## SAN JOSE CAPITAL OF SILCON VALLEY COUNCIL POlicy Prioritization: Early Consideration Response Form

Department		ESD/PW/PBCE Jeff Provenzano				Rules Date			10/1	10/13/21 Item G.3					
Department Rep. Name/Ext. Je						Council Member Sponsorship				Liccardo, Jimenez, Carrasco, Davis,					
Policy/Ordinance Subject							- F			Pera	Peralez				
							_								
							_								
Staff Recommendation															
GREEN Adopt based on tra- outlined on next pa							RED Recommend Council n								
						ess	s adopt nominated idea				MORE TIME TO EVALUATE				
	aluation		T												
Is this aligned with City Roadmap							Is this time critical or an emergency								
Yes No				Department work plan? Yes Vo			Yes 🖌 No				staffing, budget, or strategic support?				
	n to Determi	ne Scale of	IL Proiect Co		, 										
					ch of the 3	criteri	ons below a	nd then sumr	ning the s	score.					
Project complexity is determined by scoring the project in each of the 3 criterions below and then summing the score. a. Low Complexity is a sum of 6 or less.															
b. Medium Complexity is a sum of 7 – 9.							Total Score = 13								
	c. High Com	plexity is a s	sum of 10	-							-				
			Low Complexity			Medium Complexity					High Complexity				
Scoring Criterion	Estimated Duration		6 – 9 m	□=1		months	_	More than 18 months $\Box = 3$							
	Organizational		Can Easily be Absorbed			Planned Work (Future) $\Box = 2$				= 2   W	Work Not Currently Proposed $\square = 3$				
	Complexity		into Existing Work Plan			110.00	Here staff with required skillest /				Do not have staff with required				
	(Internal)						Have staff with required skillset/				Do not have staff with required □= 3 skillset/requires significant				
			Skiisey kilowieuge Tequili								research				
			Less than or equal 2 $\Box = 1$ 3			3 - 4 s	- 4 staff required $\Box = 2$				More than 5 staff required $\square = 3$				
			staff required												
	(External)		1 Additional			2 Other Departments Involved			= 2 3 or more Departments Involved $\Box = 3$						
			Departr	ment	 I						<u> </u>				
DEPT. Required	□ Airport	□ Auditor	🗆 СМО	CMO – Communication		CA	× ESD	□ Fire	🗆 HR	🗆 IT	► PRNS	Police	🗆 Retire	ement	
	🗷 Attorney	🗆 Clerk	■ CMO – Budget		Comn Energ	nunity gy	□ Finance	□ Housing	🗆 IPA	🗆 Libr	ary 💌 PBCE	× PW	🗆 dot		

Analysis

Explain the rationale for staff recommendation, including any mitigating factors that need to be considered (recent legislative action, significant work plan changes, etc.). Please address the following as well.

GREEN LIGHT: The Administration can implement this Nominated Idea under its current work plan. Item should be sent to Council to add to Department work plan. (1) How will the Idea be approached? (2) If adopted, what is its impact and/or tradeoff to the City Roadmap or to a Department work plan, including strategic support? (3) What is the minimum viable scope to move the Idea forward and reduce its complexity?

Regarding Part 1a, 1e, & 1f: ESD currently has 0.15 FTE of General Funding allocated to a Deputy Director and 0.10 FTE towards a Senior Environmental Services Specialist that are available to support all water related efforts outside of Municipal Water System, including City-wide conservation. It is anticipated that current funding levels are adequate to support Part 1a, 1e, & 1f. Staff will return to Council with a specific watering schedule, as uniform as possible to the messaging of Valley Water and other water retailers. The water schedule will focus on facilitating ease of compliance, other water use restrictions and exceptions for consideration, and expiration date.

Regarding Part 1b, 2, & 3: (SEE BELOW)

YELLOW LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council send this Nominated Idea to the Priority Setting Process due to (describe cost implications, workload impacts, or other factors).

Regarding Part 1c, 1d & 4: (SEE BELOW)

RED LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council not adopt this Nominated Idea due to (describe reason implementation would be difficult if not impossible – conflict with other laws, etc.).

## Analysis (Continued)

## GREEN LIGHT

Regarding Part 1b: Per the SJMC, enforcement of Title 15 of the SJMC falls under the Direction of ESD. To the extent that PBCE is utilized for enforcement, this function would be absorbed by the General Funded General Code Program which provides services city-wide for complaints involving single-family, duplexes, industrial, commercial, and vacant land. Currently, PBCE Code Enforcement Division has 13.35 FTE Code Inspectors, 1.94 FTE Code Supervisors, 0.30 FTE Division Managers, and 0.24 FTE Senior Office Specialist of General Funding to provide General Code Services city-wide. Enforcement of water waste would be considered a routine complaint basis and not as a proactive program. The increase in routine complaints would result in service-level and response time impacts, including the Departments ability to meet its 15-day response time performance measure. As the impact of changes to Title 15 are understood further consideration will be required to evaluate staffing and resources, and ongoing impacts to current General Code service delivery.

Regarding Part 2: Staff recommends a letter be sent to Council urging the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Division of Dam Safety and Inspections to allow a temporary variance of 20,000 acre-feet of water storage behind Anderson Dam to enable Valley Water to better manage water supplies.

Regarding Part 3: ESD currently has 0.15 FTE and 0.10 FTE of General Funding allocated to a Deputy Director and Senior Environmental Services Specialist (respectively) that are available to provide support in drafting revisions to the City's existing Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) that would require only planting drought-tolerant landscapes in new developments. The Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, responsible for implementation of the WELO, may require further consideration of staffing impacts and/or evaluation of internal procedures and staff training.

## YELLOW LIGHT

Regarding Part 1c: Although not a City-lead outreach strategy, each water retailer serving the City, and Valley Water, currently perform outreach on most of the listed items. Part 1c requires further consideration of potential outreach strategies, staff resources, time commitment, and appropriate funding source(s). Utilizing existing opportunities such as a proposed deployment of Resilience Corps members is encouraging, Staff would like to fully consider the Resilience Corp time commitment, ensuring that all other priorities are addressed, and the additional funding required from funds allocated through the state budget to California's largest 13 cities.

Regarding Part 1d: Consideration of alternatives other than those described in Part 1a may result in a delaying water shortage declaration and imposition of restrictions, including the use of water for outdoor landscape irrigation to no more than two days a week, and any other restrictions deemed appropriate by the City Manager to simplify and make uniform any conflicting restrictions imposed by Valley Water District and the three water retailers that operate in San Jose.

Regarding Part 4: Staff can look at a way to meet a reduction target on a citywide basis. Given that water usage needs vary significantly across departments, it would be difficult to meet a specific reduction target at a department level.