

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

ANN ARBOR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
JUNE 7, 2021
6:30 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
Ai Media
Www.CaptionFamily.com
Phone: (800) 335-0911

* * *

REALTIME CAPTIONING AND/OR CART (COMMUNICATIONS ACCESS
REALTIME TRANSLATION) ARE PROVIDED IN ORDER TO FACILITATE
COMMUNICATION ACCESSIBILITY AND MAY NOT BE A TOTALLY
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

* * *

>> Mayor Taylor: -- the June 7th meeting of the Ann Arbor City Council.
If you are able, please rise and join us for a moment of silence, followed bring the
Pledge of Allegiance.

>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the
republic for which it stands: One nation.

Under indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Would the clerk please call the roll of council?

>> Clerk Beaudry:

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Here.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Thank you.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs:

Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: present.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: We have a quorum.

May I have a motion to approve the agenda?

Moved and seconded.

Discussion of the agenda.

All in favor?

Opposed?

Agenda is approved do we have communications today from our city administrator?

>> City Admin. Crawford: May, I was just going -- mayor, I was just going to say we had a fun and instructive week with A2Zero we met our new ambassadors that graduated from the program, and it was a good time by all, a lot of work by staff.

I want to take a moment to recognize them and thank all who participated.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

We now have an opportunity for communication from Dr. Jackson, the chair of our independent community police oversight commission for the monthly update. Dr. Jackson, as she's being brought on over.

>> Clerk Beaudry: If Dr. Jackson could raise her hand.

I don't see her.

>> I believe Francis Todoro Hargaves is speaking on her behalf.

>> Mayor Taylor: Oh, my apologies.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Oh, thank you.

>> Hello, everyone.

Thank you for having me tonight.

My name is Francis Todoro Hargraves and I'm here speaking on behalf of our independent community police oversight commission on which I serve as the vice chair.

A particular part of my role on the commission has been my daily interaction with policing in the downtown, and at the many events that we have in our downtown area.

Over the last few months, there have been many discussions both within our commission and across the city, as to what we want policing to look like in our community.

And what steps we can take to start moving our police in that direction.

Our commission has spent a lot of time in particular -- in particular, thinking about ways to have more unarmed officers in our city and tonight we would like to propose a small opportunity from which the city may be able to gain more insight into how we could implement similar policies at the city level.

We would like to hold the state street art fair with unarmed private security and fewer required Ann Arbor police officers on detail.

Before I get into our rationale.

Let me get our thoughts.

They require us to hire officers at overtime rates to operate as a security detail, however, because these officers must be hired regardless of whether or not the event organizers choose to employ private security, we have some communication issues because it's not entirely clear what purpose everyone is serving at the given event.

And here's an example.

In my capacity as the executive director of the state street association, I oversee the state street art fair.

I'm usually assigned two officers to my district to act as security detail, but we also employ a private, unarmed security service.

Whereas I'm able to personally station our private security across the district, the two police officers patrol at their leisure, where they feel they should be.

And if we do have an incident in the district, we are told to call 911 if they are needed.

During the last art fair, we had a situation arise in which an individual was visibly intoxicated and making violent threats to people moving through graffiti alley.

This alarmed a number of nearby artists and I was alerted to the disturbance.

Thinking that this was a situation that may have warranted police intervention, I made the call to 911.

And a regular on patrol officer arrived at the scene.

When I asked why she had come, she told me she was already in the area and heard the dispatch and decided to come to the -- to the call.

She went on to handle the situation successfully, and resumed her patrol.

But at some point did either of my assigned officers arrive on the scene or

follow-up with me.

And this has suggested a communication breakdown between the police assigned and the event organizers.

In the regular patrol officers are as a matter of policy available to respond to these calls, and the on-duty -- or the duty assigned officers do not need to we need more clarification as to why just having private security would not suffice. As an event organizer of the bear, the one theoretical advantage of having police detail there is in the case of a severe incident, one which would require the use of firearms.

However, art fair has historically been an incredibly safe event and as far as I know, there has not been any occasion on which an officer has ever actually needed to use their firearm.

In the long term, we believe that this policy, both in the extend of the state street art fair and other events in Ann Arbor needs to be reevaluated and a vigorous discussion as to what this policy seeks to achieve and how we can better accomplish our goals.

In the short term, ICPOC sees this as a great opportunity to get some real life data for the city on what an unarmed presence and response could look like in other areas of our lives.

While also looking at what the police could do to properly secure the site.

We know that city council has been working on this issue for a while and this seems to us to be a great place to start testing out these ideas given the small scale and the event's past track record for safety.

We have had some initial conversations with the police department and we have already gotten the buy-in from state street association.

So the final piece of this is council's willingness to see this go forward.

Our commission would be happy to answer any questions you may have on this and we look forward to continuing to collaborate with city council and the police department going forward.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

We now come to public comment reserve time.

Public comment reserve time is an opportunity to speak to the city council.

You need to have signed up in advance by contacting our city clerk.

To speak at public comment reserve time, please enter the number on your screen that is 877-853-5247.

877-853-5247.

Once you are connected please enter meeting I.D. 94217232148.

That is 94212732148.

Once you are connected, you will be -- when it is your turn to speak, our clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone number.

You will have three minutes in which to speak to please pay close attention to the time.

Our clerk will notify when you 30 seconds is remaining and when your time has expired.

When your time is expired, please conclude your remarks and cede the floor.
Our first speaker is ember McCoy.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ember McCoy.

>> Hi, everyone, my name is ember and I'm a renter in the fifth ward.

I'm calling in to comment specifically on item c-1.

It seems like everyone involved agreed that it needs to be moved from 70 days.

I will support amending it to 210 and the right to renewal clause.

There's been a lot of discussion about what number of days is best for university students but much of this has ignoring what the students are saying.

The student government has worked diligently, collecting stories nearly 1200 signatures and releasing a joint press release, that 210-day timeline would compromise the needs of both undergraduate and graduate students.

We have spoken with and received supports from members of Greek life and the inter-cooperative council and numerous students and nonstudents alike.

Following mid-March when most leases begin in mid-August this would allow to fall within reason of incoming students and graduate students confirming their attendance at u of m and between lease signing and deposit collection.

I don't want to underestimate the significance of having even 30 more days to have the money for deposit on a new lease.

At our current rate, deposits are often at least an entire month's salary for graduate students, and having two deposits in landlord's hands as we wait between lease agreements it's a significant financial burden.

This doesn't just benefit students but also the countless nonstudents who live in Ann Arbor, and are often negatively impacted by a leasing cycle that's dominated by the university.

I have experienced this personally as I was not a student for half of the six years I have been a renter in Ann Arbor and as my current worker is a roommate at u of m.

I also want to emphasize the importance of right to renewal which currently is not a part of this ordinance or proposed amendment on the table tonight.

This does not prevent landlords from inquiring or requiring that current tenants renew their lease before 70 days.

This year and in most of the years I have been here, my landlord asked me to renew in mid-October, prior to the 70 day mark and gave me four days to decide. I have friends who have been asked to renew their lease earlier than and less time.

Many landlords emphasize that this is perfectly been the bounds.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> They can pressure current tenants to renew their leases and it continues to put tenants at risk.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is nick else.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 988, nick else, you can go.

>> Yes, this is nick else.

I manage a rental property company, lessinger rental properties.

We have been providing off campus student housing in 1968, when it was started in my father and I have been working in the business since 1997.

I'm here also to comment on item c-1.

Through the years we worked both the city and the university, create and implement policies that would be beneficial to both residents and landlords.

As a u of m student, my mother helped to form the Ann Arbor tenant union.

And we have been registered members with the off campus group in, and my mother serve multiple years on the city's housing board.

We provide quality housing to our residents.

I'm speaking on behalf of our company only and acknowledge that this may not necessarily reflect the opinions of other landlords.

Also for context, our perspective relates primarily to the student market.

I will start by saying we support the effort to improve the leasing situation in Ann Arbor.

We witnessed firsthand the intent pressure the students feel to sign leases early.

We are getting calls up to two years ahead for the larger group units.

We feel this pressure does result in students making less informed housing decisions, potentially can lead to less cohesive group.

And we feel it's come about since the implementation of the early lease sign ordinance and confusion and artificial pressure put on the mark at the time.

Something needs to change and certainly the length of the period of ordinance is worth a try.

We feel that 210-day proposal not ideal and we would suggest you change it to 150 or 180.

We feel 210 could put more stresses particularly on student renters for the following reasons.

Most 12-month leases start around May 1 or September 1.

This 200 day limit will push it before the first semester finals and the holiday break or right as finals are beginning and the school year is winding down in April.

With those leaving school at the end of the semesters, this will lead to a sudden stressful and abbreviated leasing season, possibly resulting in higher pressure to find and sign something quickly, potentially leading to higher rents and almost certainly not giving residents more opportunities to make informed decisions.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> The lease states that there are other lease start dates and as students start hearing that area students are signing leases they start to panic and feel they will miss out on not getting their leases.

We feel 150 to 180 days would be a more reasonable option and we hope you will consider that as opposed to 210.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Avery winn.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 656.

>> Hi, I'm Avery.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

I'm a renter here in Ann Arbor, and I'm a graduate student at the University of Michigan.

So I would like to actually make some rebuttals to the landlords' points because many landlords have been attempting to refute our claims about why this is beneficial to student as and I will follow up on the last speaker.

First of all, the last speaker used the phrase -- or they said that it as privilege to be a landlord.

So this is clearly recognizing that the landlords have far more opportunity in the relationship with the tenants than the tenants do.

They have capital.

They have knowledge of everything in the city housing market, far better than the tenants do and yeah, it is a privilege to be a lander landlord and that means that the tenants don't have the resources they need.

This ordinance is so important because of that power imbalance between the landlord and the tenant.

Also many landlords are saying that students like to lease early, because they are basically just leasing early unnecessarily.

So, yeah, there's no -- there's no reality in which students are just doing this out of, like, habit or university culture or whatever the landlords are claiming.

And people will call apartment complexes that are not offering leases then because it's so difficult to get a lease.

It's so difficult to get a lease that even if you don't see an advertisement for an available unit, you still need to call because there's no other way to get housing for a lot of people where they need it besides just trying all of their options and hoping that one of them works.

210 days is not a burden to students.

This would put the leasing period right at the end of not -- not the first semester, actually the second semester so I would like to emphasize that yeah, this is the true reality, not the end of the first semester and it would overlap into the summer.

So this gives the students an opportunity to make choices based on their future plans.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Nithya Arun.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 489, Nithya Arun, you can speak.

>> Can you hear me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Perfect.

My name is Nithya Arun, I'm an arriving senior and.

Student body president of the University of Michigan.

I'm here to advocate for the amendments to the early leasing ordinance as it prohibits the listing, showing or renting of the units until 210 days have elapsed since the start of the lease.

As the student body president I'm tasked with being the representative voice of the student body and therefore, I'm charged with advocating for the needs of all students on campus.

Whether they are graduates or undergraduate students.

Too many times students have expressed their frustration of how they have been forced to sign a lease too early, sometimes only within days of moving in.

I can also personally attest to a 70-day period being far too short between move-in and lease signing.

It puts an abundant amount of stress of students and the students being in uncomfortable and sometimes even unsafe living situations.

University of Michigan students comprise a large part of your constituency and I urge you to act swiftly and not table this resolution no to meet the needs of students.

This is not a matter of convenience but an issue that affects the safety and the well-being of your constituents.

I also want to comment on what the landlord said earlier.

As a student, as an undergraduate student, I want the early leasing to be extended to 210 days that falls around March time.

A lot of the leases that I have signed have been in mid to kind of 20th of August time range.

So it would fall around March and that is not during finals season.

And I would say being the college student, is dealing with multiple assignments and multiple exams at the same time so juggling this is nothing new.

I want to comment on what nick said about this amendment causing tenants to make less informed decisions.

I would think it's the opposite and to be frank, I don't think what he says makes any sense.

I would think a longer period of time between move-in and lease signing would allow students to more --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> To compare their housing options and to really get to know what they are getting themselves into.

They will also as Avery mentioned have a better why the of their plans for next -- idea of the plans for next year and base their decisions off their own lived experience.

I also want to add that students can speak for themselves and tenants don't.

We are the ones affected by these changes and I urge all city councilors to recognize that and with that, I thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Amir Fleishman.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number sending in 632, press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello.

My name is Amir.

I am a member of the G.E.O. housing caucus and I'm here to talk about the early leasing ordinance proposal.

I just want to begin by really emphasizing that this is a grassroots proposal that has been brought to you by renters.

We are coming to city council right now because we are defenseless against our landlord.

When they have a demand they want to make to us when they have a change to the lease they want to impose or a rent increase, there is nothing we can do.

You can help us, but you have to listen to us.

Renters are not represented on city council.

There's not a single renter on city council, despite we make up the majority of the population in Ann Arbor.

That gives you an extra obligation to listen to renters.

The way we are treated now, we have no rights in our own homes.

This cannot stand.

This is why the right to renew ordinance is so important for us.

This issue is not a little nuisance that's annoying for a couple of weeks one time during the year.

It really harms people.

There's been some concern about the 210-day number.

Let me say this clearly, renters are asking for 210 days.

G.E.O. members initially wanted 270 days.

But we listened to concerns of other renters, including undergraduate students and 210 days is the compromise.

I will repeat that, 210 days is the compromise.

Other jurisdictions have 310 days.

We are asking for two-thirds of that.

We are not entitled to fewer rights because we have the misfortune of living in Ann Arbor.

Everybody I know has had problems with the way the ordinance is set up of right now.

It sometimes creates serious financial hardship for people.

It could lead to bankruptcy.

210 is already a significant compromise.

Having to sign a lease, you know, like, seven months in advance -- I'm sorry, five months in advance of when it is a serious financial commitment.

Having to sign it half a year before it begins is ridiculous.

A 180 days is not acceptable to us.

We just heard a landlord talk on behalf of students.

I'm not sure where he gets the chutzpah to be doing that, but I'm asking you to listen to the actual students here.

We're speaking in one voice and we're asking for a right to renew for 210 days.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Ow next speaker is Tom Stulberg.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 534.

Mr. Stulberg, go ahead.

>> Thank you.

Hi, this is Tom Stulberg.

I'm calling from lower town and I would like to talk about a few items tonight.

First one is c- 1, the rental agreements.

As a small landlord, I don't want to speak for the students, but I do want to support the students.

We will be just fine with the 200 days as proposed.

We're small.

We can flex.

I'm not worried.

I agree that the current ordinance does need to be changed.

I do also want to mention that students -- the caller raises some good points.

Renters need a stronger voice.

Students in particular are not here when we have our August primaries.

There's been a call in the past to have nonpartisan elections which would end up making the decisions in November when the students are here, and more of them are here to vote and be educated about that vote their choices.

So I think that would be something that would be supportive of students, hopefully not speaking for them but in support of them.

I would also like to speak about c-4 which is the planned project modification.

It's repealing the existing one and replacing it with other elements in the ordinance and I think this is a very good change.

In the past, it was too arbitrary what could be and couldn't be done with too much discretion.

And now what we're doing is we are seeing, here's some specific things that you can have as a developer, some increases in height or reduction in setbacks and here specifically, what you can trade that for.

So that's how zoning should really work.

Some very specific things.

And what it does is it creates a direct way to address our communities' goals via affordability, sustainability, developer contributes some extras to those things and they get something in return.

So then I would like to move on to C-3 which is our TC-1, our transit corridor zoning.

And wanting to see a transit corridor zone for quite sometime.

I was hoping it would be different and I was particularly hopeful that it would have some direct tradeoffs.

The way we are proposing to do it is saying everything in the transit corridor can have an up zoning without a tradeoff for a direct addressing of our community's

goals.

It's more like -- it's more indirect and it's hoping that somehow we'll get it via the supply side, the economic theory of let's provide for those who are already -- the land holders, the developers and the developers attorneys will get a freebie.

They will get a bump in wealth without a direct tradeoff for something that would support our community goals.

And I wish there was something tied in like it in the c-4, the planned project replacement.

I would also like to talk about DC-6.

There's some expected consequences here.

Not unexpected but expected consequences.

I think you should remove this item from the agenda.

It's a slippery slope.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alan Haber -- I'm sorry.

My apologies.

Our next speaker is Anne Bannister.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Anne Bannister?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello.

Sorry.

I have a little delay on my system.

Can you hear me now?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

Great.

Thank you.

I am calling in, in regards to DC-6 and I'm urging council to reject this resolution.

I see this as a thinly veiled ongoing attack by Mayor Taylor and his alloys to regain their eight vote supermajority so that they can continue to be overly permissive with developer interests in the city of Ann Arbor.

And I am against it.

I think that attacking Councilmember Hayner in this way has a have chilling effect, as is intended for anyone to even run for council if you want to truly represent your residents and be a dissenting, thoughtful, independent voice separate from Mayor Taylor and his allies.

This is a form of voter suppression.

Councilmember Hayner was elected legally by ward one.

He beat the other candidates in 2018 and has served us well, particularly with regards to the Gelman plume.

And yet like all of the mayor's opponents, he has been severely attacked, viciously, shunned by the community and has ongoing trouble from the community.

So I want to point out some of the double standards.

In 2019 when another councilmember was arrested for driving twice the legal blood alcohol limit, the council at the time, allowed him the benefit of the doubt and professional courtesy, even while behind-the-scenes this councilmember took five weeks to be removed from the police oversight commission and refused to be removed from planning commission, even though he was serving for over a year after the majority of council had voted for his reappointment. Even now we have another councilmember who is facing credible charges about sexual harassment at her workplace.

And false information, statements on campaign literature, and influencing a FOIA request and yet we look the other way on all of that, and yet with Councilmember Hayner we ask him to resign.

That is voter suppression.

I ask you to make lying wrong again and as President Biden says, reject the culture where facts themselves are manipulated.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alan Haber.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Haber, phone number 083, you can press star six to unmute yourself.

Mr. Haber, if you press star six, you can unmute yourself.

Phone number 083.

You can go ahead and press star six, if you want to speak.

Mayor, the caller's phone is muted.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Haber, your phone is muted.

We are unable to hear you.

Are you confident that that's Mr. Haber's number?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes, that's the number we were expecting him to call in on.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Haber, please press star six to unmute yourself.

Star six to unmute yourself.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I have another caller on the line with the same number.

I will try that one.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Haber, phone number 083.

Mr. Haber, go ahead and unmute yourself.

Caller 083, can you hear us?

Mr. Haber.

>> Am I unmuted?

>> Mayor Taylor: You are unmuted and we can hear you, sir.

(Feedback).

>> Mayor Taylor: Are you there now?

>> Clerk Beaudry: I think we lost him, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Let's go to the next caller, Mr. Smith, and then we'll try to cycle

back with Mr. Haber, after number ten.

Our next speaker is John Smith.

Mr. John Smith.

>> Hello.

I have a resolution, I would like to speak in regards to DC-6, the resolution to request that the mayor resign from the Ann Arbor city council body whereas on July 16th, in one community and -- (Reading document).

To ensure that race, sexual orientation, gender identity and disability does not determine one's chances in life whereas on July 20th, 2020, the Ann Arbor city council declared racism as a city health crisis.

And -- the former racist H.R. director over the hiring and firing choices and held that position for a number of years while later Mayor Taylor was -- the current chief of police was almost removed by former city manager Lazarus, used to false allegations.

Only the firing of the city manager Lazarus saved Chief Cox.

Mayor Taylor remained silent during the initial suspension of Chief Cox and became animated.

He got upset when the guy who was trying to remove Cox was removed.

He didn't apologize for his harmful behavior.

And respect for diversity of elected opinion.

Whereas members of this community most directly impacted by this language and action voiced concerns regarding the harm caused by this whereas the actions of Mayor Taylor are unbecoming of a mayor and creates harm but degrades the efficacy.

And resolve that Mayor Taylor resign from the elected position of mayor of Ann Arbor as soon as possible.

I will end here.

Have a good night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Meilin Louis.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 619.

>> Thank you.

Hello, everyone.

I am a resident of ward 3, and I'm calling about DC-6, because the threat to the rule of law and democracy.

On the surface this may seem to be about criticizing the behavior of a member of council.

However, the real problem is the process the mayor and his allies are employing in order to remove a dually elected member from council.

The accusations against our councilmember are a distraction from the ongoing problem of the changes in the rules understood for the mayor and his allies to consolidate power.

Whatever your problem is with respect to proper behavior -- for a member -- for a member of council.

Let's please separate this problem from the process plagued to address us.

This has been well-documented and Councilmember Nelson's blog at bit.ly.a2democracy.

What are the mechanisms that may be employed to remove a member of council?

Recent moves by the mayor leave, quote, undefined behaviors unquote, subject to censor and leaving that to his discretion as far as what is acceptable behavior or not.

The democracy without the rule of law does not protect us from the whims. You may approve of Mayor Taylor's positions on issues but let us work together so we do not implement processes that will work to the advantage of a future mayor with whom you might disagree.

This would indeed be a bad precedent to set.

As Elizabeth Nelson points out in her blog post.

Most recently, council approved rules that dramatically expand the rights of council to marginalize and duly elected.

Vaguely phrased rules conduct unbecoming of a councilmember.

This is by design.

It creates the maximum opportunity for a majority of council to target an individual member at the absolute discretion of the mayor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> These rules could also work to the advantage of any mayor.

We must respect democratic elections and rule of law.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Thank you.

Is Mr. Haber on the line?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I believe he is back.

>> Mayor Taylor: Very good.

Our next speaker is Alan Haber.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Haber, you can press star six to unmute your phone?

>> Star six am I unmuted.

>> Mayor Taylor: We are hear you.

Please proceed.

>> Oh, thank you.

Thank you.

So frustrating.

So yes, I'm speaking also about Jeff Hayner.

So I would rather be talking about somebody else.

I know him as a cabinet maker, a wood worker, a manual worker.

I know the integrity of his work.

There's nothing racist or nothing homophobic about him and he's made excellent contributions to the city council.

Maybe if there were more workers on the council, dealing with the actual material world and having to make things actually work, you would have a better appreciation of the character and value of direct talk.

He's a direct talker.

He quotes a quote, characterizing the press is biased and lying.

What the mayor himself he called beneath contempt.

The upset people are upset because he uses a banned word.

Little did I know.

The message, though is lost in the upset in the educated people should know that media.

Perhaps Mr. Oswald is still seen as a lone killer who brought down the president.

I could say more.

Anyhow, Jeff also quotes a song with another banned word and I forward it to you from the context of that quote.

But the narrow myopia of the administrative committee, indulges outrage.

When I was a student in the '50s before many of you were born, the United States government banned the books of Wilhelm Wright and had a public book burning here in the land of the free.

They did not want you to read the book "The Mass Psychology of Fascism" from 1937, which now the administrative committee majority wants you to act out.

If there is a problem, the proper mode is to see it as a teachable moment.

This is your responsibility in this community, to explore restorative justice, truth in reconciliation.

Healing the breach, tolerance is the quality of this community.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> There's an indulgence of fragility as one black writer called it.]

The amplification of the hurt self as if to nullify the reality in which we live.

Insofar as anyone on the city council uses your authority to indulge this cancel mentality, you demean the higher values and ethics which you are supposed to represent.

The administrative committee should withdraw this wrongheaded resolution and anyone who votes for it will bear the stain of its Inoble context.

There's a higher way to function as a city government, perhaps a resolution that you ignored last week or so, to actually some counseling on how to work as a council.

Just stop this resolution.

Don't do it.

It's foolish and it demeans a very good person on the council.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Are there communications today from council?

Councilmember Nelson?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I have some ward four news.

Well, of course the resurfacing at broadman and Brockmans started today.

And starting this Wednesday, traffic going south on industrial, the construction is changing traffic patterns so people going south on industrial, you will not be able to turn right on Stimson.

And coming up on the August agenda, we will talk about connector walks in ward 4 between morehead and Delaware.

There's one on either side of 7th, a connector walk that will go north of Delaware into Lawton school and then connector walk from the end of Delaware court to Ann Arbor slain road.

So these are things that are coming up.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: Thank you.

I just wanted to second city administrator Crawford's mentioning of A2Zero week, which I wish I had been here for the whole thing but I was with my mother which is always a good thing.

But a piece of A2Zero week continues and that's the reusable takeout food pilot, which you can make use of at Zimmerman's miss Kim's, El herisa and Detroit street filling station.

And you can get certain dishes or any dish.

You take it out in your reusable container.

You eat it up and rinse out that container and then you return it to a drop box and you can get more food in reusable containers to take home and eat again.

I won't continue describing the cycle but this should run through the end of the month, and I hope that everybody takes a try at it, because I think we're all feeling really guilty about all of those things that with we recycled and threw in the trash as we tried to feed ourselves during COVID.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilwoman Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I wanted to draw your attention to e-7.

We passed a resolution in January of 2021, regarding a notice of violation for the ms-4 permit for the Allen creek -- I don't want to get into weeds too much, but I do want to say that the request was for gelman sciences to revise its Allen creek drain monitoring plan in response to a notice of violation of the ms-4 permit.

