



# Memorandum

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR AND  
CITY COUNCIL

**FROM:** Debra Figone

**SUBJECT:** REPORT ON THE JANUARY  
23, 2010 NEIGHBORHOOD  
ASSOCIATIONS/YOUTH  
COMMISSION PRIORITY  
SETTING SESSION

**DATE:** February 8, 2010

---

## **BACKGROUND**

As referenced in the overview memorandum published on Friday, February 5, 2010 titled "City Council/Senior Staff Study Session: 2010-2011 Budget Planning Update", on Saturday, January 23, more than 80 community members representing San José neighborhood organizations, the City of San José Neighborhoods Commission, and San José Youth Commission attended the Fourth Annual Mayor's Neighborhood Association/Youth Commission Priority-Setting Session.

This memorandum summarizes and transmits notes and observations from the meeting. The information contained in this memorandum will inform the February 16 City Council/Senior Staff Study Session: 2010-2011 Budget Planning Update.

## **ANALYSIS**

The session started with a briefing from Mayor Reed about the 2010-2011 budget shortfall and the Council's intended "1/3, 1/3, 1/3" approach: one-third from employee wage and benefit concessions; one-third from revenues; and one-third from one-time revenues, alternative service delivery proposals and efficiencies in operations (with a request to refrain from using one-time revenues for budget balancing, but instead for one-time needs; and to consider renegotiating existing service contracts to reduce costs). Participants then heard about the pilot Program Prioritization effort and received the preliminary rankings for General Fund funded programs. The Community leaders provided input in four ways:

- Valuing Priority Results: Marketplace Exercise
- Reflecting on Program Prioritization: Small Group Discussions
- Debriefing with the Mayor: Insights to Solve Budget Shortfall
- Written Survey: Ranking Sub-Results of Five Public Priority Results

### Valuing Priority Results: Marketplace Exercise

Meeting attendants were asked to participate in a marketplace exercise and to allocate one dollar's worth of nickels to the City's five Priority Results. The instructions were: *You have \$1 in nickels. How much would you invest toward achieving each Priority Result in 2010-2011?*

The table below identifies the five Priority Results and the relative investment levels as determined through the marketplace exercise.

#### Results of Marketplace Exercise

Priority Result	Relative Investment Level
Safe City	28%
Prosperous Economy	20%
Reliable, Well Maintained Infrastructure	19%
Vibrant, Attractive Community	19%
Green, Sustainable City	15%

In preparation for the February 16 City Council/Senior Staff Study Session, an overview memorandum was published on February 5, 2010. Part of this memorandum describes the major steps of the Administration's Pilot Program Prioritization effort. The input by the neighborhood leaders summarized in this memorandum as well as the results of the Community Budget phone survey of City residents and the online survey of various stakeholders (Mayor and City Council, Neighborhood Commissioners, Senior City Staff, General Fund Structural Deficit Elimination Plan Stakeholder Group, and City Labor Leaders) determined the relative investment levels applied to the five Priority Results in producing the final Program Prioritization ranking. A companion memorandum scheduled for release on Wednesday, February 10, 2010 will summarize the Pilot Program Prioritization ranking.

### Reflecting on Program Prioritization: Small Group Discussions

The representatives also took part in small group discussions to reflect and provide input on the initial Program Prioritization process and initial results. Neighborhoods Commissioners facilitated the discussion around four questions.

1. What is most surprising to you about the initial results of the Program Prioritization?
2. Imagine yourself now on the San José City Council. How would you use Program Prioritization information of this type to make tough budget decisions? (Follow-up: What other information would you need? Is there anything you would clearly do or not do as a result of having the Program Prioritization?)

3. What concerns do you have about how the information from the Program Prioritization exercise might be used?
4. What ideas do you have about different ways this Program Prioritization information could be used?

Attachment A provides a summary of responses from neighborhood leaders to each question. Some common themes include:

- Importance of Mayor/Council listening to neighborhood leaders and community members and being accountable to them
- Understand that City leaders must make choices – that we cannot keep doing all we have been doing
- Like having the list of all programs and appreciate the effort to prioritize, and the transparency around this process
- Interest in volunteer-based and other models to address needs when programs get cut
- See potential duplication and overlap among programs in different Departments
- Concern that they cannot easily see and understand the connections and interdependencies among programs
- Should eventually take into account the cost of the program, its effectiveness at achieving results, and its efficiency (cost/performance)

### **Debrief with the Mayor: Insights to Solve Budget Shortfall**

Participants were offered the following question, *“As we consider the Priority Results and this preliminary program information, what is your single best insight about how to solve the 2010-2011 budget shortfall?”*

Attachment B provides these verbal comments, as well as written answers some participants left on the survey as they departed. Following are some examples of the feedback received:

- **Budgeting:** evaluate long-term costs; consider cost-recovery of programs; do not rely on one-time fixes; evaluate revenue options; and control employee costs
- **Partnerships and the Consolidation/Streamlining of Services:** eliminate duplication of services, increase efficiencies through collaboration and partnership; better use of volunteers; cross-collaboration between departments; look for creative or collaborative solutions for programs that do need to be cut; and consider whether City should be providing service, if there are currently other service providers
- **Benchmarking:** analyze best practices across departments/other cities;
- **Economic Development:** bring in new business to increase revenue for the City; and increase economic development, which will increase the tax base;

### Written Survey: Ranking Sub-Results

At the end of the meeting, for each Priority Result, participants were asked to rank the Sub-Results in order of their importance for the 2010-2011 budget using the attached survey (see Attachment C). Of the approximate 80 participants, 68 participants turned in the survey. The sub-results and the result of the ranking are identified below in bold after each sub-result statement, where #1 signifies the highest ranked sub-result among the survey participants. In cases where more than one sub-result received the same ranking, the next lowest ranking was skipped. For instance for the Priority Result "Safe City", two sub-results received an equal ranking. Therefore, the remaining two sub-results are shown as the fourth and fifth ranked sub-result.

