



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Jackie Beaudry, City Clerk
Kelly Beattie, Boards and Commissions Coordinator
Tom Crawford, CFO
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Raymond Hess, Transportation Manager
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Jen Lawson, Water Quality Manager
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Colin Smith, Parks & Recreation Manager
Cresson Sloten, Systems Planning Manager
Missy Stults, Sustainability & Innovations Manager

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: March 4, 2019

AC – 1 – Memorandum from Parks Advisory Commission regarding Proposed Resolution to Add “The Center of the City” to the List of Available Public Park Rental Facilities - February 15, 2019

Question: 19-0378 -- Center of the City -- Please provide a historical range of costs that even nonprofits might need to incur related to mobile toilets (port-a-johns) and insurance. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Insurance costs will vary depending upon the type of event. A special event applicant provides City staff with proof of insurance, but not the cost of it. Port-a-Johns are generally in the \$75-100 range depending on time and location. A typical ratio of event attendees to port-a-johns is 75:1.

Question: 18-1749 -- SRTS -- Please provide a range of costs for the 250 hours of staff time and third party consultants that were referenced in Mr. Lazarus' email of 3/2/19,

including a ballpark estimate for the specific priority sidewalk gaps in the city. Also include the reason why research of how peer cities fund sidewalk is worthy of such a large expenditure of taxpayer funds; does the City customarily use a similar level of funding and staff time to research peer cities for other projects? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: This item is not on the March 4 Council Agenda. We will happy to respond to this inquiry separately.

Question: 19-0383 -- Quiet Zone -- Please provide how the millions of dollars in the report compare to other similarly priced urgent priorities in the City. Also, a resident commented during the March 3 public commentary at the Council caucus, that Cook County, Illinois, and Fargo, North Dakota have Quiet Zones. Please verify whether this is accurate and further detail about how they do it. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: This item is not specifically on the March 4 Council Agenda, however the QuietZone survey is referenced in the City Administrator's Report – March 4, 2019. We will be happy to respond to this inquiry separately.

CC-1 – Resolution to Appoint Members to the Independent Community Police Oversight Commission (7 Votes Required)

Question: Before we vote at the next meeting, will we receive any explanation of the rubric for assessment of applicants, i.e. the specific attributes and qualifications identified for appointments, how these attributes and qualifications were assessed for each applicant, and how the slate of choices meet the desired attributes and qualifications for the commission? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: Please share the scoring system used to identify appropriate candidates, the threshold score for the eleven chosen. (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: In answer to questions from the public at Council Caucus (3/3/19), CM Ramlawi explained that the first step in the process of choosing this slate was setting aside candidates that were deemed inappropriate for appointment. Please share information around this first stage of the process, a complete list of the reasons why various candidates were disqualified from consideration (this list need not – and probably should not-- refer to specific candidates). (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: What is the reason for excluding all applicants who actively participated in, supported, and endorsed the work of the summer task force? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: How will the proposed amendment impact this recommended slate of eleven? I.e. How many of the slate of eleven will require seven votes for approval, due to recent positions as temporary employees of the city? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: None of the proposed slate are or were temporary City employees.

Question: Before we vote at the next meeting, will we be receiving a slate of recommendations from the Human Rights Commission? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: What options do we have if we object to a particular appointment when this come up for a vote? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: A Council member can vote no on the entire slate or can request that the particular appointment be removed from the resolution for a separate discussion and vote.

Question: Why are more than ¼ of the selected applicants non-residents? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: This is a matter for Council to discuss among its members. City staff has had no role in reviewing or selecting the nominated persons for appointment to the ICPOC.

Question: Does the ICPOC have authority over PD from other cities, the University or the County Sheriff? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The ordinance provides that the ICPOC's duties are to advise the City Council, AAPD Police Chief, and City Administrator. It has no direct role concerning other law enforcement agencies.

Question: Please provide a list of all BOC appointments expiring in 2019, especially for Planning Commission and Environmental Commission. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Attached is one report that includes all terms expiring from boards and commissions = Terms Expiring March 4 2019 to December 31 2019.pdf

CA-4 – Resolution to Approve an Amended Five-Year Lease Agreement with the Ann Arbor Public Schools for Eberbach Cultural Arts Building (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-4, in reading the cover memo, it sounds like AAPS is the only user of the building. Does the city use the building at all? If not, why wouldn't we just sell the building to AAPS – has that been considered, and if so, what was the reason for not pursuing sale? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City does not presently use the building. A sale has not been considered. Any sale of parkland would require the approval by a majority vote of the electors of the city voting on the question at a regular or special election.

Question: Also on CA-4, the cover memo mentions that the City Administrator recommended the City not spend money on an appraisal report - what was/is the purpose of the report (to assess condition/capital needs or value of property or something else)? What is the value of the building/property? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In this case, the lease serves a public purpose. Specifically, it provides space to Ann Arbor Rec and Ed to run certain programs, which foster educational and cultural opportunities for Ann Arbor residents. Lessee pays \$1/year in rent and contributes to upkeep of the building (maintaining a capital account at \$50,000 to support certain repairs). As a result, city staff believes an appraisal is unnecessary as the lease is not intended to generate revenue. The intent of the assessment would be to determine the value of the property if it were the City's intent to lease the property at a competitive or market rate. When the building was last appraised for insurance valuation purposes in 2017 the value was \$485,900. That amount is for the building only and doesn't consider the land value.

