



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk
Tom Crawford, CFO
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
John Fournier, Assistant City Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Remy Long, Greenbelt Program Manager
Molly Maciejewski, Public Works Manager
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff Public Services
Cresson Slotten, Systems Planning Manager

SUBJECT: June 3 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: May 30, 2019

CA-3 - Resolution to Approve a Participation Agreement with Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission and Appropriate \$166,500.00 for Purchase of Fee Title to the Landau Property (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-3, the City recently granted the county a right-of-first refusal on a greenbelt transaction and it was indicated that's typical in these city-county transactions – does the City have a right-of-first refusal on this one? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, Washtenaw County has indicated that they will give the City an option to acquire or otherwise preserve the property for Greenbelt purposes.

CA-5 – Resolution to Purchase 1250 Lincolnshire Lane from the Washtenaw County Treasurer for \$932.00 (8 Votes Required)

Question: If taxes are delinquent on this parcel, who was the city trying to assess? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Charles Lewis Wright and Emma Wright were the property owners of record and therefore were responsible for the taxes. Properties with delinquent taxes are foreclosed upon by the Washtenaw County Treasurer.

Question: Who are we paying for this property? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Washtenaw County Treasurer.

Question: Will the city take responsibility for maintenance? Who has been maintaining it up to now? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The City will take responsibility. It is unknown who was maintaining it previously.

CA-7 – Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 4 to Contract with Recycle Ann Arbor for Interim Operations of the Ann Arbor Material Recovery Facility (MRF) (estimated \$2,300,000.00)

Question: Q1. Can you please remind me what the previous 3 amendments to the contract with RAA for MRF operations were for? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Amendment No. 1 changed Recycle Ann Arbor's named processor for high-content OCC (old corrugated cardboard) commercial material from Taylor Recycling to Royal Oak Recycling, and reduced the processing fee for this material from \$87.54/ton to \$51.18/ton. Amendment No. 2 included: the first 6-month extension of the contract authorized by City Council Resolution R-17-210; the addition of a "Modified Loose Loading" process option for recyclables where residential single-stream materials and high-content OCC commercial materials would both be separately loose loaded; and, added terms and processes for handling of large/bulky metals and bulky waste found in the commercial materials stream. Amendment #3 was the second, and final 6-month extension of the contract authorized by City Council Resolution R-17-210.

Question: Q2. How much was paid to RAA under this MRF contract in FY18 and how much has been paid YTD in FY19? Also, what is the full year projection for FY19? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In FY18 the City paid RAA \$2,098,627.99 under the Interim MRF Operations contract, and the City received materials credit (revenue) totaling \$794,557.41 for a net of \$1,304,070.58. In FY19 through April, 2019 the City has paid RAA \$1,902,277.40 under this contract and received materials credit (revenue) totaling \$395,397.51 for a net

of \$1,506,879.89. Averaging the first ten months expenses and applying that to the last two months of the fiscal year results in an estimated projection for FY19 of \$2,282,732.88 to be paid to RAA. By applying the April materials credit to the last two months as the markets are not expected to rebound over that time, results in an estimated projected materials credit (revenue) of \$460,265.13 for a net of \$1,822,467.75 for FY19.

Question: Q3. Amendment #4 references the 3% escalator and indicates that some fees (glass, bulk items, etc) will not be increased. What is the average percentage increase in fees for the entire contract (similar to the “1.8% adjustment to overall pricing” that’s referenced in the solid waste contract cover memo)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Over the five material audits performed to-date, the glass, bulky metals and waste (residuals) have averaged 25.72% of the materials stream, which would result in a net overall adjustment of 2.23%.

Question: Q4. The resolution appears to authorize the Administrator to extend the contract another year administratively (eg without council approval) beyond June 30, 2020. Is that correct? Also on the option for an additional year, the cover memo states it is the city’s option - does RAA have to agree, and what would be the price escalator for that second year? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, that is correct and is similar to the language in Resolution R-17-210 that awarded this contract. RAA would not need to agree to the extension. It is anticipated that the price escalator would be again be 3% as it has been for the term of the contract.