#### Safe City

- Ensures regulatory compliance to protect life, property and the natural environment (#1)
- Facilitates and ensures safe transportation, public spaces, and neighborhoods (#2)
- Investigates crimes and assists with prosecution of offenders (#2)
- Reduces crime through public education, community presence, prevention, early intervention, and smart design (#4)
- Plans for and responds to emergencies and calls for service (#5)

#### Prosperous Economy

- Develops a local workforce and connects it to potential employers (#1)
- Develops and supports community amenities and affordable housing to attract and retain a talented workforce (#2)
- Plans for land use and facilitates/regulates development (#3)
- Drives and promotes economic activity that generates City revenue (#4)
- Provides infrastructure to enable business efficiency and investment (#4)
- Attracts business investment and enables job creation (#6)

#### Reliable, Well-Maintained Infrastructure

- Provides a variety of accessible and convenient transportation systems (#1)
- Develops and maintains safe and reliable public buildings, properties, and infrastructure that support quality City services and a quality community (#2)
- Invests in the City's physical assets to ensure their long term sustainability (#3)

#### Vibrant, Attractive Community

- Celebrates and connects diverse cultures (#1)
- Offers services that promote healthy living and personal development (#2)
- Supports arts, entertainment and sports offerings and attractions (#3)
- Provides opportunities and venues for participation in recreational, learning and cultural activities (#4)
- Promotes and maintains attractive places to live, work and play (#5)

#### Green, Sustainable City

- Promotes and supports resource conservation through leadership, regulation, education, and incentives (#1)
- Minimizes use of natural resources through reuse and recycling (#2)

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

**Subject: Results of Jan. 23 Neighborhood Associations/Youth Commission Priority Setting Session**

DATE: February 8, 2010

Page 5 of 5

- Manages factors, facilities, and programs that mitigate the City's environmental impact on air, land and water quality (#2)
- Plans and designs the City's growth to minimize emissions, energy usage, and other environmental impacts (#4)
- Promotes new technology and business solutions to environmental challenges (#5)

### **Overall Evaluation of the Meeting**

Participants had the opportunity to rate the quality of the meeting on three dimensions: meaningful, well-managed and enjoyable.

- *Meaningful Participation:* 84% were "very satisfied" or "mostly satisfied"; 13% were "satisfied", with 3% "mostly dissatisfied"
- *Well-Managed:* 90% were "very satisfied" or "mostly satisfied"; 9% were "satisfied"; 1% "mostly dissatisfied"
- *Enjoyable:* 83% were "very satisfied" or "mostly satisfied"; 16% were "satisfied"; 1% were "mostly dissatisfied"

Attachment D provides other written feedback from participants about the Priority-Setting Session.

The thoughtful feedback from the participants in the Neighborhood Associations/Youth Commission Priority Setting Session is much appreciated. This feedback as well as continued input from the community will be critical as we move forward in this extremely challenging budget environment.



DEBRA FIGONE  
City Manager

Attachment A: Small Group Discussions: Reflecting on Program Prioritization

Attachment B: Insights and Ideas from Community Leaders about How to Solve the Budget Shortfall

Attachment C: Neighborhood Associations/Youth Commission Priority Setting Session Survey

Attachment D: Other Written Feedback from Community Leaders about the Session

**Small Group Discussions: Reflecting on Program Prioritization**

Budget Priority Setting Session  
January 23, 2010

***1. What is most surprising to you about the initial results of the Program Prioritization?***

- Duplication of services in what different departments do.
- Looking at the list, some of the services from various departments seem interconnected.
- Lacking a clear picture of what the departments do makes it difficult to give them a priority level.
- Since everyone has a different orientation to what they think is important, that in turn will reflect on the level they select.
- How are some of these departmental services going to help the City in the short term, intermediate and long term? That is not clear.
  - Animal adoption, return and rescue should not be a level 4, but on a higher level #1
  - Disaster preparedness #1.
  - Golf should be rated #3 and nutrition #4.
- That there is not a better understanding or a clearer picture of the program(s) being delivered and what is the benefit that is being gained.
- That until recent, there is a lack of transparency of programs and well defined descriptions of programs
- Much surprised that City Mayor and Council did not listen to previous suggestions taken place in earlier meetings. (Group agreed that community meetings are held, however suggestions are not taken to heart – meetings are used to appease the community)
- Youth organizations have been identified as a low priority and categorized as a level 4 priority considering all the issues impacting the youth, i.e., education, gang presence, truancy.
- The youth voice is not being heard nor taken seriously amongst city officials
- That certain programs were identified as level 3 and level 4 priorities
- The city did not clearly define what it means to be categorized as a level 3 or 4 – are these programs going to be cut?
- That discovered efficiencies in level 1 & 2 priorities can't generate sufficient funding to save much need programs in levels 3 & 4.
- The lack of communication and collaboration amongst various departments and there delivery of similar programs: government waste
- No real surprise - this is just the reality - City does not have \$\$ to do what is needed - must make choices
- No inclusion of social services; however, it was stated that most social service types of programs show up in the Housing Department budget (and is not part of the General Fund)
- Immensity of the situation - so many programs at risk
- Economic development is core/key/very important
- Level 2 - Economic Development Economic strategic, Policy and Analysis must be moved to Level 1
- Research the economic development model of the City of Santa Clara as a role model which takes into account revenue projections required
- Assign dollars to programs (versus the Orange Book) - This could lead to better understanding of general fund allocations and what it takes to run/operate programs
- PRNS Safe Schools should be elevated to a higher priority (versus Level 4)
- Worth focusing \$\$ on education programs that relate to prevention like Safe Schools
- Surprised by Arts/Festival Grants at Level 2 - refocus to lower priority, ie, a Level 3
- Must define "who we are" as a City to then get to the details of prioritization

