



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Sumedh Bahl, Community Services Area Administrator
Jackie Beaudry, City Clerk
Tom Crawford, CFO
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Susan Pollay, Executive Director, DDA
Wendy Rampson, Planning Manager

CC: Steven D. Powers, City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 1/21/14

CA-3 – Resolution to Approve a Purchase Order to Enertron, LLC for the City Hall Network Cabling Project for \$39,704.50

Question: While I understand that work is being done on these floors related to asbestos abatement, I do not recall any discussions about replacing network cabling. Can you please provide the rationale for this – age of cabling being replaced, benefits, new functionality enabled, etc.? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Network cabling currently in use on the 3rd, 4th and 5th floors of City Hall is a Category 3 cable, commonly referred to as Cat 3 or station wire cable. Cat 3 cabling was installed in the late 80s or early 90s for the City's network computing environment. Today, Cat 3 cable no longer provides adequate network bandwidth for City network computing operations. Many business units within the 3rd, 4th and 5th floors have experienced degraded network performance directly attributed to the Cat 3 network cabling infrastructure not being able to handle data, voice and multi-media demands. Cat 3 cable is designed to handle data up to 10 megabits/second and was an acceptable standard 25 years ago for networks. The City's network backbone is capable of speeds much greater than can be handled by the Cat 3 cable. Cat 5E is now recommended for all new network installations as a replacement for Cat 3 cabling

where the opportunity exists. Cat 3 cable for the 1st Floor, 1/2 of the 2nd Floor and the 6th floor of City Hall has already been replaced in the recent past with Cat 5E cable. Since the City is completing removal of asbestos-containing materials in City Hall, this affords a cost effective opportunity for the City's Information Technology Unit to replace the outmoded network cabling infrastructure within the 3rd, 4th and 5th floors of City Hall. A majority of the current network cabling runs through conduit in the floors. This will be abandoned in-place and replaced with modern horizontal cable runs installed above the new acoustical ceiling tile. This not only provides ease of installation but also provides the added benefit of easier access for the on-going operations and maintenance of the City's internal network. Future network cabling upgrades and/or expansion will be much easier with network cabling installed above the ceiling.

CA-7 – Resolution to Approve Street Closings for the Shamrocks and Shenanigans 5K

CA-8 – Resolution to Approve Street Closings for the University of Michigan Big House 5K on Sunday, April 6, 2014

Question: What is the process for notifying properties with drives along the race routes? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The applicant for the Shamrocks and Shenanigans plans to contact the following neighborhood associations three weeks prior to the event: Downtown Area Citizens Advisory Council, South Main Neighbors Association and Old West Side Association. They will also post to their website and announce to listeners during radio interviews prior to the event to check that website for street closure information. For the Big House 5K, the University intends to alert residents and businesses by way of press releases and the University's website. Additionally, emails will be sent to neighborhood associations. They also intend to utilize the Stadium signage.

DC – 3 – Resolution to Approve a Contract with Atwell, LLC for Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Services (\$25,550.00)

Question: Cover memo references a "preliminary ACM survey of the facility." Can you please explain what that is? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: ACM means Asbestos-containing materials. An ACM Survey is required to establish whether the materials present in the building contain asbestos and delineate the location and condition of asbestos-containing materials. An asbestos survey is based on a walk-through inspection and sampling of suspect building materials for asbestos.

DB - 2 - Resolution to Approve 624 Church Site Plan and Development Agreement, 624 Church Street (CPC Recommendation: Approval – 6 Years and 0 Nays)

Question: Can you please provide data on the capacity utilization at the Forest Parking structure and your assessment of the impact of allocating the 48 spots for this project? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Forest parking structure was constructed in 2000/01. It is the only public parking structure that is jointly owned by the City and the University of Michigan. It is also the only public parking facility in the South University area with the exception of on-street parking meters. The total number of parking spaces is 853; 277 spaces are reserved for UM use and 576 are reserved for public use. There are 131 monthly parking permits currently issued in the structure, approximately half of these permits are utilized by residents living in the Zaragon building and University Towers, and half of these permits are utilized by businesses in the area. There are also two offpeak/overnight permits in use in this structure and 3 Zipcars parked in the structure.

Parking demand is highest during the UM school year, Monday through Friday, and the structure often fills to capacity when classes are in session. At the Forest Avenue parking structure, the monthly permits generate more revenues per space than hourly users primarily because much of the hourly demand is seasonal (Sept-November and January-April) and there is ready free parking in the evening at the University of Michigan Church Street structure. This is different than at the other campus-area structures (Maynard, Liberty Square, Library Lane), where a number of nearby activity generators such as the many entertainment venues extends hourly parking demand into the evening and throughout the year.

