



City of Homer

www.cityofhomer-ak.gov

Finance Department

491 East Pioneer Avenue
Homer, Alaska 99603

finance@cityofhomer-ak.gov

(p) 907-235-8121

(f) 907-235-3140

Memorandum 20-146

TO: Mayor Castner and Homer City Council
THROUGH: Rob Dumouchel, City Manager
FROM: Elizabeth Walton, Finance Director
DATE: September 24, 2020
SUBJECT: COVID-19 Related Personnel Costs

The purpose of this memo is to provide an update on the City's existing appropriation for COVID-19 related personnel costs, a summary of projected personnel costs through December 30, 2020, and discussion concerning the inclusion of budgeted personnel costs for reimbursement with the City's Cares Act funds.

Existing Appropriation

Total appropriation to date for personnel costs associated with COVID-19 preparation and response is up to \$553,312. This appropriation total includes the following:

- Ordinance 20-25(S) appropriated \$445,000 for approved staffing expenses associated with COVID-19 response. This appropriation included expenses approved in Emergency Ordinance 20-24 (Memo 20-065 provides detail), totaling \$255,000 and "regular budgeted" personnel costs presented in a memorandum in council's laydown packet for the meeting on May 26th totaling just shy of \$190,000. Together these two estimations equate to the \$445,000 appropriated in Ordinance 20-25(S).
 - Ord.20-25(S) also set aside \$90,000 to pay for administrative costs including personnel (hired an SBERG Program Manager) for the SBERG Program. Later, Ord. 20-41 reappropriated \$50,000 of the \$90,000 to pay for administrative costs including personnel (hiring an Economic Relief Grant Program Manager) to assist with the City's expanded CARES Act grant funding programs. This dollar amount is not factored into the above total as it is only to be used for these two new positions and their programs' admin costs.
- Ordinance 20-45(S) appropriated \$108,312 for approved staffing expenses associated with COVID-19 response. This appropriation was broken out in accompanying memo 20-113 from the Finance Director.

Projected Personnel Expenses

The requested appropriation detailed below is intended to account for the City's personnel costs associated with COVID-19 until December 30, 2020. The appropriation

includes regular, budgeted employee time. According to past US Treasury guidance for the use of CARES Act Funds, “statute requires that [CARES funds] be used only to cover costs that were not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020.” On September 2nd, Treasury updated guidance on the inclusion of budgeted employee regular time. Discussion of that is provided below.

Update of the appropriations set forth in Ord 20-25(S) and Ord 20-45(S):

Combined Appropriation	\$553,312
Unbudgeted Personnel thru PPE 9/13	(\$265,691)
Budgeted Personnel thru PPE 9/13	(\$235,719)
Remaining after PPE 9/13	\$51,902

There was a summation error reported in Memo 20-144 regarding the breakdown between unbudgeted and budgeted personnel thru PPE 8/30. The costs associated with emergency hires was included in the budgeted total, however it was supposed to be tallied in the unbudgeted total. The error has been corrected in this memo and emergency hires are now properly included in the unbudgeted category.

Breakdown of projected unbudgeted personnel costs through December 30, 2020:

Standby	\$ 0
Overtime	\$49,677
<u>Emergency Hires</u>	<u>\$187,866</u>
Total Projection	\$237,543

Breakdown of projected budgeted personnel costs through December 30, 2020:

Full Time Regular	\$85,640
<u>Part Time Regular</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>
Total Projection	\$85,640

Total Projected Personnel Costs:	\$323,184
Appropriation Remaining:	\$51,902
Additional Funding Requested:	\$271,281

Budgeted Personnel Costs

Throughout the COVID-19 response, the City of Homer has documented COVID-19-related hourly personnel costs and considered these eligible, reimbursable expenses under the CARES Act. On September 2nd, US Treasury updated their guidelines to state that “payroll expenses allocated on an hourly basis to employees’ time dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency” would qualify as reimbursable

expenses. This confirms the City's position of applying both substantially dedicated employees' time and hourly regular budgeted personnel expenses to CARES.

Recommendation:

Approve additional appropriation of \$271,281 to fund COVID-19 related personnel costs for the remainder of the CARES Act eligibility period (ends December 30, 2020).