CA-8 - Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 6 to Contract with Recycle Ann Arbor for Municipal Resource Recovery Services (estimated \$2,350,000.00)

Question: Regarding CA-8, what is the basis for a 4% increase in the price for FY20 and 4% again in FY21 if that option is exercised? What have been the percentage increases in the price paid to RAA for collecting curbside recyclables since the contract was signed in 2003? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The 4% escalator for the per cart-tip fee was put in place beginning in FY16, so that has been applied to this amendment. From FY12 through FY15, the per cart tip-fee was constant at \$3.55/tip after an adjustment from \$3.25/tip (9.23%) in FY11. Prior to FY11 the payment was on a different basis (per unit rather than per cart-tip).

CA-7 - Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 4 to Contract with Recycle Ann Arbor for Interim Operations of the Ann Arbor Material Recovery Facility (MRF) (estimated \$2,300,000.00)

CA-8 - Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 6 to Contract with Recycle Ann Arbor for Municipal Resource Recovery Services (estimated \$2,350,000.00)

CA-9 - Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 2 to Contract with Waste Management of Michigan, Inc. for Commercial Refuse Collection Services (estimated \$1,850,000.00)

Question: Regarding all three of these extensions (CA-7 thru CA-9), what is the justification/explanation for the different year-to-year price increases in CA-7, CA-8, and CA-9 -- 1.8% to Waste Management for commercial refuse collection, 3% to RAA for MRF operations, and 4% to RAA for curbside collection of recyclables? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The price increases match the existing increases in each of their respective contracts.

CA-13 - Resolution No. 2 - 1425 Pontiac Sidewalk Special Assessment District #54

Question: Regarding CA-13, the cover memo indicates that the 1425 Pontiac property being assessed is being sold and has an anticipated closing date of June 1st. How, if at all, does this pending assessment impact that closing? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The previous owners originally told staff that the closing date was June 1, 2019. However, the Clerk recently brought it to staff's attention that the sale took place May 7, 2019. Therefore, the new owners will be the ones engaged by staff and the ones to receive the special assessment.

CA-16 – Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with WSP Michigan, Inc. for the Traffic Signal Operational Study (\$367,961.00)

Question: Regarding CA-16, it's good to see this on the agenda. When did we last do a traffic signal operational study? Also, how do we decide which intersections will be studied? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: To staff's knowledge, the last system wide traffic signal study was done in 1984. Over the long span of time from then to present, there have been multiple planning-level studies (e.g. Transportation Plan Updates) that identified traffic signal system infrastructure needs and made recommendations for improvement. Most of items identified in Transportation Plan Updates have been implemented through capital projects. Day-to-day operational adjustments to traffic signals are carried out by staff members.

For the proposed operational study, locations vary by study task.

- For the task on clearance interval update, all signalized locations and all RRFB locations in the City are included.
- The task on 'Alternative Clearance Intervals' will focus on intersections near schools and other locations identified through the course of the study.

- For the task on ‘Left-turn evaluations,’ staff specified 34 existing or future signalized intersections with potential to add/change/remove left-turn indications.
- The task on ‘Timing Plan Optimization’ will focus on intersections that currently do not have real-time traffic adaptive technology. Traffic adaptive technology are deployed along major corridors connecting downtown to freeway interchanges on the City perimeter.
- Intersections near U-M central campus will be evaluated for potential pedestrian-only phase in signal operations.
- Intersection along major U-M commuting corridors will be evaluated for an early morning inbound plan.
- Intersections along First and William will be evaluated to consider future bicycle facilities.
- Main Street from Michigan Stadium to M-14 will be evaluated for a special event timing plan.
- A preliminary evaluation will be conducted to identify potential locations for testing transit signal priority.

Question: Please provide the price bid by each of the firms that responded to the RFP. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The three responding firms were scored based on the scoring system outlined in the resolution memo, of which Fee Proposal was 20% of the score. The total proposed fees for each firm are as follows:

Firm	Total Cost (\$)
WSP Team (Mannik & Smith Group as sub)	\$ 367,960.95
OHM Team (TDC as sub)	\$ 399,930.00
HRC Team (AECOM as sub)	\$ 311,517.25

CA-19 - Resolution No. 2 - Dhu Varren Road Sidewalk Project - Special Assessment

CA - 20 - Resolution to Approve a Contract with the Michigan Department of Transportation for the Dhu Varren Road Sidewalk Project (\$573,100.00)

Question: Regarding CA-19 and CA-20 (DhuVarren Sidewalk project, the CA-20 cover memo indicates that construction is scheduled to begin relatively soon (in July). What’s the anticipated timing of Resolutions No 3 an No. 4 and the public hearing? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The tentative schedule is for Resolution #3 to be on the June 17th Council agenda, with the public hearing and Resolution #4 to follow on July 15th. The project will not begin until Resolution #4 has been approved by Council.

