



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Tom Crawford, Interim City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Matthew V. Horning, Interim Financial & Administrative Services Area Administrator/CFO
Jennifer Hall, Executive Director, Ann Arbor Housing Commission
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Molly Maciejewski, Public Works Manager
Gerald Markey, City Assessor
Pollay, Susan, Executive Director, DDA
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services
Missy Stults, Sustainability & Innovations Manager
Jill Thacher, City Planner

SUBJECT: April 20, 2020 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: April 16, 2020

CA-1 – Resolution Directing City Staff to Conduct Community Engagement Around Affordable Housing Development Options for 353 S Main

Question: Q1. The cover memo indicates that staff is recommending that the SmithGroup conduct community engagement for 353 S. Main, 121 E. Catherine, 721 N. Main and the parking lots on the corner of Ashley/William and First/William. When is it expected the resolutions regarding the others (121 E, Catherine, 721 N. Main and the parking lots) will be coming to council? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In November 2019, City Council approved resolution R-19-514 for 121 E Catherine to move forward with development. Adding a larger community engagement process with the other downtown sites (than what is typical for individual sites that apply

for site plan approval) is compatible with and supportive of resolution R-19-514. City Council also approved R-19-517 and R-19-518 in November 2019 to move forward with community engagement on the South Ashley & William parking lots and 721 N Main.

Question: Q2. The cover memo also indicates that the DDA passed a resolution to fund the community engagement for all five sites and the DDA ordinance resolution (DC-1) mentions a DDA resolution with \$125K for community engagement. Is that \$125K covering all of the community engagement or just 353 S. Main, and if all five properties, what level of community engagement is envisioned at \$25K per site? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The resolution covers 4 sites: 353 S. Main, 721 N Main, 121 E Catherine, and the S. Ashley & William parking lots. The scope will be essentially the same process that was used for 415 W Washington and 350 S Fifth which will include focus groups, development of building concepts, open house workshops, on-line and in-person surveys, and other public meetings.

Question: Q3. As the cover memo notes, the site is “modest” in size. How large of a building (height, FAR) would be necessary to realize the 50 units of affordable housing also mentioned in the cover memo? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: A 50-unit building could be accomplished as a 6-story building with an estimated height of 75-85 feet, and an FAR of 500-600%. Depending on the final FAR, this would require a minimum of 15-20% of the residential square footage dedicated to affordable units but the intent is to include as many affordable units as is financially feasible, up to 100% of the units.

Question: Q4. It seems SmithGroup has, and will, conduct all of the affordable housing-related community engagement efforts. Including the work on these five sites and the previous work on the Y Lot and 415 W. Washington, how much will be paid to SmithGroup and what gives us comfort the fees are reasonable (was any of this work ever competitively bid)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: An RFP was issued for 350 S Fifth and 4 responses were received and all 4 contractors were interviewed before selecting the SmithGroup for \$75,000 and then the contract was amended to add 415 W Washington for a total of \$150,000 for both sites. The new contract with the SmithGroup will be executed by the AAHC. The SmithGroup is able to provide the same level of engagement at a lower cost than for 415 W Washington and 350 S 5th because it has already developed the tools and strategies for community engagement such as information gathering, survey development, website development, communication tools etc. that can be refreshed for the new sites. The additional cost is primarily staff time to conduct the community engagement and to develop financially feasible site-specific concepts for community discussion.

CA-3 – Resolution No. 3 Establishing a Public Hearing for the Proposed Jackson Avenue Sidewalk Gap Project

Question: Regarding CA-3, I noticed the date in the notice is May 4 and not the May 18 referenced in the resolution. Not sure what is correct, but one probably needs to be changed. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The public hearing date was moved to May 18th to allow for adequate public noticing. The May 4th date has been corrected.

CA-4 – Resolution to Award a Construction Contract to Ideal Contracting, LLC for the Landfill Scale and Entrance Improvements Project (\$1,599,714.00, Bid No. ITB-4618)

Question: Regarding CA-4, can you please provide a sense of how much of the \$1.6M cost is for replacing the old single scale, how much for upgrading to a dual scale, and how much is for the entrance improvements? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The project was bid as an ITB with a lump sum project cost so expenses are not broken down by material or construction phases. A dual scale is more efficient for traffic flow and provides needed equipment redundancy so this was the only configuration considered.

CA-5 – Resolution to Award a Construction Contract to Cadillac Asphalt LLC (ITB-4260, \$8,899,300.00) for the 2020 Street Resurfacing Project, and to Appropriate \$1,000,000.00 from the Major Street Fund, \$1,990,000.00 from the Local Street Fund, \$350,000.00 from the Stormwater Fund, and \$100,000.00 from the Alternative Transportation Fund (8 Votes Required)

Question: I see Dicken Drive is included among the resurfacing projects—is this plan inclusive of the “truck turn-around” at the end of Dicken Drive? Jack and I attended a public meeting about the design of that stretch of road, I’m curious if we settled on a final design? Will that end of Dicken Drive be part of the repaving project? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: The proposed turn-around at the end of Dicken Drive is not part of the current resurfacing project. A design for the turn-around has not been finalized at this time. Because of the timing of this and the need for additional public engagement, it will likely be handled as a separate project.

Question: Regarding CA-5, thanks for including the discussion of the neighborhood meetings. These meetings are valuable/informative for the impacted neighborhoods and what are you contemplating in terms of the “communication alternatives”? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Public meetings to share information are an important part of our normal procedure for the Resurfacing Program. However, these meetings have also been somewhat sparsely attended in the past. Because of the current constraints on public gatherings, staff is looking into alternatives, although have not settled on a final solution. The most likely option is to publish a detailed web page that includes any information that would have been shared with residents at a public meeting, and encourages residents to contact the City's project manager with any questions that they may have. This resource would be shared directly with affected residents through a postcard mailing, and also referenced through other communications, such as press releases and postings on NextDoor Neighborhood.

CA-7 - Resolution to Direct the City Administrator, Ann Arbor Housing Commission, and Planning Commission to Create Proposed Application Materials, Review and Recommend Development Entitlements to the City Council for 415 W. Washington to Support the Development of Affordable Housing in the City

Question: The memo notes that the 415 W. Washington site is impacted by floodplains. Have the discussions of the potential use of this property for development included consideration of the proposed Floodplain Management Ordinance currently under consideration by the Planning Commission? Would the adoption of the proposed Floodplain Management Ordinance impact the options for using the 415 W. Washington property? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, the proposed floodplain overlay ordinance was considered in the analysis for this property. The proposed ordinance would impact the options for use in the following ways: 1) Requiring any residential use to be elevated to a level 1 foot above the 0.2% annual chance flood elevation (currently required to elevate 1 foot above 1% annual chance flood elevation) For this location the 0.2% flood elevation is less than 1 foot above the 1% flood elevation; 2) Non-residential uses would need to be elevated or floodproofed to a level 1 foot above the 0.2% flood elevation (currently 1 foot above 1% flood elevation is required); and 3) No critical facilities, house trailers, or structures without foundations would be permitted. There are also proposed changes to the floodway in the proposed overlay district, however, the proposed development scenarios for this site reserve that area for Treeline trail use and amenities.

CA-8 - Resolution to Direct the City Administrator, Ann Arbor Housing Commission, and Planning Commission to Create Proposed Application Materials, Review and Recommend Development Entitlements to the City Council for 350 S. Fifth Avenue (former Y-Lot) to Support the Development of Affordable Housing in the City

Question: Has the Downtown Development Authority provided a commitment as to how much funding it will contribute to the cost of the development of this site? For example,

if the DDA were to commit to contributing \$2 million per year to cover a portion of the bond payment, the project could include more affordable housing that would be possible if the rents from the development were the only source for paying down the debt. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The DDA has provided a \$25,000 grant to the City to help fund the public engagement and analysis of the 350 S. Fifth Avenue property, and it has also committed \$745,000 from its Housing Fund to the goal of seeing a substantial number of affordable housing units constructed as part of this property's redevelopment.

