

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

June 1, 2011 2:35 PM
City Council Chambers

Members Present: Pam Walzer (acting chair), Ed Childers, Lyn Hellegaard, Bob Jaffe, Marilyn Marler, Renee Mitchell, Dave Strohmaier, and Jon Wilkins

Members Absent: Jason Wiener (chair), Dick Haines, and Cynthia Wolken

Others Present: Bruce Bender, Kevin Slovarp, Jolene Ellerton, Scott Paasch, Carl Horton, Brentt Ramharter, Don Verrue, Steve King, Dan Jordan, Gilbert Larson, Lloyd Twite

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- A. Approval of the minutes of – May 25, 2011 (to be approved at a later date)
- B. Announcements – None
- C. Public Comment on Non-Agenda items – None

II. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Approve the third amendment to the first and second amended agreement between the City of Missoula and Lloyd A. Twite Family Partnership related to Sanitary Sewer extension and upsizing for the South Missoula area. (memo)—Regular Agenda (Kevin Slovarp) (Referred to committee 05/23/2011) (REMOVE FROM AGENDA)

Motion: The committee recommends the City Council approve the Third Amendment to the first and second amended agreement between the City of Missoula and Lloyd A. Twite Family Partnership related to Sanitary Sewer Extension and Upsizing for the South Missoula Area.

Kevin Slovarp, City Engineer for City Public Works, explained that the third amendment encompassed the following changes to the first and second amended agreement. Section 3.14 was changed from 167 feet to 177 feet, adding 10 extra feet to stub the sewer line out of the end manhole. The only other change was to Section 4.06 which increased the amount paid by the City to Lloyd Twite to \$49,293.00, which was based on actual quantities installed on the ground, and was a total increase of \$15,115.00. He then asked Council to approve the third amended agreement.

Dave Strohmaier made the motion to approve the third amended agreement. Hearing no public comment or discussion, the vote was called; the motion passed unanimously, and was placed on the consent agenda.

III. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

- 2. Continue presentation of the proposed upgrade from our current Permits Plus and Asset Management Systems to the web based automation application. (memo) - Regular Agenda (Dan Jordan) (Referred to committee 05/13/2011) (REMOVE FROM AGENDA)

Dan Jordan, GIS Manager for City Public Works, gave his presentation on [Accela Automation](#). First he wanted to clear up some questions that were asked during the previous Public Works meeting.

- Why had the state chosen Missoula?
 - The state asked Missoula to participate in the selection process and to be the first jurisdiction to come on board because of City/County GIS expertise, expertise of the IT departments, and there is an existing system shared by the City and County.

- What would the benefits to contractors and citizens be?
 - Accela Automation would reduce the amount of trips contractors and citizens make to City Hall, inspection results would be in real time and quickly available, more revenue may be generated since more people will take the time to apply for a permit on-line since it is easier than coming to City Hall, there would be education on how to apply on-line, the majority of permits could be purchased on-line, Automation is a stable application that has 115 installations, it would be more efficient since the process could be streamlined, and inspections could also be streamlined.

- How does Accela Automation compare to our present system?
 - Permits Plus was installed in 2001 with permits dating back to 1992. Other departments were also be automated, which we did not have before. Customers would be able to schedule inspections and get their results by an automated phone system. Field staff have limited wireless mobile capabilities at this time. The city's internal plan review process is currently hand carrying plans from department to department, and this would be done electronically. With the new system permits/applications could be submitted online for review and approval. Customers could access permits/licenses 24/7. Pre-application can be done on-line so an applicant would know what fees they would need to pay up front. Asset management was a module of Automation eliminating the need to maintain separate parcel, address, and street tables.

- How would the city pay for Accela Automation?
 - Currently maintenance costs are \$94.8K annually and Automation would cost \$95.4K annually. The City would pay for the licenses and implementation costs through a municipal lease of 10 years at 4.5% interest with the first payment due in FY13. Each department would absorb the cost into their budgets.

