



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nicholas Hutchinson, City Engineer
Matt Kulhanek, Fleet and Facilities Manager
Susan Pollay, DDA, Executive Director
Tom Shewchuk, ITSU Director
Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources and Labor Relations, Director

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: March 5, 2018

CA-10 - Resolution to Temporarily Relocate Precincts 1-1, 1-4, 1-12 and 4-1 for the May 8 Special Election due to Construction Projects at the Michigan Union and Ann Arbor Community Center

Question: Regarding CA-10, what elections/ballot proposals are scheduled for the May 8th special election? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The May 8 Special Election was called by the Ann Arbor Public Schools. There is one question on the ballot titled **Replacement Operating Millage Proposal**. The statement below was provided by the Schools as explanation as to the purpose of the ballot question.

This proposal would restore, replace and extend the authority of the Public Schools of the City of Ann Arbor to levy up to 18.00 mills for general school district operating purposes on taxable property in the School District to the extent that such property is not exempt from such levy and would restrict the levy on principal residences (owner occupied homes) to no more than 12.3777 mills. If approved, this proposal would restore the authority of the School District to levy

the statutory limit of 18.00 mills on non-homestead (principally industrial and commercial real property and residential rental property) which currently expires with the School District's 2019 tax levy and allow the district to continue to levy the statutory limit of 18 mills on non-homestead property in the event of future Headlee rollbacks of up to 3 mills. Under existing law the School District would levy on principal residence property only that portion of the mills (in 2017 4.3564 mills) necessary to allow the School District to receive the full revenue per pupil foundation allowance permitted by the State.

CA-15 – - Resolution to Approve a Contract with Yellowfin BI North America, Inc. for a Business Intelligence (Big Data)/Data Visualization Platform for FY18 - FY23 (\$257,100.00) (8 Votes Required)

Question: Can you please give some examples of the types of decision making the platform will support? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The City's various lines of business have been generating data for many years. This data is, in most cases, siloed by line of business and the application that supports that specific line of business. In other words, Cityworks data is used by Cityworks users; payroll system data is used by payroll users; pension data is used by pension users; etc.

This platform will allow the City to converge all its disparate data into a central location so employees can view data not only related to their application or system, but cross reference it to other applications and systems outside of their area.

For example, we can combine recruitment data, benefits data, payroll data, and pension data from three disparate systems into a single view of an "employee". Or we could look at activities over a given time period by combining data from Fire/Police Calls; A2FixIt service requests; petitions under review; etc. into a single view of a "ward".

Once combined, the platform will allow us to provide our employees a tool that will allow them to visualize this data using dashboards and charts so they can monitor our critical Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and potentially expose this data on the City website for consumption by the general public.

This platform supports machine learning - which will allow us to do predictive analysis looking at items such as potential leak detection based on reported water consumption; how weather effects work orders; or how any of the City's line of business are actually performing when compared to their projections.

In summary, this platform and the tools allow us to put the capabilities above in the hands of our employees so they do not have to rely on others to manually assemble this data for them (the way we operate today). The visualization tool allow them to manipulate the data to gain a better understanding of how systems are performing, which will in turn allow them to make better business decisions.

Following is a link to the Yellowfin website: <https://www.yellowfinbi.com/>

Question: If the resolution passes and the City spends \$200,100.00 from the IT Fund Balance, how much will remain in the IT Fund Balance? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: \$523,000.00 (7% of budgeted expenditures) of IT Fund Balance will remain. We originally did not intend to utilize Fund Balance, but the vendor offered a savings of \$112,400.00 if we paid for 5 years of maintenance in two annual payments instead of five.

Question: Regarding CA-15, the cover memo indicates this contract will “enable intelligent, data-driven decision-making across the enterprise” and that the City currently does not have this capability. Can you please elaborate on what that means and please provide an example or two of what specifically this platform/program will allow the City to do that we can’t now? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Please see response to Question 1 regarding this item above.

Question: Can staff please describe in layperson's terms what functionalities this contract will bring, and is it an annual contract? Is this a renewal or new, how do other cities handle these vendors, etc. (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: This is a brand new 5-year maintenance contract. The vendor offered us a \$112,400.00 savings if we paid it over a 2-year period. Please see responses above.

