



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Stephen K. Postema, City Attorney

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

SUBJECT: City Attorney's Office

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #25 & #48:** For the City Attorney's Office, you mentioned at the work session (and the budget impact sheet indicates) that the funding for the new position/FTE is \$35K from Public Services and \$42K for elimination of 0.5 FTE. It is also mentioned that this is for succession planning, yet the costs are shown as recurring. Can you please clarify the funding and classification of the costs, specifically (1) why is Public Svcs. paying a portion of the costs – shouldn't that be covered in the Municipal Service Charge? (2) What 0.5 FTE position is being eliminated? (3) why the costs are considered recurring? (I had asked about this previously, but do not recall seeing a response.) (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** This cost is to assist with Public Services issues as part of succession planning. Any costs directly reimbursed by another fund are excluded as part of the municipal service charge. There is a staff person reducing their hours to half-time thus providing the opportunity to help fund another staff person to help with succession planning. As we expect this succession planning to take 2-3 years, the cost is listed as recurring. Budget staff will monitor this to ensure the amounts do not continue in the budget past the completion of the succession.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Living Wage

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #41:** What is the impact of resolution 14-1448 regarding living wage: “RESOLVED, Each year as part of the budget process the administrator shall report to Council the cost to ensure that human service funding keep up with living wage adjustments and if there is a shortfall between living wage compliance and the human service allocation in the administrator's proposed budget”? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The City Administrator’s FY17 Recommended budget included a \$2,000 increase for compliance with this resolution.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator  
Marti Praschan, Financial Manager – Public Services  
Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Pedestrian and Safety and Access Task Force/Human Rights Commission

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #44:** Regarding the \$100K provision for the PSATF recommendations, and the \$50K provision for the Human Rights Commission (police recommendations), can you please describe the process that will be used to authorize spending these funds (who's involved, who recommends, who approves etc)? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The process for the \$50K provision for the Human Rights Commission has yet to be determined.

During the FY 16 budget process, \$100K was allocated in the FY 17 plan for Pedestrian Safety Improvements specified for Sidewalk Gaps & Enforcement. Public Service Area staff have identified the existing sidewalk gaps and has begun work on the project prioritization model. Typical contract approval processes will be followed when projects have been identified and scheduled.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Fees

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #45:** The only fee increases included in the budget book were for the Water Utilities and for Public Works. Mr. Crawford had mentioned there were not many fee increase proposals this year, but can you please confirm there are not any other recommendations for increases (e.g. Parks & Rec facilities, building, planning and development fees)? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** There are no other fee increases.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Deer Management

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #46:** Regarding the deer management \$35K budgeted as recurring for lethal methods, what are the total projected FY17 costs for continuing the lethal program including the costs of the cull, aerial surveys, monitoring of browse damage, staff time etc. (I'm assuming the \$35K budgeted for lethal does not cover all of these items)? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** We have not received all information in order to determine the extent of the cost of the entire program for FY17.

**Question #47:** Also on deer management, what is the basis for the \$35K budgeted as one-time for non-lethal methods (is it just to match the \$35K for lethal or is it based on something else/specific actions)? Also, what is the process envisioned for consideration of the non-lethal methods? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The \$35K for non-lethal was a provisional amount for FY17. No specific actions have been developed at this time.

**Question#70:** Would you kindly clarify if the original \$90 is still there for 2017? (Councilmember Kailasapathy)

**Response:** The \$90K allocated to the deer cull for FY16 was a one-time adjustment. Council only adopts one budget year at a time per State law so if the budget amendment says "one-time", the amount does not get budgeted in subsequent years. For FY17, the budget is \$70K (\$35K for lethal which will recur in subsequent years'

budgets) and \$35K for non-lethal which is currently non-recurring. All costs for deer management are charged to the service unit where the funding is provided.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources Director

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

SUBJECT: Human Resources

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #49:** HR, there is a 0.5 FTE reduction proposed (from 13.13 to 12.63). Can you please elaborate on that (e.g. is it a transfer or a net reduction)? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** This reflects the elimination of the 0.5 FTE payroll analyst position that is no longer needed in the Human Resources service unit. The 0.5 FTE was transferred to the Safety service unit.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jackie Beaudry, City Clerk  
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator  
Colin Smith, Parks and Recreation Director

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

SUBJECT: Dog Licenses

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #50:** On p. 33, it indicates the number of dog licenses increased by over 50% in FY15 (from 1,151 to 1,772) and 1,800 are projected for FY16 and FY17. That's great progress and do you expect the new dog park (and requirement that a person needs a dog license in order to obtain an off-leash permit) to add to these numbers? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The increase in dog licenses sold in FY15 and 16 was due to the increased education and marketing efforts of the City's dog license program. In addition to a new ordinance and fee structure, which included options for 1, 2 and 3-year licenses and discounts for spayed and neutered pets, the promotion included print advertising, postcard mailings to all City households and a one-time discounted price for new licenses during national pet month in May 2015.