Question: Also on CA-19 and CA-20, have these assessment amounts shown on attachment 3 been communicated to the impacted property owners? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes. Those were mailed to every assessed property owner in advance of the April 3 administrative hearing/public meeting at Clague School.

CA-22 - Resolution No. 1 - Prepare Plans and Specifications for the Proposed Hollywood Drive Improvements - Special Assessment Project, and Appropriate \$200,000.00 from the General Fund Balance for the Design of the Project (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-22, the original 2017 communication and petition referenced Allison and Dellwood as well as Hollywood Drive. Have there been any subsequent discussions with property owners about paving those other two streets? (If they were also interested, it might save money do all three at the same time? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The petition submitted by residents mentioned Allison Drive in the text, however no signatures were ever submitted for this location. While the petition requests the paving of Dellwood Drive, only 7% of the affected property owners signed the petition, which is not high enough to trigger including the project in the CIP (50% of the affected property owners need to sign the petition to create a project).

Question: Also on CA-22, seeing this reminded me of the requests for grading and work on Chalmers – has that happened? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: We are grading all gravel roads every 4-5 weeks. Chalmers is included on this list.

B-3 – An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.15 (Table 5-15), Section 5.16.3, and 5.37.2 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Mobile Food Vending Service) (ORD-19-16)

Question: What concerns caused the initiation of this ordinance amendment? Were food trucks causing problems? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: No. The opposite, staff receives numerous inquiries for food trucks, and in most cases, they are not permitted.

Question: What other regulation are food trucks subject to (for example health department)? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: They have to have a health department license as well.

Question: Is there any regulation of waste generated by food trucks? For example, can the City require recycling and composting of waste generated by food trucks? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The regulation of waste by food trucks would not be distinct from the regulation of any other commercial solid waste, per Chapter 26 of the City Code. Public Act 389 of 2016 adds additional restrictions to the City from banning “auxiliary containers” i.e., bags, cups, bottles, or other packaging.

Question: The ordinance allows Mobile Food Vending Service is permitted in any Mixed Use Zoning District or any Nonresidential and Special Purpose Zoning District. Does this mean that a food truck would not be allowed in a residential neighborhood for any purpose, such as during block parties? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: This proposed ordinance would not have any regulatory impact on such use. A block party or a birthday party at a house does not present the same generalized public access as a food truck in an office parking lot or other business lot. The ordinance would not allow a food truck in a residential neighborhood to open for general commerce business.

Question: What is the reasoning for prohibiting food trucks in neighborhoods? Has there been a problem? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: There was significant debate at the Planning Commission over the introduction of food trucks as a commercial enterprise in residential neighborhoods. The Planning Commission ultimately recommended continuation of residential zoning standards, which generally prohibit commercial uses in those districts.

Question: Are there any restrictions on hours, when food trucks would be allowed to operate? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No.

Question: Does the city have authority to regulate aspects of operation more strictly than other food service/restaurants? Is this an opportunity to test out stricter requirements around waste (e.g. banning use of straws and other non-recyclable plastics)? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No, the regulation of waste by food trucks would not be distinct from the regulation of any other commercial solid waste, per Chapter 26 of the City Code. Public Act 389 of 2016 adds additional restrictions to the City from banning “auxiliary containers” , i.e., bags, cups, bottles, or other packaging.

C-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.18.1 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Front Porch Exception from Front Yard Setback)

Question: Q1. Regarding C-1, can you please remind me what the minimum front setbacks are in the zoning districts where the exception would be allowed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In the majority of instances, the front setback is established by the average setback established by the existing setback of adjacent properties within 100 feet of the lot (but not less than 10 feet, nor greater than 40 feet). When an average setback is not established, the front yard setbacks are as follows: R1A – 40 feet; R1B – 30 feet; R1C & R1D – 25 feet; R1E – 15 feet; R2A – 25 feet; R4C – 25 feet.

