

Council ARPA Questions - 2/15/22

LIBRARY

What about the add alternate options previously discussed? What would be required in terms of redesign or other aspects to be able to consider moving some of these from base bid to add alternate, and what would the cost impact(s) be? (Kostiuk)

Previous bid alternates discussed in 2020 were to leave the new lounge and MAC lab as an empty construction “shell” corridor until funding became available to in-fill, and/or have the Recreation Department and group bathrooms renovations be a bid alternate to be renovated separately from the other project components. Bid alternates are part of the discussion staff are having with the construction management firm and the architectural team as part of the value engineering study; we expect to receive the VE report next week.

How much would it cost and time would it take to do an alternative design and permitting process that might result in further savings than we would get without doing a further redesign? I'd like to know what the cost of that vs potential savings would be -- mostly, I'm thinking of relatively minor overall changes, rather than a total design overhaul. (Kostiuk)

Staff expect to receive the value engineering report from the construction management team next week, at which point the RRMM architects will review the report results and provide a sense of timing associated with the various options. Staff can provide additional information after that information exchange has occurred.

What other creative financing ideas does the staff have for the Library? bond, naming rights for a benefactor, etc (where do they get their funding? who do they approach when there are cost overruns on projects?)

According to Library Director Jessica Jones: “I have been giving a lot of thought to this ever since coming on board last spring in anticipation of cost increases (worst case scenario) or flexibility with add-ons (best case). I have had a really difficult time finding capital project grants for which we would be eligible - most foundations and granting

institutions want to fund service-based projects rather than capital ones. Or, they only want to support projects in a specific geographical area.

Barring a privately funded capital campaign, I'm at a loss for alternative funding sources right now. I'm going to keep looking, but I haven't had any luck so far. It's outside my area of expertise to run a private capital campaign, but I do know that consultants can be hired to manage one if that's the direction we need to take. I'm not opposed, and nor were any of my staff in our last weekly meeting where we did some brainstorming, to offering naming rights or commemorative recognition of donors (e.g., "sponsor a brick/chair/computer lab")."

Yesterday, we did receive notification of a State grant opportunity for digital divide projects that might cover \$75,000 of the Computer Center Renovation. Staff can continue to look for these kinds of funding opportunities, every little bit helps, however with limited capacity these sporadic opportunities are unlikely to fill the budget gap.

Can we get a table showing actual to-date costs over and total anticipated? The charts now show different things than the charts we were shown previously. (Kostiuk)

Yes, funds have been spent since the charts shown previously. All of the State Capital Grant account activity has been related to the RRMM contract and has been expended on design work, permitting, document preparation, and other related expenses approved for this particular State grant. Bond funds have also been spent advancing design work, prior legal services related to the project, permitting fees, etc. Below is a breakdown of bond expenditures activity:

<u>Description of Cost</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Asbestos Inspection	\$2,895.00
Billable Hours - Council Meeting Appearances	\$2,507.50
Construction Documents	\$117,174.00
Cost Estimates	\$1,600.00
Design - Labor Charges	\$31,379.00
Floodplain Study	\$74,000.00
Floodplain Study Fee	\$1,140.00

Legal Reviews	\$11,615.50
Permit Design Review	\$11,941.00
Permit Fees	\$14,123.47
Reclassification - Grant Expenditures	\$110,385.54
Reimbursable Expenses	\$365.86
Reproductions - Drawings and shipping	\$214.13
Schematic Design	\$102,248.20
Sign Postings	\$554.18
Total	\$482,143.38

Total expenditures to date and funding sources are detailed below (the \$482,143.38 above matches the library infrastructure bond activity - two amounts below):

Funding Source	2022_02 Budget	Notes
Library Infrastructure Bond Reserve Original Balance	\$ 7,000,000	
Library Infrastructure Bond Activity through FY21	\$ (456,113)	Per Tyler report on 1/10/2022
Library Infrastructure Bond Activity FY22	\$ (26,030)	
State Capital Grants Original Balance	\$ 300,000	Submitting for full reimbursement in FY22
State Capital Grants Expenditures	\$ (299,322)	
Cable Capital Grants	\$ 2,500,000	Current reserve balance is \$3,575,818 - Tyler report 10/4
Total Funds Expended TD	\$ (781,466)	
Total Funds Available	\$ 9,018,534	
Cost Category	Cost Estimate	
RRMM Contract Balance Remaining	\$ 275,497	Based on most recent invoice #56681 on 2/1
Construction Estimate	\$ 11,255,849	Includes design contingency 3% and escalation to the midpoint