CA-7 – Resolution to Direct the City Administrator, Ann Arbor Housing Commission, and Planning Commission to Create Proposed Application Materials, Review and Recommend Development Entitlements to the City Council for 415 W. Washington to Support the Development of Affordable Housing in the City

And

CA-8 - Resolution to Direct the City Administrator, Ann Arbor Housing Commission, and Planning Commission to Create Proposed Application Materials, Review and Recommend Development Entitlements to the City Council for 350 S. Fifth Avenue (former Y-Lot) to Support the Development of Affordable Housing in the City

Question: Q1. For 415 W. Washington, because of the floodplain and railroad issues and the resulting high local per unit subsidy required for affordable housing, 415 W. Washington was initially a candidate for private development/sale and using the proceeds to support affordable housing elsewhere. Is that possibility still being considered and if not, why not? Also, what is the likely required local subsidy per affordable unit (or range)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The 415 W Washington site is the most challenging site to include affordable housing due to the complicated, competing public purposes and expensive site issues (greenway trail, preservation of chimney swift habitat, floodway/floodplain, net-zero energy and brownfield). The site is still a good candidate for private development/sale and using the proceeds to support affordable housing elsewhere. Staff are still exploring every possibility to include affordable housing on the site but it may be infeasible. The range of local subsidy we showed in our financial modeling was \$47,000/unit to \$110,000/unit depending on the number of affordable units. The greatest unknown cost is the brownfield clean-up.

Question: Q2. How much of the 415 W. Washington property is actually in the floodway and would that portion remain as greenspace and be reserved for the Treeline Trail under any development scenario? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: 32% of the site is located in the floodway, which is proposed to remain as open space for the Treeline Trail.

Question: Q3. The second resolved clause for 415 W. Washington says “petition the city for redevelopment” while the second clause for 350 S. Fifth says “petition the city for re-zoning.” Both resolutions use the language “Planned Unit Development and Concept Plan, or another mechanism.” Can you please clarify why there’s the difference in the 2nd resolved clause language and what is the likely proposed zoning for the two properties (PUD zoning for both, D1 for the Y lot and D2 for 415 W. Washington, or something else)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This is only a difference in final language referencing the distinction between a primarily vacant site and a site with existing structures. Your zoning assertions are shared; PUD is a possibility for both sites. After PUD, likely zones to consider for the two sites would be D1 zoning for 350 S. Fifth and D2 for 415 W. Washington.

Question: Q4. Under the preferred plan for 350 S. Fifth (288 market rate units, 130 affordable units), is an ongoing local subsidy required and if so, roughly how much? Also, are the 130 affordable units at 60% AMI? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: These financial scenarios do not include any ongoing local subsidy. The subsidy is for development with the intent that the development subsidy is sufficient to eliminate the need for operating subsidy.

Question: Q5. The ground floors for 350 S. Fifth contain about 27K sq ft (20K in east building and 7K in west building) – what uses are contemplated for those spaces? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Nothing specific has been identified, but those uses that are appropriate in the D1 Zoning District would be appropriate for the ground floor of this site.

Question: Q6. How many parking spaces would be lost if these two sites are developed and do the preferred options for the properties include parking and if so, how many spaces? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: There are 88 spaces on the 350 S. Fifth Ave lot, and 149 spaces on the 415 W. Washington lot. As the entitlement plans are developed the strategies may change, but at this time it is recommended that the development on 350 S. Fifth not include parking onsite, but instead be developed as a transit oriented project that takes advantage of its proximity to the transit center and the Library Lane and 4th/William garages, and the 415 W. Washington site be redeveloped with both car-share spaces as well as parking on site to meet the needs of its residents (between 94-159 spaces).

Question: Q7. Is the plan that these two developments would be net zero energy? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The financial feasibility analysis does not include the cost of a net zero energy building. An additional analysis will need to be done when the projects are far

enough along in the design stage to compare different levels of green construction, including a net zero energy building to determine the additional cost for each scenario.

CA-10 – Resolution Adopting the Living A2Zero Ann Arbor Carbon Neutrality Plan

Question: Q1. I had also requested the cost breakdown by year and since you’ve done the “by year” total and the “by entity”, presumably you have the data to provide a “by entity, by year”. Assuming that’s correct, can you please provide the “by entity, by year”? (What I’m most interested in is the city cost by year.) (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The enclosed is the estimate, year over year that we modeled assuming all of the assumptions come to fruition for each of the actions. Please see the second page: “Year Over Year” for the details.

Question: Q2. Thank you for your response Monday night regarding the OSI budget request for FY21, but I’m still a bit confused. Is the \$1.85M referenced in the prior response, the total OSI expenditure budget request (all funds)? I was confused by your comment about just the General Fund so if you could confirm the total expenditure request and provide the funding sources, that would be great. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Here is a breakdown of proposed FY21 expenses by fund:

Energy Fund	\$159,819
General Fund	\$549,045
Water Fund	\$65,181
Stormwater Fund	\$53,336
Sewage Fund	\$48,486
Solid Waste Fund	\$46,086
County Rebate	\$940,000

TOTAL: \$1,861,953

Question: Q3. Regarding UM, you mentioned they were working on their reduction targets and plans – do you know if they have a timeline for completion? Also, do you believe there is genuine interest on UM’s part in substantive partnerships (e.g., joint projects/purchases, shared resources/research, etc.)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The University of Michigan’s President’s Commission on Carbon Neutrality was given the following timeline to work from: “Periodic updates to and engagement with the community throughout the process; formal interim reports due in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020; Final recommendations by Fall 2020.”

In terms of partnerships, we do believe the University is sincere. The devil is always in the detail, as they say, but we see numerous pathways to true collaboration and look forward to engaging not just with staff but with leadership in the City and at the University

to achieve that partnership. We will likely be proposing some ideas in the near term for potential partnerships around this work.

Question: Q4. In our work session with the DDA, they indicated they were planning to budget \$2M in FY21 for carbon neutrality-related projects. What do we know about how that \$2M will be spent? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: In November 2019 City Council voted unanimously to declare a climate emergency and set forward an ambitious carbon-neutral goal by 2030. To support this goal, the DDA is underway with a study to analyze potential costs and engineering needed to substantially increase the number of Electric Vehicle chargers in the garages, in particular greatly increasing the amount of electrical capacity in several facilities. And a second study scheduled for early FY21 will examine how to substantially reduce energy consumption through the installation of new LED lighting and sensors. The \$2M included in the DDA's FY21 budget is intended to be used to implement the purchase and installation of equipment recommended by these studies within the eight parking structures.

Question: Q5. In the response related to my question on “safe harboring” for the solar facility at the landfill, it stated that in order to lock in the tax credit, we'd be purchasing some of the solar equipment yet this year. Approximately how much will that purchase be, how will it be funded, and when do you expect to request council approve the purchase? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: To “safe harbor” or lock in the federal tax incentive, you need to secure at least 5% of the eventual project costs by the end of the calendar year (for us, this would mean December 31st, 2020 to secure the 26% tax incentive) and take physical receipt of the equipment in early 2021. We are quite a few steps away from being ready to safe harbor as we need to see the results from the interconnection study (just about to start). The interconnection study will tell us what capacity the existing site has for additional energy generation as well as what the range of costs would be to upgrade the site to be able to take our projected load (assuming grid improvements are needed). Once we know that information, we'll be coming back to Council to discuss our next steps. If a decision is made to move forward, The City, in partnership with DTE, will open an RFP for solar developers to bid on developing the project. We'll then select a developer and begin working on the pricing structure based on the winning bid. This will come back to Council once we know the specific contract terms and pricing.

Question: Q6. The response to my question about tiered parking rates didn't fully answer the question. The response cited examples of other cities that have parking rate discounts for electric vehicles and for disabled drivers, but not examples of cities with parking discounts for lower income drivers, which is part of AA's carbon neutrality proposal. Are there other cities we know of that have different parking rates for different income levels? Also, I asked how having different rates for parking for individuals was consistent with what we were told over and over about water rates – that the rates must reflect only

the cost of service and nothing else – can you please explain why that principle applies in water rates, but not parking rates? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: While many colleges and universities have implemented income-based sliding scale parking fees (and parking tickets), there has been less innovation in this regard in US cities. Most income-based transportation subsidies are targeted to reducing the cost of riding transit or driving in a community-based shared car service such as BlueLA (<https://www.bluela.com/>) That being said, we found that there was a recent proposal for the New York City Housing Authority to charge their residents for parking on a sliding scale basis that takes into account household income, disability status, age, and employment location. Also, Councilmembers in Boston and NYC have expressed desires to make parking fines income-based. Again, that is for parking fines and not parking rates. As for the question of water rates and parking rates, we would need guidance from Legal to ensure that we were conforming to all state law. Should Ann Arbor pursue this idea, we would be doing so as a bleeding edge city.