The 624 Church Street project will be utilizing the City's "contribution in lieu" (CIL) option to meet its parking requirement. Before the CIL was available, other downtown developers have met their parking requirement by leasing monthly parking permits in the public parking system through parking contracts approved by previous City Councils. There is no standard "normal" length of time to these contract terms. Some examples include:

City Council approved parking contracts				
2003	Corner House Lofts	In perpetuity/until site plan requires a change	21 permits	Liberty Square
		20 year term	55 permits	Liberty Square & Maynard
2006	Syndeco/Ashley Mews (residential & office)	20 year term	100 permits	4 th & William
2006	McKinley Towne Ctr (office)	20 year term	252 permits	Liberty Square
2007	Village Green (residential)	20 year term plus four 5-year renewals *	73 permits plus 73 offpeak permits (3pm-9am)	First & Washington

*At the renewal periods the City/DDA retained the right to renegotiate payment terms and the number of permits with Village Green

Question: Also, can you please provide the rationale for the DDA's agreeing to the (3) five year extensions to the normal 15 year parking agreement term, and have extensions been agreed to (or requested previously)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The DDA uses its management of the public parking system as a tool to help it accomplish its mission. The DDA recognizes that the Forest Avenue structure is the only public parking facility in the South University commercial area and for this reason, the DDA members thought very carefully about the request to provide parking beyond the 15 years set forward under the CIL program. Ultimately they unanimously voted to support providing the three 5-year extensions, but as part of their vote, their resolution made it clear that they were reserving the City/DDA option to relocate these permits to other parking locations, if necessary, at the time of each contract extension. The DDA recognizes that the developer of the 624 Church Street project strongly requests that the permits for its tenants be maintained in the Forest Structure given its proximity to the development, but reserving the option to move these permits if needed provides the City/DDA with flexibility in the future.

Question: What impact (if any) would the recommended changes to premiums endorsed by the Planning Commission and contained in DB-1 have had on this project if they were in place? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Planning Commission recommended reducing the residential premiums in concept but did not identify a specific number for the reduced premiums, so any impact would be speculative. The current 624 Church petition utilizes residential use and LEED Silver certification premiums. The premiums being used would permit the petitioner to build up to a maximum of 690% FAR, but the petitioner has opted to propose a FAR of 667%, or 4,406 square feet less than the maximum allowed. If the residential premiums are reduced, the project might be unaffected given the ‘unused’ amount of FAR from the current proposal and the fact that the project also incorporates several items mentioned as possible new premium categories including, increased energy efficiency and active ground floor use (e.g., the proposed outdoor bar/dining area).

Question: The estimated construction cost in the Staff Report still shows \$17M which was the estimate for the smaller project we approved last year – do we have an estimate for this site plan? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The revised cost of construction is \$26.5 million.

DB-3 – Resolution to Approve Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Aaron Seagraves as Public Art Administrator (\$18,500.00) and Appropriate Funds from the Public Art Fund Balance (\$20,500.00) (8 Votes Required)

Question: When Council approved the last amendment in August, that covered the period through December 31, 2013. Has Mr. Seagraves been working in January, and if so, under what authority? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Mr. Seagraves has performed minimal work during the two weeks of January from the sixth through seventeenth. Mr. Seagraves worked on moving several projects forward and attending one planning meeting for the Arts Commission. While the time of the contract ended December 31, 2013, there are available funds to pay for the minimal work performed in the January period. This work was approved by the Public Services Area Administrator in order to continue moving projects forward.

Question: Can you please provide detail on what Mr. Seagraves has been working on since August as well as what he will be working on over the next six months. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Mr. Seagraves has worked on the Ann Arbor Bridges, Argo Cascades, Kingsley Rain Garden, Allmendinger Park projects. Additionally, Mr. Seagraves has worked with staff and the Arts Commission on developing a methodology/tool for identifying and prioritizing future projects as “enhanced” projects in the Capital Improvements Plan.

In the next six months Mr. Seagraves will continue to assist the Public Art Commission in developing a tool for identifying and prioritizing projects, selecting art for Argo Cascades, refining the art selected for Ann Arbor Bridges, oversee the construction of

the art in the Kingsley rain garden, developing a project in association with the Wastewater Treatment Plant capital investment.

Question: For the August 8, 2013 meeting in response to my request, you provided a budget spreadsheet on the Public Art fund through August 1st, by project and by funding source. Can you please update that spreadsheet as of Dec. 31, 2013?
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: For the August 8, 2013 meeting in response to my request, you provided a budget spreadsheet on the Public Art fund through August 1st, by project and by funding source. Can you please update that spreadsheet as of December 31, 2013?

