

# PORTLAND UTILITY BOARD

---

**Members:**

**Allan Warman, Co-chair**  
**Colleen Johnson, Co-chair**  
**Meredith Connolly**  
**Ted Labbe**  
**Robert Martineau**  
**Micah Meskel**  
**Lee Moore**  
**Dan Peterson**  
**Scott Robinson**  
**Hilda Stevens**  
**Mike Weedall**

**Ex-officio Members:**

**Alice Brawley-Chesworth**  
**Ana Brophy**  
**Van Le**

Staff Contact:  
Melissa Merrell  
(503) 823-1810  
Melissa.Merrell@portlandoregon.gov  
City Budget Office  
111 SW Columbia St., 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Portland, Oregon 97201

To: Mayor Ted Wheeler  
Commissioner Nick Fish  
Commissioner Amanda Fritz  
Commissioner Chloe Eudaly  
Commissioner Dan Saltzman  
Auditor Mary Hull Caballero

Re: PUB Recommendations for the Budget Submissions for the  
Bureau of Environmental Services and the Portland Water Bureau

Date: March 28, 2018

The Portland Utility Board (PUB) serves as a citizen-based advisory board for the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) and the Portland Water Bureau (PWB). On January 24, 2018, PUB submitted its initial input on the budget requests of the bureaus and submits this correspondence as its recommendations on specific requests. This letter is submitted in compliance with City practice for budget advisory committees, and in response to our specific duties to:

*“advise the City Council, on behalf of and for the benefit of the citizens of Portland, on the financial plans, capital improvements, annual budget development and rate setting for the City’s water, sewer, stormwater, and watershed services. The Board will advise Council on the establishment of fair and equitable rates, consistent with balancing the goals of customer needs, legal mandates, existing public policies, such as protecting water quality and improving watershed health, operational requirements, and the long-term financial stability and viability of the utilities. (3.123.010)”*

This letter summarizes the requests for which there was member consensus on a recommendation (all members sharing the same view), requests for which there was majority agreement on a recommendation (six or more members sharing the same view), and requests for which the board members did not reach agreement. In all cases, this letter

attempts to capture the deliberation of members to aid in Council's understanding of the view and opinions of members and how recommendations were constructed. While there were several individual items for which there were different views among members, there was consensus among all members present supporting this communication to City Council.

In summary, PUB supports 12 of the 21 FTE requested by the PWB. It does not support four of the requested FTE and has no recommendation for five of the requested FTE. PUB supports 15 of the 22 FTE requested by BES. It does not support one of the requested FTE and has no recommendation for six of the requested FTE. It also supports, with some reservations, the proposals to expand the Low-Income Assistance Programs. Overarching themes of board discussion included concerns with the capacity of both bureaus to absorb the number of staff being requested and deliver the ambitious capital programs envisioned. Those themes are discussed in more detail as part of the recommendations on specific decision packages.

PUB invested more than 25 hours reviewing the FY 2018-19 proposed operating budgets, major additions and adjustments to the five-year capital improvement plans, and decision packages for both bureaus. PUB receives significant support from both bureaus' directors and staff, the ex-officio members, Commissioner Fish and staff, as well as the City Budget Office and our analyst. We are grateful for their collective efforts to help us understand and navigate the complexities of these utilities.

PUB members reviewed the analysis of the City Budget Office and the PUB analyst, considered input from the bureaus, and weighed the requests through the lenses of the PUB's stated values, cost, impact on service delivery, connection to strategic plans, and expected outcomes. PUB finalized its recommendations at the March 22, 2018 meeting. Two members were not in attendance at the meeting. See Exhibits 1 and 2 for a summary of recommendations for each bureau by decision package and FTE requested.

### **Portland Water Bureau FY 2018-2019 Requested Budget**

The Portland Water Bureau's (PWB) FY 2018-19 budget request includes \$100.8 million for operating expenses, \$136.7 million for capital projects for the next year, and an additional 21 FTE. If City Council were to approve all the decision packages included in the request, the bureau's operating costs would increase by almost \$3.5 million. \$1.3 million of the proposed operating increase is requested from the General Fund: \$1.1 million for preservation work at Mt. Tabor and \$225,200 for park maintenance activities. The total rate of increase for the typical single-family household to support the bureau's requested budget would be 8.9%. Including the proposed rate of increase for the Bureau of Environmental Services, the combined monthly increase would be 4.97%. The final rate of increase will depend on the items that are approved by City Council through the budget process.

