



Five Year Spending Plan for American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funds

Council Work Session
January 26, 2022

City Council Review of Potential ARPA Projects

- Social Services Partnerships
 - Community Connectors
- Library Expansion
- Direct cash assistance *new*
- Stormwater mitigation *new*
- Citywide Traffic Safety Study & Plan *new*

Social Services Partnerships

\$1,200,000

What kinds of partnerships are envisioned?

The \$1.2 million could be used for one or multiple projects, at Council's discretion. Given limited staff capacity, intent is to implement social services and/or intensive community outreach to vulnerable residents through partnerships.

Possible uses of this spending bucket might include:

- Supplement other projects already proposed (e.g. workforce development, grant programs)
- Distribute to non-profits through RFPs with different tracks for particular services
- Create Community Connectors program
- Hire consultant for resident surveys, focus groups, or provider mapping to further assess resident needs
- Dedicate full amount to direct cash assistance

Direct Cash Assistance

Est. \$1,200,000-\$2,235,000

Direct Cash Assistance: Two Options Scored

OPTION ONE: Cash assistance for low-to-moderate income renters, no strings attached

- **Estimated cost: \$2,325,000**
- One-time transfer of \$1,000
- Target 2,100 renter households making less than 60% AMI (about \$51,000); most renters earning <60% AMI experience cost-burden
- Hire accounting firm, marketing & outreach, Community Center pick up, eligibility agreement

OPTION TWO: Basic Income Pilot program

- **Estimated cost: \$1.2 million - flexibility in design; fixed research costs**
- One year-pilot (some flexibility)
- Different options:
 - Option A: Research-oriented pilot program with monthly payments, maybe 250 participants, control/research group, other cities vary in benefit levels (typically \$200-1,000 a month); research cost \$1-1.5M
 - Option B: One-time cash transfers to low-to-moderate income households, more participants than Option A, limited data collection/reporting e.g. \$1,000 to \$2,000 for LMI single moms; 14.3% poverty rate

Direct Cash Assistance: Pros/Cons

OPTION ONE: Cash assistance for low-to-moderate income renters

- Pros: Evident that renters in Takoma Park are more vulnerable; good research on benefits of direct assistance
- Cons: Challenge of making sure eligible households access benefits; one-time payment; uncertainty around whether City can provide this long-term; potentially less precise compared other programs (if reaches more higher-income households, fewer lower-income)

OPTION TWO: Basic Income Pilot

- Option A pros/cons (research-oriented)
 - Pros: inform design other programs; contribute basic-income research/partner with research orgs; learn more about how would work in TP
 - Cons: Unlikely to reach many households; could be challenging to implement; research component extends cost/timeframe; a lot of pilots completed
- Option B pros/cons (direct assistance)
 - Pros: inform design of other programs; benefits more households; good research on benefits of direct assistance
 - Cons: one-time payment; could be hard to implement; short-term benefits

Community Connectors

Est. \$450,000-\$1,700,000

Community Connectors Proposal: Background

Scored proposal: \$1,700,000 (\$340,000 per year, 3 full-time connectors and a supervisor)

Cornell University student research:

- Per diem, stipend or flexible funds for connectors with one full-time manager
- Aims to build trust, create two-way dialogue, share information and resources communities
- Requires clear goals/relationship and trust-building, partnership vs. top-down
- Can be generalist or targeted to different goals

Community Connectors Proposal: Pros/Cons

Pros

- Improve community engagement with harder-to-reach groups
 - Ability to distribute information about government programs, create dialogue
 - Obtain community input beyond existing tools

Cons

- Requires setup/design, recruit connectors, hire staff, build community relationships within ARPA time limit
- If done poorly, could create distrust/have opposite effect

Citywide Traffic Study & Plan

Est. \$\$TBD

Vision Zero Plan Proposal: Background

- Traffic Safety Assessment and Plan of traffic issues in the area
- Council cost estimate: \$200,000 year 1, TBD after; no staff estimate yet
- Study areas of high-traffic safety issues, create plan to make improvements, and implement over time with goal of reducing traffic deaths to 0
- Vision Zero Network nationally: 51 cities/counties/states, 47 cities ranging 28,352 to 8.4 million in population, median population 269,702