Enclosures:

Coronavirus Relief Fund Guidance for State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Governments-
Updated September 2, 2020

Coronavirus Relief Fund
Guidance for State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Governments
Updated September 2, 2020¹

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to recipients of the funding available under section 601(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 5001 of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (“CARES Act”). The CARES Act established the Coronavirus Relief Fund (the “Fund”) and appropriated \$150 billion to the Fund. Under the CARES Act, the Fund is to be used to make payments for specified uses to States and certain local governments; the District of Columbia and U.S. Territories (consisting of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands); and Tribal governments.

The CARES Act provides that payments from the Fund may only be used to cover costs that—

1. are necessary expenditures incurred due to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19);
2. were not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020 (the date of enactment of the CARES Act) for the State or government; and
3. were incurred during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 30, 2020.²

The guidance that follows sets forth the Department of the Treasury’s interpretation of these limitations on the permissible use of Fund payments.

Necessary expenditures incurred due to the public health emergency

The requirement that expenditures be incurred “due to” the public health emergency means that expenditures must be used for actions taken to respond to the public health emergency. These may include expenditures incurred to allow the State, territorial, local, or Tribal government to respond directly to the emergency, such as by addressing medical or public health needs, as well as expenditures incurred to respond to second-order effects of the emergency, such as by providing economic support to those suffering from employment or business interruptions due to COVID-19-related business closures.

Funds may not be used to fill shortfalls in government revenue to cover expenditures that would not otherwise qualify under the statute. Although a broad range of uses is allowed, revenue replacement is not a permissible use of Fund payments.

The statute also specifies that expenditures using Fund payments must be “necessary.” The Department of the Treasury understands this term broadly to mean that the expenditure is reasonably necessary for its intended use in the reasonable judgment of the government officials responsible for spending Fund payments.

¹ On June 30, 2020, the guidance provided under “Costs incurred during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 30, 2020” was updated. On September 2, 2020, the “Supplemental Guidance on Use of Funds to Cover Payroll and Benefits of Public Employees” and “Supplemental Guidance on Use of Funds to Cover Administrative Costs” sections were added.

² See Section 601(d) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 5001 of the CARES Act.

Costs not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020

The CARES Act also requires that payments be used only to cover costs that were not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020. A cost meets this requirement if either (a) the cost cannot lawfully be funded using a line item, allotment, or allocation within that budget *or* (b) the cost is for a substantially different use from any expected use of funds in such a line item, allotment, or allocation.

The “most recently approved” budget refers to the enacted budget for the relevant fiscal period for the particular government, without taking into account subsequent supplemental appropriations enacted or other budgetary adjustments made by that government in response to the COVID-19 public health emergency. A cost is not considered to have been accounted for in a budget merely because it could be met using a budgetary stabilization fund, rainy day fund, or similar reserve account.

Costs incurred during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 30, 2020

Finally, the CARES Act provides that payments from the Fund may only be used to cover costs that were incurred during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 30, 2020 (the “covered period”). Putting this requirement together with the other provisions discussed above, section 601(d) may be summarized as providing that a State, local, or tribal government may use payments from the Fund only to cover previously unbudgeted costs of necessary expenditures incurred due to the COVID-19 public health emergency during the covered period.

Initial guidance released on April 22, 2020, provided that the cost of an expenditure is incurred when the recipient has expended funds to cover the cost. Upon further consideration and informed by an understanding of State, local, and tribal government practices, Treasury is clarifying that for a cost to be considered to have been incurred, performance or delivery must occur during the covered period but payment of funds need not be made during that time (though it is generally expected that this will take place within 90 days of a cost being incurred). For instance, in the case of a lease of equipment or other property, irrespective of when payment occurs, the cost of a lease payment shall be considered to have been incurred for the period of the lease that is within the covered period but not otherwise. Furthermore, in all cases it must be necessary that performance or delivery take place during the covered period. Thus the cost of a good or service received during the covered period will not be considered eligible under section 601(d) if there is no need for receipt until after the covered period has expired.

Goods delivered in the covered period need not be used during the covered period in all cases. For example, the cost of a good that must be delivered in December in order to be available for use in January could be covered using payments from the Fund. Additionally, the cost of goods purchased in bulk and delivered during the covered period may be covered using payments from the Fund if a portion of the goods is ordered for use in the covered period, the bulk purchase is consistent with the recipient’s usual procurement policies and practices, and it is impractical to track and record when the items were used. A recipient may use payments from the Fund to purchase a durable good that is to be used during the current period and in subsequent periods if the acquisition in the covered period was necessary due to the public health emergency.

