



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jim Baird, Interim Police Chief
Larry Collins, Interim Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Cresson Sloten, Systems Planning Manager

CC: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 12/7/15

CA-1 – Resolution to Approve a Contract between City of Ann Arbor and Industrial Organizational Solutions, Inc. for Police Promotional Assessments for the Ranks of Sergeant and Lieutenant (\$39,870.00)

Question: The cover memo references a “competitive process”, can you please elaborate on that including whether that refers to when this firm was originally hired three years ago or to this contract renewal? Also, what do you see as the range for the number of possible retirements at the supervisory level in the Police Dept. (Sergeant, Lieutenant, Deputy) over the next 18 months or so? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In October 2015, RFP-947 “Promotional Process of AAPD Officers” was developed with the assistance of City purchasing to elicit responses of current vendors of this service. The previous three promotional exams were conducted by the last company selected through the RFP process. It was time to check the marketplace to ensure the most qualified vendor continued to provide this service to the City. 0-10 promotions possible. 3-8 likely.

CA-4 – Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 2 to Carlisle/Wortman Professional Services Agreement for Planning Services

Question: I understand that this amendment is not adding dollars, but is re-defining the scope. In looking at Exhibit A-1, I can't tell what's changed. Can you briefly summarize the changes and why they are required? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Amendment No. 2 to the CWA contract for planning services adds one (1) additional assigned staff for day-to-day planning support, which necessitated inclusion of the necessary pay rate information for the additional staff in Exhibit B-1. This change was necessary due to the volume of planning activity currently and anticipated during the beginning of 2016. In addition, the duties and responsibilities of CWA staff have been modified in Exhibit A-1 based on adjustments to internal staff responsibilities and specific day-to-day support needs. CWA day-to-day support of the Community Services Area Administrator was expanded to include development and land use application review and zoning and site plan review and to clarify CWA's supervision responsibilities for and representation of the Planning Unit until a new Planning Director is hired by the City.

DC-5 – Resolution to Approve Council Rules

Question: Was Councilmember Grand's proposal to change which items are included in consent agenda moved forward? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Councilmember Grand wanted to move DS next to Consent Agenda. That proposal was not adopted. Instead, potential amendments may address this concern by further modifying the Consent Agenda rule.

Question: Is the intended result of the Council Interactions With Staff and Contacts rule that Council would not contact service unit managers directly (e.g. not contact Colin Smith about parks issues?) (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes, for non-routine service, information, and follow-up requests. The processes described in the "Council Interaction with City Staff" document were arrived at through discussions with Mr. Powers and the Executive Team. The Executive Team recently re-reviewed this process and affirmed their support in order to best ensure Council receives a timely and accurate response from staff.

Question: There was no cover memo outlining the changes to the existing Council rules being proposed for 2016, but in looking through the attachments, it appears that what's proposed is (1) to change the meeting agenda to move the Consent Agenda to before any Public Hearings (2) to adopt a new Council Administrative Rule and (3) adopt new Council Ethics Rules #5 through #12 related to Improper Use of Position and Council Ethics Rule #13 related to enforcement. Can you please confirm if that is

correct and if not, please indicate other changes that are proposed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, that is correct.

Question: For the proposed Council Ethics Rules #5 through #12 – the rules related to Improper Use of Official Position – is it common for municipalities and/or considered a best practice to have these (in addition to conflicts of interest rules/provisions) specifically outlined in a rules document? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes. Recall that prior Council Resolution was to develop these Rules. Also, the ethics consultant who came in 2014 stated that ethics rules were best practices.

DC-6 – Resolution Concerning Michigan’s Energy Policy and Current State Legislation Under Consideration

Question: The cover memo indicates that a recent summary of the related bills was attached, but it was not in the packet and I was also unable to access the state website – can you please provide the attachment referenced. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The synopsis attachment from the state website link provided in the memo has been attached to Legistar.

Question: Have any other municipalities/counties taken positions on these various bills and if so, can you please provide some detail? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Staff is unaware of other cities that have taken positions, and likewise the Michigan Municipal League, when asked, did not list any that they were aware of.

DC-7 – Resolution to Oppose Michigan House Bill 4425 Amending the Michigan Vehicle Code

Question: The cover memo indicates that “The prior standard of establishment of a safe maximum or minimum speed limit based on engineering and traffic investigation is replaced by the percentile formula.” Can you please clarify what that means including:

- what flexibility does the City now have in setting speed limits on streets (and for which streets – major, local, trunk lines, etc.)?
- if HB4423-4426 are ultimately passed as currently written, what speed limit changes, and on what streets, will the City be required to make?

Is the Michigan Senate considering a similar set of bills and does city staff have a position on this resolution? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City currently has a prima facie limit of 25 miles per hour on all streets and highways in business and residence districts. In other instances where a different

speed limit is established, engineers can use access-point formula, conduct traffic studies, or set the limit at the 85th percentile speed of free-flowing traffic. Engineers also consider sight distance limitations in the process. While it appears that the bills seek, to a certain degree, to standardize limits across the state and provide for consistency—they do so at the expense of local control. The City Administration generally opposes the loss of local control to set local limits pursuant to traffic and engineering investigation. If HB4423-4426, as currently written are adopted, it will be necessary to evaluate the speed limits on local streets. A similar package of bills has not been introduced in the Senate.

DS-3 – Resolution to Approve Change Order No. 1 with Doan Construction Company (Bid No. 4320) for the 2015 Ramp & Sidewalk Repair Project (\$400,000.00)

Question: Could you have staff provide the details for 15-1361 - the change order on the Doan sidewalk contract? I'm curious as to why the change and additional \$400k charge? (Councilmember Smith)

Response: The City is currently completing the fourth year of a 5-year program to perform repairs on the City's entire sidewalk system. Quantities of work for each year are estimated based upon the amount of sidewalk in each area, but field conditions determine the actual amount of work needed in each area. For the 2015 construction area, the amount of work needed was greater than anticipated, requiring additional work to be performed by the contractor to complete the areas scheduled for 2015.

DS – 6 – Resolution to Approve the Purchase of Commercial Water Meters from SW Controls, Inc. \$75,000 Annually, \$225,000.00 for a Period of Three Years (FY 2016 to FY 2018); Bid NO. ITB-4408

Question: I understand it makes sense to not introduce parts and equipment from a number of different suppliers, but only as long as the premiums are not too large – how does the SW Controls price for their meters compare with the two alternate types of commercial meter? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: For the typical commercial flow meter sizes 3" to 8", Sensus OMNI T2 flow meters were on average 15% more expensive than the comparable ABB meters. Badger M-Series Magnetic Flow Meters were on average 40% less expensive than the comparable ABB meters. However, if Badger were selected, the City would need to purchase additional programming equipment and train staff on how to use their products. The Badger meters are also not the same length as the ABB meters, so any meter replacements would be made more difficult and expensive. Thus, the cost saving that was realized on the front end would be negated by the time and money spent on having two meter standards.

Finally, the ABB meters are preferred over the Badger because the ABB meters have the ability to measure sewage flow in addition to drinking water, which the City has utilized in specialized situations. They also have the ability to use an external flow testing/verification device after installation to ensure accurate metering and minimize water loss. Badger meters do not have these capabilities.