



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: April 2, 2018

CA-6 – Resolution to Approve Amendment #1 to the City’s Contract with Tex Hahn Media, Inc. (“Tex Hahn”) for the Public Outreach and Marketing Plan for Utilities (the “Contract”) (\$23,165.00)

Question: Specifically, what type of public engagement is planned (neighborhood meetings, public meetings, etc.) and have any meetings been scheduled? Also, whether it’s public meetings or other forms of communication, is it two-way communication including a mechanism for public input? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The RFP was for a “public education and marketing plan.” Thus, Hahn Public’s recommendations were focused on developing a communication plan that would equip the A2 staff with the information, knowledge and data to properly engage with residents on issues regarding stormwater. The RFP did not ask for the consultant to engage with the public in the form public meetings etc. Thus, the only form of gathering public input (that is within the stipulations of the RFP) is pre and post surveys, focus groups and in-depth interviews.

Question: Does city staff agree the primary purpose of the contract amendment is to “gain support for the rate adjustment recommended by the COS” ? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No, that intent/purpose of the survey is indicated in the response to the related question below.

Question: Does Tex Hahn have a local/Michigan office? Did any Michigan firms submit proposals in response to this RFP? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Tex Hahn does not have a local/Michigan office. Yes, the following firms submitted proposals:

Advance 360:

- New York, NY
- Grand Rapids, MI

Q&M:

- Ann Arbor, MI
- Traverse City, MI
- Los Angeles, CA

Lambert Edwards, & Assoc:

- Grand Rapids, MI
- Lansing, MI
- Detroit, MI

MCCI:

- Detroit, MI

The Allen Lewis Agency:

- Farmington Hills, MI

Hahn Public:

- Austin, TX

Question: I'll readily confess I'm not a survey structure expert, but it just wasn't clear to me what the purpose of the survey actually was – could you please clarify the purpose and what information/knowledge we were trying to acquire by conducting it? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The purpose of the survey is to:

1. Gather baseline knowledge on stormwater and water issues in A2.
2. Gather baseline perceptions on the role of individual to improving water quality in A2.
3. Measure residents' perception on government trust, expertise and fiscal responsibility.
4. Measure the effectiveness of existing and new messaging in explaining stormwater and water rates to the average resident.

All of the above purposes are important to building a holistic education and outreach campaign that can be used for several years and easily updated and repurposed by the staff.

Question: The first question of the survey asked for zip code and allowed folks to check several non-Ann Arbor zip codes including two in Canton (48187, 48188), one in

South Lyon (48178), and one that's primarily Pittsfield Township (48108). Are we using responses from non-city residents and if so, why would we do that? Also, what is the survey household distribution/sampling plan? (I received one survey (appropriate) which was sent to my a2gov.org address. I am aware, e.g., that some city staff have received > 1 electronic survey (i.e., sent to their a2gov and home addresses.) (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Non-city resident responses are not being used. The question on the non-A2 arbor zip codes were used as a screener- a mechanism to disqualify anyone who is not from A2 or someone who might be trying to game the system. The survey link was distributed via Facebook. Thus far, we have all demographics represented that reflect the current make-up in A2. The reason some staff may have received the survey more than once is because they are part of an official city listserv. While we have restricted participants from taking the survey twice by tracking their IP addresses, there are just some cases where we can't prevent it. Even then, the number of double responses is not significant to impact the overall dataset.