Question: Is AAPS keeping up with the repairs on this building? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Yes. The City is satisfied with the condition the building is kept in, and has a good working relationship with Rec & Ed to determine when AAPS or the City should be leading a repair.

Question: Is the set-aside for repairs enough? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The funding collected for facility repairs has been sufficient.

Question: Has the city ever publically or privately solicited other offers or bids for use of this facility? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Current staff are not aware of other offers or bids for using the facility.

CA – 5 – Resolution to Enter a Lease with Huron River Holdings, LLC for Argo Overflow Parking at 412 and 416 Long Shore Drive (\$48,000.00/4 years) (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-5, although the lease payments seem reasonable, can you please explain what the basis is/how the payment amounts were derived? Also, please elaborate a bit on why the payments are increasing by 30% (was the \$9,000 in effect for multiple years)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Parks department has not been able to find comparatives for commercial properties renting parking lots to liveries for local river recreation use. Without these comparatives, the Parks department and Huron River Holdings (HRH) have worked together to negotiate a rate that is acceptable to both parties. Between 2015 – 2018 the annual payment was locked at \$9,000. The updated lease considers the fact there was no increase in payment for 4 years and reflects the fact that the proposed lease with HRH provides for the use of an additional 18 spots on weekends and holidays between mid-April and the end of October increasing the total available spots from approximately 7,600 per year to roughly 8,700 per year.

CA-6 – Resolution to Petition the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner for the City of Ann Arbor FY20 Tree Planting Project in the Huron River Green Infrastructure Drainage District (Total Cost: \$400,000.00; City's Apportionment: \$400,000.00)

Question: Is it possible to include this in the Climate Action funding category? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The Urban and Community Forestry Program is currently funded from the Stormwater Fund, and is part of the rate structure. It is possible to utilize Climate Action General Fund funding for the Forestry activities; however, doing so would re-allocating funding from other programs/work plans.

Question: Residents have asked if this money would be better send rebuilding our Forestry Department? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Street Tree Planting has been programmed as a part of the Stormwater Fund Capital Expenditure Budget to continue the investment in the City's Urban Forest. As the City's street trees die, they are replaced with diverse, site-appropriate, tree species that will support the growth and health of the Urban Forest. This project directly contributes to the overall diversity and health of the urban forest.

Question: Residents have asked about the quality of the trees and reported that the new trees they are receiving are of low quality. What oversight does the City provide that the trees are of high quality and worthy of the expenditure? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The planting contract will be managed by the City's Public Works Unit – Forestry Group. The bid specifications and documents require that “All plant material shall conform to *American Standard for Nursery Stock*”. Each planting location and planted tree will be inspected and approved by a City employed Certified Arborist.

Question: Has the City reached out to DTE and other sources of funding for the new trees? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: To date the City has not specifically sought funding for tree planting from DTE. Other funding sources such as, proceeds from the Dean Fund and Developer contributions are utilized for planting of new trees.

CA-8 - Resolution to Approve Execution of Articles of Incorporation for, and Becoming a Constituent Member of, the Washtenaw Regional Resource Management Authority (WRRMA)

Note: Due to the extent of Council's questions, staff's responses and the associated back-up are provided as a separate document.

A – Approval of Council Minutes

Question: How do we go about changing the minutes to reflect opposition (stated at the council session) to a voice vote? In two cases on Feb. 19 meeting 19-0163 and 19-0017 I voted “Nay” - can that be reflected in the minutes somehow without my calling for a voice vote each time? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: A response was not received in time to be included in the published response, however will we provide a response.

B-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 8 (Organization of Boards and Commissions), Section 1:210, Title I of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor to Allow Council to Waive City Employment Restriction (Independent Community Police Oversight Commission) (Ordinance No. ORD-19-05)

Question: How does this amendment impact the recommended slate of eleven? How many of the slate of eleven will require seven votes for approval, due to recent positions as temporary employees of the city? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: None of the proposed slate are or were temporary City employees.

DC-2 - Resolution Directing the City Administrator to Include Funding in the FY20 City Budget to Conduct the Lower Town Area Mobility Study

Question: If this resolution fails, where would the city put the funds instead? Would crosswalk lighting be a possible option? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: It should be noted that the funds identified in the resolution are from the operations and maintenance budget of the Major Street Fund. This funding supports a host of activities.

Question: Is it common practice that projects rejected by City Council be brought back to be entered into a future budget cycle? This seems like an end-run around the 8-vote requirement. (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Staff defers this question to the resolution sponsor.

Question: Many times during our discussion of this project, the city's traffic planners have stated to the effect "we don't know what the results of this will be, nor will it provide specific recommendations." Can you tell us clearly what is the purpose of this study, and what will be included in the final results? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The purpose of the study is to identify what projects will be feasible to address transportation and mobility needs of the Lower Town area. To be clear the study will provide specific recommendations – however, staff cannot anticipate what those are at this time because the study, including analysis and public input, has not commenced.