## ATTACHMENT A

- That the City pays for Arena repairs and Convention Center repairs. The Arena and Convention Center should pay for its own repairs. The Airport should also pay for its own repairs and maintenance.
- Staff informed this resident that money for the Airport is segmented from the General Fund.
- Police Metro Unit is in Level 2 as opposed to Level 1 – it should be in Level 1.
- Sheer number of programs that the City provides. It is interesting to see that relationships between programs that you would think would be together do not actually exist.
- The multiple housing loan program and the National Environmental Policy Act are listed as Level 1 –why?
- Fire and Medical is on Level 2, but should be in Level 1.
- Disaster Preparedness is on Level 1, yet neighborhood trainings for disaster preparedness are not on the same level as disaster preparedness for staff.
- Surprised and pleased to see that CEQA is Level 1.
- Surprised at the number of services listed. Housing, jobs, environmental, and safety are all vital.
- There are duplicate programs between the departments (ex: SJPD anti-graffiti and PRNS anti-graffiti).
- Surprised to see police items in level 4, crime prevention. Aren't they of any value?
- Methodology is skewed. Each program has some objective, history. It's better to say how they are achieving objectives, need more analysis on objective.
- We should eliminate/combine programs. The groupings are badly constructed.
- Level 1 & level 4 priorities are not consistent like gang preventions is level 1 and Washington Area is level 4. They both focus on gang prevention but are on different levels.
- Level 4 lists more activities like sports and arts activities which gives the impression that these programs are lower priority to the City of San José.
- Seems like the city is looking to cut programs that are lower costs and keep programs that are higher costs.
- Public is not involved in review process.
- Part of design and implementation doesn't include review to improve process.
- We shouldn't only do this in crisis mode but as a standard review process of city programs yearly.
- Expected more dramatic higher or lower levels.
- Did appear that vibrant city was lower.
- Safe city a little higher-makes sense because of public safety concerns.
- No real surprises.
- One participant was completely new to the process of community involvement. Was here to learn. Did not have a lot to contribute.
- Hard to judge the vases. Has difficulty with spatial judging-so exercise no use to her.
- Confused about categories-consider Parks and Rec infrastructure.
- Need to know how items relate to other programs. Ex. Level 3 DOT Sustainability – what would be impacted?
- Surprising that all PBCE are Level 1 (except for one).
- Level 1 – Economic development Outdoor events and Parades, looks like duplication.
- Multiple Housing Loan Program should be Level 1.
- Public Safety and Code Enforcement are strong because of community participation. Programs with community involvement are listed as low priority.
- Crime prevention as a low priority.
- Homicide – Level 2 program expected to be much higher.
- Disappointed Art & Education in Level 2.
- Some concerns:
  - monetary association on how this was leveled
  - policing could be increased in public areas
  - how the levels were set-up

## ATTACHMENT A

- Everything impacts each other.
- Prioritizing the way it is might affect budget ineffectively.
- #2 programs that bring revenue:
  - outdoor events: festival during the summer, Christmas in the Park, Cirque du Soleil, etc, bring people from the outside which it turn, brings in revenue.
- Not surprised but it doesn't mean something is not important.
- Some things should be in different levels, for example Cinco de Mayo celebration and other events cost the City a lot of money, and other don't.
- It's shocking! Kids with too much time in their hands. Parents are not involved, etc.
- Each department needs to cut fat, auto-audit.
- Add something very specific – Infrastructure: for example, Department of Transportation process to install a Stop Sign, costs too much money. The City flushed money down the drain.
- Neighborhoods Commissioners need to really look at how the City is run, how to be budget wise.
- Are we helping to determine the budget or going the wrong way?
- Challenges working with Department of Transportation.
- Like the fact that it was broken down into divisions.
- Surprised to see nothing that is a revenue maker.
- Since there was no dollar amount associated with each item, it's difficult to priorities. We don't know how the money is being spent.
- Surprised to see so many programs – do any of them over lap? Example - Is anti-graffiti in different categories?
- Pleased to see the logical progression and every tier seem to be balanced. So everyone will feel the pain.
- The first three level programs seem to be reactive program and the people programs are at the bottom. This causes some concern and we feel dismayed.
- Neighborhood support could be better identified and be moved up in importance.
- Categories hit the nail on the head. Positively surprised.
- Pleased to see that due diligence has been done and staff has really prepared for this.
- Pleased about the openness to involve the community early in the process.
- Thrilled that commissioners be part of the process.
- Liked that information was posted and community was invited to comment directly.
- Level 1 services are critical and necessary.
- Some programs should not be in the level that they are in (example: neighborhood clean-ups should be volunteer opportunities).
- Overwhelmed by the number of items.
- It was surprising to see some economic development items under level 4 while others where level 1. Why?
- The information did not look at departments or items that cost money, some are a higher level while others are a lower level, but should be the same.
- Some items should state if they are or have the potential to be cost recovery.
- Not surprised, but interesting.
- Interested in knowing more about level 4 because they are close to getting cut.
- Wants to know the total costs represented in each level.
- Level 1 items are expected, but why level 4 items.
- What are the available opportunities for people to volunteer to take on a program that is cut?
- Concern to see senior and youth centers/program in level 4. They are critical to keeping neighborhoods safe and friendly for everyone.
- Concerned with non-profits taking over programming because they do not listen to the needs of the community.
- Need to format the dictionary so that it can be read on a computer monitor (is it in a PDF format?).

- Having a neighborhood center open, without any programming does not make sense.
- Programs should be linked to each of the 5 main service priorities to better understand the programs and priorities.
  1. Tie program to priority
  2. Break out the cost recovery programs
  3. What is the total cost of each level? What does it add up to?

**2. *Imagine yourself now on the San José City Council. How would you use Program Prioritization information of this type to make tough budget decisions?***

- Prioritize the work; what is necessary (benefit analysis).
- Opportunities for volunteer work with the City (civic engagement).
- Looking at broader perspectives using items in multiple ways (creativity).
- Maintaining and enhancing criteria in all programs (quality improvement).
- General Funds and programs (cost analysis).
- Allows for a high-level discussion to understand and define the value-add of each program.
- Allows for the community to communicate to the council what the community wants and use this exercise as an indicator to meet those wants.
- To look at the bigger picture and forecast what programs really need to be cut and push for smart programs that actually work regardless of position or status amongst the priority tiering columns.
- Look for duplication of programs: Can we consolidate our efforts?
- Target areas there truly need resources and filter those resources to those areas.
- City Mayor and Council shall not go through the motions and appease the community, but actually listen to the community.
- The City, Mayor and Council need to have a follow-up meeting after the budget is adopted to verify if they listened to the community's wants and recommendations.
- Listen to neighborhoods – all government is local
- Jobs, Transportation are key priorities.
- Work backwards – look at level 4 programs as a start and start eliminating for programs that are not essential to City's core mission.
- Take all opinions into account.
- Figure out impact of each and every program before making final decisions.
- Determine short-term and long-term impacts of keeping and/or eliminating each/every program.
- Do financial analysis and ratio of cost to impact - weigh this information into the equation.
- Don't drop programs valued into the long-term.
- Look at consolidation strategies and cost savings of programs.
- Rank Safe Schools and Economic Development at higher levels/higher priorities.
- Assign dollar values and impacts to each program.
- Program consolidation (ex: anti-graffiti).
- Departments should step up and get out of their "bunkering down" mentality and should be rewarded for coming together.
- The City Council should raise taxes in those areas with high crime, since those areas use more resources (raise property taxes, create a surtax to pay for police). (Note: other members at this table opposed this idea.)
- Establish higher fines for Code Enforcement violations. Stop giving warnings and start affecting pocketbooks.
- The information becomes one of our tools and gives us a way to ask questions and a starting point to where to begin with questions.
- The information lets us see where the City can be more efficient (we see which departments are duplicating efforts).