Green Design & Energy Efficiency Improvements	NA	Now included in construction estimates
Solar Panels	\$ 73,997	only moving and storage cost; additional panels quantity TBD
Soft Costs	\$ 1,365,890	
Total Cost	\$ 12,971,233	
Construction Contingency Advised	\$ 562,792	5% of total construction cost
Funding Required	\$ (4,515,491)	
<i>Additional Cable Capital Grants Available</i>	\$ 595,818	Reflects \$195,000 already taken out for the FY22 Communications capital ask, as well as \$285,000 through FY26 CIP already taken out

Here is a breakdown of the estimated soft costs totaling \$1,365,890:

Soft Cost Item	Estimated Cost
Asbestos Remediation	\$ 30,000
Construction Manager	\$ 270,000
Furniture	\$ 570,000
Security Cameras & Telecommunications Installation	\$ 76,300
Moving/Storage Costs	\$ 300,000
Miscellaneous Permitting Fees	\$ 45,440
Additional Landscaping	\$ 25,000
County Required Design Changes - Permitting/MR	\$ 49,150
Total	\$ 1,365,890

Variables within soft costs are Moving/Storage costs:

- The most recent moving quote we have is from 2020, and costs may have increased since then. Libraries require movers who are experienced with moving libraries and are capable of maintaining collection integrity and organization.
- This number is currently budgeted to accommodate moving out of the Community Center, moving back into the Community Center, and storage of some items to which we would not have access during construction. Some of the moving costs may be mitigated if all Library property is moved to a single location, which would also be best for maintaining Library operations during the duration of construction.
- Leasing of a commercial property may necessitate an increase in this amount but would also allow for Recreation spaces to remain open and continue to generate revenue throughout construction.

One of the reasons we moved from the earlier smaller design to the current larger one was because with that smaller design (owing primarily to ADA requirements) there would have been less space for books than we currently have. My understanding of the current design is that it would allow at least the same amount of space for books, and possibly more. It would be great to get a clarification on that point (Kovar).

The collection we house is very comprehensive, especially considering its size, and a public library collection is less a repository than a living thing. It is important for public libraries to scale and maintain collections to best serve its patrons' needs, which is why we weed the collection for out of date, obsolete, and unappealing materials that may give unfavorable impressions and dissuade patrons from utilizing them. For instance, we do not need to devote shelf space to outdated reference materials when the newest editions can be found in our Oxford Reference subscription online. And, that space in the "Reference" section can now be used for other anticipated needs - it's a net zero gain in shelf space, but the composition has altered.

Many libraries have actually been physically scaling down their collections in the last decade or so, in favor of diverting users to more digital resource use. I don't think that model fits this library or community particularly well. While our online resources may grow, I think that means that we can allocate more shelf space to materials in print that are interesting and relevant to the community we serve. Our goal is to be useful, effective, and unique. We can accomplish this in a new building with a comparable amount of shelf space.

What is the forecast for future inflation and costs? Is it possible to identify whether a brief postponing of the project could result in cost reductions? I don't want to delay for long, given how long we have already delayed and the need, but I wonder if there is a better or worse timing to think about. (Kostiuk)

The total construction cost already includes both a contingency amount and an “escalation to midpoint” which is intended to account for potential inflation over the course of the project. Those amounts are calculated based on a July start date; any further delays past July causing a different start date could result in revisions to those amounts.

I've received several questions regarding the stormwater aspects of the project, specifically concerning the anticipated heavier rainfall and stormwater flow our State is likely to see in the future. (Kovar)

The Stormwater permitting process, as well as most other permit processes overseen by the City or County, do not include a process for peer review or independent confirmation. The City Code specifies the requirements of the City's stormwater permitting process. That Code was modeled on the requirements provided by the State of Maryland and is fully consistent with the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual, which is the official guide for stormwater management principles, methods and practices and to which the City is required to comply by State law. The City's Code was approved by the State of Maryland prior to adoption.

The Floodplain Delineation Study is a requirement of Montgomery County, Dept. of Permitting Services. It is not overseen or reviewed by the City. It is wholly a County requirement. The design engineering team for the Library has prepared the required study and DPS will review it and determine if it meets their requirements. That review is currently underway.