City Council stated the purpose of the study in Council Resolution R-17-472 (passed 12/18/17):

Whereas, The City of Ann Arbor provides an exceptional quality of life to its residents and is therefore a community of choice that attracts new residents and businesses;

Whereas, Development in the northern areas of the City can reasonably be expected to add demand to the City's mobility network;

Whereas, City Council desires to mitigate the potential impacts of this development on the City's quality of life;

Whereas, The confluence of Pontiac Trail, Broadway Street, Plymouth Road, Moore Street, Wall Street, and Maiden Lane (also known as Lowertown) has the potential to become a mobility chokepoint; and

Whereas, The City has previously conducted area-wide assessments of traffic in this area;

RESOLVED, That City Council directs the City Administrator to have staff develop the scope, schedule cost, and funding sources necessary to review and update previous studies of vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movement leading to and traveling through the Lowertown area; and

RESOLVED, That City Council directs the scope, schedule, costs and funding sources be presented to the Transportation Commission at its January 18, 2018 meeting; and this information along with Transportation Commission comments and recommendations, and any necessary budget amendments be presented to City Council at its February 5, 2018 meeting for consideration.

Sponsored by: Mayor Taylor, Councilmembers Ackerman, Bannister, and Kailasapathy

Question: Given that our own staff do not know what to expect from this study, who will be interpreting and implementing the results? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The scope of work and required deliverables are specified in the contract. The scope of work includes the development of a model that can be used to perform alternatives analyses. As the analyses lead to discrete projects, City staff will be responsible for coordinating implementation. It should be noted that implementation may rely in part on entities other than the City itself.

Question: Is there anything – other than the language of this resolution – that would prevent the city from soliciting bids from new parties? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The draft resolution directs “the City Administrator to reopen negotiations with the qualified firms who initially submitted with a revised scope of work that addresses Council’s concerns about cost and delivery schedule, and to bring the revised contract back to Council for consideration not later than the second meeting in September 2019.” If Council wishes to direct staff to open a new RFP process, then the resolution would need to reflect that direction.

Question: Where did the figure of ~\$650K come from? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Given the complexity of the study and based on rough estimates provided by several consulting firms, staff had estimated that the cost of the study would be around \$600,000. Per Council’s direction, the scope and cost estimate were presented to the Transportation Commission on [January 18, 2018](#) and back to Council on [February 5, 2018](#).

Question: How was it determined that ~\$650K is a fair cost? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: See response above.

Question: How does this resolution fit with 18-1331 Resolution which was defeated by Council? Please respond to resident complaints that this an unfair work around from 8 votes to 6 votes. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Staff defers this question to the resolution sponsor.

Question: What conversations and emails have occurred to ask UM to help with in-kind expertise and funding? Please refer to City-UM Policy Coordination Meeting notes from 6/5/18 and 9/11/18 and the upcoming 3/5/19 meeting? Can this topic be addressed at the 3/5/19 meeting, and a report given to Council and residents? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: At the February 19, 2019 City Council meeting, the City Administrator stated that the University has been asked to help with this study. While UM is an interested

stakeholder and will provide data required to validate the model, they declined to offer any direct financial support.

Question: How much would it cost to alternatively spend this money on a professional pedestrian safety engineer to oversee urgent needs in the community? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The City Administrator has proposed adding a new transportation engineering position focused on pedestrian safety in the FY20/21 Financial Plan. This is separate and apart from the uses of the funding for the Lower Town Mobility Study.

Question: Does the Communications department have plans to educate residents on how to use See Click Fix and the AAPD traffic complain questionnaire and the Traffic Calming Program to gather and track citizen input on priority dangerous cross walk and public/pedestrian safety concern areas? Shouldn't these known hot spots be prioritized over spending more money on consultants, whose reports won't be available until 2023? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The second RESOLVED clause in the resolution directs the City Administrator to address Council's concerns about cost and delivery schedule. Staff has met to discuss the means to deliver the model sooner, and then use it as the basis for the community outreach that is part of the contract.

Staff is funding upgrades to lighting at the high priority crosswalk locations throughout the City. The City Administrator will be proposing further significant increases in pedestrian funding in the FY20 budget using one-time monies that have become available.

Councilmembers are reminded that staff pursued the Lower Town Mobility Study at the request of Council.

City staff are continually educating the public, through A2 Fix It, regarding the best way to notify us of various issues. To help assist folks to report crosswalk issues, we have recently added a crosswalk category to A2 Fix It. Crosswalk issues reported through A2 Fix It, along with those coming through the traffic calming process, are collected by our transportation staff and used as part of their data set for crosswalks.

The AAPD traffic questionnaire is a tool the police department uses to collect information that can assist them in assigning officers for traffic enforcement. A2 Fix It, on the other hand, is the tool used by residents to request improvements or additions to infrastructure.

Question: Please provide transparency for Council and residents a list of possible outcomes of the study, such as safety improvements and roundabouts. Residents have asked for staff members to share their insights on what the "wish list" of possible solutions might entail. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Staff cannot anticipate what improvements/projects will come out of the study at this time because the study, including analysis and public input, has not commenced. There is no wish list of possible solutions.

Question: Residents have asked whether another could RFP be launched for \$150K or \$250K? They would like transparency on why \$649K is needed? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The draft resolution directs “the City Administrator to reopen negotiations with the qualified firms who initially submitted with a revised scope of work that addresses Council’s concerns about cost and delivery schedule, and to bring the revised contract back to Council for consideration not later than the second meeting in September 2019.” If Council wishes to direct staff to open a new RFP process, then the resolution would need to reflect that direction. Additionally, staff would like direction from City Council as to what aspects of the scope should be cut to achieve the desired price-point if this course of action is pursued.

