

FY 2022 Pre-Hearing Budget Oversight Questions

Department of Public Works

1. Please provide a detailed breakdown of all ARPA funds in DPW's proposed budget, including division, program, activity, purpose, and the years the funds will be used.

Response: The ARPA funding was loaded in the DPW budget as follows:

- Solid Waste Management Administration
 - a. Leaf Program: Extension of 108 existing Temporary Staff for the remainder of the fiscal year. (\$5,360,450)
 - b. Leaf Program: Non-Personnel funding to support the extension of the 108 temporary staff. (\$250,000)
- Parking Enforcement Management Administration
 - a. Parking Enforcement Staffing: Ideally DPW would handle most parking complaints. They are currently staffed from 7am to 7pm, Monday-Saturday, with a 24-hour SLA. The new proposed funding will allow the creation of 10 new staff for DPW to cover the hours of 7am to 11pm, with a 1-hour SLA for priority calls. (\$426,970)
 - b. Parking Enforcement Equipment: Vehicles and equipment for newly created 10 FTEs. (\$390,000)
 - c. Parking Enforcement Training: Training and uniforms for newly created 10 FTEs. (\$28,750)

The total amount of ARPA funding that is loaded within the DPW budget is \$6,456,170. The funding is for one fiscal year (FY2022).

2. Please explain the 34% increase in Contractual services (CSG 41). What is the source of this increase?

Response: The 34% increase in CSG 41 is attributed to the transfer of fuel from the Department of General Services (DGS) to the Department of Public Works (DPW) Fleet Management

Administration. The total amount transferred in was \$10,822,897.42.

3. DPW's proposed budget would create 6 new positions using Special Purpose Revenue funds. For these positions, please describe the role, amount of funding, and SPR source.

Response: The 6 newly created positions are Recycling Monitors within the Solid Waste Management Administration in the Disposal Division. These staff will inspect recycling loads that are disposed of at the transfer station to ensure that loads are not contaminated. The amount of funding to add these 6 FTEs is \$436,419 and the funding source of this is Fund 6082, the Disposal Fund.

4. Please provide a crosswalk of all FTEs that were reclassified to a different activity in the FY 2022 proposed budget.

Response: Please see Attachment A.

FY 2022 Post-Hearing Budget Oversight Questions
Department of Public Works

Operating Budget

1. Please explain the rationale for the following proposed adjustments within (1000) Agency Management:
 - a. 1 FTE increase in (1015) Training and Employee Development.

Response: The 1 FTE increase in 1015 Training and Development was a Training Instructor position that was realigned from the Solid Waste Management Administration.

- b. Removal of 1 FTE from the Office of Waste Diversion (OWD). What position has been cut and why? In addition, please provide the total increase in spending at the OWD and how it will be used.

Response: The 1 FTE that was removed from the Office of Waste Diversion was a position that was erroneously budgeted in this office in FY2021. The position title that was removed is a Solid Waste Program Coordinator. The \$116,136 increase in the OWD budget will be used for outreach services and initiatives.

- c. The budget indicates that 2.0 FTEs and \$237,000 will be transferred from Agency Management to the Office of the Mayor. What positions are these and why are they being transferred?

Response: The two FTEs removed from the DPW Agency Management budget and transferred to the Office of the Mayor are the Office of Clean City positions that were housed within the DPW budget. The positions transferred are Clean City Coordinator and Program Analyst.

2. Please explain the increase of 6.0 in (130F) OCFO and corresponding decrease in (120F) Agency Operations. Is this a transfer? If so, why does increase in funding in (130F) OCFO (\$995,000) exceed the decrease in (120F) (\$631,000)?

Response: The realignment of the OCFO positions was an attempt to correctly budget positions where they should be. The realignment activities within the OCFO budget that caused an increase in 130F of \$995,000 and a decrease of \$631,000 are attached. See Attachment A.

3. Please explain the proposed 10.8% increase in CSG 14 (Fringe Benefits – Current Personnel).

Response: The 10.8% proposed increase in CSG 14 Fringe Benefits is the projected increase in departmental benefits (insurance premiums) for DPW employees.

4. For Office of Waste Diversion, will there be any cuts or expansions to programs that existed in FY 2021?

Response: No cuts or expansions are planned for FY 22 for programs existing in FY 21. The additional NPS funding for OWD will be used to initiate a new program, the Zero Waste DC Plan.

