

**City Council Questions and Answers for
Thursday, October 01, 2015**

These questions and answers are related to the
Austin City Council meeting that will convene at 10:00 AM on
Thursday, October 01, 2015 at Austin City Hall
301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX



Mayor Steve Adler
Mayor Pro Tem Kathie Tovo, District 9
Council Member Ora Houston, District 1
Council Member Delia Garza, District 2
Council Member Sabino "Pio" Renteria, District 3
Council Member Gregorio Casar, District 4
Council Member Ann Kitchen, District 5
Council Member Don Zimmerman, District 6
Council Member Leslie Pool, District 7
Council Member Ellen Troxclair, District 8
Council Member Sheri Gallo, District 10

The City Council Questions and Answers Report was derived from a need to provide City Council Members an opportunity to solicit clarifying information from City Departments as it relates to requests for council action. After a City Council Regular Meeting agenda has been published, Council Members will have the opportunity to ask questions of departments via the City Manager's Agenda Office. This process continues until 5:00 p.m. the Tuesday before the Council meeting. The final report is distributed at noon to City Council the Wednesday before the council meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

1. Agenda Item # 2: Approve issuance of a rebate to Clarion Partners for performing energy efficiency improvements at the Lantana Ridge Apartments located at 6636 W. William Cannon Dr., in an amount not to exceed \$94,989 (District 8).
 - a. QUESTION: 1) Does the property owner pay the utility bill or is it billed directly to each residence? 2) What review system is in place for this program that assesses the dollar/energy savings outlined in the RCA and what is the oversight mechanism? COUNCIL MEMBER TROXCLAIR'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: 1) Each renter pays their electric bill, and contributes to the customer benefits charge ("CBC") which funds this program. 2) Austin Energy staff calculate kW and kWh savings using modified engineering calculations based on the Public Utility Commission of Texas' Texas Technical Reference Manual, V 3.0, Vol 2: Residential Measures. Calculations were confirmed in several ways: a. The calculated kWh savings were compared to actual Austin multifamily kWh consumption (from Energy Conservation and Disclosure data) to test for reasonableness of the savings. b. The deemed % leakage for different types of air handlers used in the calculations was verified using actual measurements for different types of air handlers, measured in Austin Energy's grant-funded Better Buildings Program. c. The calculation results (% savings, etc.) were compared with other multifamily duct seal programs around the country for reasonableness. Demand and energy reduction results are measured by Austin Energy's Energy Efficiency Services business unit and verified by a separate business unit, Data Analytics and Business Intelligence, through bill analysis. In addition, Austin Energy periodically engages outside consultants to assess savings assumptions.
2. Agenda Item # 7: Authorize award and execution of a twelve month interlocal agreement with the Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) for planimetric and impervious cover data using City of Austin aerial imagery through an existing contract between CAPCOG and Fugro Earth Data, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$499,932.
 - a. QUESTION: Could staff provide a more detailed explanation of how the funding for this item was determined being that multiple departments will

benefit from access to this data? COUNCIL MEMBER TROXCLAIR'S OFFICE

- b. ANSEWR: The majority of the funding is coming from CTM as it allocates funds for aerial data collection as part of its annual operating budget for use by all departments. CTM is only paying for spatial coverage of that part of the planimetrics that all of the departments in the City agreed upon. Unfortunately, that area CTM pays for only covers partial watersheds in many cases. Watershed Protection is paying for extra coverage due to its need to perform studies and do modeling for complete watersheds. Different parts of Watershed Protection put together the additional funding based on the business need for each group that contributed.
3. Agenda Item # 8: Authorize negotiation and execution of a 12-month interlocal agreement with the Capital Area Emergency Communication District (CAECD) related to the City's participation in the enhanced 9-1-1 emergency telephone system as follows: CAECD reimbursement in an amount not less than \$589,431 for maintenance of the 9-1-1 database on a county-wide basis.
 - a. QUESTION: For the past 5 years, how much has it cost per year? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: This Interlocal agreement is for reimbursement to the City of costs incurred by the City for services provided to the CAECD for the maintenance of the 9-1-1 Database. The reimbursements to the City for the last 5 years were as follows: 2010-2011: \$440,523, 2011-2012: \$330,414, 2012-2013: \$435,518, 2013-2014: \$626,030 for 13 months. The CAECD was formed in September, therefore, they reimbursed us for September 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014, 2014-2015: \$577,874. There was no cost to the City in any year. The funds were fully used each year to pay for the services provided.
4. Agenda Item # 10: Authorize negotiation and execution of an interlocal cooperation agreement between the City and Travis County to provide emergency medical services in areas of Travis County outside the City's corporate limits and dispatch support services to Travis County's STAR Flight program for a 12-month term beginning on October 1, 2015 in exchange for payment of \$16,501,797 by Travis County.
 - a. QUESTION: 1) How many flights over past 5 years in City/outside of City? 2) What is total cost? 3) Does TC Health District pay? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: See attachment.
 - c. FOLLOW UP QUESTION: The estimated cost per flight is \$31,853 (using the total 518 flights in 2014). When was the last time ATCEMS evaluated the Star Flight program vs. using the \$16,500,000/year for other services? (IE, if

