



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Sumedh Bahl, Community Services Area Administrator  
Jackie Beaudry, City Clerk  
Tom Crawford, CFO  
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator  
Cresson Sloten, Systems Planning Manager  
John Seto, Police Chief  
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director  
Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources Director

CC: Steven D. Powers, City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 7/6/15

---

**CA-3 – Resolution to Amend and Approve the Operational Agreement for Information Technology Services between the City of Ann Arbor and City of Chelsea (\$62,203.05)**

**Question:** Can you please confirm that the fees charged to Chelsea for the IT services provided represent our best estimate of the full costs of the services. Also, has the fee changed over the five years the agreement has been in effect? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The costs charged to Chelsea are summarized on page 12 of the contract and reflect staff's estimate of the full costs incurred by Ann Arbor in support of Chelsea. For the past five years the contract amounts were:

2012 - \$32k  
2013 - \$32k  
2014 - \$55,614  
2015 - \$56,823  
Partial year \$23,676  
2016 - \$62,203

**CA-6 – Resolution to Approve Street Closings for the Electric Bolt 8K Run/Walk  
July 26, 2015**

**Question:** Does the City have standards by which it evaluates street closings? If it has standards, may I have a copy of those standards? If there are no standards, how does staff determine whether to recommend a particular request for street closing?  
(Councilmember Eaton)

**Response:** There is no written standard available for evaluating special event street closure applications. Each application is first reviewed to avoid conflicts with road construction, other major events and the City's guideline for not holding public meetings on days of religious observation. The application is sent to a review team of City staff which includes Fire, Police, Solid Waste, Project Management and Legal. The application is also forwarded to AAATA, DDA, UM, and street associations for review. New and large events typically have multiple meetings and/or conversations with the aforementioned and the applicant to minimize impact to residents and businesses. Street closing requests are not recommended to City Council if staff objections are not completely addressed. In rare situations when a street closing request is forwarded for Council consideration with unresolved staff objections, it is stated in the Memo to Council.

**CA-10 – Resolution to Appropriate Funds (\$65,000.00) from Information  
Technology Fund Balance to Amend the FY 2016 IT Operating Budget to Fund the  
Continued Use of the Current Human Resource and Payroll Services Software  
with Ultipro Software Group (8 Votes Required)**

**Question:** Has a fix been identified/implemented for the issue experienced during testing of the new system and when is it now expected the new system will be launched? Also, how long does the \$65K extend the existing agreement with Ultimate Software Group? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The conversion has taken longer than anticipated because of a change in ownership of software vendors. Rather than pushing through the new system and risk errors in wages and benefits, we continue to perform User Acceptance Testing (UAT) on the entire system. The benefits module, for example, integrates with many other processes, such as employee hiring, termination, open enrollment, life events, benefit vendors, etc., so the testing must also encompass those processes as well. A specific launch date for the new system will be set when the testing and verification are complete. The additional funds will continue the current system until no later than October 31, 2015.

**C-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 4:60, 4:61 and 4:62, and to Delete Section 4:63 of Chapter 49 (Sidewalks) of Title IV of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Ordinance No. ORD-15-04)**

**Question:** If the ordinance were amended to provide for two (or three) notifications per season (rather than the one notification that's in the current version of the ordinance on the table) to homeowners allowing them 24 hours to clear the sidewalk prior to the City's right to have it cleared and issue a citation without notification, would that constitute a significant enough change to warrant the ordinance reverting back to First reading? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Yes, the ordinance would have to go back to first reading, if it were amended to provide for two or more notifications per season rather than one.

**Question:** Regarding homeowners' responsibilities for clearing snow and ice from sidewalk approaches and ramps leading to crosswalks and for clearing snow and ice from concrete bus stop pads adjoining their sidewalk, are these two responsibilities currently enforced (and to what extent) and how would that enforcement behavior change if the ordinance currently on the table was adopted? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Community Standards Officers routinely enforce the removal of snow and ice from ramps leading to crosswalks. There would be no change in the enforcement behavior for ramps leading to crosswalks if the proposed ordinance language was changed. The enforcement of snow and ice removal at concrete bus stop pads adjoining sidewalks rarely occurs. If the proposed language was adopted, there may be increased enforcement because the language would be more clear, possibly resulting in more complaints.

**Question:** Would adoption of the version on the table mean that residential homeowners would now be responsible to clear the higher-volume bus stops AAATA currently clears? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The responsibility, of the owner or occupant of a property, to clear bus stops would not change with the amendment version currently being considered.

**DS-2 – Resolution to Award a Contract with The Ecology Center Inc. for In-School Recycling Education (\$89,316.00 for year one; \$91,995.00 for year two; \$94,755.00 for year three) (RFP No. 923)**

**Question:** For what period of time was the RFP posted on BidNet? (When was it posted initially and when were bids due?) (Councilmember Eaton)

**Response:** RFP# 923 was posted for 20 days. It originally published on BidNet/MITN on Thursday, March 5, 2015 and responses were due before 3:00 pm, Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

**Question:** What company or entity submitted the rejected bid? (Councilmember Eaton)

**Response:** An RFP response was received after the March 25, 2015 deadline from Natural Community Services. RFP responses received after the deadline are retained for the procurement file but are not opened.