Question: Q2. The ordinance language states that “No unenclosed porch, deck, or platform shall be located within five feet from the Front Lot Line.” What was the rationale for the 5 feet minimum setback and for the 8 feet encroachment limit? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The rationale for the five feet was to eliminate porches coming directly to the sidewalk and to provide a minimum space for landscaping and/or stairs to access a porch. The maximum 8 feet was to propose a balance between a reasonable depth of porch in total, while limiting the ability of exceedingly large porches to be constructed.

Question: Q3. Were the 5 feet minimum setback and the 8 feet encroachment limit the standards the ZBA used in approving/rejecting requests? If not, what was the ZBA’s criteria? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The ZBA standards depend on the type of application (Variance or Approval to Alter a Non-Conforming Structure). Below you will find a summary of the past three years of related actions by the Zoning Board of Appeals, which on average, accommodated a front porch depth of approximately 8 feet:

Address	Front Yard Zoning Board Appeals Action	Depth of Front Porch (in feet)
806 Mt Vernon	1' 10" Variance Approved	10
1016 Daniel	1' 8" - Variance Denied	8
1503 Shadford	0 - Approved Alteration Non-Conforming Structure	8
408 Wilder Place	3' 4" - Variance Approved	6
1008 Brooks	0 - Approved Alteration Non-Conforming Structure	11' 6"
1810 Abbott	3' 4" - Variance Approved	7' 4"
2510 Elmwood	7' - Variance Approved	7

Address	Front Yard Zoning Board Appeals Action	Depth of Front Porch (in feet)
1106 Michigan	3' 11" - Variance Denied	9' 8"
517 Berkley	3' - Variance Approved	7
2104 Winchell	3' 5" - Variance Approved	7
3245 Kingwood	0 - Approved Alteration Non-Conforming Structure	6' 11"
1632 Kirtland	5' 8" - Variance Approved	8
2105 Wallingford	3' 8" - Variance Approved	4' 8"
2000 Anderson Ct	12' 10" - Variance Approved	6

Question: Q4. Does staff see any potential problems/issues with this change? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No. From a design perspective some covered front porches may be constructed that were not typical to a particular style of architecture (e.g. ranches), however the use of front porches is considered by staff to be a positive occurrence for the City, potentially encouraging public interaction.

C-2 – An Ordinance to Repeal Chapter 87 (Recreation, Amusements and Games) of Title VII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: I am curious about other chapters potentially at risk of being deemed obsolete. Looking at the very next chapter (88), under “Circuses, shows and exhibitions” -- how many Animal Shows (\$16 per day) have been licensed in the last five years? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Staff checked with Community Services, Customer Service and the Clerk’s Office and to the best of our knowledge there have not been any permits requested or issued for an animal show.

Question: Is there any city restriction that would prevent the licensing of an animal show on the “Library Lot”? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: A proper response to this question would require legal research.

C-3 - An Ordinance to Amend the Zoning Map, Being a Part of Section 5:10.2 of Chapter 55 of Title V of the Code of Ann Arbor, Rezoning of 8 Acres from R4B (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R4D Multiple-Family Dwelling District) WITH CONDITIONS, Brightdawn Village Rezoning(2805 Burton Road) (CPC Recommendation: Denial - 0 Yeas and 7 Nays)

Question: Regarding C-3, although it may be an academic question, have enough petitions been received that the zoning approval would require 8 affirmative votes? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes.

C-4 – An Ordinance to Amend Sections 8:513, 8:516, 8:517, 8:519, 8:525, 8:528, and 8:530 of Chapter 105 (Housing Code) of Title VIII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: If \$500 is the current upper limit for fines, how many \$500 fines are typically assessed per year? Where do those funds go? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Five hundred dollars is the upper limit for ordinance violations that are misdemeanors only. The Fifteenth District Court may be able to answer how many \$500 fines are assessed per year. One-hundred percent of the fine goes to the City because 1/3 goes to the municipality whose ordinance was violated (the City) and 2/3 goes to the funding unit (the City).