we were to purchase more ambulances, hire more personnel, etc.; would that give us higher results?) COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE


- d. ANSWER: The Interlocal Agreement with Travis County is to provide ambulance services to the entire Travis County area not just STARFlight dispatch. The \$16,501,797 fee paid to the City of Austin by Travis County covers the staff and resources necessary to respond to all emergency calls received throughout Travis County. the City of Austin does not pay Travis County for any STARFlight responses. The funding from Travis County enables ambulance coverage throughout the County and STARFlight provides additional services that cannot be provided with ambulances such as some water rescues too hazardous for boats and swimmers, areal search and rescue in wooded areas, long distance critical care transport of neonatal patients, night vision operations, and firefighting services using helicopters. ATCEMS routinely provides feedback to Travis County regarding the STARFlight program. This feedback is used to make program adjustments as needed.
5. Agenda Item # 14: Authorize negotiation and execution of an agreement with MANCHESTER TEXAS FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC, for the encroachment of the Red River street right-of-way and license of Waller Creek parkland and Austin Convention Center property for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an overhead pedestrian bridge (District 9).
- a. QUESTION: 1) The Request for Council Action indicates that the Transportation Department sponsored this request. Was the Austin Transportation Department required to pay the application fee for the license agreement? 2)The RCA indicates that the City will assume full responsibility for construction costs if we terminate the license agreement. Is there precedent for assuming that liability under the conditions of a license agreement?
MAYOR PRO TEM TOVO'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: 1) The developer is paying the application fee for the right-of-way encroachment portion of the agreement. There is not an application fee between PARD and ATD for the Chapter 26 change of use. 2) The City does not typically pay for construction costs of licensed improvements in the event of a license agreement termination. However, due to the scope of the private investment and the acknowledged public benefit, reimbursement for construction costs in the event of a not-for-cause termination was acceptable to the City. A termination for cause will not require reimbursement.
6. Agenda Item # 17: Authorize execution of a 36-month contract with ASSOCIATED TIME PARKING & CONTROLS to provide onsite maintenance, repair, and support services for the parking operating systems of the Aviation Department in an amount not to exceed \$2,157,688, with two 24-month extension options in an amount not to exceed \$1,264,813 for the first option, and \$1,292,623 for the second option for a total contract amount not to exceed \$4,715,124.


- a. QUESTION: What was the past 2 years' worth of revenue made each year by parking services? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: See attachment.
7. Agenda Item # 20: Authorize execution of a 36-month contract with COMMUNITY TRUCKING LLC to provide crushed rock in an amount not to exceed \$993,603, with three 12-month extension options in an amount not to exceed \$331,201 per extension option, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$1,987,206.
 - a. QUESTION: 1) Please provide a complete bid tabulation. 2) Why did the current vendor not bid on this solicitation? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: 1) See attachment for the bid tab. 2) Purchasing is currently conducting spot-orders to buy this material. At the time this solicitation was conducted, the previous contractor was ineligible to bid. This company was ineligible due to their non-compliant performance on the earlier contract.
8. Agenda Item # 21: Authorize negotiation and execution of a 36-month contract with LONE STAR TENNIS COMPANY to provide management services the for Austin Tennis Center in an amount not to exceed \$171,000, with two 36-month extension options in an amount not to exceed \$171,000 per extension option, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$513,000 (District 1).
 - a. QUESTION: For the past 5 years, how much revenue has the Austin Tennis Center brought in each year? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: See attachment.
 - c. QUESTION: Why is this item coming before Council when the contract does not expire until January 2016? COUNCIL MEMBER HOUSTON'S OFFICE
 - d. ANSWER: The current contractor, which is also the company to be awarded the new contract, has stated that the current contract prices are not sustainable for them and that they do not wish to proceed. PARD and the contractor are agreeable to end the old contract early and begin the new contract, at the new prices, by November 1, 2015.
 - e. FOLLOW UP QUESTION: How many unique people play each year (so if the same person came 10 times, that would count as 1 person)? How many total people play each year (so if the same person came 10 times, that would count as 10 people)? What is the total budget for this year for this facility including maintenance, utilities, etc.? Is there any additional revenue from this facility beside what was provided in the previous Q&A? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