The environmental commission discussed it.

There were some discrepancies that need to be resolved and the environmental commission is willing to hold a special meeting if necessary.

At this point, I requested clarification from our legal team on some of the specifications in the resolution.

More importantly, I want to thank all parties that have been involved in this.

It's really an example of ideal collaboration between state, county, city staff and elected leaders, card members, and a number of very knowledgeable community members.

I'm optimistic that this will be resolved without court intervention.

This is a major step in terms of standing up to gelman and requiring what is the best plan for our citizens to maintain clean water.

And part of it EGLE has already rejected gelman's monitoring plan and they are mandating permit shallow -- groundwater monitoring wells in the area.

So you will be hearing more about it.

If anyone wants more information, you're welcome to contact me or

Councilmember Hayner who has a lot of expertise in this area or councilmember Lisa Disch would also be on the environmental commission with me.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I would like to invite folks to take a look at the Ann Arbor district library's recent books discussion on Carol Anderson's white rage and the racial divide.

There's an excellent, excellent recorded book discussion and I think it's a -- it would be a good point of discussion considering what's on our agenda and what is happening within our community.

If you dig a little deeper in Ann Arbor's library work, they also covered "The Color of Law."

And this introduces the united way's 21-day challenge and if you list to wemu's piece today, you can learn a little bit about the equity challenge and hopefully folks can participate.

I know the city of Ann Arbor has participated and city administrator Tom Crawford has supported this in the past.

Some of the exercises is the daily exercises include revisiting your personal racial identity, reflecting on your personal and implicit bias what is privilege?

What is white fragility, trauma to healing and how to be an ally.

I would encourage everyone's participation.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you, Mr. mayor.

Tonight, I believe is our first official meeting since the beginning of pride month, and so I just wanted to acknowledge that tonight I assume that after 2020 and canceled celebrations throughout the year, and with vaccines on the rise, I would encourage everyone to celebrate pride.

I also just want to point out a little bit of our history.

Most of you probably know that Ann Arbor has a unique connection to pride because we were the first city to formally recognize gay pride in the United States.

About three years before that, what we know as pride, is out of the Stonewall riots which is violence against the LGBTQ community, and the black and brown transgender community and drag queens and gay men of color.

As we look to celebrate safely and responsibly I ask that we reflect on this history and continue to think about the work that needs to be done as we continue to work towards equality and justice for all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I encourage all residents to look to the parks website pretty much every week we continue to open up more facilities both inside and out.

So that's incredibly exciting and they do an excellent job working with the county to make sure that we can do that safely, but as -- as conditions change, also provide more opportunities to recreate in our community, including lots of

volunteer opportunities as well.

And I just want to congratulate especially all the -- and tonight was the last graduation, but it was really thrilling after the year we've had to see all of our high schools -- the five high schools in Ann Arbor to have graduation ceremonies that were in-person.

So congratulations to all of those graduates, including one very special one who was a child of someone on this council.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communication from council?

I would like to recommend the following -- oh, I should say there is a resolution, cc-1, to Appoint Chris Vanden Broek, Evan Redmond, Lunia Oriol and Yongwen Zheng to the Environmental Commission.

That's for consideration at our next meeting; is that correct?

Thank you.

I have Councilmember Disch and Ramlawi.

Is that in connection with CC-1?

CC-1, Councilmember Disch?

You are on mute, councilmember.

>> Councilmember Disch: Sorry, I was thinking that Councilmember Griswold would do this but Mr. Redmond is going to be moving to Illinois.

So we will be finding a replacement for him but all the others we will -- we will be voting on at the next meeting.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Ramlawi, that was your message?

Thank you.

I would like to recommend the following nominations for your consideration to the -- at our next meeting to the Ann Arbor Marinetta porter, and Hugh flack and Robert parks and to Elizabeth dean fund, Lynn Nybell, the housing board of appeals, Angela Rasmussen and Lisa Stettler.

Not housing and human services advisory board, Jason Talley.

Fourth ira resolution to Appoint Jamall Bufford to the Ann Arbor Public Art Commission.

All for consideration at our next regularly scheduled meeting.

And now a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Moved by Ramlawi and seconded by Nelson.

Discussion, please of the consent agenda.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, we have Mr. Hupy here to answer some questions for CA-1, if you would like to hear that?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Hupy, you have the com.

>> Good evening, I'm Craig Hupy, public services administrator and the question was asked regarding the use of temporary vs. permanent and to clarify that these temporary hirings are for seasonal work.

They are not used in a permanent-type position and we only use the outside agency when we are not able to acquire our temps through our own recruitment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the consent agenda?

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, while Mr. Hupy is here, I would like to ask a question about CA-8 to clarify the temporary or extended temporary nature of those contracted employees, I assume or contracted services.

CA-8 speaks to some \$6.6 million for approximately up to three years of construction inspection services and this is in lieu of using city inspectors.

Is that my understanding?

>> We do our -- we do use city inspectors to inspect construction, but because of the seasonal volume of work, we don't have enough full-time inspectors to do that type of work, and then to keep them employed the rest of the -- the rest of the year.

So we use these firms to do inspection during the peak construction period.

>> Councilmember Hayner: And that would be not just, you know, residence or special construction, it's road services or anything.

>> We would not use them for residential building construction.

These are for road utilities, the municipal-type construction projects.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.

Thank you.

I wanted to clear that up.

I wasn't quite clear on that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the content agenda.

Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I would like to pull CA-1, please.

>> Mayor Taylor: CA-1.

Further discussion the consent agenda.

All in favor the consent agenda with the exception of CA-1, please say aye.

Opposed?

Consent agenda with the exception of CA-1.

With 11 councilmembers present, thus satisfying the eight vote requirement with regard to CA-3, CA-10, CA-11, CA-12, CA-13 has been approved from the consent agenda, CA-23, CA-25, CA-26, CA-27, CA-29.

CA-1, resolution to award a contract to Manpower Inc. of southeastern Michigan for temporary staffing services for public works.

Moved by eyer and seconded by Radina.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I would like to postpone this to our next meeting.

What is, that the 21st?

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded by?

Councilmember Radina of the discussion of postponement?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes, if I may.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, you still have the floor, councilmember.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

Yeah.

No, just some late-break questions came from members of the community and I have some additional questions as well.

Just in terms of ensuring that these temporary workers are -- that the way that we're filling these positions is not in conflict at all with council policy to essentially

not outsource our public works staff.

So until we can get some further answers to some of the more detailed questions if it pleases the body, it would be great to postpone this for two weeks.

I don't think this will make much difference in terms of the contract.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I need ask our city staff and our administrator whether postponing this will create any hardship, problems, how will postponement affect our ability to fulfill our obligations?

>> We will need to divert workers from other public works activities to use solid waste.

We have staffing shortages and because we use temporary workers we have used them for more than a decade now, on a temporary basis to help seasonally, and so we won't have those workers to help with compost.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: So would this affect collections?

>> No.

What we would do, because this is a core service, we would just defer work in other areas.

So work like hydrant flushing would be delayed.

Other utility operations, street maintenance could be delayed.

While we pull workers from those areas to cover.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: There was, I guess, questions that perhaps weren't -- I'm not sure if they were submitted and the answers were inadequate, I'm just concerned about causing this type of inaction in some other areas.

What are these -- I mean, could you answer those questions that Councilmember Eyer has now?

Or is it going to take time to research and require a postponement or can we simply answer those questions and concerns here?

>> I'm not sure what the questions are.

So I can't answer that.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Were those written questions?

I'm not sure -- what were the questions, if I can ask the chair, or I'm not sure, but this is a little unusual.

>> Mayor Taylor: I don't know the questions that were asked rather than having cross talk.

Your vote on postponement would be helped if you knew what the questions were?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina?

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

I submitted in other questions.

I did come in late and I think I probably prompted that staff introduction.

A view of my questions are the ones that Councilmember Eyer pointed out.

I think I got one answer to probably a couple of questions -- a few of the

questions that I asked.

Specifically I was wondering let's see here, it appears to be -- this appears to be a contract for temporary staffing services.

But I believe the standing policy as established by council resolution in May of 2018 opposes privatization for solid waste services.

Not being perform an outside and forestall permanent employees.

I wanted to know how the contract' essentially was not in violation of that standing policy of council.

And I was looking for what length of time we would anticipate holding the same position during the three to four to five-year contract period, considering that a five-year period that a temporary employee for five years doesn't seem like a temporary employee to me.

And that's something I wanted to have a better understanding of.

And I wanted to know if it was fulfilled by staff, how many additional staff would be needed.

Those were a few of the questions I asked.

I don't know if Councilmember Eyer had others but I also -- I have a few concerned regarding established council policy and wanted to have a better understanding before we move forward and I guess I would just add that I hope that particularly for things like this, if they are urgent and a couple week delay might delay the contract that we see the contract a little bit earlier in the future.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

I may have called upon Councilmember Radina ahead of you in the queue, whereas I think you may have called in first.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I didn't notice.

>> Mayor Taylor: Very good.

My earnest apologies.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I just want to thank Councilmember Radina. I'm glad you spoke first because I appreciate you mentioning that 2018 resolution.

This is legitimately, I fear, against council policy.

We are trying to discourage these types of temporary worker situations and so I am happy to support a postponement.

I have some questions about just how effectively we are attempting to recruit.

I appreciate your questions about people taking these jobs consecutively.

This is a good thing for us to ask more questions about this and so I'm happy to support a postponement.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please on the postponement?

Starting with me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.
>> Councilmember Hayner: No.
>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
>> Councilmember Griswold: No.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.
>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: We now come to a set of public hearings.

This is an opportunity for the public to speak to the council about a specific item on the agenda.

That is to say the specific matter of the public hearing.

To speak at a public hearing, you need not have signed up in advance but your speech must relate to the opportunity matter of public hearing that is to say, the item on the agenda.

To speak at public hearing, please enter the number on your screen, that is 877-853-5247.

Once you are connected please enter meeting I.D. 94212732148.
94212732148.

Once you are connected and we are in the public hearing, the public hearing has been called to which you wish to speak, please enter star nine.

Star nine to indicate that you wish to speak at that public hearing.

Having entered star nine your hand will be raised and the clerk will let you know when it's time to speak by identifying you by the last three digits of your telephone number.

Once you are called upon by the last three digits of the telephone number, you will have three minutes in which to speak.

Our clerk will notify you when you have 30 seconds remaining and when your time is expired, please conclude your remarks and cede the floor.

Public hearing number one, An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.15 (Table 5-15-2) and Section 5.16.6 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Accessory dwelling units.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 663, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, am, I unmuted.

>> Mayor Taylor: We can hear you.

>> I'm here to speak in support of this resolution about expanding the accessory dwelling units, the ordinance change.

I think that this is one of the best things that Ann Arbor can do to make housing more abundant and ease err to live in Ann Arbor because Ann Arbor is a beautiful city and we want more people to live in it.

I think increasing the amount of the accessory homes allowed to the things

provisioned for in the current resolution that we are having the hearing on, really allows for a lot more flexibility and it really makes, you know, Ann Arbor an easier, more friendly city for people to live in.

I can think of many examples for which, you know -- examples where this be beneficial.

For example, if you have multigenerational households, you have parents who have a young child, who grows up and, you know, graduates and wants to continue to live in Ann Arbor, and Ann Arbor is really, really expensive to live in for a young person.

Now, if they were able to live with their parents and build something on their parent's property, they will be able to have their own place to live and it would be like a multigenerational household.

This could -- I it would be like a small community that everybody could benefit from in that transaction right there.

And, you know, there's so many different things that you can help and the -- one of the -- there's so many different things that an ADU can help, seniors.

You know, a way to create more housing, more housing options, Ann Arbor, most ultimately you want it to lead to a tighter knit community.

And it will lead to the soft benefits that we can't really quantify and it will lead to the quantifiable benefits.

It will make it easier to live in Ann Arbor.

They can get less cost prohibitive.

So there is, you know, so many benefits here and there's no downside.

So I really would love to see the council and resounding support for this.

I yield my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 327, do you have a comment?

>> Yes, I do.

We are adamantly opposed to the Valhalla Glen project.

I think it's not a wise idea in the slightest.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, Valhalla is the next public hearing.

This is the public hearing with respect to ADUs.

>> Okay.

So how do I get in at that point?

>> Mayor Taylor: Great question.

Thank you for asking.

So you can just take off star nine, or rather our clerk will lower your hand and then stick around until this public hearing is over.

I will announce that this public hearing is over and then I will say we are in public hearing number two, and blah, blah, blah, Valhalla, and then --

>> How long do you think that will be?

>> Mayor Taylor: I don't have any idea wish to speak.

There are five in the queue now, anywhere between 10 and 20 minutes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number --

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, thank you clerk caller with the phone number ending in 250, do you have a comment on this hearing?

You can press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hi.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

Great.

So I'm Loretta card-Rickson.

Our four kids Charmaine, they are educated in the new versions too.

Our children grew up, and some moved away and some are still here, unlike others we have only owned this one home and are now looking at the possibility of moving.

Maybe within Ann Arbor, maybe out of town.

The home that we live in is what is called bilevel.

The bottom portion is a one bedroom apartment which when allowed we rent it out.

When we were told that in order to develop the space into a fully functioning one bedroom apartment and rent it out, we would have to stay either upstairs or downstairs and add a deed restriction, it dashed our hopes of possibly following one or more of our children and still be able to live.

So as a result, I'm in support of the housing and human services advisory board's request that city council approve the accessory dwelling unit changes proposed by city planning staff.

I want to thank you all for your service to our community.

I truly appreciate it, and I follow each one of you.

I'm done.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Caller with the phone number ending in 677, do you have a comment?

Phone number 677 go ahead.

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and I'm calling in support of the ADU amendments.

I think that this will provide a useful -- a useful tool for getting more housing and to allow people to stay in Ann Arbor, through certain life changes.

It will allow more people to live in Ann Arbor and share this wonderful town.

I wish we would have more housing than that.

There are some people who are worried that the ADU is -- would cause a big disruption to the town and I really don't think we'll see a large number of ADUs being built even with these changes but I would rather have these changes bring the small number of ADUs that they will bring and give people choices that fit their lives rather than Timing our current ADU process in which very few are built.

So, yeah.

Please allow this -- these ADU changes that are proposed tonight.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Anne Bannister, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, yes, this is Anne Bannister calling again, and about these ADUs, granny flats sound wonderful and what is not to like about a granny flat, an accessory dwelling unit.

This particular ordinance is not ready!

It has some severe limitations, the 3-foot setback is -- it needs to be given much more thorough thought.

The owner occupancy requirement being removed needs much more thought.

And the protection for the trees needs a lot more attention.

You know, we discussed this last week or so ago, the environmental commission looked at it.

Yeah, and people said, well, not that many will be built anyway.

That's a very bad policy that we should never approve a bad policy under the pretext that not that many will be built.

We -- there was discussion that well, we can plant new trees.

So at the environmental commission, we spent the first hour and a half of the meeting talking about how mature trees are exponentially, in many cases, more valuable than new trees, depending on the tree.

So just planting new trees does not help us.

We heard that well, only 7,000 properties being impacted.

That is not true!

We are effectively eliminating single family zoning when we allow two separate detached units in the single -- in the previous single family zoning categories.

So that's very serious and 20,000 properties are impacted with a significant change and the public doesn't know.

People came to the public hearing but they represent 1% of the impacted property owners.

And we hear -- so enforcement is another issue.

Ann Arbor fix it is not up to speed yet for us to track complaints about ADUs, and map them and see which developers are abusing the ordinances.

So we need to get enforcement in place.

So we heard other things, reasons, oh, stormwater is not part of this ADU discussion.

It's being handled elsewhere.

I reject that.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Because we know try as they might to do a good job, city staff is still making significant mistakes in stormwater management.

Just because we think it's not going to cause a drainage and stormwater problem, we are finding that many of our changes actually are.

So I'm calling this greenwashing and that we need to go back to the drawing board to improve these granny flats.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 755, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending in 755, press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 755, do you have a comment?

Caller 755, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending 534, do you have a comment?

Caller 534, press star six to unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

Caller 534, please unmute yourself to speak.

>> Hello, this is Tom Stulberg again calling from Lowertown.

I can support about 99% of what callers have already said, and simultaneously ask you to not pass this ordinance tonight.

The reason why is that the ordinance as proposed creates a very broad spectrum of possible outcomes.

Some of those outcomes are good.

Some of those outcomes are very problematic.

The problem is this would create a by right situation that does not currently exist for over 20,000 residences, the vast majority of them unaware of the full spectrum of the possible outcomes.

The vast majority of people are unaware of most of the possible outcomes.

Even councilmembers seem unaware of some of these outcomes.

Councilmember Song, you mentioned "The Color of Law" one of the things that book does is deal with the historic and systemic injustices in our system lending and housing policies that have denied certain groups the opportunity to build intergenerational wealth through homeownership.

One of the unfortunate possibilities under this new ordinance proposal, is that we're no longer going to have an owner occupancy requirement for at least one of the two units.

What that can do is have cash investors buy up modest homes, so that they can turn that home into a rental, and build a separate up to 800 square foot home in their back home as close as 3 feet not lot line, creating two rentals.

I'm a real estate broker.

I have been one for over 25 years.

I take this very seriously.

Buyers on the lower end of the market are going to shut out by cash buyers and the real estate will disappear.

While we do not know exactly -- we can't compare exactly, you know, income to different groups, we know that it would disproportionately impact certain groups that we're really trying not to negatively impact.

Two years ago we raised the issue that there should be more notice that we should do this.

We had two years to give people notice.

Specific notice to the 20,000 plus residences that are impacted by this.

And educating them and engaging them would be helpful but we have declined to do that for two years.

There's not an excuse for doing that.

There was a gentleman who presented at planning commission at ADU but he

wasn't aware that the owner occupied.

He didn't think you could build as big a unit in the backyard as you can under the proposal and he was one of the planning commission at planning commission.

Imagine what 99% of those over 20,000 residents are unaware of.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 644, do you have a comment?

>> Yes, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you, my name is Kathy Boris I live at 1726 Charlton.

Mayor, city council and fellow Ann Arborites when considering the proposed amendments to Ann Arbor's current ADU ordinance, we should ask ourselves: Would benefits from the proposed changes?

And who might be disadvantaged by them.

Back in 2016, when Ann Arbor city council approved an ADU ordinance, making it possible for Ann Arbor homeowners to add ADUs to their properties, it was a mom and pop affair.

ADUs could be added to the main house, or set up in a preexisting out building and property owners who were required to live in the ADU or the main house.

But this changes the picture completely.

The most significant proposed change is to allow a second detached habitable structure to be constructed in the setbacks in all single family zoning categories.

That means that a second house could be constructed by right as close as 3 feet to the back and side property lines.

Is this acceptable to the Ann Arbor property owners who would be affected by this change?

No one knows.

No one knows because the owners of the more than 22,000 affected properties were not sent a postcard to notify them of this effective elimination of single family zoning.

According to which two detached houses would be allowed where only one house was allowed previously.

Neither have property owners been notified that the 2016 ADU ordinance restriction requiring owner occupancy of either the main house or the ADU may also be removed.

Real estate investors, however, are keenly aware of the changes being proposed to Ann Arbor's ADU ordinance.

Perhaps they even suggested them.

Keep in mind that regular folks, especially folks who are having trouble paying their mortgage or property tax, cannot afford to build new detached ADUs.

Investors on the other hand, can afford to build them.

Moreover, it would be extremely lucrative for them to do this and rent both the original house and the new ADU at market rates.

Add to that the fact that investors will buy Ann Arbor's least expensive home and

properties to work the scheme to their greatest profit and you will see that it will push our lowest income residents out of town, which, of course is the opposite of what we want.

Please ask yourself why we should create more opportunities for realty investors by allowing two detached houses on each single family lot.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 965.

>> Hi.

My name is Joe spalding and I live in Holland, Michigan, but, you know, I'm a housing activist.

I spend a great deal of time working in the bay area.

And, you know, frankly, I have gone to city council meetings virtually and in person at probably, oh, 17 or 18 different places over the last year, and ADUs come up in literally every single one of them.

I can say for certain that none of the terrified rhetoric, the scare tactics should be given any credence whatsoever.

We are in the middle of a housing crisis that is now expanding nationwide.

I have been saying this in different places across Michigan over the last three years.

And, you know, starting at my own local spot over here in west Michigan.

And the reality is any type of delay is putting gasoline on the housing crisis, but furthermore, let's -- let's be honest about what greenwashing is.

And I know that there's some issues with some folks being honest because they personally, you know, to the press about me while they were on council.

But anyway, let's talk about greenwashing there but it's climate arson to delay the addition of the opportunity for more housing.

And any type of concern about the environment outside of that, or doesn't take that into account is a shell game.

And that's the reality and the data lies -- you know, plays that out.

And the last thing that I want to talk about is "The Color of Law" and the thesis of "The Color of Law" is quite simple and it was not what was mentioned earlier.

It's that after redlining, after the -- you know, the housing act -- the direct housing discrimination was illegal, cities zoned completely single family only in order to lock in that existing segregation.

In Ann Arbor, we can see that with Washtenaw County being the eighth most segregated, you know, county in the country.

And we're looking at the effects of that.

So when we talk about delay, you know, as a Person of Color, I'm sick to my stomach hearing some folks come in and, you know, white folks come in and try to speak for People of Color here and then the other side of their mouth, turn around and start defending a city councilmember who has no problem -- no problem saying the "n" word to a Person of Color twice.

When no white person should be saying that, period, let alone an elected official representing a huge chunk of people inside of Ann Arbor.

So let's get our act together.

Let's build the housing we need and when it comes to ADUs, like, come on, man!

Be the granny flats!

No one is going to get run over by a truck if we put these up.

No one is terrified of these things.

These are the housing that our state now needs.

It's a statewide problem.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Caller with the known number ending in 250, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, this is Loretta kaldrin.

I want to second --

>> Mayor Taylor: My, my apologies.

There's only one -- only -- people are only permitted to speak once at each public hearing.

My apologies.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Sorry about that, mayor.

Caller with the phone number ending in 556, do you have a comment.

Phone number 556, if you press star six to unmute yourself?

>> Hello, my name is Ralph McKee, I live 16 red oak.

Can you hear me okay?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> I have a couple of comments that I would like to echo what Mr. Stulberg said and Ms. Bannister.

I'm in favor of ADUs.

I think some of the comments were, perhaps, misinterpreted.

I think many of us would like the ADU opportunities to be expanded but not quite as far as has been proposed.

I think a reasonable setback limit of 10 feet, 15 feet would enable many, many of these to be built, without risking quite as much of the loss of the tree canopy of the mature trees.

I think that's a tweak that could be done without a whole lot of delay.

The other piece that I think we need to recognize we do have a housing shortage.

Yes, we do.

But these are expensive.

At current construction costs it's going to be -- I think the consensus among opponents and proponents is that they will cost \$200 to \$250,000 and at a typical landlord profit pieces you will be looking at about it thousand a month to rent.

So we are not really helping with the affordability if the small number of units that the proponents are saying will be built would be built.

Not really doing anything.

The concern that I have with owner occupancy is the same that Mr. Stulberg and Ms. Boris referenced.

So I won't repeat.

That what I would like to dispute is the argument that I have seen several times that older folks would be able to build these and -- who are struggling financially already would be able to build these and thus provide income to enable them to stay in their houses.

As a long-time bankruptcy lawyer and as having worked with a lot of elderly comment and a lot of financial advisors, that to me is financial Russian roulette and I would never, ever advise an old elderly homeowner to borrow \$250,000 to build something on the if come.

If it works, great.

If it doesn't, if you have a delay in construction or the unexpected repair, you have a foreclosure and you have lost your house, forever, end of story.

I think that particular argument is specious and should be taken off the table and should not be used in support of this proposed ordinance.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 755, do you have a comment?

Caller 755, you can press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller with the phone number 755, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending in 217, do you have a comment?

Caller 217, if you can press star 7 to unmute yourself.

Do you have a comment?

>> Hello, yes, am I unmuted.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Okay.

Great.

So I will admit, I'm a little less informed on this issue than one calling in, but one thing that has really stuck to me about every comment that every caller made -- yes, every comment that every caller made on this issue is that everyone, even people didn't support this, and, in fact, especially people who didn't support this resolution.

Tends to agree on the fact that landlords and real estate developers are going to behave in a predatory manner as far as these ADUs go and as far as driving up housing prices goes.

And I just -- I wonder if that is, you know, the most productive use of that time and energy when we're all in agreement that, you know, landlords coming in and jacking up rent prices to the point where no one can afford to live here is wrong. And we have a housing crisis.

So why are we attacking the measure to build more housing, have more flexible housing options?

Why are we pushing back against that instead of working to perhaps regulate landlord's rent prices and real estate development.

It just seems like perhaps in the pushback against this ADU measure, we are -- our ordinance, we're kind of barking up the wrong tree.

That's all I've got.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 367, do you have a comment?