The Flood Mitigation Plan that was undertaken by the City in 2009 served a very different purpose than that of the Flood Delineation Study. The goal of the Mitigation Plan was a citywide review of potential flood hazard areas, specifically identifying the local 100 year floodplain and to develop general mitigation goals and objectives for further consideration. The purpose of the referenced floodplain delineation study is specific to the impacts of the proposed Library site on the existing floodplain in that location. The extent of the studies parameters are guided by County regulations.

The design rainfalls required to be used for purposes of the stormwater management plan design are specified in the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual and City Code.

There are efforts underway for review of the rainfall levels, especially based on the impacts of climate change. When the State of Maryland changes those rainfall designations, then the City will also. The City can not independently require stormwater design with a different designation in rainfall levels than Codified in State and City law.

The engineering design team did specifically calculate the actual impervious area within the proposed Library site. This was stated to be 103,683 sf. and was determined by actual site conditions. I believe your statement to the contrary, bullet point 4 above, was in reference to the Flood Delineation Study and not the stormwater permit application.

The evaluation performed as regards to the infiltration testing by the engineering team meets the requirements of the City. While the City Engineer does agree that the results of the infiltration test are quite high, it is noted that the planned bioretention facilities will be built with an underdrain, which will be a direct conduit for filtered run-off from the facility to go directly into the stormwater drain pipe on the site.

Lastly, as noted above, the rainfall amount used in the design of the stormwater management facilities meets the MDE standards specified in the Design Manual and City Code as does the amount of impervious area for which treatment must be provided.

One of the things that I and many other parents love about the Takoma Park Library is that kids can focus on books there because there aren't computers in the children's area. All of the other area libraries that I'm familiar with have computers for kids with language- and math-type games on them, and although this sounds nice in theory, the reality is that it makes it difficult for most kids to focus on the books because they are drawn to the computers.

There is huge value in providing computer access for digital equity and early learning, and this is being addressed for most kids through MCPS. All kids at MCPS now get school-issued Chromebooks that they use throughout the day and take home for evening use. The new laptop lending program should also help in addressing other inequities with regard to computer access.

There could be additional computers located elsewhere in the library/community center area (like there are now), but I think it is very important for the children's area to be kept separate from computers other than the card catalog. I was on a Zoom call today for parents with kids who have special needs, and a parent was bemoaning the issues they have with screens at libraries and was overjoyed when I noted that the Takoma Park Library does not have this setup. It is a very unique feature and one that I would hate to lose with the renovation. (Kostiuk)

The plans as we currently have them contain some catalog computers in the Children's Room so that the Library's catalog can be accessed, but not general public internet use, for many of the reasons that you have stated. Since we have specialized Computer Center staff, we also like to keep most of that function within an easy sightline for them. That has worked well for us in the past, and I do not see us altering that arrangement unless circumstances change substantially.

I have worked in libraries that allocate a couple of computers in children's areas for general public logins. It is mainly done to keep parents and caregivers who need the computers within easily supervisable proximity of their child(ren). When parents come to a library for an extended computer session (for instance, to create a resume or fill out a FAFSA - something that can take a lot of concentration) and have to drop their children off in another part of the facility that they cannot see and hear, things can get disruptive. If that becomes an issue in the new building, then we may revisit having an internet computer or two that would be intended primarily for parent/caregiver use, but it's not in the current plan. We have an especial affinity for the analog in this Library, and I don't want to unnecessarily change things that set it apart from the big library systems around us.

BROADBAND AND HOTSPOTS

Does this mean that the City would end up subsidizing what is otherwise a free program for people who qualify? The City would be subsidizing what is otherwise a \$9.95 (plus tax) program for people who qualify by Comcast's criteria, and we would also be able to subsidize that cost for anyone, regardless of how their application would be handled independently of the City's sponsorship.

For those who would qualify, would they typically (without City involvement) get free Internet, or is it just reduced-fee Internet? After the City's subsidy ends, residents who are eligible by Comcast's criteria can stay on the service and pay ~\$10/month.

Would the City have to pay for residents to be a part of this program who would otherwise be able to qualify for free Internet? Anyone enrolled in this program does incur the \$~10/month fee, regardless of income, unless their access is sponsored by a program like this one we have proposed.

ARPA INVESTMENT COMPARISONS

What are other cities doing with their SLFRF funding? (Dyballa) What other communities in the COG region are doing with ARPA on public infrastructure and direct assistance? (Dyballa)

The following resources help see other cities funding decisions with ARPA funds. Figure 1 also provides an overall sense of the distribution of ARPA investments in terms of investment type. For the national sample average, government operations actually had the highest percentage.

