

CC 06-04-21

* #0/#&%7 c b h] b i Y X ·
Study Session Item
, &7 c a a i b] m i
: i b X] b [Grant
Program

Written Comments

CC 06-04-21

#1

Study Session II
FY 21-22 Proposed
Budget

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: Rhoda Fry <fryhouse@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 4:05 PM
To: City Council; Cupertino City Manager's Office; City Clerk
Subject: June 4 City Council Study Session Agenda Item: #1

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council Members,

Regarding June 4 City Council Study Session Agenda Item: #1

I don't think that the City should be spending money on a new City Seal at this time. Given COVID with homelessness, unemployment, hunger, etc... it just seems that doing a vanity project now is tone-deaf. I recommend postponing the City Seal idea until sunnier times, if at all. The current seal is adequate.

Did you know that the City owns the water rights at the Blackberry Farm Golf Course? Former Public Works Director Ralph Qualls was quite adamant about it. But for some reason, the City switched to watering the greens with expensive San Jose Water Company water instead of water onsite. This has caused a massive increase in the cost of operations. Also, one of the items for the Stevens Creek Corridor plan was to fix the water system at the golf course (my recollection was in the \$250K range). This did not happen. The golf course has been getting a lot of renewed interest and it is nice to see people, young and old, getting outside. Meanwhile, I'm flummoxed by pouring \$750K into the swimming pools that don't seem to be getting much use.

Thanks for all of your hard work.

Rhoda Fry

Cyrah Caburian

From: Jean Bedord <Jean@bedord.com>
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 5:07 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Budget study session
Attachments: Bedord Council - 2021-06-04 Budget.pptx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi, Kirsten,
Would you put this up when I speak at the budget session tonight?
Thanks much!

Warm regards,
Jean Bedord

2022 Proposed City Budget



- Jean Bedord
- Cupertino City Council
- June 4, 2021

1

Concerns

- **City Attorney**
 - Budgeted **\$1,943,655**
 - **Three lead attorneys:** city attorney, housing attorney and land use attorney
 - Litigation likely to increase: HCD, Vallco, others on closed sessions
- **Mid and Long Term Planning**
 - Budgeted **\$1,524,188 with only 2.5 FTEs**
 - Reviewing and amending the General Plan, Housing Element, Municipal Code, including Zoning
 - Review compliance with CEQA
 - Special projects, including RHNA and General Plan Updates

Which benefits the residents???? Shouldn't planners be prioritized over lawyers?

2

Cyrah Caburian

From: City of Cupertino Written Correspondence
Subject: FW: Budget Written Communications June 4
Attachments: Budget Review .pdf

From: Kitty Moore <Kmoore@cupertino.org>
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 9:35 PM
To: Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org>
Subject: Budget Written Communications June 4

See Attached for item 1



Kitty Moore

Councilmember
City Council
Kmoore@cupertino.org
(408) 777-1389



Audit Committee
Budget Format Subcommittee
Comments/Questions Regarding the FY 2021-2022 Proposed Budget
June 4, 2021

Audit Subcommittee Chair Daisy Liang comments:

1. Page 35 and 55 of the FY 21-22 Proposed Budget: Please add the Adopted Budget amounts for anywhere the FY18 and FY19 actuals are presented. This will allow a reader to understand where the actuals ended in respect to the amounts budgeted.
2. Page 42: The Non-Personnel Assumptions section discussed one-time special projects. Can we add links throughout the document for repeated information? Can we add one-time special projects as a saved “view” in OpenGov to allow the public to easily access the information?
3. Page 81: The Basis of Budgeting section discusses the budget being split into nine departments. Can the document include a pie chart to show the departments percentages?
4. Page 93: What is the formula to calculate the \$19,000,000 for Economic Uncertainty reserve?
5. Page 138: Can General Fund fund balance be added to the 20-Year General Fund Financial Forecast chart?
6. Page 148: What is “salary savings” as presented in the Five-year General Fund Expenditures Forecast chart?
7. Page 541: Where are the capital projects for FY 21-22 as well as any previously funded projects that have yet to be completed?