Phone number 367, you can press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Yes, this is Brian chambers, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

I'm calling in in favor of the ADU ordinance.

We do have a housing crisis.

I went back and I looked at the U.S. census data for the American community survey that they do on an annual basis, and looked at the distribution of household income, and single family homeownership and renters or occupied housing in Ann Arbor.

The greatest increase as we all know is with though households earning \$155,000 or more, it's been consistently increasing over the past ten years.

We have had a decline in the distribution of houses going to renters below \$50,000 a year in income.

These are the macro trends.

So right now, house prices are increasing over the past 12 months about 5.8%.

As of Zillow data.

I use what is available, right?

So prices are escalating.

There's a housing scarcity on the market right now.

You can look at the Federal Reserve and they tracked this.

We have it explicitly here in Ann Arbor.

So here's an opportunity to improve the housing stock across Ann Arbor.

Yes, it affects single family zoning.

I don't understand why we need to maintain the character of single family zoning on an absolute basis.

I have never understood the call for that.

I have never understood the need to maintain single family homeownership across Ann Arbor as a thing in and of itself.

It's certainly right now 70% of the parcels across Ann Arbor are single family home r-1 parcels.

We don't have a single family home problem in Ann Arbor.

We have a housing scarcity in Ann Arbor.

The ADU ordinance is going to free up single family home parcels to be able to increase housing stock across Ann Arbor.

This is a good thing.

I don't understand the nay sayers.

I really don't understand the nay sayers on this.

I encourage you to support it and I encourage you to support other proposals that will increase the housing stock across Ann Arbor that are on your agenda and certainly the ADU amendment should be supported.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 828, do you have a comment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 828, go ahead.

>> My name is Kathy tracken and I live in ward one.

I have a question I would like to pose.

I would like to know the impact of an ADU on property taxes and if that could be clarified somehow in this ordinance.

I'm not sure that that's normally how it's done.

I'm wondering if one of two things will happen, it will affect your taxes likely in one of two ways, either there will be no change or most likely your current rate will be uncapped to the current market rate, which might make a huge jump in a person's property taxes which that aligned with the cost of building the ADU would definitely impact the price you have to charge to rent it out to break even.

I wonder if it's possible to put in that ADU ordinance how that will affect people's property taxes because I think that will be a very big factor in whether someone decides to do that and I personally don't know how building an ADU would affect my property taxes.

I can only think that they would go up, but it would be really nice to have that clarified exactly how will my property taxes affected by building an ADU.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any other callers with their hands up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: I received an email from a caller.

-- a caller at 755.

755 who wishes to speak.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I called on her several times.

I will try again.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Just do your best.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 755, please press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller with the phone number ending in 755, please unmute yourself.

Press star six.

Caller with the phone number ending in 755, can you please unmute yourself?

>> Mayor Taylor: I see them as remaining on mute as well.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I do have a few other callers with their hands up at this point.

>> Mayor Taylor: Please go on to them, thank you.

Caller with the phone number ending in 764, do you have a comment on this

hearing?

Caller ending in 764, press star 6.

>>> John Floyd, 519, sunset road.

I would like to echo comments from Tom Stulberg and others about the process of the notification to the public.

It's a strawman argument that wanting notification by postcard of the property laws in town means you are against the ordinance.

It simply means we have a process that hasn't informed many people.

This issue came with the planning commission where it was simply ignored.

This is an important issue of process.

I think to notify people, you have a stronger community support and stronger ordinance.

There's no reason to rush this without actually finding out what people want.

But thank you.

That's enough for me tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 693, do you have a comment?

>> My name is Wendy Carmen, I live at 2340 Georgetown.

The ADU ordinance that you will vote on tonight effectively rezones all single family properties to duplexes in the name of providing more affordable housing.

Ironically, the last-minute change to remove the owner occupancy from one of the two units will likely increase the chances that outside investors will be the ones profiting from this, and simultaneously raise prices on the most modest homes making it even harder for lower income families to live in single family homes in Ann Arbor.

If you were actually to create a special zoning category, they would have both single family unit and a smaller secondary unit, and then move to rezone single family properties to the new zone, there would be a strong risk that owners would have opted to legally oppose that, which would have been their right.

With the approach you have used, you simply changed wording in the definitions to say that an accessory use can be in the second unit and voila, you didn't even have to notify the 20,000 affected households.

I'm not sure why this is a legal approach.

Like many other big changes occurring in our land use ordinance it should have been the result of meaningful community dialogue, but it wasn't.

It should have been part of the master planning process.

And it wasn't.

Instead there were hypocritical uses about why that was not necessary.

This is being done without meaningful public involvement.

Instead, those who wanted to ensure the participation of most affected owners in this process were shamed.

The issue is that if you have a great idea, you should have no reason to use this approach because you should -- would you have thought everyone would agree with you.

But not only do you not know whether that's true, I don't think you agree.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller ending in 360, do you have a comment on this hearing.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you, my name is John Godfrey and I live on Brockman.

I urge the council to engage first with Ann Arbor residents before voting on the proposed changes.

There's little public awareness of the proposal and its implementations and a carefully considered policy but more needs to be known and discussed and many facts have not yet been fairly acknowledged.

I would like to share some of these concerns.

We heard conflicting statements from supporters of this proposal.

We have been told that lifting restrictions on ADUs will add to rental costs and adding to supply.

In cities such as Seattle, ADUs are promoted as investments that have high rental rates.

It's very reasonable.

This has been a very modest 2.4%, but the growth of the university student population has driven up demand and fueled construction of high rises with high rent this makes it difficult for younger workers to find affordable housing.

As seen elsewhere in the country, this is unlikely to improve rental affordability.

We have also heard assurances that further deregulation, including allowing both primary residents and the ADU to be rentals will not have a significant impact in neighborhoods.

Only 1% of homes.

On closer examination, it's far more complicated and deserves greater public awareness.

And with enlarging ADU, almost all are built as income, and design build firms are eager to push these marks forward.

A quick count shows at least eight Portland firms specializing in ADUs, 12 in Seattle and more than a dozen in San Francisco, one of which employed a recent member of this city council.

These firms offer an inexpensive modular ADUs at at least one provides a ground lease option under this arrangement, the firm provides the ADU and manages it at no cost to the owner who receives 25% of the rent.

It's not difficult to imagine the same in Ann Arbor affecting certain neighborhoods more than others.

And a warning comes to San Diego where new regulation has led to a proliferation of ADUs and tear out trees and yards and built as many units as possible.

And the backlash to the unanticipated effects of loosening regulations hundreds of San Diegoans are demanding a moratorium on ADUs.

I urge the council to pause and engage with the residents to evaluate the

potential long-term benefits and risks.

Let's assure that all residents have a chance to participate in an informed discussion of our shared goals for the city's future.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Brandon dimchef, do you have a comment?

>> I will keep it quick.

I know it will be a long meeting.

I support these changes to the ADU resident and I'm a resident of the ward 4.

I'm happy to have more neighbors.

I'm not worried about all of this doom and gloom and I think this is a good step forward.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there anyone else who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: I don't see any others with their hand up.

>> Mayor Taylor: This public hearing is closed.

Now public hearing two.

An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 9.8 Acres from TWP(Township), R1C (Single-Family) and R1A (Single-Family) to R4E With Conditions (Multiple-Family Dwelling District with Conditions), Valhalla Ann Arbor Conditional Rezoning, 31, 50, 57, 77, 97, 98, 107, 145, 147, 151, 155, 159, 163 Valhalla Drive and 2065 2099 South Main Street.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 297, do you have a comment?

Caller 297, if you press star six, you can unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

>> Can you hear me?

>> I'm Dan, and I'm speaking on behalf of Valhalla and country place condominiums.

Since learning about this project we have viewed all relevant meeting of the planning commission and the city council and have had 30 different meetings with the mayor, the city, and traffic planning staff and most all councilmembers. We documented our findings and made material was sent to all of you and we thank you for those who heard our concerns.

We have you to pate for a proposal consistent with the master plan and the city planner's recommendations.

Here are the three primary reasons.

First of the rezoning of these parcels are for spot zoning and this is a well-documented dangerous slippery slope that violates strategic.

It's actually a theme we are hearing tonight.

It violates Ann Arbor's master plan which you have approved within the last five years.

It goes against the advice of our professional city planners.

They recommended r1-d zoning with 48 units and this developer is requesting a density over five times of that.

This is inconsistent with the location and the parcel size and requires overengineering to try to make it work.

This is the first proposed of r4d zoning on major traffic corridors and ironically it doesn't meet the definition of r4e since main street has not been designated as a transit for high density development.

Many councilmembers have told us that they rely completely on the professional judgment of the city traffic engineers.

Why then would you not rely on the professional judgment of our city planners?

Secondly the traffic and safety issues have not been adequately resolved.

The entrances and exits for this development for up to 1,000 people are not aligned with existing signalized intersections.

This created constraints on entrances and exits and thus unresolved congestion and safety issues at increasingly busy intersections near a high school and Michigan stadium.

Hopefully you have visited the Valhalla site to make a judgment for yourself.

A city traffic engineer actually told us that congestion is good because it slows down traffic.

Has this become city policy?

Our safety concerns were sharpened when one of our residents was recently hit by a car in a crosswalk at main and Valhalla.

And third, only 3% of this proposed units contribute to affordable housing.

The bow in housing needs assessment you will recently consisted documents a demand for affordable housing.

This project at the high cost of the spot zoning makes a minimal contribution to this need.

Please vote no.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 107.

Do you have a comment?

Caller 107, if you press star six, you can unmute yourself.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> My name is Jean Holland.

It seems in recent years, the city has gone on accelerated building crusade, often with mixed results.

This can be handled in the building project, such as Lowertown, 2857 packard and the garden.

None of our group is opposed to construction commensurate with sound planning and the constraints that regulate land use.

Land use planning has been ignored.

This is not a case of not in my backyard because this project is in everyone's front yard.

And has far reaching effects well beyond the nearby neighborhoods.

The notification rules worked very well in your favor because 1,000 feet only requires the developer to notify in that radius.

The fact that the report from the developer indicated that the residents were generally in favor was grossly misrepresented.

I read the report and it was not the experience that I recall.

In fact, no one I talked to that night was in favor.

Then the pandemic last year put the clamp on effective communication.

While convenient, it doesn't provide the same impact that an in-person meeting would have provided.

Both of these situations greatly enhance the city council and planning commission to allow this to proceed virtually unincumbered.

Regardless of whether callers under favor or opposed to this project, there's one element of this whole thing that cannot be ignored.

The city council has taken it upon them to override the master and override the construction and establish a new zoning code never before assigned any development in Ann Arbor.

This the abuse of several appointed power.

We do have precedence regarding this type of violation and cannot ignore it.

I'm requesting that this vote be deferred or denied until such time that the master plan be updated using the rules already in place for such modification in order to align the projects scope of land use plan for the area.

Should the vote be taken tonight to approve this project?

We will take legal action against the city for violating its own rules.

If you do the no defer your vote, we have no other choice.

Do you not have the authority to approve this zoning, nor do you have the authority to approve a project of this scope.

Once again, I respectfully request that you defer your vote or deny and do this the right way.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 663, do you have a comment?

Caller 663.

>> I'm here to speak in support of the -- this resolution to rezone the Valhalla parcels.

I find it really strange that people come in and they say, oh, we are in support of building and housing, and we are supportive of people coming into Ann Arbor but then they qualify it right away by saying we are not in support of changing the rules and we are not in support of housing that isn't affordable and scare quotes. So I think it's necessary for Ann Arbor to realize that Ann Arbor is being choked by its own regulations.

It's being choked by the zoning regulations.

One the callers said Ann Arbor has grown by 4.2%, even though the population of unite of Michigan students has boomed.

I'm a University of Michigan student myself and I can tell when I go to Ann Arbor

and I look for a place to rent, the rent is so expensive and I look for places close to campus.

If you look at places on the way far edge of north campus, for example or places south of the campus in Ann Arbor, rent there is still enormously expensive.

And why is this?

Is it because there's a lieu that it's Ann Arbor and the rent musting expensive.

It's because of the restrictive zoning laws that made it so the segregation in Ann Arbor -- it institutionalized segregation that was built in Ann Arbor like the caller said before with the Fair Housing Act.

What is the solution?

To take dramatic action.

It's not that people don't want to go to Ann Arbor.

It's that they can't go to Ann Arbor.

University of Michigan students aren't like the ones that stay in Ann Arbor, can't stay in Ann Arbor because they can't find a place to live where they can afford it. They have to go somewhere else.

And now when you say we don't want to rezone this because it's against some rules, there's a council that has the authority to do this and that's why they are doing it.

You know, this is like, particularly procedure.

This is part of their bylaws.

This Valhalla property, it will create over 400 new housing units and there will be parking spots for those concerned about parking.

And there will be more neighbors and more people coming to Ann Arbor, and supply will increase and it will be closer to the demand that is sky high in Ann Arbor.

It's one step closer to solve the housing crisis in Ann Arbor.

I yield my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 965, do you have a comment?

>> I do.

Once again, this is Joe spalding.

I wanted to speak out strongly in favor of this specific rezoning.

The only thing I wanted to say on side of that because I think the statements about density and the need to fight the housing shortage which is driving up the need for rent, I think it's pretty obvious and folks understand that and the writing is on the wall politically down the road, that idea doesn't have a pushback when you get popular.

The only other side of that is paired directly with words spoken by Donald Trump when he was playing chicken little about the suburbs falling.

So I do think that this is an important step forward for Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan here.

And one thing I wanted to say with respect to Valhalla and the opposition here.

When it comes to litigation, I have no ability -- I don't think anyone here has the

ability to influence the outcome of anything like that or they want to -- I don't think anyone wants to speak to their ability to influence the outcome of a court case. I certainly know some folks that have the ability to have some influence on public opinion and I think the people of Michigan, everyone has right to know that the local level, there are people standing up and suing cities to try to block new housing in the middle of a housing crisis.

And I think that's not a hard sell.

I think even folks in newspapers are going to run that story more and more. They will running the stories about the housing shortage and the effect on low-wage workers.

I think hearing other folks call in, college students, speaking in favor of this in terms of the impact for zoning and, just how this will impact people's lives in positive ways is moving and I want to commend the city councilmembers would vote in favor of this amendment as it goes forward.

Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 327, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Thank you.

Is in the appropriate time to talk about the Valhalla project?

>> Mayor Taylor: It is.

Thank you.

>> Okay.

Thank you.

As I was trying to mention before, we are adamantly opposed to the Valhalla Glen project.

454 units is significantly larger than the number 84 units that was originally recommended.

And this would be unnecessary and I think irresponsible density considering where it is, with significant traffic and safety concerns.

We live just off Scio church road and we do south main daily, and the traffic between 4:30 and 5:30 is intense with U of M employees leaving work and heading to I-94, and that stretch of road is busy most of the time.

It's absolutely impassable during the fall when there are football games and that's just a specific time.

But I think that sort of density would be just irresponsible as I said before.

And it would affect the housing quality and the prices of homeowners in the area. I don't think it would improve Ann Arbor.

I think there are other places that that type of housing can be planned and we urge you to vote no on this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Scott Trudeau, do you have a comment.

>> Yes, hello, council.

I would like to address a couple of points on this one.

I enthusiastically support this project.

One of the complaints we are hearing are concerning about traffic with this many people living at this intersection and I would like to point out that if we choose not to build here and we choose to only allow less to be built here, those people will not disappear and they will go somewhere else and commute into our city with all the other people who have been priced out or can't otherwise get access to the city and coming up that I'm route, increasing the traffic anyway and driving even more.

I would also like to challenge the idea that we had a building crusade or a building boom, it has been historically low over the last decade.

It may not feel that way, but it is.

We are building a lot less than we ever have.

And lastly, I would like to point out that the r4e zoning that is proposed for this.

It was created out of input from our master plan, specifically for this kind of purpose, intended from the code itself, permitted for high density, along signature transit corridors which this is, with nearby access to number -- public land, schools, which this has and shops which this has and out of the D.D.A. boundary.

Such intensity use on adjacent property and on the community as a whole is minimized.

It's on the golf course.

It doesn't have an impact.

It's a perfect application of this zoning and it achieves many of the goals identified in our master plan and reduced impervious and all the goals outlined in the A2Zero building plan and full building electrification.

I think it's a slam dunk.

I don't think there's a reason not to support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 875, do you have a comment? Press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and I would also like to enthusiastically support this development.

I think that I would like to see more housing to help us dig ourselves out of the housing crisis, and this is a great opportunity to build a whole lot of housing at once.

I would like to share this town.

I would like to have more people move here and fewer people move out of here.

I think that also when we build big developments like this it lets people live closer to their jobs and that means we are not going to have so many people driving in and out of town at the exact same time as elsewhere because they will be even if they drive cars from this apartment complex, they will be, you know, using the city streets and they will be using it in a different pattern than the people who are driving in and out of town.

So and they will be driving a shorter distance.

That's great for the climate, and that's great for the safety of our roads and it's I would love to see more people living in Ann Arbor.

I think it's great for the neighborhood character of all neighborhoods in Ann Arbor, any time there's people who live here.

Every person who lives here is someone who might have a dog, they might post about their dog on the Internet.

I might be able to see pictures of that dog!

There's somebody who might be -- who might make wonderful contributions to this town and I would like more opportunities for people to live here and be a part of my community.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 532, do you have a comment?

Caller 532, please -- go ahead.

>> Good evening, everybody, my name is aerial Ryan.

I'm a resident of the westover hills neighborhood.

The last time I spoke before you guys was in opposition to the lockwood development because of all the ways they didn't address our concerns and so I'm in enthusiastically supporting this rezoning because I think the developer has gone above and beyond to meet the really stringent requests we have for sustainability and affordability and accessibility to multiple options for transit.

I'm impressed by the LEED silver standards that they listed that they would like to reach with their green roof and their solar panels.

I'm impressed with their ability to see that we would need additional sidewalks and hopefully a new shelter for the closest bus station.

I'm over there as a bed all the time.

I have family members over there.

My husband works there and we're a single car family and so we drive that corridor often.

And so I feel I'm a part of what would happen there and I see more benefits than concerns about extra cars on the road if traffic and congestion is really the biggest concern, I would ask other residents of Ann Arbor to give up their multiple cars to allow people to move in who might need cars, and there are multiple ways to deal with traffic and one of those is current residents giving up their multiple car households.

So thanks for listening.

Again, I enthusiastically support this and I would love to see it go through.

Thanks so much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 561, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> So my name is Nicholas Ryan and I'm a homeowner here in Ann Arbor.
I support the Valhalla project.

I live close to the site for a couple of years and I still drive by and walk by this location frequently.

It's on my route to work.

So I will personally be impacted by any project at this location.

From a sustainability perspective as was mentioned at the very beginning of this meeting, and this is a very important aspect for me and this project has done an admirable job of preserving natural aspects on the property.

They reached for the LEED silver certification.

They will have green roof space and car share options and electrical vehicle, and the solar panels they plan to put on.

It will be able to generate its own power needs.

I would love it if all Ann Arbor projects demonstrated a similar level of care and this type of mixed use for the land is housing and Power Generation is something we need to achieve our renewable energy goals I'm grateful that there's several sustainability choices.

From a location perspective, I'm having a hard time imagining a better location for a mixed project.

So many amenities are within walking or biking distance and there's close access to public transportation and any argument in terms of access or traffic, we tolerate a lot of traffic through that same area.

Not owning a vehicle may also be an attractive option for Valhalla residents, given that they have access to the car share opportunities and the public transportation.

With below ground parking, it helps with water retention on the site.

There are other benefits but to keep this short, we are facing a housing crisis in and a climate crisis and this will add a much needed set of housing options in Ann Arbor while taking sustainability into account and nearly all of that care appears to be voluntary and not required of the developer.

If we can't find a way to approve a housing project like this, that has met or exceeded every demand that we can reasonably place on it and it's on a site that is as before as it gets and I believe fits with the goals and values as a community, we are harming ourselves and looking foolish and digging ourselves fourth into our own housing crisis.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Molly Kleinman, do you have a comment?

>> I do.

Can you hear me?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can hear you.

My apologies.

>> Thank you so much.

I live in ward 4 and I'm calling in support Valhalla rezoning and site plan as many other callers have mentioned we are in a housing crisis and we are in desperate

need of more housing of all kinds including market rate apartments.

This is on a major transit line.

It's walkable and bikable to downtown and directly across the street from pioneer high school.

It has plans for solar power generation and it includes affordable units and plans for all electric appliances.

This location to put all of these apartments here could actually reduce traffic through this corridor because as others have mentioned, lots of people have to drive through this, because they can't live closer to town and so they live far away and have to drive through and if they live here, they could be taking the bus or walking or biking school.

This is aligned with our stated sustainability goals and being a welcome community goals.

I encourage you to vote yes, sir on this rezoning.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 936, do you have a comment?

936, please press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello council, so glad to meet you guys.

I'm speaking -- I'm Nancy wellman -- of one of the members of the family that lives on that property since 1965.

Talk about seeing growing in that area and growth in building and oh, my goodness what else is happening?

We have seen it.

It has been a wonderful, wonderful piece of property, but it has literally gotten swallowed up with all the building that's going on around there.

I am so for this project because I firmly believe it will be a beautiful building that people will be able to come and see when they come off of I-94, heading into the city, and this is really -- it's I don't know what else would go there, this has been a wonderful, wonderful place for our family to grow up in there.

We parked cars and we went to pioneer and went to school and we did everything.

This little special piece of island that is now coming into the city ---- the city, living there, but that was just what you did when you lived in a little part of Pittsfield township, but I -- it's so bizarre listening to everybody decide what should happen with that property that they don't really know what it's been.

It's a beautiful property!

I think it will be a great, great asset to this town that I lived in, I was born in, 1959.

That it's -- come on, folks!

I don't know all.

All of a sudden everybody is coming out of the wood work and we have to do this and we have to do that.

No!

This is what happens and life goes on and building goes on.

We see it.

We have seen it.

And all I can say is I support it thank you council and all and everybody who has worked so hard on this project.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Donell Wyche, do you have a comment.

>> Yes, I live on Scio church.

I live about 1,000 feet from this proposed property.

So I want to enthusiastically endorse.

It here's why.

Density is great for people's wallets.

One of the things that we get is a lot of benefit when we get some density.

Things like providing services can drop dramatically.

We also get the enhancement of social connections while we were trapped in our house during the last year under the COVID lockdown, one the things that I witnessed was more of my neighbors was walking in front of my house.

I hadn't seen so many neighbors walking in front of my house.

And I was delighted to sit out actually and have my work office be in front of my house so that I could meet my neighbors.

So I want to say as enthusiastically as Nancy just did, that I'm in support of this development.

Density helps our environment.

We will see lower emissions and more energy efficiency.

Density can improve health outcomes because the space is walkable, to bush's, to the dry cleaners to the vet, to the pharmacy, to the schools that are there, both Lawton and pioneer.

Density also does something that Ann Arbor prides itself on.

Progressive politics.

It moves us in a progressive direction.

And I want to end by saying density is fun!

Please, please, please build more housing in the city of Ann Arbor.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 231, please star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello?

>> 231.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can hear you.

>> Okay.

Okay.

I wanted to comment.

I analyzed the situation, and one of the things that I'm appalled about is that the University of Michigan created this problem by adding 7,000 undergraduate students.

Now, I'm very happy to hear that 7,000 additional undergraduate students will be

attending the University of Michigan.

But the fact is that they -- the University of Michigan threw a giant turd in our lap. Basically they made the decision to force the rest of us to deal with the problem they created and they are not offering any resources to help manage this problem.

Why is that?

You know, I did a calculation.

I tried to figure out how much additional revenue they get into their general fund with 7,000 additional undergraduate students coming in.

And the number I came up with was -- you should write this down.

I figure that u of m is realizing a net of 100 merchandise and 7,000 students.

Okay?

That's after paying the instructors and administrators and one of the administrators would be Lisa Disch who gets \$200,000 a year for nine months of work.

Now, why are we not going to enact them to put pressure on u of m.

The state gives u of m money.

Why are we not asking them to help to put pressure of u of m to create some very real problems.

Clearly we need housing.

We have -- we have rental vacancy rates in the low single digits and that means rents in Ann Arbor are increasing faster than people's income.

That is disrupting the social contract.

That is not fair.

That affects every renter!

That was a decision u of m made without consulting anybody and they simply threw the problem in our lap and they are basically telling us to go deal with it.

That is not right!

That is not just.

I'm more than -- I would love to see the city and the university work together but if the university's position is we create the problems and you go solve them for us, that's not working to go.

That's -- nobody has raised this issue.

U of m is the elephant in the room!

And I think it's true, what these people are saying.

There' a definite shortage.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> I will send there.

I think I said enough.

Have a nice night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 786, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 786.

Press star six to unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

>> Good evening, my name is Julie Krohl.

I'm the applicant traffic engineer.

We have been working on the traffic study for this property for over two years now.