It is too early to determine how behaviors will be modified and how that equates to the number of dog licenses in future years. With respect to the new dog park, the answer largely depends on whether new and different dog owners will apply for permits to visit the new dog park or if the new park will mostly draw from dog owners who are already licensed with us and using the other parks.





---

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: Dams

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #51:** On page 3 of the budget message (one-time requests), a \$64K loss of Dam revenue is listed. What are the full costs and revenue generated for the Dams and hydropower operation? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The dams are budgeted to generate \$372K in revenue in FY16 and cost \$337K. The operating loss for FY 17 is reflective of increased capital maintenance costs.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator  
Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources Director

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

SUBJECT: Workforce Planning

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #52:** Regarding the \$500K budgeted for workforce planning and the requested authorization for 10 additional temporary FTE's (from 729 to 739), can you please describe the process for approving specific actions under the program - who recommends, who decides, Council involvement (if any) envisioned? Also, what was the basis of the 10 FTE authorization requested - just a ball park or based on analysis of specific positions? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The Service Area Administrators (SAA's) and Human Resources Service Providers (HRSP's) will review each department's projected retirements and identify positions using the following criteria:

- a. Knowledge and experience not easily transferrable
- b. Position cannot be covered by temporary or contractor
- c. Position is difficult to fill, requires certifications or licenses
- d. Continuity of a project or initiative
- e. Single v. multi-incumbent roles
- f. Number of retirements in an area

As this is a pilot program, the 10 FTEs was an estimate. Analysis using the criteria above would be done after the program is funded.

**Question: #53:** In your March 23 responses to questions on specific positions that may be in the pilot program beyond Safety Services, you provided general criteria that would be used to decide (which was helpful/made sense), but not any specifics on positions or service areas that may be included. Can you please provide any updated (non-

confidential) information on the program that may be available at this time that will help Council understand what's envisioned and what Council's role is to be?  
(Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** We do not have this information at this time.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Finance and Administrative Services

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #59:** In Finance & Administrative Service area (customer service) there is a proposed reduction of 1.30 FTE (from 11.60 to 10.30). Can you please elaborate on what that change is (transfer or net reduction) and if net reduction, what impact on customer service the reduction will have? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The FTE is a transfer of staff from Customer Service to Public Services. This has no impact on customer service.

**Question #91:** What is the process for surplus sales? If it is not already being done, has there been consideration of inter-governmental cooperation for this process, as was described by one of the administrator candidates? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Our internal Administrative Policy and Procedure (APP# 203) which is based on an ordinance is followed for the sale of surplus property. In essence a department completed a Surplus Property Disposal Form and provides it to Purchasing. Purchasing then reviews, collects more information and photos (if needed) and then posts the item(s) onto Michigan Inter-governmental Trade Network's (MITN) governmental surplus auction website. Fleet specific surplus items (mostly vehicles and equipment) are typically auctioned live and in person and on occasion they are done in conjunction with Washtenaw County and/or the University of Michigan.



---

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 6, 2016

---

**Question #61:** Regarding the Police metrics (page 217), the target for downtown foot patrols is listed as a 10% increase, but the actual hours have dropped significantly – from 1,747 hours in FY14 to 1,480 hours in FY16. Rather than a 20% increase over 2 years, there’s been a 15% decline. Can you please explain why? Also, has the DDA officially rejected Council’s request to help fund downtown foot patrols/beat cops or does that remain under consideration? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The FY16 is a projection not the actual number of foot patrols for FY16 as the year hasn’t ended yet. Foot patrols are one of the numerous tasks performed by officers and will have normal variation based on call load and other areas of focus.

**Question #62:** Also on police hours, I believe I’ve asked this before and the data wasn’t available, but can you please provide whatever data is available on the hours, number patrols etc related to dedicated neighborhood traffic enforcement over the last few years. (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Traffic Enforcement time documented is listed below. “Neighborhood” traffic enforcement is not specifically tracked.

