum or other curricula.
- On teacher ratings of total behavior problems, particularly problems involving hyperactive behavior, children in High/ Scope classes dropped significantly ( \(p<.05\) ) during the year, significantly more ( \(p<.05\) ) than did children in classes using Creative Curriculum or other curricula.

Of the \(91 \%\) of Head Start teachers who used one or more curriculum models, \(39 \%\) used Creative Curriculum, 20\% used High/ Scope, and \(41 \%\) used some other curriculum,
such as High Reach, Scholastic, or Los Cantos Los Ni§os. The quality of Creative Curriculum and High/Scope classes was significantly higher than the quality of classes that used other curricula, particularly with respect to language. On the 7-point Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (Harms, Clifford, \& Cryer, 1998), with 5 identified as good, High/Scope classes averaged 5.04, Creative Curriculum classes averaged 5.02, and classes using other curricula averaged 4.55. On its language items, average scores were slightly higher, but the differences were about the same. On a quality composite, the average scores for High/Scope and Creative Curriculum were nearly half a standard deviation higher than the average scores for other curricula-clearly an educationally meaningful difference.

The High/Scope Training for Quality study (Epstein, 1993) also offers evidence for the effectiveness of the High/Scope preschool model as practiced throughout the U.S. Half of High/Scope-certified trainers in the study were in Head Start, \(27 \%\) were in public schools, and \(20 \%\) were in private child care agencies. They had a median 15 years of early childhood experience, \(88 \%\) had completed college, and \(85 \%\) had teacher-training responsibility-spending an average of 8 hours a week training teachers. At the time of the study, the High/Scope Registry listed 1,075 early childhood leaders in 34 states and 10 other countries who had successfully completed High/Scope's 7-week trainer certification program in the past decade. The average trainer had trained 15 teaching teams, so an estimated 16,125 teaching teams, including \(29 \%\) of all Head Start staff, had received High/Scope model training from these trainers. Since trainers regard \(45 \%\) of these classrooms as examples of the High/Scope model, they would nominate an estimated 7,256 early childhood classrooms throughout the U.S. and around the world as examples of the High/ Scope model. High/Scope classrooms were
rated significantly better than comparison classrooms in terms of classroom environment, daily routine, adult-child interaction, and overall implementation. The children in High/Scope programs significantly outperformed the children in comparison programs in initiative, social relations, music and movement, and overall child development.

\section*{Didn't the High/Scope Perry Preschool program achieve a level of quality that cannot be duplicated in ordinary preschool programs?}

This criticism is rooted in the fact that the High/Scope Perry Preschool program paid teachers public school salaries and added a \(10 \%\) bonus because the program was a special one. There is no reason to think that such pay would have attracted teachers who were substantially better than other public school teachers, and in fact the teachers who worked in the program were hired locally by ordinary search and hiring procedures. Nevertheless, current child care (and Head Start) teacher salaries average only about half as much as average public school teacher salaries (National Institute for Early Education Research, 2003). More and more preschool programs, however, are hiring teachers at public school salaries. It has also been suggested that the quality of the Perry Preschool program was due, in part, to the charismatic leadership of the program's director, David Weikart (Schorr, 1989). While Weikart's leadership was certainly essential to the program's success, there is every reason to believe that any dedicated preschool program director could exercise similar leadership with respect to assuring the quality of the programs under his or her supervision. Such leaders insist on program quality and fidelity to a validated educational model and strive to provide program staff with all the resources and encouragement they need to achieve them, including adequate salaries.

\section*{Although the program had a strong effect on children's intellectual performance, didn't it fade out over time?}

It is true that the High/Scope Perry Preschool program had a statistically significant effect on children's IQs during and up to a year after the program, but not after that. This pattern has been found in numerous other studies, such as those in the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (1983). The pattern raises two questions: How far does it generalize, and what does it mean?

For some time, the pattern of children's intellectual performance found in this study was taken to represent all outcomes of this and similar programs. It was concluded that the program had strong effects that faded out over time. However, all of the subsequent findings of program effects in this study (effects on school achievement, high school graduation, adult earnings, and crime prevention) disprove this conclusion. Indeed, so many studies have now found evidence of long-term effects of high-quality preschool programs that the opposite conclusion is practically indisputable: High-quality preschool programs for young children living in poverty do have long-term effects.

So what is the meaning of the fadeout of program effect on children's intellectual performance? More than anything else, it teaches us about the nature of multiage intelligence tests. Unlike most achievement tests that are age-specific, most intelligence tests, like the Stanford-Binet (Terman \& Merrill, 1960), are designed to be used with individuals of a wide range of ages, from early childhood to adulthood. Also unlike achievement tests, intelligence tests were not designed to assess program effects, and so the way they function in this role was not, and is not, well under-
stood. Multiage intelligence tests actually consist of a series of age-specific test batteries (the Stanford-Binet has 6 items per battery) designed to function with a specific age level, such as children 4 years old or children 4 years and 6 months of age. The preschool studies found effects at the ages during and a year or two after the program, but not subsequently. Children with preschool program experience got more items right on those agespecific batteries, but did not get more right on age-specific batteries designed for older children. It seems reasonable to conclude that, when used to assess preschool program outcomes, intelligence tests functioned more like achievement tests than intelligence tests, and indeed that is precisely the use to which they were put. Imagine if achievement tests for grades \(4-8\) were all combined into one grand multiage test of achievement. It would not be at all surprising if a really good grade 4 classroom improved children's achievement test scores on this test at grades 4 and 5 , but not at grades 6, 7, and 8. That is precisely what happened in the temporary effects of high-quality preschool programs on children's intellectual performance.

To take this thinking to a theoretical level regarding children's intellectual performance, we might simply say that the preschool studies showed intellectual performance to be environmentally sensitive-it went up in intellectually stimulating preschool settings and down in less intellectually stimulating elementary school settings. Or, to put it in terms of program and no-program groups, it went up when the program group's experience was more intellectually stimulating than that of the no-program group and returned to the same level as that of the no-program group when both found themselves in the same elementary school settings.

\section*{Was the preschool program's effect on intellectual performance critical to its success and can this goal be replaced by another goal, such as early literacy skills and other content?}

The causal model presented in the Lifetime Effects monograph (Schweinhart et al., 2005) identifies intellectual performance as the gateway from the preschool program to all subsequent program effects. However, the original hypothesis was that a good preschool program would increase children's intellectual performance permanently, not temporarily; and typically, after early childhood, intellectual performance does not change much (Terman \& Merrill, 1960). Perhaps rather than identifying the gateway variable as early childhood intellectual performance, we should call it the preschool intellectual boost.

The High/Scope educational model was originally called the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum (Weikart et al., 1970) because it focused on cognitive, logical processes identified in Piaget's theory of education (Piaget \& Inhelder, 1969)-such as representation, classification, and seriation. Tests of early childhood intellectual performance demonstrably tap these processes. So the High/Scope preschool classroom provides a preschool intellectual boost as measured by these tests. It also provides other experiences that facilitate these intellectual processes, such as planning and reviewing one's activities, exploring what one is curious about, and developing a sense of personal control over the events of one's life-what might be called intellectual performance, broadly defined.

It makes sense to combine or supplement this emphasis on intellectual processes with a focus on early literacy or mathematics skills found to predict later achievement, but it does not make sense to replace the first with the second. To do so runs the risk of sacrificing the known long-term effects on school achievement, high school graduation rates, lifetime earnings, and crime prevention.

\section*{Why did the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program affect males and females differently?}

Males and females in this study differed substantially from each other on educational attainment and lifetime arrests.

Evidence of stronger program effects on females appears for regular high school graduation rate, repeating a grade, and treatment for mental impairment. Over \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) times as many program females as no-program females graduated from regular high school ( \(84 \%\) vs. \(32 \%\) ), whereas about the same percentages of program and no-program males graduated from regular high school ( \(50 \%\) vs. \(54 \%\) ). Half as many program females as no-program females repeated a grade ( \(21 \%\) vs. \(41 \%\) ), while slightly more program males than no-program males repeated a grade ( \(47 \%\) vs. \(39 \%\) ). Less than one-fourth as many program females as no-program females ( \(8 \%\) vs. \(36 \%\) ) were treated for mental impairment, while only twothirds as many program males as no-program males were treated for mental impairment ( \(20 \%\) vs. \(33 \%\) ).

Evidence indicates that the program effect on criminal arrests was stronger for males than for females, partly because males had more arrests: \(69 \%\) of no-program males, but only \(34 \%\) of no-program females, were arrested five or more times. The apparent program effect in persons with five or more arrests was a reduction of about one third for males ( \(45 \%\) vs. \(69 \%\) ) and for females ( \(24 \%\) vs. \(34 \%\) ), but because the percentages were higher for males, the reduction in number of arrests was greater. The starkest gender difference was in arrests for drug crimes, for which less than half as many program males as no-program males were arrested ( \(18 \%\) vs. \(49 \%\) ), while the percentages were about the same for program and no-program females ( \(8 \%\) vs. \(11 \%\) ).

A possible explanation for this pattern is that teachers and school staff responded differently to girls and boys whose academic
performance improved as a result of receiving the preschool program. As would be expected, educators responded to the preschool program's effect on girls' early academic performance by keeping them in regular classes rather than by having them repeat a grade or by assigning them to special classes for mental impairment. Girls who were not tracked into repeated grades or special classes were more likely to graduate from regular high school. On the other hand, boys in the program and no-program groups were retained in grade and assigned to special classes for mental im-
pairment at about the same rate, despite better performance on intellectual tests by the group who had preschool. This may be because teachers and school staff focused primarily on classroom misconduct (more common in both groups of boys than in the girls) rather than on objective measures of academic performance such as intellectual tests. For this reason, the intellectual gains made in preschool by the male program group may not have translated as expected to gains in high school graduation rate and in other long-term indicators of educational success.
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\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Sara Hicks-Kilday <sara@ecesf.org> \\
رent: & Tuesday, June 26, 2018 12:13 PM \\
To: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Subject: & CPAC Add-back Budget Request for FY2018-19 \& FY2019-20 Budget \\
Attachments: & CPAC Add-back Budget Request 2018.docx
\end{tabular}

Dear Linda Wong,

CPAC requests support for an increase in funding for Early Care and Education. Please see the attached request for dollar amounts and rationale.

This request has also been shared directly with Budget Committee members and aides.

\section*{Sara Hicks-Kilday}

On behalf of CPAC

Sara Hicks-Kilday
San Francisco Child Care Providers' Association
415-891-7322 (Cell)
sara@ecesf.org
www.ecesf.org
Many educated and talented young people rightly view early childhood educationjobs as a pathway to poverty. Even the most well-paid pre-K teachers in schoolsponsored settings earn, on average, only three-quarters of the compensation of kindergarten teachers. In community-based public pre-K and Head Start programs, achers with bachelor's or higher degrees earn only slightly more than half the average income of comparably educated women, and slightly more than one-third of mparably educated men. Teachers in child care centers fare even worse.

The services intended to ameliorate poverty should not generate it.
MARCY WHITEBOOK
Berkeley, Calif., Jan. 30, 2014
NYTimes Letter to the Editor

June 25, 2018

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisor's Budget Committee
Re: CPAC's FY2018-19 Budget Request
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Yee, and Sheehy:
San Francisco voters continue to demonstrate their commitment to early care and education as a priority area of need. With consistent dedication to grow revenue we can meet the goals the San Francisco community and leaders agreed to in the San Francisco Early Care \& Education (ECE) Citywide plan, including:
- Building a citywide ECE system which enables all families with children 0-5 years old to access high quality early education and care
- ECE compensation parity with TK-3 educators

CPAC urges San Francisco leaders to act on the recognition of ECE as an urgent policy priority and equity issue, and increase San Francisco's annual funding for ECE by at least \(\$ 300\) million within the next 5 years. While the current San Francisco budget and add-back process cannot meet the entire need, with consistent dedication to grow revenue by both securing new revenue sources, such as the recently passed Proposition C , and matching this with annual increases through budget allocations.

Our request of \(\$ 10\) million in immediate investments for FY 18-19 came out of a close examination of cost estimates and need provided by the Office of Early Care \& Education, as well as input from direct providers. Proposition C funds, while all but officially passed, may face challenges delaying access of funds. We must not backslide just as the voters have shown their priority to push forward on funding ECE. We respectfully ask for as much of the \(\$ 10\) million as possible, but no less than \(\$ 5\) million, to be split between increased services to families of infants and toddlers as well as increased educator compensation to build the stable educator workforce needed for current and expanded service.

Rationale:
- The ECE workforce crisis is acute.
- Early educators, a large majority of which are women of color, are the lowest paid of any profession requiring degree attainment. With incomes that are far below that of SFUSD TK-12 teachers and classroom support staff, nearly all early childhood early educators earn below the self- sufficiency index for San Francisco.
- This makes retaining and attracting qualified staff extremely difficult and constrains the capacity of the ECE sector to meet the needs of San Francisco's families and children. Currently sites identify lack of teachers as the top barrier to increasing services. An investment in compensation is an investment in the quality care needed by San Francisco families and children.
- Investing more in early care and education is a key strategy for ensuring San Francisco is a city in which socio-economically diverse families can live. Currently, there are 3,000 eligible children on the waitlist for child care subsidies. \(2 / 3\) of them are infants and toddlers.
- Parents and guardians need quality, reliable child care so that they can be productive members of the work force, increase self-sufficiency, and advance our city's goal of equitable opportunities for all children and families in our diverse community.
- Early care and education is often a larger expense for families than housing. When we help families pay for early care and education, they can afford more for housing.

On behalf of San Francisco's families and children, we thank you for your consideration and support for our request.

Sincerely,
CPAC Executive Committee

Monica Walters, Chair
Gretchen Ames
Sandee Blechman
Kelly Dodson
Sara Hicks-Kilday
Bev Melugin
Elaine Merriweather
Matt Pemberton

Written Testimony-Submitted for the Record

June 19, 2018
City of San Francisco
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102
RE: This letter is written to address the on-street parking program for car share vehicles being considered for substantial change by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and the SFMTA

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors and SFMTA,
I have been a Zipcar member since Zipcar first came to San Francisco. Their on-street parking is essential to continue our way of life. I sold my car upon becoming a Zipcar Member here in San Francisco and have found it is cheaper and more convenient than car ownership. Without this program, I would have to buy another car adding to our already congested city. Being disabled Zipcar has been played an essential part in helping me to make it to Doctor Appointments and has allowed me to remain independent. Zipcar also allows me to shop where I could not go before. Living here in Hayes Valley there are no grocery stores that are within walking distance.