Given that it is not always possible to estimate with precision when a good or service will be needed, the touchstone in assessing the determination of need for a good or service during the covered period will be reasonableness at the time delivery or performance was sought, *e.g.*, the time of entry into a procurement contract specifying a time for delivery. Similarly, in recognition of the likelihood of supply chain disruptions and increased demand for certain goods and services during the COVID-19 public health emergency, if a recipient enters into a contract requiring the delivery of goods or performance of services by December 30, 2020, the failure of a vendor to complete delivery or services by December 30, 2020,

will not affect the ability of the recipient to use payments from the Fund to cover the cost of such goods or services if the delay is due to circumstances beyond the recipient's control.

This guidance applies in a like manner to costs of subrecipients. Thus, a grant or loan, for example, provided by a recipient using payments from the Fund must be used by the subrecipient only to purchase (or reimburse a purchase of) goods or services for which receipt both is needed within the covered period and occurs within the covered period. The direct recipient of payments from the Fund is ultimately responsible for compliance with this limitation on use of payments from the Fund.

Nonexclusive examples of eligible expenditures

Eligible expenditures include, but are not limited to, payment for:

1. Medical expenses such as:
 - COVID-19-related expenses of public hospitals, clinics, and similar facilities.
 - Expenses of establishing temporary public medical facilities and other measures to increase COVID-19 treatment capacity, including related construction costs.
 - Costs of providing COVID-19 testing, including serological testing.
 - Emergency medical response expenses, including emergency medical transportation, related to COVID-19.
 - Expenses for establishing and operating public telemedicine capabilities for COVID-19-related treatment.
2. Public health expenses such as:
 - Expenses for communication and enforcement by State, territorial, local, and Tribal governments of public health orders related to COVID-19.
 - Expenses for acquisition and distribution of medical and protective supplies, including sanitizing products and personal protective equipment, for medical personnel, police officers, social workers, child protection services, and child welfare officers, direct service providers for older adults and individuals with disabilities in community settings, and other public health or safety workers in connection with the COVID-19 public health emergency.
 - Expenses for disinfection of public areas and other facilities, *e.g.*, nursing homes, in response to the COVID-19 public health emergency.
 - Expenses for technical assistance to local authorities or other entities on mitigation of COVID-19-related threats to public health and safety.
 - Expenses for public safety measures undertaken in response to COVID-19.
 - Expenses for quarantining individuals.
3. Payroll expenses for public safety, public health, health care, human services, and similar employees whose services are substantially dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

4. Expenses of actions to facilitate compliance with COVID-19-related public health measures, such as:
 - Expenses for food delivery to residents, including, for example, senior citizens and other vulnerable populations, to enable compliance with COVID-19 public health precautions.
 - Expenses to facilitate distance learning, including technological improvements, in connection with school closings to enable compliance with COVID-19 precautions.
 - Expenses to improve telework capabilities for public employees to enable compliance with COVID-19 public health precautions.
 - Expenses of providing paid sick and paid family and medical leave to public employees to enable compliance with COVID-19 public health precautions.
 - COVID-19-related expenses of maintaining state prisons and county jails, including as relates to sanitation and improvement of social distancing measures, to enable compliance with COVID-19 public health precautions.
 - Expenses for care for homeless populations provided to mitigate COVID-19 effects and enable compliance with COVID-19 public health precautions.
5. Expenses associated with the provision of economic support in connection with the COVID-19 public health emergency, such as:
 - Expenditures related to the provision of grants to small businesses to reimburse the costs of business interruption caused by required closures.
 - Expenditures related to a State, territorial, local, or Tribal government payroll support program.
 - Unemployment insurance costs related to the COVID-19 public health emergency if such costs will not be reimbursed by the federal government pursuant to the CARES Act or otherwise.
6. Any other COVID-19-related expenses reasonably necessary to the function of government that satisfy the Fund's eligibility criteria.

Nonexclusive examples of ineligible expenditures³

The following is a list of examples of costs that would not be eligible expenditures of payments from the Fund.