**Question:** Did City staff have any communication with the Ecology Center or its representatives that gave notice of the RFP that the disqualified company or entity did not receive? (Councilmember Eaton)

**Response:** The RFP document was posted March 5, 2015 on BidNet/MITN and City staff had no further contact with any companies or vendors about the proposal prior to the RFP response due date.

**Question:** Was the price of the disqualified bid less expensive than the price of the bid from the Ecology Center? If the rejected bid was cheaper, by how much was it cheaper? (Councilmember Eaton)

**Response:** RFP responses received after the deadline are retained for the procurement file but not opened. Therefore, staff has no knowledge of the price of the disqualified proposal.

**Question:** Why are we funding a program in the Dexter schools? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** This education component has been part of the City's stormwater permit requirement. The Dexter Schools were added as a program for source water protection. Dexter's stormwater ends up in the Huron River, which is the source of approximately 80% of the City's drinking water.

**Question:** Has there been any thought to shifting from a lottery system to one that reaches the schools more equitably? For example, reaching all students in grade x? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** The goal of the increase in classroom programs from a total of 110 in the most recent contract to 250 in the proposed contract is to eliminate the lottery system, and to serve all of the classrooms requesting the program.

**Question:** What is the percentage of AAPS v. private schools that are served by the program? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** Over the term of the last contract, the percentage of programs delivered to private schools ranged from 3.5% - 5.9%, with last year 5.1% of the programs serving private schools.

**Question:** The cover memo indicates that the City has contracted for youth outreach presentations since 1982. Has any firm other than the Ecology Center been the contract provider in any of those years? If so, who was the firm and for how many years? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The City provided this service directly until 2010 when the Ecology Center was awarded the current 5-year contract that expired on June 30, 2015.

**Question:** The resolution indicates that "adding the Custodial/Staff training to the in-school program and providing additional opportunities for in-school education is requested." Can you please provide detail on how much the program is being expanded in total and how much the expanded scope adds to the cost (e.g., what is contract fee currently)? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** This is a new aspect of the contract, and there are thirty-five custodial/staff training presentations per year included in the proposed contract. The additional cost for this new item is: \$10,632 in Year 1; \$10,939 in Year 2; and, \$11,254 in Year 3.

**Question:** The scope includes presentations in the Dexter schools as well as Ann Arbor schools. Do the AAPS and Dexter (city and schools) provide funding for these services? If they support financially, what is the amount for each? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Neither of these school systems, nor the City of Dexter provide funding for the program. The program is entirely funded from City funds as outlined in the resolution.

#### **DS-4 – Resolution to Approve Agreement between City of Ann Arbor and Washtenaw County for Animal Control Services (\$135,570.00)**

**Question:** As I recall, this \$135,570 is the same amount the City originally agreed to pay for animal control services when the initial agreement was made in 2013 -- is that correct? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Resolution No. R-14-245, Resolution to Approve Agreement between City of Ann Arbor and Washtenaw County for Animal Control Services (\$135,570.00) and Designate Humane Society of Huron Valley (HSHV) its Animal Shelter, was approved by Council on September 7, 2014 in the amount of \$135,570.

**Question:** Does this agreement contemplate any change (increase or decrease) in the total funding amount HSHV receives from the City and County? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** This contract is only with Washtenaw County in the amount of \$135,570.

**Question:** We passed an amendment related to dog licensing that anticipated \$54,000 of incremental revenue (reflecting a 30% participation rate) with \$27K used to support this HSHV contract, and \$27K for internal program costs. For FY16, in response to a budget question, staff anticipated obtaining approximately \$12K in additional revenue in FY16 (vs. the \$54K originally anticipated for FY15), and that the ongoing expenditures for the program would be \$10K. Can you please provide an update on the dog licensing program including the number of licenses, compliance rate, revenue generated, and the expenditure amounts. (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** A major change in the program last year was the restructuring of dog licenses from a 2-year license, to an option of 1, 2 or 3 years, matching each dog's rabies vaccination expiration date. The change in the licensing structure also included a fee reduction to match the fees charged by Washtenaw County and to recognize a discount for pet owners who spay/neuter their pets. Current fees are \$6 for 1-year, \$11 for 2-years and \$15 for a 3-year tag (double for unaltered animals). There are approximately 2500 dogs licensed in the City at this time. Revenue for FY15 was \$22,300, an increase from the previous two years of approximately \$19,000 per year, or approximately a 17% increase. A dog license compliance rate is unknown as the exact number of dogs in the City is not known. Current registration numbers do not reflect recently expired tags on June 30, and renewal efforts will continue into July.

The FY15 budget amendment included \$27,000 in expenditures for the program. In addition to the necessary costs to manage the program (forms, postage, dog tags), additional expenditures included new marketing materials (banners, window decals, print advertising and a new form design). Regular advertising in the Ann Arbor Observer (\$5000.00) and a citywide mailing promoting National Pet Month and offering a \$1 discount on licenses (\$9000.00) were highlights of the increased marketing effort.

As previously reported, revenue did not meet the budgeted target. For FY16, staff proposed reducing the revenue projection, as well as a reduction in the expense budget. The current \$10,000 budget for expenses will provide for continued printing of the new forms and tags, as well as some advertising and printing to continue the communication and education efforts.