- [The National League of Cities COVID-19: Local Action Tracker](#), which describes local governments ARPA spending plans
- [The National League of Cities ARPA State Fiscal Recovery Allocations](#), which describes state-governments ARPA policies
- [Results for America](#) prepared a data dashboard breaking down ARPA expenditures by place and Treasury expenditure category
- [The Brookings Local Government ARPA Investment Tracker](#), which describes local governments' ARPA policies and presents summary statistics on spending decisions. The summary statistics show finds 37.9% of ARPA funds have been spent on local operations and 12.1% on infrastructure (full graphic follows):

Figure 1: Distribution of Local Government ARPA Investments based on Brookings [ARPA Investment Tracker](#)

National Sample Average

GOVERNMENT
OPERATIONS
37.9%

INFRASTRUCTURE
12.1%

HOUSING
12.7%

ECONOMIC &
WORKFORCE DEV
10.5%

COMMUNITY AID
12.3%

PUBLIC SAFETY
2.3%

PUBLIC HEALTH
12.2%

We do not have the capacity to do a full accounting of other cities' expenditures, but identified the following cities as devoting some portion of their funds towards public facilities renovation by doing a quick word search in the National League of Cities dataset and a limited-search through the Bloomberg dataset. The NLC dataset is downloadable which makes it much easier to filter and search, but the Bloomberg dataset is more detailed, describing places' individual policies rather than plans.

Table 1: Select ARPA Infrastructure Investments by Other Cities Based on National League of Cities [Data](#) and Brookings ARPA Investment Tracker [Data](#)

<i>City</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Infrastructure Investments</i>
Texarkana, AK	29,657	\$1.63 million on Texarkana Regional Airport projects
San Jacinto, CA	49,215	\$11,773,274 from the American Rescue Plan in the next five years to improve the city's deteriorating infrastructure and other projects to improve the daily lives of the city's residents
Salinas, CA	155,465	Out of \$51 million, \$11.5 million towards public facilities, \$12 million towards public infrastructure

Duluth, MN	85,618	\$12 million on new ventilation for Duluth City Hall
Dayton, OH	140,407	\$21.5 million will keep city facilities and agencies operating, out of \$138 million
Westerly, RI	22,509	\$344,000 for skate park expansion
Corpus Christi, TX	326,586	\$4,050,000 to construction of fire station
York, PA	44,022	\$9 million to city services and infrastructure (\$2,750,000 towards renovating the City Hall roof, \$750,000 towards renovating a Fire House and \$750,000 towards renovating Penn Market)
San Antonio, TX	1,547,253	\$10 million for infrastructure improvements to campus of Texas Biomedical Research Institute
Bethlehem, PA	75,815	\$12 million to capital needs
Kenosha, WI	99,944	\$2.25 million for renovation of a building as a local training center
Goshen, IA	34,217	\$5.1 million to library construction
Worcester, MA	185,428	\$7.5 million in DCU Center, \$10 million in public parks, \$2.5 million in municipal parking
Port Huron, MI	28,749	\$8 million on immediate needs including capital facilities
Tulsa, OK	401,190	\$8.1 million to public facilities and infrastructure
Buffalo, NY	255,284	Community center enhancements (undescribed amount)
Superior, WI	25,977	Library and theater rehabilitation (undescribed amount)
Utica, NY	59,750	Repairs to public facilities (undescribed amount)
Williamsburg	14,954	Construction of the new police station facility and the relocation of public works storage are priced at \$17.5 million
Atlantic County, NJ	263,670	\$6.5 million towards HVAC replacement at the County Office Building, \$2 million towards HVAC improvements at the Government Center

Charleston County, SC	411,406	\$1.5 million in replacement of Judicial Center roof, \$3.5 million in replacement of law enforcement center roof, \$325,000 in renovating library, \$560,000 in repairing and repainting a building exterior, \$600,000 in replacing 4 elevators, \$1.5 million in replacing a building's windows, \$1.6 million in replacing another roof, \$2 million rehabilitating a courthouse, \$281,000 rehabilitating another roof, \$326,000 rehabilitating another building
Chula Vista, CA	268,920	\$8 million in demolishing and building a new recreation center
Colorado Springs, CO	464,871	\$7.5 million for City capital projects, facilities maintenance, and security projects, and \$2.5 million to rehabilitate the City Auditorium
Knox County, TN	470,313	\$13 million in construction of new engineering and public works facility
Onondaga County, NY	476,516	\$4 million for rehabilitation of Carnegie building
Orange County, FL	1,429,908	\$1.2 million for renovation of Orange County Emergency Operation Center, \$2.8 million in heavy equipment purchases, \$425,000 in upgrading digital infrastructure at 12 community centers,
Plano, TX	285,494	\$150,000 in Community Center roof replacement, \$450,000 in generator replacement at Parkway Operations Building and Fleet Services Building, \$1,450,000 in remodeling Police Headquarters Building
Santa Barbara County, CA	446,499	\$400,000 replacement of the upper roof

