

RESPONSES TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS REGARDING 3/24/15 AGENDA

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Item 1.C.

I don't see how this saves staff any reporting work since it is proposed that the grants still be reported on, but up to a year later. Why not just modify Council policy to favor short RTC's for such items. Why not adopt a Council policy that allows short RTC's on a broad range of items. I recall seeing some very short RTCs with another City, I think Santa Clara. If staff are present that can answer questions, and the item is non-controversial, on consent, why not limit the RTC to one sheet + any info attachments needed. Would staff be interested to discuss this?

Staff Response: While report length can impact staff time on RTCs, grant appropriation reports follow a prescribed template and are usually no more than two to three pages. The time consuming portion is the process of putting an RTC on the agenda, which includes determining a Council date and review and approval of the report by several departments. As a result, it typically takes at least several weeks from grant award to Council approval. Delegating additional authority for the City Manager to appropriate grant funds up to \$100,000 under specific parameters will streamline this process. Staff's intention on periodic reporting of grant awards is to consolidate information of all grants awards into one report and provide either as an information only item or with the City Manager's Biweekly Report. This would be less time consuming than individual RTCs.

PUBLIC HEARING/GENERALBUSINESS:

Item #2

In the minutes of the Parks and Recreation Meeting Director Rosenblum notes that she sets the rates for park fees. Is she able to do that outside of the fee schedule that the Council passes?

Staff Response: Director of Library and Community Services sets fees for recreation based on Council Policy 7.1.1 (1.2b.2).

7.1.1 Fiscal – Long Range Goals and Financial Policies

- **I.2 Community Recreation Fund Policies**
 - **I.2b.2 User fees for recreation services shall be set administratively by the Director of Parks and Recreation in accordance with a documented methodology that depicts a relationship to cost recover, market forces, and adjustments based on such factors as:**
 - Perceived benefit to the community
 - Pricing which favors Sunnyvale residents over non-residents
 - Target populations
 - Promotional and marketing considerations

Isn't section 9.62.100 of the regulations a bit vague and broad? Would it stand up to muster in court?

City Attorney Response: Section 9.62.100 authorizes the director to close sections of a park “at any time and for any interval of time, either temporarily or at regular and stated intervals (daily or otherwise) and either entirely or merely to certain uses, as the director finds reasonably necessary.”

This is standard language for these types of ordinances, and enables the director to effectively manage park operations related to maintenance, repair, usage, etc. The language provides that a closure must be “reasonably” necessary, meaning that it can’t be arbitrary or capricious. This is typical language that courts are used to seeing; it would not be considered vague and broad on its face.

In section 9.62.130 it says that the Director and park attendants will enforce the provisions. Should not the Public Safety Department be included in enforcement?

Staff Response: Depending upon the issue, Public Safety can be called in to enforce provisions.

The fee for use of Park Buildings at \$60 an hour seems a bit high?

Staff Response: \$60 falls within the low to mid-range of benchmarked cities.

	Campbell	Cupertino	Mt. View	San Jose	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale
Park Buildings						
Resident Rate	N/A	\$55/hr.	\$117/hr. Off-Peak \$177/hr. Peak	N/A	\$55- \$110/hr.	\$60/hr.
Non-Resident Rate	N/A	\$88/hr.	\$177/hr. Off-Peak \$177/hr. Peak	N/A	N/A	\$90/hr.

Item #3

In section 3 of the salary table, the salaries for council and the Mayor appear to be annual amounts but the entries say "(monthly)".

Staff Response: The "(Monthly)" descriptor that is included in the proposed Salary Table for the Mayor and Council salary rates is in error and should read “(Annual)”. The intent in including this descriptor is to provide for transparency. Staff will correct the descriptor prior to posting. This correction will also be noted in the staff presentation of the item during Public Hearing.

Item #4

Does table A of attachment 1 show net new units or total units constructed? Most of the sites were previously non-residential so it may not make a difference.

Staff Response: None of the 14 projects listed in Attachment 1 had any existing residential units that were displaced.

Item #5

Page 5 of the report shows a budget of \$104,714 and by adding 28 hours a week the total cost rises to \$120,087 (Difference of \$15,373) why do we show a need for \$73,026 of additional funding?

Staff Response: The \$104,714 includes \$40,000 in funding from Council Set Aside budgeted through FY 2014/2015. The \$73,026 additional funding considers the following: \$40,000 funding from the Council Set Aside; and additional funding to increase program level to 68 hours per week.

Sourcewise grant funding of \$18,000 is not guaranteed annually and is not used to offset annual program costs. For example, in FY 2014/2015, Council directed staff to use grant funds to augment budgeted service level – an \$18,000 grant provides an additional 13 hours per week.

The report goes on to say that the Sourcewise Grants are directly related to the size of the project, but in the next sentence it says that 40 hours a week is the largest program grant. This is a bit confusing?

Staff Response: Sourcewise Grants have a cap. The temporary \$40,000 awarded by Council from the Council Set Aside made the program eligible for the largest grant amount possible. If the program were to divert back to 20 hours per week, the program will only be eligible for a \$13,000 grant level.

How does an allocation of \$40,000 a year assure funding at 40 hours a week for the next 20 years?

Staff Response: The Council Set Aside funding of \$40,000 to the Care Management Program is set to expire at the end of FY 2014/2015. The temporary funding of \$40,000 has allowed the program to provide a service level of 40 hours/week. The option to add \$40,000/year to existing allocation would permanently fund the program.