So I just wanted to add a little bit of commentary to some of the comments that I have heard tonight and maybe a little bit of clarification.

So we have worked closely with city staff to put together the traffic study that was presented and reviewed and approved by city staff and your traffic engineers, the transportation engineers at the city.

One of the things we were concerned about with the city is improving safety and one the things we will be doing if this project moves forward tonight is working to improve safety, along south main street, in front of the property, where there is a median opening.

So that that is part of the next phases on this is to actually improve the safety along the corridor in conjunction with the site access that is proposed.

The trip generation that we used for this -- it -- this didn't include modal split.

And these are reductions in trip generation for using buses, biking, and walking.

This development is on a bus route.

There is going to be increased pedestrian connectivity.

They are going to add additional sidewalks to connect to the south so you can walk to the grocery store.

You can now -- there's bike lanes.

You can ride your bike to campus.

You can walk to pioneer high school.

That fourth reduces the traffic impact associated with this development.

By having that modal split.

So being that it's on such a multimodal area, that we're seeing less traffic impact than we would see if we were to take this development and put it, say in a suburban location.

So the traffic impacts associated with the 454 units is significantly less than we would see in another location in the city.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> I just wanted to point that out and I will be on the call if there's further questions later tonight, I will be able to answer those specifically.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 942, do you have a comment?

Press star six.

>> Yes, this is Brad straiter, I'm a planning consultant.

To look at the master plan implications.

And I did want to point out -- first of all, someone brought up a spot zone.

So clearly this is not a spot zone.

A spot zone is a very small site which this is not and it's where the spot zone is

inconsistent with the surrounding land uses and this is not the case either.

In fact, I helped write the strict zoning with Marty Oberheizer.

We went through all the criteria for spot zoning.

This is clearly not a spot zone.

But on the master plan, so as you have seen in some of the reports, the master plan for this site was created in 1990 so over 30 years ago.

The city identified 12 areas in the master plan for special study but this site was not one of them and that's not unusual, because this was designated in the Pittsfield township master plan and in Ann Arbor's master plan in the future annexation site and it's very normal to just leave things the way they are as they promote a higher density, just as we are doing tonight.

The master plan by way was not followed in the immediate development over the last 20 years.

None of them were single family, such as the main street apartments were shown as single family in the master plan, but they developed with the uses that are there today.

So the master plan is very updated and it's supposed to be updated every five years and it hasn't been.

That's why the planning commission voted in looking at all the factors here overwhelmingly in support of this project and the rezoning because they felt their job is to look at the master plan was looking at all the factors, not just the future land use map, which is just a small part of the master plan, but the master plan is also the city's policies and goals and as you have heard from some of the other speakers tonight, and the proposal is very consistent with the city's modern goals such as affordable housing, adding density along a high transit corridor that is within walking and biking of the high school and downtown and restaurants and shopping.

This is the perfect place to have it type of density and it doesn't abut single family homes and it abuts the U of M golf course.

The single family homes are on the other side of the road.

I want to make sure that you are considering all the comments here tonight.

I think the outdated master plan map.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Should not artificially influence.

It's consistent with the development trends in the area and the city's needs.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 534, do you have a comment?

>> Thank you.

This is Tom Stulberg calling from lower town.

I'm glad I followed that previous caller.

He did an excellent job of describing a lot of the process and how the master plan relates to this either and this site.

I'm neither in favor or opposed to this particular development.

I know somebody who lived on Valhalla for quite a long time.

It was always known this site, these houses would be redeveloped.

I do think it's a good site for a higher density development.

What actually -- you know what is the number?

What level of density is appropriate for this site?

We have a current master plan it has not been updated and in my personal opinion and that opinion is given as somebody who has done development as somebody who has done rezonings, and somebody who participated in a master plan rezoning for one of his own rezonings where the community said we like what you are proposing but you don't meet the master plan.

What we would like to do is do a master plan revision for the immediate area which they did and after that master plan, it met the master plan and was approved.

The key is they did that evaluation for the immediate area, not just my parcel and my parcel alone.

It allowed an evaluation of traffic and other issues that impacted the immediate area so that we can make a true plan.

I think it's appropriate to update the outdated master plan for this area prior to the rezoning.

I do think a dense development is appropriate there.

I don't know what the final number for density should be and I think the community has the right to participate in that decision.

We heard a lot of good points from people for and against this.

And those are the exact kind of communications we would have if we had a master plan revision through this area but it would include some other parcels.

There are parcels nearby that I believe are being put together to common ownership but it would be appropriate to evaluate their proposal in this revision at the same time.

I would like to mention that look would not meet the master plan.

But had that master plan revised, the community might have said we want to do that project and nobody went back and revisited the master plan revision for that. That could have been done.

I think if we follow the process, we all come up better in the long run.

It takes a little longer to do it right but we reduce the errors and we make our decisions more legally secure so that when we are saying this guy over here already did it, or zoned it something else.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 556.

>> I had Ralph McKee.

I will keep it brief.

It's going to be a long night.

I would echo what Mr. Stulberg said.

On the caller who called in about the u of m being the elephant in the room.

I would note that some states including California require the university when

they up enrollment to build housing for the increased enrollment.

We could certainly have some of the statewide activists that we hear on this comment period regularly maybe put that on the list of some things to look at. Number one.

Number two, on the relationship between the -- that land use plan and the relationship of that to our developments, I think we ought to really evaluate that. If as Mr. Streeter said, we are routinely approving projects that don't meet the revision or the current plan, we ought to revise the plan for the whole area so that we're not just routinely rezoning to override what is on that plan without the significant public input, the land use plan for a specific area, which wouldn't take five years and wouldn't take a huge amount of budget.

That's just how we should approach this.

And I know this is frustrating, the delay, but that could be done if a development came in at the beginning, if that was done right out of the date, it probably wouldn't delay the process hardly at all.

I think we ought to take a hard look at that.

I know that's not a popular idea but I think that's what we should be doing.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 348.

Are.

Caller 348, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, yes, this is mortgage Cohen, 2249 south main street.

I live right across the golf range from the proposed development.

And I'm not an expert on development.

I'm just a guy whose life will be impacted by this thing and I agree with the reverend.

You know, I'm all about density.

Density is fun.

I chose to live in a condo, you know, community with 48 units all close together, because I believe in a planned community and I think that density is the best for the environment, but 454 units is a lot of density and it will blot out the sky 100 yards away from me and so it's kind of a big deal.

I take walks in the evening with my dog and I have got arthritis and don't get around so well anymore, and this is going to be an impact.

Still.

I just wanted to share my comments.

I'm against -- I'm against this development.

I mean I want some development.

I want something built there, obviously, 84 units sounds great or 100, but 454 is just I think outrageous.

So thank you.

Bye.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 299.

>> I'm Mike O'Keefe and I'm golfview landing.
Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this project.
I think it's my third or fourth time.
I'm not against development even in my own backyard.
I support affordable housing.
I even support the ADUs you spoke about and the benefits of more density.
And all the traffic doom and gloom we are talking about and all the unicorns and rainbows, I'm not here to dispute.
I'm really calling about a request to vote this down or delay it.
Really, our city government has a process to adjust, update and rework the master plan for the city.
Approving this one parcel now without seeking and responding to the broader community around it, which would happen with the reworking of that plan is making an inefficient and illogical approach.
This council like this is this and they may decide a different usage next door that approach to long-term planning is not how you would make long-term decisions to how you may run your own businesses, how you lead teams through long-term strategic planning or make big decisions for just your family.
You want to approach them from a more holistic point of view before making a series of disconnected and one off decisions or like earlier today, Councilmember Eyer and others requested council to pull from consideration the consent agenda item number one, because it may or may not conflict with how the city should or should not use temporary positions for solid waste jobs.
Please use the same consideration for a longer term issue which is a known conflict with the master plan as you are putting towards those temporary positions.
Dot right thing.
Pause this and seek to involve the wider community to get our input on the city's master development plan, and understand not just what this one development might do, but what everything else you may want to accomplish in the city, in this particular area instead of just considering the one open point of view.
I appreciate the time tonight and I'm done speaking.
>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 968, do you have a comment?
Press star six to unmute yourself.
Go ahead.
Caller with the phone number ending in 968, you can go ahead.
Caller with the phone number 968, you are unmuted but we don't hear you.
>> Hello, can you hear me now?
>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.
>> Thank you very much.
This is Brad Moore, one of the architects on the project.
I wanted to assure that we have followed all the procedures of development, including a thorough review by multiple staff, you know, going through planning commission, multiple times we were there at least three times to work out every

detail and make sure that this project does comport with the goals of the master plan as Mr. streeter said, the fact that it was a single family it only reflected the existing use it at the time it was done as a single family.

There's nothing that have suggested in a holistic unzoning or rezoning single family homes to something else.

As to density, I had a plan approved by Congress 2050 that had an approved density over 69 dwelling units per acre and this one is just 45-point this.

This not uncharacteristic of the plans that the city has approved before.

We have all of our experts in every discipline here at the meeting tonight.

If you have any questions we are able to answer them.

Thank you very much.

>> Clerk Beaudry: I don't see any other callers on the timeline.

>> Mayor Taylor: Would anyone else like to speak at this public hearing?

This public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number 3.

Resolution to Approve Valhalla Ann Arbor Site Plan and Development Agreement, 31, 50, 57, 77, 97, 98, 107, 145, 147, 151, 155, 159, 163 Valhalla Drive and 2065, 2099 South Main Street.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at this public hearing.

Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number four.

Resolution to Adopt the Ann Arbor Moving Together Towards Vision Zero City of Ann Arbor Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Molly Kleinman, do you have a comment?

>> I do.

Sorry.

Give me just one second.

Hi, I'm Molly Kleinman.

I'm calling in support of adopting the new comprehensive transportation plan.

I serve as the chair of the Ann Arbor transportation commission.

The commission, as well as the planning commission both unanimously recommended the plan's adoption at their joint April meeting.

At the time, commissioners observed that the plan aligns with the city's sustainability goals and our vision zero goals of no serious or deadly crashes in the city and it prioritizes safety, equity, accessibility and sustainability.

This plan was created with extensive community engagement and participation and transportation commission had several opportunities to review drafts and make suggestions.

Personally, I appreciated seeing the way that the consultants working on the plan made revisions and additions with respect to city residents speaking only for myself, I want to live in the Ann Arbor that this plan envisions.

The Ann Arbor of this plan is designed for people, not cars.

It considers the needs everyone who uses our streets, including disabled and elderly people, families with young children, people who can't or don't want to

drive cars, people who choose to get around by bike or on foot.

It recognizes the ability that the ability to move around safely and easily is fundamental to creating a livable city and I encourage you on city council to adopt this plan.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone else with their hand up for this public hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there anyone else who would like to speak at this public hearing?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 677, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and I too am excited about the transportation plan update!

I'm a person who would like to be of much of what I can do by bicycle as I can, and it's very clear when you are outside of a car that the city is not designed for people who are outside of cars.

Nevertheless, like, this -- Ann Arbor is one of the better places to get around not by car and that is what attracted to me living here in the first place and why I stayed here for past 20 years.

I want more of that.

I want more people to be comfortable getting around without using a car.

I want more destinations that you can get to without using a car.

And I want there to be space to get to those destinations without using a car.

I want people to think nothing of allowing their kids to walk or bike to their destinations.

Because I want the city to be that safe to get around.

It's just wild how much we take for granted the assumption that everything has to be designed for cars and a large number of cars have to be moved and I'm excited that this transportation plan puts us into a position where we are thinking more about the people who are not driving cars.

So I can't wait to see it get updated, and approved.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone else with their hands up at this time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Would anyone else like to speak at this public hearing?

Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

It's 9:51.

Let's take a short break, returning at 10:01.

Thank you.

[Break]

>> Mayor Taylor: We are back after a short break.

A-1, we have before us the work session minutes of May 10 and the regular session meeting minutes of May 17, both 2021.

May I have a motion to approve minutes moved by Ramlawi and Griswold.

Councilmember Nelson was that a discussion or an aye.

All in favor?

All opposed?

It's approved.

B-

An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.15 (Table 5-15-2) and Section 5.16.6 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

1 discuss of b-1.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I don't want to take up too much time.

We have so much on the agenda.

Ann Arbor has the ADU ordinance in 2017, even though that ordinance itself has been made -- it has been relaxed prior to now.

We still have fewer than 24 or just about 24 people who have applied for ADU and fewer than that have been constructed.

So the are current order allowed approximately 15,600.

They will be 6750 properties newly eligible to host ADUs as many callers actually mentioned of 21,000 properties.

Now maybe this is a big change compared from going to not leg to legal which is the first change that we made in 2016, or maybe it's a small change.

Because going from legal to -- from not legal to legal was the big leap.

Maybe this is an even bigger change than going from legal to not legal, because the revisions we propose here would allow detached ADUs to be built on 21,000 properties whether they are owner occupied or not and whether they have a did detached structure on their property or not, prior to the first ordinance.

I think these things are disputable and we can argue.

The concern that I want to address is the concern that many residents expressed regarding the idea that these changes will provide an incentive for investors to buy up low-end market properties, rent them, slap an ADU out in the back and get two rentals for the -- you know, on a lot that would otherwise be designed for one.

It's really important for us to remember that developers are already buying low-end market housing.

Sometimes they are putting down all cash offers for that housing.

That is happening whether we liberalize our ADU laws or not.

The question is whether ADUs, liberalized ADU law will accelerate or intensify that.

It's very hard to predict the future, but we can see from the past that we have had very few people bite on the ADU opportunity, and we know that ADUs are expensive to build, and difficult to finance.

They are also a really poor return on your investment.

Rather than buy a modest home and build a smaller one out back, a rational investor would be more likely to buy a second modest home that would have more bedrooms and more living space and therefore yield more rent.

So --

>> Mayor Taylor: Am I there?

>> Councilmember Disch: You are there.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you have.

I have a lot of concerns on this and it's unfortunate because I don't believe it's going to be clear if this passes as it's proposed.

There are many things here I have do favor.

There are a lot of changes that are going to be occurring through removing the minimum of 5,000 square feet of a lot, to removing the requirement that any new entrance be located on the rear or the side of the structure.

We are removing additional parking requirements.

We are doing a lot to facilitate more of these being built.

It's very perplexing and muddled this conversation has been because of awful the different competing interests and concerns that have been put forth.

Affordable housing.

Well, these aren't going to be affordable in think stretch of the imagination.

Because of the lending requirements and restrictions, the cost to build them, on top of the fact that correct me if I'm wrong, the property taxes will be reassessed once these are corrected.

If anybody -- not if anybody but a lot of people know that one of the biggest hinderances to affordability in Ann Arbor is your property tax bill, that's why many people choose to lip in the township -- choose to live in the townships.

That's why I want to protect what is existing that remains to be affordable.

And it is predictable what is going to happen.

In fact, we knew that very few of these were going to be built because of the costs associated to them along with the restrictions.

Prior meeting, when this was first brought up at the first reading, I introduced an amendment to require owner occupancy of one of these dwellings and I asked our city attorney whether that same amendment can be proposed here tonight again Mr. Postema, can that same amendment be proposed in this case because of the discussions the community has had since the first reading.

>> City Atty. Postema: I think you can bring it again and it would be subject to the same voting procedures but there's no opposition to voting on that.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would like to make that amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: What is the amendment?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will passion it to Ms. Beaudry right now.

It's exactly the same that wasn't supported first time.

Simply --

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Beaudry, do you have it around?

>> Clerk Beaudry: I just sent it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Beaudry.

Councilmember ram law, you have a little bit of time.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Do you have a --

>> Mayor Taylor: You were at two minutes and a few seconds.

Now you have a new clock on the amendment.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: We have many people who are concerned. Not having an owner occupied requirement with these ADUs will put more pressure on what is available for folks in the lower market of the real estate. That's how intergenerational wealth is transferred and actually created is through homeownership.

I'm here for all types of residents to be here.

Renters, people that are coming in, visitors, whoever.

But we have a systemic problem in this country of inequity, huge inequity.

And that inequity only exacerbated in the last ten years because of commercialization of residential properties.

That will continue to be the case as we go forward and we're dumping fuel on the fire when it comes to the gentrification of our community.

I will point out in water hill, what happened in that area.

Maybe it's just a correlation.

I'm not entirely sure.

But once the setback requirements were changed in water hill, that area experienced great gentrification.

I feel this ADU ordinance will do the same to other parts of our community that now people find affordable.

That this is going to be more pressure on those larger lot sizes, with smaller homes that people come in with cash offers and buy 'em and create more investment opportunity.

And shift people out of homeownership on top of all the other concerns that we have heard.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs you are in the queue before, are you in there now?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

I think we heard earlier the fifth ward, the homeowner speak to how the owner occupancy would help her family at least to be able to build an ADU and how the restrictive nature has been discouraging them from building one.

We a few years ago made the change to allow ADUs in our community.

I'm reading from an AARP report that I will read more from it later, perhaps later, but one of the rules that discourages ADUs is specific regulations that don't also apply to primary dwelling, E.G., owner occupancy requirements.

If we allow ADUs in our community, I think we wouldn't be simultaneously discouraging them, so I will be voting against this amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Thanks I want to follow up on exactly that point.

Planning commission did not land on lifting the owner occupancy requirement to benefit developers.

We are following the AARP.

That the owner occupancy requirement could be burdensome to seniors or people who lose their job and have to move to get a new one.

If you have an ADU on your property that you are renting out and we have a

requirement of owner occupancy, then you would not be able to rent that private -- that primary residence in the interim between when you needed to move and when you are ready to sell it or when it's ready to go sold.

Or say you are a senior.

If you need to to move into assisted live, your tenant would have to voluntary indicate.

The uncertainty as to whether a lease may be abruptly terminated will discourage tenants from renting.

Those are the things that are persuading us, not to line the pockets of developers.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Fortunately, we are always having to choose the lesser of two evils.

There's never an absolute generally -- I should say never, I should not be speaking in absolutes but rarely is there a case -- there will be a couple that we will vote unanimously with very few reservations if any.

This is a case where it's a balancing act between competing interests and concerns.

Our comparable cities, Bloomington, Indiana, Pittsburgh, pa, even our neighboring communities require owner occupancy.

I think our housing crisis is a nationwide crisis.

It's not just a local issue.

In fact, we should be addressing it regionally.

And Dexter and Chelsea who just revised their ADU ordinances included the owner occupancy requirement.

I just feel that we are going to create more pressure on folks who can least afford it.

Who actually own -- who own homes and this might lead to greater gentrification in a city that cannot forward more of it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Counsel member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, I think we have to look at what has happened in progressive cities on the West Coast that are further along than we are.

I agree, it's a balancing act.

I would like to approve ADUs but I'm not ready to give up the owner occupancy requirement tonight at this time.

I would like to see it play out first.

I realize there's some difficulties with doing that, but I think that on balance that's the right way to go.

We're also compromising in terms of trees and many other issues and so I -- I'm not concerned with starting out with this amendment and after we have evaluated it, or for the next year or so, been moving forward.

It's done in many corporations and many governments and I think it's the smart way to go.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I do see this as phased implementation what we are doing this evening.

I'm disappointed that after having this fail one time that we are having the same discussion over again.

To me, it's actually quite simple.

We can go with the expertise that Councilmember Briggs and Councilmember Disch brought up or we can call it evil and go with speculation.

And so I will go no on this and vote yes on ADUs that were really thought out based on insight from our staff and the planning commission.

You know, it's -- it's just disappointing to me that we are having this conversation again when we have so many important housing and other things that we need to talk about on our agenda this evening.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment?

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I think we are having this discussion because we did listen to our community and our constituents and we are trying to compromise.

So that's the reason I'm supporting this amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment?

Roll call vote, please on the amendment, starting with me.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

Had.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: No.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

Since staff is here and we were just told we're relying on the expertise of our staff, I was wondering whether the setback recommendations from 3 to 5 feet were part of what staff had recommended or who recommended that, which was not included in this amendment.

Now, that is not a sticking point for me, but I just want to understand if that was recommended by staff as well, but was not included.

>> Good evening, mayor and council, I'm Brett Lenart the planning manager.

We would type these accessory structures just like we would street any other accessory structure that permissible to build.

We didn't create accessory dwelling units but applied the same accessory structure that would apply.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you for being here to answer that. Unfortunately because of the prior vote and not having the owner occupant requirement for this, and the concerns that it will increase the gentrification and reduce the homes for the people who can least afford it, I cannot support this ADU in the way it's presented tonight.

I think we can do significant progress and advancement with having that and without it, it just opens up a lot of unknowns and I think the people that are going to be paying the price are the people that can least afford it and increased gentrification in the city.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you, Mr. mayor.

I will run down a few things that residents have asked me to talk about.

There's something that's miss from it.

Some callers said it and some people.

There's no consideration for tree preservation or solar rights or privacy rights, we are letting these things right on the property lines.

Yes, they will be expensive to build, even if you reuse a prefab sips type construction system, they will be extensive to build.

I will wash the notion that there's any affordability associated with ADU.

When did an accessory dwelling unit change from accessory to the building, to the accessory of the lot has never been satisfactorily answered to my consider.

In neither instance, either when we did the initial ADU. ordinance revision, for the 15,000 plus houses, or this one before us today, that brings the total to 21,000 plus lots did we properly notify residents.

Zoning ordinance or the local laws and they are subject to judicial review, and, you know in, a rezoning an additional requirement is notify nearby property owners or affected property owners has to be met.

Well, this is not met -- this is effectively a rezoning of all of our residential zoning districts from R1A to R4E with the exception of mobile home parks and so, you know this is essentially a rezoning of all of those and I feel that really did need a proper process and that was Pooh-Poohed by the planning commission.

I know.

The truth of the matter is if -- if we're looking for diversity and diversity of opinions and voices and ideas, a snapshot of our planning commission makeup may not necessarily provide that.

I think -- I don't know if everyone else received the email I saw today, of a very well spoken argument for increasing diversity on our planning commission, in keeping with the Michigan zoning enablement rules for what a planning commission is supposed to be, I think we might get a different picture and a different outlook on who is affected by these changes that are brought forward for planning commission.

And so those are legitimate concerns that people have.

And I will reject any supply chain arguments that it will increase of the availability.
And so I have a question about the taxes.

I would like to ask a question of Mr. Crawford or anyone else who would be able to answer.

What will be the impact of constructing a second -- say a standalone ADU where an accessory building did not exist prior, under our new laws?

What will happen to someone's property taxes?

>> City Admin. Crawford: I think Mr. Cheng looked into this.

>> Yes.

In fact, I have it up.

I will read exactly the response that I got from the assessor's office.

And so what it's saying is when there are multiple units on a property, including an ADU, the property is no longer eligible for a 100% PRE.

That's a principal residence exemption.

This is true whether it is rented or not.

It could be completely vacant, rented for free, or used by the homeowner for another purpose, and as long as there are separate units on the property, the property is only eligible for a partial P.R.E. in accordance with the value of the unit occupied as the principal residence.

It goes on to state this is stated best on the principal residence exception affidavit itself, it states if you own and live in a multiunit or multipurpose property, you can only claim a partial exemption based on -- exemption based on that portion that you use as your residence.

If the parcel of property has more than one home you must determine the percentage that you own and occupy as your principal residence.

A second residence on the same property is not part of your principal residence, even if it is not rented to another person.

The overall assessment is the physical value of the property.

If there is a detached ADU, the separate building is subtracted from the overall value of the all the property's physical improvements in order to determine the value of the property improvements that are eligible for a P.R.E.

That determined percentage applicable to the principal residence is the overall portion eligible for a P.R.E.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: In layman's ladies and gentlemen -- terms, you can't claim 100% homestead exception.

Is it correct to refer to this as a rezoning?

>> No, this is a text amendment, and regarding notice, we followed the prescribed procedures that the U.D.C. instructs us to do.

Staff is very careful to not subjectively or arbitrarily modify that so we follow that direction.

And so all notice was performed appropriately.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Can planning -- can planning help me understand how many single family homes are in our community that are currently nonowner

occupied.

>> I can try.

I think that there are approximately -- I'm just looking at numbers and trying to do quick math in my head, but roughly 3,000 nonowner occupied single family homes in the city.

>> Councilmember Song: So this is not a new issue to have non-occupied homes which I hope we can consider as the ADUs serving homes and folks looking to expand home options.

For me, the requirement for a home owner occupancy limits folks' ability to secure loaned and actually construct ADUs and this has been pointed out in a number of articles in the AARP study, sightline institute.

So if we are going to say that it's an impossible solution in the crisis, because of access to capital, then we have to acknowledge that this is a requirement that impedes access to those kind of loans.

So I will be voting in support of this ordinance and hopes that we can get more ADUs to everybody ongoing needs.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I mean, it's clear that the majority of the body that sits at this table is in favor of any and all development.

I have yet to see anything even questioned.

And, you know, that's all well and good.

What I guess I would ask -- I guess I can make it a formal request with a letter but my question is, is there some way that building and development can keep track of new ADUs and report back to city council.

