

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
APRIL 5, 2021  
6:30 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:  
Alternative Communication Services  
www.CaptionFamily.com  
Phone: (800) 335-0911

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

>> Mayor Taylor: -- pledge of Allegiance.  
>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the  
republic for which it stands: One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and  
justice for all.  
>> Mayor Taylor: Would our clerk please call the roll of council?  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Hayner.  
>> Councilmember Hayner: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Disch.  
>> Councilmember Disch: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Griswold.  
>> Councilmember Griswold: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Song.  
>> Councilmember Song: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand.  
>> Councilmember Grand: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Radina.  
>> Councilmember Radina: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor Taylor.  
>> Mayor Taylor: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Eyer.  
>> Councilmember Eyer: Here.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Nelson.  
>> Councilmember Nelson: Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs.  
>> Councilmember Briggs:  
Here.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi.present.  
>> Clerk Beaudry: We have a forum.  
>> Mayor Taylor: May I have a motion to approve at agenda?  
Moved by Disch and seconded by Ramlawi.  
Discussion of the agenda?  
Councilmember Ramlawi.  
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Is it possible to invert c-4 and c-5?  
>> Mayor Taylor: Yeah, sure make that motion.  
Your motion is to hear c-5 before c-4; is that correct?  
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: That is mayor.  
Is there a second?  
Seconded by Nelson.  
All in favor?  
Opposed?  
Would somebody please be a pal and move DC-6, the resolution to appoint Marti Praschan as CFO from the very end of the meeting to immediately prior to the consent agenda so that -- moved by Councilmember Nelson and seconded by Councilmember Grand.  
Further discussion of that amendment?  
All in favor?  
[Chorus of ayes]  
All opposed?  
That amendment is approved.  
We will surely keep her here late at night for a variety of reasons but there's no reason to do that for the job.  
Further discussion of the agenda?  
The agenda as amended is approved.  
Are there communications from our city administrator?  
>> City Admin. Crawford: Thank you, mayor.  
I know you have a long agenda.  
I will be brief.  
With the change in seasons, there's a few changes in services our residents will see.  
I just want to highlight.  
First as compost collection starts, residential compost collection started today.  
You will see the spring fire hydrant flushing process starting next Monday.  
You can check out our website to see if your neighborhood is scheduled for that.  
We will not be doing a spring tree planting due to the expectation of the cicadas, however, there will be -- part of the 10,000 tree planting initiative.  
We have free trees that we are giving away.

These trees are not the type of tree that cicadas feed on.  
They are not in the right-of-way but you may plant on your property.  
Please visit our website if you are interested in that.  
And you will get some information on how to help them grow and thrive.  
Next, I wanted to point out that you have a work session scheduled for next Tuesday.  
That work session, I would like to cancel.  
The content of that session will be ready for your May 10<sup>th</sup> work session date.  
So unless anybody has an issue, staff had planned to move that content over to May 10<sup>th</sup>.  
Also want to recognize just a couple of things.  
Oh, before I do that, streetlight outages, remind our residents that if you see streetlights that are out, please contact or utilize a2fixit.  
It does help staff keep your -- the streetlights lit by following up with DTE and our own staff.  
I want to recognize the clerk for their and the residents' support on the voter sticker initiative that got another recognition and award.  
And so Jackie and everyone that you had working on that initiative and the residents who participated, thank you very much and congratulations on your award.  
And lastly, I wanted to recognize the matching grant that the treeline conservancy has received for \$2.5 million.  
We all hope that that is successful and I think -- you know, and this kind of day and age when the funds are hard to come by for government, it's great to see our residents finding ways to make things happen with matching grants like this.  
So I want to highlight that for everyone's recognition.  
That's all I have, mayor.  
>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.  
I do see there was some -- a request with respect to ac-1.  
Ac-1 is there any staff intro on that or --  
>> City Admin. Crawford: We have Dr. Stults with us tonight.  
Was it AC-1.  
That is Dr. Jackson, right?  
>> Mayor Taylor: That's INT-1.  
If you have nothing on AC-1.  
Dr. Stults is here for some questions that were received on ac-1.  
>> Hi, everyone.  
>> Mayor Taylor: Dr. Stults.  
>> Okay, great.  
Questions just reading them off here.  
The aging in place efficiency, items include xyz and there's a number of things listed.  
The question was: Which items were provided by A2Zero and which were provided by other organizations.  
So that OSI provided the bags that the kits are in.

The door draft protector that goes underneath the door to help with drafts and energy-saving tips in addition to what was installed and we had a fact sheet on how to install everything that was provided in the kit.

Not everything is intuitive in terms of what was received.

We provided information on A2Zero and how to engage in different activities and then we had a limited number of supplies left over from preCOVID activities that we used until we ran out and they included some additional L.E.D. lights, some additional L.E.D. night lights and toilet water saver that goes into the bucket of a toilet and reduces the amount of water.

When will the assessment of 2020, G.H.G. emissions will be available to review. By the end of the summer.

We are working to deploy the data now.

We will hopefully have that by the end of the summer.

Next question, which of the 44 A2Zero affect the G.H.G. to the greatest extent and how much?

Any immediate G.H.G. reductions in 2020 will likely be impacted by COVID and transportation emissions.

So we will have to work to disentangle that and I look forward to exploring that to greater depth.

In terms of A2Zero actions, the programs like the solarized initiative are going to have the biggest impact because of their physical infrastructure in the ground immediately producing renewable energy.

And then most other programs were in the design programming and implementation stage.

So we are starting to see their impact but it probably won't be as comforting.

Third question, what has been the priority strategy of focus for this fiscal year.

That's a really good question and a little tricky.

The O.S.I. are working on 22 of the 44 actions in A2Zero and we plan to continue the renewable energy, the electrification, and the 10,000 trees initiative decision to preparing our infrastructure for electric vehicle charging and the electrification of the -- let's see, fourth question, what progress has been made on the top three ranked A2Zero strategies referencing the G.H.G. metrics, preferred or other.

We welcome the opportunity to follow up on this.

I'm not sure I understand the question, the A2Zero strategies are not ranked that way.

I'm afraid I don't have much but I look forward to understanding it question and coming back with more.

And then the last question, which was what items did A2Zero offer in the free home energy efficiency kit and that was for information, both on energy saving tips and how to install information on A2Zero and then until we ran out, additional L.E.D. lights and night lights and a toilet bar.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you, Dr. Stults.

We now have an introduction, of course from our independent community police oversight commission, ICPOC, monthly update by chair Lisa Jackson.

Dr. Jackson?

You have the com.

>> Thank you, good evening, everybody.

I'm Lisa Jackson from the Ann Arbor independent community police oversight commission.

On April 4<sup>th</sup>, 53 years ago, Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated.

So many people were engaged in remembrance of that yesterday in addition to religious services.

And many people forget that MLK actually talked about police brutality in his "I Have a Dream" speech.

He said we can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of unspeakable horrors of police brutality.

He spoke of this as people protested in the south, including protesting when on May 7<sup>th</sup>, 1963, a black woman, was forced off the sidewalk by five patrolman, one of whom pinned him down with his knee on her neck.

Events such as those documented on television in newspapers and in magazines all across the paper were credited with awakening white Americans to question the civility of a country that allowed as poet Lorraine Hansbury put it, the white cops putting their knee on the Negro's neck.

We are reminded that the issues we are facing are not new.

Many Americans were similarly awakened last May as we all watched Derrick Chauvin with his knee on George Floyd's neck for what we know is more than nine minutes.

As we grapple with this, we now have the opportunity to make real change to public safety.

The independent community police oversight commission supports an array of programs related to restorative justice strategies for public safety and community support, including education and enrichment programs for at-risk youth, promoting criminal diversion programs, expungement as well as the reduction of conduct with armed law enforcement for noncrimes that.

Final point reducing the dispatched is especially crucial.

When an armed crisis response team responded to a Salt Lake City's mom call for help for her son who was on the autism spectrum, the report that followed indicated that the young man was triggered by the sight of police.

When they arrived, he ran and they fired at him 11 times.

Although he was shot many times, he is lucky.

He survived.

The availability of unarmed crisis responders for mental health crises would be a step in the right direction to avoiding such tragedies.

In a similar vain, another similar activity lies in traffic stops as we saw in the cases of Philando Castille who was pulled over for a broken tail light and Sandra Bland who was pulled over for failing to use a blinker in changing lanes.

These are civil infractions.

Not criminal ones.

And unarmed traffic enforcement of transgressions such as these would be a

step in the right direction.

The passing of one year since George Floyd's death seems meaningful in so many ways.

But it will be a significant moment precisely because his death wasn't just different -- it was not significantly different from the deaths of so many persons who have died after what could have been ordinary actions with the police.

We must not only remember George Floyd but also Philando Castille and Sandra Bland and the hundreds of others whose deaths continue to remind us that it's never enough to bear witness to the tragedies around us, and that true justice lies in taking action.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

We now have a proclamation of senior housing for Ann Arbor board of directors. As folks know the Ann Arbor Housing Commission, the City of Ann Arbor recently purchased Lurie Terrace which has long served as a location for senior affordable housing in Ann Arbor and we are delighted to be able to continue the structure and its mission, but we are only able to do so because of the good work performed by the board of directors of Lurie Terrace over the many, many years preceding.

And so in connection with the closing of the transaction, staff, it will be appropriate to issue a proclamation in honor of the good folks of Lurie Terrace. Whereas the Lurie Terrace was founded in 1964 and has been operated as an affordable housing complex for adults 64 and older since its inception; whereas, Lurie Terrace has provided an affordable, convenient and safe living community to 2,000 seniors for Monday than 55 years; and whereas, it has been operated by the senior citizens housing of Ann Arbor volunteer board of directors, many of whom have devoted significant time and effort on a daily and weekly basis to keep Lurie Terrace affordable and running smoothly for the benefit of its residents.

The city of Ann Arbor recognizes the outstanding organization and the many individuals who have contributed to its success as board members over year the years, including the current board members and their years of service.

President Mary Jean Raa, 28 years of service.

Past President David F. Hirth, 27 years of service.

Vice President Andy Jacobs, 7 years.

And secretary Mike Gatti, 14 years.

Jim Danforth, 17 years, Steve Darr 11, Susan Hinton 11, Ronald Gardner 9 years, Roberta Duda 9 years.

And E.R. Raymond 8 years of service.

Whereas the Ann Arbor -- pardon me, whereas the current volunteer board has decided to sell the building to the nonprofit the Ann Arbor affordable housing corporation in order to ensure that Lurie Terrace remains affordable housing forever to the benefit of tenants and the community.

Whereas the senior citizen housing Ann Arbor board of directors provides services for seniors in the community and whereas the city of Ann Arbor wishes

to recognize current board members commitment to serving the seniors of this community and their dedication to providing quality affordable housing. This group of individuals exemplifies what it means to serve the community and be a leader among peers.

Now therefore, I Christopher Taylor, extend the commendation and congratulations to the senior citizens housing of Ann Arbor for having to profoundly provided affordable housing for adults 26 and older in the community. Your support in helping older adults to afford quality housing in downtown Ann Arbor has been and will continue to be a monumental contribution to the Ann Arbor community.

Thank you to the good folks at Lurie Terrace.

We now come to public comment.

Public comment reserve time.

Public comment reserve time is an opportunity for members of the public to speak to council and the community about matters of municipal interest.

One needs to have signed up in advance by contacting our city clerk.

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

877-853-5247.

Once you have connected, please enter meeting I.D.94212732148.

94212732148.

Once you are connected further, please enter star nine to raise your hand to indicate that you wish to speak.

Our clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone number when it is your turn to speak.

When it is your turn to speak, please enter star six to unmute yourself.

Star six to unmute yourself and begin to talk.

Speakers have three minutes in which to speak.

So please pay close attention to the time.

Our clerk will notify you when 30 seconds are remaining.

Please conclude your remarks and cede the floor.

Our first speaker is Laurie Lounesbury.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I had Ms. Lounesbury on the line and I think she has hung up.

Wait a minute.

I think she's back.

Caller with the phone number 374.

Is this Laurie Lounesbury?

You press star six, to unmute yourself, caller 374.

>> Hello?

>> Mayor Taylor: Hello.

>> Yes?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, Ms. Lounesbury, it's your turn to speak.

You may begin.

>> Thank you very much.

I'm Laurie Lounesbury and I live at 507 Miller avenue.

I have three points to make.

First, my claim is different than other claims.

I am not asking the city to pay for the sewer backup damage.

I am only asking to be compensated for the salvage able items that were unlawfully taken by my payment by serve pro workers which followed the sewer backup.

Second, serve pro representatives informed me they were authorized agents of the city of Ann Arbor and told me the city's insurance would compensate me for my losses.

A serve pro agent demanded I sign a document saying I approved -- preapproved of all the items being non-salvageable before she was in my house. I was under extreme duress with my sister who was sick with cancer.

My sister died two weeks ago.

The city agent led me to believe she would not take all of my property.

The serve pro workers took family heirloom and band music equipment and power tools on shelves, most of which were serviceable and could have been cleaned.

She advised me I would be reimbursed for them by the city's insurance.

The city has never disputed the value of these lost items, which I carefully determined and presented to the city on an itemized 14-page spreadsheet totaling \$11,812.

Since then this happened I have paid the city more than \$12,000 in real estate taxes.

Third, the city's agents taking of my property and falsely claiming all the items were a total loss constitutes willful misconduct.

I assume your attorneys will advise you that willful misconduct is gross negligence and therefore, an exception to the governmental immunity defense claimed in the city's denial letter of February 23<sup>rd</sup> by Lori O'Malley, senior claims adjustor for highland administrative services.

In summary, the short argument is simply this --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Government immunity for a sewer backup does not extend to governmental immunity for theft.

Finally, I rely on the brief, my lawyer submitted.

Thank you.

I'm done.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

The next speaker is Katie Minder.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Minder, you can unmute yourself and speak.

>> Good evening, everybody.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Thank you.

My name is Katie Minder.



I'm the president of the Washtenaw apartment rental association, and independent renter.

I come you to regarding the proposed first read of the lease signing ordinance. We understand you would like to amend this ordinance to require 240 days to pass from the signing of the current lease before a landlord can show or lease to another person.

This would put the lease signings for May 1<sup>st</sup> for most student housing, after September 1<sup>st</sup>.

That is after final exams.

What would be the best time?

90 days?

We tried, this and the students doesn't like looking at housing during finals.

Anything before the start of winter semester would mean those studying abroad could not secure their housing for the next year before they left.

150 days would be February 1<sup>st</sup>, but, again, would disadvantage those going abroad and would force folks to look for apartments during the extreme cold.

180 days is March break there does not exist an ideal time frame to constrain market conditions that in the cause pain to everyone.

Individuals have their own needs.

Any time frame you select will send a message that this is the day they need to make a choice, our that is not true!

Right now there's ample housing available.

Even though the current ordinance says 70 days.

Anyone who has waited until now can have housing secured by this fall.

We would like to recommend this ordinance be done away with and we would encourage you instead to run an educational campaign encouraging students to wait to sign contracts.

If the students did not shop early, no rental providers would be able to sign them either.

Thank you so much for your time.

We really appreciate it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Thank you.

Our next speaker is Natalie Forshee.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Forshee.

>> I have two little ones.

My name is Natalie Forshee.

I'm the director of rental properties and I'm a member of the Washtenaw apartment area association.

I'm here to express my opposition to the proposed early lease signing and ordinance amendment.

I understand that the purpose of the amendment is well intended, however, I feel that it will have unintended consequences that I wanted to bring to your attention tonight.

The current ordinance in place, restricts landlords from showing an apartment.

They seek to extend that restriction to 240 days.

Unfortunately any extension will put unnecessary stress on our prospects and force local landlords to face challenges.