Councilmember Moore
May 18, 2021

Format:

1. While Contingencies may not be an appropriate format issue to discuss, I think it should be removed and the reserve in the General Fund be appropriated as needed. The item has not been transparent from its inception in 2013 and looks like a slush fund with the largest share in the City Manager’s budget. The Staff Report to City Council in June of 2013 neglected to mention that a new contingency amount of \$427k was even being appropriated and now the current format for the Budget shows \$3,773 for contingencies for the City Manager on p. 221, yet on p. 245 of the current Proposed Budget, there is \$593,250 appropriated in contingencies. Additionally, the City Manager is given authority to approve their spending on p. 244. This practice, and the whole contingency category, in my opinion, needs to end.
2. I do prefer the staffing tables used by Campbell and Sunnyvale for clarity.

3. I prefer the more detailed accounting which the City did in 2013 and other cities continue to do, referred to as the Account Level Summary.
4. I would like the previous comments from the last Budget Format Review Subcommittee (attached) added along with my comments and Daisy's for next week's City Council Budget Agenda item.

Content:

Proposed Budget is pretty easy to read and follow. Movement of money between funds along with department divisions and tasks moving between departments makes following the changes to department costs difficult to capture. Because some funding increased a great deal in 2020, it would help to have a comparison back to 2019 in some instances (City Manager Contingency, for example, Proposed Budget p. 245)

1. Community outreach improvements to get input regarding the Proposed Budget goals and process.
 - a. Proposed Budget mentions input from the Audit and Fiscal Strategic Plan Committees, however neither has reviewed the Proposed Budget for input. Should these committees receive the Proposed Budget prior to coming to City Council in the future or is this process order better? The Fiscal Strategic Plan Committee is not codified and has no codified duty to review the Proposed Budget.
2. The organizational charts need to reflect the Cupertino Municipal Code (CMC)
 - a. Add date of organizational chart
 - b. Update the online chart
 - c. Update CMC to reflect current organizational structure (e.g. add I.T. Department)
 - d. This should probably not be a work plan item, but an ongoing process of CMC cleanup
3. CMC mentions a potential Public Safety Department should Police and Fire be administered by the City. The City contracts out both. How is the Fire Department paid for?
4. City Manager discretionary spending was \$743 for 2020 yet the 2022 Proposed Budget is \$593,250. Additionally, the Program Overview states that the contingency budget for the City Manager requires the City Manager approval (Proposed Budget p. 244). I would recommend this amount be removed and a policy for oversight be put in place. The City Manager's overall budget has increased from \$786,535 in 2019 (expenditures plus contingencies) to \$2,115,071 proposed for 2022. How is this increase accounted for? Review the City of Cupertino Purchasing Policy (2013) Code Sec. 3.22 and 3.23.
5. Economic Development has switched to a contract service and has more than doubled in cost.
6. Some committees use staff time (which seems to imply they have a budget amount) and are not codified: Economic Development Committee, Disaster Council, Fiscal Strategic Plan Committee. Needs clarification.

7. Multiple projects which are not approved in the City Council Work Plan show up in the Proposed Budget: New Logo, online store. Please remove these items from other headings such as "Contract Services" to a new heading which indicates they are Proposed Work Plan Items and not approved.
8. Communications costs seems to be a separate area, could this be shown as a group?
9. It is unclear how much of the Cultural Events (\$402,137) items will occur, such as the 4th of July celebration. (PB p. 335-336), a similar item, Neighborhood Events (\$163,119) raises the same question (PB p. 350). Total events: \$565,256.
10. Economic Development was \$89,910 for the 2019 actual expenditure and is now proposed at FY 2022 \$337,074 with a new contingency and materials amount of over \$60K with no staffing. Additionally, there is no codified Economic Development Committee which uses staff time. This area needs attention.
11. Please explain the large increase in the BMR affordable housing fund PB p. 393 which shows an increase of revenue from 2019 actual of \$159,179 in taxes to 2022 Proposed Budget taxes of \$3,611,855. There is an allocation of \$600,000 shown for Homelessness and other Special Projects which has not been approved and the City Resolution to support the county Task Force on Homelessness indicated that the City would participate in a county-wide program which the City would likely be asked to contribute financially to.
12. Code Enforcement has increased from \$508,167 in 2019 to \$1,202,392 proposed 2022. PB p. 406.
13. Facilities would be easier to track if grouped together, Facilities and Fleet next to Grounds, for example. Where are Stockmeir, Byrne, Blech?