

## Participatory Budgeting Committee Minutes

7/18/22

### Attendees:

*Committee Members, advisers:* Heather Crocker, Lynn Bachner, Devin Del Pos, Jeff Altamari, Hal Rose, Tim Holmes, Norah Brennan, Doug Gerhardt, Minita Sanghvi

*Guests:* Joe O'Neill Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, Mike Veitch – Business Manager, Department of Public Works, and John Hirliman – Recreation Director

### Topics:

*Minutes from last meeting:* move to approve from Jeff, second Tim

#### *Q&A with City Resources*

What is the normal budget cycle for the City; What are the key dates in preparing the budget; When does the City Council on the budget? Lynn – provided written responses to answers (shared in email to committee members)

PB is not tied to city budget schedule – however is informed by it as budget provides the funding.

PB is done through an assignment (cash); any projects done through the PB program will be a budget amendment.

Lynn – there is a definition document for capital projects; would be able to obtain that to confirm.

Private donations – they can be accepted, the committee would need to discuss what criteria or types of donations we'd accept (can't be for just certain projects types, or can be – to be discussed)

#### *DPW Q&A*

What kind of lead time would be needed; Joe, should be straightforward to do a project such as the water fountain at dog park; have similar efforts in place (such as water mains going through) coordinated with the state. Could be done close to city property (or on it).

What is scope of what falls out of DPW delivering a project? Joe – typically when it's a capital project, needs to go out to bid, \$\$\$ projects. Projects that are big enough to displace DPW resource existing responsibilities.

Tim: scheduling question – what process is used to fit a project into planning? Discussion turned to sidewalk projects – likely to not be covered under PB but could be referred to DPW or appropriate dept for addressing under other budget means.

Mike pointed out benefits of PB, as it is putting projects on their radar that previously weren't known; can now be planned in, even if not voted through PB. Their priorities could be influenced with capital projects as well.

Jeff: as we are encouraging people to submit projects, we should have departments pushing people to us to submit projects.

Mike: agrees, also Rec is a great way to put information out to large audience.

Minita suggests signage around town at places where we want to provide opportunity to submit ideas to us (have QR code up) – good outreach program

Tim – how does Rec and school district work together? John – he would be point of contact to reach out to him to then facilitate with the school district, it's up to them to fund (or it may go to state budget). Projects like lights at west side rec would require a feasibility study.

Mike: reiterated that feasibility studies are important particularly for large projects to understand a clear scope and impact.

*Project updates:* - 5 new projects received and being reviewed; Heather will be coordinating with project leads to connect with appropriate city resources.

*Outreach:* Farmer's market was successful; need to evaluate how to have strong communication of rejected projects. Tim: good reason we need to have early triage so we can get things to the right people right away and engage. Devon: we may not be able to facilitate, but we can be a

*Open Discussion:*

Minita: strongly recommends feasibility studies to be included; Norah raised concerns about how a study doesn't impact community directly with a result.

Minita: have another potential committee member; Hal is resigning from committee after tonight. Thank you to Hal for your contributions.

Jeff raised concern about waiting until Aug 1 before next meeting; Heather indicated that we will start pushing project work on individual tracks so anticipate making significant progress between now and then.

Meeting adjourned.