The Zipcar on-street parking program has become a convenient and essential way of living in our neighborhood. I could not imagine having to buy another car. Think of all the cars that are eliminated from our city streets with everyone sharing one car in the Zipcar on-street parking program. I urge the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and the SFMTA to PLEASE make a positive change and continue to allow or expand the Zipcar on-street parking program.

Thank you!

Richard Rodriguez

\author{
Zipcar Member, Hayes Valley Resident
}


\author{
Written Testimony- Submitted for the Record City of San Francisco, Board of Supervisors June 25, 2018 \\ Witness: Franco Arieta, Regional General Manager, Zipcar
}


Good morning. My name is Franco Arieta, and I am the Regional General Manager for Zipcar's West Coast region. Zipcar is the world's leading car-sharing network, driven by a mission to enable simple and responsible urban living. With more than one million members worldwide and vehicles in 500 cities and towns, Zipcar enables its members to live car-free or car-lite by providing ondemand access to "wheels when you want them."

Zipcar launched in San Francisco in 2005, and today we enable tens of thousands of San Francisco residents to live car free or car light. Members have access to our local network of over 1,000 vehicles in the Bay Area by the hour or by the day, as a convenient and cost-effective alternative to car ownership.

Since our founding, we've believed that car sharing is a vital part of the city's transportation ecosystem. We've been working closely with the SFMTA since 2014, with the start of a pilot program for on-street car share parking. Since then, we've located over 120 cars in on-street locations from the Bayview to the Sunset to SOMA, making car sharing more accessible for all residents.

On-street car share parking permit fees are scheduled to increase \(17 \%\) on July \({ }^{15 t}, 2018\) and another \(15 \%\) on July \(1^{\text {st }}, 2019\). With this \(35 \%\) increase over the course of the next 13 months, Zipcar will be forced to take a critical review of our footprint in San Francisco, possibly retracting a substantial number of our vehicles from the on-street spaces. These proposed increases are a step backwards for the success of sustainable, accessible, and shared mobility options in San Francisco.

Independent research has found that each Zipcar eliminates the need for up to 13 personally owned vehicles on the road. After joining Zipcar, households see a monthly reduction of transportation expenses by 70 percent and a personal reduction of carbon emissions by up to 1,600 pounds per year. In San Francisco, \(54 \%\) of our members did not own a car in year before joining Zipcar. After joining Zipcar, this number increased to \(72 \%\).

Our vision has long been a world where car sharers outnumber car owners, and we believe we've never been closer to that vision thanks to partnerships like the one with the SFMTA. Thank you for your continued support and for the opportunity to testify today.

Wong, Linda (BOS)

\author{
From: Somera, Alisa (BOS) \\ Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 12:47 PM \\ To: \\ Subject: \\ Attachments: \\ \title{
Wong, Linda (BOS)
} \\ FW: SF Chamber Letter re: Budget Allocation to Increase Police Staffing \\ 6.22.18 Police Department Staffing Budget.pdf
}

For file

\author{
Alisa Somera \\ Legislative Deputy Director \\ San Francisco Board of Supervisors \\ 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 \\ San Francisco, CA 94102 \\ 415.554.7711 direct | 415.554 .5163 fax \\ alisa.somera@sfgov.org
}

Click HERE to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information-including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees-may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

\section*{From: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)}

Sent: Sunday, June 24, 2018 4:08 PM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS).<alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: SF Chamber Letter re: Budget Allocation to Increase Police Staffing

From: Alexander Mitra [mailto:amitra@sfchamber.com]
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 11:22 AM
To: Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; MayorMarkFarrell (MYR) <mayormarkfarrell@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org> Subject: SF Chamber Letter re: Budget Allocation to Increase Police Staffing

Dear Supervisor Cohen,

Dlease see the attached letter from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce supporting the Police Department's .nding request to increase police officer staffing.

Thank you,


\section*{Alex Mitra}

Manager, Public Policy
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
(O) 415-352-8808•(E) amitra@sfchamber.com
(2) 0

Wong, Linda (BOS)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Jessica Lum <jessical@sftravel.com> \\
Sent: & Friday, June 22, 2018 4:26 PM \\
To: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Cc: & DPH - cassandra \\
Subject: & Letter of Support for Police Staffing Levels - SF Travel \\
Attachments: & SF Travel - Letter of Support for Increase Police Staffing.pdf
\end{tabular}

\section*{Hello Linda,}

I hope you are well. San Francisco Travel would like to submit the attached letter of support urging the Budget and Finance Committee to approve the proposed increase of 250 uniformed police officers to the Police Department.

Could you please distribute the attached letter to the board and put it on file?
Thank you!


Jessica Lum | Director, Public Policy \& Executive Office Programs E jessical@sftravel.com | T 415.227.2623 | F 415.227.2668

San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 | San Francisco, CA 94111
sftravel.com | Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

Never the Same. Always San Francisco.
June 23-24 SF Pride | July 20-22 Rugby World Cup Sevens

Got Meetings? Check Out Our Pick Two Promotion!

June 22, 2018

The Honorable Malia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, \#244
San Francisco, CA 94012
Re: Police Department Staffing Budget

Dear Supervisor Cohen,
On behalf of the San Francisco Travel Association, which represents over 1,300 businesses, I am urging the Budget and Finance Committee to approve the Police Department's funding request to increase staffing levels to meet the City's growing needs.

The Charter "minimum" police staffing levels, set by voters in 1994, was fixed at a time when the population was approximately \(724,000,20 \%\) lower than it is today. In 2017, San Francisco welcomed over 25 million visitors, compared to only 16 million visitors in 1999. This is an increase of approximately 25,000 more visitors per day from when the staffing levels were established.

There is a clear need for increased staffing. We believe the best way to deter crime and threatening street behavior is to put more officers on the beat in popular tourist attractions, neighborhood commercial districts, and transit hubs. We must also ensure that the City remains ahead of the curve with retirements and assure that response times to all crimes in progress are met. Our growing city needs to increase police staffing levels.

San Francisco Travel urges the Board of Supervisors to approve Mayor Farrell's four-year plan to increase the Police Department's uniformed force by 250 officers.

Sincerely,


Joe D'Alessandro
President and CEO

June 22, 2018

The Honorable Malia Cohen
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, \#244
San Francisco, CA 94012

Re: Police Department Staffing Budget

Dear Supervisor Cohen:
The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, representing the interests of thousands of local businesses, urges the Budget and Finance Committee to approve the funding request of the Police Department to increase staffing levels to meet the growing needs of the city's residents, workers and visitors.

The Charter "minimum" police staffing levels, set by voters in 1994, was fixed at a time when the city's population was approximately \(724,000,20 \%\) lower than it is today. In fact, it was based on a staffing level set by Mayor Feinstein's administration when the population was under 700,000 .

With the transfer of jurisdiction for Treasurer Island and Hunter Point Shipyard to the city, the geographic area the Departments polices has expanded. Our day-time workforce population has increased from 595,000 in 1994 to over 800,000 workers today. And, while serious crimes have declined, the type of crimes that impacts residents on a daily basis have increased by an alarming rate.

There is clearly a need for increased staffing. We believe the best way to deter crime is to put officers on the beat; downtown, at transit hubs and stations and on neighborhood retail streets. At the same time, we must remain ahead of the curve with retirements and assure that response times to serious crimes in progress are met. In our growing city this can only be accomplished by adding to the Department's uniformed and civilian workforce.

The Chamber of Commerce urges the Board of Supervisors to approve Mayor Farrell's four-year plan to increase the Police Department's uniformed force by 250 officers.

Sincerely,


Jim Lazarus
Senior Vice President of Public Policy
Cc: Clerk of the Board, to be distributed to all Supervisors; Mayor Mark Farrell

AMERICAN ACADEMY \({ }^{\text {rm }}\)
OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

655 Beach Street San Francicisco, CA 94109-1336
\(\mathrm{T}:+1415.561 .8510\)
www.aao.org
David W. Parke II, MD
Chief Executive Officer

June 19, 2018

London Breed, Mayor
Office of the Mayor
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Breed,
Congratulations on your election. You have a big job ahead of you. I'm writing to you today as the CEO of a national professional association, the American Academy of Ophthalmology. The Academy has about 200 local employees and has been headquartered in San Francisco since 1979. Our main office is at 655 Beach Street near Fisherman's Wharf.

Besides being a local employer, the Academy also has a large annual convention that rotates through San Francisco. Our meeting is scheduled to rotate here next in 2019. Typically, our convention brings about 26,000 visitors to San Francisco for up to a week. Our convention's economic impact on the city is between \(\$ 70\) and \(\$ 100\) million, and as a local company we have historically been proud to show off our city and benefit our fellow citizens. However, as an employer and a convention organizer, l've become concerned about the decline of San Francisco the last few years. The streets are filthy and unsafe. I'm embarrassed to take our out-of-town Board members to dinner, as I never know what we might see and/or experience. Scenes of public drug use, urination, defecation, and panhandling more than offset the scenes of Coit Tower and the Golden Gate Bridge!

My apprehension has grown after speaking with the Executive Director of the American Urological Association (that just had their meeting here in May). He said that they had several attendees physically accosted within blocks of Moscone and that their international attendance was down because of their stated fear for safety in San Francisco.

San Francisco has always been an expensive city in which to hold a conventionthe most expensive of any of the cities in our rotation. However, most SF conventions would also experience an offsetting registration bump due to San Francisco's popularity. If that bump no longer occurs due to what is happening
in our streets, then we (and others) will reconsider our future attendance dates. Currently we are scheduled to return to San Francisco again in 2023 and 2027, but we will definitely revisit this decision based on our experience here next year. As Past-President of the national association of medical societies, I know others are having similar thoughts. Since most organizations of our size book meetings 10 years in advance, it takes a decade or more for a city to fully economically recover from the loss of convention business.

I understand that the issues facing San Francisco are complex and that it will take years to resolve most of them fully. However, something must be done now to make the streets clean and safe again so that San Francisco remains a popular and safe, albeit expensive, destination.

Sincerely,


David W. Parke II, MD
Chief Executive Officer
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
From: & Board of Supervisors, (BOS) \\
ョnt: & Friday, June 15, 2018 1:05 PM \\
10: & BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Subject: & FW: Don't cut library evening hours
\end{tabular}

From: Carl Russo [mailto:c_russo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 12:23 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Don't cut library evening hours

Dear Supervisors:

I am a user of the San Francisco Public Library. We are fortunate to have such a rich, varied, and accessible public library system. Many San Franciscans, however, work long hours and may not make it to the library by 9 p.m.

Now the SFPL is proposing to cut late-night hours back from 9 pm to 8 pm , along with other schedule cuts. Personally, I often ride my bike to a branch that is open till 9pm. Please support keeping opening hours as they are now.
ihank you,

Carl Russo
1965 Page Street, Apt, 303
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Deetje B <deetje@aol.com>
Monday, June 11, 2018 12:26 PM
Cohen, Malia (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)
Wong, Linda (BOS)
Budget Committee item: SFPL RFID funding

Dear Supervisor:
Budget Committee; Request to put funding of SFPL's RFID on
hold
I'm writing to urge the Budget Committee put the proposed RFID system in the SF Public Library on hold until the new City Librarian has been selected and is up and running. For the following reasons:
1. As an active patron of the public library I am not in favor of the Interim City Librarian's proposal to switch the SF Public Library's check-out system from its perfectly working bar code system to radio frequency technology (RFID). I urge that your committee put this item on hold until a new City Librarian is installed and has a chance to evaluate the necessity and/or desirability of this very expensive change to the Library's circulation system. Perhaps s/he will prefer to invest these millions in more open hours or in filling the holes in the collection (for instance, for a good example, replacing Let the Glory Out by Sen. AI Gore, Sr. Indeed, there are a lot of titles I've had to borrow through Link+ because they are not in our collection or do not circulate -- as in the case of The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community? (any of which Link+ borrowings the Library should but does not keep track of, but I have a long (available). list of the ones I've had to borrow through Link+ because they are not available here). Plus, I understand there's talk of opening up several new branches in the developing parts of the City, which will put additional strains on the budget.
2. Just because a new technology exists is not necessarily a reason to use it. And I wonder who is benefitting from this proposed purchase? Not the public! Not the staff! Then who? The vendor, I suppose. And who is that? Has the Committee been informed?
3. I am opposed also because of the threat of tracking, if only a PERCEIVED threat, to the library patrons' privacy. At this anxious point in our highly technologized and surveilled society, concerns about our privacy are uppermost, and it would be a great shame if people felt that the Library, of all institutions, constituted a threat to their freedom to read and research without surveillance by any party! The Library has in the past (e.g., the Patriot Act's attack on library borrowers' privacy) firmly established that it honors and will protect patron's privacy by never divulging to anyone what titles any patron borrows from the library. That is their position and they should stick to it. Even the mere suspicion on the part of the public that the RFID system has the ability to track borrowers or their books is unacceptable -- and completely unnecessary if we keep our present bar code system. After all, the public library serves as a major pillar of our democracy, providing equal access to all to our heritage and serving as an educational institution available to all, rich and poor, young and old. And everyone should feel free to avail themselves of its treasures unwatched.

The Board put this decision on hold the last time RFID came up. I strongly urge that you do so again; at least until a new City Librarian is installed and has a chance to review the proposed change and, if it were to be made, be in a position to deal with any problems that might come up in installing it and managing it as time passes. Additionally, the new City Librarian might instead choose to use the millions needed to purchase and install this uninecessary new system for other things, such as more open hours or for
filling holes in the collection. After all, the main function and purpose of the public library system is to provide maximum access to books for all of our City's residents.

Tank you for your attention.
Respectfully,
Deetje Boler

\author{
Gorsha Sur, Esq. \\ Versus Advocates, P.C. 1700 Shattuck Ave., Suite 210 \\ Berkeley, CA 94709 \\ gsur@versusadvocates.com \\ +1 (650) 209-0090
}

May 16, 2018
Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\section*{Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget}

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Xe,
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
It is no secret that small law firm lawyers and solo practitioners provide essential legal services to small business, nonprofits and individuals who find the hourly rates charged by big law firms prohibitively high. To provide quality representation to these budget conscious clients, lawyers must have free access to legal research tools and databases available at law libraries, avoiding hefty subscription fees. Losing this vital resource or attaching a cost to it will mean additional overhead passed on to clients.

Law libraries also offer a place for continued education and social gathering for the lawyers who often work alone and can become isolated.

In light of the above, I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide valuable resources to San Francisco's people and legal community.

Sincerely,


Gorsha Sur
Principal / Lawyer
Versus Advocates, P.C.