2013	5798 hours
2014	9864 hours
2015	9293 hours

**Question #63:** The police budget (page 215) reflects a \$580K (15%) year-to-year increase in District Detectives (from \$3.70M in FY16 to \$4.28M in FY17 – page 215) and a \$350K decrease in Patrol. Can you please elaborate on that apparent re-allocation and what it means (if anything) for neighborhood safety, patrols and traffic enforcement? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** There was no reallocation. The amounts referenced are mostly personnel costs. These numbers are based on the rate of pay of the specific employees assigned to each section when the budget is submitted. The District Detectives tend to be more senior employees who have a higher rate of pay. Any promotions or retirements ultimately result in a new officer being hired. These officers are all assigned to the Patrol. These employees are at the bottom of the pay scale. There were no FTE's shifted from one section to the other.

**Question #64:** If council were to add 3 to 5 sworn officers to the Police budget (or an equivalent amount of overtime or other dollars), how would the additional resources be deployed and what would be the benefits? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Additional FTE's would be used to supplement staffing in existing areas of focus. Some possible uses for the FTE's would be community engagement, traffic enforcement, patrol and the detective section. The benefits of additional personnel in each of these areas are listed below.

Community engagement – currently we have three personnel assigned with 4 in the summer. The fourth is taken from road patrol staffing.

Traffic enforcement – allows for additional focus on dedicated traffic enforcement without being dependant on calls for service workload.

Patrol – allows for additional proactive policing if calls for service are spread out amongst more officers.

Detective section – allows for more cases to be assigned instead of closed without follow up.

**Question #73:** Page 215: Why have the costs of administrative services gone up so much since FY14? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The Fringe Benefit Activity (1100) was combined with Administration (1000) starting in FY15. The total of those two lines has actually decreased over time from FY14.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Pension

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #65:** Regarding the pension plan, I understand the full actuarial estimates are only done at fiscal year-end, but are there updated estimates of the unfunded liability at December 31, 2015? Also, in the April 1 staff response to a budget Q, it was indicated that the city's overall contribution is increasing 2.0% in total and 4.92% in the General Fund – how much are those in dollars? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** There are not updated estimates. The unfunded liability is solely derived from the actuary report. The overall contribution increases \$392,541 and the General Fund portion is \$488,269.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Susan Pollay, Executive Director, DDA  
Joe Morehouse, Deputy Director, DDA

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

SUBJECT: DDA

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #66:** At our budget work session with the DDA in response to a Q on why personnel costs were budgeted to increase \$60K (16%) , it was mentioned that the DDA was considering staffing changes. What is the latest status of that evaluation?  
(Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Members of the DDA continue to discuss the future possibility of adding a new staff member to assist with the management of the parking system; however, there is no immediate plan of action. Some of the possible responsibilities that may be assigned to this position may include receiving and verifying parking data from the DDA's parking operator, preparing reports, overseeing the DDA's monthly permit wait list, working with the operator on planning for big special events and facility repairs/construction, responding to patron inquiries and complaints, and special projects.





---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: LDFA

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #67:** The LDFA tax capture continues to grow dramatically. At \$3.3M for FY17, that's a \$750K (29%) increase from the \$2.55M forecast for FY16 and the tax capture has more than doubled in the last four years. The fund balance will be about \$2M (about 75% of annual expenditures) at the end of FY17. Given all that, and the likelihood that the tax capture will continue to grow significantly (there's no cap, like DDA), what is the long-term financial plan? Is it to continue to build reserves, invest in capital infrastructure, or to continue to increase dollars passed through to SPARK for their operating expenses, or some other strategy?  
(Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** As approved by Council, Ann Arbor & Ypsilanti SmartZone applied for a 15 year extension over a year ago. The State has been very slow in following up on all of the applications. Without knowing the future of the funding, the LDFA allowed the fund balance to increase over the past couple of years. Recently, the State has shown signs of moving ahead with the applications. At the LDFA April meeting, the board put on their June agenda to discuss the longer-term plan since they felt they couldn't wait any longer. The preliminary information from the State is that they will be permit the Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti SmartZone to keep the growth up through FY2018 but then reduce the amount of growth thereafter from 50% to 25%. The full effect of this limitation is still being determined.