Given the complexity of the study and based on rough estimates provided by several consulting firms, staff had estimated that the cost of the study would be around \$600,000. Per Council’s direction, the scope and cost estimate were presented to the Transportation Commission on [January 18, 2018](#) and back to Council on [February 5, 2018](#).

Question: What other consultants beside OHM responded to the RFP and why was OHM preferred? How many contracts have we had with OHM and their dollar amounts? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The three proposals from OHM, HRC, and Bergmann were included in City Council’s [November 19, 2019 packet](#). OHM has provided services to the City for many years. Staff requests that this request be narrowed to provide time parameters (e.g. between date-x and date-y) around the question so a response can be provided.

DC-3 - Resolution Regarding the City of Ann Arbor’s Spending of Proceeds from the 2017 Washtenaw County Mental Health and Public Safety Millage

Question: What is the status on the survey that is being conducted on the Mental Health Rebate Millage and what to do with the monies? Any chance the results of the survey can be surmised and given to council before March 25 2019? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: The vendor is still collecting survey responses. A second round of mailings to randomly selected households was completed last week to increase the number of respondents to ensure the final results are statistically representative of the city population. Staff recommends waiting for the final report to help ensure the results are unbiased.

Question: Re: the community survey referenced in this resolution: I have heard from three residents who received a second copy of the community survey (after mailing in a response to the first copy they received). This is confusing, residents are unsure about sending in a second response. What is the purpose of sending multiple copies of the survey to the same residents? Should residents send a second response? Also: why did the deadline change to March 25? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The vendor's protocol is to send a post-card to the households letting them know they were selected at random to participate in a survey on the millage and then follow up with two mailings of the surveys to encourage response. The survey indicates that "the adult 18 years or older in your household who most recently had a birthday (regardless of year of birth) should be the one to complete this survey", so only one response is necessary. The final report was delayed in order to reach the sample size required for a statistically representative result.

Question: If the end date for the survey is March 25, on what date can Council expect to see results of the community survey? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The report will be completed when a sufficient number of responses is obtained to achieve a statistically representative response of the community. The vendor anticipates the final report will be completed by March 25.

Question: Is there time for Council to see results of the survey (end date March 25) before "taking action" on or before April 1, as described in this resolution? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Staff anticipates the final report by March 25th, which is approximately 1 week before the April 1st Council meeting. Although it is past the stated standard deadline, staff is capable of incorporating changes in the City Administrator's recommended budget if it is received by April 1st.

Question: At what point will the City Administrator be designating allocations for the millage rebate funds, i.e. what is the latest possible date when the City Administrator could receive additional "policy direction" from Council regarding allocation of the millage rebate funds? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The City Administrator included recommendations for expenditures of the County Millage Rebate in his presentation on the FY20 General Fund projected budget. Depending upon actions the Council may take on April 1st, the Administrator may change allocations of funds to comply with any changes in Council-directed policy while preserving the proposed program for the FY2020 budget.

Question: Is the previous council resolution of September 18, 2017 (40/40/20) legally binding in any way?

Response: The City Council acts through its resolutions and those are binding until City Council rescinds or alters the Resolution. This Resolution is a directive to the City Administrator.

Question: Is the millage money General Fund money, by statute? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The millage monies are being placed in a separate dedicated fund. The monies are legally unrestricted.

Question: Does the 40/40/20 resolution prevent myself or the City Administrator from making a budget recommendation of 50% Climate Action/50% Affordable Housing? Or 100% for Climate Action? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: The 40/40/20 resolution provides policy guidance to the City Administrator. The Administrator takes direction from actions adopted, approved, and executed from Council as a whole.

The 40/40/20 resolution does not prevent a Councilmember from moving to amend the budget the City Administrator presents to change the 40/40/20 allocation to a different allocation, whether 50% Climate Action/50% Affordable Housing, 100% for Climate Action, or some other allocation. The amendment should explicitly reference and rescind the 40/40/20 allocation approved by City Council in its September 18, 2017, resolution. If the amendment to rescind the September 18, 2017, resolution and to change the allocation is approved and adopted by City Council, that will be the City Council's new directive to the City Administrator.

Question: Please provide ballpark estimates of what's already being spent and accomplished for Climate Action, Pedestrian Safety, and Affordable Housing, including across all departments, including OSI, Communications, the B2B tunnel projects (and others), Treeline, stormwater management, Solid Waste, community solar, air and water quality, and transportation. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: From the wording provided as part of this question, staff is interpreting the question to be asking what has been accomplished with the county millage funds this year. The FY19 budget included:

- a. Climate Action (\$880k allocation per council resolution) – \$75,000 for planning was allocated in FY19. Staff did the planning internally, freeing up resources which have been used to fund the incremental costs to purchase the City's first three electric vehicles, to hire two interns to help carry out the Office's work plan, to pay for necessary dues and licenses that help the office operate, and support day to day operations of the Office.
- b. Pedestrian Safety (\$440k allocation per council resolution) – \$420k authorized in budget. \$105k transferred to other funds for street light

- installations and the balance used for major uncontrolled crosswalk lighting upgrades.
- c. Affordable Housing (\$880k allocation per council resolution) - \$200k authorized in budget. No expenditures to date.

Question: Please specify a range of funding alternatives to using the mental health millage. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The three areas funded by the County Millage Rebate (climate action, pedestrian safety, and affordable housing) are all able to be funded by the Rebate and/or the City's General Fund. Pedestrian safety may also utilize road funds. Affordable housing may also utilize the Affordable Housing Trust fund and DDA funds (to the extent the DDA determines they qualify based on legal and policy restrictions).