The decisions we are making outside of a comprehensive land use plan process I think we deserve to consider what the efficacy of the changes to our zoning ordinances are.

I think we need feedback if this is working and the thing that supposed precipitated this text change to the ordinance, which does effectively act as a rezoning for 21,000 propertied, maybe not in word but in deeds needs to be evaluated.

We only have' handful of them and let's make it more open and more easy to bill and I just want to know what mechanisms do we need to put a mechanism into place, outside that wraps around this ordinance?

Or can we just have some way that they track this and report back to council in some timely manner?

Because otherwise, we are making decisions in the dark.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

I know that many neighborhoods have deed restrictions that two require greater setbacks than this ordinance is going to require.

Does the city have any access to the deed restrictions in the neighborhood with the city of Ann Arbor.

Are we aware of them or would we just wait until a neighbor possibility pointed out that this was a deed restriction?

And ADU?

And what I'm trying to avoid is people spent money on planning and even construction without knowing that there is a deed restriction on that property.

>> Yes, I can answer that.

The city is not party nor has any role in enforcing those deed restrictions.

That is the -- the challenge of that, though, is -- you will note that our current ADU ordinance does require a deed restriction.

That's a way for us to convey when a deed restriction similar to when they acknowledge any other deed restrictions.

We enforce the city's development regulations.

We don't have all the varying deed restrictions that apply uniquely to neighborhoods and subdivisions across the city.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Thank you.

I want to avoid any missteps or wasted funds in this process.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

For my part, I'm glad that this is going to be moving forward.

You know, I believe it will be -- it's a property to give homeowners the ability to have expand the -- the homeowners' ability to have an ADU.

It will expand housing choice within the city.

And I -- I expect it to be an incremental net positive.

Further discussion?

Poll call vote, please, starting with -- roll call vote, please, starting with me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: B-2, an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 9.8 Acres from TWP(Township), R1C (Single-Family) and R1A (Single-Family) to R4E With Conditions (Multiple-Family Dwelling District with Conditions), Valhalla Ann Arbor Conditional Rezoning, 31, 50, 57, 77, 97, 98, 107, 145, 147, 151, 155, 159, 163 Valhalla Drive and 2065 2099 South Main

Street.

Moved by Councilmember Disch.

Seconded by Councilmember Eyer.

Discussion, please, of b-2.

Mr. Lenart?

>> We did have a council question on this, I'm happy to address if that's okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Please.

Yes, thank you.

>> The question is I would like to request paid staff give council an explanation on the planning department position it has on the Valhalla rezoning for the agenda resolution for June 7.

Rezoning decisions incorporate a degree of discretion based on factors such as the master plan designation, current conditions of the site and area and other attributes of the project.

As a result, rezoning decisions such as this one can be considered in different views.

To there are proposal staff believed it was viable to consider other densities at this location, however, the proposed zoning and project scale deviated substantially from the master plan recommendations without evidence of changing conditions or substantial compliance with other master plan goals and objectives as the planning commission considered staff's recommendation and the petition, the rezoning application evolved where the planning commission made a favorable recommendation.

It's not frequent, but it is okay that staff and the planning commission to reach different conclusions, and based on their role as the recommending body to the city council, I would encourage you to elevate their recommendation at this time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

We have a lot of land issue here tonight and I'm sure the narrative will be painted in a way to make it seem as if I'm against all types of housing.

I'm just against the premises where this is, whether it's the preceding ADU ordinance or even this one.

We are skirting our responsibilities of revisiting master plan it's way overdue and there's very little interest or discussion by this body to -- to do that undertaking. And instead we are taking different parts and pieces that ultimately alter the land use plans for the entirety here we have something that staff had recommended something with 84 units and we're looking at something that is five and a half times denser than what staff has recommended that would be consistent with our land use.

And there's obviously some benefits to this project all electrification is definitely a plus.

That can happen at any density.

That doesn't happen at only 454 units.

There's severe traffic concerns.

The traffic patterns coming in and out of that development are irregular.

There's folks saying there's all sorts of amenities nearby.

There's own one shopping center that's within walking distance.

The receipt is a pretty big hike.

Any how, I'm not convinced that this is the best development for this site and that we have some goals of ours that are superseding our master plan and all of our other disciplines that we should have when we make decisions like this.

Again, I would support something with density that is in line with those recommended by staff, but in this case, I guess some may not choose to follow that advice.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

With all due respect, I don't think that it's this council body that has been delaying the master plan or the comprehensive land use plan.

That happened under the previous council.

We have certainly been advocating for that process to move forward.

I would like to perhaps -- I was on planning commission when this was approved.

And so I certainly want to note that we wrestled a great deal with this project and there was a fair amount of back and forth with the developer, the development team to work to improve it and it's no small addition that it will now be entirely electrified site, 454 units electrified is huge for our community and huge for our climate action goals.

We have to remember that we cannot require this of any development this is a voluntary addition, and so we would not get this likely out of many separate developments.

And what we can see even though this is not going to be all clean energy when it first comes in, we will have the ability to transition to that in the future and that is significant for our community.

I also want to speak to the process piece of this and the expectation of what might come out of this land use plan update.

At least as the previous discussion went, there aren't going to be -- the planning was not that they were going to be site specific recommendations that would be coming out of that process.

So I don't think that we could go through this -- when we begin this process, I don't think we come out the other side of it with a specific recommendation for this piece of property, what we are left with is a much more updated plan but I would hope and expect that we have some of the many values in the upcoming plan as we had out of our recent planning efforts particularly, or carbon neutrality and our transportation plan, which is -- much of which was planning commission was using to justify the support -- our support for this one, when we approved it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I actually used to live in this area, behind what was Mervin's and now Whole Foods and really enjoy being able to walk to the bush's that still remains there.

I knew the dry cleaner owner would support a lot of the pioneer musical

theater arts programs, covering scholarships for those who couldn't participate in them.

The amazing award-winning seven-time Grammy Award winning musical program at pioneer high school.

I -- I have spoken to Ann Arbor public schools.

It sounds like the appeal to attend an award winning school in music, arts and sports won't be -- it wouldn't diminish any time soon.

That school has produced Olympians, Broadway performers, including one who is currently starring on Netflix.

I'm sure we can point to a number of what used to be Ann Arbor high alumni who have distinguished themselves in our community.

I would move to see this as an opportunity for future families to be able to shop nearby, walk nearby, and work nearby and send their children to schools nearby.

And I hope that we can be a welcoming city.

We are part of the program in this state that makes itself as a welcoming city.

If we are the welcoming wagon, I hope we can vote in that manner tonight.

So I support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I will be fairly brief because I spoke at length about this project at a previous meeting and we heard from a lot of folks in the community who certainly pointed out a lot of the project benefits.

I will just say I will be supporting this project because I believe it will be a positive development for our community in many ways because we have a housing shortage in Ann Arbor, and because we need not just ones but thousands of new housing units I started my own personal deliberations of this development from can we make this work?

I spent many months researching this project, asking questions of staff and of the developer and talking with concerned residents.

All of the concerns raised have been addressed to my satisfaction and it's important to me to know that our city's public services, engineering and planning staff all say that our infrastructure will support this project.

Beyond providing much needed new housing units, this development supports many of our progressive initiatives in the city, including A2Zero, transit affordable and increased multimodal transportation.

As one caller rightly pointed out this is also exactly the type of area that the R4e designation was created for and last but not least, this development will provide much needed new tax revenue as we continue to face a structural budget deficit.

Personally, I want to say over the course of the last month, and the last few days I have communicated with many residents for and against this development.

As I said to voters many times during my campaign we may not agree on every issue but I will approach issues thoughtfully, be forthright in my reasoning and take actions that I believe are in the best interest of the city.

And for me, the Valhalla project fits that bill.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

I thought it was especially interesting the caller that pointed out, the concept of long-term planning, that we kind of make a patch work of decisions as a body and lack of holistic approach to our planning and rezoning decisions I think it was pretty accurate.

I think they hit the nail on the head there, that we do that a lot.

We do have a patchwork approach to long-term planning.

One things that has been pointed out by myself and others in the community, is, we fail to do any type of regional planning whatsoever.

Now this project is as close to Pittsfield township as it is anywhere else.

In all the essence -- in all of our projects we fail to do regional planning.

Has anybody asked Pittsfield what they think about that?

No, they are just going off and developing.

I think the future that some people see for our city and it's embodied in these plans that we always seem to refer to these, the A2Zero plan, the transportation plan and the affordable housing plan such as it is and for some reason we never talk about the comprehensive land use plan or master plan as informing our decisions but, you know, we keep referring to every other plan, and, you know this doesn't -- this meets them?

Some ways and it doesn't in other ways but all of those are regional plans and, you know, we are not thinking regionally.

The essence of it is that, you know, we are asking for 40 to 80,000 people to move to the city in the next ten years essentially doubling our permanent population and some people can't wait for that to happen and others are concerned about say, just for example, the capacity of our wastewater treatment facilities.

Setting that aside, I think it's an open secret that this was held up for a favorable council makeup and that's why it will pass tonight.

That's all well and good, but I don't think it's appropriate that it is when you go to 8, to 98, to 450 units and think nothing of it.

It's an eye opener for people.

They see what is happening to our community.

And, you know, university -- this offered a unique situation where the university completely surrounds this property and so they didn't file a formal complaint that would have triggered a supermajority vote.

And the folks who are just a little bit farther away couldn't either.

And so once again, as the caller said, the university is kind of turning a blind eye to the demand they have created in our supply and demand equation that is our housing -- part of our housing costs and so, you know, just dumping more in here may or may not resolve that.

3% affordable housing in this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Hayner: These items --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, I will speak a second time then.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I think that this is a really good example of why we have councilmembers who are elected from specific wards and hear the interests, and local interests. This is an area for people who maybe are not from ward 4 that has a number of township islands that will be developed in the near future. And because it is in my neighborhood, I have been able to visit a number of times and try to wrap my head around this number of units and I have also had a lot of thoughts about how this could possibly work and I think this is going to be an unfortunate situation where, of course, it will be framed as any opposition to 545 units is opposition to housing generally.

Even with a recommendation from staff for a more reasonable proposal.

I heard a couple of things from callers that if we don't make the housing units here, then people are driving in.

I think that ignores a basic reality about Ann Arbor which many of us should be aware of, our access to 94 and this location's access to 94 means that it also functions -- Ann Arbor functions as a bedroom community for other employment centers.

So pretend that every -- that everyone who finds housing in Ann Arbor is headed downtown is not very realistic.

We have no look at how the housing units will function.

How many people live in Ann Arbor and commute out.

My husband did before we started working from home.

Every one of these housing decisions, the decision about the number of units that will fit reasonably well in different conditions and different context and different situations, all of those decisions equate to being welcoming.

I mean, that's a wonderful word that has lovely positive connotations but it's not fair to apply that to a decision that really is based on a whole lot of facts on the ground.

It's not a warm -- facts on the ground.

It's not a warm fuzzy decision.

It is a decision that will have a huge impact and we have to take the decision seriously.

Mr. Postema, I don't want to extend this meeting any further about the idea of a member of our staff directly telling us and encouraging us to elevate the position of our volunteer commissions because as I see the reports that we get on our agendas, we are given a full range of information, reports from staff that are one perspective, reports from boards and commissions that are another perspective and we are asked to weigh those.

We are asked to weigh those and I do appreciate that there is movement afoot to take away our opportunity to weigh these issues and I just want to go out on a limb and say that I will oppose any effort like that, because this -- the last week for me has been an opportunity to hear from a whole lot of residents, who definitely wanted representation in ward 4 and they wanted to be heard.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I'm done.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Question for staff.

If the Valhalla project were to fail, at some point during the planning process, given that the zoning is r4e, what would be the max numb number of units by right without any extras such as electrification, affordable housing what is the maximum number of units for a vanilla r4e on that number of acres?

>> So regular r4e can be up to 75 units this would restrict to no more than 50.

I don't know the size of the lot, but that would just be a calculation based on how many acres up to 75 times that.

>> I was looking for that.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Isn't it like 9.6 acres, just under 10 acres?

>> If it was a 10-acre site, it would be a maximum of 750 units.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to know what is our risk, if this were to fail. What would another developer be allowed?

>> Well, I want to clarify the proposed rezoning that's being proposed here is r4e with conditions.

So the conditions that are being proposed would apply to the rezoning of the property, what that meaning is any comment project be it there one or another project would have to abide by those conditions.

So I want to be clear that by rezoning of nature, it wouldn't mean if another projects, it would be subject to the maximum of 50 dwelling units per acre.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I didn't hear.

>> It would be restricted to the maximum of 50 dwelling units per acre, the maximum height would be fully electrified and still require the affordable units and all the other items in the conditional zoning.

That's part of the zoning for the project.

So no project could occur without satisfying those.

>> Councilmember Griswold: And that includes the electrification?

>> That's correct.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: We saw signs that density is fun.

I think that should be a new catch phrase.

So I want to address a couple of conspiracy theories.

One, there's no movement afoot to get rid of council approval of rezoning.

And stop.

This -- this was not delayed due to getting a new council and some of these blanket statements about, you know there's just no matter what every development goes, it doesn't speak into the amount of work of the iterations of this project of the positives that we see today.

When we look at the concerns.

It was sent to residents to try to vote against that.

I what tonight Ms. Holland for sending that out.

Am I concerned about it on the golf course?

On the density?

No.

I think we heard a lot of great arguments of why it's appropriate.

Traffic.

That was rightly addressed.

We heard from callers.

Are we concerned about the building that the greet newcomers.

No, I'm not concerned about people looking at it.

I am excited having a child that goes to pioneer and plays field hockey, and she may be able to have classmates who can now walk across the street.

Some day or when my son goes there and go to that school and take advantage of what's in the area.

Because when I think of a welcoming community, I think of a place that gives variety of housing options where kids and families and others can take advantage but including families can take advantage of living in housing directly across the street from a couple of really terrific schools and -- and I want my own kids to go to school in a place where there are a variety of housing options around that school.

So I -- I'm enthusiastic about this, and really just think all the work from both the development side and the planning side that went into this.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks, I want to make a quick clarification based on what I heard earlier about why we don't we hear more about the land use plan. And we hear so much about the carbon neutrality plan and I want to make it clear to folks in the public and all of us that the master plan is a compilation of many documents, and resource documents and so when we talk about the master plan, we are not talking about specifically the land use element or one document. We're talking about a stack of many, many different plans that have been compiled over time.

And so it is both regional and very localized in nature and very specific depending on what those resource documents are.

One of the challenges and one of the reasons we want to update our master plan document is that there are some conflicts within it.

But then there's a lot of repeating themes as well and we want to make sure that moving forward, we're able to point to this document and have greater clarity both for ourselves and the public at large.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes, there are some conflicts in that.

That's why I suggested we take a look at it.

We had a council body who passed it without even questioning it, you might say when you take consideration of the our hears plan, the lower town plan, and that horse had left the barn approved a project complete out of recommendation with the platter plan.

We happily approved it with leaving that in there.

It's crazy how of date that was.

So finish what I was saying before when we have here is a developer that's asking for something outside of what typically through existing zoning or even a type of mild upzoning would be loud.

Yes, we don't have the right to demand developments but we can't require electrification, or green roofs, we can require some of them and we will talk about that with planned project modifications down the road here and TC-1 also.

If we are true to our plans like the A2Zero plan, that these things are not requirements they should be expectations of this body.

We should expect that somebody who is going to build a building especially residential housing in our community that they expect to stand past the year 2030, builds it in such a way that is consistent with those plans.

We can't ask them to, but we can't force them to.

It should be an expectation and we should be driving that expectation as a body that if your building is going to be standing after 2030, it needs to meet those 2030 goals.

And so things that come before us that don't should be given additional scrutiny. I think that's legitimate.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Hayner: And shovel ready projects if you want to Google cutting city council out of the loop.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: I took a quick look at spark's top regional employers. It was updated past January.

And of about the 30 major employers from the University of Michigan, all the way down to C.A.C. products almost half of them are in Ann Arbor.

So I think from what we under with how commuter destination city, we can expect demand for this particular type of housing to remain unchanged -- especially as part of our recovery from the pandemic.

I urge folks to take a look at this.

It ranges from General Motors, and u of m, and the public schools.

I think it's worth reminding us when we complain about traffic are mostly computer coming into town and it's worth to consider when we think about housing.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, starting with me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Db-1, Resolution to Approve Valhalla Ann Arbor Site Plan and Development Agreement, 31, 50, 57, 77, 97, 98, 107, 145, 147, 151, 155, 159, 163 Valhalla Drive and 2065, 2099 South Main Street.

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Councilmember Eyer.

Discussion of db-1.

Following up briefly on this, I didn't say anything about that, first I wanted to touch briefly.

On the second, I would say that this has been a topic of a fair bit of conversation. You know, to council and the community, and I honor and respect that.

I believe, our that this will be a net positive for the community both the proximate community and the community as a whole.

Ann Arbor does need housing.

And this will provide housing in an area that's fairly far away from other residents it's an area that's suitable for dense zoning and I'm incredibly excited by the -- by the extent to which this hits our A2Zero goals.

It shows that it can be done and it ought to be done whenever we can attain it.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: We talked about children living in these units and I'm just wondering what are the plans for accommodating children in this type of dense housing?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Kowalski, staff.

>> Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

Do you have a second question?

Okay.

I could say there is a playground that's planned.

They have some play ground equipment as part of the review of the project.

We look through -- parks -- excuse me, parks looked at, this and they look at play equipment and general location and goals like that.

They did look at it and they are proposing a small play area.

It's towards the center of site on the eastern side, in front of one of the larger buildings on the eastern side.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Oh, okay.

Thank you.

The reason why I'm asking this question, is we had issues with different building types over the decades and probably the most extreme would be the south side of Chicago where we know that that high-rises are not conducive to a healthy childhood.

And so I hope that that's being considered.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Db- 2, resolution to Adopt the Ann Arbor Moving Together Towards Vision Zero City of Ann Arbor Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Moved by and Griswold.

Discussion of db-2.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: This is really an exciting evening given that we have been talking about vision zero for many years and I have been talking about it for it seems like a decade.

So this is really a data-driven plan.

Which is exactly what we need.

I feel that some of.

Detail in the actual plan which is very cutesy and has all types of little people and is somewhat aspirational.

I'm somewhat concerned about that.

But I'm willing to pass it.

Let's focus on the data and let's realize that streets are not playgrounds.

The streets are extremely dangerous.

The fatality rate is up.

And we can pretend that this is not the's.

I get the impression that we are not taking it as seriously as we should.

And my other comment is in going some research, we talked about the need to be equitable and complaint based systems such as streetlights that are out or overgrown vegetation are not equitable.

Certain communities feel much more comfortable complaining lodging a complaint that there's a streetlight out or there's vegetation blocking a crosswalk sign and visibility.

So if we are going to have an equitable community, then we need to be proactive in those areas and I know that there's a mention about visibility at crosswalks.

I hope that's interpreted more broadly than just lighting at the crosswalk.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

This is another thing that's likely to pass.

That's fine.

When I add up everything that's in this plan and I take a look at what's in the C.I.P. that approving this plan is committing to about \$750 million of transportation infrastructure revisions over the next eight to ten years.

And so I think it's important that somebody says that number out loud.

That's what it adds up to in our C.I.P. right now and that's what the plan focuses on and so that's a big commitment, it's three-quarter of a billion dollars over the next decade, and, you know, by such means do we go seeking increases in tax revenue.

And I think some parts of this are excellent and I think some parts of this will be shocking to people try to implement, like additional fees for driving in certain parts of city.

I don't know what people will make of that and I don't know how we really consider implementing that and so I imagine as councilwoman Griswold said, many of these things are aspirational, not necessarily practicable or practical. You can go ahead and move forward with this, but it's a commitment to something that unfortunately likely never to happen, unfortunately when we don't have a federal commitment to things like Europe does at changing the shape of vehicles in our community.

And various safety standards like that.

There's a lot in here.

I wish it would be successful.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

I share Councilmember Griswold's excitement for this plan and completely concur that in many ways our streets are dangerous, and that is what our this plan is aiming to improve.

The reality is that we have built streets that have steeps that are too high and often too wide and encourage behavior that we don't want to see.

And so this plan may be pretty, which I think is a good thing if we want people to read it, and read through it.

Depending on how aspirational it is.

I think we demonstrated a strong commitment to taking it seriously in our budgeted option at our last meeting.

We allocated additional resources.

We're not previously committed how we are in this coming fiscal year.

I hope to see that year after year.

I don't know if Councilmember Hayner's calculations are correct in terms of C.I.P.

I think that C.I.P. may shift as we move forward and we start putting in additional elements incorporated into this plan.

In terms of the commitment, yes, it's a commitment to best practices.

It's a commitment to what our community wants and I hope and I'm excited to see us beginning to implement it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

I'm really glad this will be moving forward.

Obviously it reflects a great deal of work from our volunteers at the transportation commission and I thank them for it.

We also hear time and time again that folks want to be able to get around our community same live outside of the car, whether it's as a cycle lift or as a pedestrian, it plays such an important role in our life.

It will help us in our carbon neutrality and A2Zero goals and I'm proud that we will be able to have an operationalizable document.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would be remiss if I didn't talk about something that my constituents asked me to talk about.

When we look for equity.

When we look for I can wit across our plans -- equity across our plans and actions that we seem to continually bend towards a youthful vigor when it comes to transportation.

I mean just to be frank, somebody said that they read through this entire plan and they found it to be very ageist.

They don't have -- they can't ride a bike to work.

They can't walk to work.

They have transportation needs that require a vehicle or a fan with a lift or another consider and I would encourage us to keep in mind that not everybody in Ann Arbor is a 24-year-old recent graduate who wants to ride a bike.

Nor can everyone in Ann Arbor ride a bike or walk.

As we narrow down the cars I expect that there will be considerations to those who have needs to have a motor vehicle, electric or otherwise in our city, that's elderly and folks with ADA considerations, the service industries and things like that.

I think we need to keep an open mind that vehicles will not give away, no matter how much we live in a vehicle-free Utopia.

I want to put that out in front of the public that we need to watch our ageism when we move these plans forward.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I would like to try to be clear.

This was not developed as an ageist or ableist plan.

It was very much developed with equity in mind.

In a Valhalla rye of different ways.

This is not about becoming a car-free utopia.

Many folks will continue to drive.

And it's about giving freedom to folks and create a safe environment for people to walk and bike and have a safe environment.

It's about accommodating multiple users.

It's building out our system, to fit more of our community.

In terms of equity, the second biggest cost in folk's households beyond housing, transportation.

And so when we improve the transportation network, we are hitting our

transportation goaled.

When we think about the road diets and the federal highway driver.

Who they impact the most are the senior drivers.

The road reconfiguration -- I don't need to return to previous projects but they will help to benefit our elderly drivers, oftentimes the most because they are the ones that are -- when we look at the data overall, most likely to have crashes in certain -- for certain crash irrelevant shoes.

So I think this will impact and help everybody in our community from those who find that they need to drive to those who would like to leave their cars at home.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, I just want to focus on key mobility strategy number five, enhanced mobility at uncontrolled crosswalks.

I want to acknowledge that staff did provide illumination at one of the crosswalks.

I was south of the state for a few days driving back home after midnight and it's like, oh, my goodness, there are lights there now!

So it was a good welcome home.

However, we have to realize that we had ten years of at streetlight moratorium.

And we haven't recovered from that staff was spending additional money trying to make that up.

They are not doing this year and I agreed with that.

However, we turned around and took at \$100,000 out of you are budget.

So we can't have these strategies and for the of field good feelings if we don't put the money where the -- on the strategies and we still have -- I can't get the number from staff yet -- we have many extremely dangerous crosswalks where we have no illumination within 100 feet.

This is not the case in most communities.

They just don't even do this.

So sorry to end on a negative note, but we paid half a million dollars for this plan and I think we will implement it and it's data drive and that means illumination for our crosswalks.

Thank you.

Further discussion?

>> Mayor Taylor: I will say by quick of with regret, I neglected to thank staff.

Nothing we do at the city -- and I say we in scare quotes.

Nothing that we do in the city doesn't include staff front and center and so I would be remiss and was remised by omitting my thanks to Mr. Hess, Mr. Lenart and Mr. Crawford as well.

Thank you.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.
>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.
>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.
>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: C-1, An Ordinance to Amend Section 8:530 of Chapter 105 (Housing: Entry to Show Premises and Time for Rental Agreements) of Title VIII (Building Regulations) of the Ann Arbor City Code.

Moved by Radina and Nelson.

Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I'm going to ask to postpone this to the second meeting in July, but before -- before that, I guess I just want to acknowledge how many people we heard from and how important this issue is, and I want to say that we heard from people who are currently renting who had previously rented who are homeowners who are tenants, we are heard from a whole lot of people and this is an issue that matters and it's an issue that we recently have started to talk about in the right to renew, which is somewhat different than the original ordinance that we were planning to amend.

And the right to review and just cause for eviction is a policy that's been implemented in a number of places all across the country and so the task of pulling together all the different moving parts of how it works in other places. I got help from all kinds of legal advocates, from organizations outside of our city hall.