Question: Q7. I appreciate the response on the cost of purchasing streetlights from DTE and converting them to LED (roughly \$500 per streetlight or \$3M to purchase and convert), but was surprised at the notion that DTE may not want to sell them. Why wouldn't they? Have we asked DTE or made them any kind of offer? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No, we have not yet directly asked DTE to purchase their lights mostly because this is a relatively new development in the streetlight discussion and existing budgets would not have supported this in addition to the streetlight work already programmed. Staff is not able to comment on whether or not DTE would sell the lights - the inference in the response is meant to solely highlight that these assets are DTE's and they must be a willing seller if the City were to take them over and based on anecdotal experience we are hearing from colleagues in Dearborn who are also trying to acquire their streetlights. Also please keep in mind that the \$480 cost estimate per light is at the low end of the range of possible costs - the actual cost may vary considerably.

Question: Q8. Regarding electrification of city buildings, the response indicated about \$1M a year for 5 years will be added to the CIP. Do we have a sense of which CIP projects will be deferred (particularly in FY21)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: We are just gearing up to launch the CIP review process for the coming year so at this time, we do not have a definitive answer to this question.

Question: How can community leaders lead by example as we ask community members to make major changes and sacrifice existing vehicles, appliances and HV/AC? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: The first step would be to assess each of our individual greenhouse gas footprints to understand the impacts of our livelihood. Following that, we can take steps such as investing in renewable energy (either directly on our homes if they are viable or

through programs such as Arcadia's Renewable Energy options of our utilities Green programs). As our appliances age out, we can replace them with electric alternatives. We can immediately conduct a home energy audit and start implementing energy saving techniques or improvements that will reduce our energy bills and our environmental footprint. We can shop locally and focus on reusing materials. We can replace our vehicles, when they age out, with electric options which are ideally powered with renewable energy. We can talk to our neighbors about the work we are doing and encourage them to join us. We can invest in a local rain garden and grow some of our own fruits and vegetables. We can plant a tree (or two or three). These are just some of the things that our community's leaders already are and can continue to do to be vanguards in this space. OSI is working on some outreach materials that summarize what we can all do to make our lives a little greener and we'll be sure to share these with Council.

Question: How can we ensure that our gains do not negatively impact other less fortunate communities? For example, when we replace vehicles with EV's, will the older vehicles go to other communities? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Our goal has always been to share the information we learn from the A²Zero process since we know that most other towns/cities in the region do not have the same level of resources we do. We believe that the most effective way to ensure that there are no (or few) negative externalities from this project is to have representatives from affected communities at the table. In fact, the City of Ypsilanti is a sponsoring partner of the project.

In addition, while keeping all tax dollars spent inside our city borders, we are committed to opening up any projects that we can to residents and businesses in the County. A couple of these kinds of projects include: increased advertisement of the County weatherization program, the Aging in Place Efficiently Program, bulk solar and/or EV buys, and our training and educational outreach efforts.

For initiatives that involve replacing equipment that still has a useful life, we can invest in recycling and repurposing programs. In some cases, this will mean that our old equipment gets a new life in someone else's home or office. This isn't always a bad thing, especially when we are helping someone access a technology they previously didn't have access to and/or if we are helping them discard an inefficient piece of equipment with something that is more viable. In the end, however, the specific answer to your question will depend on the specific action and opportunities for repurposing, recycling, and repair that exist.

Question: I support the plan, but would like a more regional approach as we implement the plan. Any opportunities? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Absolutely! Two of our existing partners are the City of Ypsilanti and Washtenaw County. We have nearly endless opportunities to collaborate with these two partners to scale our carbon neutrality and equity work. We are also already partnering with Pittsfield Township on the landfill solar project so that's another existing opportunity

to scale our work. Pre-COVID-19 we had discussed convening a regional meeting to present our carbon neutrality strategy and seek ways to partner with peer communities. We are now thinking about how to move that idea forward, even if virtually, to get at the regional collaboration and scaling you referenced. Any additional ideas would be very much appreciated.

Question: The plan is focused on carbon neutrality. Are there opportunities to address flooding, which is a growing concern? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Absolutely. One of the pillars of our work was resilience (the other was equity). Resilience is also one of the seven explicit strategies in the Plan. What this means in practice is that we fully acknowledge that climate change is already happening and is going to continue. With our efforts towards carbon neutrality, we are striving to limit the amount of climate change we experience and therefore, limit the overall impacts we feel. However, we are already feeling impacts and will continue to do so which is why adapting is a critical component of this work. We have a few actions that have ties to flooding including expanding our sensor and monitoring networks, our emergency preparedness work, and green infrastructure expansion – which is actually woven into multiple actions. In addition, we anticipated that our neighborhood and youth ambassador programs will have a strong focus on resilience, especially flooding and supporting our communities of concern. In addition, we are continuing to look at solutions to address flooding locally and regionally and could see this as another topic for regional collaboration.

Question: There is request for an additional 3 FTE's, what will the wages to be set @ for these positions including benefits? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: The proposal is for two analysts and one program coordinator. The analysts are projected at a base salary of \$60,000 and the Coordinator at a base salary of \$65,000. With those base salaries, the total cost for all three positions, including benefits, is \$276,099.

Question: Want are the job descriptions of each? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: The traditional job description that we post has not been written yet but the breakdown of activities used to project staffing needs is enclosed. This document looks at who on the team will take the lead on which activity within the A²Zero Carbon Neutrality Plan. The positions highlighted in yellow are all new. The Lead for America Fellow is a 2-year temporary fellow that is partly supported through the national program Lead for America. The Solarize consultant is not a full time position and, as such, we have decided to keep it as a consultant position for at least the next year. The three new positions are highlighted in yellow. It's notable that this spreadsheet represents an optimistic look at what our staff will be able to accomplish. As such, it should be viewed as a floor for our immediate staffing needs and not the ceiling.

Question: How many years will each position need to be filled and funded, for the goals of each position to be met? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: These positions are not projected to sunset. Instead, they are proposed as FTE's that continue in the office, at least through 2030 (we didn't project staffing needs after that).

Question: Has City Council formally adopted an internal carbon tax as a policy? If so, what is that policy in full disclosure? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: No, the city does not have a formal internal carbon tax policy. We are proposing one in this year's budget. We have been working for over a year with Master's students at the University of Michigan to design the program that is being proposed.

Question: What type of work will be performed with the \$50K ask for renewable and efficiency at city facilities? (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: Depending on how successful we are with fundraising and what, if anything, comes out of future federal stimulus packages, the proposed \$50,000 will either go to support solar on municipal roofs or energy efficiency improvement at City Hall, the Farmers Market (which would be paired with solar), or improvements at Wheeler.

C-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Section 1:156 of Chapter 7 (Downtown Development Authority) of Title I of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: The ordinance amendment changes the target for affordability from up to 50% AMI to up to 60% AMI. Please remind us how much income 50% of AMI is for a single person, and for households of 2, 3 and four people. Using 30% of income as the measure of affordability, please provide the rent each of those households could pay based on 50% AMI. Please remind us how much income 60% of AMI is for a single person, and for households of 2, 3 and four people. Using 30% of income as the measure of affordability, please provide the rent each of those households could pay based on 60% AMI. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response:

Area Median Income	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person
30%	\$21,270	\$24,300	\$27,300	\$30,360	\$32,790
50%	\$35,450	\$40,500	\$45,550	\$50,600	\$54,650
60%	\$42,540	\$48,600	\$54,660	\$60,720	\$65,580

RENTS based on 30% of income, including all utilities

Area Median Income	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person
30%	\$531	\$607	\$683	\$759	\$819
50%	\$866	\$1,012	\$1,138	\$1,265	\$1,366
60%	\$1,063	\$1,215	\$1,366	\$1,518	\$1,639

Question: Q1. The cover memo mentions a parking study and housing market study related to the affordable housing projects. Can you please provide more information on those studies including purpose, scope (both geographic area and focus of study), and deliverables? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Attached is the scope for the housing market study as well as the parking study.

Question: Q2. At the March 23 work session, the DDA indicated its FY21 budget included \$1.3M for affordable housing on city-owned properties. Is the \$200K referenced in the cover memo part of that \$1.3M or in addition to? Also, will this \$200K or the \$1.3M for affordable housing in FY21 use funds from the DDA's Housing Fund balance and what is that balance currently? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The \$200K grant from the DDA is from its FY20 budget. Separately the DDA has budgeted \$1.3M for affordable housing in its FY21 budget. Assuming the DDA \$200,000 is expended in FY20 as currently planned, it is anticipated that the DDA Housing Fund balance will be \$800,985 as of June 30, 2020.