5. Regarding the Food Waste Drop-Off Program:
 - a. How much is allocated for this Program in FY 2022?

Response: OWD will utilize a combination of Local NPS and Special Purpose Revenue (Solid Waste Diversion Fund) funds at a total of \$478,941 to implement this program in FY 22 for contracted services, materials/supplies, and market fees.

- b. Are there any plans to expand the number of Drop-Off sites? If so, when and where?

Response: There are currently no such plans.

- c. What funds would be necessary to expand the Program to all 8 wards year-round?

Response: There are not a sufficient number of year-round farmers markets in all of the city's 8 wards to achieve this goal, outside of re-designing the program to be sited at additional locations other than farmers markets. Each of the program's 4 year-round market locations cost an average of \$50,652 per fiscal year to operate.

6. Please provide a description of the planned yard waste program for FY 2022, including anticipated funding and scope.

Response: There is currently no funding available to implement such a pilot program in FY 22. The pilot would provide once-a-week curbside collection for DPW-serviced residents in all 8 wards on a small-scale to test equipment and operations. Residents would request a scheduled collection similar to what residents do for bulk waste collection.

7. The Mayor's budget overview indicates that the FY 2022 budget has investments in increasing the District's composting capacity. Please identify

exactly what funding has been designated for this purpose, and what it will be used for.

Response: The capital funds for the Benning Road TS modernization project allow for a design of a flexible, zero waste center, and not just a one-for-one replacement of the existing transfer station. Through an iterative design process, DPW and DGS will consider all potential design strategies that support specific zero waste programs and initiatives, including organic waste diversion.

8. DPW has indicated that existing regional facilities have adequate capacity to handle the organics stream generated by DPW-serviced households, and that it will pursue regional capacity rather than building its own composting site.
 - a. What is the timeline for identifying regional composting capacity and pursuing curbside composting program using this capacity?

Response: DPW continues to assess existing and emerging opportunities in the region to support greater composting in the District.

- b. How much would it cost for the District to send residential compost to existing facilities? As part of this response, please break down costs for DPW to collect the waste, as well as processing costs.

Response: The Waste Characterization Study (2021) found that there is the potential to recover 18,015 tons of food waste and 14,321 tons of leaf and yard waste per year from the single-family residential sector. At an average cost of \$45/ton, it would cost DPW approximately \$1,455,120 a year to dispose of this material to a nearby composting facility. However, the Compost Feasibility Study (2017) found that a medium participation scenario could incur a net program cost between \$5,912,459 and \$9,024,618 to operate in full. See the chart below:

Table 4: Scenario A, Base Case Medium Participation, Results			
		Low Generation	High Generation
	Food waste diversion (HHO)	4,441 tons	11,657 tons
	Yard waste diversion	6,278 tons	18,833 tons
	Total SSO diversion	10,719 tons	30,490 tons
Program Details	Required number of new trucks	21 trucks	35 trucks
	Net system cost per ton	\$552 /ton	\$296 /ton
	Net system cost per household	\$56 /HH	\$86 /HH
	Total staff needed for program	68 staff	114 staff
Capital Costs	Total startup capital cost of containers	\$4,342,008	\$4,342,008
	Total capital cost of trucks	\$4,110,000	\$6,960,000
Annualized Costs	Annual cost of program	\$6,401,120	\$10,414,677
	Annual money saved from landfill/WTE haul and tip fee	(\$488,661)	(\$1,390,060)
	Total annual cost of program	\$5,912,459	\$9,024,618

There are costs to implement such a program that go beyond the cost of collection and disposal, such as the robust education and outreach required to ensure low-contamination rates yet enough participation to ensure economies of scale. In addition, the capital cost for new curbside containers for residents and additional vehicles dedicated for organics collection are significant.

9. At the budget hearing, Director Davis promised a cost estimate for a composting pilot. Please provide such an estimate, with details of its scope.

Response: In FY 23, DPW would need between \$2M to \$3M to pilot curbside organics collection. The program cost is highly dependent on scope, market costs for a third-party vendor, and cost for equipment. Current thinking is for the pilot to serve 10,000 households in all 8 wards and to accept food scraps.

10. When will DPW's Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan be released?

Response: We expect the solid waste management plan to be finalized this fall with release shortly thereafter.

