

To: PUB Members
From: Colleen Johnson, PUB Co-chair
Date: March 5, 2018
Re: Budget Requests

Hello PUB members,

I am out of town for the month of March so I won't be attending meetings in person, but Melissa and I will be using Skype (I hope) so I can attend at a distance the March 6 and March 22 meeting. The March 15 meeting will probably just be over the phone.

I did want to pass along my initial thoughts on the FTE requests in the DPs. I reserve the right to change my mind after listening to the CBO analysis on March 6.

PWB (8 FTE)

WATER TREATMENT—OK 3 FTE

Why 7 positions all at once? What's the timeline for when the work will begin for these positions and how does it integrate with the treatment projects?

Will the amount of reporting and invoicing increase substantially immediately?

Don't understand why you need Water Treatment Operators (2) now. When will the new corrosion control facility be online and when will the pilot testing start?

- Principle Engineer (1)
- Associate Engineer (1)
- Program Coordinator (1)

These 3 positions, assuming they are hired quickly, can get started on planning and system maintenance for the increased treatment that comes from filtration and corrosion control. As the planning and design work advances, a more systematic evaluation of necessary FTE can be conducted.

UNIDIRECTIONAL FLUSHING—OK 3 FTE

Why not put in place two 2-person teams dedicated to flushing the entire system, see how it goes over the next year or two, and then use the data you collect to infer the most efficient amount of staffing needed. In the meantime, use limited term and/or community service aides to supplement.

- Tech 1 (1)
- Tech 2 (2)

WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT—OK 1+? FTE

There are currently 10 permanent inspectors in PWB. DCTU contract allows use of contract staff if “there is a cost savings” among other reasons. Is there a breakdown that shows contract staff hours v. projects, that is which projects need the most inspection hours? What are the specialty inspectors? In 2014-15 and 2016-17, the largest number of hours is during peak season and in 2015-16, it looks like there’s slightly over 1.0 FTE in total hours (2080). If we eliminate peak season hours, none of the years shown, rise to full-time, so how to count ‘peak season.’ I’d like more information on the safety position and what their duties would be. What’s “PTE” stand for? How often does the RMP and PSM need updating?

- Public Works Inspector (1)
- Safety Support—?? not sure yet

ASSET MANAGEMENT—OK 1 FTE

There’s already na AMG in PWB and a Reliability Centered Maintenance strategy and a Water Audit and Strategic Water Loss Control Plan. Why not hire one person to begin the process of implementing and tracking these plans and then evaluate whether or not more staff are needed.

COMMUNICATIONS--NO

How does this requested position align with the Asset Management positions? It says that increased asset management documentation is needed under this position’s problem statement. Is there enough technical writing work to support an ongoing FTE or is it more sporadic that would be best served by outside contractors? Also, it’s my understanding the different programs in PWB have communication duties embedded in them so why can’t they do the technical writing related to their programs and then pass it by the communications group for editing and accessibility issues?

PWB has 6 regular FTE and 1 PT staff in Communications, while BES has 13 FTE (1 Public Affairs manager, 3 staff in communications, 2 staff in environmental education, and 7 staff in Community Outreach. Why not combine the two PWB and BES areas for 20 people and work together to improve overall communications to better achieve economies of scope and scale and more consistent messaging, especially since many citizens see them as joined (e.g. ‘the water bill’). There may be different missions and different skills and knowledge in each bureau, but there already seems to be overlap and cooperation, so why not explore a single communications group. I realize the City’s structure is of concern (e.g., a future mayor splits the two bureaus among two different commissioners) but perhaps if the bureaus were less siloed, there would be more incentive to keep the bureaus under one commissioner. And sending a consistent message from both bureaus seems like a benefit to consumers.

EQUITY—NO

Equity goals are important but there are currently 4 people in PWB who work on equity issues/goals. There are already equity goals and objectives for PWB and some achievements, so what exactly is the research, the data analysis and policy and procedure documents that will be prepared. Seems like boilerplate language. Why can’t the Bureau piggyback on the research

and data gathered by the Office of Equity and Human Rights and BES instead of reinventing the wheel. Why can't BES and PWB have a single equity program, or better yet, why can't the City's Office of Equity and Human Rights be the central service for all bureaus?

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE—NO

It's not clear to me why we need two NEW FTE for this. The program is itself a laudable experiment, but it seems as though there could be some realignment/reclassification of existing positions. There are around 9 vacancies in Customer Service (7 Account Specialist I, 1 Account Specialist II, 1 Management Asst) plus the Program Manager for the Low Income Program (applications are being reviewed). Even if the city needs dedicated personnel for this specialized program, why not hire the Program Manager (already in the budget), have that person operationalize and begin to implement it before adding positions to this area. According to the Auditor's Report, there are about 30 employees in Customer Service. Several positions are currently vacant, so why not repurpose one or two of those for these more specialized positions? Questions of impact for performance metrics, but if there is a dedicated staff and dedicated phone number, wouldn't the number of calls to Customer Service go down? Currently recruiting for new Program Manager (due to retirement) so the 2 FTE would make 3 total. Are new positions different classification resulting in higher pay (new positions are Program Specialists, \$170,496 for both positions)? Explain table in decision package. What is total cost of program?

BES (12 FTE)

Of the 11 FTE approved for this fiscal year plus the 4 FTE approved during the Fall BMP, one-third (5FTE) remain vacant. This seems to underscore that the Bureau could focus on hiring fewer staff and once those are in place, re-evaluate the needs of the programs.