Our current leasing cycle is just about 10 months.

If the amendment passes, our leasing cycle will then become about four months.

Starting at the tail end of September we receive hundreds of leads a day and we execute a very high number of leases.

This is a strong indication that students want to conclude their housing search early on and during a time that's convenient for them.

An extension of the current ordinance would force them to begin their housing search around final exams and at a time of the year when they are looking forward to their summer vacation.

Because most of the student prospects want to see an apartment in which they will be living, I expect that the student prospects will need to remain in Ann Arbor until they can complete their housing search and I suspect this will be a major inconvenience and it will not go over well with the students and their parents.

Then find the workarounds of the current 70 day and knock on the doors of the locations that they would like to live.

They request a tour and the other students are often agreeable and then they request a lease for this location.

This is a competitive market and students do what they need to do to secure the space that works best for them.

This is conversely a dangerous practice and would be further complicated by the amendment being proposed.

The second half of my argument pertains to the staffing and employment challenges that local housing providers will face and how it negatively impacts those looking for housing the extension will compress from 10 months to four months and it renders a less than desirable outcome for customer service and leading our prospects waiting for a longer period.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 second.

>> They will not have enough work for 40 hours this would be full-time employment to seasonal employment.

Landlords contribute to the economic ecosystem.

It's my understanding that graduate students in the graduate employees organization proposed the extension, but it could ultimately disenfranchise a larger student body of undergraduates who need to seek housing early in the leasing cycle.

While I truly understand the desire to protect privacy and livelihood this will negatively impact the people you are trying to protect.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jennifer Langenberg.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 400.

If you press star six.

>> Hello.

Thank you for having me on here.

I have an a student landlord in Ann Arbor now for over 20 years.

And we are coming across this new adjustment to this ordinance and it's something that we truly need to speak about and work together on.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller, you muted yourself.

You ever unmuted again.

>> Thank you.

Sorry there's some feedback with like the time on this.

This change to this ordinance is going to create such chaos amongst students, amongst residents, amongst landlords, amongst everybody.

There is a demand that students bring about that they would like to lease these properties.

Where we already came from, from when this original ordinance happened, we already reduced the days because the students gave us feedback.

It was too long of a time period.

We all want to work together.

How the new wording is wrote, it is going to hurt local landlords who have been very sufficient to the Ann Arbor community because we don't have models to be able to show people.

We are going to be restricted with these gigantic high-rises.

We aren't going to be able to compete.

You are going to take the local person that has been here since the land before time and you are going to suffocate them.

It's unfair.

And I think if you would sit down and talk with all of us, I think there's a way that we can all come together and figure out a way.

But this -- what you want to restrict on us, it's not fair.

It's a level of police power that is being restricted on to multiple property owners and I just think we all need to finally come together.

Let's come together.

This is our community.

All love it and you are hurting the local man and that's not cool.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Have a good night.

But think about it.

You are hurting the local property owners.

Don't do it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ralph McKee.

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

You can press star six to unmute yourself.

>> This is Ralph McKee, can you hear me okay?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> I'm talking about starting an STRs.

I sent an in-depth email this morning on the legal framework and hope you had a

chance to read that.

The essence of it, the grandfathering proposal rests on two flawed premises, an incorrect understanding of the local framework and then incorrect understanding of the fairness issues.

The legal framework I heard again and again, because the RUDC had not expressly banned the STRs, that they were legal.

That was flat rejected by the Michigan Supreme Court.

I'm sure most of you are familiar with.

The rolling issue is actually whether the old ordinance definitions indirect barred STRs.

For example, in the definition of allowable residence of a dwelling unit said family or functional family and it implied permanence, that would bar STRs.

There's a Pennsylvania case which is just like that.

Our ordinance has a definition that could be interpreted that way too.

But no one talks about that.

They just the assumption is that it's automatically legal because we never enforced the old ordinance.

That's not sufficient.

That's not correct.

So unless the city attorney's advice, which I haven't seen but you have, said that definitely the city would lose, this case can and should be litigated in court or settled hasn't this can be done with zero risk by simply deferring enforcement of the ordinance against STR owners in residential areas until the thing is litigated. You don't have any damages if you haven't enforced the ordinance.