Question: Practically speaking, what will be the difference in processing a civil infraction versus a criminal misdemeanor? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Processing civil infractions is easier for reasons that include the following:

Service of Ticket on Defendant:

Civil infraction: post ticket on the property and send it first class mail.

Misdemeanor: certified mail

Court Hearing(s):

Civil infraction: a judge holds a formal hearing without a jury, which is usually short. Defendant can be required to testify and the burden of proof for the prosecutor is the “preponderance of the evidence.”

Misdemeanor: a judge holds at least three hearings -- an arraignment, a pretrial, and a trial (additionally, a jury pick if defendant demands one). Trials, especially jury trials, can be time-consuming because a criminal defendant has many more constitutional rights than a civil defendant, including the right not to testify and the requirement that the prosecution satisfies the higher burden of “proof beyond a reasonable doubt.”

C-5 – An Ordinance to Amend the Zoning Map Being a Part of Section 5:10.2 of Chapter 55 of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor, Rezoning of 13.81 Acres from M1 (Limited Industrial District) to PUD (Planned Unit Development District), 841 Broadway PUD Zoning and Supplemental Regulations (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yeas and 2 Nays)

Question: Q1. The cover memo indicates there is an approved Brownfield Plan. Perhaps I've forgotten, but I do not recall approving a Brownfield Plan for this

site. Has the City (or county) approved a Brownfield Plan and if so, does the plan involve tax abatements or any other city of Ann Arbor financial support? If not, who approved the Brownfield Plan and where is the clean-up funding coming from? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City's Brownfield Review Committee has approved the Brownfield Plan, which will be presented to City Council concurrently with second reading of the proposed PUD Zoning and Area Plan. Before proceeding, the Brownfield Plan will need to be approved by City Council, the Washtenaw County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority, and the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners.

Question: Q2. There is not a site plan accompanying this zoning request, but an area plan instead. I'm trying to understand what is firm and what is flexible in the development should council approve the PUD zoning and Area Plan. The sentence, "It should be noted this area plan may or may not resemble the future site plan submission" gives me pause. The cover memo suggests, however, the supplemental regulations are firm requirements. Is that correct? Are there any elements of the Area Plan beyond the supplemental regulations that are firm and if so, what are they? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Supplemental Regulations are firm in that they would establish the zoning requirements for the site. There are no elements of the Area Plan beyond the supplemental regulations that are firm. While the petitioner has represented that the eventual site plan will be similar to the Area Plan, so long as the Supplemental Regulations are met, an alternative plan could be proposed, that would have to be evaluated against the Supplemental Regulations.

Question: Q3. In that same vein, I struggle with the concept of approving PUD zoning, which is supposed to be geared towards a specific development, without a detailed site plan. While the Area Plan sounds very promising, what does staff assess the risk to be that the future site plan does not resemble the area plan and what are the areas of the most risk? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The consistency of the Area Plan and future Site Plan is unknown. Staff, the petitioner, and Planning Commission have attempted to create Supplemental Regulations that lead to an expectation, but to be sure, the proposed site plan could be different. A few examples of site aspects that could differ from the Area Plan while still meeting the Supplemental Regulations include:

- The regulations require a minimum of 90 residential units on the site, while the area plan shows 104 units. There is no maximum number of residential units that could be developed.
- Other uses, such as retail, restaurant and hotel are permitted on the site but not required. A revised site plan could demonstrate a residential only development.
- The building forms and locations of all uses, apart from open space adjacent to the River, are not set in the regulations. For example, the residential units could be constructed in one building or multiple buildings on the site, or could be moved closer to the River, where hotel and restaurant uses are now shown.

- If parking is shared off-site, then no parking structure would be required pursuant to the Supplemental Regulations. Currently, some structured parking is shown on the Area Plan.

Question: Q4. In terms of the secondary emergency access, when is it expected the Fire Marshall will rule on the proposed plan, and if approved, when will PAC weigh in on the proposed access using Broadway Park? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This will be evaluated as part of the site planning process. PAC will make a recommendation on the proposed use of the park, prior to any consideration of approval by the City Council for such access.

