

City of Sacramento
Measure U Community Advisory Commission Report
915 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cityofsacramento.org

File ID: 2026-01021

6/15/2026

Dissolution of the 2026/27 Budget Recommendations Ad Hoc Committee

File ID: 2026-01021

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Pass a **Motion** dissolving the 2026/27 Budget Recommendations Ad Hoc Committee.

Contact: Ash Roughani, Special Projects Manager, (916) 808-7751, aroughani@cityofsacramento.org, Office of the City Manager

Attachments:

1-Description/Analysis

2-Final FY2026/27 Budget Recommendations

Description/Analysis

Issue Detail: At the March 16, 2026, Measure U Community Advisory Commission (Commission) meeting, the Commission Chair Richard “Teddy” Georgeoff, III (Chair) established the 2026/27 Budget Recommendations Ad Hoc Committee (Committee). Subsequently, the Commission presented its recommendations to the City Council’s Budget and Audit Committee on May 5, 2026 (Attachment 2). As the Committee’s work has concluded, the Commission should dissolve it.

Policy Considerations: Sacramento City Code section 2.40.160(A) states that city commissions may create temporary meeting bodies that are known as ad-hoc committees, and they are subject to the restrictions of both the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code § 54952 (b).) and the City’s administrative policy pertaining to ad-hoc committees.

Economic Impacts: Not applicable.

Environmental Considerations: Not applicable.

Sustainability: Not applicable.

Commission/Committee Action: None.

Rationale for Recommendation: This action formally dissolves the 2026/27 Budget Recommendations Ad Hoc Committee as required by the City's Administrative Policy on Ad-Hoc Committees.

Financial Considerations: Not applicable

Local Business Enterprise (LBE): None.

Measure U Community Advisory Commission

FY 2026-27 Budget Recommendations

Prepared by the Measure U Goals & Metrics Ad Hoc Subcommittee

Executive Summary

Measure U generates roughly \$150M per year for City programs. This document recommends some strategic changes to how that money should be allocated in FY 2026-27 and, more importantly, how programs should be held accountable for results in future cycles.

Headline calls:

1. We believe there are a few programs that are primary examples of funds overdelivering on an ROI basis. We have also identified a few that could use reduction or restructure. Overall the commission felt most programs should remain funded as is. (See the budget action recommendations)
2. Roughly \$8M in FY25 Measure U spending reads as General Fund work and should be relabeled. This is a transparency fix, not a savings claim, but also would stop the GF (general fund) from subsidizing Measure U.
3. Programs that utilize their funds to seek out grants which create a multiplication effect on the funding available are amazing, and should be highlighted as great uses of funds.
4. Many programs funded by Measure U also get substantial funding from GF. This was considered in our evaluation.

1. Budget Action Recommendations

Grow:

GPIT & Office of violence prevention: ~2400 individual participants all servicing youth. This is a critical Public Safety measure, which rates as a high priority according to the City Survey.

Office of economic development: Investments into this office seem to yield net positive value to citizens. For every dollar invested they create nearly 9 dollars more for the people of Sacramento.

Fare Free Transit: Low cost program that is a necessity for some families

Participatory budgeting: We understand that we are in a structural deficit, which makes it all the more important we invest in high RoI programs. Dollar to dollar Participatory budgeting was one of the highest returns for impact because it utilized a lot of volunteer hours and people already embedded in the community. All programs also had strict metric capture and reporting requirements.

Reduce / Restructure:

Arts & creative edge: In a time of fiscal turmoil, its just not something we would want to trade funding off of essential services for.

Community Engagement: The time put into podcasts, vlogs, zins, or otherwise seem to have low engagement and we could likely get some funding back from here to put elsewhere.

2. Findings

2.1 Police Hiring Pipeline

Although we are not proposing a change to the budgeting amount for this program, the idea that it's called a hiring pipeline, does not well represent what this program is. As such its true benefits fail to be transparent to the public. We propose that this program be broken up into 3 distinct programs for clarity and better goaling.

- 1) Youth Development
- 2) CBO Program
- 3) Hiring & Outreach

This allows for each of these to be goaled according to the problem they are trying to solve.

2.2 Spending that doesn't fit in Measure U

The following FY25 lines look like General Fund work rather than Measure U purpose:

Program	Budget	Why it reads as GF
---------	--------	--------------------

Gen Insurance/Termination	\$2,635,411	Citywide operating cost
Retired/Transfer Employee Benefits	\$1,071,100	Labor-agreement obligation
Citywide IT Maintenance and Support	\$289,684	General operating IT
Employee Development	\$116,395	HR function
City Facility Reinvestment Program	\$2,200,000	Roofs, HVAC, electrical, ADU-style repairs
Facility ADA Compliance Program	\$500,000	Federal/state legal mandate
SPLA Maintenance	\$400,000	Building maintenance MOU
Citywide Pool Assessment/Repair	\$450,000	Capital repair
IT Regional Support / PD Systems Support	\$73,447	IT reimbursement backfill
Commission Stipends (4 depts)	~\$40,500	Governance operating cost

Subtotal: ~\$8.0M. Shifting these lines to the General Fund does not save the City money, it is a transparency fix so Measure U is seen to be funding the services voters approved, not to claim \$8M in new capacity.

3. Accountability Framework

The reason recommendations can swing year-over-year is that many programs fail to state up front what they were trying to achieve. Funding programs without pre-stated goals makes success unfalsifiable. We are working with staff, but would like the Council to endorse or adopt an accountability loop for all Measure U programs.

3.1 Program Goal Template

Each program must submit, before budget adoption:

1. **One-sentence purpose.** What problem this program exists to solve.
2. **1–3 measurable outcome goals for the coming year**, each with:
 - Baseline value (prior year actual)
 - Target value (next year goal)
 - Source of the data (system, report, or survey)
3. **1–2 activity metrics** (throughput), only as context for the outcome goals.
4. **Named accountable owner** (not a department, a person).
5. **What failure looks like**, the threshold below which the program should be restructured or defunded.

We feel that this is an important part of analyzing the success of programs for continued investment.

3.2 Review Cadence

- **Midyear check-in (Q2):** each program reports progress toward its stated target. Off-track programs get a written corrective plan, not automatic cuts.
- **Annual review (end of Q4):** each program reports actuals vs. target. Three outcomes only:
 - **Met / exceeded** → eligible for normal renewal.
 - **Missed but explained** → renew with a corrective plan and a new target.
 - **Missed without a plan** → proposed for reduce/restructure/shift in next cycle.
 - **Two-year rule:** any program that misses its stated outcome goals two cycles in a row, without a credible restructuring plan, should be proposed for defunding or outsourcing.

Prepared by the Measure U Goals & Metrics Ad Hoc Subcommittee. Comments, counter-evidence, and departmental responses are welcome.