



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Robert Pfannes, Deputy Police Chief
Robyn Wilkerson, Human Resources and Labor Relations, Director

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: March 19, 2018

CA-1 – Resolution to Approve Street Closures for March for Our Lives on Saturday, March 24, 2018 from 11:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

Question: Regarding CA-1, typically on street closings there's language referencing obtaining necessary permits and liability insurance and reimbursing the City for event expenses. How is that being handled for this event and if the City is absorbing costs, approximately how much are they and how are they being funded? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Marches and rallies are handled differently in the special event process, mainly due to First Amendment rights along with the uncertainty of the number of participants. For this particular event, the street closure will only occur if City Police deem it necessary, based on numbers. These events are then treated as public safety issues and costs are absorbed by Police.

CA-4 - Resolution to Approve Amendment to Member Services Agreement with Keenan & Associates (\$88,000)

Question: Regarding CA-4, the cover memo indicates the member services agreement rates have increased. How much have they increased and are these rates in effect for the full period of two calendar years (2018 and 2019)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Keenan fee has increased from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per member / per month. The fee is based on the City's overall drug spend which has gone up. The Sub-broker fee remains unchanged at \$0.29. Yes, these rates will remain in effect for two calendar years (1/1/2018 – 12/31/2019).

DC-1 - Resolution to Confirm Members of an Advisory Task Force to Prepare a Recommendation Outlining the Roles and Responsibilities for a Proposed Community Policing Commission

Question: Regarding DC-1, this nomination process is consistent with the February 5th resolution (Mayor makes nominations and the HRC recommendations would be considered and provided) and comparing the lists, most of the Mayor's appointments are the same as the HRC list with a just a couple of exceptions. Can you please provide the rationale for the differences (e.g., what skills or experiences are being sought)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The process followed the guidance Council provided in its February 5th resolution. As stated in the resolution, all but three of the nominees are Ann Arbor residents. The Council has the discretion to make the exceptions to the residency requirement that Council established.

Question: Also on DC-1, can you please confirm what role is planned for AAPD in the Task Force's work and if that is not yet determined, what will be the process for determining it?/ (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: AAPD will provide technical expertise, facilitate training and fulfill a liaison function with the Task Force.

DC-2 - Resolution Supporting the Energy Commission's Resolution Concerning DTE's Propos 1100MW Natural Gas Power Plan (Case U:18419)

Question: Regarding DC-2, the cover memo indicates in the second to last whereas clause that the MPSC staff found a number of "issues and inconsistencies" in DTE's submission. What is the MPSC's process in working through those "issues and inconsistencies" and where does that process stand? Also, when is it expected the MPSC will make a final decision? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The last set of briefs in U-18419 were filed March 12, 2018, and the Administrative Law Judge is scheduled to issue her proposal for decision (PFD) on April 2. Parties to the case must file any exceptions (objections) they have to the PFD by April 12, and all replies to those exceptions are due by April 19. The Public Services Commission will make its decision after considering the PFD, exceptions and replies to exceptions.

Question: Also on DC-2, were there any DTE representatives at the Energy Commission meeting and if so, can you please share any information that was provided/discussed? If not, were they invited to participate in the discussion? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: As has been the practice with Energy Commission, one member of the Commission is a DTE employee and was present during the Ecology Center's presentation and subsequent discussions at the Energy Commission's meeting in February. While not an official representative of DTE's position on all matters, that member articulated what she purported to be DTE's view on why this new power plant was being requested. DTE personnel directly involved with the proposed plant were invited to the March Energy Commission meeting but did not attend or present. The Energy Commission resolution was then introduced and passed, with the DTE staff member on the Commission voting against the resolution.

DB-1 - Resolution to Approve 1505 White Street Site Plan (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Question: Regarding DB-1, the staff report indicates that there were not any objections to the project from neighbors at the time the staff report was written for Planning Commission. Have there been any objections raised since from neighbors or others? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No.