



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator

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

SUBJECT: Community Services

DATE: May 10, 2016

Question 54: In the April 1 budget responses, it was indicated that benchmarking data for building, planning and development staffing levels is difficult to come up with (particularly now with the city's workload levels and staff vacancies). That's understandable, and if there were not requests to add 3 permanent FTE's to the area (2 in building and 1 planner), I wouldn't be following-up. Is there any benchmark staffing data that you do have/can share and can you please also confirm that we are not staffing to the peak workload level we're experiencing today? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The previous April budget response was responding to a request to evaluate staffing based on comparable building and development activity, not traditional measures like population, region and demographics. That response was based on the difficulty to identify, create and obtain those criteria, especial considering workloads and backfilling of current staff vacancies.

In addition to the original April 1st response staff has had the opportunity to continue to evaluate workload. At the building inspector level we are just meeting the standard of 24 – 48 hour turnaround time on permit and inspection requests. Those times are currently being subsidized by outsourcing plan review services, between December 12, 2014 and April 12, 2016 over 2000 plans have been outsourced for review, the average is about 125 per month. All costs associated with plan review are pass-through to the applicant. Both building positions, scheduling & permit technician and assistant building official, are designed to create greater customer service and efficiency. The April 1st response goes into greater detail. Both positions are funded through the construction fund

The planning FTE is solely workload driven, there are more projects identified and in the pipeline than there are staff to administer. Currently, and for the foreseeable future there is enough staff to keep up with the project review and approval demand but much of the long term planning and ordinance review is on hold or not being conducted. The additional staff will allow the planning unit to improve responsiveness to the priorities of Council and the community.

Question #58: On pages 55, 56 and 64 of budget book, there are good building and planning-related metrics and history. On the avg. days to complete first plan review and avg. days to for a building permit (both targeted at 7 days), that 90% of first plan reviews are completed within 14 days, and that 40% of requested inspections are completed within 72 hours - do we have a sense of whether our targets are faster/slower/about average compared with other similar communities? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: We have not done this analysis yet. Staff is currently working on filling critical vacancies.

Question #83: Page 55: Do we have a service standard for complaint resolution for disputed permit or rental inspections? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Currently there is no defined service standard for permit or rental disputes. There is an expectation of staff that any complaint or inquiry be responded to within 24 – 48 hours, even if it is only to acknowledge receipt and indicate what the process for follow up is. The specific issues may dictate the amount of time necessary to provide the appropriate answer. If an issue is unresolved at a staff level the owner/landlord does have the ability to appeal staff decision to the appropriate board of appeals. The timeframe and criteria for such an appeal is dictated by ordinance and law.

Question #84: Page 64: These metrics measure workload but do not strike me as “customer service standards.” Are there plans to develop customer service standards for planning? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Yes, staff will continue developing better standards. Currently the best representation for customer service in the planning area is turnaround time for plan review, (two weeks is considered ideal). The way plan review is currently tracked that information is not available, it is something staff is looking into tracking in the future.

Question #86: Page 83: are swim and golf lessons self-financing, or do they require a public subsidy? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: As budgeted in the general fund swim and golf lesson revenues cover expenses. Fees are developed by staff using comparative data, recommended by PAC, and approved by City Council. Scholarships are available to Ann Arbor residents. Lessons have their own revenue account and expenditure function set in the budget

that reflects direct costs: seasonal staff time to teach the lessons and materials and supplies. Indirect costs, such as administrative support, marketing, full time staff support for lesson development, and pool maintenance and utilities are not reflected.

Activity	FY2017 Revenue Budget	FY2017 Expense Budget
Golf lessons	\$24,000	\$11,000
Buhr swim lessons	\$20,000	\$9,012
Fuller swim lessons	\$10,000	\$5,614
Mack swim lessons	\$25,000	\$15,174
Veterans swim lessons	\$13,000	\$7,900



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Lisa Wondrash, Communications Manager

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

SUBJECT: CTN

DATE: May 10, 2016

Question #57: CTN revenue in FY17 is down about \$225K from FY15. Presumably, that's the franchise fee. Can you please confirm that and what are the projected CTN revenues going forward? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: At the time the FY16/17 budget was developed, FY14 actual results were the latest available. CTN typically updates their revenue projections every two years so that single year variations in revenues do not skew the future budgeted revenues. In addition, revenues are generally projected conservatively so that funds are available in future years from fund balance for other capital or other initiatives.