The table below shows the same results for direct-cash assistance programs using ARPA funds. In our responses to the next question, we provide more detail on some of these policies. Additionally, in our memorandum, we identified a number of cities implementing basic income programs, some using ARPA funds. It should be noted that a number of the programs in the table below have yet to be implemented.

Table 2: Select ARPA-Funded Direct-Cash Assistance Programs Based on National League of Cities [Data](#) and Brookings ARPA Investment Tracker [Data](#)

Place	Population	Direct-cash assistance programs
St. Louis, MI	300,576	\$500 direct cash assistance payments to negatively impacted residents
Santa Ana, CA	310,227	\$6 million allocated; 20,000 rental units are to receive a \$300 prepaid card that can be spent at businesses that accept Visa
Albuquerque, NM	564,559	\$4.2 million allocated; \$4.1 million in aid, \$1,000 per household for households experiencing economic hardship
San Diego County, CA	1,125,286	\$15 million allocated for direct cash assistance for individuals and families that were disproportionality impacted by COVID-19 and reside in one of the 39 Health Equity zip codes; \$10 million allocated for cash aid to low-income immigrants excluded from federal and State benefits, who were disproportionately impacted by COVID-19
Harris County, TX	4,731,145	\$65,400,000 allocated; one-time payments of \$1,500 to 40,000 Harris County families whose financial situation has not yet returned to pre-pandemic levels
Nassau County, NY	1,395,774	One-time payment of \$375 per household for households making less than \$168,900 annually, seniors receiving certain types of assistance, and people who experienced economic hardship
Boston, MA	675,647	\$800,000 to households facing housing insecurity, through the Boston Housing Authority (more detail in next question)
Austin, TX	978,908	\$2.3 million allocated; \$1,000 or \$2,000 grants to eligible musicians, prioritizing equity in selection
Phoenix, AZ	1,608,139	\$12 million allocated out of \$196 million total; 1,000 families receive a monthly stipend of \$1,000 per family for 12 months (more detail in next question)
Anchorage, AK	293,531	\$50,000 allocated for extra-financial assistance to people in need
Boulder County, CO	326,196	\$300,000 allocated to financially support negatively-impacted workers ineligible for UI or stimulus funds

Buffalo, NY	256,480	\$5.5 million allocated to help low-income residents with assistance clearing outstanding bills; \$13 million for debt forgiveness of water and sewer debts
Ingham County, MI	292,406	\$5 million allocated for direct financial assistance for adversely impacted households
Louisville Jefferson County Metro Government, KY	386,884	\$225,000 allocated for individuals from multicultural communities who were adversely impacted
Oakland County, MI	1,274,395	\$1.2 million allocated for financial assistance to families where childcare is a barrier to employment
Washington, DC	692,683	\$26,581,351 allocated to district residents otherwise excluded from District and federal aid related to COVID-19; \$11,694,350 allocated to support 300 families over 5 years; \$5,000,000 allocated to provide one-time payments of \$500 to each DC resident who waited at least 60 days from their first UI check

In general, communities in the COG region are investing in broadband, sewer and stormwater infrastructure, and, to a lesser extent, direct assistance payments to individuals and households. The NLC database provides information for large cities and counties and does not drill down to NEU local unit of government. For the COG region, data has been presented below for Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties. You will also see below, some detailed examples from other cities that include projects focusing on direct assistance payments. A more high-level overview of cities’ infrastructure and direct assistance ARPA/SLFRF policies can be found in our previous response on all cities’ ARPA spending decisions.