Vision Zero Plan Proposal: Pros/Cons

Pros

- Sets out comprehensive plan for making pedestrian-friendly improvements; reducing auto accidents
- Better understanding of unsafe roads, impacts changes to roads on other roads
- Potentially more creative ideas from comprehensive plan than isolated approaches

Cons

- Staff capacity for RFP/consultant/planning
- High cost: study + implementation of recs
- TP smaller than any cities that done this, most much bigger:
- 7/47 cities < 100k people, 2 cities < 50k
- Question of impact: limited City control over roads, esp. state
- Challenges for other cities: unable or unwilling to implement full changes
 - Not clear effective in other cities: where effective, already had policies in place

Stormwater Infrastructure/Private Property Flood Mitigation Est. \$\$TBD

Best Practices Research – Private Property Interventions

- Initial research into examples in other areas found few cities with programs to address stormwater issues on private property. Those that exist are similar to the County Rainscapes model or more flood mitigation grants or reimbursement; \$1,500 - \$7,500 per project
 - Flood mitigation includes waterproofing foundations, raising door opening, correcting window wells, installing flood walls, battery back ups for sumps, etc.
 - Rainscapes programs include rain gardens, bioretention facility permeable pavement, green roofs, etc.
 - Property owner identifies solutions, and selects contractor (one City offers engineering support and site recommendations)
- Low Impact Design Center has completed several stormwater resiliency analysis for Cheverly, Somerset and Hyattsville. In these cases a geographic area was selected and analyzed for existing stormwater issue, infrastructure and possible green and grey solutions

Stormwater Private Property Interventions – Pros/Cons

Pros

- Addresses stormwater challenges on private property, assists homeowners in need
- Contributes to the goals of the City's Climate Action Plan
- High level of community organization around action on the issue

Cons

- Lack of staff capacity to initiate or implement either model
- Planned public infrastructure projects still need to be completed
- Potential legal risk if City is developing designs for private property
- Long-term initiative, ARPA is time-limited funding. Will need other sources - increase to stormwater fee
- Est. cost of engineer, full-time administrator for robust private SW management support program upwards of \$4 million over five years for 2-3 projects per year

Library Expansion

\$2,000,000

Takoma Park Library: ARPA alignment

- Alignment with ARPA goals
 - ARPA Category 1. Public Health/Negative Economic Impacts: Capital Expenditures that support COVID-19 public health or economic recovery efforts
 - Bridging Digital Divide and Economic recovery
 - Space that accommodates “new normal” operations
- Features that support ARPA goals
 - Improved computer instruction areas
 - Increased square footage
 - Increased availability of Wi-Fi and power outlets for charging and using personal devices
 - Public space to work, learn, train, and practice
 - Isolated spaces to connect

Takoma Park Library: Process and timing

- Where are we in this process?

We are here:

- Design work is in finalizing stages
- Permits are forthcoming
- Construction Manager has been hired

Activities remaining to reach bidding process:

- Constructability review, then;
- value engineering study, risk register and conducting a risk workshop
- Finalizing construction documents so we can solicit RFQ/RFPs
- Go to bid

- Why is timing important?

- Progression towards bidding
- Inflation and supply/labor costs

A Recovered, Resilient Takoma Park

Staff Spending Plan Key Areas

- 50% - Assist the City's most vulnerable residents and businesses
- 36% - Invest in City facilities and public infrastructure
- 14% - Support City operations, workforce, and fiscal stability

SPENDING PLAN BREAKDOWN

Goal 1: Vulnerable Residents				Goal 2: Community Anchors					
Multi-Family Housing Rehabilitation Fund; \$1,500,000		Social Services Partnerships; \$1,200,000		Library expansion; \$2,000,000		Community Center Atrium Fill-In and Dispatch Renovation; \$1,200,000			
Utility assistance: Weatherization, Electrification; \$1,000,000		Municipal Broadband; \$568,243				Maple Avenue Complete Street; \$1,000,000		Recreation Center Redevelopment; \$350,000	
		Emergency Rental Assistance (not approved); \$500,000						Takoma Branch Stream Restoration...	
		Mental Health Crisis Counselors; \$600,000				Scholarships for Recreation Programs; \$500,000		Goal 3: City Operations	
		Takoma-Langley Crossroads Business Incubator Funding; \$500,000		ARPA Contingency Amount; \$1,501,857		Premium Pay for Essential Workers; \$272,000		Financial Software Up...	
		Grants for small...	Workforce...			Interactive...			