1. Expenses for the State share of Medicaid.⁴
2. Damages covered by insurance.
3. Payroll or benefits expenses for employees whose work duties are not substantially dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

³ In addition, pursuant to section 5001(b) of the CARES Act, payments from the Fund may not be expended for an elective abortion or on research in which a human embryo is destroyed, discarded, or knowingly subjected to risk of injury or death. The prohibition on payment for abortions does not apply to an abortion if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed. Furthermore, no government which receives payments from the Fund may discriminate against a health care entity on the basis that the entity does not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.

⁴ See 42 C.F.R. § 433.51 and 45 C.F.R. § 75.306.

4. Expenses that have been or will be reimbursed under any federal program, such as the reimbursement by the federal government pursuant to the CARES Act of contributions by States to State unemployment funds.
5. Reimbursement to donors for donated items or services.
6. Workforce bonuses other than hazard pay or overtime.
7. Severance pay.
8. Legal settlements.

Supplemental Guidance on Use of Funds to Cover Payroll and Benefits of Public Employees

As discussed in the Guidance above, the CARES Act provides that payments from the Fund must be used only to cover costs that were not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020. As reflected in the Guidance and FAQs, Treasury has not interpreted this provision to limit eligible costs to those that are incremental increases above amounts previously budgeted. Rather, Treasury has interpreted this provision to exclude items that were already covered for their original use (or a substantially similar use). This guidance reflects the intent behind the Fund, which was not to provide general fiscal assistance to state governments but rather to assist them with COVID-19-related necessary expenditures. With respect to personnel expenses, though the Fund was not intended to be used to cover government payroll expenses generally, the Fund was intended to provide assistance to address increased expenses, such as the expense of hiring new personnel as needed to assist with the government's response to the public health emergency and to allow recipients facing budget pressures not to have to lay off or furlough employees who would be needed to assist with that purpose.

Substantially different use

As stated in the Guidance above, Treasury considers the requirement that payments from the Fund be used only to cover costs that were not accounted for in the budget most recently approved as of March 27, 2020, to be met if either (a) the cost cannot lawfully be funded using a line item, allotment, or allocation within that budget *or* (b) the cost is for a *substantially different use* from any expected use of funds in such a line item, allotment, or allocation.

Treasury has provided examples as to what would constitute a substantially different use. Treasury provided (in FAQ A.3) that costs incurred for a substantially different use would include, for example, the costs of redeploying educational support staff or faculty to develop online learning capabilities, such as through providing information technology support that is not part of the staff or faculty's ordinary responsibilities.

Substantially dedicated

Within this category of substantially different uses, as stated in the Guidance above, Treasury has included payroll and benefits expenses for public safety, public health, health care, human services, and similar employees whose services are *substantially dedicated* to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency. The *full amount* of payroll and benefits expenses of substantially dedicated employees may be covered using payments from the Fund. Treasury has not developed a precise definition of what "substantially dedicated" means given that there is not a precise way to define this term

across different employment types. The relevant unit of government should maintain documentation of the “substantially dedicated” conclusion with respect to its employees.

If an employee is not substantially dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency, his or her payroll and benefits expenses may not be covered *in full* with payments from the Fund. A *portion* of such expenses may be able to be covered, however, as discussed below.

Public health and public safety

In recognition of the particular importance of public health and public safety workers to State, local, and tribal government responses to the public health emergency, Treasury has provided, as an administrative accommodation, that a State, local, or tribal government may presume that public health and public safety employees meet the substantially dedicated test, unless the chief executive (or equivalent) of the relevant government determines that specific circumstances indicate otherwise. This means that, if this presumption applies, work performed by such employees is considered to be a substantially different use than accounted for in the most recently approved budget as of March 27, 2020. All costs of such employees may be covered using payments from the Fund for services provided during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 30, 2020.

In response to questions regarding which employees are within the scope of this accommodation, Treasury is supplementing this guidance to clarify that public safety employees would include police officers (including state police officers), sheriffs and deputy sheriffs, firefighters, emergency medical responders, correctional and detention officers, and those who directly support such employees such as dispatchers and supervisory personnel. Public health employees would include employees involved in providing medical and other health services to patients and supervisory personnel, including medical staff assigned to schools, prisons, and other such institutions, and other support services essential for patient care (*e.g.*, laboratory technicians) as well as employees of public health departments directly engaged in matters related to public health and related supervisory personnel.