ART IN PUBLIC PLACES			
Budget Summary as of 01-01-14			
	Revenues	Transfers/ Expenditures	Available Balance
Street Millage	\$ 651,296.00	\$ 413,981.99	\$ 237,314.01
Parks Millage	\$ 50,525.42	\$ 21,934.75	\$ 28,590.67
West Park	\$ 15,467.00	\$ 15,467.06	\$ (0.06)
Solid Waste	\$ 35,861.00	\$ 331.89	\$ 35,529.11
Water	\$ 429,818.00	\$ 370,032.67	\$ 59,785.33
Sewer	\$ 986,895.00	\$ 538,761.48	\$ 448,133.52
Stormwater	\$ 80,703.00	\$ 60,084.18	\$ 20,618.82
Airport	\$ 6,520.00	\$ 103.60	\$ 6,416.40
Energy	\$ 3,279.00	\$ 159.00	\$ 3,120.00
E. Stadium Bridges Project (St. Millage)	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 14,290.84	\$ 385,709.16
Rain Gardens (Stormwater)	\$ 27,000.00	\$ 19,990.15	\$ 7,009.85
Argo Cascades (Water)	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 6,865.07	\$ 143,134.93
Total Available In the Public Art Fund, #0056	\$ 3,605,994.42	\$ 2,230,631.25	\$ 1,375,361.74
FY 2014 Administration Allocation	\$ 34,500.00	\$ 19,687.47	\$ 14,812.53
Total Available for Court/PD Art	\$ 203,828.00	\$ 206,165.38	\$ (2,337.38)

DS-1 – Resolution to Appropriate and Amend the Project Budget for the Construction Phase of the Waldenwood Drive Sidewalk (\$6,818.00) (8 Votes Required)

Question: I'd like to understand the role of the Annual Street Resurfacing budget in this project.

Could you please explain: Who will do the work? Whether this work will be done as part of the sidewalk - or the street resurfacing – projects? I understand that the Annual Street Resurfacing budget would be reimbursed by general funds - just don't quite get why. (Councilmember Briere)

Response: The work will be performed by the contractor that is selected for the 2014 Street Resurfacing project. Waldenwood is one of the local streets selected for the resurfacing program this year, and as a matter of cost savings and practicality, it makes sense to do the work with the contractor that is already on site. Since installation of new sidewalk is not covered by the Street or Sidewalk Millage, the cost of this new sidewalk would be paid for by the General Fund.

Question: DS-1 is about installing the sidewalk without regard to the decision to move the crosswalk. Does approving the crosswalk mean we are also approving the relocation of the crosswalk? If not, how will the decision to move the crosswalk be made? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: This resolution does not include any modifications to the existing crosswalk at the school entrance.

Question: What is the current position of the Safe Routes (Walk) to School Committee? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: The School Safety Committee has not changed its support.

Question: What is the current position of the King School PTO and the current Principal? Have they made a recommendation as a result of the October 3rd community meeting? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: There has been no communication from the PTO. The current Principal, Kathy Morhous, attended the October 3 meeting and spoke in support of improvements near the school.

Question: Has the feedback form been e-mailed to all the King School families through the King School e-mail distribution list? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: The feedback form was provided at the public meeting and to those emails collected by City staff from interested parties.

Question: Can AAPS provide a statement as to whether they would eliminate a crossing guard as a result of moving the crosswalk prior to the council vote?
(Councilmember Petersen)

Response: The existing crosswalk is envisioned to stay in place. The crossing guards are staff of the AAPD and are placed with input from the AAPS and the School Safety Committee. At this time no decision on the crossing guard has been made. The conditions after the installation of the sidewalk would need to be assessed to measure the volumes of children crossing and the availability of safe gaps.

Question: Has a safety study actually been conducted? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: The 2010 memo from Homayoon Pirooz contains the only recent safety study. It was based on the crash history at the intersection and near the school. A quick scan shows that between 2010 and 2012 no crashes occurred at the intersection and no pedestrian crashes occurred in the vicinity of the crossing. Therefore, we believe the 2010 memo is still valid.

Question: Can we attach the documents below to DS-1? (Councilmember Petersen)

Response: Yes, they have been attached.

DS-4 – Resolution Approve a Five Year Lease Between the City of Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan for City-Owned Property Behind 926 Mary Street (\$4,000.00 annually) (8 Votes Required)

Question: The memo indicates that we have other parking agreements like this with UM. Can you please provide information on how many of these agreements there are, number of parking spaces involved, and what UM pays? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City Clerk's Office has only the Mary Street parking lot lease; however, the City also has leases with the University of Michigan for the Fuller Parking Lot and Riverside Park.

Riverside is \$11,880 annually and 18 spots.

Fuller is \$78,655 annually. Number of spots not stated in agreement as part of the lease if for an unpaved section so the number of spots can fluctuate. The most spots would be about 475, but it varies greatly depending on time of year and time of day.