11. Please provide the following information regarding the Solid Waste Diversion Fund:
 - a. A calculation of expected revenue in the Fund for FY 2022, including all sources.

Response: The Solid Waste Diversion Fund FY2022 budget was derived by using historical data. The source of the fund is the \$1 surcharge that is charged for every ton of trash disposed of at the District transfer station.

- b. A breakdown of all planned spending for the Fund in FY 2022.

Response: The Solid Waste Diversion Fund's FY22 budget authority is \$360,706. \$35,000 will be used to support Zero Waste DC Planning and the remaining \$325,706 will be used to support the Food Waste Dropoff Program. Both Zero Waste DC Planning and the Food Waste Dropoff Program will also use available resources from OWD's local budget.

12. DPW recently implemented a regulation that will charge haulers a surcharge on recycling that is contaminated over a certain rate. What is expected revenue from this surcharge for FY 2022?

Response: The projected revenue from this initiative will yield approximately \$100K for the first year. With the changed behavior, there is an expectation that the revenue will go down.

13. Please provide the following information regarding the Clean City Fund:
 - a. A calculation of expected revenue in the Fund for FY 2022, including all sources.

Response: The calculation used to derive the FY 2022 revenue projection was to take the last two fiscal years' revenue generated and to use the average of the two years. This method is used because there is no way of knowing when a particular citation will be paid.

- b. A description of all planned spending for the Fund for FY 2022.

Response: The planned spending for this is to fund 15 FTEs throughout the department (\$1,349,061.49) and to fund certified mail for \$200,000 for the Solid Waste Enforcement and Education Program.

14. At the budget hearing, DPW AFO staff promised an updated estimate of per ton costs for the processing of solid waste at District transfer stations. Please provide an updated estimate for Full Freight, Other (SWMA), Recycling, and Settlement Agreements that includes all considerations provided in the FY 2020 estimate (including fixed and variable costs) and incorporates depreciation of capital investments.

Response: The revised cost estimate for the processing solid waste at the District transfer stations incorporating the depreciation of the capital expenses is attached. See Attachment B.

Using depreciation, a business expenses a portion of the asset's value over each year of its useful life, instead of allocating the entire expense to the

year in which the asset is purchased. The purpose of depreciating an asset over time is to align the cost of the asset to the same year as the revenue generated by the asset.

15. Please provide the rationale for the following proposed adjustments within (6000) Solid Waste Management:
- a. Decrease of \$280,000 at (6010) Enforcement of Sanitation Regulations.

Response: This decrease in funding for the Household Hazardous Waste materials was budgeted in 6010 (RECY) in FY2021 and realigned in the FY2022 budget to the location where the activity actually occurs in 6030 (RECL).

- b. Increase of 4,609,000 at (6020) Public Space Cleaning and decrease of 6.0 FTEs. At the hearing, Director Davis stated that these FTEs would be moving to Collections. Why? Will there be a reduction in services due to the decrease in FTEs?

Response: The increase of \$4,609,000 is the net of the increase for converting 110 Seasonal (Temporary) Leaf employees to permanent year-round staff and the addition of 9 new FTEs with this initiative, minus the fact that 15 FTEs moved from 6020 to 6030 to provide support to the Household Collections. This caused a net decrease of 6 FTEs.

- c. Increase of \$1,666,000 and 15.0 FTEs at (6030) Sanitation Collections and Removals.

Response: These FTEs were realigned to provide support to the Household Collections Division within the Solid Waste Administration.

- d. The crosswalk provided by DPW indicates that 16 FTEs are being repurposed out of (6020) Public Space Cleaning. Why are these positions being moved, and why aren't they being used to support the Building Blocks Initiative?

Response: These positions were repurposed to our Solid Waste Collections Division to supplement trash and recycling collections personnel due to the consequences of unscheduled and scheduled leave as a result of the pandemic.

- e. Decrease of \$1,629,000 and increase of 5.0 FTEs at (6040) Sanitation Disposal.

Response: The \$1,629,000 decrease in 6040 Sanitation Disposal is the net of the decrease of approximately \$1,800,000 due to the projected reduction in hauling and disposal costs. The reduced tonnage at the transfer stations is caused by the increase of the tipping fees by \$10 per ton in FY2021. The above-referenced \$1,800,000 is offset by the creation of 6 new FTEs (Recycling Monitors).

- f. The decrease of \$2,048,000 in NPS across SWMA.