Question: Please answer these questions with regard to metrics:

What is the goal / desired outcome?

- What is the associated indicator / metric?
- What is the current status?
- What are the targets, short-, medium- and long-term?
- What actions are necessary to achieve the targets?
- What resources are necessary?
- Finally, and perhaps most importantly, is all of the above realistic, individually and collectively (i.e. for every issue we want to tackle)? This has to be evaluated in the context of the city's overall situation, including that of the Environmental Commission. We need to ask ourselves if we have the money, time, energy and focus to achieve them. If not, we're just trying to juggle 20 balls at the same time. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response:

Climate Action

The City is planning to use the rebate resources for climate action to meet (and exceed) the Council's goal of a 25% reduction in community-wide greenhouse gas emissions by 2025 and 100% of city operations being powered by clean and renewable resources by 2035. In terms of indicators, we will be tracking greenhouse gas emission reductions, public engagement numbers and type, co-benefits of programs, dollars spent, and costs avoided (to the extent feasible). The current status of these programs is extremely limited – mostly focused on planning, as we have not had resources to undertake new programmatic offerings which will help us meet the goals established by Council. Targets

are as follows: short-term – establish the programs in collaboration with relevant partners; medium-term – launch programs and monitor indicators; revise as necessary; and long-term: 25% (or more) reduction in community-wide greenhouse gas emissions by 2025 and 100% of municipal operations powered by clean and renewable energy by 2035 (or before). In terms of resources, we need capacity, technical skills, and financial resources as most of these are new programs that need support to launch and sustained until they are institutionalized. Yes, this is realistic. See the attached work plan, which has previously been shared with Council, for more details.

Pedestrian Safety

Goal: Zero pedestrian accidents/deaths

Metric: Number of pedestrian accidents/deaths

Status: Currently upgrading lighting of major uncontrolled crossings
Standardizing crosswalks

Targets: Short: updating standards

Medium: upgrading lighting

Long term: standardizing/updating all crosswalks

Resources: \$115,000 annually for lighting upgrades (3-4 years)

TBD: crosswalk upgrades

Additional Senior Traffic Engineer

Realistic: Yes.

Affordable Housing

Delivery of 2,800 new affordable units and a fiscally sustainable Housing Commission are the goals. X units have been built of the 2,800. The 25% allocation to the Housing Commission of the affordable housing piece was done to help achieve sustainability. Additional details can be provided at a later date.

DC-4 - Resolution Requesting the City of Ann Arbor to Develop and Adopt a Solar Access Ordinance

Question: Is there a timeline for when City Council might expect to receive a proposed draft of a solar access ordinance? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The proposed resolution requests that we work through CY2019 to develop an ordinance. This process requires a significant investment of time to explore the technical and legal aspects of the request, followed by a process that runs through the Planning Commission. As staff was not consulted in the preparation of the resolution, it would be imprudent to place a time-certain on a response at this point in the face of the many other requests we've received from Council and as we prepare the FY20/21 Financial Plan.

Question: I understand that this just starts the process, but I am concerned about a project that is happening right now, on Kingsley, where a large house is being built to the direct north of a house already outfitted with solar panels. Will this ordinance consider

“grandfathering in” buildings that violate the spirit of the ordinance? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: As no proposed ordinance is formulated at this time, there is no clear answer. If any ordinance was incorporated into the Unified Development Code, then any such occurrence would be “grandfathered” as zoning changes are prospective, and by state law, do not retroactively apply. Nothing would prevent the homeowner from contacting the neighboring property and arranging to purchase or otherwise secure an easement on the adjacent property to restrict solar impacts.

Question: Is there anything the homeowner can do at this point to insure that their investment in solar is not made useless by this new construction? (Councilmember Hayner)

Response: Please see above.

DS – 1 – Resolution to Approve Street Closings for the Ann Arbor Marathon Running Event - Sunday, March 24, 2019

Question: Regarding DS-1, the cover memo indicates that “the current route and location of beer tent are the result of those meetings”. Does that mean all parties – City, UM, applicant - are now OK with the plans? If not, what are the remaining key issues and is there a plan for further meetings to try and resolve them? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The original map had the beer tent on Keech and the University felt that was too close to the Stadium and feared it would give the impression that the University was linked to this event. The University felt that the Davis Avenue location was more acceptable. There are no remaining issues or additional meetings planned.