Question: Q5. The cover memo states that, “Supplemental regulations do allow shared parking with the adjacent site as permitted by City Code. A parking structure is required if all required parking is provided on site.” Given the uses contemplated in the Area Plan, what would the required parking be? And with the Area Plan as proposed, about how much parking would be provided in the structure and surface lots? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Given the uses proposed on the Area Plan, the project would require 452 parking spaces. The Area Plan as proposed has 276 parking spaces in a structure and 210 surface parking spaces for a total of 486 parking spaces provided.

DC-2 - Resolution Directing the City Administrator to Develop an Interim Plan for the Use of the Library Lot to Support Community Activities

Question: Regarding DC-2, can you please provide an update on the status of the Center of the City Task Force appointments? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Ann Arbor City Council is accepting applications for the Center of the City Task Force until 5 p.m. on Friday, May 31, 2019. Councilmembers Grand and Hayner will review applications and will present Center of the City Task Force member nominations at the June 17, 2019, City Council meeting with appointments to be finalized at the July 1, 2019, City Council meeting. Thirty-Five applicants submitted complete applications, as of May 28, 2019.

DB-1 - Resolution to Approve Bristol Ridge Site Plan and Development Agreement, 2750 Pontiac Trail (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Question: Regarding DB-1, this was postponed May 6th at the request of the developer. Has anything changed in the site plan proposal or development agreement since then? Also, have we received any additional input from the public since May 6th? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No, on all counts.

DS-1 – Resolution to Approve a Contract with Liberty Security Group Inc. for Guest Services at the Guy C. Larcom City Hall (\$102,500.00) RFP #19-01

Question: At the May 20 City Council meeting, John Fournier indicated there had been months of planning leading up to the selection of Liberty Security Group. Please elaborate on the discussions about the problems identified and how it was determined that this was the best solution, beyond what is already outlined in Resolution 19-0604? (YouTube video beginning at 2:35 hours, featuring Mr. Fournier at 2:55 hours) (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The preliminary outline for using elevator access control was presented to CA Lazarus on 7/3/18 and to the leadership group on 9/17/18. Tweaks were made and the revised proposal was presented to the leadership group on 12/13/18. The RFP was published on 12/6/18 and opened 1/10/19. Proposal review, contractor interviews and scoring of the proposers were accomplished in Jan/Feb 2019. Another update to the leadership group was held on 4/25/19 after multiple meetings with Safety and IT over the preceding 30 days.

Question: Please identify other ways to solve the identified problems (as mentioned by CM Griswold on the YouTube video 2:45 hours). (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Initial discussions about providing security to the upper floors through physical building changes were not acceptable under the Building Code, so the efforts were refocused towards access control at the point of entry into the building via the elevator. Elevator control requires active management and current staffing operations were not able to address the level of this activity. Using trained security guards in the role of guest services allows us to improve security and improve the customer experience. Balancing security and the openness of a public building was paramount. Contracting this work provided many advantages to the City.

Question: What would be the impact of amending the resolution to include that the authorizations beyond FY19 go back to Council for approval, rather than authorize the City Administrator to extend the contract without approval? Please prepare this amendment for Council consideration. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The proposed initial contract term was for one month of FY19 and the full FY20 for a total of 13 months. Three additional one year options were also included upon CA approval. With the extended deliberation on the issue, FY19 coverage is out of the question. Contract renewals are typically an administrative function as opposed to Council approval as administrative control provides the stability of longer term agreements (and hence better pricing) as it is separated from the volatility of a political environment.

Question: Residents have suggested that this role of "greeter," be fulfilled by local people, as opposed to outsourcing through the Wyandotte firm. Was this option

considered, and if so, why was it not selected as a solution? What would be the pros/cons of hiring local people, including current staff members, for this role? One of the benefits would be that local people are likely to be more welcoming than outsourcing this role. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Staffing of this function serves both customer service and security purposes, requiring familiarity with the building's requirements, training in security measures, and reliability in providing staffing. Outsourcing this type of requirement best meets these needs, and is a common industry practice, as it provides for redundancy, meets the owner's insurance requirements, and provides mechanisms for curing of performance issues.

Question: Any other details you could provide about this \$417,500 expenditure would be helpful. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The resolution provides for the following allocations: \$7,500 in FY19, \$95,000 in FY20, \$100,000 in FY21, \$105,000 in FY22, and \$110,000 in FY23.