Response: The \$2,048,000 decrease in NPS is a result of the hauling and disposal budget being reduced due to tonnage decreases at the transfer station (\$1,800,000) along with \$248,000 in decreases in the Fleet Pro budget and the elimination of traveling and training.

16. Regarding the \$5,610,500 for extension of leaf-season staff:

- a. Please clarify how many seasonal positions are being made year-round.

Response: There is a total of 110 employees that are being made year-round.

- b. If these funds are creating “permanent, year-round positions,” why is this not reflected in the number of FTEs?

Response: These individuals are already occupying current FTEs within the DPW Leaf Program and the AFO thought that this would inflate the number of departmental FTEs.

- c. Relatedly, please explain the significant increase in CSG 12 (Regular Pay – Other) 140% increase from 3,796,000 to 9,099,000. Does this reflect the conversion of seasonal workers to year-round? Why aren’t these funds under CSG 11 if the workers will be converted to year-round?

Response: Yes, this increase is the result of converting the seasonal workers to year-round. These positions were funded in CSG 12 Regular Pay-Other, because these are still temporary employees that will be extended for a short period of time. The funding will only last for a three-year period, just like a term position that is funded in CSG 12.

- d. This represents a significant expansion of year-round employees. What exactly will these employees be doing? Where will they be located?

Response: These employees will be located at various SWMA locations depending on the operations assigned. The locations are:

- 1431 W Street NE
- 1851 Fenwick Street NE
- 1910 Independence Avenue SE
- 2700 South Capitol Street SE

The plan is to assign these employees to support the following programs:

- Building Blocks Initiative
- Nuisance and Abatement Program
- Night Litter Can Collection
- Illegal Dumping Removal Program
- Homeless Encampment
- Collections Program

- e. How will the \$250,000 in nonpersonal funds be used?

Response: The funds will be used to purchase small equipment, tools and uniforms for building blocks initiatives and initiatives in public space cleaning.

- f. For the 9 additional FTEs, please provide a breakdown of their roles and how DPW determined that 9 FTEs were necessary. Where will these 9 additional FTEs be located?

Response: The additional FTEs will be assigned to SWMA Operations Divisions as follows – 6 Sanitation Supervisors at Grade 09; 1 Mental Health Coordinator and 2 Mechanical Helpers at Grade 4/5.

Supervisor Role –

- Each will supervise 3 or more crews responsible for collection, cleaning or disposal operations.
- Responsible for planning the use of crews, equipment and materials on a day-to-day, week-to-week and month-to-month basis;
- Establish work requirements based on the plan developed which will include deadlines, priorities route coverage and adjustments; respond to special request from a number of sources including higher-level supervisors
- Coordinate with other supervisors not only within the Administrations but with other Administrations within SWMA

- Document and track work production and output measures to determine whether each of the crews is accomplishing goals and objectives established.
- Manage leave requests of subordinates and perform other duties as assigned.

Mental Health Care Coordinator –

- Will work with the FTEs in the program as an advocate and ensure that they understand the steps needed to access programs such as transportations and other barriers that could prevent them from effectively assimilating in their new role
- Communicate between staff and managers on client progress
- Develop goals, handle training and coordinate case management and education.

Sanitation Workers –

Work under the general supervision of a crew lead to pick up trash, recycling, clean streets and perform other related duties as assigned.

17. How many SWEEP inspectors are there per Ward?

Response: There are two (2) SWEEP inspectors per Ward.

18. Do the settlement agreement companies ever tip recycling at the transfer stations (rather than transload) given the very low tipping fees for recycling?

Response: Both settlement agreement companies transload their recycling materials per the agreement.

19. At the budget hearing, DPW indicated that it had plans for updating the recycling tipping fee. What is the timeframe for that update, and how will DPW determine the new rate?

Response: The timeframe for that update is the new fiscal year. The new rate would be based on the current cost to recycle, which will include the following:

<i>Transportation and Processing Costs</i>	<i>Value of Rebate</i>	<i>Transfer/Tip Fee</i>	<i>Waste Diversion Surcharge</i>
--	------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------

Please note that regional market conditions may be factored into the equation, which will affect the new rate.

20. Please provide the rationale for the following proposed adjustments within (5000) Parking Enforcement Management:

- a. The increase of \$826,000 and 3.0 FTEs within (5010) Parking Regulations Enforcement.

