



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jim Baird, Police Chief

CC: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator
Matt Horning, Interim CFO
Karen Lancaster, Finance Director

SUBJECT: Police

DATE: May 16, 2016

Question #113: Are there crime metrics or other policy advice from prior councils that guide decisions concerning police staffing and budget? (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: Staff is not aware of any metrics or policy advice from prior Councils that have been used to guide police staffing decisions.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Marti Praschan, Financial Manager – Public Services

CC: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator
Matt Horning, Interim CFO
Karen Lancaster, Finance Director

SUBJECT: Public Services

DATE: May 16, 2016

Question #92: Page 166: Why is site plan review time in public service rather than community service/planning? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Site plans are submitted to the City through Community Services/Planning, however various staff in the Public Services Area are involved in the review of the plans to ensure compliance with various codes, standards and specifications. Systems Planning and Project Management staff review these plans for impacts to: water and sanitary utilities; stormwater; soil erosion control; right-of-way; trees; solid waste collection; and traffic.

Question #93: Page 173: What are the requirements for “all required cross connection inspections”? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: We are required by the Michigan Safe Drinking Water Act (Act 399) to test and inspect all installed, testable backflow prevention devices on a prescribed frequency. The frequency depends on the identified degree of hazard and for all commercial accounts is never less than 3 years. Our current approved program requires testing by a certified plumber followed by inspection by City staff.

Question #94: Page 179: I’m confused by the FY17 budget for priority 1 pruning. If we’ve completed 100% of priority pruning and 1%/year need priority pruning, why is the goal 10%? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: We have completed priority one removals; however, pruning still remains an area to be addressed. After the publication of the draft budget book, the performance measurement was modified to make the measurement understandable and easier to measure:

Service Unit Measures	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Projected	FY2017 Budget
Number of Trees Pruned* (Trees pruned to address large dead limbs, sight clearance and/or immediate hazards) .	173	253	571	375

Question #95: Page 180: Should we also have a goal for the stormwater utility along the lines of gallons of increased stormwater mitigation or capacity? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Although not considered for this budget cycle, the following could be recommended for future budget submittals:

Goal: Increase stormwater infiltration.

Measure: Percentage of Stormwater infiltration for new developments.

Question #96: Page 188: Why is % of biosolids reused going down? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The wording of the goal was revised from, “100% of biosolids processed from May through November land applied, weather and budget permitting” to the current wording, “% of biosolids reused through land application during land application season”. By removing the caveat of weather and budget permitting, this measure is more meaningful in the context of biosolids reuse as measured against total biosolids processed during the same timeframe. For instance, in the past, 100% reported might only be 80% of what we processed during the season. We are still following our strategy of land applying as much of our biosolids as we can during the land application season; however, the current metrics provides a better comparison because it relates to the total amount of biosolids processed during this season.

Question#97: Page 188: Should there also be a measure of accidental discharges (either at the plant or through the conveyance system) and a goal of reducing them? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) represent an instance in the system when excess flows, grease, tree roots, towels or other materials cause a clog in the pipe. The system goal is zero overflows. There are events that affect that system that are not in the City’s control (i.e. what residents flush down the toilet...; therefore, believe it not to be an accurate measure of system performance.

By measuring the number and location/cause of the overflows, it allows the City to allocate limited resources to reduce SSOs and limit their negative impact on the

environment. Measuring the number and location/cause could help in directing additional educational or outreach measures, and it could evaluate the effectiveness of a lining or capital project.

Question #112: How did staff approach apportioning a fair division of investment in Connector-related costs among participating agencies? Has there been analysis of land value impacts proximate to the proposed route? (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: The funding model is consistent with the discussions with the local partners. There has been no analysis of land value impacts proximate to the proposed route.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Susan Pollay, Executive Director, DDA

CC: Matt Horning, Interim CFO
Karen Lancaster, Finance Director

SUBJECT: Budget Amendment Questions

DATE: May 16, 2016

AMENDMENT 3

Question #116: Amendment 3: What is the City's commitment to the DDA for the Kerrytown lights project? Do we have an agreement? If so, is there any precedent for backtracking on cost-sharing agreements with the DDA? (Councilmember Grand)

Response: Historically, The DDA has paid for initial investments as part of a DDA improvement project. Maintenance and replacement has been the responsibility of the appropriate City unit/fund on an ongoing basis. Any DDA funding of maintenance, replacement outside of a DDA improvement project has been by one time agreements. This practice was the basis for the proposed Kerrytown area lighting; DDA is paying for the lights in the improvement project, City would be paying for the balance of the light replacements. Attached is a map for reference.

