

**UFC Oct. 23, 2012 Meeting Notes -- Agenda Item 5
("Changes to Admin Staff for UFC")**

GENERAL STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD

Submitted by: Rose Hillson

David Assmann's Oct. 2, 2012, 5:17pm email: Reason for elimination of staff support person = "dwindling fiscal support."

1. NUMBERS:

- I have, from the City Controller's Office, information on the DOE "budget forms" which are the basis for the DOE budget.
 - Budget for UFC for Fiscal 2011-2012 = \$51,000
 - Budget for UFC for Fiscal 2012-2013 = \$51,000
 - Budget for UFC for Fiscal 2013-2014 = \$51,000

UFC has the same exact budget for the last 3 fiscal years...\$51,000.

- The budget forms show that UFC gets an income from the following:

○ Airport	\$ 1,000
○ Recreation & Park	\$25,000
○ Public Utilities Comm's'n	<u>\$25,000</u>
TOTAL	\$51,000

UFC has 2 staff support people – the Coordinator and the Council Secretary. For this fiscal year from July 2012 thru Oct 2012 – 4 months – we have had these 2 support people until today.

The UFC account ALLOCATION for salaries = ~ \$36,000 -- overhead and supplies are NOT included for all fiscal years. Materials and supplies for all fiscal years per the budget forms state \$0 (zero dollars). If out of the \$51,000, one subtracts \$36,000, one has \$15,000 left over. I do not think this remaining \$15,000 was used for paperclips.

The salary for both support people -- UFC Council Secretary and the UFC Coordinator -- = ~ \$25,000. Just as last fiscal year, this fiscal year, UFC's support salary is still ~\$25,000.

With the same budget allocation and the same salary, we are suddenly one staff person short just 4 months into this fiscal year. But the UFC budget is supposed to be for 2 staff people as shown in the books. Nothing has changed.

The UFC should be the recipient of the same level of service for the same number of dollars. I question the bookkeeping used to substantiate the number of hours of work for each staff person.

The number of meetings for full UFC, PFC and LTC were as follows:

- Fiscal 2011-2012 = 24 meetings
- Fiscal 2012-2013 = 19 meetings – a reduction of 21% over previous year
- Fiscal 2013-2014 = 6 meetings (excluding today's meeting of full UFC)

If you have more meetings with the same amount of money, you sh/b able to provide staff support for fewer meetings. Instead, we have fewer meetings and with the same money for less staff. The same dollars do not provide the staff for the meetings held. More meetings usually add up to more hours so with fewer meetings, we should have adequate staff money as allocated to support all the meetings.

**UFC Oct. 23, 2012 Meeting Notes -- Agenda Item 5
("Changes to Admins Staff for UFC")**

GENERAL STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD

(continued)

1. NUMBERS (continued)

If, however, one says that the support person does not have enough work to do to support the UFC and is therefore being redirected elsewhere outside of the UFC, the money for that support person should still stay inside of the UFC account and be used for staff support (part-time intern, e.g.) for UFC support. Budget money earmarked for UFC cannot be given to others.

And if the UFC account did not have a budget of \$51,000, what money did it have?

2. LEGAL CODES

The UFC is an advisory body to the DOE. However, it is also advisory to the Dept. of Public Works under Public Works Code Article 16, Section 803(a) as passed in BOS Ordinance 17-06. In order to support urban forestry activities for DPW, both support staff are needed and required. So it is not only a DOE issue.

If some of the budget dollars the UFC gets from the Airport, R&P, PUC goes to DPW, perhaps all those funds should be given to DPW through a request to the BOS since UFC supports them as well.

DOE wishes to eliminate the staff coordinator position which is “essential” for the UFC per

- 1) BOS Ordinance 171-03 in Environment Code Section 1208(b)
- 2) BOS Ordinance 21-01 in Administrative Code, Article 23, Chapter 5, Section 5.238 – “Staffing Support & Responsibilities”

Just 4 months into the fiscal year we are eliminating a staff support person when ALSO in Administrative Code, Article 23, Chapter 5, Section 5.238(a), “The coordinator is essential in order to implement the intent of this legislation.”

There is massive confusion due to the UFC being an advisory body to both DOE and DPW.

Part of the reason for eliminating the staff support position of coordinator was that the UFC gets no revenue from the General Fund. However, the UFC also did not get any fundraising support that I am aware of.

Was any fundraising done by the UFC coordinator since Environment Code Section 1208(a)(1) lists “fundraising” as the first item of responsibility for the coordinator position? Perhaps the coordinator was not allowed to do so.

There should be a BOS hearing on the elimination of this staff support person for the UFC. Most agency-assigned people such as those sitting on the UFC do not have time to do the work of the coordinator. The volunteers may not as well. In addition, volunteers may be less likely to provide the administrative support of a trained City employee staff person who has with the proper resources such as equipment, software, training, familiarity about City procedures, etc.

Conclusion: Based on the budget numbers and the City ordinances, I believe that the UFC should not have the coordinator staff position axed.