\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & David Wright<david@dwimmigration.com> \\
-ent: & Wednesday, May 16, 2018 7:35 PM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); \\
& Yee, Norman (BOS) \\
Cc: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Subject: & Law Library Budget
\end{tabular}

Bd of Supervisors Budget \& Finance Committee
1 Dr Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
I am an immigration lawyer in solo practice serving the legal needs of low income families and individuals. The resources available at the SF Law Library are far too expensive for me to afford on my own, yet they are essential to my ability to provide the most reliable professional service to my clients. I hope you will support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so the library can continue providing these important legal resources to the people of our city.

Chank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,
David S. Wright
Attorney at law
Law Office of David S. Wright
1232 Market Street, Suite 102
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel. 4154211264
Fax 4158612309
david@dwwimmigration.com
The foregoing communication and any accompanying attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please be advised that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or its attachments is strictly probibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, fax, or telephone (we will accept collect calls). Address Change Information: Anyone living in the U.S. who is not a U.S. citizen must report every change of address to the USCIS within 10 days of the move on Form AR-11 http://uscis.gov/graphics/howdoi/address.htm

\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Nancy Brandt <nsbrandtlaw@gmail.com> \\
Sent: & Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:38 PM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); \\
Cc: & Yee, Norman (BOS) \\
Subject: & Wong, Linda (BOS)
\end{tabular}

Dear Members of the SF Budget \& Finance Committee:
I am a vice-president of the California Appellate Defense Counsel organization (cadc.net) and, more importantly in this context, co-chair of the San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of CADC. I'm writing on behalf of the local members of our organization to encourage you to continue to fund (generously) the Law Library located at 1145 Market Street.

Our chapter meets regularly at the library for continuing education sessions (MCLE) that are both critical to our work as appellate attorneys and necessary per California Bar requirements. Most appellate attorneys work in solo offices and need the opportunity to acquire the MCLE credits we offer. The library provides a perfect location for our meetings.

In addition, because we are almost all practicing as court appointed attorneys, our pay is far lower than that of attorneys in the private sector, which means that the legal research resources at the SF Law Library are extremely valuable to us and our indigent clients.

Please do not overlook this extremely important resource in your budget.
Sincerely, Nancy Brandt

Nancy Brandt nsbrandtlaw@gmail.com 510-545-4920

\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Kai Haswell <kai@alrp.org> \\
„ent: & Tuesday, May 15, 2018 3:14 PM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); \\
& Yee, Norman (BOS) \\
Cc: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
Subject: & Re: SF Budget Committee Meeting 5/17/2018 \\
Attachments: & Letter of Support - San Francisco Law Library.pdf
\end{tabular}

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter of support for the San Francisco Law Library, in consideration of the SF Budget Committee Meeting on May 17, 2018. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

Kai Haswell
Staff Attorney | AIDS Legal Referral Panel
1663 Mission St., Suite 500 | San Francisco, CA 94103
P: (415) 701-1200 ext. 323 | F: (415) 701-1400 kai@alrp.org | www.alrp.org
Pronouns: she/her

Your generosity makes our work possible: www.alrp.org/donate
"Like" ALRP on Facebook! www.facebook.com/AIDSLegalReferralPanel
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\author{
Via Email
}

Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
May 15, 2018

\section*{Re: Letter in Support of the San Francisco Law Library}

Dear Supervisors,
My name is Bill Hirsh and I am the Executive Director of the AIDS Legal Referral Panel (ALRP) in San Francisco, CA. ALRP provides free legal resources, counseling, and representation to people living with HIV/AIDS throughout the seven Bay Area counties. Our inhouse staff provides services in numerous legal areas, including housing, immigration, and benefits counseling, among many others. We also have a network of over 700 private attorneys on our referral panel, who contract with us to represent our clients pro bono or on a sliding-scale basis.

I am writing in strong support of the San Francisco Law Library and the services it provides to the public interest legal community in San Francisco. ALRP staff attorneys and ALRP panel attorneys frequently use the services provided by the Law Library in order to provide the highest level of representation to our clients, most of whom are low-income and living with multiple disabilities.

Given ALRP's limited resources and space, the Law Library has been an invaluable resource in providing us with free conference rooms in order to meet with clients, stakeholders, and other attorneys, as well as providing a neutral space for us to conduct depositions and mediations. Our panel attorneys also frequently use the Law Library services for similar purposes.

The Law Library is an essential part of San Francisco's efforts to expand access to justice for the most vulnerable members of our community. I strongly urge you to continue supporting the Law Library and the many low-income residents it serves.

\section*{Regards,}

BillHirsh
Executive Director
AIDS Legal Referral Panel

\title{
Cc: Linda Wong, Clerk Litulawong indgovorg:
}

Malia Cohen, Chair
maliacohen(osfgovorg
Sandra Lee Fewer
Sandra.fower@sfgovorg
Catherine Stefani
Catherine.stefani@sfgov.org
Jeff Sheehy
Leffsheehy@sfyovorg
Norman Yee
Nominawee@styoviorg

\title{
CHIOSSO LAW
}

Anthony C. Chiosso TONY@CHOSSOLAW.COM Licensed Attorney in CA

May 15, 2018
VIA US MAIL
Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\author{
RE: SF LAW LIBRARY APPROPRIATION
}

Dear Sir or Madam,
I am a frequent user of the San Francisco Law Library and lam writing to encourage this committee to maintain or increase its funding of this important resource. As a solo practitioner, it is impossible to duplicate the resources of large firms. The SF Law Library's resources help even the playing field so that I can fairly represent clients that large firms won't take on as clients. The staff are incredibly helpful and they routinely go above an beyond to assist patrons. Without this valuable resource, many of the most vulnerable members of our society will be at even more risk of being taken advantage of by those with more resources.

I am available to discuss this matter with you at your convenience, you can also contact me via email at: tonv@chiossolaw.com.


Anthony C. Chiosso
Attorney

Cc: Linda Wong, Clerk
Linda.wong@sfgov.org
Malia Cohen, Chair
malia.cohen@sfgov.org
```

201 MISSIONST., SUITEI2OO SANERANCISCO, CA P 94105
PHONE:415-964-1321.FAX:415-358-4315
WWW.CHIOSSOLAW.COM

```

Sandra Lee Fewer
Sandra.fewer@sfgov.org
Catherine Stefani
Catherine.stefani@sfgov.org
Jeff Sheehy
Jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org

Norman Yee
Norman.yee@sfgov.org

\title{
O'Grady Law Group
}

May 15, 2018

Budget \& Finance Committee.
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\section*{Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget}

Dear Members of the Committee:

Iam writing in șupport of the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget.

I'm a long-time user of the law library as well as a presenter of library seminars. I began using the library when I was in law school and I've been using it extensively for more than 30 years.

As the only public law library in San Francisco, the San Francisco Law Library is open to everyone and provides free resources to the public as well as legal practitioners. For example, the library offers support for solo and small firm attorneys such as myself.

I have attached a flyer for my presentation at the library on Thursday entitled "Celebrating Human Greatness in the Law." I wish that you could attend, but it will be at roughly the same time as your hearing. I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide valuable resources; such as these presentations, to San Francisco's people and legal community.

Members of the San Francisco legal community such as myself know how important it is that the resources provilded by the San Francisco Law Library be available to us and the people of San Francisco. Thank you for your consideration.


John E. O'Grady
Enclosure
Celebrating Human Greatness in the Law

Celebrating Human Greatness in the Law is a group conversation about how the human spirit gets expressed in high conflict situations. We share stories of times that greatness touched our lives, entiching each other with our memories and re-connecting with our owni greatness. Many of us will tell stories from our rich experience in our work as lawyers, mediators, paralegals, and legal workers. Get to know lawyers and others on the journey while being inspired to live and work fully in the moment. When have you acted in greatness? Have you seeing others acting in the spirit of greatness? Bring your stories. Our meeting will be facilitated by John O'Grady. John guides people to navigate family conflicts about guardianship, aging, death; taxes, inheritance, and property rights while addressing the underlying conflicts, salvaging importatit telationships, and staying connected and in conversation for a lifetime. This end result is priceless.

\section*{Prescated by Attorney \& Mediator John E. O'Gtady O'Grady Law Group}

John O'Grady is an estate planning lawyer and a mediator of inheritance battles. He has been practicing in San Francisco for more than twenty-five yeats. He served as the 2012 Chair of The Estate Planning, Trust. \& Probate Section of The Bat Association of San Francisco. www.ogradylaw.com

\section*{Programs are Free and Open to Everyone \\ San Francisco Law Library \\ 1145 Market Stteet, 44 Floor \\ San Francisco, CA 94103 \\ 415-554-1772 \\ www.sflawlibrary.otg \\ Seating is on a fitst-come, first-setved basis}

Civic Center Batt \& Muni stops outside the building, between 7 th \& 8th

Dear Budget \& Finance Committee Supervisors,
The San Francisco Law Library is a remarkable institution, and deserves your support-as well as the gratitude of all of us here in San Francisco.

What is important to me about the library is that it is open to all of us who live here in San Francisco. That is, any one of us who wishes to know what the law is, whether of this city, this state, or this country, can walk into the library and seek it out, and ask for help from one of its librarians.

The library is in this respect, I believe, unique in San Francisco. It certainly is in comparison with the two principal law school libraries (Golden Gate and Hastings) to which admission is substantially restricted.

It is worth a quick check of the library's website (sflawlibrary.org). There under "Policies and Rules" you will see that "The San Francisco Law Library is open to all". You will also see on its home page an admirable example of its outreach, an upcoming, free noon time session on "How to File a VA Disability Claim".

All this is done at a modest cost, particularly given the value of what is provided. My understanding is that the budget last year for the library from the City was \(\$ 1.4\) million. That is a bit less than \(\$ 2\) per San Francisco resident.

Please recognize the value of this library to all of us who live here-and perhaps even be proud of what it does!

> Sincerely yours,

\author{
Joe Luttrell
}

28 Napier Ln
San Francisco CA 94133

\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Warren Jackson <warrenajackson@outlook.com> \\
eent: & Tuesday, May 15, 2018 8:04 PM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); \\
Cc: & Yee, Norman (BOS) \\
Subject: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
& Law library funding
\end{tabular}

Dear Members of the Budget \& Finance Committee:
I write to implore you to do everything you can to support the law library. I understand that the budget and funding are intended to remain consistent, but that the drastic decrease in civil filing fee revenue has unintentionally resulted in a severe decrease in the law library's funding.

I have been a grateful user of the law library's services for many years as a small-firm and contract attorney (you may recall that there used to be at least two other branches, but we are now down to just one library for the entire city). The law library is a crucial resource, and not only for people like me-every time I go to the library I encounter non-lawyers who would be lost without the resources and services the library provides in helping them with life matters from employment to divorce to probate issues. I don't know if most people realize how important the law library is, so it's critical for me to share my experience and observations with you.

Thank you for your time and for your attention to this important issue.
Yours truly,
Warren Jackson
P.S. The address below is my business address, but I live in the 94109 ZIP code, in Ms. Stefani's district. Congratulations on your appointment, Ms. Stefani-- I look forward to meeting and working with you!

Warren A. Jackson, Esq. 601 Van Ness Avenue
\#E340
San Francisco, California 94102
415-640-2993
warrenajackson@outlook.com
The information in this email is confidential and may also be privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify us by forwarding the message to warrenajackson@outlook.com and deleting the original message. Thank you.

\title{
James A. Michel \\ ATTORNEY AT LAW \\ 2912 DIAMOND STREET \#373 \\ SAN FRANCISCO CA 94131-3208 \\ TEL.: 415/239-4949
}

May 15, 2018

\section*{By Email to:}

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget \& Finance Committee
Hon. Malia Cohen, Chair
Hon. Sandra Lee Fewer
Hon. Catherine Stefani
Hon. Jeff Sheehy
Hon. Norman Yee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\section*{RE: San Francisco Law Library Proposed Budget}

To the Honorable Members of the Budget \& Finance Committee:

I am a San Francisco resident and self-employed attorney who uses the San Francisco Law Library on a regular basis, and have done so since I began practicing law more than 21 years ago. Especially after the Law Library moved to its current location, I have come to depend on the Law Library's resources and services multiple times per week for legal research. I regularly use the Law Library's conference rooms for meetings with clients have conducted depositions there. I also participate in the community events hosted by the Law Library. I depend on the Law Library for my continued success and I know of a dozen others you will not hear from who would say the same. For those reasons, I humbly request that the Budget Committee increase its continued support for the Law Library.

cc: Linda Wong, Clerk

May 16; 2018

\section*{Via Email Only}

Budget \& Finañee Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr.. Carlton B. Gọodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget
Dear Supervisors Cohen; Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
In this age where the income gap is widening, so widens the gap between those who can afford representation and those who canot. Small law firm lawyers and solo practitoners balance every day the desire to help those who are almost able to pay with the realify of the cost of keeping the lights on in a law office.

These small law firm attoneys and solo practitioners have often given up the comforts of big firm life in order to pursue their sense of justice for the underdog.. They keep rates lower for consumers by foregoing the conveniences of subscription research tools (and sometimes even offices) by utilizing the databases made available at the law library. Losing this resource or attaching a cost to it will mean additional overhead that must and will, in the grand scheme, be passed on to clients.

The library also provides a place for continuied education and social gathering for these lawyers who often work alone and can become isolated:

I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library. may continue to prôvide valuable resources to San Erancisco's people and legal community.

Thank you for your consideration.


Tia email
Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

\section*{Re: San Francisco Law Library budget}

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Sheehy, Stefani, and Yee:
I'm writing in support of the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget.
I am an estate planning lawyer with a solo practice. The Law Library is invaluable to me as a research tool. It gives me access to treatises, practice manuals, and other materials that I simply would not have access to otherwise. In that way, the Library serves the public by enabling practitioners like me to do the best possible work for our clients.

I've also seen the Library serve the public more directly. In my visits there, I've seen the staff assisting people who are not lawyers with everything from basic legal research to specific questions. Our city should be proud to provide, and continue providing, this kind of help with understanding the law, which is the foundation of our democratic society. (And the librarians are unfailingly patient and helpful.)

I respectfully urge you to maintain this investment in what I see as public education and fairness.

\author{
Sincerely, \\ /s/ Chris O'Connell
}

\author{
GYEMANT PARIS LAW \\ Creating Families \\ 1330 Castro Street, San Francisco, CA 94114 \\ www.adoptsf.com (415)513-5502 EFax (855)473-1877
}


May 16, 2018

\section*{Via Email Only}

Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\section*{Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget}

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:

I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.

In this age where the income gap is widening, so widens the gap between those who can afford representation and those who cannot. Small law firm lawyers and solo practitioners balance every day the desire to help those who are almost able to pay with the reality of the cost of keeping the lights on in a law office.

These small law firm attorneys, and solo practitioners have often given up the comforts of big firm life in order to pursue their sense of justice for the underdog. They keep rates lower for consumers by foregoing the conveniences of subscription research tools (and sometimes even offices) by utilizing the databases made available at the law library. Losing this resource or attaching a cost to it will mean additional overhead that must and will, in the grand scheme, be passed on to clients.

I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide valuable resources to San Francisco's people and legal community.

Thank you for your consideration.


44 MONTGOMERY STREET
SUITE 2405
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

WWW.CARTERFRIES.COM

May 16, 2018

\section*{Via Email Only \\ Via mail Only}

Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Me:
I write in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
Our small law firm relies on the Law Library for research and volumes that are not available to us. Losing this resource or attaching a cost to it would mean additional overhead that either would be passed on to our clients or reduce our ability to do first-rate work.

The library also provides a place for continued education and social gathering for small-firm lawyers who often work alone and can become isolated.

Please support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide the valuable resource that has been a wonderful help to our firm.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely yours;


Robert T. Fries


May 16, 2018
Via Email Only
Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

\section*{Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget}

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
In this age where the income gap is widening, so widens the gap between those who can afford representation and those who cannot. Small law firm lawyers and solo practitioners balance every day the desire to help those who are almost able to pay with the reality of the cost of keeping the lights on in a law office.

These small law firm attorneys and solo practitioners have often given up the comforts of big firm life in order to pursue their sense of justice for the underdog. They keep rates lower for consumers by foregoing the conveniences of subscription research tools (and sometimes even offices) by utilizing the databases made available at the law library. Losing this resource or attaching a cost to it will mean additional overhead that must and will, in the grand scheme, be passed on to clients.

The library also provides a place for continued education and social gathering for these lawyers who often work alone and can become isolated.

I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide valuable resources to San Francisco's people and legal community.

Thank you for your consideration.


Matthew J. Gluck

MEDINA SETO
LAW GROUP

May 16, 2018
Via Electronic Mail
Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:
I write this letter in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.

The San Francisco Law Library is an invaluable resource to the legal community, particularly those in small firms, solo practices and the non-profit community. When I resigned as a partner from one of the largest defense firms in the nation four years ago, I did so to open this law firm with the goal of representing plaintiffs and providing legal representation to underserved communities and people who otherwise could not afford it. Medina Seto Law Group is able to provide legal representation for reduced rates or on contingency bases and take on smaller cases that large firms would bypass. Without the significant resources that the Law Library provides, including costly subscription legal search engines such as Westlaw and Lexis, my firm's annual operating budget would increase significantly, and I would be forced to rethink my business model and/or pass on the increased costs to my clients. Frankly, I have trouble imagining how my firm could operate without having the Law Library as a resource.

The Law Library's staff is also amazing. Reference librarian Andrea Woods and her colleagues are always welcoming, helpful and ịmpressively knowledgeable. My firm's Of Counsel and I have said to each other more than once, "I love the Law Library!" I look forward to the times I have a reason to go, and have even asked whether they have Law Library t -shirts because if they did, I would buy one and wear it proudly.

I strongly urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget. It is an inestimable resource to San Francisco, its legal community and its underserved communities that many Law Library members endeavor to serve.

Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
May 16, 2018

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Thank you for your consideration and your time and attention to this important matter.

Very Truly Yours,


Rowena C. Seto of
Medina Seto Law Group
cc: Linda Wong (via electronic mail)


MEDINA SETO
LAW GROUP

May 16, 2018

\author{
Via Email Only \\ Budget \& Finance Committee \\ San Francisco Board of Supervisors \\ 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place \\ San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
}

Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy and Yee:
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library. The Law Library provides a vital service to the local legal community.

I recently left my long-time practice with a large national defense firm, in order to pursue my work in a two-lawyer firm representing individuals and small businesses instead of insurers and large corporations. Often our clients come to us with "sticker shock" after inquiring with large law firms about representation.

As you are no doubt aware, the cost of legal services in San Francisco is more than most people can afford. The cost of practicing law here is made more expensive by the subscription rates of various legal research tools and databases. By offering those services to local attorneys, the Law Library helps us keep our own rates affordable to those who might otherwise have to go without legal representation.

The Law Library also offers a very pleasant place to work. The staff are extremely courteous and helpful. I urge you to support the Law Library's proposed budget so that the library may continue to provide valuable resources to San Francisco's people and legal community. Thank you for your consideration.


Timothy S. Kirk of
Medina Seto Law Group

May 16, 2018
VIA EMAIL

Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: San Francisco Law Library Budget
Dear Supervisors Cohen, Fewer, Stefani, Sheehy, and Yee:
I am writing in support of the proposed budget for the San Francisco Law Library.
The Law Library provides a tremendous service to the community. As a solo practitioner who works primarily with small businesses, I rely heavily on the Law Library. The Law Library provides access to subscription services that only the largest of big firms can afford. In fact, I wish I had known more about the Law Library's services during my 15 years at the City Attorney's Office, because it has access to subscriptions that are even too expensive for that office to maintain.

Additionally, the Law Library is an essential service for the general public. Every time I am there I see people who are not lawyers accessing the very valuable information that is available at the library.

The availability of print and online legal resources, not to mention the incredibly knowledgeable and helpful reference librarians, should be protected. In this age where the income gap is widening, so widens the gap between those who can afford representation and those who cannot. The Law Library enables small law firm lawyers and solo practitioners to provide a wide range of services to San Francisco's individuals and businesses. I urge you to support the San Francisco Law Library's proposed budget.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,


\footnotetext{
Rose-Ellen Heinz Fairgrieve
}

\footnotetext{
Office: 126 West Portal Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94127
Mail: 58 West Portal Avenue, \#333 San Francisco, CA 94127
roseellen@fairgrievelaw.com | www.fairgrievelaw.com | 415-890-6057 | fax 415-534-3489
}
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May 16, 2018

Linda Wong, Clerk
Budget \& Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Wong:
The San Francisco Law Library has been a partner with The Bar Association of San Francisco (BASF) to bring important legal education sessions to the public and the legal community and we strongly oppose reduction in funding for the library without which the delivery of critical services to the public and attorneys, especially our solo and small firm attorneys, will be gravely affected. In an era where legal standards are challenged, due process and access to counsel are under attack, and the rights and protections of vulnerable populations are at risk, the services available through the San Francisco Law Library cannot be diminished.

We have partnered with the SF Law Library to bring educational seminars to the public and to attorneys, free of charge, on a variety of legal topics including mediation, a critical component to reducing the costs of litigation in the City. In particular, BASF's Conflict Intervention Service has greatly benefitted from the partnership with the library to provide a neutral space for participants to mediate conflicts in the affordable housing context thereby reducing the risk of eviction for those most vulnerable. For these reasons, the BASF strongly supports continued funding for the San Francisco Law Library to help meet the critical needs in the San Francisco attorney community and the public overall.

Sincerely,


\author{
Malcolm A.' Heinicke BASF Board President
}

\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Paul Kim <pkim@ifpte21.org> \\
ent: & Wednesday, May 16, 2018 1:56 PM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); \\
& Yee, Norman (BOS) \\
Cc: & Wong, Linda (BOS); Debra Grabelle \\
Subject: & The Union's Request in Regards to the Proposed SF Port Budget \\
Attachments: & Letter to the BOS_SF Port Budget.pdf; Program Delivery Assessement Memorandum_SF \\
& Port.pdf
\end{tabular}

\section*{Honorable Commissioners,}

The Union, IFPTE Local 21, wanted to reach out to all the Budget and Finance Committee members in regards to the Mayor's Proposed Budget for the Port of San Francisco. There are a number of exciting projects that our members are participating in at the Port, but the Department has not budgeted a parallel staffing plan to account for the increase in work. I've attached a report from Parsons/Lotus Water recommending the hiring of more technical full time staff to meet the deadlines set forth by the Port Commission and department management. We'd like you to consider this when approving the budget for this upcoming session. If you have any questions please free to contact me.

In Solidarity,

\section*{Paul Kim}

Lead Representative/Otganizer
IFPTE Local 21
1167 Mission St, \(2^{\text {nd }}\) Floor
an Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 914-7351

Honorable Budget and Finance Committee Members
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton. B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Honorable Members of the Budget and Finance Committee,
The Port of San Francisco currently has 70 active projects with an overall total project cost of \(\$ 196\) million. The Engineering Division at the Port of San Francisco executes the delivery of these infrastructure facilities and their enhancements. As the Port of San Francisco has been aggressive in its vision of modernizing its facilities in preparation for increased activity, climate change and potential natural disasters, it has not had the equivalent foresight in hiring/training staff to execute this increase in work.

The Port of San Francisco consulted with Parsons/Lotus Water, a joint venture of two different consultant firms, to assess current project delivery and to recommend work efficiencies, including an estimate of adequate staffing to complete these projects. Currently the Port has 11 full time staff available for design and construction support. The study's assessment is that 25 more full time internal Port design and construction support staff will need to be hired for all 70 projects to be completed on schedule.

The Union, IFPTE Local 21, has concerns with what this increase in work load to existing staff will do to efficiencies. We also have concerns that only exempt Project Managers positions have been hired and not actual design and construction support positions, which would be engineer positions. The Union respectfully requests that the Committee take this into account when evaluating the proposed budget and recommend that more full time Permanent Civil Service Engineer positions be opened up for hiring. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this further please feel free to contact me. I can be reached by telephone at (415) 9147351 or by email, pkim@lfptezi:org.


Paul Kim
Lead Representative/Organizer

A JOINT VENTURE

\section*{MEMORANDUM}
TO: Rod Iwashita, Port of San Francisco
DATE: 1/15/2018

FROM: Rodney Pimentel, Parsons
PHONE: (510) 907-2172

SUBJECT: Program Delivery Assessment Memorandum (Task 3) - FINAL DRAFT

\section*{1 Executive Summary}

The Engineering Division of the Port of San Francisco (Port) executes the delivery of infrastructure facilities and their enhancement to meet many Port objectives. As the number of capital projects grows, more efficient project delivery becomes necessary.

\subsection*{1.1 Objective}

The primary goal of this memorandum is to assess current project delivery and recommend improvements, including an estimate of adequate staffing to complete a list of 70 active capital projects. It also identifies options to refine these estimates and improve project delivery through more efficient project management.

\subsection*{1.2 Existing Projects}

The Port currently has 70 active projects, with an overall total project cost of \(\$ 196\) million (M), inclusive of construction. For this analysis, Port staff broke these down into three categories:
- High-Priority projects -26 projects equaling \(\$ 125 \mathrm{M}\) (schedules available)
- Priority projects -14 projects totaling \(\$ 24 \mathrm{M}\) (schedules available)
- Low-Priority projects - 30 projects totaling \(\$ 45 \mathrm{M}\) (no schedule data available)

Together, the Prioritized projects (those with schedules; that is High-Priority and Priority projects) total \(\$ 149 \mathrm{M}\).
Figure 1-1 shows an overall program schedule reflecting data from the 40 projects with schedule data from Project Summary Reports. These 40 projects represent approximately \(\$ 32 \mathrm{M}\) of total project cost per year (inclusive of construction). All 70 projects represent approximately \(\$ 42 \mathrm{M}\) per year.

\section*{PARSONS | 参 Lotus Water}

\section*{A JOINT VENTURE}

Figure 1-1. Prioritized Projects by Phase

(See full-size schedule in Attachment A)

\subsection*{1.2.1 Resource Needs}

The combination of data from existing schedules for the 40 Prioritized projects (Priority and High-Priority projects) and an estimate for additional Low-Priority projects without schedules \({ }^{1}\) show a peak need of 42 full-time equivalents (FTE) (assuming all Port staff) in 2018 Q1 for all 70 projects. This peak reduces to 32 FTE if all Low-Priority projects are deferred until 2019 and after. Table 1-1 summarizes the total number of projects in each key phase, the FTE needed to support delivery for the Prioritized projects, and an estimate for Low-Priority projects.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{1}\) Assumptions:
- Soft costs for each project estimated as a percentage of construction cost include:
- 19\% of construction cost for design and permitting services and
- \(15 \%\) of construction costs for construction/contract management services.
* An average hourly rate of \(\$ 77.25\) per hour was used to calculate equivalent FTE at 160 hours per month with a \(150 \%\) multiplier for Port staff and a \(300 \%\) multiplier for contract staff.
* FTE for the 30 projects without schedule data were generated using a direct ratio of FTE/total project cost for the 40 projects with schedules.
}
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Table 1-1. FTE Demand for 40 Prioritized Projects
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{c}
2018 \\
Max FTE \\
(Annal Average \\
FTE)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Max FTE \\
(Annual Average \\
FTE)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c}
2019 \\
Max FTE \\
(Annual Average \\
FTE)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Max FTE \\
(Annual Average \\
FTE)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Permitting/Design & 17 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\
& \((12)\) & \((1)\) & \((0)\) & \((0)\) \\
\hline Construction & 15 & 14 & 8 & 4 \\
& \((13)\) & \((10)\) & \((5)\) & \((2)\) \\
\hline Key Phase total & 32 & 17 & 8 & 4 \\
& \((25)\) & \((11)\) & \((5)\) & \((2)\) \\
\hline Estimate for Low- & 10 & 10 & 10 & 10 \\
Priority Projects & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\subsection*{1.3 Existing Staffing Resources}

Estimates of current available resources for Port projects are based on approximations of last year's level of effort provided by the Port, and include vacancies that are expected to be filled in the short term.
For this analysis, current resources in the Engineering Division include 35 overall FTE, including 18 FTE for capital projects. Of these, 11 FTE are available for design and construction support \({ }^{2}\) services. There are also approximately \(\$ 2.7 \mathrm{M}\) remaining of existing on-call contracts. Using all remaining capacity for design and construction support services equates to approximately 6 consultant FTE over a 1 -year period.