Also, what happens to the Rate Stabilization Fund if BES increases rates by 2.5% instead of 3%, all else held constant in the proposed budget? That is, what is the revenue impact on the RSF of reducing the retail rate by .5%? Asking people today to pay higher rates than they need to in order to push up the RSF for future projects and consumers raises questions of intergenerational equity—people today paying for benefits that future generations will receive.

SERVICE DELIVERY (5 FTE)

1 FTE: Tech I Maintenance Insp (#20)—NO

In 2015-16, 657 facilities were added and 19.8% were inspected; in 2016-17, 913 were added and 11.6% were inspected. Two inspectors and 1 manager who also inspects for a total of 3 FTE. The blip year was 2015-16 with almost 20% inspected, 2016-17 was in line with previous years.

2 FTE: Tech II Plan Review (#3 and 18)—OK 1 FTE

Current staffing is 1 program manager plus 5 FTE plus an intern, up 1 FTE from previous year. DP says that in FY 2017-18 BES hired short-term casual employees and plan to request 2 FTE additional limited term Tech II in Fall 2018-19 BMP. Why does the table on Page 7 show only 4 staff for 2017-18?? Seems reasonable to hire 1 FTE and then with approval of limited term position in the fall, re-evaluate second position for following year.

1 FTE: Laboratory Analytical Spec (#19)—OK 1 FTE

Work has increased 60% since 2001-02 with no change in staff. This position should result in some cost saving.

1 FTE: Tech II Industrial Stormwater (#5)—OK 1 FTE

This position will support permit work required by DEQ including the MS4 and NPDES permits.

1 FTE: Envir Program Coordinator SPCR (#11)—NO

Other staff in this area includes 1 Environmental Tech I, 3 Environmental Tech II, 1 Program Manager, and 13 Duty Officers. The Environmental Tech I was hired last year. When did the Tech I come on board? Wait another year and re-evaluate.

1 FTE: Engineering Tech II Facilities Mgmt (#1)—OK 1 FTE

Current staffing is one FTE, the Facilities Manager. Seems reasonable to add one Tech position for support.

1 FTE: WW Operator II (#15)—OK 1 FTE

Dredging resumes in July and two operators are needed for operations.

CIP PLANNING AND DELIVERY IMPROVEMENTS (5 FTE)

1 FTE: Condition Assessment, Field Tech (#2)—not sure yet

1 FTE: Pump Station RR&M Mgmt/Design (#7)—OK 1 FTE

This position requires long-term experienced labor which cannot be easily substituted by contract workers. Without this position, 5-6 projects would be delayed, ranging from a project value of \$6-12m over the 7year period for the CBWTP clarifier work.

1 FTE: WW Treatment Plant Project Mgmt/Design (#12)—OK 1 FTE

Currently 5 design staff (2 senior engineers and 3 engineers). This position will manage significant projects at both the Columbia Boulevard and Tyron Creek WW Treatment Plants. The new position will manage up to three projects that are elements of the larger programs.

1 FTE: Supervising Engineer WW Design (#6)—NO

BES says this division is heavily loaded with professional engineers and senior engineers and that they are likely to reclassify an existing position to a supervising engineer. Also the baseline

ratio of supervisor to staff ranges from 1:5 to 1:11 direct reports and this position would drop that to 1:4 for the Principle Engineer and 1:3 for the Supervising. Why not reclassify and the reevaluate the need for another supervising engineer.

1 FTE: Construction Mgmt (#16)—NO

Does the City/BES need to re-evaluate the number, size, and complexity of the projects it moves forward every year? It seems that there's a disconnect between what the bureau wants to do and what it can do.

1 FTE: Project Cost Estimator (#22)—OK 1 FTE

Need to have more rigorous practices and supports for the fundamentals of project cost, schedule and scope development.

1 FTE: Engineering Support for Continuous System (#17)—NO

There is/was a 3-year project to update the CCSP with a \$1.5m consultant project?? So why this position now? When was the 3-year period?

1 FTE: Surface Water Project Mgmt/Design (#8)—NO

What does it mean "\$10m open unassigned projects?" Is this position intended to reduce the amount of 'unassigned' projects or will there just be more projects added and a higher amount of unassigned projects requiring more staff, more projects, etc. Would it be better to realign the amount of projects to a number that can be handled by existing staff? There seems to be a disconnect in that projects are approved even though staffing is not which then sets up further backlogs. Not sure the answer is just to add more and more FTE.

1 FTE: Program Manager SWSP Asset (#1)—OK 1 FTE

This position and the next one will develop a program and evaluate the significant needs of the SWSP Asset condition.

1 FTE: Business Systems Analyst-SWSP Asset (#4)—OK 1 FTE

See above

WORKFORCE (0 FTE)

1 FTE: Training Coordinator, Limited Term (#21)—NO

I don't see why this can't be done in-house so that the Bureau develops these skills with the positions that were approved in the Fall BMP and the consultant work.

2 FTE (?): Interns, WWG Maintenance—NO

These are ongoing requests? Were they approved last year?

RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS (2 FTE)

1 FTE: Business Systems Analyst-Env Investigations (#10)—NO

Just hired Data Strategist in December 2017

1 FTE: Financial Analyst: (#9)—OK 1 FTE

Would add a 4th position to the Financial Planning Division which would help to centralize bureau-wide budget monitoring.

1 FTE: Procurement Assistant (#14)—OK 1 FTE

This will address existing long procurement process and extended contract negotiations and should speed up the process of implementing the CIP.