Question: Q3. Lastly, I had asked questions related to the March 23 work session on AAHC, DDA, and Retirement System and have received responses on the AAHC and Retirement System, but not the DDA (unless I missed it). I still would appreciate responses to those questions and before Monday's meeting if that's possible. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Responses to questions about the DDA's FY21 budget have been submitted for final review and are anticipated to be provided this week.

DB-1 - Resolution to Approve MSGCU Site Plan, 2151 W Stadium Boulevard (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Question: Regarding DB-1, West Stadium was one of the corridors that was identified as a potential T1 (Transit Support) zoning district. Is 2151 W. Stadium in that area and if

so, would this project be permitted under the draft T1 ordinance from the Fall?
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Staff's vision is that transit supportive zoning districts would have the structure to provide for adjustments based on corridor and/or context, however, many requirements would likely remain consistent. As currently drafted for the Washtenaw and South State/Eisenhower areas, this proposal would not meet the draft zoning district in the following ways:

- It includes a drive-through facility, which would be prohibited
- It is not mixed-use (it does not include a minimum of 50% floor area dedicated to residential)
- The building is not 2 stories
- The building does not span at least 80% of the lot width
- The building does not meet the 60% first floor transparency requirement



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 19-2125 **Version:** 2 **Name:** 11/18/19 Affordable Housing Financial Feasibility City Property - - Development of Ashley & Catherine
Type: Resolution **Status:** Passed
File created: 11/18/2019 **In control:** City Council
On agenda: 11/18/2019 **Final action:** 11/18/2019
Enactment date: 11/18/2019 **Enactment #:** R-19-514

Title: Resolution to Direct the Ann Arbor Housing Commission to Develop 121 E. Catherine as Affordable Housing

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
11/18/2019	1	City Council		
11/18/2019	1	City Council	Amended	Fail
11/18/2019	2	City Council	Amended	
11/18/2019	2	City Council	Approved as Amended	Pass

Resolution to Direct the Ann Arbor Housing Commission to Develop 121 E. Catherine as Affordable Housing

On April 1, 2019, Ann Arbor City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing. This resolution incorporated previous resolutions R-19-110, R-19-111 and R-19-116.

Jennifer Hall, Executive Director of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission led the analysis along with support from a staff team and several contractors to determine the feasibility for 11 sites including review of land use and zoning, environmental conditions, financial resources, site -specific costs, and overall risk among other factors. The analysis, three potential portfolio scenarios, and next step recommendations were presented to City Council at the Nov.18, 2019 City Council meeting.

Through the analysis, two properties are best suited for immediate action for affordable housing development: 121 E. Catherine and 404 N. Ashley. Both properties are free of negative site issues that would impede affordable housing development, both score competitively for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and other federal and state funds for affordable housing. Both sites are also in the DDA district, and are eligible to receive financial support from the DDA. If tax credits are secured for both sites, the sites could be developed with very little local financial support compared to the other sites. It's estimated that together both sites could yield between 120-170 units of affordable housing for households up to an average of 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

The staff team is requesting that City Council direct the Ann Arbor Housing Commission to proceed

with development of these two sites as affordable housing for households up to an average of 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) with an underlying ground lease.

Note: This resolution was split by City Council on November 18, 2019 to consider 404 N. Ashley separately.

Prepared by: Teresa Gillotti, Director, Office of Community and Economic Development

Reviewed by: Jennifer Hall, Executive Director Ann Arbor Housing Commission
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator

Approved by: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

Whereas, City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing; and

Whereas, The extensive analysis was completed and presented to City Council on November 18, 2019; and

Whereas, The analysis found that two properties are well suited for affordable housing development due to minimal site issues, excellent potential to receive Low-Income Housing Tax Credit financing, and DDA support for affordable housing;

RESOLVED, That City Council direct the Ann Arbor Housing Commission to pursue affordable housing development of 121 E. Catherine as the developer utilizing a ground lease, for approximately 60-85 units for households up to an average of 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI);

RESOLVED, That the direction includes conducting applicable due diligence such as environmental reviews, surveys, and other site investigation items; hire a co-developer to work with an architectural firm and engineering firm to design a project for site plan approval, submit an application for Low Income Housing Tax Credits and other related affordable housing financing;

RESOLVED, That the Mayor and City Clerk be hereby authorized and directed to sign related documentation to support the Ann Arbor Housing Commission's application for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and other federal, state or local funding for development of affordable housing on 121 E Catherine; and

RESOLVED, That the City Administrator be authorized to take the necessary actions to implement this resolution.



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 19-2127 **Version:** 1 **Name:** 11/18/19 Affordable Housing Financial Feasibility City Property - - Community Engagement Ashley/William and 1st/William Surface Parking Lots

Type: Resolution **Status:** Passed

File created: 11/18/2019 **In control:** City Council

On agenda: 11/18/2019 **Final action:** 11/18/2019

Enactment date: 11/18/2019 **Enactment #:** R-19-517

Title: Resolution to Direct City Staff to Conduct Community Engagement Around Development Options for Ashley/William and First/William Surface Parking Lots to Support Affordable Housing in the City

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
11/18/2019	1	City Council	Approved	Pass

Resolution to Direct City Staff to Conduct Community Engagement Around Development Options for Ashley/William and First/William Surface Parking Lots to Support Affordable Housing in the City
On April 1, 2019, Ann Arbor City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing. This resolution incorporated previous resolutions R-19-110, R-19-111 and R-19-116.

Jennifer Hall, Executive Director of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission led the analysis along with support from a staff team and several contractors to determine the feasibility for 11 sites including review of land use and zoning, environmental conditions, financial resources, site -specific costs, and overall risk among other factors. The analysis, three potential portfolio scenarios, and next step recommendations were presented to City Council at the Nov.18, 2019 City Council meeting.

As part of the analysis, the Klines lot (Ashley/William surface lot) has great potential for development and will significantly impact the downtown. The Kline’s lot D1 zoning, and affordable housing density bonus, would allow for 400-600+ housing units and other uses such as first floor retail or office space.

This site scores competitively for the largest source of funding for affordable housing, which is Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). However, tax credits have a funding cap on a per project basis. A developer can apply for 2 separate tax credit applications as 2 separate projects in order to maximize the value of LIHTC funding. Even 2 LIHTC projects is capped out well below what the density allows on this site. Applying for 2 LIHTC projects is complicated but not impossible. The analysis included a financially feasible project that included 125 tax credit units through 2 separate tax credit applications and the remaining 475 units were market-rate.

If a private developer develops the site, they can combine market rate housing with 1 or 2 LIHTC projects, or affordable housing can be included through the affordable housing density bonus and

essentially subsidized by the market-rate housing. Or the property can be sold to a developer and the proceeds can be used to subsidize affordable housing on smaller city-owned site that is not going to be competitive enough to secure LIHTC such as 2000 S. Industrial, 3400 Platt, 721 N Main and 1501 E. Stadium.

Redevelopment of the Kline's lot may or may not trigger parking requirements by the City's zoning ordinance, depending on what is built, but the loss of this parking lot will likely impact the downtown. The proximity of the First/Williams surface parking lot could be utilized to support parking needs or requirements of a development on the Kline's lot. By itself, the First/William parking lot is not suitable for housing development due to its location entirely in the floodway and floodplain. However, if a parking deck is built on First/ William, it could be connected to Ashley street and the cost is significantly lower than building underground parking on the Kline's lot. In addition, a parking deck can be designed to leave room for a greenway along First Street.

The staff team is requesting that City Council direct City Staff to work with the DDA to conduct community engagement around the development options for Ashley/William and First/William surface parking lots to determine the optimal development plan for this site in support of affordable housing in the City.

Prepared by: Teresa Gillotti, Director, Office of Community and Economic Development

Reviewed by: Jennifer Hall, Executive Director Ann Arbor Housing Commission
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator

Approved by: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

Whereas, City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing; and

Whereas, The extensive analysis was completed and presented to City Council on November 18, 2019; and

Whereas, The analysis identified the Kline's Lot as a site with high development potential which could include a mixed-income, mixed-use site; and

Whereas, Development of the Kline's lot will have a significant impact on the downtown due to the potential size of the development; and

Whereas, The most recent DDA feasibility study on the cost to build underground parking on the Kline's lot was approximately \$90,000/unit and it would be much less expensive to build a parking deck on the surface parking lot at William/First;

RESOLVED, That City Council direct the City Administrator to work with the DDA to conduct community engagement around the development options for Ashley/William and First/William surface parking lots to determine the optimal development plan for this site in support of affordable housing in the City.