Assuming ongoing use of on-call contracts, current resources could produce roughly \(\$ 17 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) of total project cost per year. This converts to a general estimate of approximately \(\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) of total project cost per Design \& Construction FTE. These general estimates are also in line with past average performance of approximately \(\$ 16 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) per year for the last 10 years.
Summary of Available Design and Construction Support for 2018:
- Port: 11FTE

Estimated production rate per Design \& Construction Support FTE (from 2018 schedule): \(\$ 32 \mathrm{M}\) (project cost) \(/ 32 \mathrm{FTE}=\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{FTE}\)
- Consultant: 6FTE

\subsection*{1.4 Options to Meet Staffing Requirements}

Options to meet staffing requirements focus on design and construction support services critical for project delivery. Special development projects have dedicated project managers, while most

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) Special development projects have dedicated project managers, while most other capital projects are led by Engineering staff also responsible for project support and other non-capital projects. Design and construction support services are critical for this reason and are the focus of analysis.
}
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other capital projects are led by engineering staff also responsible for project support and other non-capital projects. Design and construction support services are critical for this reason.

\subsection*{1.4.1 Staffing Requirements}

To deliver the current schedule of 70 projects, a total of 42 Port FTE for design and construction support services would be needed at peak demand in 2018 Q1. This includes 32 FTE for the 40 Prioritized projects as scheduled and 10 additional FTE for the Low-Priority projects.

\subsection*{1.4.2 Options}

Options to achieve this rate of project delivery are:
- Add resources:
- To complete all 70 projects as scheduled:
- Add 25 internal Port design and construction support FTE, given that only 11 Port FTE and 6 consultant FTE are currently available for 2018.
- Add \(\$ 6 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 11 \mathrm{M}\) of external contracts for as-needed and specialty work for 2018 for approximately 12 to 25 FTE.
- Identify a mix of intemal staff and outside contracts, targeted to address the project peak of 42 FTE in 2018 Q1 for all 70 projects.
- To complete only the 40 Prioritized projects as scheduled:
n. Add 15 internal Port design and construction support FTE, given that only 11 Port FTE and 6 consultant FTE are currently available for 2018.
- Add \(\$ 3 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 7 \mathrm{M}\) of external contracts for as-needed and specialty work for 2018 for approximately 7 to 15 FTE.
- Identify a mix of internal staff and outside contracts, targeted to address the project peak of 32 FTE for Prioritized projects in 2018 Q1 for all 70 projects.
- Reprioritize and Reprogram Projects to Reduce Peak:
- Alone, or in combination with adding staff, prioritize and reprogram all projects to a pre-determined target rate of production. The list of current Prioritized projects in 2018 requires the addition of 1 design and construction support FTE per \(\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) in project cost delivered.
- To achieve a Port target of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) of delivered facilities per year would require additional resources, but fewer than the currently scheduled \(\$ 32 \mathrm{M}\) per year of Prioritized projects demands. To achieve the target of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) in capital costs, a minimum of an additional 10 FTE would be needed, based on the production rate of \(\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) of project cost associated with each design and construction FTE. This number would also depend greatly on the specific scope and type of the prioritized projects.
- Projects previously deferred to maintain an optimal staffing rate and/or new projects can be initiated upon the completion of the previously prioritized projects. This would likely push the overall schedule for all 70 projects beyond 2021.
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\subsection*{1.4.3 Staff Resource Mix}

Based on interviews and other discussions with the Port, the following potential key technical support gaps have been identified:
- Contract services manager or support (internal)
- Scheduler or program controls lead/manager (internal)
- Manager or liaison for internal requests/stakeholder liaison (intemal)
- Plan review/plan check support (on-call contract)
- Costing and other specialty contract services (on-call contract)
- Environmental and external permitting support (on-call contract)
- Maintenance staff or capacity (other division)

\subsection*{1.5 Future Actions to Enhance Staffing Decisions and Project Delivery}

Additional options to improve the resource estimate or improve project delivery and efficiency include:
- Improve Data: Additional data are needed to further refine the recommended resource options, to improve accuracy, and to identify specific staff role needs. These data include:
- Updated schedules; especially those for the Low-Priority projects that did not have schedule data available
- Complete and consistent profect butdéts containing cost elements of a consistent work breakdown structure (WBS) and consistent inclusion of soft costs
- Identification of in-house/contract foles such as the use of Port staff or contracts for the design and construction phases
- Develop Procedures and Tools to Improve Efficiency: Updated procedures and tools are essential to improve communication and lead to improved data and project delivery. Key elements include:
- Updated and documented project development process
- Overall project schedule
- Program approach (5-year master plan)
- WBS to track resource needs for each phase of work
- Project management information system/control system database
- Project management plan/project execution plan

\subsection*{1.6 Overall Approach}

The recommended approach is to add Port staff for key functions and use additional on-call contracts for 2018. This would allow a core team to develop and implement related project delivery improvements, refine staffing needs, and build toward a long-term solution. In addition, reprioritization of projects is recommended to "smooth out" personnel demands and achieve realistic production rates of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) capital project work per year using available resources.
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\section*{2 Introduction and Approach}

The Port of San Francisco (Port), a department of the City and County of San Francisco (City), is striving to improve its project execution. This memo report is one part of an initial effort to meet this goal. It focuses on assessing current project delivery priorities and providing recommendations for future improvement. It will be followed by development of a project management plan (PMP) template for ongoing Port use (Task 2).

This memo summarizes:
- Project delivery timelines and resource needs for a subset of prioritized projects
- A high-level delivery rate for remaining active Port projects
- Recommendations for how to improve the Port's project delivery rate

Input data and information for the 4 -week analysis include:
- Project list of 26 High-Priority projects, 14 Priority projects, and 30 Low-Priority projects
* Project Status Reports (PSRs) for 26 High-Priority projects and 14 Priority projects, each containing scope summary, current schedule, budget, and project lead, provided by Port Management on November 15, November 27, and December 6, 2017.
- Port management comments to supplement PSRs
- Organizational breakdown structure (org chart) and estimated resource allocation for the last year
* Fifteen interviews with Port staff, primarily project leads in the engineering division Interviews discussed workflow, budget, and organization elements of the project delivery process, as well as needs and requirements to achieve a successful outcome.

One component of this memorandum is to recommend adequate staffing levels for the Port's 5-year Capital Improvement Project (CIP) based on the data gathered.
This recommendation is a high-level estimate of resourcing options (internal and external staffing) to achieve a favorable CIP outcome for the Port. The existing organizational breakdown structure and resource allocation were considered in evaluating the project data to determine anticipated staffing levels for the duration of the 5-year CIP.
Approach
The approach taken to assess the current delivery process and define recommendations entailed three basic steps.
- Analysis of the existing state includes a compilation of data and definition of current project delivery:
- List of projects (High-Priority projects identified)
- High-level phased schedule of projects
- Summarized process for project delivery
- Identification of available resources
- Interviews with division staff
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- Evaluation of a future state includes determination of Port's expected level of service and project delivery expectations:
- Project schedule review and projection
- Discussion with engineering division management
* Gap assessment identifies options for how to bridge the gap between existing and future states:
- Resources
- Options for organizational structure
o Delivery method options

\section*{3 Background Information}

\subsection*{3.1 Description of Existing State of Project Delivery}

\subsection*{3.1.1 Project Overview}

There are currently 70 active projects totaling project cost of \(\$ 196\) million (M), as shown in Figure 3-1. Port staff identified 40 of the 70 as Prioritized projects ( 26 High-Priority projects and 14 Priority projects), as shown in Figure 3-2. This figure includes project-specific information such as project manager or project lead; estimated project schedule identified by major phases of planning, design, and permitting; procurement; and construction. Project schedules are based on PSRs provided on November 15, November 27, and December 6, 2017, by Port Management for the 40 Prioritized projects and on comments from Port management. Schedules for Low-Priority projects were not available.
\begin{tabular}{|lr|}
\hline 26 High-Priority projects: & \(\$ 125 \mathrm{M}\) \\
14 Priority projects: & \(\$ 24 \mathrm{M}\) \\
\(=\) & \\
\hline 40 Prioritized projects: & \(\$ 149 \mathrm{M}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Each project is managed individually and not included in a master schedule. Assumptions used to prepare the schedule for the 40 Prioritized projects are presented in Section 3.1.1.1.
Developing a comprehensive overall schedule provides a holistic view of the CIP program. The schedule was further used to evaluate resource needs. Additional categories were added through interpretation of PSR data and conversations with Port management. The schedule reflects major phases shown in Figure 3-3, Current Project Development Process.

\section*{Figure 3-1. Project List}
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Figure 3-2. Prioritized Projects by Phase

(See fuil-size schedule in Attachment A)
Figure 3-3. Current Project Development Process

(See fulli-size diagram in Attachment B)

\subsection*{3.1.1.1 Schedule Assumptions}

The following assumptions were used to prepare the schedule for the 40 Prioritized projects:
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- Information to populate the schedule and cashflow was taken from PSRs provided by Port Management on November 15, November 27, and December 6, 2017. Comments from Port Management pertaining to budget and schedule were incorporated.
- To determine a full time equivalent (FTE) estimate, the phased schedule was cost loaded for design and construction services based on a straight-line spend curve of the costs as described below.
- Unless otherwise stated within the PSRs provided, design and permitting services were assumed to be \(19 \%\) of construction cost, and contract/construction management costs were assumed to be \(15 \%\) of construction cost. These percent allocations were based on planning phase estimates used by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.
- Due to their large construction values, Crane Cove Park Phase 1 and Mission Bay Ferry Landing design and permitting services and contract/construction management services were assumed to be contracted outside of Port staff. The portion of work assumed to be attributed to Port staff for design and permitting services was \(2.5 \%\) of the project value stated within the PSR. The same percentage was used for contract/construction management services.
- Once design and construction totals were assigned to each project, average staff rates were applied similarly across all projects. A raw rate of \(\$ 71\) per hour was used for design and permitting, and \(\$ 77.25\) per hour was used for contract and construction management resources. These averages rates were based on comparable positions at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. A multiplier of \(150 \%\) was then applied to account for fringe charges to determine an overall number of hours of effort to be expended by Port staff within a given period.
- One FTE is assumed to be 160 working hours per month.
- Cost escalation was not accounted for in the estimates.

\subsection*{3.1.2 Summary of Procedures for Project Delivery}

This section summarizes the current project delivery process based on input gathered through staff interviews. Projects are currently initiated with the submission of a Project Initiation Form (PIF), principally by Engineering staff or project sponsors in Real Estate and Maritime Divisions. PIFs include project description, information about entitlements, dependencies, and a preliminary schedule and budget. The Capital Committee reviews and prioritizes project proposals for funding and inclusion in the following two-year budget cycle.

Once a project is ready to expend funds, a Project Expenditure Approval Form (PEAF) is completed to use funds for approved projects. This includes a more detailed cost breakdown and a list of the funding sources. Figure 3-3 conceptually shows a PEAF completed for the design phase, and a second completed for construction. Milestones within the design phase include \(30 \%, 60 \%\), Construction Cost Estimate, \(90 \%\), and \(100 \%\) design.
Interdivisional signoffs occur for each milestone to approve work and move to the next milestone. Permitting activities usually are conducted during the design phases when permits are required. Figure 3-3 provides an overview of the current project development process.

Once a project manager or project lead is assigned to an approved project, the ongoing requirements for management of that project include providing a biweekly project status report
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and a separate database for management review. An informal checklist can be completed at any time throughout the duration of the project. The checklist includes various items and has locations for the project manager and review manager to check off activities as completed. The items range from project upfront folder set-up, to filing, to close-out of the project. Use of the checklist should be actively monitored throughout the project lifecycle to effectively assist project delivery. Other guidance documents (e.g., those outlining contracting processes and forms) should be revised and made more accessible to Port staff.

\subsection*{3.1.3 Available Resources}

All projects require resources; key resources include staff and budget.
Table 3-1 presents the total FTE for Port staff resources available for the last year. Based on available data provided by Port and interviews conducted primarily during the week of November 13,2017, the resource allocation was summarized and categorized based on functional groups within the organizational chart. A tally of each staff's time allocation was divided into two categories:
- Non-Capital Project Assignments
- Plan checking
- Rapid structural assessments
- Small maintenance projects
- Document requests
- Requests from other Port divisions
- Capital Projects Assignments
- Projects over \(\$ 100,000\), either constructed by Port maintenance or outside contractors
- Support for special development projects

The total FTE of 34.52 provides the technical and project management support for non-capital and capital projects.

In addition to Port staff, as-needed contract vehicles are established. A total of \(\$ 6 \mathrm{M}\) was budgeted for four contracts (each approximately \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) ) for a duration of 4 years. For the past 17 months, a total of \(\$ 2.7 \mathrm{M}\) (approximately \(55 \%\) ) of the budget has been used to support various aspects of current projects.
Special development projects are managed by designated project managers, while all other projects are managed by Engineers/Architects. Figure 3-4 shows an organizational chart for the Engineering Division that illustrates organizational structure, key roles, and a summary of existing resource allocation associated with each group and overall design/construction function. Pie charts show the resources division associated within each group for both non-capital and capital projects. Total capital project FTE (not including the project managers who are designated to special development projects) associated with project management for nondevelopment projects, design support services, and construction support services for the entire Engineering Division are also shown.
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Table 3-1. Summary of Total FTE for Capital and Non-Capital Projects
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Group } & Non-Capital Projects & Capital Projects & Total \\
\hline Deputy Director & 0.80 & 0.20 & 1.00 \\
\hline Executive Secretary & 0.78 & 0.23 & 1.00 \\
\hline Facilities Manager & 0.53 & 0.48 & 1.00 \\
\hline Civil/Survey & 1.915 & 1.085 & 3.00 \\
\hline Facilities Assessment & 1.72 & 2.28 & 4.00 \\
\hline Utilities & 2.285 & 2.715 & 5.00 \\
\hline Architecture & 0.64 & 1.36 & 2.00 \\
\hline Construction and & 1.35 & 3.65 & 5.00 \\
\hline Contracts & 6.92 & 0.00 & 6.92 \\
\hline Bldg Permits & 0.1 & 5.50 & 5.60 \\
\hline Project Management & \(\mathbf{1 7 . 0 3}\) & \(\mathbf{1 7 . 4 9}\) & 34.52 \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{5 9 . 3 \%}\) & \\
\hline Total & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes:
Student interns are not loaded in the calculations.
Vacancies on the organizational chart are assumed to be filled.
Additional requests currently in process are included.
Project Managers are designated to special development projects.
Due to rounding, the sum of a group's non-capital projects and capital projects my not exactly match the total.
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Figure 3-4. Organization Chart and Available Resources
ORGANIZATION \& RESOURCES


FTE CAPTAL PROJEGTS
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { FLANNING A OESIGN } & 6.47 \\ \text { CONSTRUGTION } & 239\end{array}\)
PM

ON-GALL CONTRACTS ( \(\$ \times \$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) each, 4 yrs)
Mrymbiviti
(See full-size chart in Attachment C)
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\section*{4 Existing State and Future State Analysis}

\subsection*{4.1 Key Observations}

The observations in this section area based on interviews conducted thus far with the following Port staff members:
- Rod Iwashita
- Kenneth Chu
- Tim Leung
- Uday Prasad
- Peter Luong
- Kathryn Purcell
- Ananda Hirsch
- Johnathan Roman
- Dan Hodapp
- Tiffany Tatum
- Wendy Proctor
- Rich Berman
- Winnie Lee

People, policies and procedures, and tools work together and support effective communication, decision making, and project delivery. In the existing state of project delivery at the Port, these three are not fully aligned. Staff have identified various suggestions for improvement, which they shared during interviews. Observations are described for each of these categories in Sections 4.1.1 through 4.1.3.