Not substantially dedicated

As provided in FAQ A.47, a State, local, or tribal government may also track time spent by employees related to COVID-19 and apply Fund payments on that basis but would need to do so consistently within the relevant agency or department. This means, for example, that a government could cover payroll expenses allocated on an hourly basis to employees’ time dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency. This result provides equitable treatment to governments that, for example, instead of having a few employees who are substantially dedicated to the public health emergency, have many employees who have a minority of their time dedicated to the public health emergency.

Covered benefits

Payroll and benefits of a substantially dedicated employee may be covered using payments from the Fund to the extent incurred between March 1 and December 30, 2020.

Payroll includes certain hazard pay and overtime, but not workforce bonuses. As discussed in FAQ A.29, hazard pay may be covered using payments from the Fund if it is provided for performing hazardous duty or work involving physical hardship that in each case is related to COVID-19. This means that, whereas payroll and benefits of an employee who is substantially dedicated to mitigating or responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency may generally be covered in full using payments from the Fund, hazard pay specifically may only be covered to the extent it is related to COVID-19. For example, a recipient may use payments from the Fund to cover hazard pay for a police officer coming in close

contact with members of the public to enforce public health or public safety orders, but across-the-board hazard pay for all members of a police department regardless of their duties would not be able to be covered with payments from the Fund. This position reflects the statutory intent discussed above: the Fund was intended to be used to help governments address the public health emergency both by providing funds for incremental expenses (such as hazard pay related to COVID-19) and to allow governments not to have to furlough or lay off employees needed to address the public health emergency but was not intended to provide across-the-board budget support (as would be the case if hazard pay regardless of its relation to COVID-19 or workforce bonuses were permitted to be covered using payments from the Fund).

Relatedly, both hazard pay and overtime pay for employees that are not substantially dedicated may only be covered using the Fund if the hazard pay and overtime pay is for COVID-19-related duties. As discussed above, governments may allocate payroll and benefits of such employees with respect to time worked on COVID-19-related matters.

Covered benefits include, but are not limited to, the costs of all types of leave (vacation, family-related, sick, military, bereavement, sabbatical, jury duty), employee insurance (health, life, dental, vision), retirement (pensions, 401(k)), unemployment benefit plans (federal and state), workers compensation insurance, and Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes (which includes Social Security and Medicare taxes).

Supplemental Guidance on Use of Funds to Cover Administrative Costs

General

Payments from the Fund are not administered as part of a traditional grant program and the provisions of the Uniform Guidance, 2 C.F.R. Part 200, that are applicable to indirect costs do not apply. Recipients may not apply their indirect costs rates to payments received from the Fund.

Recipients may, if they meet the conditions specified in the guidance for tracking time consistently across a department, use payments from the Fund to cover the portion of payroll and benefits of employees corresponding to time spent on administrative work necessary due to the COVID-19 public health emergency. (In other words, such costs would be eligible direct costs of the recipient). This includes, but is not limited to, costs related to disbursing payments from the Fund and managing new grant programs established using payments from the Fund.

As with any other costs to be covered using payments from the Fund, any such administrative costs must be incurred by December 30, 2020, with an exception for certain compliance costs as discussed below. Furthermore, as discussed in the Guidance above, as with any other cost, an administrative cost that has been or will be reimbursed under any federal program may not be covered with the Fund. For example, if an administrative cost is already being covered as a direct or indirect cost pursuant to another federal grant, the Fund may not be used to cover that cost.

Compliance costs related to the Fund

As previously stated in FAQ B.11, recipients are permitted to use payments from the Fund to cover the expenses of an audit conducted under the Single Audit Act, subject to the limitations set forth in 2 C.F.R. § 200.425. Pursuant to that provision of the Uniform Guidance, recipients and subrecipients subject to the Single Audit Act may use payments from the Fund to cover a reasonably proportionate share of the costs of audits attributable to the Fund.

To the extent a cost is incurred by December 30, 2020, for an eligible use consistent with section 601 of the Social Security Act and Treasury's guidance, a necessary administrative compliance expense that relates to such underlying cost may be incurred after December 30, 2020. Such an expense would include, for example, expenses incurred to comply with the Single Audit Act and reporting and recordkeeping requirements imposed by the Office of Inspector General. A recipient with such necessary administrative expenses, such as an ongoing audit continuing past December 30, 2020, that relates to Fund expenditures incurred during the covered period, must report to the Treasury Office of Inspector General by the quarter ending September 2021 an estimate of the amount of such necessary administrative expenses.