Jurisdiction	Type of ARPA/SLFRF Project	Amount
Montgomery County, MD	<p>Direct Payment: The Working Families Income Supplement expansion provides financial assistance to the County's low income working residents that are eligible to receive the State's Expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit under Senate Bill 218. The County matches 100% of the State EITC.</p>	\$25,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Broadband): Montgomery Connects Digital Equity funding will be used to support provision of digital equity training in Mandarin, expanded outreach in Spanish, enrollment of low-income residents in free computer device and home broadband discount programs, and expansion of MoCoNet service to residents.</p>	\$100,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Broadband): FiberNet3 funding will be used for equipment, warranties and support contracts for networking equipment and data center connections that enable exponential growth in FiberNet network capacity.</p>	\$700,000

Jurisdiction	Type of ARPA/SLFRF Project	Amount
Prince George's County, MD	<p>Infrastructure (Sewer and Water): DPWT is constructing drainage and stormwater management in the Longfield neighborhood. The project proposes new storm drains and bio-retentions to reduce flooding and nuisance waters.</p>	\$2,770,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Sewer and Water): The flood study would be performed on a watershed basis. It will identify areas prone to regular flooding, assess current and future flooding vulnerabilities in the watershed, and recommend measures to reduce flooding impacts to communities.</p>	\$2,300,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Sewer and Water): The project is proposed in Cheverly, MD and will achieve dual benefits to address residential structure drainage issues and improve water quality.</p>	\$605,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Sewer and Water): This project entails the installation of public under drains in the County right-of-way to alleviate street flooding and to provide stubs to which residents may connect private systems that would convey discharge from sump pumps to the public underdrain.</p>	\$800,000
	<p>Infrastructure (Sewer and Water): This project proposes new storm drains to protect over twenty homes from frequent flooding which is causing extensive and repeated property damage. The storm drains will be sized for the 100-year storm to account for climate change.</p>	\$1,860,000
Boston, MA	<p>Cash Transfer/Direct Payment: The Boston Housing Authority (BHA), a subgrantee of the City of Boston, will conduct a cash assistance pilot. The BHA will identify a subset of its tenants, voucher holders, or, in partnership with the Supportive Housing team at the Department of Neighborhood Development, Rapid Rehousing clients to deliver cash assistance. The BHA will target several hundred households for either one-time or short-term recurring cash payments based on economic factors, existing benefits programs and housing-related needs. One likely target population is formerly homeless residents who are housed at BHA public housing, a project-based voucher site, or through BHA-run mobile voucher programs, with cash assistance beginning at time of placement or move-in to ensure basic needs are met.</p>	\$800,000

Jurisdiction	Type of ARPA/SLFRF Project	Amount
Phoenix, AZ	<p>Direct Payment: A portion of these funds will be used to provide residents with City water, sewer and trash, electric, internet/broadband, natural gas utility and rent/mortgage assistance. Funds are intended to be used on residents who don't qualify for the City's more restrictive \$106M Emergency Rent Assistance Programs (ERA 1 and ERA 2). A portion of funds will also be used to provide landlord incentives as part of the Emergency Housing Vouchers program.</p>	\$10,000,000
Phoenix, AZ	<p>Direct Payment: Funds would be used to provide financial assistance to help low-to-moderate income families in Phoenix. The intent of this funding would be to ensure that families have resources needed to provide quality childcare and to cover other household expenses. Resources could also be used to provide mini-grants to Phoenix childcare facilities in low-to-moderate census tracts for technology upgrades that could include classroom screens, web-cam access, digital sign in/out software, childcare management software, and/or general WiFi upgrades.</p>	\$12,000,000
Portland, OR	<p>Household Assistance/Direct Payment: The Portland Water Bureau (PWB) provides billing services for the City's publicly owned sewer, stormwater, and water utilities. Due to the financial crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic, many Portlanders have been unable to pay their sewer, stormwater, water bills. PWB estimates that Portlanders have more \$22 million of back-due bills. Account holders who are enrolled in our financial assistance program owe \$1.4 million of that, and we believe there are many more Portlanders in need of financial assistance are currently in debt. This project supports those who have been economically impacted by reducing the outstanding delinquent balances on their accounts. It will focus on low-income Portlanders; according to Portland Business Alliance's State of the Economy Report from 2021, households most impacted by economic crisis in Portland include low-income earners: from Jan 2020 to Dec 2020, there was a 24.5% decline in jobs that made less than \$27K a year, 6.2% decline in jobs that made \$27K-\$60K per year, and a 0.8% increase in jobs that made more than \$60K per year. Black, Indigenous, and Portlanders of color are overrepresented in these industries.</p>	\$2,600,000