So I am looking for looking forward to come forward something more substantive in the second meeting in July.

And I want to thank everybody who has worked with me on this.

Councilmember Radina, of course, the folks at G.O., C.S.G., I have had conversations with Jennifer Hall.

I've exchanged emails and gotten information from Avalon, legal services at the University of Michigan, that's just a lot of balls in the air, I guess.

And currently Burlington, Vermont, is actually working on this right now.

So we are in good company to be contemplating a policy like this and I look forward to further discussion.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thanks.

-- actually Councilmember Nelson said most of what I needed to say anyway. I wanted to say thank you to everyone who is reaching out and contributing to this conversation.

Obviously Councilmember Nelson for the significant amount of work that she's put into this so far.

I think that we are moving in the right direction and -- but there's still some work

to do and hopefully we can finalize this and bring something back relatively soon, but -- but, yeah, I wanted to echo the thanks and the continued engagement open this and I hope we can bring something back relatively soon that will be more substantive for us to discuss.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to say I made contact with a number the student organizations about this and I was really impressed with the efforts they made to determine a proper number and I think if we have been monitoring our mailbox, I think we were a little bit confused by some of the communications that we got, like, oh, yeah, sure, 240 days will be fine.

That's mid-March.

Which it isn't.

And, in fact, they acknowledged to me, yeah, we weren't county when we endorse -- weren't counting when we endorsed that.

They reached the 210 number that the I don't think was on the resolution that was on the agenda.

I was assuming that Councilmember Nelson was going to amend that or something.

And that for them represents a sweet spot that works really well for undergraduate and graduate students.

We had one landlord call in and say that it would work well for him tonight.

I'm hoping that we can have a process if we have got this extra time with this amendment, I'm hoping that we can have more land lord speaking up about this and not causing too much of a problem if they feel that way.

Because it's important that we have some stakeholder support here as much as possible.

And I want to reflect because the students -- the undergrads whom I spoke with did emphasize this to me, that they feel very urgent about having this relief in place in the fall, so if the just cause eviction provision is going to tank the entire ordinance, I think they would prefer to divide the question.

So my two cents.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi, if we are going to postpone this, perhaps we can postpone it.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: To the postponement and it piggybacks on what Councilmember Disch just spoke to, the fact that we would like to have something in place before the return of the students this fall.

I guess this may be a question for our legal staff whether pushing this to July 19th as a first reading given the needed for a second reading in the publication of any changes, et cetera, are we in danger of not having something that could go into effect for the fall semester of '21?

>> Potentially, you have your first reading and then your second hearing, you will have a public hearing.

And then it will be ten days after the publication which is a couple days.

We just ran into this tension a little bit in the third-party delivery if you remember that.

It will be close.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: The current ordinance, based on the fact that it already has the -- the tenant is already protected by 70 days to begin with, they will still be protected with those first 70 days.

So if there is an ordinance change, we are -- we still are working with 70 days into that lease that was signed in August?

>> Right.

Some of the leases are the middle or end of --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Why don't we -- I know it's a moving target.

But it is -- we are running against the clock, I would just say to the sponsors.

And others.

That hopefully we can come to some sort of consensus on dates and days so that this can go into effect to give the relief that many of us want for folks who are dealing with this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Agree.

There's numerous times to get into this effectiveness.

Is there a reason that you are hoping for the second meeting in July, versus the first meeting in July?

Is there could we do this a little quicker?

>> It's not yet -- to my recollection, a motion to postpone made.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: To Councilmember Briggs' point, I'm basing this timeline on how quickly we have moved thus far.

I think that's a realistic timeline, the second meeting in July.

I -- we -- well, it's just based on the number of weeks that I have been making.

I would formally like to make a motion to postpone to the second meeting in July.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded by?

Councilmember Radina of the discussion postponement.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is postponed.

C-2, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 112 (Non-Discrimination), Section 9:151 Title IX of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor to Add Definition of Race to Include Prohibition Against Race-Based Hair Discrimination.

Moved by Councilmember Radina, seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion of c-2.

Councilmember Radina?

>> Councilmember Radina: I prepared a little bit.

I wanted to start by thanking all the black community leaders who participated in weighing on this ordinance to all the cosponsors who weighed in and contributed as well and also to the human rights commissioners who had a really great robust discussion on this and for their unanimous support as well.

This ordinance amendment would add local to prohibit race-based hair discrimination.

The language that I'm proposing tonight nearly mirrors the language by Sarah and others at the state level, to Michigan's Elliott-Larsen's Civil Rights act. It's nearly identical language to that, that's been adopted by the United States and other local governments throughout the country.

And the reason that this is important is BIPOC people are disproportionate that single out natural hair styles this includes discrimination, especially in the workplace.

In 2019, a research study was conducted by the crown coalition and dove which found some fairly concerning trends.

Black women are 30% more likely to be made aware of formal workplace appearance policies.

80% of black women express the need to change their hair from its natural state to fit in at work.

Black women were one and a half times more likely to be sent home from work because of their hair.

And black women's hair was 3.4 times more likely to be perceived as unprofessional.

Just in the last couple of months.

We saw a high-profile case here in Michigan that demonstrated after a 7-year-old biracial young girl was sent home from school when she had her curly unsymmetrical haircut by a staff member without parental permission.

This will hopefully provide a boost and momentum to the amend Elliott-Larsen.

I hope you join me to support this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion, Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you ever.

And thank you to Councilmember Radina and others for bringing this forward and the human rights commission who does much of this heavy lifting and lengthy meetings.

When it comes to complaints and enforcement, I know our human rights commission takes up those.

Are there other things that members of our community should lodge complaints and enforcement on this ordinance change?

And what are the consequences for violating this ordinance?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema.

>> City Atty. Postema: I would have to get the exact language up.

As far as other places they can go besides this certainly if it's work based, there are provisions in the Michigan Civil Rights Act and there's other avenues for complaints but within the city, again I don't have the exact language but like all of our human rights ordinances a violation can be investigated and prosecuted through our office and through, you know, referrals here.

The human rights commission does a good job of taking complaints and they resolve complaints that have been out there and they can also look at it in first instance, but they can refer it here and it can be prosecuted, yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And now Councilmember Radina talked about residents of our community.

Does this protect employees, many of our employees obviously do not live in Ann Arbor that.

Protects them as well, correct?

>> City Atty. Postema: Yes.

The exact find is \$500 a day.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Okay.

Thank you for answering those questions and giving that information out to the public.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I was wondering if the sponsors wanted to respond or mention about -- we had received, I think maybe one letter around expanding this to religious discrimination, and specifically around sort of headdresses and things like that, but if they were any thoughts on that, if the commission discussed it at all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina?

>> Councilmember Radina: Yeah, thank you, Councilmember Briggs.

I already forwarded that recommendation along to the human rights commission. My suggestion was not to try to amend this on the fly tonight, because obviously with ordinance changes we want to make sure the attorneys have time to review but also with it being a -- specifically religious head wear, things like that, it would likely fall under a different definition section of the nondiscrimination ordinance and to Councilmember Ramlawi's point as well, I think to the extent that there may be other avenues this is why I will use my public platform to encourage the state to adopt an amendment to Elliott-Larsen as well to make sure that this protection is passed statewide and the state's Civil Rights commission has a lot more authority with this.

So I hope that we can -- we can help lead that change.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Can I be added as a cosponsor, please?

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

For my part, I'm delighted this will be moving forward.

This is obviously an area that we should be taking action on and I'm glad we will be doing it and this is also too a set of protections that ought to be made at the state level and Councilmember Radina's hope that this provides some momentum for that important effort.

Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

Dc -- pardon me.

C-3, an Ordinance to Add Sections 5.12.9 and to Amend Sections 5.15, 5.16.3, 5.17.4 and 5.20.4 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

New zoning district, TC1 transit corridor.

Moved by Disch.

We had a couple of questions on this matter.

Mr. Lenart.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Mr. Lenart, you have the com.

Or would.

>> Clerk Beaudry: He's coming over now.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> You will all be so proud to know I was actually just talking into my computer without being part of your meeting.

Equipments were why do we implement these amendments without first determining requirements or sustainability, and public open space.

Would we determine those were requires before we apply the zoning to specific areas of city this is there any conceivable situation where we would apply this zoning anywhere without first determining those requirements and incentives and wait to see what gets built and realize we have incentivized terms or open space and how long would it take to contemplate these ideas and compose recommendations for what would be required or incentivized?

So the proposed ordinance staff and the planning commission does achieve sustainable and affordable development without specific quotas or incentives it would eliminate minimum parking lots and both potential to reduce that could translate to lower rental or sales costs, and revise the mechanism for new investment in previously under developed corridors.

These are impervious areas that are existing and would exist on existing transit corridors which would accelerate the costs.

Towards sustainability goals.

If this were directed, I would estimate a six month time frame for us to bring back more specific incentives or targets.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Discussion?

Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: So this week -- council has been talking about and looking at transit corridors for a while.

The ordinance that we have in front of us -- or the -- yep.

-- it responds in many ways to concerns that were raised earlier.

So the proposed ordinance contains -- includes a height minimum that requires buildings to be at least two-stories high.

Currently this district is by request of the developer.

It is not fixed in certain areas of the city, like d1 and d2 are.

It's located along corridors that have frequent bus service now and can accommodate additional buses as the user base expands.

It aims to encourage infill development and promote housing development in areas of the city that cannot command the kinds of rent that the downtown market allows at least not currently.

I like to think of this ordinance as taking us out of the era of strip malls and into an era of corridors that are interesting to walk along.

And in the specific response to one the major concerns to the earlier version of this ordinance, this one provides for graduated height restrictions that require lower height the closer a development is to a residential neighborhood.

I won't specify what those are because you can all read them.

I have wanted to let you know that I expect to bring a resolution when we look at this again and that resolution will ask staff to look specifically at the state and Eisenhower area.

And -- well, that's all I will say and if -- well, no, that's fine.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Questions on parking, as we can have a very circular argument as to the future of automobiles, I don't really want to go down that rabbit hole, but I do believe they will be around long after the internal combustion engine is long gone.

That welcome said, how do we calculate the parking maximums?

What will be used and I apologize that this is somewhere else.

But how will the parking maximums be calculated?

>> So two ways.

Parking maximums for some uses are specified in our ordinances where we provide minimums and maximums and in those circumstances, they will set that level and then in the case of residential units this proposed district also sets some overall limits based on the number of the units on a per unit basis, I think it's .5 spaces per residential unit.

I'm looking at Alexis to tell me if I'm wrong.

Other ones would point to existing standards in our code and drop away the minimum requirements that are currently specified for those uses.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Drop them to zero or --

>> We would drop the minimum.

We won't prohibit -- we are not setting a minimum number of parking spaces.

We are saying that you don't have to provide parking for those uses but you can't go among the specified maximums that our ordinance already designated.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, it will be interesting to see how this unfolds and plays out once the rubber hits the pavement.

My concern with this is the issues we see in other parts of our city where you have development, and people still choose to drive or own automobiles.

Maybe they don't have available space where they are living or maybe they are just trying to save a few bucks and not buy the additional parking permits that are required to park their car where they live and you have the external costs borne by the surrounding neighborhood and residents.

I feel as this goes forward, we'll need a much stronger program when it comes to residential parking permits and enforcement and so on.

I think that's going to be undue consequences, unintended.

And that's a big one.

As much as we said earlier tonight, we would like to be more like our European

counterparts and not drive such big and massive cars and have two per household, that will be a hard habit to break.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: So that is my concern going forward.

I will be supporting this tonight, thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: It's worth passing on to a second reading.

For the second reading, we should have the definitions in order.

When you look at the allowed permitted or special exceptions.

We see if someone wants to take up tc1 as a use -- I mean, this is here nor, there ADUs are not allowed but if someone wants to take up a tc1 that office is not allowed, a restaurant bar and retail a restaurant bar and food tales are not allowed.

How do we make up mixed use when they are not allowed.

Those are exempted.

Blank cell means not allowed in that district.

To suggest that restaurant, bar is not part of the mixed use.

This is sort of a broadcasting of this.

This is not a transit hub.

With we have not necessarily coordinated with our transit providers.

We have zero foot and zero setbacks.

I don't find it comfortable as a pedestrian myself.

I think it removes the future use of microtransit.

Where do you go?

Only into the roadway.

And I have concerns about the mixed use definitions which is any two uses and the same percentage and we can have 99.96 residential and .004% nail salon or something.

And so I have concerns about this.

I will vote to pass it on to the next reading but I expect to bring concrete answers in the uses and the changes with me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

>> Did you have your hand up?

>> I wanted to clarify that a lot of those uses are dully permitted in the tc1, I don't know if for some reason the pdf version wasn't reflecting that correctly, but I'm looking at the version and the legistar packet right now but those uses, we are happy to follow-up and clarify with you the uses that are included in that zoning district.

>> Yeah, like page 14 pulled from today's packet doesn't show several.

That's one cam.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes, there's no --

>> Page 14 is the accessory use table.

There are more of that but the primary use of retail is included in the primary use

table and that's a permitted use.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Why is it not part of that.

>> It's almost like a downtown setting, and you don't have the flexibility to set up sidewalk sale tents for those properties.

I'm sorry.

I know the vote just occurred but I wanted to clarify that.

I will follow up on clarification on the use table.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Beaudry, do you want clarification on something?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Sorry, mayor.

I was letting you know that council Griswold has alerted me that she's not feeling well and she's signing out for the night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

I'm not sure I completed the vote.

All in favor of c -- what number is this, c-3, please, say aye.

Opposed?

It is approved.

C-4, An Ordinance to Amend Sections 5.18.3, 5.18.4, 5.17.3, 5.37.2.A and 5.37.2.S, to Add Sections 5.19.6 and 5.33.6, and to Repeal Sections 5.30.1 and 5.30.4.B of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Disch and seconded by song.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to say that I'm proposing an amendment to this ordinance that will add a payment in lieu option to the affordable housing component of the ordinance.

I circulated the amendment language in advance and I will read it here.

So I will read what is in it and then with the proposed amendment and the added language, the amended language begins with the word "or."

This is affordable housing component when and where 15% of all the dwelling units or 15% of all floor area is devoted to affordable housing dwelling units, amended language, or when a payment in lieu has been made to the affordable housing fund in the rate or the amount established by resolution of the city council.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Grand.

Is that friendly to the body?

I'm deeming that friendly to the body.

Thank you, Councilmember Disch.

You still have the floor.

>> Councilmember Disch: Thank you.

I would like to discuss my amendment, but where are my notes on that?

>> Mayor Taylor: The amendment has been adopted.

You may discuss it if you wish.

>> Councilmember Disch: Oh, right.

Oh, but now we're talking about the motion as amended.

The motion as amended.

Right.

So I wanted to explain to you why I'm doing that and I do not know why those notes disappeared, but I should be able to find them.

Yep.

Got it.

Okay.

So we -- this amendment is motivated by two desires.

One is to ensure the strategies that we are using as a city for affordable housing units are serving the vulnerable and needs and the land use is aligning with and advance D.E.I. goals.

We need to be able to see whether the units that we're getting through private development, the affordable units we are getting through private development are helping us become more or less diverse and inclusive and to understand who in particular gets included and excluded by the private developer units.

And now it's hard to make an Ed-based assessment of that -- evidence-based assessment of that because we collect a lot less data on the developer than we do on the publicly funded units.

But to give good measure of how the two compare, based on the data that we have available from beakman and the city club apartments we can say that these developments are providing a benefit, they are designated to serve people at 60% of the area median income which is about \$44,000 a year, and but in contrast, the city's publicly funded affordable housing and in addition driven like Avalon serves significantly higher numbers of households with extremely low incomes and extremely low income is half of 60%, and it's up to 30% A.M.I.

So we are serving more vulnerable and special needs populations and there's some other crucial measures but I bet I'm running out of time and I will stop and let you all chat.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

I appreciate you bringing this change, councilwoman Disch and I think it's necessary to nail this stuff down.

When we talk about the rate or the amount establishes by resolution of council, we need to bring that forward post-haste, I assume, right?

And establish that rate, and I would just urge us when we do establish that rate, to recognize that -- I mean I'm not a super big fan of saying affordable housing or sustainability, because it's -- it's -- it is likely -- I don't like to pit those two things against each other because we need them both but to speak to the affordable housing portion of it because that's open there tore interpretation by resolution of city council that, you know we have private housing, it has an effect on the market.

We can ask private development through plan project modifications to provide affordable house or payment in lieu, and the social housing that we build as a city is the other effort that we make to come up with affordable housing.

And that needs money, of course, and there's your payment in lieu.

I would say is not necessarily be one or the other and it could be both.
When we consider what that resolution would be we should say private housing can be built because there's a benefit to have it actually built and existing, although as we saw with beakman it made it extraordinarily difficult, and the rules around it allowed the leasing agent to pick and choose from the list of qualified tenants.

And so Jen hall rightly says she would rather have the money to affect social housing through her programs and they are both good.

I think a third choice is either, or, and, right?

And so and could be both.

We could say you can build some because then we have immediate benefit.

We can point to it and say something has been built and you can also make a contribution to the housing commission.

I wanted to add that in there saying we don't need to be so binary on issues that it may be all three.

Thank you for bringing this forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Lenart, do you have a contribution?

>> I do, thank you, Mayor Taylor, and Councilmember Hayner.

The city council has adopted that payment calculation.

That's a calculation that the city council may revisit.

The current rate adopted is \$126 per square foot.

>> Councilmember Hayner: And that's completely up to our discussion to change in the future.

>> Correct.

We have several items that point to the U.D.C.

As council updates that has applicability to all the different sections that reference it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

I'm excited to see this coming forward.

I think the planning projects will be improved by the greater clarity of our investment in terms of our objectives.

I'm hoping when this comes back to us for second reading that if there's any concerns that staff may have around this language, it may come to us.

I know we debated back and forth around the benefits of having affordable units.

I think there's -- we have heard over and over again the payments in lieu.

I'm very excited if that's direction that we can be headed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Since Brett spoke to, you said the payment in lieu, \$126.

What is the unit again?

>> So we do it in two ways because depending on some zoning we do floor area ratio.

And then we would apply it on a floor area.

When we convert it to units we simply determine what the average size of units is

and that's the residential units.

We would multiply that per square foot factor by that unit size.

So we use that same formula to apply to both our zoning units that are units per acre and they are regulated by floor area ratio where we don't -- where the development review is not based on a cap or limit of number of units.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And that number has stayed static at 126?

>> It stayed static for a long time prior to that.

I think the last time it was adopted prior to that was 2007.

So 2007 to 2019, it was stagnant and so 2019 was the last update to it.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And there's no annual increase?

>> It could be done on whatever frequency that council elected to do so.

The office of economic development.

Their aspiration is to do it on a more frequent basis.

They want to bring an update to last year's consideration to the city council.

I don't know specifically but probably in the next two to three months, perhaps.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I wanted to provide more background to this.

This came out of a conversation that I had with Jennifer Hall.

Where when I usually ask her is there anything I can do for you.

And she said, actually, there's this one thing.

So Councilmember Disch and Mr. Lenart and Ms. DeLeo and Mr. McDonald and I were able to meet about this, knowing that these revisions were coming forward it just seemed the right confluence of things to come together.

You should be able to get some legal advice if you need it, because we had this discussion.

So thanks for the question.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

Dc-1, resolution to Appoint Kristen Schweighoeffer to the Housing Board of Appeals.

Moved by Councilmember Hayner.

Seconded by Ramlawi.

Discussion of DC-1.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks I will be real brief and say I had the pleasure of sitting on many, many meetings with Kristen because she sits out as a county official.

She's chaired that group for a while.

I have a lot of respect for her perspective on public health matters and I can only hope it will serve us well on the housing board of appeals.

And so I appreciate her putting her name out there to serve.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-2, resolution Establishing a Council Subcommittee for the Purpose of Studying and Setting Parameters for a Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Program for the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Ramlawi and seconded by Hayner.

Discussion of DC-2.

>> Councilmember Hayner: We didn't get into this too much.

The essence of this is many communities take a look at this.

It serves various purposes.

One is to create a better understanding of the relationship of nonprofit entities with the community.

It's a good way to understand and tout the benefits that nonprofits serve in our community, even while they own property that is tax exempt, and so many of these benefits are direct, outside of paying taxes, or indirect in another way, but either way, I think it's an opportunity for those benefits to be recognized.

It also has the potential to provide some level of much needed tax revenue and it's something I have been looking at for quite a while.

It's a good project, it won't take away from anybody ago time especially and it's something we can take a look at and see if it's a fit for our community as it has been for others.

I think this is wholly appropriate in some of the public comments we received today about some nonprofit entities in our community being involved in our -- being involved in our community and creating benefits.

This is in related payment in lieu of taxes.

They exist in the -- there's the PILT, they pay for tax exempt lands and it has a greater impact in rural counties but Washtenaw County does receive PILT, and it's not without precedent in our greater metro area.

We're asking for a couple of my council colleagues to sit down for a few meetings with our assessor, ironically city administrator and anyone else who is interested and have this conversation.

So it's that, and it's pretty straightforward, and I would appreciate your support.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: You know in perhaps different times, I would be somebody who would be really interested in sitting on such a committee, but I have a I appreciate the postpone to read through the links and I learned a lot.

I have a some significant concerns about how the resolution is put record right now, one being the timeline which is to produce this report by October 18th.

I think that given the priorities facing our community right now and where we should be having staff spend their time this seems like an ambitious timeline.

And given that this would be a voluntary program to bring this forward right now in times where our biggest nonprofits is facing really significant cuts and with our nonprofits struggling from the pandemic, it doesn't feel like the sort of a partnership approach.

It's not typical to have a long timeline on something but I can understand the fact

that you never get anywhere unless you good et cetera started if this was a couple year timeline I think that's really long but sometimes you get to move forwards something.

It would make more sense and we would make our way towards that and maybe the economy would be a little bit better and we would be in a better place to have discussions with our community partners to this.

This doesn't feel like the right time to move forward on something like there.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I share Councilmember Briggs' concerns and I concern about staff's time being allocated to an effort that -- that at my core I think I'm fairly pragmatic about things and it just doesn't strike me given some of the other priorities that we have as a city, which are many that I really want staff chasing at this particular windmill right now.

So I think it -- I will while appreciate the intent I just don't think this makes sense to support it at that time.

I don't see any differences from the last resolution.

I know it was just a postponement but there were some questions that were raised that weren't answered as well but mostly even looking ahead to DC-5 and some of the opportunities for known funding that's coming down the pike, I would rather see staff focusing there.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate my colleagues' concerns on how we direct staff.

We have a bare bones organization, but I don't think that right now with what we know should be a deterrent.

I know Mr. Crawford in the last meeting used the word "significant" and we weren't sure as to what the word meant, "significant."

I know we can work around some other things simply by moving and amending the recommendation to council, pushing that back a couple months.

I believe that something like this will take many months, if not years to enact.

This is putting together a task force to look at the pitfalls associated with this.

We're not taking action.

This is an exploratory phase of a program that would be around for many, many years.

One no cost to the city, other than looking into it.

So I'm kind of shocked to hear the pushback on this considering the financial outlook of our city, the structural deficit.

We are told the way to fix that is just build, build, build.

You know, there's more than one way to skin this cat.

So Mr. Crawford, could you elaborate how much staff time would be required?

>> City Admin. Crawford: It really depends on how deep you go.

If you look at the model like they did in Cambridge, that will take some time.

Developing a program would take some time and conversations with the entities.

I would envision it taking, you know, a couple weeks' worth of time of an

individual spread out.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And if I elaborate can it be done in phases. Can we scratch the surface to get a better understanding of what the total commitment would be if we want to go into it further rather than committing all that up front?

>> I'm sorry, Tom, if I could speak for you or with, if I could.

Staff has done some research, partly directed by the state's jacks commission as mandated that we identify tax exempt parcels.

Staff has initiated a land value analysis, and we have completed that 500s, and it's spread out throughout this task year to identify the building values for the tax exempt parcels.

There's 894 parcels in city of Ann Arbor.

And I can break it out if quick detail.

U.S. government has 14, state of Michigan has nine, parks 23, and cemeteries are two.

Miscellaneous 123, Ann Arbor schools 49.

Churches 109, Ann Arbor city, 209, pilot parcels similar to Avalon, 84, county 19, University of Michigan, 254.

So we would take staff time scattered throughout this tax year to identify using resourced available from other departments and the taxpayers themselves to get a high level idea of what the insured value of the domains are and then more driven down and the actual value would be.

We anticipate being done if we follow our aggressive schedule to get a decent idea of what the building values are.

Thank you, Tom, for letting me speak.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, Jerry.

>> City Admin. Crawford: So that's the state tax question.

Driven work for all places but if I understand Councilmember Hayner's, the entities can describe what their benefit is to the community, that is an offset to this.

You have to understand what their ability -- their ability to implement is very different than just the high level what's math going to be, right?

