

First, a **Crime Analyst** position in the **Police Dept** was previously funded. At the 2/26/24 CC work session, Commissioner (Norman) & Chief (Odindo) said the Crime Analyst position was an error; they asked to change that position to a **Fire/EMS Operations Analyst** position instead.

**Question:** I want to clarify that the police dept does not need a crime analyst?

I agree w/Council Member Browne that -based on the description given by Commissioner Norman and Chief Odindo, i.e., a “data scientist”- it makes more sense to hire a consultant than hire a new full-time employee.

Second, Ambulance purchases and “standing up” EMS:

- In Aug 2022 the CC approved the purchase of 4 ambulances – \$1.24 million using URA ARPA funds.
- At that time Ms. Browne asked Commissioner Norman if a cost/benefit analysis was done to validate this new government initiative. An analysis was not done. The CC approved the initiative anyway.
- It is now 18 months later. We own these ambulances and thousands of dollars of other purchases have been made to have them fitted with equipment. **Still, no cost/benefit analysis has been done. This strikes me as problematic.**

I understand that a decision like this is not just about money. First and foremost, it’s about human welfare. When I was here last year, I gave the CC a reference list. One of the papers referenced was on a type of analysis called “Marginal Impact of Public Funds” or MVPF. In assessing the benefits of a government initiative, the MVPF analysis measures the extent to which the initiative improves the lives of its beneficiaries.

It seems to me that the moment the CC approved the purchase of these ambulances in August 2022, it committed the city to adding new EMS employees to the city payroll, and the CC did this while blind to the potential long-term social and economic consequences for the city.

**Question 1:** If we do a cost/benefit analysis now and it shows that this initiative is not a wise undertaking, what do you recommend we do? Sell the ambulances? Move forward with the project anyway?

**Question 2:** *Will each of you commit to ensuring that in the future, a cost/benefit analysis is carried out BEFORE you approve spending public funds on new initiatives that entail adding employees to the city payroll?*

Third, I have a question about the conditions under which a city council member should abstain from a vote.

For a “yes” vote on spending legislation to be credible, it should be plausible to imagine the council member could vote “no”. This is not the case when it comes to approving spending for a cc member to attend a conference. For example, the CC recently approved spending \$1,200 for Councilman Poteat to attend a conference. It seems to me that Councilman Poteat should have abstained from voting on this legislation because it is not plausible for the public to think he would vote “no”. But he did not abstain, he voted “yes”.

**Question:** Does the CC use guidelines to help determine when a member should abstain from a vote, and if so, can you please make those guidelines public?

Finally, several large salary increases were recently approved. For example, the mayor’s chief of staff and the Recreation Commissioner each received a 16% salary increase (\$125k to \$145k).

**Question:** are these increases part of the approved 2024 annual estimate?