CA-16 - Resolution to Authorize a Professional Services Agreement with Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc. for Engineering Services for Guardrail Evaluation and Design - Task 2 - RFP No. 978 (\$39,178.50)

Question: Regarding CA-16, the cover memo indicates the work in evaluation phase (Task 1) and design phase (Task 2) were separated and that makes sense since they’re sequential. Was a separate RFP conducted for Task 2? If so what were the results, and if not, why not? Also, once construction begins, will construction support engineering services be needed and if so, will that be bid out? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The original RFP broadly defined the nature of the work to be accomplished for Tasks 1 and 2. The consultant was selected based upon their abilities and knowledge. However, until Task 1 was completed and reviewed the extent of Task 2 work could not be well defined. Additionally, by approving the work by Task, staff is able to match work priority to available budget.

CA-18 - Resolution to Award Purchase Order to Amtrak for the Engineering Review of the Barton Raw Water Intake and Pump Station Improvements Project (\$20,328.00)

Question: Section 14.2 of the City Charter requires Council approval of contracts for services in excess of \$25,000. Is there a reason why this contract for \$20,328 requires Council approval? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The reason that this resolution is on the agenda for Council approval is that this purchase order with Amtrak increases the annual total contract value with Amtrak above the \$25,000 threshold. Amtraks's review process is multi-phase. The first phase review, which has been completed, cost the City \$7,017. The second phase review has a cost of \$20,328, bringing the total contract value to \$27, 345.

CA-20 - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Vehicle from Berger Chevrolet (Oakland County Bid - \$30,854.00)

Question: Regarding CA-20, I recognize this vehicle is not being replaced due to the Police mileage restrictions, but wanted to follow-up on the response to my question February 5th on those contractual replacement mileage provisions. I was surprised to see the mileage replacement provisions had not changed in 20 years and the response indicated that "Fleet staff would agree with the assertion that modern vehicles have a longer lifespan but such a change would need to be negotiated between the City and the respective bargaining units." Given that, I'm wondering whether these replacement mileage provisions in the Police Officers agreement could be re-negotiated fairly easily (e.g., as a simple amendment to the contract rather than a complete opening of the contract and re-negotiation)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This question does not relate directly to the specific resolution on the agenda. Council recently approved a three-year renewal of the Police Officers agreement, however staff will consider Council's recommendation.

DC-2 - Resolution to Accept Conveyance of Land for Public Park at North Oaks Condominium (Nixon Farms North) from Toll MI VI Limited Partnership (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding DC-2, the third resolved clause indicates that "the transaction shall be concluded by September 1, 2018 or as soon thereafter as practicable". Six months seems like a long time to complete due diligence and I'm wondering if there was any particular reason a six month period was chosen or is that typical? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This is to allow for any issues that come up in due diligence to be resolved. If no issues come up, staff anticipates concluding the transaction sooner.

Question: Also on DC-2, I know that Toll Brothers was contractually committed to pay a share of the Nixon-Green-DhuVarren intersection. Were there provisions/language in the development agreement or any other documents related to sharing of costs for other Nixon Road improvements (e.g., Corridor Traffic Improvement Project)? Has this been discussed with Toll Brothers (or the Woodbury Club owners)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This question is not related to the posted agenda item. Staff will follow up with a separate response at a later time.

F-3 - Communication from the Ann Arbor Downtown Authority - Public Notice Regarding Parking Rate Increases

Question: Does the DDA's plan to increase parking rates require any Council action? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: No the parking rate increases adopted by the Downtown Development Authority do not require further Council action. Under the City's Parking Agreement, the most recent amendment to which was approved by Council at the February 20th meeting, the DDA proposes rates for the Municipal Parking System within the DDA's Parking Area after consultation with the City Administrator and Council, which was done at the Joint Work Session on November 13, 2017. The DDA then holds a public hearing and adopts the new rates. It then files the changes with the City Clerk and the rates take effect 30 days after the filing.