Question #81: Page 39: I am unclear of the measure of "public information distributed and community engagement activities." What is in this measure? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The measure of this goal is determined via the monthly Communication Office matrix, which tracks and monitors the increase or decrease in the following activities: news releases, community engagement action plans, newsletter/brochures/collateral marketing materials, public meetings, CTN programs, city website and social media updates and reach and email notifications.

Question #82: Page 39: When is the national citizen survey scheduled? I think we should use the results for the start of the 2-year budget cycle, but I doubt the numbers will have moved a lot for the FY18/19 cycle. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Per Council request, the next Citizen Survey will be conducted in September 2018 in order for results to be available at the beginning of the next two-year budget cycle.



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Larry Collins, Fire Chief

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

SUBJECT: Fire

DATE: May 10, 2016

Question #60: On page 208 of the budget book, there are good metrics related to the Fire Department, but no data on response times. Can you please provide whatever the latest data is on response times and comparisons with the national standards?
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The department's average response times are below:

- For 2015, medical emergencies, first unit on scene, out of 3648 responses was: 5 min 18 sec
- For 2015 all other calls, that were emergent, first unit on scene, out of 2796 responses, was: 6min 40 seconds

The Center for Public Safety Excellences (CPSE—the Fire Department Accrediting Agency) pretty much follows the NFPA standard regarding response times, which are:

- CPSE uses 4 min travel time for medicals + turnout time for a medical is 60 seconds or less = 5 minutes total
- CPSE uses 4 min travel time for 1st unit on scene for fires and other emergencies and an effective response force on scene (meaning all assigned units to the emergency are at the scene and working or are ready to work) on scene within 8 min travel time + turnout time for a fire is 90 seconds or less for a fire = 9 minutes 30 seconds total

Question #98: Page 208: For the metric “structure & other fires & emergencies,” what incidents does this include? Does it include alarm calls without an actual fire? Does it include CO calls (if not, are they reported here)? What other fire prevention services are conducted (e.g. smoke alarm education)? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Regarding fire response and others incidents, this would include Smoke and CO detector activations; Technical rescue calls, such as confined space or water rescue incidents; auto fires; vehicle entrapments; Fire alarm activations in commercial and institutional buildings; trash, rubbish and grass fires, haz/Mat responses, etc.

Other Fire Prevention Services might include:

- Public education services
 - Safety town (yearly during the month of July)
 - Citizens Academy
 - Special events
 - Schedule station and truck visits
 - Community presentations (such as Elderly Groups)
 - CERT Participation at Community Education Events
 - Annual Open House(s)
- Fire investigations
 - Origin and Cause
 - Report writing
 - Witness interviews
 - Depositions
 - Courtroom testimony (if necessary)
- FOIA's (Freedom of Information Act) requests
- Issue permits
 - Prescription burn permits (site visit if necessary)
 - Tent permits
 - Liquor license permit
 - Sidewalk occupancy permit
 - Street banner permit
- Site plan reviews for new/existing developments and remodeling
 - Report writing/comments for site plan revisions
 - Meetings with other city staff & project developers
- Knox Box Program
 - Knox Locks for FDC's (mainly in the downtown area)
 - Educate, facilitate and approve the need for a business Knox Box
- Art Fair
 - Booth inspections
 - Public engagement
 - Complaint investigation
 - Cooking vendor inspection and permit
 - City Art Fair Committee
- Hydrant water flow testing to determine fire sprinkler systems calculations (building construction)

- Business complaint investigation/inspections
- Monthly city board meeting
 - BBA – Building Board of Appeals
 - ADC – Advisory Development Committee
 - Hording Task Meeting
- Invoicing for fire prevention services
 - Inspections
 - Permits
 - Hydrant testing
- Collect and Organize State Require Firefighter Right to Know and State EHS Site Data
- Personnel education requirements
 - Maintain EMT licensure
 - Maintain Fire Inspector and Plan Review certifications
 - Maintain Fire Investigation certifications
 - Remain current on updated national and local codes and standard



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 10, 2016

Question #76: Why does Sidewalk replacement project list only \$646k in previous FYs when the 2016-2021 CIP lists \$3.8M (including FY16)? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The sidewalk project (TR-AT-13-01) in the CIP was split and accounted for multiple projects, only two of which have funding in the current capital budget: Sidewalk Replacement Program and Asphalt Sidewalk Replacement. The two together have a prior year total listed of \$796k.