- f. ANSWER: The Department does not have a unique player count. Total number of people that played at ATC last year was 4,447. These are not all unique and most re repeat customers. Total budget for the facility is \$78,496.0 (that includes the management fee of \$36,000 paid to the contractor). No additional revenue is generated at this facility.
- 9. Agenda Item # 26: Authorize negotiation and execution of a 24-month contract with INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL SOLUTIONS, INC. DBA I/O SOLUTIONS, or one of the other qualified offerors to Request for Proposal No. JRD0309, to provide civil service promotional examination services for the Austin Police Department in an amount not to exceed \$150,000, with two 24-month extension options in an amount not to exceed \$150,000 per extension option, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$450,000.
 - a. QUESTION: Over the past 5 years, how many of each exam have been given each year? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: APD tests for each rank every two years. The Detective/Corporal Exam is given in odd numbered years and the Commander, Lieutenant, and Sergeant exams are each given during even numbered years. The result is that we have one exam given in odd numbered years and three exams given each even numbered year.
 - c. FOLLOW UP QUESTION: How many officers in each of the past 5 years have taken the exams? Please break out by type of exam. COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - d. ANSWER: See attachment.
- 10. Agenda Item # 28: Authorize negotiation and execution of a 60-month revenue contract with GILA LLC DBA MSB, or another qualified offeror to Request for Proposal EAD0122, to provide collection services for the Emergency Medical Services Department for an estimated revenue of \$7,500,000, with two 12-month extension options with an estimated revenue of \$1,500,000 for each extension option, for a total estimated revenue amount of \$10,500,000.
 - a. QUESTION: Over the past 5 years, for each year what has been the starting total balance of Delinquent Accounts as well as the number of Delinquent Accounts? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: See attachment.
- 11. Agenda Item # 29: Authorize execution of a 36-month contract with TEXAS HIGHWAY PRODUCTS LTD to provide signal monitors in an amount not to exceed \$601,119, with three 12-month extension options in an amount not to exceed \$200,373 per extension option, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$1,202,238.

- a. QUESTION: 1) How many signal monitors will this contract be buying? Is this a “repair as broken” contract? 2) Over the past 5 years, how many have been repaired each year? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: This contract is for an annual amount up to 350 signal monitors at a price of \$505.00 each. The new monitors includes a feature allowing the remote diagnosis of the monitor and the ability in many cases to remove an intersection from flash almost immediately. In the previous 5 years, approximately 100 monitors have been repaired in house and another 165 have been sent to the manufacturer for repair. Earlier this year, the manufacturer stated they would no longer repair any monitor older than 18 years, of which the City of Austin still has many in the field. At this time, the intent of the contract is to replace units as broken, install at new signals and if funding becomes available, upgrade other intersections to take advantage of the remote diagnosis and reset capability which should significantly reduce the amount of time signals are on flash.
12. Agenda Item # 34: Authorize execution of an interlocal agreement with the CITY OF LEANDER, TEXAS to allow for cooperative procurement of goods and services.
- a. QUESTION: What other cities/governmental entities do we have these with? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - b. ANSWER: We have interlocals with: City of Seattle, WA, Travis County, TX, Cedar Park, TX, City of El Paso, TX, Williamson County, TX, Austin Independent School District, and Denver Stapleton Airport.
 - c. FOLLOW UP QUESTION: How often do we use the existing interlocal agreements for cooperative procurement? Do we have any measure for the savings the City has received from them? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE
 - d. ANSWER: See attachment.