Exhibit 1: PUB Recommendation for PWB Requested Budget Items

	Decision Package	Request	Recommendation	Poll Outcome *
Portland Water Bureau	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Principal Engineer	Support	Consensus
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Engineering Associate	Support	Consensus
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Engineering Associate	Do Not Support	Majority (3-6)
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Program Coordinator	Support	Consensus
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Management Analyst (contracts)	Support	Consensus
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Water Treatment Operator	Support	Majority (7-2)
	WA_01 Water Treatment	FTE - Water Treatment Operator	No Recommendation	(5-4)
	WA_02 UniDirectional Flushing	FTE - Environmental Technician II	Support	Consensus
	WA_02 UniDirectional Flushing	FTE -Environmental Technician II	No Recommendation	(5-4)
	WA_02 UniDirectional Flushing	FTE -Environmental Technician I	Support	Consensus
	WA_02 UniDirectional Flushing	FTE -Environmental Technician I	Support	Consensus
	WA_02 UniDirectional Flushing	FTE - Environmental Technician I	No Recommendation	(5-4)
	WA_03 Workforce Management	FTE -Public Works Inspector	Support	Consensus
	WA_03 Workforce Management	FTE -Public Works Inspector	Do Not Support	Majority (3-6)
	WA_03 Workforce Management	FTE -Safety and Risk Officer	Support	Consensus
	WA_04 Asset Management	FTE -Program Coordinator (RCM)	No Recommendation	(5-3-1)
	WA_04 Asset Management	FTE -Management Analyst (Water Loss)	Support	Consensus
	WA_05 Communications	FTE -Management Analyst (technical writer)	Do Not Support	Consensus
	WA_06 Equity Manager	FTE - Sr. Management Analyst (Equity)	Do Not Support	Majority (6-3)
	WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	FTE - Program Specialist	Support	Majority (8-1)
WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	FTE - Program Specialist	No Recommendation	(5-4)	
WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	non-FTE - Increase Crises Voucher	Support	Majority (8-0-1)	
WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	non-FTE Adjust Income Guidelines	Support	Majority (8-0-1)	

Decision Package	Request	Recommendation	Poll Outcome
WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	non-FTE - Provide New Discount to 30% of MFI	Support	Majority (8-0-1)
WA_07 Financial Assistance Expansion	non-FTE - Multifamily	Support	Majority (8-0-1)
WA_08 Mt. Tabor	Non-FTE	No Recommendation	note concerns
WA_09 Parks Maintenance	Non-FTE	Support	Consensus
WA_10 Fountains	Non-FTE	Do Not Support	Consensus

\*For items where there was a consensus, all members shared the same view. For items where there was a majority, six or more members shared the same view. Poll tally = (support - not support - undecided).

### *WA\_01 Water Treatment*

The Water Bureau is requesting seven FTE (one Principal Engineer, two Engineering Associates, one Program Coordinator, one Management Analyst, and two Water Treatment Operators) for water treatment. The positions are primarily being requested to address the increased work resulting from City Council direction to build a filtration plant. PUB members support five of the seven requested FTE.

Building the filtration plant will be a major capital undertaking for the bureau and one which PUB supports. There is consensus among the members to recommend the Principal Engineer, one Engineering Associate, the Program Coordinator, and the Management Analyst. Members viewed the positions as part of the leadership core that will be necessary to successfully deliver the 10-year project which will include a mix of bureau staff and consultants.

In conversations with PWB, it said it would likely use contracts to complete the engineering and management work for any of the requested positions that were not recommended. The CBO review of this package stated that, “The design and planning phases of both projects (filtration and corrosion control) will require increased staffing for a limited time. CBO recommends these positions but encourages the bureau to consider this as a potential area to decrease long-term personnel costs by using contract services where possible.” A majority of members considered that recommendation and felt that the second Engineering Associate position was a need that the bureau could likely meet with contracted services. A majority of members do not support the request for the second Engineering Associate at this time.

