

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: January 19, 2016
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	<u>Sent Time</u>	<u>Received Time</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>Redactions</u>	<u>Reason for Redaction</u>
2	8:37 PM		City Council	Sabra Briere	Jacqueline Beaudry, Sara Higgins, Tom Crawford, Stephen Postema, Kevin McDonald		
3	8:31 PM		Christopher Taylor	Lauren Sargent	Zach Ackerman	Email address	Privacy
4	10:14 PM		Jane Lumm, Kirk Westphal, Sabra Briere	Ann		Email address	Privacy
5	10:28 PM		Julie Grand	Stephen Kunselman		Email address	Privacy

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Briere, Sabra
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 8:37 PM
To: CityCouncil
Cc: Beaudry, Jacqueline; Higgins, Sara; Crawford, Tom; Postema, Stephen; McDonald, Kevin
Subject: Re: Proposed amendment to the CORE / Library Lot resolution

As shared earlier. These amendments offered as a whole.

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council
Ann Arbor
734-995-3518
734-277-6578 (cell)

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 19, 2016, at 11:37 AM, Briere, Sabra <SBriere@a2gov.org> wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

Attached is a proposed amendment to the CORE / Library Lot resolution. I've discussed this proposed language with Mr. Crawford and Mr. McDonald; Mr. McDonald drafted the language for me.

By offering this amendment, I hope to clarify our expectations for the eventual project. And by offering this amendment, I am not committing to supporting the final resolution. I simply want the best possible building with the most community benefits that can be considered.

The amendments in this document reflect the following considerations:

Sustainability: LEED Silver is a low bar to reach, and with the design of the underground parking structure, is too easily attainable. Expecting LEED Platinum (and potentially accepting LEED Gold) helps us reach our goals for private development and environmental impact.

Affordable Housing: Seeking 10% of all residential units to be owned by the City using one or more mechanisms for that ownership and rented to those making 60% - 80% of the adjusted median income (AMI) would help us reach our affordable housing goals and would also create some needed downtown housing that doesn't create conflicts within the development. (Income levels for a single adult at this range are between \$35,460 and \$46,100). This use was included in the Offering Memorandum on Page 20: *Residential (market rate and/or affordable housing and not targeting only one market segment).*

Alternative transportation, Non-motorized transportation, Pedestrian Safety and Access: Asking the staff to work with the developer to create a project that includes safe and attractive walkable connections between Liberty Plaza and Library Lane, and between Blake Transit Center and Library Lane, meets our expectations for pedestrian connectivity. The Offering Memorandum acknowledged high pedestrian use in this area on Page 19: *This district is intended to contain downtown's greatest concentration of development and serves as a focus for intensive pedestrian use.*

If you have any questions, please contact me directly. Of course, I will offer this amendment from the floor. (Because if it's extensive nature, I wanted you all to have full notice.)

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council member
Ann Arbor, MI

(734)277-6578 (cell)
(734)995-3518

Emails sent and received by me as a Council member regarding Ann Arbor City matters are generally subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

<CORE Resolution Amendment REV1.docx>

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Lauren Sargent [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 8:31 PM
To: Taylor, Christopher (Mayor)
Cc: Ackerman, Zach
Subject: Meeting with Mayor Taylor:

Dear Mayor Taylor and Council Member Ackerman,

As I am sitting here in Council Chambers I realized that I had not yet sent you the list of questions I promised. I had hoped to clean this up a bit, but now feel it is more important to just send my notes. Thank you in advance for reading and responding to these questions.

Meeting with Mayor Taylor:

- 1). Why was there no study of the environmental impacts of deer, prior to developing a "management" plan?
- 2). Why was there no effective community engagement, as recommended by the DNR, Lance DeVoe etc?
- 3). Why was the MOST controversial and dangerous "solution" the first step rather than the last resort? How was USDA APHIS selected? Did You read the NYT Op Ed and or view Exposed? Was there competitive bidding on this contract?
- 4). Why did WC4EB have privileged access to Council and City staff? Did they write the plan? Design the survey?

I ask you to propose:

Moratorium--episodes of suspicious activity in Bird Hills, Kubler Langford, Pontiac Trail neighborhood

Deer Advisory Committee (a la Rochester Hills) and wildlife biologist on staff

Proactive--no repeat of this year

Additional concerns:

Safety in Baits 2, UM bus stop. Miranda

Dismissive response from Council members, police, deer management site etc.