What could it be is not really what it could be when you factor in -- the likelihood of getting the monies and the difficulties in processes to get it.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I want to thank Mr. Markey for laying it out.

The essence was it would on the required work.

We have been fortunate in the staff level.

We had a couple of excellent assessors in my time here at city council.

I have learned so much from Mr. Perry prior to this and Mr. Markey also.

So thank you for that.

This is a political component but it's really a study of what makes up our community.

Folks have had a -- I'm asking for a council subcommittee, a couple of us sit down and we follow the work that Mr. Markey and ors are doing.

They might not be done until next spring.

So perhaps I can amend and to strike the October report back and just say sometime in 2022, for all I care.

I want to get going on this.

I don't want to chase staff down and force staff to meet deadlines.

It's a conversation we should be having as a community.

I would move to amend this resolution to strike the ported hey back and have the words sometime in 2022.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Ramlawi S. that friendly to the body?

>> Councilmember Grand: Mayor, no, it's not to me, because I -- I -- part of my concern is that the parameters are not fully thought out here.

So I'm not okay with just some time in 2022.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

Discussion of the amendment?

Perhaps a vote on the amendment?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Can I make an amendment to the amendment?

>> Mayor Taylor: You have the floor.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: A more date specific, like March 31st, 2022.

Is there a second to the amend to the amendment.

Is that friendly to the body?

Is that amended amendment friendly to the body?

The amended amendment is friendly to the body.

The motion now refers to March 31, 2022.

Further discussion of the main motion?

>> Clerk Beaudry: That was March 31st.

>> Mayor Taylor: Correct.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

And I understand using precious staff time.

One that we have not explored and the work is going to be with what will be done anyhow.

I really feel this is an opportunity to try to look under every stone and try to find what we can in order to benefit our community and organization and I do think that this is a worth while effort.

I hope there's enough support on this body to move this forward.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I still have concerns.

With we looked at other task forces.

Who will serve on it.

How many members are going to serve on it?

There's some clear parameters and just frankly more planning behind such an effort before it comes to council.

I also just think that this is, like, personally for me just in the recommend.

-- realm of fantasy, so I don't think it's a good use of time.

Beyond that, if other members wanted to work on this, I just feel like it's notes -- it's just not as fully as I would like to see and so I think this is more.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I think there's a lot of detail on this resolution in terms of what the key items are that are being asked one for staff to be working on. And they are large.

They are large items, establishing guidelines and rules for participation future pilot program and those are not small activities they are really substance items. And I think it's important to create a list of what it takes to create a pilot program, I don't think it's quick work having read through some of the documents around this.

It's -- this is a substantial program and it requires a lot of interfacing with our partners and our community to establish what those might be and one of the -- if I'm remembering correctly, one of the pieces around Boston was that they didn't have them quite as clearly and then they made it more official.

Anyway, it's a big -- this is a big endeavor and I don't think it's a bad path for our community going down a lot of communities do have this and I think it's an interesting model for one -- a community that has so much, I think 33% of our property is nonprofit.

It's an interesting piece but there's a reason that these properties are tax exempt because the federal government says they provide benefit about providing taxes. -- without providing taxes.

We have to go into this with a really strong partnership approach to this.

Anyway, I'm concerned about the March timeline.

I think this is an ambitious project, and I think it takes a long time.

I was a lot more comfortable in saying somewhere in 2022 because that's a year and a half.

This is a big effort to put on staff's back, I think.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: Can the sponsor speak to how this effort differs from what already is being done in our policy committee?

And how we have actually already dedicated staff time and have voted on our policy agenda supporting, you know, taking a look at the Headley and prop a can you give me some context in how these two efforts would compare?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember?

>> City Admin. Crawford: Was that the staff?

>> Mayor Taylor: Let me put this question to staff.

How would staff envision this being different from that effort?

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> City Admin. Crawford: This effort would have a lot more engagement with it, with the community, whereas the policy work in Headley is trying to engage with other communities.

It's more detail type work and unique.

I would characterize it as harder to know because it's a matter of building support for it.

It's the different nature of the topics I would say.

>> Councilmember Song: All right.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I think they are completely different and one is when we do policy agenda we are urge the federal government or whatever it is to act laws and change policies and reconsider thing and this could have a position in the policy agenda statement.

We could ask them to consider this.

We could also do this -- the policy agenda committee could weigh in on this.

This is not community.

And thank you but to use the university's example to allow the university to state that they are whole public when only 6% of there are funding comes from state tax dollars.

That's one scam.

The -- that's one example.

And all nonprofits are like that, and so, yeah, policy agenda can certainly get involved and say, hey, state take a look at these antiquated laws and the relationship and the events that they have on communities that have a large percentage of their land off the tax roles because of the large nonprofit percentage in their communities I think the things can work together.

My last statement is that this would not developed -- this was not something that -- I just kind of -- through -- this was developed and working with our city administrator and our legal staff.

It was fully vetted and comes before you as such.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I'm -- I'm hearing a lot of interesting perspectives in sort of the interesting combination, I guess.

So I'm hearing that this is sort of a ridiculous idea to even try and that we should have a much more conservative idea about waste.

Like, waste of staff time.

And we -- this is a -- this is a this is the right perspective given the challenging times that we are in and I guess this might be a good moment to remind folks that we rather casually added \$650,000 to our budget.

So I hope that there's a majority support for thinking of creative ways to generate more revenue.

Because that's what this is about.

And so you can say it's pie in the sky and dismiss it.

I don't know whether it's too hard or impossible or such a good project that it should just take a really, really long time.

And we shouldn't try at all.

That's all I have to say.

I hope this gets support.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I have just a clarifying question.

So I'm looking at the list of things that are asked for in the resolution and it sounds to me -- and I question this question is actually for Mr. Markey now that I think about it, but I may want to follow-up from Councilmember Hayner.

It looks like items 1 through 4 are start of the state mandated process that is already being done.

And it's items 5 through eight that would get on to the terrain of requiring stakeholder engagement and the invention of a model that doesn't clearly exist for Ann Arbor yet and so if that is correct and if there's interest in seeing this as a phased project, would it be possible to not but 5 through 8 on the March 31st, 2022 timeline?

I'm asking and not offering it as an amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Are you asking Mr. Markey that question?

>> Councilmember Disch: Are items 1 through four what you are already doing? And its a two-part question for two different folks.

>> Thank you, mayor, I will address that question to the council, and to 1 through 4, at the assessor's office has initiated that process.

We have identified land values at the moment.

The building value portion would be the most challenging, not knowing how much we have and then what value we are going to assign.

It will require us to physically measure the buildings, and it would require us to -- it would be identified what each building is.

We have initiated that challenge and that task by the state.

The state has not set a mandate for us.

We have set land values.

And when the time exists, it was also complying with state mandated goals that is required by my office to get done.

But, yes, we are working on 1 through 4 at the moment.

But I don't have a deadline to complete those.

The building side of it.

>> Mayor Taylor: I think Ramlawi and Hayner you both have spoken twice on this.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: On the main motion.

>> Mayor Taylor: If you tell me I have gotten it wrong, I will accept that.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I have.

I was going to answer briefly, 1 through 4 are in motion already and that's why 5 through 8 exist.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I can't remember to be honest.

I have a couple of quick things.

>> Mayor Taylor: Go for it.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would say we have a lot of ambitious goals we have A2Zero and vision zero.

Those are very ambitious goals.

I don't think we are in many cases detracted by the magnitude of reaching those

goals.

Would suggest what it's due back and when it's due back.

Simply we can have a report back to council, a progress report by March 31st.

It doesn't need to be a final report.

It doesn't need to be all of these eight steps need to be completed but we should be working towards it.

That's all.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Actually, at the risk of extending this conversation a little bit, I was going to propose what Councilmember Ramlawi just said.

If we are concerned about completing this work by the 31st deadline, I wondered about changing the word "final" to progress report.

Or progress so that we could get a progress -- an update at that point if a final report can't be done.

And then potentially include with a recommendation for a date in the future for another report.

Sorry, we're writing an amendment here, but essentially trying to get around this firm deadline for a report.

I would be comfortable in getting an update at that point.

What would be normal procedure if we wouldn't meet a deadline?

Is that something where you would report back to us and adjust.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Yes, mayor, if I might.

If you have the resolution, we would let you know if we are not going to get there.

My concern is probably less about the timing and the latest news that I have learned about the university in particular about how they are being stressed financially by the state it looks like, is the ability to engage.

You know, peck put the time in the world out there, but in the university is looking at having significant cuts.

Having a meeting with them and what benefits they can provide to the community and how that correlates to what they can potentially impact to the impacts of the community it may be a challenging conversation to get -- to maintain their attention on.

And so I have some pause on that practicality and you extend that to schools and others this is definitely a large task, and the criteria itself may change depending on the entity that you have.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

I think hearing that and knowing that this might be ongoing work and we're concerned about that being a final deadline anyway, I guess I would still just proposal and hope a friendly amendment to exchange the word final with progress and we move including its recommendations.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Hayner.

Is it friendly to the body?

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with me.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner:

>> Mayor Taylor: Your mic doesn't appear to be working.

Try it again.

I hear -- I see a yes.

I'm going to take this as a yes.

We can't hear you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Thank you.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold, absent.

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-3, Resolution to Approve Amendments to the Council Rules.

Moved by Ramlawi, seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion, please, of -- what number is this?

Dc-3.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

This is another proposed rule change that was discussed in our admin meeting in order to try to end our meeting at an earlier time, something that we will struggle with tonight, unfortunately, but, of course, we know why.

We had lengthy public hearings and a big agenda.

But in an attempt to end our meetings sooner, I proposed and others proposed to begin the meetings sooner.

In this case we would start our meeting at 6:30, versus 7:00.

And then the second part to this where all public speakers must speak from the podium, unless the public speaker is attending remotely, and this is, I think, foreshadowing that when we do return to in-person meetings that we like to find some component of public comment to be able to be done electronically if possible but that requires some additional work.

So this is something I'm in support of.

I think if we began earlier, we could perhaps end sooner.

I would like to be done with the meetings by midnight for sure.]

That would give us four and a half hours, in my math is right.

Four and a half hours before we start -- five and a half hours.

It's getting late, before we hit midnight.

So I hope this gets the support of the body, so we can start our meetings again just sooner so we can end sooner.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I wonder if we can split these two in separate votes?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, actually.

If I may, let's roll with the second.

Thank you, let's roll with the second one first.

Change to rule seven.

Can I assume that no one has anything to say about rule seven.

Is that correct, Councilmember Hayner, do you have something to say about rule seven.

>> Councilmember Hayner: If we make a change.

Right now public speakers must speak from a podium.

We recognize that it is my state resolution, I -- maybe that's not the right word but by state decree or whatever because we are forced to meet remotely, that, you know, it's sort of the nonsensical.

It's assumed to be a virtual podium and now if we add this and we say unless the public speaker is attending remotely is that consideration that as Councilmember Ramlawi said we are going to start to allow remote attendance to our speaking, even if we are back.

Ann Arbor residents who for whatever reason can't -- you know, maybe it's -- maybe it's an inability to seek transit at that time of the evening.

Maybe, you know, whatever the reason, is they can't make it down here and they have the right to be heard.

Will that extend to people who aren't Ann Arbor residents and who aren't county residents and state residents, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

My only concern about that is it is a benefit to allow as many residents as possible to have access to our meetings but I don't want to see this set in such a way that in the future we are adopting that anybody can call from anywhere and weigh in on our city matters buzz I'm not shower that that's exactly what we are looking for.

And so, you though, without those guarantees, I'm just going to kind of heed caution and vote no on this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer, I treated your comment as procedural.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Not at this time, I will wait until the next one.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: On Rule 7, I think perhaps based on further thought, it may be premature to introduce this new rule I would like to understand what the future is with the open meetings act and the state governing how we conduct ourselves in meetings whether this rule needs to be introduced right now or if this can be postponed until we get better understanding of what future meetings will be like with the electronic format and the laws governing our

meetings.

Mr. Postema, I don't know if you have anything to add.

>> City Atty. Postema: They can do that.

I don't think this rule would change anything in terms of just saying what is recently going on, certainly you are correct that the state law would supersede the fact that if you can't speak at a podium, that that would -- you know, would you speak virtually.

So you don't have to vote on this tonight, its just recognizing that that that's the reality of the situation.

But it does not mandate that you that Ed to continue to have a virtual call-in.

It doesn't need to be done tonight.

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm comfortable going forward with it or not.

I do -- my intent was to certainly try to work through this to increase accessibility.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah, I'm very supportive of the changes to Rule 7 and don't share Councilmember Hayner's concerns around that.

There's obviously a benefit to residents but there are many reasons that nonresidents might want to speak to us.

Before calling Ann Arbor, or they are traveling and yet an important issue has come up, and then we draw national attention to ourselves and sometimes we draw national attendees and so whether it's an expert on an issue, I would hate to focus in on having residents be the only people to speak remotely.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I want to contribute that this is an accessibility issue and it's an issue that's been talked about on the commission on disability issues. Online meetings are creating a really good opportunity for people who are challenged in physically getting to a space.

I support it and Councilmember Hayner's point, I actually think -- when we see what you are talking about and what you are concerned about, I mean it's fairly revealing.

So I'm kind of okay to have that still out in the open.

I think the -- I think the community can see what is going on.

There's a value to that kind of transparency too.

So for me, the accessibility is the primary reason for this real seriously.

We have talked with the disability commission, that feel like second best, best is if we can be in a room together.

This is better.

But people who have genuine challenges not just who want to intrude in a meeting that they are not really an interested party to.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will remind the audience, whoever is still listening at this point, you know, that there are abilities, other ways that the public can engage us through ecomment and they can email us during a meeting and it becomes part of our meeting records and such and correct me if I'm wrong but there are many ways that the public can contact us.

I move to table this until we get back into in-person meetings and then we can understand what is allowable or not allowable based on the state statutes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Motion to table I think requires a second.

Is there a second.

By song.

There is no -- there is no debate on a motion to table.

Roll call vote.

AM. I incorrect about that?

>> Councilmember Eyer: If I may.

No, you are not incorrect, but -- but it's not proper to use a motion to table in this instance.

It would be -- it would need to be a most to postpone.

A motion to table is -- is something that you use when there's something more urgent that's come up and needs to be looked at first.

So this would be a motion to postpone.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Mr. Postema, can we get clarification.

>> City Atty. Postema: That is the technical definition under Robert's rules of order.

Some people use a very broad interpretation of something that's come up.

I don't think that the -- that the change -- the possible change in the situation is not contemplated in that.

I recommend that you do it to a date certain in the fall and I think that's the easiest way to do this.

I think it's better to wait and define this all at once and so I agree with the motion.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Um, since it's been seconded can it be withdrawn and put forward a postponement day.

>> City Atty. Postema: Do a withdraw.

>> Mayor Taylor: Anybody have any objection to that?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would like to postpone to the second meeting in October.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded.

Congress.

Councilmember Nelson, your hand is still up.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yeah, it's on purpose.

I wanted to verify with Mr. Postema that a date in October is not likely to be a date after we resume online meetings or resume in-person meetings do.

We have an idea of general timeline?

Because it's meaningful to me if we set a date that means that we might have a number of --

>> City Atty. Postema: I don't know the exact timing on it, but if something changes it could probably be moved forward.

So I would have to -- I would have to review that.

>> Councilmember Grand: Ms. Beaudry.

>> Clerk Beaudry: The temporary clang to the open meetings act allows us to meet virtually until December 31st or unless the emergency order is rescinded.

>> City Atty. Postema: Right.
>> Councilmember Nelson: The local emergency order or the state?
Which emergency order?
>> Clerk Beaudry: Local or county.
We would have to act under one of them.
>> City Admin. Crawford: The county.
The local one is not in effect.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Great.
Thanks.
I don't know where we are.
Roll call vote starting with me.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Are you ready for the roll call?
>> Mayor Taylor: I am.
Yes.
>> Councilmember Eyer: No.
>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.
>> Councilmember Hayner: (No audio).
>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember being we cannot hear you even when you are unmuted.
>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.
>> Mayor Taylor: Now we can hear you.
>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.
Councilmember Griswold, absent.
Councilmember Song.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Councilmember Grand: No.
>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion of rule three.
Councilmember Eyer.
>> Councilmember Eyer: I would like to move to postpone this one indefinitely because I don't know exactly when we would want to bring it back for sure. The reason being, I think in the workshop that we're going to be having with Dr. Chopman, the issue of council meeting time will be on the agenda, and so to me, it doesn't make any sense to make a change right now, when we're going to be having a discussion as a body about what time we should start and end meetings together.
With somebody who will hopefully help guide us.
>> Mayor Taylor: Do you have a time or date certain?
>> Councilmember Eyer: Well, I don't know -- we don't know when the work session is going to be scheduled yet, so I would vote to -- I move to postpone it indefinitely for now.
>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second.

Grand.

I have grand and Ramlawi with respect to the postponement.

Do you wish to speak?

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes, I do.

Even though this came out of admin committee, I didn't support it.

I don't think it really speaks to why we have meeting times.

I think there's about some good data that's been released recently that speaks more to that.

I think there's some reasons that 7:00 works.

For people would want to spend a little time with their families or, you know, partners, other people important in their lives between work or just to have time to eat.

I think it's important to start at 7:00.

I know there's plenty of times where it's enabled me as a parent to be able to get a kid somewhere at least, where they need to be and I know that and past council -- former council Eaton was commuting from his job.

So I think it -- to work close to where we live, it's not always the case with everyone on could you sill and I don't think someone be precluded from an employment opportunity just because they have to bet back at 6:30.

I want to be sensitive to that as well.

Thanks.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi postponement.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

Mr. Crawford give us an update on when Mr. Tropman was going to have work session with us, and that was sometime in June.

>> City Admin. Crawford: I indicated he had available dates, I think the 28th and July 12th.

We have not had a chance to meet with him yet to kind of formalize any dates.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate that.

I don't know what he's going to do that would change time necessarily.

I can understand how he would recommend where to put things on the agenda so that we are makes the best use of our abilities to make decisions at certain points of our agenda.

But I think this is -- I think regardless of what is talked about there this shifts things up 30 minutes.

It lets us get home 30 minutes sooner and perhaps our next day isn't so shot.

I understand the issues that folks have with commuting and families but those issues are still relevant when your next day is blown because you are up so late the night before.

So, you know, it's 6 of one and half a dozen of others.

And frankly, I would rather have it up front than be affected by it days later.

So if we are going to postpone it, I would rather do it indefinitely.

I don't know whether that was procedurally appropriate.

But to postpone it to the first meeting in August.

>> Mayor Taylor: First meeting in August.

It is an indefinite postponement is in order.

It is an option.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Can I amend that to a state certain --

>> Mayor Taylor: Let me suggest that voting no on it is equivalent as an amendment and if the postponement to indefinite date passes then your amendment would not have passed, but if it fails then perhaps we have a definite postponement.

Roll call, vote, please on the postponement to an indefinite date.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold, absent.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-4, Resolution Supporting the For The People Act.
HR-1/S1.

Moved by Eyer and Radina: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: It is late and I will be brief.

This -- this is something that came to me through a friend and colleague, Brannon Dylan, former chair of the Michigan democratic party, who is working to build a coalition for the For the People Act.

I will assume that folks have read the information.

This is something that, of course, has been widely talked about in the news.

So I don't think it needs a lot of introduction but it's a series of voting reforms, expecting access to voting, and it's a federal bill that has passed the house and is now awaiting action in the senate, the future of it is very uncertain and so by this vote, we would simply be affirming our support for it, and passing that support along to our representative at the federal level and the state level as well. To make them aware.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I know as a community, we have placed, you know, and rightly so, great trust in our clerk Ms. Beaudry to improve access to the ballot box and I think we have done a fine job on that, and I don't know if she has any comments about this, if it would really affect her job in any way, because we are out there at other communities, and I think the biggest benefit that this act would have would be the considerations consider campaign finance and dark money and out-of-state donors.

I think that has played a role in all sorts of elections.

Supportive of these types of reforms generally.

I'm not sure if this should be added to the policy agenda.

We broadly support these type of ballot access rules.

So it's easy to support this.

And, you know, anything that has to do with ethics is important.

Hopefully this won't put any undo burden on our clerk's office if it comes to pass in the future.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-5, Resolution to Recommend and Prioritize the Allocation of the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Seconded by Councilmember Nelson.

Discussion, please of DC-5.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, Councilmember Ramlawi.

This was a pretty straightforward.

This is prescriptive to our local needs and issues.

We will be receiving or have at least received some of the \$24 million that is coming to our community from the American relief act.

The -- it's simply that there's been a lot of conversations, not formal, and not with any kind of continuity as to what should be do on with this money or how -- we need a roadmap.

We need a recipe.

We need direction, I think.

I believe it asks our city administrator, our staff, to look at what we applied for in grants, and look at our, you know, partners necessity county and the communities around us who are also receiving our money all at the same time, who are -- for all of these municipalities to be infused with this type of cash to be collaborative and to leverage and magnify the benefits that we will get with this money, this one-time infusion.

So simply asking again our city administrator for direction based on all of our different priorities, plans and applications for federal and state grants and working with the county partners to best use this money in the recommendations that he has and that would be by October 1st of this year.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I was pleased to see this put on the agenda.

I think it was really smart.

I like to be added as a cosponsor.

In terms of getting the meaningful perspective from the people who are professionals the city hall and I think this is an obvious -- an obvious thing to support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: We do have a lot of water, sewer and broadband

infrastructure needs and so hopefully this doesn't, you know -- I mean -- I would hope that when our spending plan comes back it includes those as prioritization as necessary, secondly, I just want to point out in the third bullet whereas clause just for the clerk's benefit, there's a doubling, a typo.

It was fast charging stations and it says state street corridor improvements twice. I'm not sure where they will come into play spending this money but I know there's problems down there and that's one of the reasons why we tried to get tc1 started in that area first.

I appreciate the forward look at this and I can fully support this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I have a question for Mr. Crawford this -- I guess in the absence of a resolution like this, how would you plan to communicate to -- to develop a plan for using this money and communicate it to council?

>> City Admin. Crawford: This would -- we would talk internally, about some projects and recommendations that have feasibility to be achieved during the time frame and probably communicate with the county to see if there's any coordination that could be done with some of our partners, as well as any other entity that had funds and then, you know, look at our plans and see what priority can be delivered where we have active project.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Is this resolution in conflict with that at all?

>> City Admin. Crawford: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I think this is pretty consistent with how staff would operate.

I think it's our expectations and the piece, I think it's a whereas clause is the whereas clause, the final one that talks about the priorities for allocation of funding should be in -- align with the draft of the city of Ann Arbor plan.

I think it's still definitely in draft form and some of the equity pieces -- we as a council probably need to have our discussions and we need to make sure that we have adopted a strategic plan.

So this is not part of the resolve clause but I just wanted to point to that as maybe just a small point of caution.

But looks great.

I'm glad we had something officially out there.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate the positive feedback and the help from staff in drafting it.

This is simply just to give us a roadmap, a north star in finding the best and most responsible way of using this money.

So it seems to hopefully have the support and be just even more -- and I keep using the word responsible but I think this is the best recipe for that and allowing staff to, again, come back to us and show us all the things that we have outlined and where this can be spent.

So thanks and I'm rambling because it's getting late.

Sorry.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of DC-5.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

DC-6, Resolution to Request that Councilmember Jeff Hayner Resign from the Ann Arbor City Council.

Moved by grand and seconded by Disch.

Discussion, please, of DC-6.

>> City Atty. Postema: I received a question initially.

>> Mayor Taylor: Please.

>> City Atty. Postema: And I will try to dispatch it promptly.

The question is: For me to outline charter and rules that allow for circumventing the due process in this situation, and let me just say that the question is ill-phrased and what I mean by that is there is no due process circumvention, and I have written on the due process in many memos and I will go through just briefly there is no property or liberty interest that would be implicated in this matter for a procedural due process and for substantive due process, it's not an issue of the deprivation of the fundamental right and it doesn't shock the conscience under the legal terms and what that all means is that the resolved clause at issue from a legal standpoint and I don't want to insult either the drafter or the -- who it's aimed at in this, but it is not a legal -- it is not -- it has no legal consequence.

This has no legal bearing.

It's no the asking -- this is not a resolution removing Councilmember Hayner from the council.

That's covered under the ordinance and so this is -- if I characterize it, it would be what we talked about before in March 18th memo.

It is just speech by the council or action by the council in response to other councilmember's speech and that's what this is.

So I think that -- I hope that I have answered the question.

The question being there is no due process circumvention.

>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion, Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you, Mr. Postema, for saving me some space to address these concerns.

I really do appreciate that because there has certainly been that narrative out there.

This is not something that I have looked forward to.

This is not anything that I took any pleasure in drafting, nor something that I want to spend time and it -- it's too bad because we -- we really accomplished some incredible things in terms of progressive housing policy at this meeting and I was hoping we could focus on that and it's not the way I wanted to end the evening.

But that's sad.