## ATTACHMENT A

- Some questions that arise from the information: How many of the programs generate fines? Are these programs cost recovery?
- This is an inside out ranking. It would be useful to get an outside in ranking.
- I would look at 3 things. One, what is the cost recovery or impact on general fund? Two, what is the effectiveness of program? Three, what is the level of nexus of funding or duplication of the program?
- Discussions should be to measure programs.
- Should not fund programs that do not have clear objective. There should be an opportunity for recovery costs of the programs.
- Priorities of the programs should not be competitive between departments.
- I would not use this process, it is not assistive to the objectives we are trying to achieve.
- Why is “safe city” a priority while the less costly “neighborhood watch” is not a priority?
- The most important thing is to attach a dollar amount to each program as opposed by prioritization level.
- Identification of programs is important. Some programs might be funded based on usage but people might not be aware of the programs.
- We’re not provided enough information to decide importance of programs.
- The more the community understands, the easier it is for city council.
- We need to know what goal is of each program. What are they doing to get there?
- Does the financial component meet the needs of the programs?
- Do these programs provide the need?
- City Web-site has too much non-organized information.
- Need to have, have to have, hope to have (priority listing helps to put in perspective).
- Program Dictionary very helpful.
- Issue of volunteers available, but no one at the City of San José to coordinate-prioritization could help to focus this effort.
- Some Level 4 priorities are valid/ necessary.
- Arts Education for schools-Is it really the City’s job to fill this in for the school districts.
- City’s re-use policy a good partnership model.
- Duplication of services-e.g. of City of San José doing spaying and neutering. Doesn’t the SPCA do this?
- Perhaps use volunteers for celebration of the Cambodian New Year.
- Safe School Campus Initiative vs. graffiti abatement. Initiative is at Level 4 and graffiti is at Level 1. Initiative is preventive versus graffiti, which is reactive. The city may eliminate a program that is preventative in nature.
- Put dollars to each program first and then look at duplication across the organization – get rid of duplicates.
- Performance measures that compare San José to other cities and nation.
- Long term effects of eliminating, reducing programs. Especially crime prevention and gang prevention programs, street maintenance.
- San José has never defined Essential City Services. SJPD, Fire, Streets are essential but also look at other programs. Each department should do it for their programs.
- If you don’t understand what is in the program, you don’t understand the long term effects.
- Digest all the information.
- Ramifications of retirement of police officer. Who is going to replace employees? Will not attract qualified people. Will be the only City that makes less in retirement.
- Additional information needed to clarify your decision:
  - How do we compare to other cities in our area
  - Are we going to be able to recruit and maintain the level of service
- Survey in website in District; anonymous, break down by questions. In Town hall meeting might not be the way to go.

- A lot of level 4 areas might not have many ramifications.
- When taking care of things at a low level, then it takes care of things at a higher level.
- Community Policing, first offenders then if you take care of it, it would benefit later.
- Concerned about all the major interactions that affect all of it.
- How many people are impacted by the change and how each prioritization will be reassessed?  
Reconsider the ranking.
- Two approaches to get more information:
  - Need comparative information to address validity and reality
  - On-line survey – allows everyone to be heard
- Will take two weeks to absorb the dictionary.
- Make considerations for programs that help people the most.
- What could be done to balance the under-served communities – so they are elevated in importance.
- Question: How much money is already invested in the existing programs?
- Changes need to be made.
- Listen to community to help set priorities.
- What does the community want and need.
- Review the categories/list to see what programs have been successful and identify which generate revenue.
- Ask yourself if we are on the right track.
- Check programs more fully to see if they are placed in the appropriate category/level.
- How do programs affect the different areas?
- Would like to see an effort made to save as many jobs as possible.
- The more jobs that are cut, I feel is self defeating.
- How can we save City jobs?
- If you do a broad cut across all programs, you end up with misdirected priorities that don't make sense (ex. Opened centers and no programming).
- Everyone should evaluate and prioritize their programs and give them a target so that everyone is treated fairly.
- City needs to identify priorities and support them to the fullest rather than take away a bit from all of them because you will eventually end up with ineffective programs that don't serve anyone
- Look at alternative ways to fund lower priorities (level 4).
- Look at low cost/non-monetary solutions that have a minimal impact on general fund. What policies do we need to put in place to allow for non-monetary solutions? Council to look at it by program and cost.
- Every neighborhood and council district has different priorities.
- Place the cost of each program to understand if "I'm getting the biggest bang for my buck."
- Need both qualitative and quantitative information to make decisions.

**3. *What concerns do you have about how the information from the Program Prioritization exercise might be used?***

- It will be overlapping community feedback on financial choices.
- Criteria with specific areas were not completely descriptive enough to make educated decisions.
- Won't be able to visualize duplicate services.
- Expenditures of general fund on what services and how much.
- Performance measurements should be taken into account.
- That priorities 1 & 2 will receive too much positive attention, become too big and become complacent.
- Great concern that programs in priority 3 & 4 will drop off the radar and receive less funding and consequently be dismantled.