Name	Board Bame	End date	Position
Ali Ramlawi	Airport Advisory Committee	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Kathy Griswold	Airport Advisory Committee	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Melanie McNicholas	Airport Advisory Committee	31-May-19	
Peter Greenfield	Airport Advisory Committee	31-May-19	
Larry Krieg	Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority Board	1-May-19	Ypsilanti Township Rep.
Prashanth Gururaja	Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority Board	1-May-19	Ann Arbor City Rep
Ali Ramlawi	Ann Arbor Public Art Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Connie Rizzolo Brown	Ann Arbor Public Art Commission	31-May-19	
David Esau	Ann Arbor Public Art Commission	31-May-19	
David Zinn	Ann Arbor Public Art Commission	31-May-19	
Kathy Griswold	Ann Arbor Public Schools Transportation Safety Committee	2-Dec-19	
Ali Ramlawi	Audit Committee	2-Dec-19	
Anne Bannister	Audit Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Audit Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jane Lumm	Audit Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jeff Hayner	Audit Committee	2-Dec-19	
Elizabeth Nelson	Board of Insurance Administration	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Jane Lumm	Board of Insurance Administration	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Chip Smith	Brownfields Plan Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Brownfields Plan Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jeff Hayner	Brownfields Plan Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Kathy Griswold	Brownfields Plan Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Ali Ramlawi	Budget and Labor Committee	2-Dec-19	
Chip Smith	Budget and Labor Committee	2-Dec-19	
Christopher Taylor	Budget and Labor Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Budget and Labor Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jane Lumm	Budget and Labor Committee	2-Dec-19	
Howard Lazarus	Building Authority	30-Jun-19	
Tom Crawford	Building Authority	30-Jun-19	
David Arnsdorf	Building Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Gordon Berry	Building Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Hugh Flack, Jr.	Building Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Kenneth Winters	Building Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Robert Hart	Building Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Jack Eaton	Cable Communications Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
John Torgersen	Cable Communications Commission	31-May-19	
Erica Briggs	City Planning Commission	30-Jun-19	
Julie P Weatherbee	City Planning Commission	30-Jun-19	
Scott Trudeau	City Planning Commission	30-Jun-19	
Zachary Ackerman	City Planning Commission	30-Jun-19	Member of the City Council
Julie Grand	City/School Committee (Ann Arbor Public Schools Liaisons)	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Alison Stroud	Commission on Disability Issues	31-May-19	

Elizabeth Nelson	Commission on Disability Issues	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Kathleen M Mozak-Betts	Commission on Disability Issues	31-May-19	
Larry D Keeler	Commission on Disability Issues	31-May-19	
Tim Hull	Commission on Disability Issues	31-May-19	
Anne Bannister	Community Events Funds Committee	2-Dec-19	
Julie Grand	Community Events Funds Committee	2-Dec-19	
Anne Bannister	Coordinated Funding Leadership Team	2-Dec-19	
Christopher Taylor	Council Administration Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Council Administration Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jane Lumm	Council Administration Committee	2-Dec-19	
Julie Grand	Council Administration Committee	2-Dec-19	
Kathy Griswold	Council Administration Committee	2-Dec-19	
Ali Ramlawi	Council Liquor License Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jane Lumm	Council Liquor License Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jeff Hayner	Council Liquor License Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Kathy Griswold	Council Liquor License Review Committee	2-Dec-19	
Chip Smith	Council Policy Agenda Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Council Policy Agenda Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jane Lumm	Council Policy Agenda Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jeff Hayner	Council Policy Agenda Committee	2-Dec-19	
Kathy Griswold	Council Policy Agenda Committee	2-Dec-19	
Anne Bannister	Council Rules Committee	2-Dec-19	
Chip Smith	Council Rules Committee	2-Dec-19	
Christopher Taylor	Council Rules Committee	2-Dec-19	
Elizabeth Nelson	Council Rules Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Council Rules Committee	2-Dec-19	
Gary Cooper	Design Review Board	31-May-19	Landscape Architect
Don & K Duquette	Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)	31-May-19	
Hugh M Sonk	Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)	31-May-19	
Joan French	Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)	31-May-19	
John Chamberlin	Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)	31-May-19	
Kathleen Nolan	Downtown Area Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)	31-May-19	
Joan Lowenstein	Downtown Development Authority	31-May-19	Citizen at-large
John Mouat	Downtown Development Authority	31-May-19	Person having an interest in property located in the downtown district or officers, members, trustees, principals, or employees of a legal entity having an interest in property located in the downtown district.

			Person having an interest in property located in the downtown district or officers, members, trustees, principals, or employees of a legal entity having an interest in property located in the downtown district.
Phillip J Weiss	Downtown Development Authority	31-May-19	
Ali Ramlawi	Downtown Development Authority Partnerships Committee	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Jane Lumm	Downtown Development Authority Partnerships Committee	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Dale Leslie	Economic Development Corporation Board	31-May-19	
James Adams	Economic Development Corporation Board	31-May-19	
Jan Davies McDermott	Economic Development Corporation Board	30-Jun-19	
Tim Marshall	Economic Development Corporation Board	31-May-19	
Ken Westerman	Elizabeth Dean Fund Committee	31-May-19	
Monica Milla	Elizabeth Dean Fund Committee	31-May-19	
Susan Perry	Elizabeth Dean Fund Committee	31-May-19	
Brock Hastie	Employees' Retirement System Board of Trustees	31-Dec-19	Citizen Trustee
Julie Lynch	Employees' Retirement System Board of Trustees	31-Dec-19	Citizen Trustee
Carlene Colvin-Garcia	Energy Commission	31-May-19	
Jack Eaton	Energy Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Jay M Zocher	Energy Commission	31-May-19	
Jeff Hayner	Energy Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Mark Clevey	Energy Commission	31-May-19	
Wayne Appleyard	Energy Commission	31-May-19	
Anne Bannister	Environmental Commission	31-Dec-19	Councilmember
Chip Smith	Environmental Commission	31-Dec-19	Councilmember
Mike Appel	Environmental Commission	20-Mar-19	Parks Advisory Commission Rep.
Stephen C Brown	Environmental Commission	31-May-19	
Jean Cares	Greenbelt Advisory Commission (GAC)	31-May-19	Agricultural landowner or operator of an agricultural business
Jennifer Fike	Greenbelt Advisory Commission (GAC)	31-May-19	Representative of a environmental and/or conservation group
John Ramsburgh	Greenbelt Advisory Commission (GAC)	31-May-19	Public-at-Large Rep.
Julie Grand	Greenbelt Advisory Commission (GAC)	31-Dec-19	Councilmember
David Rochlen	Historic District Commission	31-May-19	
Max Cope	Historic District Commission	31-May-19	
Ali Ramlawi	Housing Affordability and Equity Task Force	2-Dec-19	
Anne Bannister	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
David Blanchard	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	31-May-19	Representative of the business, development, banking, architectural, or legal community