There are a couple of issues at hand here.

I think I outlined the arguments in the whereas clauses and I won't go through all of them, but just to say that there's real harm done and there's a pattern of behavior that we're revisiting.

It's not trying to limit anyone's ability to have free speech but understand that there are consequences for that speech and it's our right to speak as Mr. Postema said and -- and Rend seriously some sort of opinion about how we feel about it and for me, the harm and the pattern of behavior crossed a line that I think it's important for us as council to say, this doesn't represent our community. These aren't actions that when someone looks to our city, how we want to represent ourselves and it really does distance members of our community from their government.

I think it can really actually have a chilling effect where people in the community don't feel value, don't feel comfortable and so it was important, although we are still going through with this parallel process with the rule 12 and the reprimand process that we act swiftly and we come forward at this meeting with -- with some sort of statement to the community.

To me, I don't really honestly care about whether or not it's restorative for Councilmember Hayner.

I care whether or not this is restorative for or community.

And I think this is an action that just speaks to who we are as a council, who we are as a community and what we value and that there's -- there's just some behavior that's unacceptable and there's no context in which it is acceptable.

There's been no action of remorse or apology and frankly based on the pattern of behavior, it wouldn't make a difference to me, because after what was done was done.

I would hope this would be --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Grand: But this crossed a line.

And I will leave others to speak.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Some residents have written to ask me not to support this resolution, because it makes too big of a deal about a word or two.

I was talking this to a friend that Michael Eric Dyson wrote as a sermon to white people it.

Explains why white people need to stop saying a certain word.

I will not say that word when I read to you from that next, though professor Dyson uses it five time in the passage I will quote.

He writes I will not arguing there's evil magic in white lips to call down violence with words.

But that word has such fantastically evil resonance because it comes close as anything to suggest the racial violence.

The would says lynching, castration, rape, rioting, intellectual inferiority, bad schools, poor neighborhoods, police brutality, racial terror, mass incarceration and more.

It has no rival.

There is no rough or refined equivalence between the determine and the many derisive evidence.

There's no examples of black folk killing white people en mass, terrorizing them with racial violence, shouting cracker as they lynch them from trees and selling postcards to document their colossal crime.

Black folk have not enjoyed protection at the hands of the state to carry out such misdeeds, end quote this idea that this world has no rival because the white people's violence for which it stands has no equivalent in black people's violence, suggests to me that we white people need to stop saying it.

Even if it's only to quote a song title or to make a point in a philosophical debate about free speech.

I'm sure that every one of my colleagues agrees with me that these words are vial, when they choose to vote for this resolution or not.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah, I struggled a bit with this and partly I think it is some of the -- some of the whereas clauses because my reasoning for voting yes for this season is a little bit different but I come to the same conclusion.

As the resolution's sponsors.

There is -- there is the obvious use of language that is unacceptable.

But it's the context as well, that language was used in, that further makes me believe that this was -- it is important for us as a body to stand up for what our values are.

So it's impossible to not go back to the first use of the hunter S. Thompson quote and the context in which that was being used in, and the context it was being used in was to attack essentially an editorial where our local paper was asking to stop attacking local journalists, that they and their families were being put at risk.

And it was in response to this that Councilmember Hayner used his original offensive quote.

You know, he initially doubled down in an interview with a student paper, saying that that was okay and then he later issued an apology for that, which some of us questioned in April.

But it was then -- the community has come out with the recall campaign and it was in that article in that interview with the journalist that the last offensive language was used and in that article not only did he use very offensive language, he defended his original language that he used.

He negated his initial apology.

He went back.

It's now been two months and he has -- he's essentially said that we should attack local members of our community and he's done that using very offensive language.

And so for me, part of restorative justice is that the offender takes responsibility. That's the key component of restorative justice.

Not that I necessarily think that needs to be a part of this, but that's lacking for

those who are calling for it.

Beyond that, you know, know folks want us to be focusing on policy goals and I do too.

I think this is an embarrassment for our community but another part of our responsibility is to stand up for what our values are we do that all the time with different resolutions that we pass and for me as uncomfortable as this is, it is a statement about what my values are.

My commitment to the code of ethics and my commitment to civil conduct and discourse.

And so that's why I feel like I need to vote for that tonight, not because I'm happy in any way that this is in front of us but because I feel like it is our responsibility and, you know, I think Councilmember Hayner has every right to use the language that he wishes to but there's a certain responsibility whether we voice it in front of this body and resigning seems appropriate if you want to behave in a different way.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I will be voting in favor of calling for Councilmember Hayner's resignation in light of his continued use of slurs as an E.S.L. learner, I use this language to empower myself and those who need help, language should not be used to diminish and humiliate other as a tool for hateful ideology.

This is accurate in 2021, we should not have a conversation defending the use of the "n" word even in quotes.

I have spoke went black can parents and black local religious leaders as well as Mr. Hampton and the president of our local chapter of the NAACP who has assure me this resolution will be discussed they local NAACP meeting.

We are so tired to have to fight to be heard we are trying to raise our children and memorial those who we lost through violence and virus.

And city council is saying that our feelings done matter and they can speak on our behalf.

That's not right.

Do not victimize us.

It's demoralizing when it's predetermined that the first amendment rights trumps when we expect the officials to speak and act as allies.

Why do you expect victims of racial slurs no defend ourselves and fight alone.

Officials must be held to a different standard, the fact that there's a back and forth on this is incredible.

The city council believes defensible to use racial slurs in meetings with constituents at this place of work and this is why I checked with our own code of conduct and discrimination policies that we enforce as a city employer, city staff would use anti-LGBTQ slurs and racial slurs have been fired it doesn't require direct harm and is harmful on how the city staff conduct themselves publicly, particularly when they are easily identifiable as members of the city.

BIPOC looks at the support of Juneteenth and the anti-Asian hate and harassment resolution as being disingenuous when we have a councilmember

who is yet to apologize for the most recent slurs and insist that he's the victim that.

Wouldn't pass muster here in the city and it shouldn't be tolerated on this body.

>> Mayor Taylor: I will be supporting the resolution.

The predicate facts here are well-known and to my knowledge, not in dispute.

The voicing of racial and homophobic slurs is 100% unacceptable.

The word in question today, as Councilmember Disch articulated through the reading, is an unacceptable obscenities and to debate and dehumanize and to enforce and perpetuate white supremacy.

It's taboo and not be uttered period and the voicing of this word in any context whatsoever by an elected official is not acceptable.

We should not accept it and I certainly do not accept it.

The voicing of the word severs employees from their employer.

It severs community members from their government.

It pushes them away from us and this is -- this is profoundly hurtful.

This is contrary to their missions.

The harms, the true and deep harms will not abate on their own and the only method to heal this harm is through contrition and decisive penance.

Both performed by the person who has inflicted that harm -- that is the only way to achieve the goal.

To be specific, what is needed is an apology to the individual with whom the gentleman was speaking to the community, who has been harmed, and then a resignation.

That's what is needed here, plain and simple.

Further discussion?

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: It's quite here that I seek recusal from any conversation or vote on this matter.

So with the -- before a call the vote, I would ask for your permission to refuse myself from said vote and keeping in with our ethics rules.

>> Mayor Taylor: Could you like to be recused now?

Is there a second on that?

Councilmember Radina?

Councilmember Ramlawi, are you objecting?

All in favor?

Opposed?

You are recused.

>> City Atty. Postema: Mayor, just one point here, the recusal in a situation like this would not prevent Councilmember Hayner from speaking on his own behalf, even though a refusal might in other circumstances prevent that, but I just think it's important to say that because I think he's correct and properly did identify the ethical rule but it would not prevent him from do it.

So I don't want him to feel compelled not to speak if he so wishes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: This is such a dark hour.
Dark hour for so many different reasons.
The dark hour for myself as well.
I'm not going to support this resolution.
And because of that, I will suffer greatly because people are going to suggest that I'm condoning the abhorrent behavior and the hurtful language that Councilmember Hayner has used.
But that's not why I'm voting no on this resolution.
I am troubled by the pattern of behavior this new council has taken.
This is a pattern that started before the new council was sat.
One of the members of resolution sponsors warned us that she would become a seek and destroy missile.
I feel that this resolution was brought to the admin committee in wrong spirit this resolution did not belong in the admin committee.
The admin committee was called to a special to discuss a sworn complaint this resolution should not have been part of last week's meeting which by the way was abbreviated and didn't even allow for all public commenters to comment.
And the public comment portion of that meeting is scheduled to resume on Tuesday, tomorrow or later today that is.
I feel there is a process to handle this and that process is ongoing and that's through Rule 12.
The harm that will be -- the harm that will come out of this resolution and the acts receding this resow -- preceding this resolution will be great and everlasting and I hope the community will forgive me, the ones who will paint me as a sympathizer of bigotry and hate, that that's not when my no vote is about.
This is stripping an elected official of his position or suggesting, I should say, stripping an elected official of his position.
There is a process for all of that to occur and that's a process that is going on as well outside of Rule 12678 there's a recall -- Rule 12.
There's a recall going on.
I will raise my hand again.
>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.
Councilmember Ramlawi.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: There's a recall underway by the residents of the first ward.
That's where much of this should occur along with Rule 12.
I believe there's a very dangerous precedence that's being set today and I understand the hate and the wrongfulness of the behavior and the language that was used.
And I hope, again, that my no vote is not twisted and manipulated to suggest that I condone such terrible behavior, because I do not.
And those folks would do know me, know that.
And I guess as people say, politics is a rotten, rotten profession and I think I know why after what I witnessed and I don't know what to say, but this is the darkest hour that I have been involved in.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I'm just troubled by the idea that racial slurs that our community reads, hears, has -- over the course of the history of our country and in people's daily lives, is -- isn't being centered here.

This has happened before at this table, where councilmember directly expressed his own pain, his own experiences and yet that was not centered.

That was dismissed.

I would encourage my colleagues to speak with black residents, constituents, elected leaders and tell me who the victim is and would be suffering.

And what their darkest hours are.

It's the least that we can do as councilmembers who apparently can do this when it comes to other resolutions who can empathize and show compassion when it comes to other diversity-oriented efforts and apparently not for this and that's shameful.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I think the most dangerous precedent we could possibly set tonight is to not speak with one unanimous voice in condemning the language and agreeing that anyone who chooses to use such language unapologetically shouldn't sit at this table.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner is recused.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold is absent.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DS-1, Resolution Authorizing Summary Publication of Ordinance No. 21-14, An Ordinance To Amend Section 5.15 (Table 5.15-2) And Section 5.16.6 Of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Of Title V Of The Code Of The City Of Ann Arbor, Amendments to Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi, seconded by Briggs.

Discussion of DS-1.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

Do we have a closed session today, Mr. Postema?

>> City Atty. Postema: No, we do not.

>> Mayor Taylor: We have before us, the clerk's report of communications, petitions and referrals.

May I have a motion to approve the clerk's report, moved by Disch and seconded by Ramlawi.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

Clerk's report is approved.

Do we have communications from our city attorney?

>> City Atty. Postema: No, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: We now come to public comment general time.

It's an opportunity for members of the public to speak to the county and council.

To speak at public comment, call 877-853-5247.

Enter meeting I.D. 94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you are connected and you wish to speak, press star nine.

Star nine to indicate that you wish to speak.

Once it is your turn to speak, the clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone number.

Our clerk will notify when you 30 seconds are remaining.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at public comment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 941, do you have a comment?

>> Hello?

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Mozhgan Savabieasfahani.

Ann Arbor city council would like to pose as a progressive antiracist bunch.

Your actions are anything but progressive and antiracist.

Ann Arbor city council has failed to clean our water.

They have failed to build public housing.

They don't even have the decency to stand up for \$15 minimum wage.

But worst of all Ann Arbor city council is a racist bunch.

At a time when globally, millions are standing up and saying Israel is an apartheid racist state and they should be penalized for butchering people of Palestine, at a time when thousands of Ann Arborites show up at your door step chanting cut off military aid to Israel.

At a time when students at University of Michigan pass resolutions to boycott Israel and sanction Israel.

At a time when students write on the rock boycott Israel.

At a time like that, when people.

Ann Arbor have spoken loudly against racism, you suppose as antiracists but stand firmly behind an apartheid racist state that is Israel.

Every single one of you has the blood of the children of Palestine on your hands.

No up with believes a word of what you take, what is you are antiracist and antiwhite supremacists.

You are racist by your actions.

It is clear to all of us that you are racist.

Mr. Mayor, by your actions you have shown us, you are ace racist.

Every single one of you, no matter jibber jabber by Ms. Disch or gobbledygook from Ms. Eyer will make it any different.

We know you are a racist bunch.

We demand that this body pass a resolution that we are against the military aid to Israel.

That's the least you can do to show that you are not racist.

The only way you can redeem yourself is to pass this resolution or forever you will be known as a bunch of weak, racist people.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 766.

Caller with the phone number ending in 766, go ahead.

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and Councilmember Hayner, you have now been asked to resign by your Ann Arbor city council colleagues who have passed a resolution following their processes in asking you to resign.

They joined the D.S.A., the Y.D.S.A., G.O. and value black lives llc in passing resolutions asking you to resign and what I would like to know is will you please resign?

In the hopes that you can undo some of the harm that you have done to our community and in the knowledge that if you continue to remain on the city council that you will be continuing to do harm to our community.

We want to be a community that we can be proud of.

We want to be a safe place for LGBTQ people, when someone defends the use of homophobic and racial slurs in any context.

Please quit harming our community.

Please resign please.

So I would like you to answer tonight and I would like you to answer in the affirmative.

Will you resign?

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 936, do you have a comment.

Go ahead.

>> Hello.

Hello.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Yes.

>> Okay.

Great.

Wow, it's 1:35.

I don't have the energy to make my brain work too good right now so I will just read part of the Twitter threads that I thought about and wrote just a few hours before this meeting began.

Tonight, tonight one of the main items up for debate is the new housing development located next to the university golf course.

We have a local housing crisis.

I haven't been advocating as much for housing as I have been in the past because Councilmember Hayner has been using homophobic and I have been helping with the Hayner recall campaign.

We raised \$7,000 to remove you from office so far.

Tonight, council will vote on a resolution calling for Hayner to resign.

It will be a difficult conversation to watch.

Councilmembers Nelson, Ramlawi and Griswold will all likely to defend Hayner complaining the process has been rushed.

It's been nearly two months since his first use of a homophobic slur and touting conspiracy theories.

We can't be silent and stand by and do nothing or else it legitimizes the behavior.

Hayner says it's his first amendment right to say what he wants and I don't dispute this.

We can take say that this unequivocally unacceptable.

And where we had openly racist white supremacists elected to the highest offices it's all the more important to take a stand when bigotry creeps into politics no matter the level of office.

Please tune in tonight if you can or check in with local coverage from Michigan daily and mlive.

It's slightly amusing that Hayner is invoking the first amendment in his defense because he's relentlessly attacked the free press.

This was in a conversation about an article describing increased threats of violence against journalists.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Yeah.

So I guess that just about brings me to the time that I would like to thank councilmembers for taking these steps and -- although the -- although it's Hayner's choice now to resign or not, and please resign.

I'm glad that this step was taken.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 231, do you have a comment?

>> Yes.

This is caller 231.

I'm disgusted by this hypocritical display of obvious racist bigots on the Congress, with the people of Palestine who have been oppressed.

Council had an opportunity to speak out about that oppression and remains silent.

But that's not the only issue.

The previous caller says the context doesn't matter, any use the n word doesn't matter?

Really?

Really?

So Erica Briggs use of the newsletter unredacted, according to that standard --

I'm looking at you right now.

Look into the camera.

Yes, you!

You!

You used the word unredacted.

So now this complicates the problem.

You have to explain why context seemingly matters but doesn't matter.

It matters -- it doesn't matter when it's Jeff.

It matters when it's Erica, because Erica is on our side and Jeff not on our side.

So we change the rules.

You have no argument.

Your practice shows you for what you are.

This is cancel culture brought to Ann Arbor.

You are ruining our politics.

The black community should be outraged that this is being done in their name.

This he should be.

And so should the LGBTQ community.

Their causes are being manipulated by people who are interested in power.

You want Jeff's seat.

You want your eight vote majority.

That's what you want.

You are not fooling anybody.

That is all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 865.

>> This is Joe spalding.

I want to talk about some things going on at the capitol, in terms of an attempt at

voter suppression but also I just thought it was interesting to point out calling in

for the almost year now that Jeff, we are somewhat cousins.

My great grandmother her grandmother were descendants of the Hayner.

So just thought that was interesting.

But more importantly the republicans in the state legislature are tempting to

circumvent the governor's veto.

I will cut to their strategy at this point.

There's a flurry of bills that, you know, seems the resolution about HR-1 this

council would be interested in, most of the folks of Ann Arbor want to know a little

bit more about, and it looks like the governor will be vetoing most of these bills

and the republicans.

Look to leverage that or slingshot that into messages to help fuel a ballot

initiative.

That's important to know because that requires a whole heck of a lot of them to get informed about what's out in the field and if there's people trying to pass a petition around that's doing things like the state house is considering doing things like stopping like rock the vote to have access to the qualified voting records. They have registered tens of millions of people over the last 16 years. And they need access to the qualified voter files so they can tell in the field who is registered already and who isn't.

And the state -- the republicans are asking as if there's some sort of weird, nefarious hacking going on there when the reality is they want to make sure that fewer people vote.

What I want to do, my only point here is you want folks to help spread the awareness that there's a concerted effort to try to lower the voter turnout.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And the lower voter turnout is higher voter turnout is what's -- that's what holds politics accountable at the end of the day and I think there's some issues specifically locally in Ann Arbor that the city would not have if the voter turnout was higher.

That's all I have to say.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 344, do you have a comment.

>> Good evening, my name is mark daskin and I'm a resident of the ward two. I'm here to comment on the tabled resolution from the May 3rd, 2021 meeting, dealing with the conversation about the Palestinian people and Palestinian Americans.

Any such discussion initiated by city council is wrong.

The issue is beyond the purview of the council.

While some seek to initiate -- for the past 18 years they protested outside my synagogue.

There were signs that read, quote, Jewish power corrupt.

Pane resist Jewish power.

There's nothing about these political signs.

There are blatant Anti-Semitism.

They want to focus on issues, on issues 6,000 miles away.

For those who say it's the demonstrator's right to stage this protest.

How you defend this?

Would you defend the right of a group that shows the public sidewalk outside of a local ethnic restaurant about the Syrian Civil War.

Is what if someone created a website about hatred and bigot in Ann Arbor?

Would you defend the rights of that person?

If you would not promote the first amendment in each of cases emergency your motives for the inaction outside of my synagogue.

For those who -- rep that the definition of antisemitism adopted by the U.S. State Department and many other nations including Germany chance say using a double standard for Israel is a double standard.

Indifference is the benefit of the enemy.

The silence of city council with respect to years of ongoing antisemitism speaks volumes and it's time it ended.

This is especially important during this period of rising antisemitism across the country and in Ann Arbor.

City council must condemn the protesters outside of Beth Israel synagogue.

You should pass such a resolution now and every quarter as long as this hatred and bigotry exist in our city.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller end until phone number 556, do you have a comment?

>> This is Ralph McKee from the fifth ward.

It's been a long night.

At Mr. Story said, all of us are tired and our brains are not working properly.

I would like to make a point that hasn't been praised season and that I sent you a long email today about the recent developments in the gelman disadvantaged.

The group of card actives working on that for many years were deeply disturbed by the order committed recently by our -- submitted recently by our lawyers and the Scio township lawyers and the county lawyers because it's directly opposite of what the decisions that were made by each of the elected official bodies in those jurisdictions and it's very troubling how that happened.

I don't have time to go into the basics of that but I would really strongly urge you to read the email I sent today.

This is not just me talking.

This is several experienced lawyers totally agree with what I said.

One of them is Mike Moran is the Ann Arbor township trustee, and is a long-time trial lawyer, and who clerked for the U.S. Supreme Court.

We are very troubled by the actions of our own council both inside and outside.

Putting in an order, submitting an order which goes against the rejection of the C.J. and now adopts it without even speaking to you about it, I'm told and I think you need to ask the prudent questions that were set forth at the end of that email before making any other decisions before going forward with the gelman matter.

That's what I have for this evening.

It's unpleasant.

But it's a difficult subject same as the other difficult subjects you dealt with tonight.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 534?

>> Good morning.

This is Tom Stulberg calling again from lower town.

I know it's late.

I've got three minutes.

I won't use a moment more than the three.

Mr. Crawford, I know I complimented you before or asked you to pass on compliments to why your staff.

Ann Arbor really is a wonderful city.
There's a lot of people who make it work.
The staff that works at the city, for the most part are wonderful.
I've gotten to know a lot of them.
The citizens of Ann Arbor for most part are wonderful.
Sadly for us, when we watch a council meeting we are seeing Ann Arbor at its worst sometimes.
I wish that were different.
The last couple of years, I watched council caucus on Sundays.
Maybe more than a couple.
Maybe it's a few now, I'm losing track.
Usually Sunday night caucuses are very collegial and we see what council could be.
Those who don't attend Sunday night caucus, just watch it to see an example of what city council meetings could be like?
Thank you.
I would appreciate if you do that one small favor for me, just watch it one time and for those who do attend.
I thank you.
I thank you for putting in that extra time.
It matters.
It matters to us citizens.
Now, I would like to get a little bit serious here and call for a resolution at the next meeting for another city councilmember's resignation.
I would like to call for city councilmember's Joe spalding's resolution.
If someone could put that forward.
I listened to the admin meeting last week.
And to hear Joe spalding who runs this town blackmail and threaten a couple of other councilmembers, saying you have to do what I say or I'm going to be there in November.
And I've got the goods on you.
And I'm -- I forget what he said after that, but somehow he's going to ruin them.
Can we just pass a councilmember to have councilmember Joe spalding resign.
Whose Ann Arbor is this, Mayor Taylor?
Is in your Ann Arbor, are you the leader?
Joe spalding being look up five corner strategies and see what they do.
They are paid to promote developers projects.
They are paid to do what Jo he spalding does.
I think it's a conflict of interest.
I think we should ask Joe spalding to resign.
Please next councilmember, someone put forth that resolution.
Have a good night or morning.
>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 684, do you have a comment?

>> Good morning, everyone.

It's late.

So I'm going to be real brief with you here.

Eric Sturgis from the first ward.

I was looking up on Wikipedia, and the idea was to insert ground forces into hostile territory, search out the enemy, destroy them and withdraw immediately afterwards.

That's what a seek and destroy missile is. So Councilmember Song, for you not to be outraged that someone would say that to another councilmember is very hurtful.

That she considered that councilmember an enemy and she wants to search out the enemy, destroy them.

That's unbecoming of a councilmember.

So Councilmember Song, what you said, I agree with a lot of it, and it would have a little more veracity if you were consistent in the way you applied your thinking.

So I would ask you to ask that councilmember to openly apologize to

Councilmember Ramlawi, if you truly care about every minority in the city.

Our only Palestinian member on council is told that he is going to be searched out and destroyed.

Don't look to me blankly.

Do what you are supposed to do.

Be consistent and maybe DC-6 people will say, maybe their actions are consistent.

The fact that we are okay with comments like that but we are not okay with other comments is very hurtful to a lot of us.

Oh, I just want to let you know, and, again, I'm getting this off of Wikipedia, the idea was to insert ground forces into hostile territory, search out the enemy and destroy them.

Search out the enemy and destroy them.

That's what a seek and destroy missile is.

So just thought I would make us aware of what was said from what councilmember to another and I hope the people would see that that's unbecoming of a councilmember as well.

Thank you.

You have a great night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak at public comment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 869, do you have a comment?

>> This is Blaine Coleman.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> [Garbled audio]

Has spoken unanimously on one thing for almost 20 years.

This council has unanimously turned a cold hard racism shoulder against the

Palestinian people for 20 years.

This council right up to this minute has unanimously decided that Palestinian life is not even worth defending with a simple human rights resolution.

This council unanimously views Palestinian life as something worth so little.

So little that not even the simplest human rights resolution can even be increased in the council.

Not one member of this city council, not one pitiful member of this city council.

Not one is willing to introduce a resolution that simply says we are against military aid to Israel.

Not councilmember is willing to introduce a resolution that simply says, quote, we are against military aid to Israel.

Not one.

And this is at a time when Israel just finished murdering hundreds of Palestinians.

This at a time when Israel just finished murdering hundreds of Palestinians with military aid that comes out of your pocket, and even at this time, not one pitiful contemptible city councilmember dares or cares to even introduce a resolution against military aid to Israel.

Not one.

That tells me that this entire city council is either racist to the bone or has utterly surrendered to racism.

It works out pretty much the same.

So don't dare pretend you are against racism.

Don't dare pretend you are against racism when you are racism to the bone.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak at public comment?

Seeing no one.

Public comment is closed.

Are there communications today from council?

May have a motion to adjourn.

Moved by Disch and seconded by Radina.

All in favor?

All opposed.

We are adjourned.