The PUB had a robust discussion about the request for two Operators which are needed in the long-term to provide day-to-day operation and maintenance of the filtration facility once operational; in the medium term to provide day-to-day operation and maintenance of the corrosion control facility once operational in 2022; and in the short-term to contribute to the planning and design process of both facilities and to address current needs. Most of the

concern for this request was about timing and not the underlying need for operators. This is a large, complex, decade long project and the request was viewed in light of the other requested positions and the number of new staff the bureau can absorb given the current workload and overall vacancies in the bureau. Three members thought it important to recommend all the requested positions but there was majority support for one operator at this time. It was noted that because the main concern is one of timing, once initial progress is made on the project and the timing of the need is apparent, the board would reconsider if the second operator position were requested at a later time.

### *WA\_02 UniDirectional Flushing*

The Water Bureau is requesting five FTE (two Environmental Technician II and three Environmental Technician Class I) for its unidirectional flushing work. Generally, flushing is a method of moving water through the pipes to respond to water quality issues or as a part of regular maintenance to reduce biofilm and accumulated debris that could affect water quality. PWB currently doesn't include strategic system-wide flushing as part of its maintenance plan and instead does spot flushing in reaction to known water quality issues. With the planned increase and change in chemicals for corrosion control and the move to a filtered system, PWB would realize benefits from a systemic flush.

All members were supportive of the implementation of system-wide unidirectional flushing which will improve overall water quality and potentially reduce the amount of chemicals that may be needed for corrosion control. Member discussion focused on the timing of the team expansion in light of the other requested positions for the bureau. There is consensus among the members to recommend three of the requested positions which, when combined with the existing FTE in this program, would give PWB two dedicated flushing teams. The members did not have a majority that supported recommending for or against the third team. Three members thought it important to recommend all of the requested position but several concerns were raised by other members. Those members thought it would be better for the bureau to first transition to two dedicated teams, evaluate how many miles of flushing the dedicated teams could complete, and assess the capacity of internal support staff. Those members would reconsider support for additional FTE for this program after the performance and estimates have been reevaluated.

### *WA\_03 Workforce Development*

PWB is requesting three FTE (two Public Work Inspectors and one Safety Officer) to address workforce management needs.

### Public Works Inspectors

PWB has a staff of public works inspectors and augments this staff with contracted inspectors when necessary to inspect capital projects of the bureau. The demand for inspectors fluctuates from year to year and is concentrated at peak times during any given year. PWB provided data on the number of contracted hours it has used to supplement city staff for the past four years. That data showed a sustained need for one inspector. The need for a second was less clear based on prior year use.

There was member consensus to support one of the two requested position. A majority of members did not support the second requested positions. These members agreed with the CBO and PUB analyses that while the data showed a clear need for one, it did not support a current need for two. They felt that this was a request that could be considered in subsequent years if the data shows a sustained need, as the bureau expects, but for now it would be best for the bureau to continue to contract when extra capacity is required. One member raised the issue of the pay premium for contractors. According to the bureau, the cost for contracted general inspection work is on par with the cost for city staff. The cost for specialized inspection work is higher than city staff. As city inspectors can do all required inspection work, its assumed the bureau will manage the inspection workload in a manner that maximizes city staff and minimizes contracted costs.

### Safety and Risk Officer

PWB is requesting a Safety and Risk Officer for the Operations Group which currently has 120 FTE and no one dedicated to coordinating the safety needs and training required by federal and state regulators. This position would update safety plans, assess training that should be provided and which staff have received the required training, design and implement a training program to schedule and deliver required training, and track staff completion. PUB recognizes the need of the bureau to ensure safe work environments for its staff and there was consensus to recommend this position.

### WA\_04 Asset Management

PWB is requesting two FTE – a Program Coordinator and a Management Analyst – to support asset management.

### Program Manager for Reliability Centered Management

PWB proposes hiring one FTE in the Operations Group to further efforts of tracking and using asset data for repair and replacement decisions. The members did not have a majority that supported recommending for or against this position. While members understand and support the role of asset management and the importance of data-driven decisions, some members felt this need could be filled when an existing vacancy in the Asset Management Branch was filled or realignment within the bureau.