Keeping deer shooting activity secret to protect people? Ludicrous

Lack of signs--fixed through our efforts yet implications that anti shooting folk are removing signs.

Divisive

What non lethal plans are in the works?

Sent from my iPhone

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Ann [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:14 PM
To: Lumm, Jane; Westphal, Kirk; Briere, Sabra
Subject: Woodbury Club Postponement

Thank you all for a job well done. I am so glad you attended the meeting at Barclay Park on Friday and were able to act on our concerns as quickly as you did. I realize that it involved hard work and patience on your part. Sabra,s amendment does help to clarify the situation, and I am grateful for that.

I wish the parcels had been joined before, and I am still worried about the natural features . Still ! Progress has been made thanks to you.

Sincerely,
Ann Attarian

From, Ann. Sent from my iPad

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Stephen Kunselman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:28 PM
To: Grand, Julie
Subject: Re: Proposed Sale of the Library Lot and compliance with the Securities Exchange Commission

Nice. I had let her know of my concerns last week. Hockey has been great; I forgot what it was like to sweat so much.

Steve

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 19, 2016, at 6:43 PM, Grand, Julie <JGrand@a2gov.org> wrote:

Thanks so much for this, Steve. Jane proposed a similar caucus question, so we are all looking into this issue.

Enjoy hockey!

Julie

Julie Grand
Ann Arbor City Council, Ward 3
(734) 678-7567 (c)

On Jan 19, 2016, at 5:11 PM, Stephen Kunselman <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear City Council,
I am hoping during your discussion of the Library Lot development rights sale, that the importance of ensuring the sale complies with the SEC requirements for the original bond sale will be discussed openly. I've attached the link to the SEC judgement against Allen Park that illustrates the importance of abiding by the law [SEC.gov | SEC Charges Allen Park, Mich. and Two Former City Leaders in Fraudulent Muni Bond Offering for Movie Studio Project](#)

	<p>SEC.gov SEC Charges Allen Park, Mich. and Two Former ...</p> <p>FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE 2014-249</p> <p>Washington D.C., Nov. 6, 2014 — View on www.sec.gov Preview by Yahoo</p>
---	--

There is much to be concerned about with the direction this proposed sale is going:

A). The original Library Lot proposal was for a publicly owned "building authority" to be created by City Council to own a hotel/convention center with the backing of the full faith and credit of the City. Hence the Bond sale may have been premised on this scenario, but that is no longer the proposal - similar to the Allen Park case.

B). The \$10 million purchase price offer is less than what the value of the development rights are when one includes the interest charged to the \$50 million loan. The property is easily worth \$5 million (Y-lot sold for about as much), and there is \$5 million worth of extra cement for the foundation according to a number of public statements - but there's no inclusion of any amount of the \$30 million of interest from the government subsidized low interest loan. It's as if the City is cashing out it's equity from a Federal low interest loan with private use restrictions and in turn subsidizing private development by not charging for the interest accrued on the \$5 million used for the extra cement. It's also interesting to note that the \$5 million in cement is 10% of the \$50 million loan, which I believe is the threshold for the private use restrictions of the Build America Bonds. If there's more than \$5 million attributed to private use, than it seems the sale would violate the threshold.

C. The 2010 letter from Noah Hall (attached) details a number of concerns about the parking arrangements that have been proposed back when the proposal was a public project. With the proposed sale to a private purchaser, he states, "Presumably, the parking structure does not itself cause this test to be met, although there is still some uncertainty regarding the amount of bond proceeds being used to support future private development at the site rather than construction of public parking spaces."

Clearly, unless you have received a letter from Bond Counsel (which I asked for many times, even having met with Bond Counsel) that this sale is legit with the SEC, this sale could be a problem. Considering the SEC judgments against the Mayor and Administrator of Allen Park, I implore you to not jeopardize the career of Tom Crawford, City of Ann Arbor Interim Administrator, in this effort.

Good luck - I'll be ice skating while you deliberate this one!

Steve

<GLELC-Ann-Arbor-Parking-Structure-Bonding-Letter-2010.pdf>