- In Summary, automation supports economic development, improves City/County customer service, increases efficiency, and reduces risk associated with an outdated system.

Mr. Jordan than explained that City Public Works would be coming back with contracts to the Council for approval; however, the issue was time sensitive and he needed to have a decision by June 27, 2011 in order to meet the July 1, 2011 deadline that Accela has given the city.

Bob Jaffe asked if Mr. Jordan could return to the slide of the contract/financing costs. He asked if the costs would be absorbed by the departments mainly through the efficiencies gained in the system. Bruce Bender, Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Missoula, explained that it would be part of each department's budget for the following fiscal year. The Engineering Division already had savings since the division reduced personnel, the Building Division has revenue available, Finance would have to figure it out within their budget, and Wastewater would have to absorb it in its budget. Some departments may have to reduce personnel in order to afford the annual payment.

Ed Childers believed that automation would make the system faster, more reliable, and would be better for customer service. He asked about reliability on the City's end. What would happen if the system went down, what delay is acceptable, how long would it take to get a result back.

Carl Horton, Information Technology (IT) Director, stated that the City currently had two T1's; however Quest had upgraded its infrastructure and would be looking at upgrading the City's bandwidth. The City currently sits at 3 megs per second and could jump to 20 to 30 megs per second for the same cost

the city was currently paying. All outbound permitting traffic would be directed to servers in Helena and city IT did not anticipate any problems to the inbound traffic to the network.

Mr. Childers explained that all systems fail and wondered what the City would do for those instances. Mr. Jordan explained that the same problem could occur now and there was a back up paper system in place and the system could be restored in a timely manner by the IT Department.

Mr. Childers wondered what the current response time was with automation. Mr. Jordan said we would not know until it was installed. Mr. Childers asked him to find out since it was an expensive system and we should know about its functionality before we purchase it. Mr. Horton added that it would be extremely quick since the state had a cluster database and a 50 meg pipe into their system.

Lyn Hellegaard stated that she was uncomfortable about purchasing Accela Automation and wanted specifics on how the cost would be absorbed into each department's budget. She thought the state should contribute money for the City of Missoula to go to automation since it was the state's project. She did not want tax payers to pay for it. She also thought there was a limit on the size of email that the state could receive and she was not comfortable with the new system, or the cost, and how it would be budgeted.

Renee Mitchell thought that Accela Automation was probably not the only available program. Had the city spoke to anyone from the other software companies, couldn't the city just get along with software on a smaller scale.

Mr. Bender explained that the state went through a request for proposals (RFP) process and received three submittals. After extensive review Accela Automation was chosen, so staff had looked at other systems. Accela was the most qualified of the three proposals.

Ms. Mitchell wondered why the city needed to even be tied to the state in the type of software it chose. Mr. Bender explained that using a local provider of software was more expensive and the city wanted to centralize, it was more expensive to go with an individualized system.

Ms. Mitchell wondered if all information would be centralized and coordinated so, for example, Northwestern Energy would know what permits or work Mountain Water was performing.

Mr. Bender stated that the state already had centralized locates and all utilities had to participate in that program. A coordinated notification system was required by state law and that process was supposed to be utilized.

Ms. Mitchell asked if anyone had asked the state about a pilot program for financial support to the municipalities.

Don Verrue, Building Official, explained that the city was not buying the program the city was paying for data conversion to the new system. Ms. Mitchell wondered if the total included staff training. Mr. Jordan stated that the cost noted was the cost to have Accela convert the data for the city and the city would have to invest in staff time to learn the new system and implementation.

Ms. Mitchell asked if Jolene Ellerton, Permit Specialist, would speak to ease of use of Accela Automation and what she thought of it.

Jolene Ellerton said that it would make issuing permits easier for staff even though there would be a learning curve and it would take contractors a little time to learn the process. In time Accela would make issuing permits more efficient and the contractors would be able to make fewer trips into city offices. She also said that many of the contractors she spoke with were very interested in purchasing permits online or on their smart phones. Contractors also would not have to fight traffic and bring their big equipment to City Hall in order to purchase a permit, which would make their lives much easier. Ms. Mitchell asked if the trip into the building was to apply for the permit, pay for the permit, or have the

permit reviewed. Ms. Ellerton explained that most of the time permits were a one stop process. The contractor came in, purchased the permit, and then left. Fence permits were different, they required prior review and approval before they could be purchased which sometimes took three trips and this could all be taken care of on-line. Although at times she can see that it would just be easier for the contractor or citizen to come in instead of applying on-line.

Ms. Mitchell then asked why the rush to purchase Accela Automation now, wasn't the software available any time? Ms. Ellerton explained that as of July 1, 2011 the cost to the city would increase.

Jon Wilkins thought that the state owned the Accela program. Mr. Jordan explained that the current discussion was for implementation and converting the data only. Mr. Wilkins then asked if the city would have to purchase the program from Accela to perform the conversion. He felt that the state was hard to deal with, would be a weak link, and would demand more money in the future to maintain the program.

Mr. Bender stated that the major cost to the city was the cost of the conversion to Accela. Once the conversion took place the city could purchase its own hardware and install the system. Also, this software was not unique to the state. The software was universally used by many jurisdictions. In the future the city could make the switch to its own system if the state was found to be disagreeable.

Dave Strohmaier felt that this was a noncontroversial issue. To him moving towards on-line services was a no brainer. This system was not a custom database; it was a more universal tried and true system. Mr. Strohmaier wanted to move forward with implementation of Accela and thanked staff for moving forward on the issue.

Bob Jaffe thought that potentially thousands of permits could move to the new system and those represented multiple trips downtown that would no longer occur because of the new software. When adding up labor and gas it would probably save contractors up to \$100,000 per year. Contractors would benefit greatly from Automation much more so than city staff would. Automation was also a major benefit to the building community and is very business friendly. Automation was also not the same as a custom built system, there was a much lower risk when a product is basically 'off the shelf' and used for many applications like this system would be. He wondered what the agreement with the state entailed.

Mr. Jordan explained that he had not seen the documents yet, but the Division of Labor and Industry started the automated system and they were bringing it to West Yellowstone and Havre and were setting them up in the future.

Mr. Jaffe then asked what it would cost to have the state subsidize the system for the city. If that subsidy ended, then that cost would have to be absorbed by the city. What was the dollar amount of the subsidy and was there any long term agreement in place? What if the state pulled the plug on the agreement after the city was heavily invested. Mr. Jordan explained that the \$32,100 was a one time fee to the state to configure the servers, and then there would be a yearly maintenance fee once the system was up and running. The city would be responsible to tweak the system to make it work. The city would then have the ability to change data at any time to fit its processes. Mr. Bender reiterated that the costs mainly had to do with converting the data to the Accela system.

Mr. Jaffe wondered if the city was responsible for its data conversion and what the practical implications of not having historical data were. Mr. Jordan explained that the cost was \$44,600 for the data conversion, which had to do with converting all the city's existing permits. Mr. Jaffe stated that Mr. Jordan didn't exactly mean that the full cost had to do with converting existing data to the new system, but had to do with creating the templates to support the existing permit types. Mr. Jordan agreed, that was part of the conversion process to make sure everything worked correctly and to configure the new data to work with the existing permit types.

Pam Walzer announced that the council had run out of time on the Accela Automation topic. Mr. Jordan stated that he would be bringing back contracts for the council to approve or deny.

3. Approve Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Contract agreement with the Montana Department of Transportation for \$37,942.00 for the FY2012 Bicycle Pedestrian Program. (memo)—Regular Agenda (Phil Smith) (Referred to committee: 05/23/2011) (REMOVE FROM AGENDA)

Motion: The committee recommends the City Council approve and authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement with the Montana Department of Transportation for \$37,942 for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the Bicycle Pedestrian Program in FY2012.