RESOLVED, That the City Administrator be authorized to take the necessary actions to implement this resolution.



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 19-2128 **Version:** 1 **Name:** 11/18/19 Affordable Housing Financial Feasibility City Property - - Community Engagement 721 N Main

Type: Resolution **Status:** Passed

File created: 11/18/2019 **In control:** City Council

On agenda: 11/18/2019 **Final action:** 11/18/2019

Enactment date: 11/18/2019 **Enactment #:** R-19-518

Title: Resolution to Direct the City Staff to Conduct Community Engagement Around Development Options for 721 N Main in Support of Affordable Housing in the City

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
11/18/2019	1	City Council	Approved	Pass

Resolution to Direct the City Staff to Conduct Community Engagement Around Development Options for 721 N Main in Support of Affordable Housing in the City

On April 1, 2019, Ann Arbor City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing. This resolution incorporated previous resolutions R-19-110, R-19-111 and R-19-116.

Jennifer Hall, Executive Director of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission led the analysis along with support from a staff team and several contractors to determine the feasibility for 11 sites including review of land use and zoning, environmental conditions, financial resources, site -specific costs, and overall risk among other factors. The analysis, three potential portfolio scenarios, and next step recommendations were presented to City Council at the Nov.18, 2019 City Council meeting.

As part of the analysis, it was determined that 721 N Main had numerous site challenges including close proximity to a railroad and a deed restriction prohibiting any development (including a parking lot) in the floodway and floodplain. As the vast majority of the site is in the floodway/floodplain, that portion of the site is best suited for green space. The northwest corner of the site that abuts W Summit street is the only portion of the site that is suitable for housing development and could include 25-35 units.

This site is not eligible for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) or HUD funding, which makes it more difficult to develop as affordable housing.

Consequently, the analysis included the option of developing the property as a limited equity cooperative for households primarily at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) or less. The cooperative model is not the same cooperative model common in Ann Arbor such as Arrowwood, Forest Hills and University Townhomes. Those cooperatives were built more than 40 years ago with federally financed

mortgages at a time when construction costs were much lower, which enabled these properties to maintain their long-term affordability today.

This proposed cooperative option requires many risky factors to work. It would require a developer who specializes in cooperative development to secure private construction financing to develop the property. The developer would market the properties and sell the individual units to homebuyers. The homebuyers must be able to secure a mortgage between \$275,000 - \$385,000. The individual homebuyers would become members of the self-governed cooperative and pay monthly membership fees to pay for the maintenance of the property. The model is very similar to a condominium association except the project will be on a ground lease with the City, there will be a limited equity resale provision, and the legal structure of the cooperative can potentially make it eligible for a PILOT instead of paying full property taxes.

To develop this property as affordable rental housing, alternative local financing such as housing revenue bonds, DDA affordable housing funds, brownfield funds, Ann Arbor Affordable Housing Funds and/or proceeds from the sale of other public sites need to be utilized instead.

Alternatively, the property could be leased to a private developer and the City can require a percent of the units to be affordable to 60% AMI households. Or, the property could be sold to a private developer to develop as market rate housing and the proceeds can be used to subsidize housing on other city-owned sites that are also not competitive enough to secure LIHTC such as 2000 S. Industrial, 3400 Platt and 1501 E Stadium. Or the property can be held as public land for a future public use.

The staff team is requesting that City Council direct staff to work with the DDA, Tree Line Conservancy and other community partners on community engagement around the optimal development options for 721 N Main in support of affordable housing in the City.

Prepared by: Teresa Gillotti, Director, Office of Community and Economic Development

Reviewed by: Jennifer Hall, Executive Director Ann Arbor Housing Commission

Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator

Approved by: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

Whereas, City Council adopted Resolution R-19-138 directing the City Administrator to collaborate with the Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) to provide coordinated analysis on the feasibility of city-owned properties as potential locations for affordable housing;

Whereas, The extensive analysis was completed and presented to City Council on November 18, 2019;

Whereas, The analysis determined that 721 N Main had numerous site factors impacting its suitability for affordable housing, a majority of the site in the floodway/floodplain and a railroad adjacent to the site that disqualifies the site from federal funding including Low-Income Housing Tax Credits; and

Whereas, The northwest corner of the site could be developed as housing;

RESOLVED, That City Council direct the City Administrator to work with the DDA, Tree Line Conservancy and other community partners on community engagement around the optimal development options for 721 N Main in support of affordable housing in the City.

SUMMARY

	Total Costs	GHG Reduction	% total emissions	\$/ton	Party Primarily Responsible for Implementation	Co-Benefits	
Strategy 1	Community Choice Aggregation	\$3,245,000	784,000	35.8%	\$ 4.14	City of Ann Arbor	AIR; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Bulk Purchase of Renewables	\$605,000	85,000	3.9%	\$ 7.12	City of Ann Arbor and \$66k for community liaison stipends	LOCAL; NRG; AIR; JOBS; RES; \$\$; SCALE
	Community Solar Program	\$205,000	11,500	0.5%	\$ 17.83	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NRG; AIR; JOBS; RES; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Landfill Solar Project	\$80,000	23,000	1.1%	\$ 3.48	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NRG; AIR; SCALE
Strategy 2	Electrification	\$7,100,000	362,200	16.5%	\$ 19.60	City of Ann Arbor with outside legal support	LOCAL; AIR; JOBS; HEALTH; SCALE
	Electrify All Buses	\$86,000,000	13,800	0.6%	\$ 6,231.88	TheRide	LOCAL; AIR; RES; HEALTH; EQU
	Bulk Purchase EVs	\$700,000	122,900	5.6%	\$ 5.70	City of Ann Arbor and \$66k for community liaison stipends	AIR; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; SCALE
	Private EV Fleets	\$123,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	AIR; RES; \$\$; HEALTH; SCALE
	City EV Fleet	\$4,000,000	1,100	0.1%	\$ 3,636.36	City of Ann Arbor	AIR; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; SCALE
EV Infrastructure	\$42,000,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor and DDA	AIR; JOBS; Health; SCALE	
Strategy 3	Bulk Purchase of Energy Efficiency	\$950,000	242,500	11.1%	\$ 3.92	City of Ann Arbor and \$66k for community liaison stipends	LOCAL; AIR; JOBS; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Building Code Requirements	\$1,935,000	48,300	2.2%	\$ 40.06	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	LED Lighting	\$3,140,000	2,600	0.1%	\$ 1,207.69	City of Ann Arbor	AIR; \$\$
	Benchmarking	\$2,370,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	JOBS; \$\$; SCALE
	Loan Loss Reserve	\$1,578,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Energy Concierge & Community Education	\$820,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	JOBS; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Net Zero Energy Affordable Housing	\$800,000	400	0.0%	\$ 2,000.00	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NRG; AIR; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU
	Green Rental Housing Program	\$530,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; AIR; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU; SCALE
	Green Business Challenge	\$700,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor and 2030 District	LOCAL; NRG; AIR; JOBS; RES; \$\$; SCALE
	Aging in Place Efficiently	\$150,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU
Strategy 4	Weatherization Expansion	\$1,550,000	0	0.0%		Washtenaw County	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU
	Non-Motorized Plan	\$2,400,000	60,400	2.8%	\$ 39.74	City of Ann Arbor and DDA	AIR; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU
	Expand Local and Regional Transit	\$656,780,000	93,200	4.3%	\$ 7,047.00	TheRide with support from the City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; AIR; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; EQU
	Park and Ride	\$170,000,000	28,400	1.3%	\$ 5,985.92	City of Ann Arbor, TheRide, and MDOT	AIR; EQU; SCALE
	Duplex/Triplex/ADUs	\$250,000	2,200	0.1%	\$ 113.64	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; AIR; RES; SCALE
	Mixed-Use Zoning	\$365,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; AIR; RES; HEALTH
	Parking Rates	\$4,500,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; AIR
Strategy 5	Year Round Composting	\$26,000,000	400	0.0%	\$ 65,000.00	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NAT; JOBS; SCALE
	Expand Commercial Recycling	\$18,400,000	5,600	0.3%	\$ 3,285.71	City of Ann Arbor and/or Contractor	JOBS; SCALE
	Sustainable Material Use and Reuse	\$270,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; ERS; HEALTH; \$\$; NAT; EQU
	Circular Economy	\$270,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; \$\$; NAT
	Plant-Based Diets	\$208,400	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	HEALTH; NAT
	Refrigerant Recycling	\$179,400	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	JOBS; HEALTH
Strategy 6	Resilience Hubs	\$5,025,000	2,500	0.1%	\$ 2,010.00	City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NRG; RES; HEALTH; EQU; SCALE
	Neighborhood and Youth Ambassadors	\$350,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; JOBS; RES; HEALTH; EQU; SCALE
	Tree Canopy	\$1,160,000	450	0.0%	\$ 2,577.78	City of Ann Arbor	AIR; RES; HEALTH; NAT; EQU; SCALE
	Neighborhood Asset Mapping	\$300,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; RES; EQU; SCALE
	Emergency Kits	\$350,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	RES; HEALTH; EQU; SCALE
	Sensors and Data Monitoring	\$300,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	RES; HEALTH; \$\$; NAT; EQU; SCALE
Strategy 7	Equity Programs	\$200,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; RES; EQU
	SA2T Grant Program	\$1,000,000	0	0.0%		Pass through to community	LOCAL; RES
	Internal Carbon Tax	\$75,000	0	0.0%		City of Ann Arbor	LOCAL; NRG; RES; \$\$; SCALE
	Offsets	\$9,440,000	298,500	13.6%	\$ 31.62	City of Ann Arbor and Offset Organization	SCALE

