

For Tomorrow Dec 14 Public Comment Urban Forestry Eric Brooks
From: Eric Brooks
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2012 2:04 PM
To: Fish, Monica
Subject: For Tomorrow Dec 14: Public Comment, Urban Forestry

Dear Commissioners and Council Members,

The status of our San Francisco urban forest health, and urban forest proliferation, is at an all too usual bare minimum at best. We must give far more support to urban forestry.

Please redirect sufficient funding to the Urban Forestry Council to secure the hiring of at least one (and preferably two) low level staff members to assist the council in its work; and please continue to strongly urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to provide far more funding to urban forestry programs overall.

The recent much improved economic projections for the City budget easily allow for this.

Let's make it so.

thank you,

Eric Brooks
Sustainability Chair
San Francisco Green Party

UFC DEC 11, 2012 PLANNING AND FUNDING COMMITTEE COMMENTS

I am Nancy Wuerfel , formerly a member of the Park Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee for 9 years, and a long time advocate for trees and this Council. My schedule has not permitted me to attend your meetings as often as I would like, but I have always kept up with the issues of the Council's funding.

My background is that of a government fiscal analyst , having worked with budgets and city accounting for over 40 years. I have studied the Dept. of Environment's budgets for about 10 years. I come today to alert you to serious errors made by the Department in determining the cost of staff support charged to the Council's budget.

I requested from Mr. Assmann a copy of the next years proposed departmental budget that he presented to the full Commission's Operations Committee Nov 29. I will pass around a copy of his reply that shows expected revenue for the Council of \$51,000 - which is the same amount of funding that you have had for about 4 years so far. It shows that he calculates staff expenses and overhead that exceed \$58,000 , so that your expenses are estimated about \$8,000 more than your income. On analyzing these data, I have discovered errors in determining the hourly rate for staff costs that overcharge your budget because of the following :

1. The formula used to calculate the hourly rate of staff salaries is wrong.
2. Departmental overhead is being charged as part of the hourly rate , when this overhead was NOT authorized to be charged for this year and for next year.
3. The Commission Secretary is not authorized by the Board of Supervisors to staff the Council. They did authorize an environmental assistant for you at 38% of a full time employee.
4. My calculations show that you should be charged about \$37,000 for support services, not the \$58,000 shown by the department, using the same number of estimated hours of staff time. This revised charge is well within your budget.

Historically, you have functioned within the \$51,000 income with adequate staff support. In my opinion, you should not change your meeting times, procedures and modest support needs because of a lack of funding. You have the money, it just needs to be properly accounted for. If the Department is unable to adjust their charges to the Council, I suggest you explore contracting with another agency to provided the very minimal clerical needs you have. I urge you to carefully review all the components of the charges and staff time alleged to be used by the Council before approving these costs. I am glad to help you with these issues. Thank you.

From: Assmann, David <david.assmann@sfgov.org>

To: ~~nancywuertel@nrc.com~~ <nancywuertel@nrc.com>

Nancy Wuertel

Cc: Rodriguez, Guillermo <guillermo.rodriguez@sfgov.org>; Nutter, Melanie <melanie.nutter@sfgov.org>

Subject: RE: Request for budget information

Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2012 4:07 pm

Hi Nancy,

Here is the information you requested. A few words of explanation. First of all, we do not do overhead by percentage – it’s a fixed rate per FTE. Secondly, our hourly charges factor in that you can’t have a person work 100% on a project – you have to account for vacation, sick time, mandatory non-program training and meetings, floating holidays and paid holidays. Our first round of budget preparation shows a projected expense of \$58,831 for Urban Forest Council work, and revenue of \$51,000. If we can’t locate the additional funds, we will have to cut the hours worked on Urban Forest Council work to meet the revenue that we have. Let me know if you have any questions.

David

	Salary	Benefits	Overhead	Total	Hourly*	Hours	Total
Urban Forest Coordinator	\$67,964	\$34,872	\$ 53,497	\$156,333	\$ 97.61	112	\$10,903
Commission Secretary	\$95,654	\$42,753	\$ 53,497	\$191,904	\$119.82	400	\$47,928
							\$58,831
*Based on 77% available							
Vacation	160	8%					
Sick Time	104	5%					
Floating Holidays	32	2%					
Paid Holidays	80	4%					
Admin/Mtgs/Training	104	5%					
Total Non-Project	480						
% Non-Billable	23%						

From: ~~nancywuertel@nrc.com~~ <nancywuertel@nrc.com>

Sent: Friday, November 30, 2012 4:10 PM

To: Assmann, David

Subject: Request for budget information

Nancy Wuertel

Hi David,

I received a copy of the proposed FY 13-14 budget for the Dept. of Environment that was discussed at the operations committee yesterday. I am requesting the details of the expenses of the \$58,834 for the Urban Forestry Council. Please provide the following information for those expenses charged to UFC: