

CITY OF TORRANCE INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

DATE: June 2, 2009

TO: Mayor and Members of City Council
FROM: Mary K. Giordano, Assistant City Manager
SUBJECT: Additional Information regarding the Council Meeting of June 2, 2009

Attached are responses to questions that have arisen regarding Council Agenda Item 12B and 13C on this evening's agenda.


Mary K. Giordano

cc: City Clerk

/bl

COUNCIL ITEM 12B – Communication and Information Technology Department

Q. Some questions and concerns:

1. What is the total expenditure we are approving at this time? Expenditure listed in the Agenda Item cover, and on page 11, is listed as \$1,388,805. for PBX Replacement. Page 6 (and the sum of items 2 and 3 on the "Recommendations" listed on page 1) is \$1,891,087. a difference of \$502,282. Does this difference represent the cost of the fiber optic cable request listed in the third recommendation? Are we approving the cost of the fiber optics and the rest of FEAP #174 (\$1,891,087) plus the cost of the PBX replacement (\$1,388,805)? (Council Member Rhilinger)

A. 1. The proposed expenditure of \$1,388,805 includes only the costs to replace the telephone and voicemail systems. This amount equals the Nexus proposal of \$1,322,671 plus a 5% contingency of \$66,134. The capital project (FEAP 174) was funded for \$1,185,000. The requested appropriation of \$706,087 would cover the unfunded capital project balance of the expenditure (\$203,805) plus a new budget of \$502,282 for the future replacement of fiber-optic and copper cable. Staff will submit a separate Agenda Item to award a contract for the cable replacement.

The total amount to replace the telephone and voicemail system (\$1,388,805) and upgrade the City Hall campus to fiber optics (\$502,282) is \$1,891,87.

Q. 2. I have some concerns with the second last paragraph of the item: "Future budget considerations may be needed if support requirements for the Information Technology Division increase or change during implementation." Why is the on-going support costing information not available now from the vendor? It would seem that continuing maintenance would be an important part of the bid consideration. (Council Member Rhilinger)

A. 2. We are purchasing 3 years of ongoing maintenance from the Nexus IS, Inc. using funds specifically designated for telephone and voicemail maintenance. After the first 3 years, staff will re-assess the support and maintenance needs and costs, then decide whether to continue ongoing maintenance with the vendor or go out to bid.

Initially, the telephone and voicemail implementation will replace current telephone handsets with similar functioning telephone handsets on everyone's desktop. Once staff have gained effective hands-on experience and training, staff will begin deploying the computer based IP technology handsets on an "as needed" or "as requested" basis. Most

telephone users won't need the features of the new telephone system on day one but the system will have the core capability and infrastructure to provide the new features one year, or ten years, into the future. It is at that time that the requirements will change. We will need additional IT staff to support the system as it evolves and grows. The unknown and unpredictable variable is knowing how many users will need, or request, new IP telephone handsets, and when, in the future. The IP telephone handsets can be very expensive, depending on the features selected, as well as costs for software licensing needed for each IP handset. These are IT budget considerations that the statement attempts to address and brings forth.

COUNCIL ITEM 13C – Community Development Department

Q. 1. Can we require these types of errors to be fixed? Is it out of line to give a warning to Mr. Thomas about that (required remedy in case of construction error) during this hearing? (Council Member Rhilinger)

A. 1. The City Council, or the Planning Commission, could require an owner to fix a project that was built over the height permitted. The City Council could give a warning to the applicant to make sure that the project is built to the correct height or the applicant will be required to fix it.

Q. 2. Will the fact that the silhouette in place now is actually a few inches higher than the proposed project, have an impact on our case if they end up suing? (Council Member Rhilinger)

A. 2. The silhouette in place is the correct height. Obviously, a silhouette that is accurate is the best way for parties to determine if there is a view impact. But, a silhouette that is too high is preferable to one that is too low since the silhouette that is too high shows more of an impact than the project will cause.

Q. 3. Is it too late to require a corrected silhouette? (Council Member Rhilinger)

A. 3. As stated above, the silhouette in this case is correct. To address your question for future projects, it is never too late to require a corrected silhouette. The City Council could always continue a hearing, like the Planning Commission did on this case, to ensure that the silhouette is correct.