Eleanor W Pollack	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	31-May-19	Member At-Large
James Daniel	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	31-May-19	Member At-Large
Nora Lee Wright	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	31-May-19	Member At-Large
Zachary Ackerman	Housing and Human Services Advisory Board	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Jerry Schulte	Housing Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Timothy Durham	Housing Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Daniel Lee	Housing Commission	6-May-19	
Julie Grand	Housing Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Ali Ramlawi	Human Rights Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Julie Grand	Human Rights Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Linda Winkler	Human Rights Commission	31-May-19	
Mohamad Al-Azem	Human Rights Commission	31-May-19	
Vivian J. Chang	Human Rights Commission	31-May-19	
Cheryl Darnton	Huron River Watershed Council Liaisons	31-May-19	
Janis Bobrin	Huron River Watershed Council Liaisons	31-May-19	
Jeff Hayner	Huron River Watershed Council Liaisons	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Molly Maciejewski	Huron River Watershed Council Liaisons	31-May-19	
Richard Norton	Huron River Watershed Council Liaisons	31-May-19	
Jane Lumm	Independent Community Police Oversight Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Zachary Ackerman	Independent Community Police Oversight Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Paula Sorrell	Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA)	30-Jun-19	Ann Arbor City Rep
Stephen Rapundalo	Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA)	30-Jun-19	Ann Arbor City Rep
Juliet Pressel	Local Officers' Compensation Commission	30-Sep-19	
Chip Smith	Michigan Theater Board Liaisons	2-Dec-19	
Christopher Taylor	Michigan Theater Board Liaisons	2-Dec-19	
David Santacroce	Park Advisory Commission	31-May-19	
Jeff Hayner	Park Advisory Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Julie Grand	Park Advisory Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Paige P. Morrison	Park Advisory Commission	31-May-19	
Peter Woolf	Public Market Advisory Commission	31-May-19	Regular Customer
Glenn Nelson	Recreation Advisory Commission	31-May-19	
Jeff Hayner	Recreation Advisory Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Kathy Griswold	Recreation Advisory Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Katie Lewit	Recreation Advisory Commission	31-May-19	
Kelsey Zimmerman	Recreation Advisory Commission	31-May-19	
Brock Hastie	Retiree Health Care Benefit Plan & Trust Board of Trustees (VEBA)	31-Dec-19	

Julie Lynch	Retiree Health Care Benefit Plan & Trust Board of Trustees (VEBA)	31-Dec-19	
Chip Smith	Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) Liaison	2-Dec-19	Alternate
Elizabeth Nelson	Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) Liaison	2-Dec-19	Primary
Julie Grand	Student Advisory Council	2-Dec-19	
Christopher Taylor	Summer Festival Board	2-Dec-19	
Kathy Griswold	Transportation Commission	2-Dec-19	Member of the City Council
Linda Diane Feldt	Transportation Commission	31-May-19	
Michael Firn	Transportation Commission	31-May-19	Owner or operator of a transportation business operating in Ann Arbor
Robert Gordon	Transportation Commission	31-May-19	
Scott Trudeau	Transportation Commission	30-Jun-19	City Planning Commission Rep.
Tim Hull	Transportation Commission	31-May-19	Commission on Dissability Issues Rep.
Ali Ramlawi	Urban County Executive Committee	2-Dec-19	Alternate
Elizabeth Nelson	Urban County Executive Committee	2-Dec-19	
Jack Eaton	Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) Liaison (Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti Area Transportation System)	2-Dec-19	Primary
Kathy Griswold	Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) Liaison (Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti Area Transportation System)	2-Dec-19	Alternate
Anne Bannister	Washtenaw County/City of Ann Arbor Community Corrections Advisory Board (WCCCAB)	2-Dec-19	
Elizabeth Nelson	Washtenaw Metro Alliance	2-Dec-19	
Jeff Hayner	Washtenaw Metro Alliance	2-Dec-19	
Elizabeth Nelson	Zoning Board of Appeals	2-Dec-19	Councilmember
Julie P Weatherbee	Zoning Board of Appeals	31-May-19	
Todd W Grant	Zoning Board of Appeals	31-May-19	

Office of Sustainability and Innovations Work Plan

5 Year Work Plan

MATRIX KEY

Co-Benefits EDU - Education JOBS - Job Creation / Workforce Training NRG - Local Energy Production AIR - Air Pollution Reduction \$\$ - Dollars Stay in Local Economy ENV - Environmentally Friendly	EQU - Benefits the Most Vulnerable; Contributes to One Community Goals SOCO - Leads to Enhanced Social Cohesion COST - Cost Savings Accrued HEALTH - Improves Health of Residents RES - Improves the Resilience and/or Preparedness	Estimated Annual Savings may accrue to residents, businesss or the City	Impact Timeframe S - short (1-3 years) M - medium (4-8 years) L - 9+ years	Priority H - high M - medium L - low
---	---	---	--	--

