

Thomas, Samuel

From: Bruce Agid [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 10:24 PM
To: Sarah Davis
Cc: Sarah Bertram; Thomas, Samuel
Subject: MB TIF AC Meeting - October 12, 2023

EXT

Hi Sarah/Samuel,

As I mentioned in my text to you today, unfortunately I tested positive for Covid and will not be attending tomorrow's meeting. With that said, outlined below are my comments from the pre-read materials provided. Can you please provide my comments to the City Agency representatives and Advisory Committee as appropriate?

Also, hopefully we can chat before tomorrow's meeting as I would like to suggest a process to assist us in streamlining the preparation of our recommendation letter to the Mayor's Budget Office. Somewhat of a similar approach we've used in the past with some nuances.

My comments:

My general comment to all departments, how were the metrics used to inform on proposed budgets. There does not appear to be a correlation between actual/proposed expenditures and quality of services provided. What is provided is the number of resources.

My comments by slide:

Slide 6: Labor mandatory fringe costs lower than projected (can you get clarity that these lower costs plus reasonable escalation will be used going forward)

Slide 9:

-Staff capacity is limited and all Chase deployments are voluntary - resources provided should be based on what is needed to provide event attendee and neighbor safety, not based on how many people volunteer. MTA should go back to determine how to cover any resource shortfalls.

-MTAP only deployed to Warriors games. See comment above regarding what is needed to ensure safety.....

Slide 10: If operating expenditures for 84 events in FY 22-23 were \$3,314, why would the projection for 120 events be \$6,109. Events increase by 43%, and operating expenditures projected to increase by 84%.

Slide 14: Again why the proposed operating expenses carry forward that increase based on 120 events versus 84 in 22-23. Even if the sources are over \$9M, more \$'s should be targeted for Capital Expenditure Payback.

Slide 16: How are the carry over dollars from previous years incorporated into budget recommendations for FY24 and FY26

Slide 18: How do these staffing levels compare to benchmarking and best practices?

Slide 20:

- FY 22-23 actuals indicate costs for 16 playoff games. There were only 6 home games.
- MTA indicated there were 84 events in 22-23, however DPW indicates there are 136 events that drove the actuals for the same year. I understand the difference of planned going forward of 136. MTA does not augment service for small events and DPW is planning for 12.
- For the servicing costs for OCII/MB Parks for 22/23 are ~\$433k, then 23-24 it drops to ~\$257k (why the drop)
- Same section, are these numbers to cover augmented services due to events
- last column FY25-26, why ask for the full amount to cover projected expenditures of \$973,069 when you have a carry over of \$748,676. I would think the budget ask would be \$224,393

Slide 21:

- There is a significant increase in Projected expenditures going forward from Actuals of FY 22-23. I think I understand the increase is to accommodate for the needs of OCII/MB. If so, I would recommend splitting out the two buckets. DPW & OCII/MB

Hope this all makes sense. If you have any questions....please give me a call.

Thanks, Bruce

This message is from outside of the SFMTA email system. Please review the email carefully before responding, clicking links, or opening attachments.