A successful outcome for Port Management would be the delivery of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) capital project work per fiscal year. Beyond communicating this goal to the rest of the organization, three key elements-people, policies and procedures, and tools-need to be in place to be successful. Managing each project consistently within the overarching governance of all three elements will help to achieve this goal.
The subsequent sections provide more detail on people, policies and procedures, and tools that can assist with delivering the CIP. Key observations are presented in bold font.

\subsection*{4.1.1 People}

The People category refers to organization structure, communication, and how staff interface with other groups, divisions, or agencies.

\section*{Dynamic work environment}
- The existing state is a dynamic work environment where staff manage and respond to many tasks and requests. Overall, the team desires to be responsive to requests that come from various other divisions within the Port, particularly Real Estate and Maritime.

\section*{Work is divided between capital and non-capital projects}
- Non-capital projects include plan checking, rapid structural assessments, small maintenance projects, requests from Maritime or Real Estate, and document requests.
- Capital projects include
- Capital projects completed by Port maintenance,
- Capital projects completed through outside contractors,
- Special development projects, and
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- Regulatory and encroachment permitting.

Priorities can be unclear at multiple levels
* Staff often respond to urgent or political items in the City (e.g., an important tenant or a high-profile project). This leads to schedule delays on other High-Priority projects.
- Scope changes come from project sponsors, or priorities may change or may not be clear to engineering staff. Stakeholders themselves may need to prioritize requests and are not aware of the implications of new requests or changes on existing projects.
- The establishment of Port-wide priorities, shared with all divisions, would improve scheduling and resource decisions.

\section*{Unclear or uncertain workflow}
- Long-term schedules can be unclear or undefined, which can make long-term work planning difficult. At times, this can affect project delivery and responsiveness.

\subsection*{4.1.2 Policies and Procedures}

The policies and procedures category refers to overall program or project controls, including schedule, quality, budget, reporting frequency and style, and other procedures for management and project delivery.

Project delivery requirements are flexible or imbedded in institutional knowledge
- A Project Manager/Engineer/Architect checklist is available, but it is generally used merely as guidance. It is not an official checklist requiring signatures or used for project close-out, for example. While it provides guidance for overall project delivery, it is infrequently or inconsistently used by project leads or managers. An official checklist completed at all major milestones for the duration of the project, including sign-off by the project manager or project lead, as well as the reviewer, ensures quality control and support from Port project stakeholders. A version of this exists with interdivisional signoffs, but it should be revisited, revised as appropriate; and actively enforced.
- Project updates to PSRs are requested every 2 weeks but are often submitted on a less frequent basis. The PSR should be used not only for reporting but also to identify potential risk and to indicate how upper management can help with critical issues on the project.
- Development of a project delivery process is essential for presenting an overview of the project needs from planning through design, permitting, construction, and close-out. Following set procedures that are implemented through preparation of a PMP at the initiation of the project allows the project leads/project managers to understand and define the scope of work and account for potential risks and the applicable permitting requirements.

\section*{Project prioritization}
- Projects are initiated through an annual basis (the PIF). The Capital Committee reviews and prioritizes project proposals for funding, and includes the next year's budget.

\section*{}
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- Factors used to prioritize projects include presence of regulatory compliance issues, reduction in Port liability, economic benefits, natural and cultural resource protection, payback period, financial benefits to the Port, and human and environmental health.
* If the goal for successful Port management is measured by maintaining a relatively constant annual capital budget spending, it is vital to prioritize projects and allocate the available budgets accordingly, within key categories, keeping in mind the project phases and upfront cost that is needed to fund any construction contract at the start of construction.

\subsection*{4.1.3 Tools}

\section*{Multiple project tracking tools are independent and not linked together}

Project data for tracking, funding, and reporting are tracked on multiple forms for various purposes. Project leads update the forms separately, and they can be hard to share across Port divisions due to software and storage limitations. Data within them may be inconsistent, and staff have identified the need for templates or standards to make them more consistent. Tools currently include:
- PIF (Project Initiation Form) to initiate a project. It includes project description, information about entitlements, dependencies, and a preliminary schedule and budget.
- PEAF (Project Expenditure Approval Form) to gain approval for expenditure of funds on a specific element of a project (e.g. encumbrance or expenditure of funds, use of Port labor, transferring funds to another department).
- PSR (Project Summary Report) to track project development and share project status with managers. It includes goals, scope, budget, funding, schedule, and status (updated biweekly). Individual work documents are stored in engineering division folders.
* Database to track project information for Engineering, Permitting, and other divisions. A project is now under development to convert the Access format database to a web-based tool on Arches software, accessible across divisions. Improvements are also planned to record information pertinent to each division or function (e.g., engineering, environmental/permitting, other divisions). Input from Real Estate and Maritime was minimal.

\section*{Time reporting is limited to broad categories and can be inconsistent}

For capital projects, Engineering Division staff charge a single code per project. In addition, there can be inconsistent reporting between non-capital project time and capital projects. While the use of project codes allows staff time to be capitalized at project completion, data do not exist to track work by phase or other breakdown. Staff charges should be allocated accurately to monitor soft cost of capital projects, to effectively manage within a budget, and to estimate soft cost for future projects.

\section*{Budgeting}

Estimating budgets for projects can be a challenge and is one key cause of project delays when a project cost is underestimated and additional funds are needed. Currently, project managers and project leads lack the guidelines and support needed to estimate a project budget with confidence. Access to cost estimators familiar with the piers and port projects could help

\section*{PAnSONS | Lotus Water \\ A JOINT VENTURE}
improve cost estimates and avoid delays that occur due to funding shortfalls. Better information about cost estimating services available through on-call contracts could also help. In addition, better information about pier or facility condition, use of standard contingencies at the time of budgeting, or use of key process points to update cost estimates would improve accuracy.

\section*{Desire for updated procedures and templates}

Multiple types of templates are being developed or have been identified by Port staff as useful tools. These include:
- Standardized scope content
- Permitting and environmental checklist with standard timelines per type of permit or entitlement
- Standard timelines for the procurement phase of projects and duration of permitting
* Standard templates for Commission reports and other documentation
- Guidelines and checklists for costing or other components of existing management tools for consistency and comparability

Templates should serve as guidelines for Project Managers in providing information to team members in other divisions or groups (e.g., Environmental) and should identify critical path items to better define scope and estimated schedule durations. Guidelines and checklists also facilitate the production of consistent information essential for comparing information across projects.

\section*{Integration of tools and process}

During the interviews, Port staff expressed the need of not only having a clearer project delivery process but also having effective tools tied to specific steps of the process.
Figure 4-1 illustrates tools that can be incorporated into the current project delivery process.
Inclusion of the PMP step is important. At a minimum, the PMP should include basic project description, scope, key project team members, organizational chart, communication, schedule, budget, and list of deliverables. The initial schedule and budget established for the project will be presented and should be tracked throughout project development. It should also address how to track and report project changes.

Current use of the PIF, PEAF, and PSR should be continued, but these tools should be in one centralized input location to ensure data accuracy and consistency and to provide staff a one-stop-shop for providing and updating their project data.
The PMP is a living document that should be reviewed and updated at separate phases of the project. It should outline the process for change management and should list potential risks and mitigation options for the project.

Figure 4-1. Future Project Development Process


Legend:

(See full-size chart in Attachment D)

\subsection*{4.2 Resource Options}

Based on a high-level analysis, an estimated 25 FTE, assumed to be Port staff (in addition to existing staff), would be needed to successfully deliver the 70 projects identified, as scheduled thus far, in the overall CIP.
Options to complete all projects include:
- Improve data: Additional data needed to further refine the FTE estimate, to improve accuracy, and to break down specificity of role include:
- Upiated schedules; especially those for the Low-Priority projects that did not have schedule data available
- Complete and consistent project budgets containing all cost elements of a consistent work breakdown structure (WBS) and consistent inclusion of soft costs
- Identification of in-house/contract roles, such as the use of Port staff or contracts for the design and construction phases, because it is unclear from current reporting which projects are completed in house or contracted out or for which phase of work
- Add resources:
- To complete all 70 projects as scheduled:
- Add 25 internal Port design and construction support FTE, given that only 11 Port FTE and 6 consultant FTE are currently available for 2018.

\section*{A JOINT VENTURE}
- Add \(\$ 6 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 11 \mathrm{M}\) of external contracts for as-needed and specialty work for 2018 for approximately 12 to 25 FTE.
1. Identify a mix of internal staff and outside contracts, targeted to address the project peak of 42 FTE in 2018 Q1 for all 70 projects.
- To complete only the 40 Prioritized projects as scheduled:
- Add 15 internal Port design and construction support FTE, given that only 11 Port FTE and 6 consultant FTE are currently available for 2018.
- Add \(\$ 3 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 7 \mathrm{M}\) of external contracts for as-needed and specialty work for 2018 for approximately 7 to 15 FTE.
8. Identify a mix of internal staff and outside contracts, targeted to address the project peak of 32 FTE for Prioritized projects in 2018 Q1 for all 70 projects.
- Reprioritize and program projects:
- Alone, or in combination with adding staff, prioritize and reprogram all projects to a predetermined target rate of production. The list of current Prioritized projects in 2018 requires the addition of 1 design and construction support FTE per \(\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) in project cost delivered.
- A target of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) of delivered facilities per year would require additional resources, but fewer than the currently scheduled \(\$ 32 \mathrm{M}\) per year of Prioritized projects demands. To achieve the target of \(\$ 20 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 25 \mathrm{M}\) in capital costs, a minimum of an additional 10 FTE would be needed, based on the production rate of \(\$ 1 \mathrm{M}\) to \(\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) of project cost associated with each design and construction FTE. This number would also depend greatly on the specific scope and type of the prioritized projects.
m. Projects previously deferred to maintain an optimal staffing rate and/or new projects can be initiated upon the completion of the previously prioritized projects. This would likely push the overall schedule for all 70 projects beyond 2021.

In the absence of additional data, interviews conducted with staff provided supplemental information. The following key resource limitations were repeatedly raised;
- Contract services resources are limited (based on current schedule estimates, the peak shows 10 projects will be in procurement phase in 2018 Q1).
* Plan review and checking for non-capital projects generally limits the amount of time available to manage capital projects. An expected increase in plan review for upcoming special development projects will require resources. Limited staff time could cause delays for Prioritized projects or other projects led by the plan review staff.
- Additional maintenance staff or capacity to deliver capital projects is needed. Staff indicated that this could be an option to improve throughput, given lower effort needed in the procurement phase. But this approach would need to be evaluated.
- Specialty services available through contracts, especially costing, could prevent or minimize existing delays caused by inaccurate project budgets.
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At the peak in 2018 Q1, the staffing estimate shows a requirement of 32 FTE. While this peak is early in the 5-year period, maintaining higher FTE provides the bandwidth to start new projects. As projects complete a phase, this staffing level would allow initiation of future projects. The development of a master plan would allow the Port to efficiently identify facility requirements, set priorities, and pull forward backlog and/or add projects to meet future needs.

\section*{Method}

The estimated number of 42 design and construction support staff was developed by cost loading the schedule by phase. Budget and schedule information from the PSRs and resource loading resulted in a current state estimate of 32 FTE for overall total project value of \(\$ 149 \mathrm{M}\) from 40 projects with PSR data. The remaining 30 projects equate to a total estimated project cost of \(\$ 48 \mathrm{M}\). Using a direct ratio method of FTE to project costs, this translates to an additional 10 FTE needed to deliver the full active project list assumed to be completed in the next 5 years at the estimated value of \(\$ 197 \mathrm{M}\).

\section*{5 Benefits of Options/Additional Recommendations for Future State}

Key observations between existing and future states were presented in Section 4. In addition to the identified options for resource augmentation, the development or refinement of tools and procedures can also improve staff efficiency, project planning, and project delivery. The following actions should be considered to support the objective of increasing the Port's productivity.

\section*{People (Key Roles)}
*: Contract Services: Provide support for managing, administering, and executing construction contracts. Based on current schedule estimates, the peak shows 10 projects will be in procurement phase in 2018 Q1.
- Scheduler: Manage overall aggregate project schedule, apply and communicate Port priorities. The scheduler will enable management to better track progress versus planned and facilitate better management decisions for future operations.
- Manager or Liaison for Internal Requests/Stakeholder Liaison: Requests from other divisions significantly contribute to non-capital work. A liaison tasked with managing incoming requests from Real Estate or Finance, for example, would help the Facilities Manager and staff prioritize these requests with capital project work to prevent delays.
- Plan reviewers: Provide additional support in plan review and checking for projects during peak or high-capacity time for Port staff to ensure adequate reviews and to decrease any negative impact on project delivery schedule.
- Estimating/Cost Support: Additional estimating support would assist in determining more refined cost estimates and provide more certainty and clarity throughout the project lifecycle, with regards to cost and budget.
- Environmental/Permitting Support: Provide additional reach-back support to ensure searnless permitting process and execution to assist leads and managers in navigating their projects through the appropriate permitting channels.

\section*{Policies and Procedures}
- Updated and Documented Project Development Process: Review and develop processes and procedures to incorporate standard timelines based on key project components (e.g., environmental, templates, reporting frequency). Dedicate resources to prepare and further develop policies and procedures and to determine which are most useful for staff and meeting delivery goals.

Tools
* Overall Project Schedule: Reflect, plan, and manage Port priorities for all phases of each project. Develop schedules that are cost- and resource-loaded to provide regular forecasts and reports to Engineering Division Manager, Finance, project sponsors, and Executive Management. Provide context and communicate project priorities and dependencies to team members.
Work Breakdown Structure: Develop a standardized WBS that would facilitate uniform reporting and ultimately provide a method for tracking resource allocation.