Work Plan Task	GHG Reduction Potential (metrics tons CO2e)	Cost Estimate (non-staffing)	Cost / Ton CO2e	Estimated Annual Savings	Payback Period	Co-Benefits	Impact Timeframe	Priority
----------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	----------------	-------------	------------------	----------



RESIDENTIAL

Time of Marketing	29,336	\$250,000	\$9	\$200,000 - \$1,000,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; \$\$; COST	M	M
Net Zero Energy Affordable Housing Program	412	\$450,000	\$1,092	\$77,513	5.8 years	EQU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; \$\$; COST	S	H
Green Rental Program	30,844	\$331,000	\$11	\$5,100,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; AIR; \$\$; EQU; COST	M	H
Aging in Place Efficiently Program	4,165	\$200,000	\$48	\$400,000	0 years	EQU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; \$\$; COST; HEALTH	M	M
Efficiency and Solar in the Community	73,500	\$200,000	\$3	\$500,000 - \$5,000,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; \$\$; EQU; COST; HEALTH	L	H
Weatherization Expansion	14,000	\$125,000	\$9	\$250,000 - \$2,000,000	0 years	EQU; EDU; JOBS; \$\$; HEALTH	M	M
Resilience Hubs	500	\$150,000	\$300	\$40,390	3.7 years	EQU; RES; SOCO; HEALTH; EDU; NRG; AIR	M	H
Rain Ready Community	944	\$50,000	\$53	Not estimated	Not estimated	RES; EDU; JOBS; \$\$; ENV	M	M
Distributed Generation & Innovation Hubs	50,000	\$250,000	\$5	\$250,000 - \$2,000,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; \$\$; EQU; SOCO; HEALTH; COST; RES	L	M
Local Carbon Offset Program	500	\$25,000	\$50	\$80,000	0 years	EDU; NRG; AIR; \$\$; ENV	S	L



COMMERCIAL

Grand Challenge Program	73,500	\$400,000	\$5	\$400,000	1 year	EDU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; \$\$; COST; HEALTH; ENV	L	M
Solar Faithful	1,300	\$25,000	\$19	\$225,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; NRG; \$\$; SOCO; COST	S	L
Green Business Program	7,620	\$150,000	\$20	\$250,000 - \$1,000,000	0 years	JOBS; \$\$; EDU; COST; ENV	L	M
Re-Energize UM Relationship	7,126	\$25,000	\$4	\$350,000 - \$3,000,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; AIR; \$\$; COST; RES	L	H



TRANSPORTATION

EV Program	18,294	\$125,000	\$7	\$2,000,000	0 years	EDU; JOBS; AIR; HEALTH	L	H
------------	--------	-----------	-----	-------------	---------	------------------------	---	---

Office of Sustainability and Innovations Work Plan

5 Year Work Plan

MATRIX KEY

Co-Benefits EDU - Education JOBS - Job Creation / Workforce Training NRG - Local Energy Production AIR - Air Pollution Reduction \$\$ - Dollars Stay in Local Economy ENV - Environmentally Friendly	EQU - Benefits the Most Vulnerable; Contributes to One Community Goals SOCO - Leads to Enhanced Social Cohesion COST - Cost Savings Accrued HEALTH - Improves Health of Residents RES - Improves the Resilience and/or Preparedness	Estimated Annual Savings may accrue to residents, businesss or the City	Impact Timeframe S - short (1-3 years) M - medium (4-8 years) L - 9+ years	Priority H - high M - medium L - low
---	---	---	--	--

Work Plan Task	GHG Reduction Potential (metrics tons CO2e)	Cost Estimate (non-staffing)	Cost / Ton CO2e	Estimated Annual Savings	Payback Period	Co-Benefits	Impact Timeframe	Priority
MUNICIPAL								
100% Municipal Clean and Renewable Energy Strategy	26,000	\$500,000	\$27	\$3,160,800	0 years	EDU; JOBS; NRG; AIR; SS; COST; ENV	M	H
Revolving Energy Fund		\$200,000						
Assisting with Department Energy Purchasing		\$0						
Internal Communication Efforts		\$0						
Net Zero Buildings Policy		\$0						
Internalization of Sustainability into City Operations		\$0						
Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues	2,633	\$110,000	\$42	\$20,000-\$200,000	0-5 years	JOBS; NRG; COST	S	M
CROSS-CUTTING, ENGAGEMENT, & EDUCATION								
Equity Programs / Planning	0	\$25,000	Not Estimated	Not estimated	Not estimated	EQU; SOCO; HEALTH	S	H
Commission Support	0	\$0	Not Estimated	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU	S	H
Sustaining Ann Arbor Together Neighborhood Grant Program	500	\$500,000	\$1000	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU; SOCO; \$\$; EQU; ENV	S	H
Community Outreach	500	\$100,000	\$200	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU; ENV	M	H
Forming and Reforming Strategic Partnerships	500	\$25,000	\$50	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU; SOCO	M	H
National Field Building Efforts	500	\$75,000	\$150	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU; COST; RES	L	M
TRACKING PROGRESS								
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories	0	\$75,000	Not Estimated	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU	S	H
Metric Tracking	0	\$50,000	Not Estimated	Not estimated	Not estimated	EDU	S	H