



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director

CC: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 5/16/16

CA-9 – Resolution to Approve a Purchase Order for Annual Maintenance and Support of TRAKiT System with Sungard Public Sector for FY2016 (\$39,634.40)

Question: The May 6 budget question reponse stated, “eTRAKiT is considered a legacy (older) application and is currently being evaluated to see if we want to continue with this application or move to another.” Is it anticipated that this evaluation will be completed prior to the expiration of this maintenance agreement? (Councilmember Warephoski)

Response: It is unlikely any evaluation will be completed prior to the expiration of this maintenance agreement.

CA -10 – Resolution to Approve a Contract Agreement with the Michigan Department of Transportation for the Geddes Road Guardrail Replacement Project (\$110,430.00)

Question: Can you please clarify the Geddes closure and traffic/detour plan. The cover memo suggests that closure will only be necessary for one weekend – can you please confirm I’m reading that right and that traffic will be maintained (both directions) during the balance of the project construction period and that the total construction period (likely August) should be a month or less? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, that is correct.

B-2 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 2:63, 2:64, and 2:69 of Chapter 29 (Increase Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Rates) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Ordinance No. ORD-10-15)

Question: At first reading I asked about any benchmarking data the city has in terms of other communities that utilize a tiered-rate pricing structure like we do (higher rates per 100 cubic feet for higher volume users). The response was “Data regarding other municipalities using the same structure is not available in the short time-frame required for a caucus response”. That’s understandable, but I would still appreciate a response as I share the concern raised by CM Grand at the meeting that our pricing structure can result in unintended consequences (such as punishing large families who are good stewards, but simply have a large family). When do you think you could have a response? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The concern about tiered water rates and the impacts on larger sized households has been previously heard. Thus, when the water and sewer cost-of-service are reviewed/studied in FY 17, the question of affordability of tiered rates and Michigan’s Bolt v Lansing rate criteria will be an issue for the consultant and staff to work through. In the shorter term, staff is gathering comparable data and hope to be able to provide an overview of that data by mid-July.

DC- 1 – Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 4 to the Carlisle/Wortman Professional Services Agreements for Building Official and Planning Services, Approve Amendment No. 3 to the Carlisle/Wortman Professional Services Agreement for City Planning Services Unit Support Services, Amend the FY16 Budget and Appropriate Necessary Funds (8 Votes Required)

Question: When is it expected the existing authorized funding for each service (\$600K for Building Official and \$85K for Planning Unit Support) will run out? How long is it expected that each amendment amount (\$300K for Building Official and \$85K for Planning Unit Support) would last? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The funding for Building Services, (\$600k), runs out immediately. It is important to note the \$600k is not just for a Building Official but for building plan review as well. Plan review expenses are recouped through permit fees, over the previous six months more than 50% of the expenses were plan review. The requested funds are projected to last until September 2016. Planning funds will expire at the end of this month, the funds requested will last an additional three months. Planning Manger interviews are scheduled May 20, it is staff’s desire to have someone in place prior to the funds running out. The request for Planning is \$50k, not \$85k.

Question: In response to a question in September 2015 when these were last amended, staff indicated that the fees were hours-based (with couple small fixed items)

and that staff was confirming all of the invoiced hours. Can you please confirm those processes have not changed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The process has not changed.