Response: This increase of \$826,000 is caused by the influx of funding from the Coronavirus Relief Funds American Rescue Plan Act, which called for the increase of 10 FTEs. All of the FTEs should have been loaded in 5010 Parking Regulations Enforcement.

- b. The increase of 1.0 FTE and decrease of \$98,000 within (5020) Towing.

Response: The FTE increase should have been loaded in 5010 as part of the approved enhancement funded by the Coronavirus Relief Funds American Rescue Plan Act.

- c. The increase of 6.0 FTEs within (5030) Abandoned and Junk Vehicles.

Response: The 6 FTEs that increased in 5030 Abandoned and Junk Vehicles should have been loaded in 5010 as part of the approved enhancement funded by the Coronavirus Relief Funds American Rescue Plan Act.

- d. The crosswalk provided by DPW indicates that 7 FTEs are being repurposed out of Parking Regulations Enforcement. Why are these positions being moved? And, why aren't these positions instead being used to support the Non-Emergency Parking initiative?

Response: These positions are not being moved.

21. Regarding the Non-Emergency Parking initiative:

- a. The Mayor's budget narrative states that this investment is intended to shift more parking-related complaints to DPW away from MPD. Please provide the number of parking-related calls that MPD responds to per month. Are these all rerouted from 311 during non-PEMA hours, or does MPD respond directly to parking-related 911 calls?

Response: In 2019 and 2020, MPD responded to 50-70 calls for service per day for parking complaints (equivalent to 1,500-2,100 calls per month). Some of these calls are rerouted from 311 during non-PEMA hours and MPD also responds directly to some parking-related 911 calls.

- b. The pre-hearing questions indicate that this investment will expand the number of staff hours, to 7a-11p. Will this include Sundays?

Response: No, this does not include Sunday enforcement.

- c. The pre-hearing questions indicate that this investment will shorten the SLA to 1 hour for priority calls. Please describe what complaints will meet the definition of “priority call” for the 1-hour SLA.

Response: Priority calls for the one-hour SLA response will include the following violations:

1. Parking Abreast
2. Blocking Alley
3. Blocking Crosswalk
4. Less 5’ of Driveway/Alley
5. Excessive Idling
6. Less 20’ of Fire Station Driveway
7. Less 10’ of Fire Hydrant
8. Left wheel to curb
9. Fail to park Parallel
10. Vehicles parked on Public Space
11. Reduce Roadway to less than 10’
12. Parking On Sidewalk
13. No Parking Anytime or Specific Hours
14. No Standing anytime or specific hours
15. Fire Lane
16. Bicycle Lane
17. Bus Lane
18. On Streetcar guideway or platform

- d. How did you determine how many FTEs were necessary for this expansion?

Response: The deployment of this squad would entail ten (10) additional PEOs. One Rapid Response Officer would be deployed in each quadrant of the city (four (4) officers) on two shifts – the 6am to 2:30pm shift would have four officers and the 10:30am to 7pm shift

would have four officers, with an overlap from 10:30-2pm by deploying two officers per ward during the overlap period. Two officers would be deployed from 2:30pm to 11pm and would roam the city due to the lower volume of requests during that time period.

The number of PEOs was determined by the desired response times in all four quadrants of the city, which could possibly be hampered if an officer has to navigate through traffic from one point in the city to another. Having Rapid Response officers in each quadrant of the city should allow us to respond within the desired timeframe and does not have an adverse impact on other ongoing enforcement activities.

- e. Please provide a breakdown of the nonpersonal costs associated with this initiative over FY 2022-2024.

Response: See the chart below. Please note that each of Nonpersonal costs below would be a one-time purchase that should have a useful life of three to five years. Any yearly or repeated costs would be yearly for devices licensing through our vendor Gtechna:

	<u>Cost/unit</u>	<u>Total number</u>	<u>Total cost</u>
Vehicles	\$39,000	10	\$390,000
Samsung Tablets	500	10	5,000
Samsung S20 cellphones	375	10	3,750

- 22. Please provide the rationale for the following proposed adjustments within (4000) Fleet Management:
 - a. Increase in (4010) Fleet Consumables from 1,512,000 in FY 2021 to 11,988,000 in FY 2022.

Response: The increases in 4010 Fleet consumables is a result of the fuel contract transferring from DGS to DPW.

- b. \$231,000 decrease in (4030) Unscheduled Vehicle and Equipment Repairs.

