TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator
       Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
       Kim Busemeyer, Financial Manager

SUBJECT: FY25 Budget: Customer Service

DATE: April 26, 2024

**Question #6:** Several new customer service positions are budgeted. Mr. Dohoney mentioned these positions aren't all being charged to general fund. Can you clarify where these positions are being charged to, budget-wise? Are we cutting anything to pay for these new positions? I know it was mentioned hiring people new to their career to replace higher paid, experienced professionals, but that doesn't account for the bulk of the hires. (Councilmember Cornell)

**Response:** In the Planning Department an entry level planner has been added to the General Fund. The cost of this position is being covered by retirement savings from two long time City employees in Planning that recently retired. A zoning coordinator has also been added to the Planning Department. The cost of this position is split between the General Fund and Construction Fund. Retirement savings in the General Fund and fees in the Construction Fund cover the cost of this position. In the Building Department a permit coordinator and four development services inspectors have been added to the budget within the Construction Fund. It is expected that these positions will be net neutral to the Construction Fund due to building, mechanical and electrical permit fees. In Engineering a plan reviewer for private development has also been added to the budget. This position is a pass-through to the General Fund, which means that the General Fund is reimbursed for the cost of the position, and it is therefore net neutral to the General Fund. Fees associated with private development plan review will cover the cost of this position.
Question #9: For the substance use programming, is U-M able to provide these services as a low-cost community service, as a partner of the city vs a vendor to the city? I assume the city isn’t paying market rate for these services. It seems absurd we are paying U-M to support our community in this way... $200k is a drop in the bucket for its budget compared to the city’s. (Councilmember Cornell)

Response: Given the limited funding coming forth from the Marijuana Excise Tax the administration is seeking to leverage our reach wherever possible. Engagement was held with various institutions to find where leveraging could occur. The discussions with Michigan Medical yielded several areas for consideration. We settled on three. The City funding for the Ambulatory Peer Recovery Coach expands their addiction consult service with a specific focus on pregnant patients who have substance abuse issues. The hospitals current program is centered upon aiding people who on receiving inpatient care. With City support patients would also receive substance abuse support in an ambulatory setting. It is believed that supporting them after they have left the hospital will increase the percentage of people who will stay with the treatment regimen. This $56,000 will provide this service for one year.

A second area of leveraging City funds entails supporting the use of Buprenorphine micro dosing kits. The City’s investment of $50,000 will enable patients being discharged from the ER to receive a kit allowing them to start treatment. Michigan Medical maintains that current research shows that microdosing is superior to full buprenorphine initiation for treatment of opioid use disorder. Today micro dosing kits do not exist as a commercial product. They have to be hand made by a pharmacist. Each kit contains not only the buprenorphine but also other medications all aimed at trying to help people escape from their addition. The third element of City funding would provide a .5 FTE expansion of the Ambulatory Nursing Care Navigator. This effort will help connect people with other
available service providers that can help with ongoing recovery management. The cost to accomplish this for one year is $75,000.
TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Services Area Administrator & CFO
Kim Buselmeier, Financial Manager
Brian Steglitz, Public Services Area Administrator

SUBJECT: FY25 Budget: Public Services

DATE: April 26, 2024

Question #5: Resolution to Accelerate Safety Improvements on Multilane Roads R-23-415 directs the City Administrator to "develop a plan for evaluation of reconfiguring all existing multilane roads under the City's jurisdiction by 2030 for Council consideration as part of the FY2025 budget process." Please provide the plan and the annual cost of implementation. (Councilmember Akmon)

Response: Staff propose to evaluate all multilane roads in the City’s jurisdiction for reconfiguration by 2030, with a current estimated cost of $850,000. The City Administrator’s FY 2025 proposed budget includes an allocation of $100,000 that adds to previous year allocations for a current project total of $300,000. The balance of the evaluations will happen over the next three FYs and be included as part of future annual budget requests.

Question #8: Regarding changes to our road salt protocols, does this mean the city will be purchasing more salt and how does that increase costs? Versus salt, is there a non-salt, more eco-friendly way to achieve the same outcome without threatening our waterways? (Councilmember Cornell)

Response: Salting local roads will increase the amount of salt used in a season, therefore necessitating a larger purchase. The salt application proposed in the budget is a light treatment to the center of the road that will only be applied when temperatures favor the presence of prolonged ice pack. This limited application will not achieve bare pavement on the entire surface but it will help to clear the center of the road of hard pack snow and ice and offers an additional layer of safety while limiting the environmental impacts of salt overuse. The estimated cost per application is $10,000.00 for staff time, equipment and materials. There are not many options outside of the use of chlorides to
melt snow and ice on a large municipal scale. Best management practices for snow and ice control call for anti-icing before a storm to reduce the likelihood of snow bonding to the pavement, then mechanically removing as much snow as possible prior to applying deicers. The anti-icing liquid is a blend of salt brine (23.3% sodium chloride and 76.7% water), calcium chloride and beet juice that is made and blended in-house depending on the weather conditions. The new equipment on order and scheduled for delivery in late 2025 will give us the ability to apply enough anti-icing liquid to start taking that approach and is one way we are working to cut down on the amount of salt applied per event.