## ATTACHMENT A

- Are we just looking at a simple wish-list of programs or are we going to be focusing on efficiencies amongst the delivery of programs.
- Concerns how the priority list is going to be altered post today's meeting.
- It would have been nice to receive handouts ahead of time so that voices at the table could represent more than just the "rep" but the voices of the association members.
- Don't have 2 key neighborhood meetings on the same day.
- Hope City Council listens – use this opportunity to present key concerns of neighborhoods.
- Concerns that Level 4 programs will be automatically be eliminated.
- Determine how this info can boil down to something useful/pragmatic for decision-making
- That Level 4 programs might be viewed differently.
- When you start ranking something, it creates shortcuts for expediency. Two more dimensions need to be added to this information – cost and customer value. Any actions taken without considering these two extra dimensions is risky.
- Some of the rankings are in the wrong place (ex: SJPD Internal Affairs is in Level 4).
- Departments are bunkered down because of the budget. They need to break out of this mentality. The City should work more like a business and should be more interconnected. Departments often don't know what another department is doing. Employees and staff should be educated on programs outside of their department.
- This information could be taken out of context, and used on a superficial level (ex: media saying that the City has ranked its programs).
- Concern that this is a one-time deal, and that it won't be an ongoing conversation.
- There should be a longer session that incorporates discussion about other pots of funding.
- Longer term solutions are needed as opposed to band-aid mode (ex: tree maintenance).
- You must consider the "ripple effect" of the budget actions that are taken.
- Concern that if there are new projects (such as the Oakland A's) that begin and fail, that the General Fund will be affected.
- The methodology we are using will not achieve the proper results.
- This is only step one.
- When looking at metrics, there are different measures of metrics, financial, etc. Multi dimensional.
- Would be extremely interested why items ended in level 4. Is the perceived need disconnected from actual need?
- Why aren't museums ranked higher?
- Why level 1 programs feel they are the strength or priority for the city?
- How do you rank police, economic development, and arts?
- How is this going to be used in cutting budget in each department?
- Is there a standard of best practices across departments? Program evaluation?
- Focus too narrow. Why 1 year? Why not look at 3 years?
- Example of San José Family Camp-yes, it is cost recovery based. But someone has to administer.
- What about overall duplication of effort. Is anyone addressing this issue? (example of the Mayor's Gang and Budget meetings being the same day.)
- What other sources can provide some of what the city offers in services?
- Need to examine city programs every year, with the goal being to continually trim programs no longer needed.
- Decisions will be financially motivated. Were programs ranked by financial impacts?
- Most people being surveyed are not informed about programs and issues – people are not aware of the crimes that aren't investigated or deferred maintenance.
- Budgeting for performance levels. If you don't want crime levels to pass a certain level, budget for the necessary programs to keep crime in check.
- What if the program is adequately funded but the program is not efficient? The city should set performance levels.

## ATTACHMENT A

- There is not enough information to do this exercise properly and prioritize properly – decision makers will be given bad information.
- We are being asked to value programs without the right information.
- This is just for show and feedback won't be taken into consideration – will not be heard.
- Missing understanding of the cost drivers of programs. What drives program costs up?
- What is the personnel for Level 1 vs. personnel for level 4 and performance measures?
- This is a good start to establishing priorities and performance measures.
- Need more prep-time. Is tough to go through all the documents and make decisions that affect people.
- Coming to this meeting with not much information and we are representing our residents.
- This is a very positive approach.
- Fall of 2010 in order to prepare for next budget priority setting session
  - Directive from Council member to put their ideas, information in the agenda at the Neighborhood level
  - Representative should be aided on how to be an advocate
- Just because is level 1 or 4 doesn't mean they are going to go away. Is important that if it is a level 4 and we like it, then bring it to Council so we can bring it to a higher level.
- It is important for Council to know what residents want.
- Leader support at the neighborhood level. How to be leaders.
- Lack of sharing of information.
- Maybe people think their voices are not going to be heard.
- This year event is a waste. We need to have an on-going meeting more than once. Maybe 3 times a year.
- Have benchmarks, goals, a process.
- Feedback!!
- People might be apathetic about this type of ranking.
- Sometimes Councilmembers do not know about a specific program happening in their district or citywide.
- Some of us work and meeting like this is unreasonable. Budget meetings need to be accessible to all residents.
- Availability of budget meetings at more reasonable time.
- We are in a very difficult budget time and we have a problem fixing it, but even in better times, we need to keep this conversation going.
- Cuts are more important than increase taxes.
- We will be able to add programs later. Taxes will be harder in people.
- Efficiency, crossover on how to communicate to others.
- Government will have more information than does the community.
- Community leaders need to express to Council members and the Mayor what their concerns and issues are.
- Information needs to be streamlined and not duplicated.
- Scared that information will be used to eliminate jobs rather use information to save jobs.
- Use information to create more with green jobs.
- Information used as a starting point, need more information to consider further cuts.
- City staff might bias information to get the results they want.
- Do not make the programs "special interests".
- Not all neighborhoods are equal; some programs are important to one district while in another they are not. The decisions need to be looked at citywide and not made on what one council district wants or does not want.
- It helps to have an independent auditor look at all the programs and evaluate them.
- The auditor's evaluation and results may help to unbiased the information the council receives to make accurate decisions.

- What other options exist to monitor these programs.
- Move programs to special funds.
- Reduce (Council and department heads) concerns about risk, and open up decisions for creativity. .... "Allow for risk".

**4. *What ideas do you have about different ways this Program Prioritization information could be used?***

- Strategically Sustainable Models:
  1. Arts program during the school year and then have the Arts program at the Parks & Recreation during the summer months.
  2. College Students work on communication project through their school and their City Representative in designing a stream-line model of communication for San José residents to reach the correct department with ease and that is user-friendly.
  3. Community Policing with I-Pod. Currently Pete Constant Councilmember and a college student are working on it. It would stream-line the police department.
- Make relative cuts in programs
  1. 10% in level 1
  2. 20% in level 2
  3. 30% in level 3
  4. 40% in level 4
- The biggest expense is in Public Safety; take some of that money away and put it away for extra programs.
- Mayor, council and city manager need to use this feedback and information to achieve efficiencies.
- Need to refine the process and redefine the ranking process.
- Previous meetings tend to be lots of talk with little action and follow-through. The public needs to be aware of all our programs and be allowed to provide input.
- Rank programs by efficiency and productivity.
- Ask tough questions such as: What does each program deliver? What are the business processes and how do we make them better?
- Transparency needs to be used more when conducting business.
- If the current process is going to be long-term; then how do we get to see the evolution of each program and department? Are we going to see the effectiveness of each program to see what works and what doesn't work?
- Community needs to be included when setting the priority process.
- Mayor and Council need to hold a similar session after the budget is adopted to ensure that the community's feedback was accounted for.
- Be clear about terminologies and definitions so that everyone understands program significance.
- Look at cost recovery column - factor this info into analysis for sustainability purposes.
- Use neighborhood associations as volunteer crews where services will be lost.
- Think through alternative services to those city services lost.
- Recognize insights of community leaders forum and ultimate non-special interest groups are in this room.
- Be clear about how many phases of reviews before final decisions are determined.
- Prioritize scores and how these will contribute to City Council process.
- Need info ahead of time – tough job.
- List by program, cost and by department – identify overlaps.
- Give this input back to City Staff and City Council.
- Combine and consolidate programs for greater impact and efficiencies.
- Run city like a business (certain aspects).