Response: This decrease was done to bring 4030 to its historical level of spending and to allow the administration to use the funding to meet the administrations needed to increase the budget for the City-Wide leasing program.

- 23. The proposed budget transfers the District’s auto fuel budget from DGS to DPW. Please provide annual usage data for auto fuel, broken down by

month, for FY 2019, FY 2020, and FY 2021, to date, as well as projections for FY 2021 and FY 2022. Please also provide estimates of per unit cost.

Response: See Attachment C.

24. Is DPW currently purchasing electric vehicles (EVs) for all vehicle types for which EVs are available? If not, are there plans in place to do so?

Response: DPW is currently purchasing EVs for all vehicles types which have been demonstrated to be reliable, meet DPW specifications, and which are located where EV chargers can be installed. This is currently limited to compact sedans, planned purchases of newly available pickup trucks and street sweepers. DPW is constantly evaluating new models that are being introduced as the marketplace is rapidly evolving in the EV space.

25. Fleet's budget includes a net increase of \$1.3 million in Intra-District funds for nonpersonal services to maintain an MOU contract. What MOU contract are these increases for and how will they be used?

Response: The \$1.3 million increase in Intra-District funds for nonpersonal services is the portion of the fuel contract that is not budgeted within the local funds.

26. The Budget narrative indicates that there are 3 new FTEs "primarily in the Fleet Management division" to align with MOU agreements with DGS. However, DPW's budget charts do not show any increases in FTEs at Fleet. Where will these FTEs be located and for what purpose?

Response: A review by our agency of the FY2022 budget chapter narrative for DPW does not indicate that there are 3 new FTEs associated with fuel being realigned from DGS to DPW. DPW did not receive any additional FTEs with the transfer of the fuel contracts from DGS.

27. Please explain the proposed decrease of \$665,000 in (2060) contract plows within (2000) Snow Removal Program.

Response: This decrease of \$665,000 is due to the following:

- DDOT did not renew the MOU agreement to have 20 seasonal drivers transfer to DDOT to drive the DDOT snow routes during snow emergencies (\$450,000); and
- There was a realignment of \$215,000 within the snow program to purchase additional salt.

28. Please clarify how much of the proposed \$8.2 million budget for snow removal is recurring and how much is one-time funds.

Response: The FY2022 DPW Snow Removal Budget is made up of \$5,346,000 in one-time funding and \$2,854,000 in recurring funding.

29. In your proposed FY22 budget, are there specific programs or allocations that are specifically designed to address racial or economic inequities faced by District residents? In detail, please describe how these efforts address those inequities.

Response: The Department of Public Works provides an equal level of services across the city and there is no component/program that has a direct racial equity impact. However, we will continue to evaluate any ways in which our work can improve equity in the District.

30. In your proposed FY22 budget, which reductions may burden certain communities more than others? If applicable, what strategies has your department taken to mitigate any potential adverse impacts?

Response: There are no reductions in the agency's FY22 budget which may burden certain communities more than others. Also please see the response to Question #29.

31. For all vacancies, please provide when the position became vacant and the hiring plan for filling the position.

Response: See Attachment D.

Capital Budget

32. Please provide a spending plan for all new or ongoing capital projects, broken out by year, including how available balances will be spent.

Response: See the chart below.

FY	Status	Capital Project	Cost
FY20	Ongoing	FMA Mechanic Shop HVAC System Upgrade	\$2,963,354
FY20	Ongoing	Fort Totten Rehabilitation/Renovation – Tipping Floor Replacement	\$9,567,880
FY21	Ongoing	Fort Totten Rehabilitation/Renovation – Citizen Ramp	\$3,419,047

FY21	Ongoing	Clean Water Project, Multi-Facility Control Measures	\$1,094,668
FY21	Ongoing	Clean Water Project, Okie Street Vehicle Canopy, Part I – Stormwater Improvements	\$957,000
FY22	New	Clean Water Project, Okie Street Vehicle Canopy, Part II – Solar Canopy	\$525,000
FY22	New	Benning Road Revitalization	\$103,997,250

33. The capital budget includes \$103,497,000 for the Benning Rd transfer station, including just over \$100 million to demolish and replace the facility.
- a. Last year DPW estimated that this project would require \$115 million. Has this estimate been reduced, or does the project require additional funding beyond what is provided in the proposed CIP?