**Question #68:** What opportunities are there (if any) to (1) cap the LDFA capture similar to the cap on the DDA TIF? (2) remit/transfer a portion of the capture funds to the originating sources? (3) utilize the funds for purposes (capital or operating) other than SPARK? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:**

1. As indicated in the prior response, the State is in process of determining the amount of funds it is willing to allocate to the SmartZones.
2. The existing law/development plan permit the LDFA board to determine if there are excess funds and have them remitted back to the State.
3. The LDFA Board has the authority to expend the funds on capital or operating items other than SPARK as long as they are within the limitations of the state law for SmartZones and SmartZone's development plan.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Non-Departmental

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #69:** Regarding non-departmental expenditures, can you please provide a spreadsheet similar to the one provided last year (May 14 budget response) that details the expenditure line items for non-departmental “other services” and “other charges”. Also, is the \$500K shown for “personnel services” the workforce planning \$500K? And if not, what is the \$500K in “personnel services” for and where in the budget is the \$500K for workforce planning? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The \$500K is for severance pay. Workforce planning is budgeted in Non-departmental as a contingency which is grouped as other charges. Below is a chart with the information.

**Non-Departmental (Include Gen Fund & Debt Serv. Fund)**

	FY2016	FY2017	
	Amended	Budget	
Description	Budget	Request	Comments
<b>Other Services</b>			
Telecommunications	\$ 48,561	\$ 48,561	
Training	43,500	43,500	
Downtown Employee Parking Benefit (55%)	71,610	71,610	
Carryforward of in process items at year-end	13,533	-	These items were approved without regard to fiscal year.
HRC Police		50,000	
Bad debts	1,000	1,000	
Total Other Services	\$ 178,204	\$ 214,671	
<b>Other Charges</b>			
Dues & Licenses	\$ 137,135	\$ 137,135	Includes SPARK services (\$75k) plus city-wide dues/memberships.
AAATA Fee	100,707	102,749	Fee is deducted from tax distrib.
Tax Refunds	215,000	110,000	Primarily Michigan Tax Tribunal estimated refund on prior year levies
Labor & Contract Settlement contingencies	472,598	888,031	Based on Labor Committee input.
City Admin. Operating contingency	288,250	350,000	
Workforce planning contingency		500,000	
Pension contribution smoothing contingency		238,374	
Debt Service	8,939,558	8,860,199	
Total Other Charges	\$10,153,248	\$11,186,488	



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: City Administrator's Office

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #71:** P. 17: City Administrator Service Area: Is this line item adequate for the new administrator's compensation package? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** No. A budget adjustment will be needed during FY17 after all costs are calculated.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jennifer Hall, Housing Commission, Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: Housing Commission

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #85:** Page 72: Do the numbers of affordable housing units and public housing refer to just those in the Housing Commission system? Is there a standard reporting process for overall affordable units? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Yes, these units only refer to units that are income restricted and subsidized by funding that the AAHC administers. There is no standard reporting process for overall affordable units, however, the County OCED does try to track the number of income restricted housing units in Washtenaw County by compiling information from multiple sources.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Customer Service

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #87:** Page 107: These metrics measure workload but do not strike me as “customer service standards.” Are there plans to develop customer service standards for customer service? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** Yes. The metrics provided were the ones available at the time of document preparation. Separately and as a part of the organization’s strategic plan (referenced at Council’s offsite), staff has been developing customer service standards which are expected to be completed by June 30, 2016. In FY2017, unit specific customer service metrics are being developed.



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Information Technology

DATE: May 6, 2016

---

**Question #89:** Page 120: Regarding the goal to implement self-service applications, is there a goal to increase the useability? Some of our current systems (e.g. eTRAKiT, Legistar) have usability barriers? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The IT department conducts regular planning sessions with our departments to discuss the state of their applications, improvement opportunities, and any issues they may be experiencing in order to increase usability and eliminate barriers with our applications. We work closely with the department to help prioritize and recommend solutions to their issues. Some of the issues we face are simple and some are complex, and everything in-between. An issue may seem simple on the surface but may turn out to be a very complex issue or change that could significantly affect other systems or the departments operations. Some of our applications, such as eTRAKiT, are tightly integrated to the operations in Community Services and other applications throughout the city, and Community Services and IT discuss improvements to our systems on a regular basis. eTRAKiT is considered a legacy (older) application and is currently being evaluated to see if we want to continue with this application or move to another. Derek Delacourt, Community Services Director who was recently hired, is in the process of this evaluation. The IT department recently met with the Clerk's office and it was decided to evaluate the status of Legistar after the November 2016 elections.