Total	\$ 1,056,403,800
Total City of Ann Arbor and DDA	\$ 140,375,800
Total AAATA / RTA	\$ 742,780,000
Total Other Organizations (e.g., County, Community Liaisons, 2030 District, community (grants))	\$ 3,248,000
Unclear Breakdown (park and ride)	\$ 170,000,000

YEAR OVER YEAR SUMMARY

ACTION	TOTAL	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	
Community Choice Aggregation	\$3,245,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$799,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bulk Purchase of Renewables	\$605,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$55,000
Community Solar Program	\$205,000	\$18,636	\$18,640	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636	\$18,636
Landfill Solar Project	\$80,000	\$26,500	\$27,000	\$26,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Electrification	\$7,100,000	\$114,000	\$1,254,000	\$1,254,000	\$1,315,000	\$1,265,000	\$1,265,000	\$130,000	\$128,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000
Electrify All Buses	\$86,000,000	\$0	\$6,890,000	\$5,690,000	\$6,490,000	\$7,290,000	\$8,070,000	\$8,870,000	\$9,400,000	\$10,200,000	\$11,000,000	\$12,100,000	\$12,100,000
Bulk Purchase EVs	\$700,000	\$0	\$153,000	\$100,000	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875	\$55,875
Private EV Fleets	\$123,000	\$0	\$24,500	\$24,500	\$24,500	\$24,500	\$24,500	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City EV Fleet	\$4,000,000	\$50,000	\$660,000	\$560,000	\$465,000	\$360,000	\$355,000	\$340,000	\$320,000	\$310,000	\$295,000	\$285,000	\$285,000
EV Infrastructure	\$42,000,000	\$0	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000
Bulk Purchase of Energy Efficiency	\$950,000	\$0	\$275,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Building Code Requirements	\$1,935,000	\$49,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$255,000	\$206,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$210,000
LED Lighting	\$3,140,000	\$245,920	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$361,760	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benchmarking	\$2,370,000	\$0	\$408,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$218,000
Loan Loss Reserve	\$1,578,000	\$55,000	\$1,052,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$50,500
Energy Concierge & Community Education	\$820,000	\$74,545	\$74,550	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545	\$74,545
Net Zero Energy Affordable Housing	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Green Rental Housing Program	\$530,000	\$0	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000
Green Business Challenge	\$700,000	\$0	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
Aging in Place Efficiently	\$150,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Weatherization Expansion	\$1,550,000	\$0	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$177,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500	\$152,500
Non-Motorized Plan	\$2,400,000	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$150,000	\$140,000	\$110,000	\$110,000
Expand Local and Regional Transit	\$656,780,000	\$0	\$3,080,000	\$3,080,000	\$100,000	\$520,000	\$600,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Park and Ride	\$170,000,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$300,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000
Duplex/Triplex/ADUs	\$250,000	\$72,100	\$72,100	\$72,100	\$20,000	\$13,700	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mixed-Use Zoning	\$365,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$55,000	\$35,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Parking Rates	\$4,500,000	\$0	\$2,221,000	\$2,221,000	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250	\$7,250
Year Round Composting	\$26,000,000	\$0	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000
Expand Commercial Recycling	\$18,400,000	\$0	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000	\$1,840,000
Sustainable Material Use and Reuse	\$270,000	\$0	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000
Circular Economy	\$270,000	\$0	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,000
Plant-Based Diets	\$208,400	\$0	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840	\$20,840
Refrigerant Recycling	\$179,400	\$0	\$10,440	\$85,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440	\$10,440
Resilience Hubs	\$5,025,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$750,000	\$100,000	\$825,000	\$225,000	\$975,000	\$300,000	\$1,500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Neighborhood and Youth Ambassadors	\$350,000	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Tree Canopy	\$1,160,000	\$0	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$116,000
Neighborhood Asset Mapping	\$300,000	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
Emergency Kits	\$350,000	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Sensors and Data Monitoring	\$300,000	\$0	\$101,300	\$28,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300
Equity Programs	\$200,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
SA2T Grant Program	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Internal Carbon Tax	\$75,000	\$0	\$52,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500
Offsets	\$9,440,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$22,100	\$4,636,650	\$4,636,650

Total	\$ 1,056,403,800	\$1,009,702	\$27,223,630	\$24,467,221	\$41,739,746	\$42,829,446	\$643,696,746	\$52,097,746	\$53,255,246	\$52,567,246	\$58,795,036	\$58,722,036
Total City of Ann Arbor and DDA	\$ 140,375,800	\$ 991,701	\$16,733,130	\$15,076,721	\$13,329,246	\$13,198,946	\$13,781,246	\$11,907,246	\$12,534,746	\$11,046,746	\$16,474,536	\$15,301,536
Total AAATA / RTA	\$ 742,780,000	\$ -	\$9,970,000	\$8,770,000	\$6,590,000	\$7,810,000	\$608,070,000	\$18,870,000	\$19,400,000	\$20,200,000	\$21,000,000	\$22,100,000
Total Other Organizations (e.g., County, Community Liaisons, 2030 District, community (grants))	\$ 3,248,000	\$18,000	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$345,500	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$320,500	\$320,500
Unclear Breakdown (park and ride)	\$ -	\$200,000	\$300,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,500,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000

STAFFING FOR CARBON NEUTRALITY

	Assistant City Administrator	Sustainability and Innovations Manager	Energy Coordinator (Internal)	Sustainability Coordinator (NEW)	Lead for America Fellow (2-year; NEW)	Energy Manager	Sustainability Analyst (Vehicles)
Activities	Help advocating for Community Choice Aggregation	Advocate for and Create Sample Community Choice Aggregation Legislation	Bulk purchase of energy efficiency equipment - program set-up and administration	Community Energy Concierge and support community education	Policy Support for electrification	Administer Community Choice Aggregation	Coordinate with AAATA and UM re: bus electrification
	Work on tiered parking rates	Help create benchmarking ordinance	City Energy Improvements (100% clean and renewable) LED and solar lighting improvements - purchase agreement and administration	Community electrification support	Policy support for building codes	Create support infrastructure for benchmarking ordinance (residential and commercial)	EV programs and infrastructure, including EV readiness
	Helping support other legislative changes	Electrification policy		Green Business Challenge	Policy support for community choice aggregation	Start working on state-level building codes	Green Fleets
		Support Community Solar Legislation	Net zero energy affordable housing		Help with Grand Challenge program	Administer Loan Loss Reserve	Community EV bulk buys
		Start Loan Loss Reserve	Electrification of City buildings		Get Downtown Bus expansion to businesses	Work to create new energy incentives	Private fleet electrification programs
		Coordinate with 2030 District on commercial efforts and net-zero energy district	Support internal carbon price			Administer community energy programs	Work on park and ride strategy
		Landfill solar				Energy Commission Support and Management	
		Resilience Hubs					
		Grand Challenge program					
		Internal carbon price					