\section*{A JOINT VENTURE}
* Project Management Information System/Control System Database: Provide consistent reporting to view overall CIP and report performance to the project team, other divisions, Executive Management, and the Port Commission. Enable leads to consistently report on a regular basis across all projects. Consolidate data and provide user-friendly interface to allow multiple users across Port divisions (e.g., Real Estate, Maritime, Planning). Facilitate establishment, participation, and communication of the entire project team. The conversion of the access database to a web-based format in Arches is underway for the project level. The dedication of resources to add aggregate reporting functions to the database system would be required to add effective reporting features for the program level.
- Project Management Plan: Implement documented procedures; identify project needs and scope; monitor project budgets, schedule, and scope; and identify potential risks and critical path for project delivery (e.g., environmental, permits).
* Program Approach (5-year Master Plan): Capture future needs to develop schedule and goals for overall CIP. Integrate waterfront master planning and other initiatives. Evaluate and develop level of service goals and associated project categories and funding, such as special development projects, enhancements, and state of good repair. The lack of developed project schedules and estimated effort for Low-Priority projects within the active projects list highlights the need for a master plan that guides project planning and estimates of future project efforts.
* Costing Improvements and Condition Assessment: Manage lifecycle of existing infrastructure assets and develop better cost data for planning future maintenance needs and for better cost estimates for specific projects. Because funding gaps are one key cause of project delay, improved costing procedures and information would improve project delivery.

While these options would all improve overall project delivery, they require further evaluation. Next steps would require dedicating resources to prioritize these options, identifying options providing the greatest return on investment, developing a target schedule, and establishing the selected improvements.
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\subsection*{5.1 Observations and Options Summary}

Table 5-1. Observations and Options Summary
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Existing & Goals for Future & Options (Gap)/Benefits \\
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{People} & Staff manage and respond to many tasks and requests & Be responsive to requests from other divisions & Manager or liaison for internal requests/ stakeholder liaison \\
\hline & Priorities can be unclear at multiple levels & Establish and share Port priorities across divisions & \begin{tabular}{l}
Scheduler incorporates priorities into schedule, communicates Port priorities \\
and \\
Program approach
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & Unclear or uncertain workflow can result in delays & Ability to plan and be responsive & Scheduler tracks project progress to allow better management decisions \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Policies and Procedures} & Project delivery requirements are informal or imbedded in institutional knowledge & Standardize project delivery, develop clear and accessible procedures with flow charts/check lists & Updated and documented project development process \\
\hline & Project prioritization & Adopt Port-wide prioritization strategy & Program approach goals and objectives, implemented by program management plan \\
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Tools} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Multiple project tracking tools are independent and not linked together and \\
Desire for updated procedures and templates
\end{tabular} & Develop clear and accessible tools that are easy to update and maintain & \begin{tabular}{l}
Overall project schedule and \\
Project management information system/ control system database and Project management plan
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & Time reporting is limited to broad categories and can be inconsistent & Improve data and tracking & Work breakdowi structure \\
\hline & Budgeting is challenging, and cost underestimation causes project delays & Costing support and improved data & \begin{tabular}{l}
Work breakdown structure \\
and \\
Costing improvements and condition assessment
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{Attachments}
A. Schedule of 40 Prioritized Projects by Phase
B. Current Project Development Process
C. Organization Chart and Available Resources
D. Future Project Development Process

\section*{Attachment A Schedule of 40 Prioritized Projects by Phase}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline anf Roman & & & & & & & F20， & & & We & \％ & & & & & 1： & & & & & & & 15 & 3，72\％\％\({ }^{2}\) & & 147，619 & 10 \\
\hline Ken Chu & 1 & & & & & & ［4tat &  & Finctal &  & －327 & LS & & & & & & & & & & & \(\sqrt{2}\) & 7，382，870 & IS． & 362，870． & 4 \\
\hline athan foman & 2. & I & & & ［［5ax \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & & ［mind &  & 6imb &  &  & 6mat & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 6，356，000 & 5 & 218，292 & 9 \\
\hline Ken Chu & 1. & 1 & & & & & & 1．e． 1 & 1－12 &  &  & Wide & Lbibim &  & 19， & & & & & & & & 5 & 5，250，000 & 5 & 997，500 & 20 \\
\hline amansing & 1 & & & & & &  &  & － & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5. & 5，000，000 & 5 & 950，000 & 2 \\
\hline Joe Rozer & 2. & Hex－ry & & & & & & － & 1－7 &  &  &  &  & 1－3xan & 2．as & Praxy &  & G5int & Exa & Fe 3 & & & 5 & 3，900，000 & 5．－ & 741，000 & 315 \\
\hline endy Proctor & 1 &  &  & 5 mbra & － & & W\％ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 3，386，357 & 5 & 643.408 & － \\
\hline loe Rogeti． & 1 & & & \(\square\) & 1－8 & ？ & Tem & 上5x & LSS & 15959 & 12x］ & ＋27 & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 3，367，997 & 5 & 200，000 & 8 \\
\hline Jieie Rozer & 2 & E－ & T． & 1 &  & 碞 & 4xast & 4， & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 3，000，000 & 15. & 570，000 & 8 \\
\hline Joe Roger & 1 & & \％ & 㖪㯭 & EVI & 酎 & vaxam & ExT4 & E4x & 2ame & Es\％ 4 & 栭 & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 2，660，382 & 5 & 66,717 & － \\
\hline athan Romian & 2 & & & \(\bigcirc\) & F－1 & & － & ＋m＋1 & \(1 \mathrm{~T}=1\) & \％ & ceatic & hisk &  & Hex & Wata & E20 & 4 & & & & & & 5 & 2，500，000 & 5 & 475，000 & 15 \\
\hline Ken Chu & 1 & & & & Cob & 11 & 1－4 &  &  & 1 & dety & Cw， & Lax \({ }^{2}\) & C\％9 & & & & & & & & & 5 & 2，330，000 & 5 & 200，000 & 15 \\
\hline ther Luang & 1 & & & Le： & 2．ad & & 7xa &  &  &  &  &  & ［ &  & & & & & & & & & 5 & 2，300，000 & 5 & 250，000 & 13 \\
\hline Ninnititer & 1 & 4 & W9x5 &  & 290 & & & 4， & Ef & Cozatia & 530］ & C & Finm & & & & & & & & & & S & 2，300，000． & 5 & 437，000 & 15 \\
\hline David Hu & 1 & & & & 8 & & ；－mid & W8\％ & － &  & W & & & & & & & & & & & & 5. & 2，200，000． & 5 & 418，000 & 15 \\
\hline jilfan Roman & 2 & & & 7 & ［－3 & & 6－5］ & 12mer &  & \(1{ }^{4}\) & ते玉 & L2ant &  & Latesen &  & W2 & 致边 & & & & & & 5 & 2，000，000 & 5 & 200，000 & 15 \\
\hline Teter Luong． & 2 & 5 &  &  & ［ 5 & &  &  & E－20］ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，950，293 & 5 & 100，000 & － \\
\hline mdy．Prostor & 1 &  &  &  & 5 3 & E & h & 5，\％ & 敵 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，600，000 & 5 & 304，000 & ＊ \\
\hline amansingh & 1 & & & Tra & 5， 5 & 近 & F3x \({ }^{3}\) &  &  & 1 & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，462．000 & 5 & 10，000 & 3 \\
\hline Winnle tre & 1 & & & ［10 & E 4 & 速 & Whimin & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，405，951 & 5. & 10，000 & 6 \\
\hline ran Hodapp． & 2 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，300，000－ & 5 & 247，000 & \(\checkmark\) \\
\hline Kentha & 2 &  & Esta &  & W易 & & 良 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 3，000，000 & 5 & 190，000 & 2 \\
\hline Ninnie let & 1 & & － & 58931 & 153 & & & & & & － & \(\therefore 3\) & － & L－29 & Etat & FTT & & & & & & & 5. & 1，000，000 & 5 & 190，000 & 24. \\
\hline Ninnie ter & 1 & & & & ER & & Catand &  &  & ［2］ & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 887，000 & 5 & 100，000 & 2 \\
\hline Endy Procior & 1 & & \％ &  & － & 1 &  & 6， & \(\underline{4}\) & Evin & Ctios & Eint & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 650，000 & 5 & 60，000 & 14 \\
\hline anthotap & 1. & & & & & & & 宾 & Hatid & 18980 & Gel & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 600，000 & 5 & 114，000 & 6 \\
\hline endy Proctor & 1 & & & \％） & ［ \({ }_{\text {caxa }}\) & & Extas & Stata & Sajatis & Fersey & 相䢒边 & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 591,250 & 5 & 112，338 & 6 \\
\hline David Mus & 1 &  &  &  & E\％ & & E－31 & ETa & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 430，000 & 5 & 30，000 & 9 \\
\hline Joc Roiger & 2 & 128 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 400，000 & S． & 38，651 & ． \\
\hline 382．fertars & 2 & E4x & 3－2 & Exat & LTa & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \＄ & 391.488 & 5 & 74，383 & － \\
\hline Minnie Lee & 1 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 300，000 & 5 & 57，000 & － \\
\hline mimen \(\operatorname{singh}\) & 1 & & EESC3 & ET］． & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 200，000 & 5 & 10，000 & ． \\
\hline 15 Prexiopa & 2 &  &  & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 152，990 & 5 & 29，068 & \(\because\) \\
\hline Stherif & 2 & & & Trasa & 59 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 150，000 & 5 & 28，500 & 4 \\
\hline Prvid Hu & 1 &  & 24 &  & W8 & 臬 & Tata & \(2-\) & H20．9 & Exind & LE & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 318， 500 & 5 & 68，500 & 8. \\
\hline O Hersera & 2 & & & & & 骨 & C＊6］ &  & 2rese \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & brety & Exe 3 & & & & & & & & & ！ & & & 5 & 360，000 & 5 & 30，000 & － \\
\hline 2se Herrera & 2 & & & & & & Ren & HTx & ＋exaly &  & Sblazal & 2938 & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 1，150，000 & ， 5 & 70，000 & － \\
\hline 358 Herrerz & 2 & & & & & 缶 & ए23 & 17asa &  &  & Fsay & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 360，000 & 5 & 30，000． & － \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & 5 & 148，530，254 & 5 & 10，634，770 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{Attachment C \\ Organization Chart and Available Resources}

\section*{ORGANIZATION \& RESOURCES}


FTE CAPTTAL PROJEGTS
PLANNING \& DESIGN 8.47
CONSTRUCTION 2.39
PM

ON-CALL CONTRACTS ( \(4 \times \$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}\) each , 4 yrs)
Sumabier 4278


\section*{Attachment D \\ Future Project Development Process}


\section*{Wong, Linda (BOS)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ om: } & Ivar Satero (AIR) \\
ent: & Wednesday, May 23, 2018 9:20 AM \\
To: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Boilard, Chelsea (BOS); \\
& Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Gallagher, Jack (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Pagoulatos, Nick \\
Cc: & (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Fatooh, Martin (BOS) \\
Subject: & Calvilio, Angela (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Cathy Widener (AIR) \\
Attachments: & Airotrt's Follow-up to 5/17/18 Budget \& Finance Committee Meeting \\
& SFO Response to 5-17-18 BOS Budget and Finance Committee 5-23-18.pdf
\end{tabular}

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors Budget \& Finance Committee:
Attached for your review, please find the Airport's response to questions asked by Committee members at the May 17, 2018 Board of Supervisors Budget \& Finance Committee hearing.

Thank you, Chris Arrigale for

\section*{550}

Ivar C. Satero
Airport Director
San Francisco International Airport |P.O. Box 8097 | San Francisco, CA 94128
Office: 650-821-5000 | Email: ivar.satero@flysfo.com
Executive Assistant: Chris Arrigale
Direct: 650-821-5004 | Email: chris.arrigale@flysfo.com

\author{
San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee Supervisor Malia Cohen, Chair Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer, Vice Chair Supervisor Catherine Stefani Supervisor Jeff Sheehy Supervisor Norman Yee
}

SUBJECT: Airport's Follow-up to May 17 ; 2018 Budget \& Finance Committee Hearing
At the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee meeting of May 17, 2018, Committee members had a series of questions about proposed Airport budget items and policies. I would like to take the opportunity to follow-up in detail below on these outstanding issues and am prepared to discuss them further at the May 25, 2018 Committee meeting as well.

\section*{POLICE STAFFING}

\section*{What's driving increased need for police officers? (Supervisor Cohen)}

Passenger traffic at San Francisco International Airport (SFO) has increased substantially over the last 20 years from 39.7 million passengers in 1997 to 54 million passengers in 2017. Sari Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau (SFPD-AB) budgeted positions have not kept pace with the increased passenger growth. Passenger levels have increased by \(36 \%\) and SFPD-AB budgeted positions have increased by \(9 \%\).
- 1997: 130 Officer level positions budgeted
- 2017: 142 Officer level positions budgeted

Additionally, since 1997, the Airport has added 2.6 million square feet of terminal space and growth will continue with future development and construction. Consistent security coverage is required for all airfield and construction projects.
- 1998 Rental Car Facility opened
- 2000 International Terminal Building opened
- 2003 AirTrain System began óperations
- 2003 SFO BART Station opened

The Airport needs to manage the impact of increased vehicular traffic by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) such as Lyft and Uber (687,000 trips in 2017). Additionally, we must ensure a strong, visible security presence to mitigate the thireat of active shooter incidents and address global terrorism in public areas of the Airport.

Are there any federal dollars to assist with ramping up police at the Airport? (Supervisor Cohen) Beyond federal appropriations for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Department of
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Homeland Security and Customs and Border Protection, there is limited opportunity to leverage federal dollars for increased police presence at airports. The TSA is responsible for furding only its own operations, primarily screening at checkpoints and baggage screening.

SFO Finance and Governmental Affairs staff have researched potential federal grant opporțunities for law enforcement and have not found any that provide for additional police staffing.

\section*{Zero-based staffing plan (Supervisor Cohen)}

The Airport's police officer staffing level has remained roughly the same for the past decade, at just over 140 budgeted officer positions. In the aftermath of active shooter incidents at Fort Lauderdale Airport and LAX and terrorist attacks at airports in Europe, in 2017, SFO's Safety \& Security team and the SFPD-AB conducted a detailed analysis of the resources needed to address these types of threats. Staff analyzed incident reports, dispatch calls for service, arrests, annual passengers, retail operations, and new facilities over the period of 1997 to 2017. The resulting analysis was a zero-based staffing plan, which calls for an increase in the number of officers at the Airport from the current budget of 142 to 287 over the course of three years. The best way to deter threats, and to respond quickly to threats when they arise, is with a highly visible police presence on patrol in the terminals and around our airfield perimeter.