Our systems are very complex and will never be perfect, but there is a lot of history on how our systems got to where they are and that can always be improved. These applications are selected by the departments with the assistance of IT, and IT works closely with them to support and improve them. But in most cases, decisions, changes



and improvements related to their applications are driven and prioritized by the business (department). The IT department will continue to be proactive with our department planning meetings so we can mitigate issues and make continuous improvements to our systems so our employees can be productive and our citizens are getting the access to the data they require.

Following are some recent systems improvements the IT department has been involved with and these type of improvements will continue to occur:

- Expanding the use of A2 FIX-it to include the reporting of “odor complaints” near the Waste Water Treatment Plant.
- Development of an On-Line FOIA Intake Form and Log – This allows for the electronic submittal of a FOIA request. The log allows for the public to easily sort by their requests.
- CTN Web Form – Converted forms to an on-line workshop registration process for CTN customers.
- Customer Service and Forestry Information Architecture Redesign – Redesigned the website so the public and city employees can retrieve information more easily.
- iTRAKiT Mobile Inspection software deployment to improve efficiency, consistency, and enable scheduling and re-scheduling in the field for Rental Housing Zoning Compliance.

**Question #90:** Page 120: I am glad to see the goal of making more data sets publicly available. Are there processes in place to prioritize which data sets to prioritize making available, such as community outreach or case studies from other communities? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** In reference to the response above, we prioritize based on planning meetings with our departments and their priorities and requirements. We use this priority along with the 2016 IT Department Strategic Plan, Goals, Objectives and Initiatives to provide solutions and recommendations that use our existing data and provide that data to the public, if feasible.



---

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 6, 2016

---

**Question #43:** Regarding the City's Alternative Transportation Fund, can you please provide/describe both the purpose of the fund and the specific criteria utilized to determine if/when the fund is utilized. In the budget proposal, both the City's share of the Connector study costs (\$184K) and the provision for the PSATF recommendations (\$100K) are funded from the General Fund. As these would both seem to me to be Alternative Transportation items, can you please explain why they are not and are being funded by the GF? Also, if not these kinds of items, what will the Alternative Transportation Fund be paying for in FY17 with the fund's \$491K budgeted revenue and expense? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The Alternative Transportation is used to account for Act 51 monies segregated for the purpose of maintaining and extending non-motorized pathways. Because this fund's primary revenue source is restricted Act 51 monies, only certain projects qualify and funding is limited.

The FY 17 Alternative Transportation budget of \$491,861 consists of planned projects including the Allen Creek Berm Pedestrian Project, Corridor Improvements, Bike-lane Pavement Marking Maintenance, Non-Motorized Education & Outreach; as well as, allocated personnel costs for the Transportation Manager position.

**Question #55:** Also on staffing, a new Solid Waste/Systems Planning position is recommended. Can you please provide information on what is contemplated for that position? I recognize there are several major items in the Solid Waste area now

(renegotiate MRF contract, potential new programs and new drop-off facility), but would it make sense to engage consulting services/hire contract employees rather than hire a permanent employee to get through the peak? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The number of business issues and council interest items does not seem to reduce and existing staff is unable to contain all of this. In addition, as the downtown has increased activity, there's a need for additional city leadership in solving the management of the allies and customer service issues. While the DDA is providing what assistance they can, there is a need for on-going support from the City which existing staff levels cannot support.

**Question #56:** Public Services FTE's are up 3.05 FTE's (p 142). Two have been discussed – solid waste/systems planning and the deputy position – what is the third addition? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The FTE is a transfer of staff from Customer Service (now in Finance) to Public Services.

**Question #74:** I'm confused by the CIP rankings in document. For example, it lists fire stations 3 and 4 renovations as project 9 or 9, but on the CIP listed on the website there are 17 projects in City Owned Buildings. Why the discrepancy? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The "of 9" statement for the municipal facilities is an error, which staff did not catch prior to dissemination of the draft budget books. The rankings were correct in a category of 17 projects.

**Question #88:** Page 112: Why do not all service units review quarterly forecasts? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

**Response:** The Public Services Area is comprised of a number of service units, some of which are enterprise funds. Due to the volume and complexity of the area, the forecasts are not documented to the extent as the other parts of the organization, although a review by finance staff of performance is made. There are also some authorities, or otherwise separate entities (DDA, AAHC, and Retirement System) with their own oversight boards that do not that do not provide quarterly forecasts.