Phil Smith, Program Manager for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Office, explained that he wanted to go over a few questions the council had from their last meeting. One question council had asked was could the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) money be used for law enforcement activities. After speaking to the state, who in turn spoke to the Federal Highway Administration, the city could not use the CMAQ grant money for enforcement activities. Another question was could this money be used for trails. Trail construction was eligible, but federal money had to go through the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) process and it took many weeks to get through that process, possibly even a year or more. This grant money needed to be used now and there was not enough time to get through the MPO process.

The \$37,000 grant cost the city 1.3%, or \$490.00, for the federal money for the Bicycle Pedestrian Program. Concern was also expressed in educating bicycle riders to do things correctly and safely. Through radio spots and by using the bicycle ambassadors to educate citizens to ride correctly and safely, educating the public was currently happening. At this point time was of the essence and Mr. Smith asked for council approval so program activities could begin on July 1, 2011.

Steve King also stated that time was of the essence and we would ask for a vote on this today so contracts could be in place for the new fiscal year.

Ms. Walzer asked if money could be pooled with Missoula in Motion for radio/TV ads, or would it have to be spent independently. Could one agency grant another agency the money?

Mr. Smith was not sure if pooling the money would be within the confines of the contract. Missoula in Motion also had not done any safety advertising and the Bike/Ped Program had experience with safety programs. The Bike/Ped Program had a 3 or 4 to 1 match return, so the Bike/Ped Program received a great deal for its money.

Ed Childers moved to recommend the motion.

Ms. Walzer, hearing no other comment, asked for a vote. Jon Wilkins opposed the motion. The item will stay on committee reports.

III. HELD AND ONGOING AGENDA ITEMS

1. Discussion on the sizes of grease interceptors for the restaurant industry ([Grease Interceptor PowerPoint](#)) ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Stacy Rye and Bob Jaffe) (Referred to committee: 04/21/08)
2. Review infrastructure conditions at the locations of serious and fatal traffic accidents: 2007-2009 ([memo](#)).—Regular Agenda (Jason Wiener) (Referred to committee: 01/25/10)
3. T4 America partner support ([memo](#)) – Regular Agenda (Stacy Rye) (Referred to committee: (Referred to committee: 08/16/10)
4. Presentation from Public Works staff regarding proposed process for finding contractors and awarding bids for reconstruction of Russell Street. ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Bob Jaffe) (Referred to committee: 11/15/2010)

5. Resolution to change the speed limit on Reserve Street between Brooks and 39th Street. ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Wayne Gravatt) (Referred to committee: 01/24/11)
6. Confirm the reappointments of Carol Williams and Theresa Cox to the Missoula Parking Commission for a term commencing May 1, 2011 and ending April 30, 2015.
7. Consider an ordinance and emergency ordinance of the Missoula City Council amending Missoula Municipal Code Chapter 3.18 entitled Sewer Connection Expense Relief Loan Program. ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Kevin Slovarp) (Referred to committee: 04/18/11)
8. Approve the installation of an indoor shooting range at 1010 North Avenue per MMC 9-62.040. ([memo](#))—Regular Agenda (Doug Harby) (Referred to committee: 04/18/11).
9. Consider an ordinance revising provisions of Title 10 of Missoula Municipal Code related to parking. ([memo](#)) – Regular Agenda (Jason Wiener) (Referred to committee: 05/02/11)
10. Update from the Parking Commission. ([memo](#))([Parking Fines](#)) ([Policy Review](#)) ([Ltr: Iowa](#)) ([Ltr: Hensley](#)) ([Draft Parking Ordinance](#))—Regular Agenda (Bob Jaffe) (Referred to committee: 03/07/11)
11. Approve the agreement for consultant services with Eli & Associates, Inc. on Project 10-034 England Boulevard right turn lane improvements. ([memo](#)) - Regular Agenda (Kevin Slovarp) (Referred to committee 05/16/2011)

IV.ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Heidi Bakula, Program Specialist
City Public Works Department