RALITY IN FY 20-21

Resilience Analyst (NEW)	Energy Analyst (NEW)	Community Engagement Specialist	Solarize Consultant	Building Engagement Specialist	2030 Districts
Aging in Place Efficiently program management	Benchmarking/ disclosure ordinance and support (residential and commercial)	Outreach and engagement on all carbon neutrality initiatives	Solarize	Operate help desk regarding benchmarking ordinance	Support creation of Net-Zero Energy Districts
Sustainability metrics tracking	Create local offset program and guidance for community offsets	Youth ambassador program	Support Bulk buys of energy efficiency and batteries, and Evs	Green Rental Housing program	Support Benchmarking ordinances and commercial outreach
Resilience Hubs support	Support renewables bulk buy	Neighborhood ambassador program	Sign folk up for community solar	Weatherization expansion and support	
Website updates	GHG Inventories	Equity programs - including job capacity training program	Support green business challenge - especially around solar, energy efficiency, and batteries	Support building standards updates	
Environmental Commission Support and Management	Support energy efficiency, battery, and EV bulk buy	Sustaining Ann Arbor Together Grant program		Coordinate with planning and development on codes and incentives	
		Support community energy programs Support expanding weatherization programs		Support administratin of loan loss reserve	
		Emergency management and making sure that social cohesion is integrated		Support Aging in Place in initiative	

Downtown Housing Market Study Scope

The Ann Arbor Housing Commission is seeking proposals for a Housing Needs Assessment for an area in and around downtown Ann Arbor, Michigan. The purpose of the report is to identify the level of need for affordable rental housing for individuals, seniors and families. To that end, the AAHC is seeking bids for a Housing Needs Assessment to address the following:

Geography – The study should provide key demographic, economic and housing supply information and corresponding analysis for the area within a quarter of a mile of the Downtown Development Authority boundaries (see map).

Demographics – The study should provide historical (2010), current (2019 or 2020), and future (five-year projection) demographics associated with key population, household and income data. At a minimum, data should be provided for renter households, household sizes, various age groups (young adult, middle-age, and senior households), and other pertinent segments. Socio-economic information such as poverty, education levels, marital status, etc., should be provided to help understand the composition of the study area. The study should address how such characteristics and trends impact housing needs of the area.

Economics - The study should provide data demonstrating typical wages, prominent occupation types or employment sectors, unemployment rates, total employment and a summary of notable economic drivers, investments and anticipated/announced changes (business closures or expansions) that affect the local employment base. The study should address how such characteristics and trends impact housing needs of the area.

Housing Supply – The study should provide an overview of the area’s existing rental housing stock, using both secondary data sources and primary data collection. Information that is to be provided should demonstrate the typical rental rates, vacancies, condition/quality and common features of the area’s existing housing stock. The study should acknowledge any areas of oversupply or shortages of certain housing product types. Housing stock information should focus on housing affordable to households earning up to 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) levels. Analysts should provide an overview of any housing product in the development pipeline (planned projects or projects under construction) that may impact area housing needs.

Demand Estimates - The study should reasonably quantify the depth of support (or housing needs) for various income segments (e.g. households earning up to 50% of AMI, between 50% and 80% of AMI, etc.), indicating the number of rental units needed to meet current and future (five years) housing needs. Some level of discussion should be provided that addresses the need for certain bedroom types (e.g. studio, one-bedroom, etc.) and product for families, elderly and disabled populations.

Development Sites - The study, at a minimum, should provide a summary of several sites (up to 10) identified by the AAHC as potential opportunities for residential development. The summary should include a list of the sites (including the address, property type such as vacant land or existing building, size of the property, and current zoning), a photograph of each site and a composite map of all sites. The site information should be presented in such a way that allows users of the report to easily identify the location and key details of the properties. Analysts are encouraged to provide observations of the benefits and potential uses of each site.

Proposed Scope of Work

Downtown Parking Plan Update & Micro Area Studies

The City of Ann Arbor is assessing the potential to construct affordable housing on several downtown City-owned surface parking lots. The reuse of these sites for affordable housing and other uses has stimulated questions about current downtown public parking supply and demand. There is also the question of what strategies and programs are in place or could be enhanced to meet the needs of downtown customers, employees, and residents should these parking lots be redeveloped.

To this end, Nelson/Nygaard has been asked to provide a proposal to update its 2015 Downtown Ann Arbor Parking Management Study, including a utilization analysis and recommended parking management and supply options and actions.

Nelson/Nygaard will take on the project as a subcontractor to Smith Group, the consultant hired by the City to oversee its public engagement processes associated with its multi-site affordable housing feasibility analysis.

Project Initiation

The Nelson\Nygaard project manager will convene a project-kickoff conference call between the City and its planning partners involved key current areas of analysis and planning related to parking supply, demand, and available capacity, particularly:

- Opportunities to develop affordable housing on DDA/City-owned surface lots, including potential timelines
- Impacts of the Farmers Market on curbside parking activity and availability on surrounding streets and nearby parking lots
- Information about the proposed expansion of the Ann Ashley parking structure, including project purpose and sphere of influence. Information about any other parking structure construction options may also be examined.
- Parking utilization data, and potential proxy data, that is available through current DDA technologies, processes, and vendor services
- Current information from the getDowntown program, including go!Pass utilization and other programs
- We will work with the City and DDA to assemble relevant updated downtown data as available, including residential and employment figures and/or growth since 2015, mode shift data, etc.

Task 1 DDA Parking System Performance Measures

1.1 DDA Parking Supply

Nelson\Nygaard will utilize DDA resources as well as other available resources to update, tabulate, and map the downtown public parking inventory. This will include the number of public parking spaces on each block face and off-street facility, plus key parking regulations/restrictions for each. Upon completion of this subtask, the DDA will have a complete inventory of critical public parking resources within the downtown, tabulated and mapped at the downtown as well as sub-district scales, to include, at a minimum:

- Number of spaces at each facility/block face
- Type of facility: on-street, surface lot, parking structure
- Type of space: short-term, permit, metered, RPP, ADA, etc.

- Regulation by location: time limited, unregulated, permit-only, passenger and delivery loading/unloading zones
- Pricing: including days and times when rates are in effect, as well as upcoming/scheduled rate changes
- Location of residential parking permit areas outside the DDA District, as well as regulations, and walking distance

1.2 DDA Parking Utilization & Available Capacity

Nelson\Nygaard will quantify and analyze the demand and supply balance among public parking resources during critical peak periods across the DDA district. The data necessary for this is expected to be attained, as follows:

- Retrieve occupancy data from DDA/ Republic Parking for all DDA parking structures and gated lots.
- Coordinate with SmithGroup to use drone flights to capture video/imagery to complete occupancy counts for on-street and gated-lot parking locations.

The above will be attained sufficient to capture full downtown counts for three key time periods, which are likely to be:

1. The weekday midday period
2. A Friday/Saturday evening period
3. A Farmers Market Saturday morning

For all key time periods, utilization rates and patterns will be analyzed to assess the capacity for the existing supply to meet observed demand, including space availability within a yet-to-be-determined walking radius. The analysis will evaluate system-wide utilization patterns, as well as patterns with key areas of the downtown that represent and reflect how distinct stakeholder groups consider and use downtown parking resources differently.

1.3 Non-DDA Off-Street Parking Supply

Nelson\Nygaard will identify, map, and seek to quantify non-DDA parking facilities within the DDA district, including University of Michigan and private parking facilities. Parking facilities will be identified by:

- Location
- Supply
- Ownership
- Associated land uses,
- General peak and off-peak demand patterns, during the week and on weekends, from associate uses
- Days/times, including events, when shared/public access is accommodated, if any

The cost proposal submitted for this scope assumes that no new data collection will be necessary to complete this task effectively.

1.4 Secondary Performance Measures

Nelson\Nygaard will work with the DDA and its partners at the City to identify additional performance measures, that while secondary to the key measures of space utilization/availability, can deepen the understanding of system performance for its users and downtown stakeholders. Such measures may include:

- Citations issued for parking violations
- Parking permit wait lists for DDA parking facilities
- System costs, revenues, investments

- Key travel/commute measures, including scooter and bikeshare utilization and use patterns, transit ridership, mode-share for downtown travel, and participation in go!pass and other getDowntown programs
- Downtown growth measures

The cost proposal submitted for this scope assumes that no new data collection will be necessary to complete this task effectively.