### Management Analyst for Water Loss

PWB proposes hiring one FTE, likely to be located in the Resource Protection Group, to develop and implement the bureau's water loss control program. There was consensus among members to recommend this position.

### *WA\_05 Communications*

PWB proposes hiring a technical writer to help design, draft, edit and finalize significant documents produced by the bureau. While the bureau in the past had a dedicated technical writer, it realigned those resources in recent years to higher priority needs within asset management and the bureau's strategic business plan. The bureau is currently using other existing staff and contracted services on a project by project basis as available and required to meet its needs. There was consensus among members to not recommend this position. Given the other pressing needs of the bureau, members felt this was a low priority and if the need continued the bureau could rededicate its previous staff once the strategic business plan was complete.

### *WA\_06 Equity Manager*

PWB is requesting a Senior Management Analyst to coordinate the implementation of its Racial Equity Plan. Members engaged in a robust discussion about this request. All members are supportive of the equity goal of the City and believe implementation of the plans are essential to bureau progress. Members disagreed on the need for additional bureau staff to accomplish those goals. Some members strongly support the request for a dedicated manager and the need to prioritize this work within the bureau; however, a majority of members noted the work the bureau has done in its first year and thought this request could be reconsidered next year.

PWB currently has four staff that work on the plan implementation and in a recent presentation to the board demonstrated progress in the first year. The bureau listed this request as a low priority in relation to other requests because it felt it could continue to make progress, though less than if it received the position. Several members raised the issue of location of the staff and that this could be an area where the two utilities could see efficiencies by joining efforts. Some members also noted the need for the City Council and bureaus to break down the current siloed paradigm of the two utility bureaus and talk about how the bureaus can share resources.

### *WA\_07 Financial Assistance Expansion*

PWB proposes several changes to its Low-Income Assistance Program, including hiring two new Program Specialists, increasing the crises voucher from \$150 to \$500, adjusting income

guidelines for eligibility, creating a new assistance program for customers with very low income, and creating a multifamily assistance program. All members support the assistance that the bureaus provide for low-income customers. They also recognize that the current programs have limited reach and need to be revised to better meet the needs of the community.

PWB presented the proposed changes to a subcommittee of the PUB in November, provided answers to questions from board members in both December and January, and provided updates on the development of the proposals in February and March. All members appreciate the work the bureau has done but several members remained concerned about the extent to which the program is currently undeveloped and advised the bureau should take more time to analyze the data it has on current customers to better design and target the assistance programs. One proposal, transferring \$600,000 to community groups for eviction assistance for customers in multifamily residences, has little precedence nationwide and members expressed concerns about the efficacy of the proposal and lack of specified measures to track performance. Other members expressed a willingness to support the experiment knowing that the bureau will need to revise the program as they go.

Members discussed the two new Program Specialist positions requested in the context of the overall number of staff being requested by PWB, the level of workplan development, and current vacancies within the program and group of PWB. As proposed, the two requested program specialists would join the existing Program Manager position to form a Low-Income Service Team within the Customer Services Group. Inquiries related to the needs of low-income customers would be diverted from the Customer Service Call Center to this specialized team. The team also would be tasked with the data analysis recommended by the City Auditor and outreach activities to underrepresented communities.

Members generally expressed support for the service team vision. Some members supported recommending the packages as requested but several raised questions about timing, capacity, and implementation. The manager of the program recently retired; this position is currently vacant and under recruitment. Several members proposed that the manager should be hired and given time to more fully develop the team's work plan before the program specialists are hired. Several members also suggested that, because the vision of this team is to redirect calls currently handled by the Customer Service Group, PWB could realign positions from the service group to the Low-Income Service Team, and create the new program without overall increasing the size of the bureau.

After much discussion, a majority of members supported recommending one Program Specialist and the four program changes. The members did not have a majority that supported recommending for or against the second requested Program Specialist. Some PUB members thought it important to communicate to City Council the level to which this program has yet to



be developed. PUB will be requesting regular updates as the programs develop and recommends City Council should at a minimum require annual progress reports.