\section*{Police positions compared to other airports (Supervisor Stefani)}

The SFPD-AB has surveyed other Category \(X /\) Gateway Airports and found varying staffing models. For example, LAX has 543 sworn and 450 Police Service Aides (PSAs). They cover 3,500 acres and 128 gates compared to SFO's 5,207 aceres and 115 gates. Additionally, according to the Department of Homeland Security, the Los Angeles Region is the number 4 terrorist target with the San Francisco Region ranking. number 5.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline City, State, Airport Code & 2016 Total Passengers & 2017 Total Passengers & Acres & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Sworn } \\
\text { Personnel } \\
2017
\end{gathered}
\] & Gates \\
\hline Los. Angeles (LAX) & 80.9 M & 84.6 M & 3,500. & 543 & 128 \\
\hline Port Authority NYNJ* & 59.1 M & 59.3 M & 5200 & 619 & 128 \\
\hline Denver CO (DEN) & 58.2 M & 61.4 M & 33,531 & 130 & 137 \\
\hline San Francisco CA (SFO), & 53.0 M & 55.8 M \% & 5,207 & , 184 & 115 \\
\hline Las Vegas NV (LAS) & 47.5 M & 48:5 M & 2,800 & 101 & 92 \\
\hline Seattle WA (SEA) & 45.7 M & 46.9 M & 2,500 & 104 & 88 \\
\hline Miami FL (MIA) & 44.5 M & 44.1 M & 3,300 & 166 & 131. \\
\hline Charlotte NC (CLT) & 44.4 M & 45.9 M & 5,558 & 75 & 111 \\
\hline Phoenix AZ (PHX) & 43.3 M & 43.9 M & 3,400 & 108 & 116 \\
\hline Fort Lauderdale, , ¢L (FLL) & 29.2 M & 32.5 M & 1,380 & 98 & 66 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*Port Authority covers JFK, EWR and LGA.

\section*{EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITES/OUTREACH}

\section*{Employment opportünities for seniors/people with disabilities (Supervisor Yee)}

The Airport has many seniors and people with disabilities who are successfully employed with airline catering companies, food and beverage and retail tenants, as well as at the SFO Rental Car Center. These employers offer around-the-clock shifts as well as numerous part-time and on-call opportunities that often work well for individuals needing flexible and alternative schedules. Work varies by employer - from food preparation, to shuttling rental cars from one terminal to another, to customer service. Most of these jobs are covered by the City's First Source hiring policy, and the Airport works closely with the Office of Employment and Workforce Development (OEWD), the Human Services Agency (HSA), and community-based organizations to recruit for these positions.

SFO's Office of Economic and Community Development (ECD) is working with OEWD on a new entrylevel training program for our on-Airport hotel, and was recently selected as a training organization by Self-Help for the Elderly.

Along with SFPUC, we are also looking into piloting a Neurodiversity Workforce Program with our tenants and contractors that would identify internships and jobs for SF residents who are on the autism spectrum, or who have a diagnosis of severe ADHD, Down syndrome, or other learning differences. All of these individuals are existing clients of the California Department of Rehabilitation (BOR).

The Airport is currently participating in a DHR pilot that places Access to City Employment (ACE). program candidates into Temporary Exempt positions as an entry-way inṭo Civil Service. We currently: have two employees hired under this pilot.

\section*{How many internships lead to jobs at the Airport? (Supervisor Fewer)}

SFO offers two internship tracks designed to lead into Airport Commission positions. Over the past few years, over \(70 \%(20 / 28)\) of our Custodial Track graduates transitioned into permanent civil service positions, and 51\% (120.out of 235) of our Student Design Trainees in Planning, Design, and Construction and Information Technology and Telecommunications continued in follow-on positions with the Airport Commission (Commission). For our programs that are not designed to lead to Commission positions, including our high school internship programs, typically \(70 \%\) of these interns transition into part-time and full-time positions at private Airport employers.

Plans to incorporate Prop J positions into permanent civil service positions? (Supervisor Fewer) The Airport currently has four Proposition J contracts. The following contracts were approved in the FY16/18 budget cycle and were resubmitted for the FY18/20 budget cycle:
- Employee and Public Parking Management Services
- Information Booth and Guest Assistance Services
- SFO Hotel Shuttle Inc.
- Security Services
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We will assess the various job functions used by the Airport's Prop J service providers and consult with DHR and the Civil Service Commission to determine the feasibility of bringing these functions in-house as City jobs.

As leases expire over the next few years for certain services at the Airport, such as the rental of luggage carts, we will determine the feasibility of bringing these services in-house to provide entry level jobs for San Francisco residents.

\section*{Local hiring policy for Airport hiring in addition to construction iobs? (Supervisor Fewer)}

At this time, the City and County's Local Hire legislation only applies to construction opportunities. For non-construction, the Airport ensures the City \& County's First Source hiring provisions are included in all of our relevant agreements.

OEWD is the regulatory authority for both Local Hire and First Source, and our work order with OEWD includes funding for overseeing SFO's compliance with these two pieces of legislation.

To maximize compliance and opportunities for disadvantaged individuals, the Airport's ECD staff works with each of our tenants to ensure they post all entry-level jobs with OEWD. Our tracking shows that approximately \(90 \%\) of the job placements reported last year at the Airport \((1,141)\) were for entry-level positions.

\section*{Job opportunities/outreach to homeless population? (Supervisor Fewer)}

Airport ECD staff works with HSA and their network of homeless providers on referring participants to our jobs, including the following:
- Downtown Streets Team
- Back on My Feet
- Community Housing Partnership
- Hospitality House
- Episcopal Community Services

SFO participates in tours, presentations and workshops specifically targeted to these homeless providers, and has had success with hires at airline catering companies.

\section*{TERMINAL CURBSIDE CONGESTION}

\section*{Curbside Congestion Mitigation (Supervisor Fewer)}

Traffic Improvement Goals
- Reduce vehicle back-ups beyond the International Terminal on Domestic Terminal inbound roadways
- Maintain minimum average speed of 15 mph on the inbound roadways

The Airport has determined that \(50 \%\) (one of every two cars) on terminal roadways is a TNC and has developed a phased TNC Traffic Improvement Plan to improve curbside congestion. Phase 1 contains
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short-term mitigations designed to incrementally alleviate curbside and terminal traffic congestion by redistributing TNC traffic along the Terminal curbs and moving a portion of TNC operationsto Level 5 of the Domestic Garage. Phases 2-3 provide longer term projects and solutions for moving additional (or potentially all) TNC pick-up operations to Level 5 of the Domestic Garage if these short-term measures are not successful ị reducing terminal roadway congestion. The plan includes improvements to the garage to improve the customer experience.

\section*{COMIMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION}

\section*{TNC and taxi fees (Supervisor Sheehy)}

TNCs are charged \(\$ 3.80\) for each pick-up and \(\$ 3.80\) for each drop-off while the taxi trip fee is set at \(\$ 5.00\) per pick-up only, based on a cost recovery methodology where costs totaling \$123.3M for FY18/19 are allocated to the projected vehicle trips:

\section*{TNC and taxi authorization to operate (Supervisor Sheehy)}
- TNCs operate under an Airport-issued permit
- Taxis operate under the authorization of the SFMTA medallion program

\section*{Taxi medallion cost recovery assistance? (Supervisor Sheehy)}

Under federal and state law, waiving taxi trip fees or directing Airport funds to assist medallion owners to recover the cost for the taxi medallions would be problematic.

Waiving taxi trip fees would contravene the federal law mandate that airports be financially selfsustaining: Commercial users of the Airport must pay for their share of the costs associated with Airport operations and maintenance. Such a waiver would necessitate higher trip fees to other modes of ground transportation and/or would necessitate the cost be added to the calculation in determining. airline landing fees and terminal rental rates, which would violate the Airport's Airline Lease and Use Agreement which mandates the Aifport maximize revenues from non-airline users.

Directing Airport funds to assist medallien owners to recover the cost for taxi medallions would likely be considered a diversion of revenue in violation of federal airport regulations and an illegal gift of public funds in violation of the California Constitution.

\section*{Cost recovery calculations (Supervisor Sheehy)}

Total cost allocation to various ground transportation modes is projected to be:
- \(\$ 123.4 \mathrm{M}\) for \(\mathrm{FY} 18 / 19\) consisting of -
- Operating costs - \(\$ 94: 8 \mathrm{M}\)
i. Landside Operations
ii. Police \& Fire departments
iii. Utilities maintenance and other administration
iv. All ground transportation staging lots including the taxi staging area in the domestic garage
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v. Additional infrastructure improvements for the \(5^{\text {th }}\) floor of the domestic garage reconfiguration
- Debt Service \(=\$ 28.6 \mathrm{M}\)
vi. Roadway construction
vii. Roadway and intersection improvements \& repairs
viii. Roadway signal and signage improvements
ix. Ground Transportation Management System (GTMS)

\section*{Allocation of costs for TNCs and taxis (Supervisor Sheehy)}

For FY18/19, costs are not allocated directly by specific modes (i.e. TNCs). All costs are aggregated and divided by the total number of projected vehicle trips separated by low occupancy commercial vehicles (TNCs \& limousines), high occupancy commercial vehicles (shuttles, vans, buses), taxis and private vehicles.

Since taxis operate under the SFMTA medallion program, changes to taxi trip fees must be approved by SFMTA,

Amount collected in taxi trip fees (Supervisor Sheehy)
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline \hline & \(\mathrm{FY} 15 / 16\) & \(\mathrm{FY} 16 / 17\) & \(\mathrm{FY} 17 / 18\) Est. \\
\hline Taxi Trip Fee Revenue & \(\$ 7.21 \mathrm{M}\) & \(\$ 6.97 \mathrm{M}\) & \(\$ 6.07 \mathrm{M}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

How much charged to other modes? (Supervisor Sheehy)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & FY17/18 (per trip) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Proposed \\
FY18/19 \\
(per trip)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Scheduled/Charter Buses & \$3.30 & \$3.60 \\
\hline Pre-arrange \& Shared Ride Vans & \$3.60 & \$3.60 \\
\hline Off-airport Parking \& Hotel Shuttles & \$3.60 & \$3.60 \\
\hline Limousiñes. & \$3:80 & \$3.60*/\$5.00** \\
\hline ṪNCS & \$3.80 & \$3.60*/\$5.00** \\
\hline Taxi (pick up onily) & \$5.00 & \$5.00 \\
\hline & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{* \(\$ 3.60=5^{\text {th }}\) floor of domestic garage pickup/drop-off ** \(\$ 5.00(\$ 3.60+\$ 1.40)=\) Includes a terminal curbside access fee of \(\$ 1.40 \mathrm{per}\) pickup or drop-off} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or would like additional information,


\section*{SAVE MUNI}

May 152018
File \# 180444, 180445, 180446
Supervisor Cohen and members of the Budget Committee,
Save Muni urges the Board of Supervisors to take the unprecedented step of rejecting the MTA's 2019-2020 budget and returning it to the MTA for adjustment.

We believe that staffing and budget increases for this one department are not warranted given the limits placed on other city department...

MTAs proposed staff increase of 277 comes on top of continuous increases over the past decade resulting in an agency with over 6,000 employees making it the second largest city department. We believe that the agency needs an independent management audit to look at the effectiveness of its current structure before considering additional staffing..

MTAs recent performance has been at best mediocre. The Agency has a history of poor project decisions and even poorer project management.

Traffic congestion continues to worsen and Muni ridership has failed to increase even with substantial population growth and robust economic activity. The budget needs more focus on transit service and emphasis on better coordination of road projects to facilitate transit movement.

We believe that a number of specific issues with respect to the budget need to be addressed:
1) Lack of adequate time for the public to review the budget. The budget book was not available until very shortly before the MTA Board hearing, which made considered review impossible.
2) There was no meaningful narrative about the budget changes. Expenditures were not linked to specific programs and staffing levels.
3) The use of operating reserves to balance the current budget is unsustainable and flies in the face of intelligent fiscal planning. Instead we urge the MTA to reduce current costs and to identify new sources of revenue.

By returning the MTA budget to the Agency for revision, the Board of Supervisors will send a powerful message that MTAs current way of doing business needs to change.

Save Muni urges the Board to send that message.
Sincerely,
Bob Feinbaum
Chair, Save Muni

Wong, Linda (BOS)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Robert Feinbaum <bobf@att.net> \\
Sent: \\
To:
\end{tabular} \\
& Tuesday, May 15, 20189:31 AM \\
Cc: & Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sheehy, Jeff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); \\
Subject: & Fewer, Sandra (BOS) \\
Attachments: & Wong, Linda (BOS) \\
& Re: File \# 180444, 180445, 180446 \\
& savemuni.budget.rev.odt
\end{tabular}

To: Supervisor Cohen and members of the Budget Committee
Save Muni urges the Budget Committee to reject the MTA budget and send it back to the Agency for needed revisions. Please see attached letter.

Bob Feinbaum
Chair, Save Muni```


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Police positions funded by the Airport are budgeted in the San Francisco Police Department's budget, subject to appropriation by the Board of Supervisors during the June 2018 review of the Mayor's proposed budget.
    ${ }^{2}$ According to the Airport, over the past 20 years the Airport has added approximately 2.5 million square feet of terminal space, pringing the total amount of terminal space that needs to be patrolled to 5.1 million square feet.

[^1]:    $\vec{\omega}_{\mathrm{GF}}=$ General Fund

[^2]:    $\xrightarrow{G}$
    GF = General Fund
    $1 T=$ One Time

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ This represents the total authorized operating positions, less attrition due to position turnover and vacancies. Off-budget positions that are funded as part of multi-year capital projects or outside agencies are not included.

[^4]:    ${ }^{2}$ As noted above, the number of positions authorized in the City's Annual Salary Ordinance is greater than the number of budgeted positions; the City subtracts from the total amount of salaries in the budget to account for position vacancies and turnover (attrition). City departments reduce their budgeted attrition (i.e., include a smaller negative number, or subtract less) to allow for more hiring.

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ The City currently has 19 budget set-asides approved by the voters.

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ Joint Report by the Controller's Office, Mayor's Office, and Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office.

[^7]:    $\overrightarrow{C O}_{G F}=$ General Fund
    $1 T=$ One Time

[^8]:    $\mathrm{GF}=$ General Fund

[^9]:    GF $=$ General Fund
    $1 \mathrm{~T}=$ One Time

[^10]:    ద
    GF = General Fund
    $1 \mathrm{~T}=$ One Time

[^11]:    N
    GF = General Fund $1 T=$ One Time