Hall, Carolyn H.

From: Bockenstedt, Jason R.
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 11:25 AM
To: Hall, Carolyn H.
Subject: Fwd: Thank you and follow-up

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]@treasury.gov" <[REDACTED]@treasury.gov>
Date: August 20, 2020 at 10:51:43 AM AKDT
To: "Bockenstedt, Jason R." <jason.bockenstedt@anchorageak.gov>, "[REDACTED]@treasury.gov" <[REDACTED]@treasury.gov>
Cc: "Vogel, Kathryn R." <kathryn.vogel@anchorageak.gov>
Subject: RE: Thank you and follow-up

Apologies for the delay. I agree with the summary of our conversation as provided in (1) and (2).

Best,
Dan

From: Bockenstedt, Jason R. <jason.bockenstedt@anchorageak.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 4:29 AM
To: Kowalski, Daniel <[REDACTED]@treasury.gov>; Milligan, Stephen <[REDACTED]@treasury.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Kathryn R. <kathryn.vogel@anchorageak.gov>
Subject: Thank you and follow-up

**** Caution:** External email. Pay attention to suspicious links and attachments. Send suspicious email to suspect@treasury.gov **

Dan and Stephen -

Thank you for today's productive and positive conversation. We appreciated the opportunity to ask questions regarding use of Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF) for property acquisitions and other items approved by our assembly. As we explained, COVID-19 physical distancing requirements resulted in an immediate and lasting loss of over 300 permanent shelter beds in Anchorage, and our assembly has determined that purchasing buildings to house and provide services to our homeless population is

necessary because we lack suitable alternatives. We have kept our Congressional delegation engaged on our plan to use CRF for the buildings and other plans and have committed to providing an update to them on this issue, but first wanted to ensure we have memorialized our conversation accurately.

You confirmed your office has the responsibility of making the policy determinations that Treasury's IG's office will be tasked with monitoring and implementing, and as such, your answers are greatly helpful to us as we move forward in disbursing CRF.

We particularly appreciated learning from you:

- 1) If necessary due to a lack of other suitable alternatives, governments may purchase buildings with CRF to provide housing and services to the homeless displaced by COVID-19 public health measures. As we discussed, many jurisdictions are doing this across the nation, including California, which is spending \$550 million of CRF to purchase buildings. The governments may keep the buildings after the end of the funding period. As part of demonstrating that the buildings are a necessary COVID-19 expenditure we should be providing services to homeless individuals inside the buildings by December 30, 2020. [Although this was not mentioned in the call, we assume if the spending deadline were changed by a subsequent act of Congress, we might have more time to accomplish the purchases and bring homeless individuals into the buildings.]
- 2) A simpler option for local governments like ours is to spend CRF on first responder payroll, as a presumptively eligible expense detailed in FAQ A.2. While you anticipate issuing additional FAQ language on this presumption (possibly in the next two weeks), you do not anticipate it will result in rolling back of the previously issued presumption. Spending on payroll for front-line and public-facing public safety and public health department employees is permitted; and such use of CRF may have the side effect of freeing up municipal general funds that would otherwise have paid those salaries. In other words, the legal presumption allows governments to use CRF on this payroll even if the government had previously budgeted to pay those same individuals with municipal funds. Any municipal general funds freed up by being replaced with federal dollars may then be spent under ordinary rules for spending local money without the risk the IG's office will subsequently determine that the money missed a deadline or was spent incorrectly.

We also understand you have not issued any "private rulings" to jurisdictions and you may address the issue of the purchase of buildings by issuing an updated FAQ providing guidance on when CRF may be used to purchase buildings.

Is this an accurate summary of the conversation? We want to make sure our notes from the conversation are accurate, so our summary is relayed correctly to the delegation, especially on the above two points.

Thank you again for your time and attention to this matter. It was nice to connect with you and we appreciate everything you are doing.

Thanks,
Jason (and Kate)



Jason Bockenstedt

Chief of Staff

Municipality of Anchorage

632 W. 6th Avenue, Suite 840 Anchorage, AK 99501

(907) 343-7105

Jason.Bockenstedt@anchorageak.gov

www.muni.org/Mayor/