*WA\_08 Mt. Tabor Historic Preservation– Request from General Fund*

PWB requests \$1.115 million from the General Fund for preservation work at Mt. Tabor. This is the third year of General Fund support to fulfill a City Council resolution from 2015 to allocate \$4 million for such work. This request does not impact water rates. Board members declined to make a recommendation on this request. Several members raised concerns that the \$4 million commitment from City Council would fall short of the total cost to complete the preservation work needed at Mount Tabor and does not include the long-term costs of operating and maintaining the assets. Members suggest City Council to revisit this issue.

*WA\_09 Parks Maintenance– Request from General Fund*

PWB requests General Fund support for parks maintenance activities at Dodge Park, Hydro Parks, and Powell Butte. This request is in line with the judge’s opinion in the Anderson lawsuit and should not be funded by PWB. There was member consensus for recommending this request.

*WA\_10 Decorative Fountains*

Portland Parks and Recreation proposed the reduction of funding for the City’s 19 decorative fountains as part of its budget submission. Rather than shutting off the fountains, the City Budget Office recommends the fountains be funded with water rate revenue. This would result in a 0.4% rate increase for customers. There was consensus among members to recommend against this request. It is not a priority for the PWB at this time when they have several core mission needs.

**Bureau of Environmental Services FY 2018-2019 Requested Budget**

The Bureau of Environmental Service’s (BES) FY 2018-19 budget request includes \$156.9 million in operating expenses, \$133.4 million for capital projects in the next year, and an additional 22 FTE. If City Council were to approve all of the decision packages included in the request, the bureau’s operating costs would increase by \$4.4 million. The total rate of increase for the typical single-family household to support the bureau’s requested budget would be 3.0%. Including the proposed rate of increase for the Portland Water Bureau, the combined monthly increase would be 4.97%. The final rate of increase will depend on the items that are approved by City Council through the budget process.

Responding to recommendations from the CBO to reconsider its use of its Rate Stabilization Fund and PUB concern about the overall level of rates of increase for both bureaus, BES provided multiple rate scenarios for PUB consideration. Scenario A is the rate forecast that BES initially proposed with its submitted budget - a 3.0% rate of increase for all years of the forecast. Scenario B would have a rate of increase of 2.0% for FY 2018-19; 3.0% for FY 2019-2022; and 3.1% for the rest of the forecast. Scenario C would have 2.5% for the 5-year forecast followed by 3.45% for the out-years.

Members had a robust discussion about the alternatives. Members commended BES for doing what they had asked and what CBO recommended.

Some members expressed concerns. One concern was that lowering the rate could jeopardize the bond rating of the bureau by credit agencies. BES finance staff assured members that Scenario B was conservative and they did not have concerns about the rating agencies. All of the factors that recently led Moody's to update BES rating were still solid and would be unaffected by this change.

Another concern expressed was that this cash should be saved to mitigate future rate pressures that could come from the filtration plant in the Water Bureau. PWB finance staff explained that they have very conservative bond rate assumptions, and are forecasting a 7.4% rate of increase over the next 10 years. Assuming nothing significant changes, PWB finance staff state it's likely the rates of increases would be less as they get better interest rates on their bonds than they are forecasting. Rates of increase after FY 2018-19 are forecast to be less than FY 2018-19 so there wouldn't be a jump to mitigate.

A third concern was that lowering the rate for one year would result in higher rates in future years or could set an expectation for lower rates in the future. Scenario B would increase the out-year rate of increase from 3.0% to 3.1% beginning in FY 2022-23. BES finance staff responded to this concern saying that this forecast gives BES four years to manage that increase which they think they would be able to lower back to 3.0%.

Several members noted that the decrease in the rate of increase on the table as presented in scenario B would be a benefit to all customers. While the impact to customers of a one-year lower rate of increase would be small, BES stated that it could also potentially have a 2.0% rate of increase in FY 2019-20 if positive financial conditions continued. Several members are supportive of these steps to mitigate the forecasted year over year increases in rates for the customers.