## ATTACHMENT A

- Streamline the process.
- Address the pensions as a huge liability to the City.
- City staff should go after more funding from other sources of funding.
- Questions to ask: What is the cost to the City? What other sources of funding are available?
- Have an ongoing process, a continuing dialogue to see the big picture.
- Reach out to more people (through the NACs, etc) to make people more aware of the level of detail of discussion and that there is this process happening. Engage more people and foster community involvement.
- Use I.T. to put this information online to have an ongoing measurement from the public.
- Setting benchmarks for goals.
- We should know what programs make a safe city.
- If something doesn't contribute then put aside till we get more money.
- We want our money to be used effectively.
- Create social metrics which have important impacts.
- What effects will result from a program that is cut?
- Does someone else provide the same services of the program that was cut?
- We're doing a lot of people shifting in government. Just because someone has seniority they are kept but that may not be effective and could cost more in the long run.
- Main thing is nexus, being more effective by combining duplication.
- Mentality of spending money or it won't be replenished next year needs to be eliminated from departmental ideology. They need to realize it's not their money and they should look for ways to save the city money, not spending it.
- Combine departments or programs to collectively get more money.
- Create a different culture including thinking outside the box.
- Is there a way volunteers can be more involved?
- We should be looking at programs that only costs \$1 but get \$1,000 ROI for example the senior program as opposed to other costly programs that do not give as much value in return.
- The info/exercise can be used for communication/outreach to engage residents.
- At the end of the day, does all this really make a difference?-feel powerless.
- Perhaps put more narrative into the program description to help the public better understand
- It's about what people want, not what they will give up.
- It's about the demographics of the neighborhood-where there are higher income levels; you will get better maintenance, etc.
- Need more bottom up solutions.
- The listings do give people a choice/guidance.
- Maybe the listings should not include cost-recovery programs; these already pay for themselves.
- What we can cut to address the deficit should be the core of the listing, not everything.
- What about addressing the special projects that individual council members create and ask the city to support.
- Eliminate duplication.
- If they are not in place – performance evaluation.
- Performance measures are there but are they the right ones? How are they used?
- Information should be included in district budget meetings. Budget meetings last year were a bad experience.
- City Council can't make certain changes due to labor contracts.
- Avoid losing personnel – lose through attrition. There is already not enough staff and you don't want to start losing good staff because of declining work conditions.
- Compare local cities and other large CA cities to San José for personnel costs, efficiencies, etc.
- City should not be giving overtime.
- Pensions are so high because of the desire to compete – likewise for salaries and working conditions.

## ATTACHMENT A

- Driving goals and objectives into the organization.
- Should be able to draw a map and show how each employee affects programs and outcomes.
- Get experienced people on board vs. consultant that get programs implemented.
- Where is Alviso on the list?
- Residents have to trust the City.
- City has grown so quickly that there is a lot of catching up to do.
- Government salaries never go down – true 0 is shocking.
- Staff should be compensated for performance.
- Utilize current staff to generate revenue – parking control to note code issues.
- Jobs and businesses are 58 % of the city revenue, can't drive them out – they are the revenue
- Determine how much non-governmental spending adds up to and take a hard look at each program/service.
- Incentivized efficiency suggestion box for city staff.
- Too much information to be absorbed here. Who has the time to review the whole document
- Last year was much better than this years' workshop. Felt that we accomplish something. This year's exercise does not have the same impact.
- Some area I support, such as Libraries, PRNS, but I don't support others, such as youth centers.
- Can we get information ahead of time? Another way to share information and to get feedback.
- How to prepare for this meeting if I don't get information on time and with enough time – 2 weeks ahead of time.
- I don't know how this information is going to be used. No one told me what are they going to do with it.
- Is this information too much? Where do we get it?
- Can you do across the border budget cut? Some of us have seen it done in our neighborhood already.
- Trying to get to a decision such as is it time to close a specific building: Mexican Heritage Plaza, Hayes Mansion, etc.
- We don't know much how much the City pays in lawsuits.
- Mitigation in any of the issues. If handle at low levels, then saves lots of money
- Prevention in duplication services.
- Level 4 programs are full of people programs – If they go away, social services go down and we will be in deep trouble.
- The poorest community members will be the first affected if the social services programs are eliminated.
- Programs may be cut but effort needs to be made in cutting cost and something needs to be done in order to generate revenue.
- Social services should not be at the bottom of the list.
- Community needs to give guidance to Council members and Mayor before decisions are made.
- Government officials need to keep in mind the pyramid effect that could happen in social services are greatly reduced.
- Is there a new process that can be put in place to prevent what is now happening?
- Policy change is greatly needed since governmental red tape sometimes prevents progress.
- Government needs to make things easier so things can be achieved.
- Concentrating on bringing new businesses to the city is needed to increase revenue.
- We need to know the number of jobs that are associated with each program in order to support them and reduce job loss. We need to know which programs have excess and which programs are less effective.
- Hope no senior programs are cut.
- Use information to better understand the value of social programs and their greater impact rather than get confused by the information.
- More outreach needs to be given out to community members.

## ATTACHMENT A

- There is a lot of overlapping programs. Basically different departments are doing the same thing. Consolidate teams to make sure one group is doing that thing only. Efficiency.
- Use information that is currently given in future budgets.
- Why don't we set caps? Even in good times we don't need to cut then having to cut when times are bad.
- Pension Funds – City should look into a better way to administer pensions ... like Prudential.
- I like the fact the information lets us know where the money is going. At least we know what we're dealing with. I really like the transparency.
- Keep in mind the burnout factor with neighborhood leaders/volunteers.
- City needs to be creative in how they achieve things.
- Information can enlighten government officials on what services can be done by others like non-profits or third parties, so services can still be given.
- We need to know the dollar amount for employees associated with each program.
- SNI program – we need to rethink how this program is funded because it's very important.
- Neighborhoods need to have a hard copy the City Department Council Appointee Programs 2010-2011 Base Budget Department Program Dictionary so people can become better informed.
- Keeping community members up to date is very important.
- Level 4 programs are more a preventative measure, which helps in the long term and thus should be more emphasized.
- The process of evaluating every program should be applied every year, even in good budget years.
- Every year use information to review success of a department's programs and put discipline in department (incentives) to help bring attention to issues.
- Include metrics to identify effectiveness of programs, even in good years.
- Start an energy purchasing program.
- Departments should stop spending resources simply because they have to give it back to the general fund, spend on what is necessary, not because you have to.
- Use program based budgeting so you apply money to programs that are most effective and not eliminate the ones that are performing.
- Need to justify even the programs that are being successful, rather than assuming that the program/department will automatically get funding.