Task Deliverables:

- **Tech Memo: Parking Supply & Demand Conditions Summary**, with narrative, tabular, and mapped presentation of key findings
- Database of all collected data
- GIS layers and data generated for maps used

Task 2 Micro Area Studies

Nelson\Nygaard will work with the SmithGroup team to provide data-based analysis of parking conditions in four micro areas, each surrounding a DDA-managed surface lot on a site being considered for the development of affordable housing. Nelson\Nygaard will also assist SmithGroup in its efforts to engage community and business stakeholders in each of these areas.

2.1 Utilization & Tracking Surveys

Nelson\Nygaard will quantify and analyze the demand and supply balance among public parking resources in each of the four downtown commercial areas, using video captured via drone flights to:

- Quantify the public parking supply within ¼-mile of the DDA-managed surface lot under redevelopment consideration
- Document the utilization/availability of these parking spaces at four time periods, to be determined for each area based on stakeholder input
- Track pedestrian traffic movements and volumes between the DDA lot and nearby destinations

Task Deliverables:

[Complete survey dataset \(4\)](#) for each lot surveyed

[Tech Memos \(4\)](#) summarizing and analyzing data findings, mapping use and exit patterns, and identifying implications for the surrounding micro area, for each lot surveyed

2.2 Coordinated Stakeholder Outreach

Nelson\Nygaard will work with the SmithGroup team and the DDA to support their engagement of stakeholders, to assess opportunities, challenges, and concerns related to surface lots under consideration for redevelopment. The Nelson\Nygaard project manager will participate directly in focus group discussion with key stakeholder groups, while providing indirect support for other engagement efforts, such as open houses and workshops.

The enclosed cost proposal assumes Nelson\Nygaard participation in up focus group discussions on up to four distinct dates.

Task Deliverables:

Focus Group discussion summary notes

Task 3 Updating the Downtown Parking Management Plan

NN will work with the DDA project team to identify a series of potential strategies to best address key identified issues and opportunities, via an Updated Parking Management Plan. These will be organized into three categories of solutions, as described below.

3.1 Supply Expansion Solutions

Best practices for expanding urban-center parking capacities, including:

- Zoning strategies to incentivize private development to fund public-parking expansion, provide public parking on-site, and/or share excess parking capacities with neighboring uses
- Converting existing surface lot facilities to underground structured parking to support mixed uses above, including estimated cost/space
- Expanding existing structured parking facilities, including estimated cost/space
- Joint Development opportunities that spread the cost risk of funding new parking facilities, while improving facility-design opportunities and avoiding stand-alone structures
- Land-banking via surface lot acquisition and improvement in growth areas, providing temporary supply expansion & leverage to influence development in key areas

3.2 Effective-Capacity Expansion Solutions

A more cost-effective, short-term-viable strategy for expanding parking opportunities may be to create more “effective capacity” among existing facilities. To this end, NN will assess opportunities to make existing resources more effective, including the following.

- Easy Pay technology to encourage a shift away from monthly parking permits
- Parking space availability technology including mobile technology
- On-site signage and other types of communication tools
- Shared-parking strategies to unlock “off hour” capacity among private parking facilities located near evening- and weekend-oriented activity generators, **including the incorporation of “pay by phone” services that can monetize this capacity for lot owners**
- Variable curbside regulations that align regulations with demand patterns so that morning commercial-vehicle loading zones can become metered parking areas for most of the day, before becoming pickup/dropoff zones for ride services in the evening – providing capacity for three distinct uses across the day, compared to conventional regulations that often accommodate just one, resulting in underutilization for several hours when that use is in low demand
- Public valet, which operates independent of any particular land-use/destination to greatly expand the capacity of curbside spaces, and improve utilization of off-street facilities, particularly during evenings, events, and seasonal peaks

3.3 Demand Management Solutions

NN will identify opportunities to manage demand to make the most use of existing resources and reduce overall parking demand, while supporting continued economic growth and civic vitality. Identified strategies will be based on cutting-edge best practices and technological innovation that have reduced parking demand, and made parking more consistently accessible, in comparable locations.

Demand Redistribution Opportunities

Of particular focus will be opportunities to improve access to short-term parking options in commercial and mixed-use areas, including access to “front door” curbside spaces when demand is highest, and improving the process of finding available alternatives when availability is constrained. This is likely to be approached through a combination of demand-management strategies, such as “tiered” pricing, to redistribute parking demand more evenly across on- and off-street options, and information design and technology solutions to reduce the need to “hunt” for available spaces.

Demand Reduction Opportunities

The Nelson\Nygaard team will also assess opportunities to reduce parking demand, by improving means of accessing the area by foot, bike, transit, micro-transit and other driving alternatives, as well as developing/refining policies and initiatives that can make these options more competitive and appealing among commuters and other peak-defining travelers.

Event Management Opportunities

Strategies for managing parking demand, distribution, and accommodation capacity will be developed to better support key downtown events, with a particular focus on the Ann Arbor Farmers Market. Strategies will focus on improvement opportunities specific to market vendor parking, Kerrytown-area employee parking, and market customers. This is likely to include strategies to provide appropriate accommodations for market vendors and area employees, complemented by a combination of incentives and regulations that can encourage the use of these options to preserve more market-proximate parking options for customers. Other options to explore are designating areas for dropping off passengers and picking up purchases to support those with mobility differences and to expand access to curbside areas through higher turnover.

Task Deliverables:

Draft Updated Parking Management Plan

Final Updated Parking Management Plan

Task 4 Micro Area Parking Plans

Nelson\Nygaard will identify and develop parking plans for each of the four downtown commercial areas studied in Task 2, assembling management, supply, and operational recommendations that respond to the key challenges and opportunities identified for each area. Each plan’s recommendations will build upon the solutions included in the updated Downtown Parking Management Plan to identify specific recommendations for each micro area. These recommendations will be identified based on data-based findings and stakeholder input from Task 2, and in support of the SmithGroup team’s final recommendations for each micro area.

Task Deliverables:

Draft Parking Plans (4)

Final Parking Plans (4)

Cost Proposal

		Nelson\Nygaard Labor Costs				Total Direct Expenses	Total Costs
		Thomas Brown	Dan Sommerville	NN Labor			
		Principal 1	Associate 1	Hours	Cost		
Total Billing Rate		\$185.00	\$105.00				
Task	Description						
0	Project Initiation	4	2	6	\$950		\$950
1	DDA Parking System Performance Measures						
1.1	DDA Parking Supply	4	12	16	\$2,000		\$2,000
1.2	DDA Parking Utilization & Available Capacity	8	24	32	\$4,000		\$4,000
1.3	Non-DDA Off-Street Parking Supply	4	16	20	\$2,420		\$2,420
1.4	Secondary Performance Measures	4	8	12	\$1,580		\$1,580
D	Parking Supply & Demand Conditions Summary	4	16	20	\$2,420		\$2,420
	Task Total	24	76	100	\$12,420	\$0	\$12,420
2	Micro Area Studies						
2.1	Utilization & Tracking Surveys	8	64	72	\$8,200		\$8,200
2.2	Coordinated Outreach	40		40	\$7,400	\$1,000	\$8,400
D	Datasets (4)	4	32	36	\$4,100		\$4,100
D	Tech Memos (4) summarizing findings and implications	16	8	24	\$3,800		\$3,800
D	Focus Group summary notes	4		4	\$740		\$740
	Task Total	72	104	176	\$24,240	\$1,000	\$25,240
3	Updating the Downtown PMP						
3.1	Supply Expansion Solutions	8		8	\$1,480		\$1,480
3.2	Effective-Capacity Expansion Solutions	8		8	\$1,480		\$1,480
3.3	Demand Management Solutions	8		8	\$1,480		\$1,480
D	Draft Updated Parking Management Plan	4		4	\$740		\$740
D	Final Updated Parking Management Plan	2		2	\$370	\$1,000	\$1,370
	Task Total	30	0	30	\$5,550	\$1,000	\$6,550
4	Micro Area Parking Plans						
	Micro Area Parking Plans (4)	4	4	8	\$1,160		\$1,160
D	Draft Parking Plans (4)	8	8	16	\$2,320		\$2,320
D	Final Parking Plans (4)	8		8	\$1,480		\$1,480
	Task Total	20	12	32	\$4,960	\$0	\$4,960
TOTAL HOURS		150	194	344			
TOTAL COST		\$27,750	\$20,370		\$48,120	\$2,000	\$50,120