At the end of the discussion, there was not a majority of members supporting either scenario A or B, although all members favored these two over scenario C. Three members were supportive of scenario A with the higher rate of increase that is stable throughout the forecast and outyears. Five members were supportive of scenario B with the lower rate of increase for BES customers next year and the potential of a slightly higher rate beginning in the last year of the forecast.

Exhibit 2: PUB Recommendations for BES Requested Budget Items

	Decision Package	Request	Recommendation	Poll Outcome *
Bureau of Environmental Services	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Environmental Technician I (Maintenance Inspection Program)	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Environmental Technician II (Plan Review)	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Environmental Technician II (Plan Review)	Do Not Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Laboratory Analytical Specialist	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Environmental Technician II (Industrial Stormwater)	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Environmental Program Coordinator (SPCR)	Support	Majority (6-3)
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Engineering Technician II (Facilities Management)	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	FTE - Wastewater Operator II	Support	Consensus
	ES_01 Service Delivery	Non-FTE Requests	Support	Consensus
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Engineer (Pump Station Project and RR&M Project Management)	Support	Consensus
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Engineer (Surface Water Project Management)	No Recommendation	(4-4-1)
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Engineer Sr. (Treatment Plant Project Management)	Support	Consensus
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Supervising Engineer (Wastewater Design)	No Recommendation	(3-5)
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Engineer (Construction Management)	No Recommendation	(3-5)
	ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Principal Management Analyst (Project Cost Estimator)	Support	Consensus

<b>Decision Package</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Poll Outcome</b>
ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Sr. Engineering Associate (Support for System Planning and Modeling)	No Recommendation	(3-5)
ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Sr. Engineer (Project Management for Stormwater Condition Assessment)	Support	Consensus
ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Business Systems Analyst (Stormwater Condition Assessment)	Support	Consensus
ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	FTE - Industrial Maintenance Millwright (Field Technician for Condition Assessment)	No Recommendation	(5-4)
ES_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements	Non-FTE Requests	Support	Consensus
ES_03 Workforce	FTE - Training and Development Analyst (limited term Training Coordinator)	Support	Consensus
ES_03 Workforce	Non-FTE Requests	Support	Consensus
ES-04 Bureau Culture	Non-FTE Request	Support	Consensus
ES_05 Responsive Business Systems	FTE - Business Systems Analyst (Investigations)	No Recommendation	(3-5)
ES_05 Responsive Business Systems	FTE - Financial Analyst	Support	Majority (8-1)
ES_05 Responsive Business Systems	FTE - Management Analyst (Procurement Assistance)	Support	Majority (6-3)
ES_05 Responsive Business Systems	Non-FTE Request	Support	Consensus
ES_06 Community Relationships	Non-FTE Request	Support	Consensus
ES_06 Community Relationships	Non-FTE Multifamily Assistance	Support	Majority (8-0-1)
ES_07 Leadership in Government	Non-FTE Request	Support	Consensus

\*For items where there was a consensus, all members shared the same view. For items where there was a majority, six or more members shared the same view. Poll tally = (support - not support - undecided).

### *ES\_01 Service Delivery*

BES is requesting eight FTE (one Environmental Technician I, three Environmental Technician II, one Engineering Technician II, one Laboratory Specialist, one Environmental Program Coordinator, one Wastewater Operator II) for current needs related to service delivery.

There was consensus among the member to support five of these positions including:

- Environmental Technician I to augment the Maintenance Inspection Program for stormwater management facilities on private property.
- Environmental Technician II for the Industrial Stormwater program.
- Engineering Technician II for the facilities management team in the Wastewater Group.
- Laboratory Analytical Specialist to do analysis and reporting in the nutrients section of the Water Pollution Control Lab, and
- Wastewater Operator II for the biosolids work in the Wastewater Group

There was also consensus among the member to support one of the Environmental Technician II requested for the Plan Review team and to not support the second requested Environmental Technician II. Plan Review is part of the city-wide development process. These positions are being requested to address a current work load issue. The service delivery goal is to process 90% of permit folders within set timelines. Several factors have resulted in more than 40% of reviews not meeting city or state mandated time goals. BES requested and City Council approved an Environmental Technician I in the FY 2017-18 budget process. That position was filled in September 2017. BES will be use existing resources to hire casual employees this year and has implemented process improvements to help address the backlog. In further conversation between BES and CBO, the bureau stated, given the current staff plan and process improvements, it needs only one of the requested positions this year.