In January 2016, the DDA and City each approved a cost-sharing agreement for the design of the N. Fifth Avenue/Detroit Street project. The DDA is not aware of any previous projects in which the DDA has backtracked on a cost sharing agreement with the City.

This Kerrytown project will represent a true partnership arrangement between the City and DDA. The DDA has approved a total project budget of \$2.9M for its portion of the project, which includes \$400,000 for new street lights (which exceeds the amount requested of the DDA by City Council last year during its FY2016 budget discussions).

The DDA contribution will also include the cost to replace the historic brick once the street and utility work has been completed, as well as new sidewalks, trees, and other elements.

AMENDMENT 4

Question #114: Could crosswalk enhancements paid for by the major streets fund include street lighting? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Major street funding may be used for street lighting associated with a crosswalk construction project; however, not as a part of a corridor lighting installation.

AMENDMENT 5

Question # 107: Amendment 5: Do we have any idea what a community fiber project would entail in terms of cost, scope, operation, timeline, etc.? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: No specific project or scope has been established.

Question #108: Amendment 5: Are there other projects the LDFA is building up fund balance to support? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The existing LDFA agreement was scheduled to end in FY2018. An application for a 15 year extension was submitted over a year ago as approved by Council. The LDFA has been waiting, along with all other applicants, to hear the status of its application. Recently the MEDC & Treasury indicated the application will be moving forward. The LDFA was unable to perform long-term planning until the extension is known. The LDFA board has on its agenda to start discussing long-term planning at its next board meeting.

Question #117: Amendment 5: I recall that we heard from Mr. Crawford last year as to why putting funds towards an unplanned community fiber project would not make sense at that time. Do we know how much a community fiber project would cost? I'm assuming much more than \$500,000. (Councilmember Grand)

Response: Any community fiber project will be substantially more than \$500k. A more reasonable possibility is a pilot program, but the parameters of such a program would still need to be developed.

AMENDMENT 6

Question #109: Amendment 6: Have there been any conversations with the UM regarding their willingness to fund the study at 90%? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: To our knowledge, there has been no conversation/commitment by the University regarding a 90% contribution.

Question #110: Amendment 6: Will phase 3 of the study generate a final routing proposal that Council could vote on to satisfy the final resolved clause? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes.

AMENDMENT 11

Question #111: Amendment 11: Other than the workforce contingency, what is the reason for increasing the administrator's contingencies? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The City Administrator's contingency as proposed includes \$250,000 as an operating contingency plus \$100,000 for pedestrian safety. The pedestrian safety portion is a provision to help implement the Pedestrian Safety Task Force report. If funding is available, the city administrator's contingency is kept between \$250,000 and \$500,000 for both an operating contingency and to help the organization achieve a small surplus to fund future one-time request.

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR 5TH AND DETROIT STREET PROJECT



FIFTH (North of Kingsley)
Water main and
Limited road reconstruction
\$70,000
(City funding)

2018
Construction

SHARED
PROJECT AREA
2018 Construction

DETROIT
Storm \$420,000 (City)
Water main \$135,000 (City)
Road reconstruction (with potential
reconfiguration) \$900,000 (City)
\$250,000 (DDA)
Sidewalk Imp. \$ 1,075,000 (DDA)

SHARED PROJECT
AREA TOTAL
\$5,325,000

FIFTH
Storm \$270,000 (City)
Water main \$110,000 (City)
Road reconstruction \$840,000(City)
\$250,000 (DDA)
Sidewalk Imp. \$1,075,000 (DDA)

FIFTH (between Catherine and Ann
Mill and resurface)
\$80,000
(City funding)

Hands-On Store

Ann Arbor City Council