END OF REPORT - ATTACHMENTS TO FOLLOW

 *The City of Austin is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request.*

 *For assistance, please call 512-974-2210 or TTY users route through 711.*



Council Question and Answer

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Related To | Item #10 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: How many flights over past 5 years in City/outside of City? What is total cost? Does TC Health District pay? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER:

The STARFlight Program is managed and funded by Travis County. Austin – Travis County Emergency Medical Services Department (ATCEMS) through the Interlocal Agreement with Travis County provides Dispatch Services for the STARFlight Program. ATCEMS does not know the total cost of the STARFlight program as it is entirely managed by Travis County.

The breakdown of flights dispatched by ATCEMS inside the City of Austin for the five year period requested is as follows:

| Year | Flights Inside City of Austin* |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2010 | 25 |
| 2011 | 31 |
| 2012 | 44 |
| 2013 | 69 |
| 2014 | 45 |

*Provided by STARFlight Operations

The breakdown of flights dispatched by ATCEMS inside Travis County for the five year period requested is as follows:

| Year | Flights Outside the City of Austin* |
|-------------|--|
| 2010 | 407 |
| 2011 | 454 |
| 2012 | 430 |
| 2013 | 475 |
| 2014 | 473 |

*Provided by STARFlight Operations

The estimated cost for the Dispatch Services included in this Interlocal Agreement is \$16,618.00. ATCEMS uses these funds to pay Communications staff a stipend for performing STARFlight dispatch services.

The Travis County Health District (Central Health) does not participate nor pay any fees associated with this Interlocal. This Interlocal Agreement is for out-of-hospital emergency ambulance services and STARFlight Dispatch services in Travis County outside the City of Austin.



Council Question and Answer

| Related To | Item #17 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: What was the past 2 years' worth of revenue made each year by parking services? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER:

Gross Parking Revenue

FY year ending September 2014 - \$33,857,426.05

11 Month total FY 2015 thru the end of August 2015 - \$33,649,966.00

Unaudited gross revenue for September 2015 is estimated at \$3,250,000.00

FY 2015 ending September 30, 2015 estimated total revenue - \$36,899,966.00

For past two years - \$70,757,392.05

The information contained in this bid tabulation is for information only and does not constitute actual award/execution of a contract.

| <p style="text-align: center;">BID TABULATION CITY OF AUSTIN CRUSHED ROCK AND CRUSHED DOLOMITE LIMESTONE AGGREGATE</p> | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| BID NO. GLB0026 RX NO. 6300 15043000311 DATE: 7/15/2015 BUYER: Georgia Billela Special Instructions: Be advised that exceptions taken to any portion of the solicitations may jeopardize acceptance of the bid. | | | | | | | | | |
| Vendor Name | | | | Superior Crushed Steone, Inc. | | Community Trucking, LLC | | | |
| City, State | | | | Austin, TX | | Cedar Creek, TX | | | |
| MBE/WBE | | | | | | | | | |
| ITEM NO. | ITEM DESCRIPTION | EST QTY | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL PRICE | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL PRICE | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL PRICE |
| 1 | Crushed limestone, 3 x 5", Texas Crushed Stone #005 or City approved equal. (Item 2.4 of Specification) WPD - 1300 ton, ARR-125 ton , SBD-300 ton Product Offered: | 1,725 | TON | \$24.00 | \$41,400.00 | \$20.85 | \$35,966.25 | | |
| 2 | Crushed limestone, 1 x 12", Texas Crushed Stone #012 or City approved equal. (Item 2.5 of Specification) WPD - 1400 ton, SBD-300 ton Product Offered: | 1,700 | TON | \$29.00 | \$49,300.00 | \$22.45 | \$38,165.00 | | |
| 3 | Crushed limestone ballast, 1-3/4 x 3/4", Texas Crushed Stone #066 or City approved equal. (Item 2.6 of Specification) WPD - 1300 ton, ARR-125 ton , SBD-300 ton Product Offered: | 1,425 | TON | No Bid | No Bid | \$17.30 | \$24,652.50 | | |
| 4 | Crushed dolomite limestone aggregate, washed, as per Section 3.0 of the Specification 0500. WPD - 1300 ton, SBD-2500 ton, ABIA-100 ton Product Offered: | 6,100 | TON | No Bid | No Bid | \$31.70 | \$193,370.00 | | |
| TOTAL BID | | | | \$90,700.00 | | \$292,153.75 | | | |

Prepared By: Julia Ramirez
 Approved By: Georgia Billela



Council Question and Answer

| Related To | Item #21 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Additional Answer Information | | | |

QUESTION: For the past 5 years, how much revenue has the Austin Tennis Center brought in each year?
COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER: Court Fee Revenue for the past 6 years for the Austin Tennis Center. These are fees that were reported and approved by City Council.