Finally, a majority of members supported the request for an Environmental Program Coordinator for the Spill Protection and Citizen Response program (SPCR). SPCR responds to sanitary sewer overflows, investigates potential violations, and imposes enforcement actions. This position would be dedicated to enforcement actions that have been a lower priority for the group than responses to overflows.

In addition to the requested FTE, there were several non-FTE requests. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.

### *ES\_02 CIP Planning and Delivery Improvements*

BES is requesting 10 FTE (one Supervising Engineer, one Senior Engineer, three Engineers, one Senior Engineering Associate, one Engineering Associate, one Principal Management Analyst, one Business Systems Analyst, and one Industrial Maintenance Millwright) for capital planning

and delivery improvements. As a result of the Capital Improvement Planning Process Review and Enhancement Project (CIP PREP), BES will be implementing bureau-wide organizational changes and restructuring, which is planned for completion by Fall 2018. Emphasis on integrated planning and project management are major components of these changes.

PUB members are supportive of these organizational changes which are required to improve capital output which has been between 20% and 30% under plan for the last several years. As such, there was consensus to support five of the 10 requested positions:

- Senior Engineer for Project Management Stormwater Condition Assessment,
- Business Systems Analyst for Stormwater Condition Assessment, and
- Engineer for Pump Station Project and RR&M Project Management,
- Senior Engineer for Treatment Plant Project Management,
- Principal Management Analyst for Project Cost Estimating and Scheduling.

While three members were supportive of all of the requested positions, several members expressed concern regarding the overall number of staff being requested and BES's ability to onboard those staff while undergoing major organizational change within the bureau. In addition, some members felt that BES could use management techniques to realign existing staff to meet current need and reassess needs once the reorganizational plans are clearer. The members did not have a majority that supported recommending for or against the following positions:

- Engineer for Surface Water Project Management,
- Supervising Engineer for Wastewater Design,
- Engineer for Construction Management,
- Senior Engineering Associate for System Planning and Modeling, and
- Industrial Maintenance Millwright

In addition to the requested FTE, there were several non-FTE requests. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.

### *ES\_03 Workforce Development*

BES is requesting a Training and Development Analyst to create a comprehensive approach for professional development of the engineering, construction, and technical staff within BES. There was consensus among member to support this position though it was noted that while this is requested as a limited-term position, it is a need that could be expected to continue.

#### *ES\_04 Bureau Culture*

BES is requesting \$10,000 for implementation of its Racial Equity Plan. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.

#### *ES\_05 Responsive Business Systems*

BES is requesting three FTE (one Business Systems Analyst, one Financial Analyst, and one Management Analyst) for Responsive Business Systems.

BES is requesting one Business Systems Analyst for the Environmental Investigations Division (EID) in Pollution Prevention. This position is being requested to focus on data deficiencies within EID. Currently, BES has insufficient data management structures and processes which make it difficult to recognize and capitalize on opportunities to use data long-term for needs beyond their original purpose. It was noted that BES recently received authorization for data specialist positions and there were existing vacancies that could be reclassified for this need. The members did not have a majority that supported recommending for or against this position.

BES is requesting one Financial Analyst in the Financial Planning Division to assist with budget development, budget monitoring, responses to finance related inquiries, and the fiscal components of bureau-wide initiatives. A majority of members supported this request.

BES is requesting one Management Analyst in Business Services to streamline bureau work related to contract services. It is envisioned to be single point of contact for BES staff who manage goods, non-professional, and professional construction services. Long procurement processes and contract negotiations were identified as a reason for delayed capital projects. A majority of members supported this request.

In addition to the requested FTE, there was a non-FTE request. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.

#### *ES\_06 Community Relationships*

BES is requesting an adjustment related to its Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County Drainage District. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.

This package also includes \$400,000 towards to the expansion of the financial assistance to residents in multifamily units presented in the WA\_07 decision package. A majority of members support this request.

*ES\_07 Leadership in City Government*

BES is requesting \$20,000 for Disaster Response Team trailers. There was consensus among members generally to support non-FTE requests.