**Insights and Ideas from Community Leaders about How to Solve the Budget Shortfall**

**Question:** What is your single best insight or idea about how to solve the 2010/2011 budget shortfall?

*The ideas captured below were expressed verbally at the session.*

**Budgeting**

- Look at the participation of the citizens that use services before they are cut.
- Protect City jobs - as those are the people that spend money that leads to revenue.
- Look at cost recovery of services.
- Analyze each program by the performance of their objectives and the priority.
- Do not take "one-time fixes" and think that's the solution.
- Look at the cost over long-term cuts we make this year and ask what it may cost reinstate these cuts once the economic situation becomes better.
- Budget to the expected or prioritize performance standards.

**Partnerships and the Consolidation/Streamlining of Programs**

- Duplication of services with non-profits and City departments.
- Efficiency throughout all levels, collaboration and partnerships.
- Encourage the best cross-pollination of all departments where there is no duplication, and learn from each other to become more efficient.
- We need creative or collaborative solutions for those programs that do need to be cut. Are there other options or ways that they can be provided without the City's involvement?
- Cross collaboration, using one program to enhance the other.
- Engage the youth to get us up to speed on technology.
- Accept a higher level of risk to do more innovative "things" with programs.
- Look at the processes of how we fulfill the programs we have and be open to paradigm shifts ways of thinking.
- Better use of volunteers.

**Benchmarking**

- Look at best practices across departments and/or departments in other cities so that no one is reinventing the wheel.
- Evaluate if a program is offered by the county and state – if there is duplication outside the city.

**Economic Development**

- Bring in new business to increase revenue for the City.
- Increase economic development, which will increase the tax base.

**Question:** Please provide any additional input on how to solve the 2010-2011 budget shortfall.

*The ideas captured below were submitting in writing as part of the survey.*

- Eliminate HNMF and move tobacco settlement money to General Fund.  
Reduce grants to non-profit organizations in order to fund City-provided services.
- Promote and encourage increased efficiency, especially inter-agency cooperation in all City departments.

## ATTACHMENT B

- Consolidation and more meetings of neighborhood members relating to budget and operations.
- Eliminate redundancies.
- Based on priority, look at the cost of a program vs. benefit.
- Is it better cut/reduce big programs or combine smaller programs that may have similar goals
- Be open to all revenue sources:
  - 1) Taxing/Business License for medical marijuana dispensaries
  - 2) Stop giving away the tobacco tax money!! Put it into the General Fund.
  - 3) Push Unions – Police/Fire for increased concessions.
- Think lean. Create and sustain viable City employee incentive plan; they are the best sources as they see the fat, know how to streamline, and what program/dept. is underperforming or duplication.
- Identify programs that dovetail and target the same or similar subsets of the community. Identify cost recovery as it relates to the General Fund portions of each program.
- Volunteering time could help cover areas in the City. Those volunteers could use a tax break. Perhaps a tax break after a specific number of hours volunteered.
- Uses all resources widely researched.
- How effective is the City's Liaison with Congress/Senate in obtaining stimulus and other funding?
- Neighborhood Support should be included in General Fund. Duplicate services (Dept-Dept.; non-profit - Dept) City employees need to be retrained!
- Bring more business to San José.
- Vacant Building Tax – promotes landowners to bring in new businesses which will generate revenue to cover the blight created by these buildings.
- Economic Development - Reduce process redundancy, more business taxes, more volunteer work, no job reduction.
- Management by Objectives and Results.
- Cut programs that are being covered by others such as spay/neuter clinic. Ask yourselves on each program "Who else could /is providing this?" Some programs should not be funded by cities.
- Get employee costs under control.
- Cross collaboration between City departments and neighborhoods to increase efficiency through advancements in technology. Use what works and invest in the future generation and be open to new ideas.
- This was the first step.
- Re-structure Departments, so duplication is eliminated. Get on with controlling pension and health costs, or everything else is just an ongoing exercise.
- Focus on employee costs and get wages, benefits and pension costs in line with the private sector.
- Develop and publish performance metrics and standards.
- Bring accountability to services/agencies and departments that provide the same service in order to maximize efficiencies and lower associated costs.
- Allow groups to come up with alternative programs to minimize the impact to the general plan. One example: Neighborhood Watch
- Consolidate and eliminate redundancies where multiple “groups” are doing the same things.
- Increase taxes in some areas.
- Ramifications not tied to information needed.
- Address ongoing structural budget issues (revenue not meeting increasing costs) So that we don't need to have a yearly discussion on cuts to programs and services.
- Try not to cut things permanently unless duplicative. Save City jobs. Need to focus on revenue; short term use of extra funds to get us through this year.
- Increase efficiency of programs by using for profit business models.

## ATTACHMENT B

- Develop benchmarks. Consolidate service delivery. Provide more opportunity for public participation (e.g. Safe City depends on well trained residents i.e. disaster prep, neighborhood watch). This will attract business.
- I think you should correlate the priority levels to San José City core results and then rate their efficiency based on those outcomes before cutting programs.
- Volunteer driven resources (i.e. libraries only really need one paid staff person with multitude of responsible volunteers, w/tiered system?).
- Cut all Level 1 programs by 10%, all level 2 by 15%, all level 3 by 20%, all level 4 by 25%. Immediate hiring freeze and increase sales tax by 1/2 %.
- Prioritization is key so the program review is great. For programs eliminated, are there other options for them to be picked up?
- Have a follow-up session with this same group immediately after adoption of budget.
- The move toward program-based budgeting will be a very useful tool as we move forward, including when we have good budget years.
- Look at those areas in San José that cost the City extra money and tax or fee them. (i.e. San José night clubs/police costs; high crime neighborhoods should have an additional tax or fee to cover police costs.).
- Encourage volunteerism.
- Protect City jobs and non-city jobs.
- Run the city like a business and good Managers in each department - Learn from each other how to keep costs down in each department.
- We need to create a new paradigm where we think outside the box, are open to change and create public metrics to measure the delivered effect of each program and how it contributes to the overall goals of service delivery.
- Cost recovery between departments and programs, long-term investment of each program, reduce duplicative efforts, performance measures and metrics for each program.
- Budget to national performance standards like Sunnyvale.