Revenues

| | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 2009 | \$ 6,395.00 |
| 2010 | \$10,343.36 |
| 2011 | \$14,140.75 |
| 2012 | \$ 8,662.00 |
| 2013 | \$ 6,056.75 |
| 2014 | \$ 6,434.75 |
| Total | \$52,032.61 |

6 year average \$8,672.10



Council Question and Answer

| Related To | Item #26 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: 1) How many officers in each of the past 5 years have taken the exams? 2) Please break out by type of exam? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER:

1) Promotional eligibility lists, as prescribed by the Meet and Confer agreement between the Austin Police Association and the City of Austin, are effective for 24 months.

When an eligibility list expires or is exhausted, a promotional exam is administered. For the classifications of Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Commander promotional processes have occurred in even number years. The promotional process for the Corporal/Detective classification has occurred in odd number years. **6 year average \$8,672.10**

2)

| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|
| Corp/Det | | 354 | | 302 | | scheduled |
| Sergeant | 96 | | 77 | | 90 | |
| Lieutenant | 33 | | 59 | | 44 | |
| Commander | 16 | | 20 | | 18 | |



Council Question and Answer

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Related To | Item #28 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: Over the past 5 years, for each year what has been the starting total balance of Delinquent Accounts as well as the number of Delinquent Accounts? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER:

Austin – Travis County Emergency Medical Services Department (ATCEMS) maintains a billing division within the department. The EMS department aggressively collects all of the charges billed for each patient bill. Patient bills that are not paid are referred to an outside bill collecting agency for collection services. This collections agency tries to collect as much as possible on each bill. This contract allows for the collections agency to keep a percentage of funds collected. The remaining balance is returned to the City of Austin.

The numbers below represent the number of delinquent accounts and starting balance beginning in 2011. The billing collections process may carry over from year to year so each year's starting balance reflects a carryover balance from the previous year.

The Starting Total Balance and Number of Delinquent Accounts is as follows:

| Year | Starting Total Balance* | Number of Delinquent Accounts* |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2011 | \$24,622,291.56 | 34,007 |
| 2012 | \$47,369,988.26 | 68,160 |
| 2013 | \$73,946,804.43 | 106,957 |
| 2014 | \$95,158,595.46 | 138,959 |
| 2015 | \$121,540,108.30 | 176,962 |

*Provided by existing Billing Collections Vendor



Council Question and Answer

| Related To | Item #34 | Meeting Date | October 1, 2015 |
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: How often do we use the existing interlocal agreements for cooperative procurement? Do we have any measure for the savings the City has received from them? COUNCIL MEMBER ZIMMERMAN'S OFFICE

ANSWER:

Cooperative purchases are an important part of the City's portfolio of contracts. While they account for a relatively small portion of the over-all quantity of the City's contract, as these contracts are usually target towards high volume purchases, they do account for a considerable portion of the City's contract spend. Staff is currently working on a reporting mechanism to more precisely track this data but based on the best information currently available, the City maintains the following interlocal agreements for cooperative procurement:

- 140 Term Contracts
- 205 Single-transaction Contracts that are currently in the process of being fulfilled
- Total spend under all Term and Single-transaction Contracts is approximately \$236 million (Note: This is an aggregate amount over multiple Fiscal Years)
-

Staff does not currently have a mechanism for collecting savings resulting from these cooperative contracts. While such a Savings measure could be constructed, it would only reflect one aspect of the multiple benefits of cooperative procurement including:

- Preferable prices and pricing terms
- Preferable terms and conditions
- Better / more effective specifications
- Better contractor performance (As poor performance with one participating government may affect the contractor's relationship with the lead government or their prospects of further participation with other governments.)