Response: The project has been reduced by ~\$12M, which was allocated for land acquisition.

- b. What is the basis for the cost estimate? Is there a model facility that DPW wants to replicate?

Response: See the table below:

Benning Road Capital Project Spend Plan	
Demolition	\$11,850,000
New Construction	\$65,750,000
Architectural Design	\$6,575,000
Permitting Costs	\$1,315,000
Construction Management	\$6,575,000
Contingency/Assumption	\$12,032,250
Total	\$103,997,250

Note: DPW will collaborate with stakeholders, other jurisdictions, and an A/E firm to replicate industry best practices in the design and construction of the new transfer station.

- c. Please provide a detailed description of the project, including what services will be provided at the new facility to promote solid waste diversion.

Response: This capital project includes the demolition of the existing Benning Road Transfer Station and the redesign and rebuild of a modern facility to include the following improvements or capabilities:

- Source separation to improve recycling and reuse of waste materials; and
 - Stormwater and leachate equipment, measures, and infrastructure to reduce contamination and mitigate EPA or DOEE violations and fines.
- d. The project will require substantial remediation due to the previous use of the site. How much of the \$100 million will be used for remediation? How long is this remediation expected to take?

Response: DPW has earmarked approximately \$12M in funds for contingency and assumptions that would include remediation. As we develop the scope of the remediation, we will update our spend plan with designated funding for remediation.

- e. Has DPW considered incorporating composting or anaerobic digestion into plans for the facility?

Response: See the responses to Questions #33c and #34.

34. There is space available next to the Benning Rd facility, owned by Pepco, that would be appropriate for organic waste processing. Has DPW assessed the possibility of using this site for composting or other organic material processing?

Response: DPW has assessed the possibility of acquiring this site for composting and other organic material processing. However, our current plan is to use existing neighboring jurisdiction composting facilities.

35. Please provide a detailed spending plan for FY 2022-2027 for Fleet Vehicle acquisitions in FLW06, FLW07, and FLW08. Within this spending plan, please provide:
- a. A breakdown of which types of vehicles fall within each capital project;

Response: See Attachment E, 6-year detail tab, column D.

- b. A list of which vehicles would be purchased in which fiscal year under the proposed plan;

Response: See Attachment E, 6-year detail tab, columns P-V.

- c. The vehicle ID, make/model, and age of each vehicle you plan to replace;

Response: See Attachment E, DPW 9-20-20 tab.

- d. Any deviations from the Capital Asset Replacement Scheduling System (CARSS) recommendations, and an explanation of the deviation.

Response: Any deviations from CARSS recommendations are evaluated during current year purchases for five main reasons: (1) when new vehicle prices increase above predicted price; (2) when specific vehicles are needed prior to planned replacement (i.e. accidents); (3) when specific vehicles are needed later than planned replacement (i.e. low mileage/better than expected condition); (4) the fact that CARSS has assigned \$5M per year over the next three years due to replacement backlog in order to not frontload the budget and even out the replacement cycle necessitated that DPW prioritize these replacements throughout the fleet; and (5) when there are new EV model vehicle types to introduce into the fleet to reduce costs and emissions.

- e. In addition, please explain why the previous vehicle and equipment acquisitions projects (FLW01-FLW04) were replaced.

Response: The previous projects were replaced because they were based on unit pricing, and as prices increased year over year, certain vehicles types would transfer to different projects requiring funding reprogramming. This caused the program to have to perform reprogrammings to buy certain pieces of equipment when pricing changed.

36. The CIP includes \$500,000 in FY 2022 for installing EV charging stations at District government facilities (out of a total \$1.5 million over FY 2020-2022). This project was initially funded in the FY 2020 CIP at \$3 million; it was reduced last year to \$1.5 million due to budget constraints associated with the pandemic. At that time, then-Director Geldart testified that this project would be re-funded as soon as funds became available. Given the state of the proposed budget, why wasn't this project re-funded at the full amount in the FY 2022 CIP?

Response: See the response below.

- a. In particular, project funding ends in FY 2022. How will the District continue to expand EV capacity on an ongoing basis without additional funding?

Response: DPW will continue to evaluate funding necessary for this project as the transfer to EVs will continue in the foreseeable future. DPW has been very successful in the past fiscal year installing EV chargers and this fund not only helps DPW transfer to EVs but also helps all District agencies to do so.