Participant Survey

Jan. 23 Budget Priority-Setting Session  
Neighborhood Associations/Youth Commission

I. RANKING OF SUB-RESULTS

For each Priority Result, please rank-order the sub-results with 1 being your highest priority for investment in the 2010-2011 Budget.

**Safe City**

When the City of San Jose \_\_\_\_\_ (insert 1-5 below), it results in a Safe City.

Rank Order 1- 5  
(1= Highest Priority)

- 1. Reduces crime through public education, community presence, prevention, early intervention, and smart design
- 2. Ensures regulatory compliance to protect life, property and the natural environment
- 3. Plans for and responds to emergencies and calls for service
- 4. Investigates crimes and assists with prosecution of offenders
- 5. Facilitates and ensures safe transportation, public spaces, and neighborhoods

**Prosperous Economy**

When the City of San Jose \_\_\_\_\_ (insert 1-6 below), it results in a Prosperous Economy.

Rank Order 1- 6  
(1= Highest Priority)

- 1. Attracts business investment and enables job creation
- 2. Plans for land use and facilitates/regulates development
- 3. Provides infrastructure to enable business efficiency and investment
- 4. Develops and supports community amenities and affordable housing to attract and retain a talented workforce
- 5. Develops a local workforce and connects it to potential employers
- 6. Drives and promotes economic activity that generates City revenue

**Green, Sustainable City**

When the City of San Jose \_\_\_\_\_ (insert 1-5 below), it results in a Green, Sustainable City.

Rank Order 1- 5  
(1= Highest Priority)

- 1. Promotes and supports resource conservation through leadership, regulation, education, and incentives
- 2. Minimizes use of natural resources through reuse and recycling
- 3. Manages factors, facilities, and programs that mitigate the City's environmental impact on air, land and water quality
- 4. Promotes new technology and business solutions to environmental challenges
- 5. Plans and designs the City's growth to minimize emissions, energy usage, and other environmental impacts

**Attractive, Vibrant Community**

When the City of San Jose \_\_\_\_\_ (insert 1-5 below), it results in an Attractive, Vibrant Community.

Order 1- 5 Rank  
(1= Highest Priority)

- 1. Supports arts, entertainment and sports offerings and attractions
- 2. Provides opportunities and venues for participation in recreational, learning and cultural activities
- 3. Promotes and maintains attractive places to live, work and play
- 4. Offers services that promote healthy living and personal development
- 5. Celebrates and connects diverse cultures

**Reliable, Well-Maintained Infrastructure**

When the City of San Jose \_\_\_\_\_ (insert 1-3 below), it results in Reliable, Well-Maintained Infrastructure.

1- 3 Rank Order  
(1= Highest Priority)

- 1. Invests in the City's physical assets to ensure their long term sustainability
- 2. Provides a variety of accessible and convenient transportation systems
- 3. Develops and maintains safe and reliable public buildings, properties, and infrastructure that support quality City services and a quality community

II. INPUT ON SOLVING THE 2010-2011 SHORTFALL

Please provide any additional input on how to solve the 2010-2011 budget shortfall.

---

---

---

III. FEEDBACK ON THIS MEETING

The City of San Jose strives to create opportunities for civic engagement that are meaningful, well-managed, and enjoyable.

Please rate your level of satisfaction with today's meeting:

	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Mostly Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Mostly Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>
Meaningful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Well-Managed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enjoyable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

We welcome any other feedback:

---

---

---

Your Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

**Other Written Feedback from Community Leaders about the Session**

- I hope our input is used as a tipping point for decisions.
- Very good job.
- In preparation for 2011 Priority Setting Session, we need more information at the Neighborhood level in the fall months, so that our neighborhood association representatives can better advocate for our neighbors!
- A good use of time. I would have liked to have input on all three ways to balance budget: Increase revenue, employee costs and neighborhood services.
- Love it! Great first step, please continue engaging community feedback in an ongoing basis.
- Have all the Councilmembers be more informed of all programs not just in their district to have a better vote on fund or not fund?
- 1) Neighborhood Am/NACS need to get together and discuss this.  
2) We would like to come back after the 7/1/10 and have Council explain their decisions to us and how today's exercises have helped them.
- We should potluck this in the future to save money.
- The prioritization process is askew. We should not be ranking the priorities, but rather looking at the programs objectively as to how they are achieving their goals and objectives. The competition should not be safe vs. green as they are not competing priorities but integrated.
- No need to buy lunch. Just have it from 9-12.
- As a participant of past meetings – I enjoyed the format of this session much better and allowed for more creative thinking.
- See you next year.
- The piece I found to be missing was an explanation of how the 4 level ranking data was/is to be used by the City Council. You asked how we might use this data, but you never explained how you currently intend to use it.
- Put City Council and Mayor on lower pay and year-end bonus based on deficit control and balanced budget. All costs and liabilities to be on the books/ledgers. No off-balance items/period.
- Economic development strategy should be developed to increase jobs and retail. This means zoning for industry and office space should be protected.
- Budget to performance measures, measures based on bay area or national standards; amount of labor for each level of program priority.
- A bit noisy to have conversations.
- I would like to have been given information that I could have shared with the members of the neighborhood association and provide a voice as a group, rather than an individual.
- It would help to have the information before (emailed?) this meeting to be informed and be able to form opinions. (I didn't know anything that was presented until I walked in the door.)
- More space - to support greater number of participants.
- Many thanks to the City Manager and Budget Office, Mayor, Council, and NDC for their transparency of process and support of civic engagement on this vital issue.
- Well run, things could omit – reading of slides out loud to group.
- Please convene the teams before next budget session and council election.
- Is there complete costs recovery on items like police special events line item? Response to false alarms, etc.? Need info on \$ not general fund related. The time period of market place too short. Glad to see this facilitated by staff this time. :)
- I just want to express my concern about the low priority levels of youth programs such as the Safe Schools Initiative Program. If these programs are cut, the City will have to end up spending more money to combat crime.
- Thank you!
- More time to review the programs would have been very useful...

## ATTACHMENT D

- My facilitator let one woman hog the discussion at the table.
- Great meeting. Very productive.
- The materials we used needed to get into participants' hands to be studied sooner – so that we were prepared to answer the questions.
- The benefit of this process is that it offers transparency and community involvement, and it provides an objective breakdown of programs so that the Council and public can see the financial impact of each program.
- Each year, budget prioritization improves – San José needs to establish a definition of essential city services as a basis for prioritization and use national performance standards. Comparison to other like cities and Santa Clara County located cities.