So the legal jeopardy, the legal mess argument has no real basis in fact.

The settlement should include some concessions for -- from the STR owners, reflecting their monopoly position once the ordinance is enforced, no new competition can be made.

And that is a huge benefit and they are worth way more than the property taxes being assessed with them.

They have a great benefit.

So that's what I have on that one.

And a few seconds on the other issue, I'm very curious on that tetra tech contract, why this study wasn't done way back when it should have been done, to find out the damage to that lake.

I'm glad it's being done now so that you can at least use it against Gelman and EGLE if they want to enforce that, try to that done.

Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Tom Stulberg.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Stulberg.

Phone number ending in 534.

You can press star six, you can unmute yourself.

>> Good evening.

This is Tom Stulberg calling from Lowertown.

Ann Arbor recently decided to regulate short-term rentals not allowing nonowner occupied STRs to operate those businesses in residentially zoned areas. The proposal now was to allow those already operating as such to continue to do so in perpetuity.

This further enriches those small number of private businesses, by increasing the value of their properties.

I'm not talking about the rent-free collect.

I mean the increased resell value of their property.

Are we now looking to change our law to give a financial benefit to a select group of private businesses?

I'm a real estate broker and a landlord.

A couple of years ago we were approached by a small company who runs STRs. They wanted to rent property from us that we had listed on a long-term business and run it as an STR.

They would furnish it and manage it as an STR.

We didn't want to remove those two duplex units from the long-term rental stock. Perhaps we made a poor business decision because now we don't qualify to get grandfathered in or ever as an STR.

The resale value of our property would be increased considerably under the new proposed law changes.

Granting this right to a limited number of properties and thus granting them a monopoly interest that has given to the property in perpetuity, the city increases the wealth of these property owners.

Alas my partners and I missed out.

Maybe it was a bad decision to keep those rental units in the long-term rental stock.

I have been running an STR in 18 years.

I gutted and renovated it on a mixed use business.

I made a business decision of the codes of a small inn, anticipating the growth of STRs in regulations.

Spent the extra money for the techniques I used, sprinkler system and interconnected smoke and fire lines just like you see in a hotel.

I can operate that as an inn if STRs become banned.

I planned for that 18 years ago.

That's what businesses do.

They anticipate, but they may be subjected to higher standards than the average resident running an STR out of their own home.

Finally, I think that adding changes to the UDC for short-term rentals may creating some problems relating to the upcoming proposed A.D.U. changes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> The current A.D.U. proposal has changes that were not anticipated by council and not even in the proposal as recently as a month ago.

It's a fast-moving target and at a minimum, any changes for STRs need to be held off as we have these changes with whatever the ADU changes will be there.

Is no rush.

So we should wait, rather than creating a mess.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Elizabeth Collins.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Collins you can unmute yourself and speak.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> I'm Beth Collins I live in ward five.

I remember when you sat at the virtual table and sent this request to grandfather the illegal use of many hotel businesses and neighborhoods.

You said that this 150 homes approximately 150 would filter out with attrition when they sold, well that's not the case.

At the planning commission meeting, Brent Lenart said that it stayed with the property.

It was in the same meeting as transit zoning and ADUs which is adding needed homes.

They will filter out through attrition.

And Mayor Taylor made a similar.

Shout out to former Councilmember Ackerman who says the 500 bedrooms of housing that you will be taking off the mark forever and where are these properties?

If there are four in the same block, this should be a concern.

I have one nonowner occupied STR on my street which is not a party house or a nuisance house but it's a three bedroom starter home on the outskirts of town and has a one bedroom ADU in the basement and it's relatively affordable home in Ann Arbor, probably selling for around \$300,000.

If you pass this, it will be forever a business and the owner can sell the non-conformity with the property, and probably doubling that price to \$600,000 or more.

What will it do for the overall affordability of homes in town?

It's an occupied mini hotel six out of seven nights, sometimes all week.

A real business.

I want real neighbors in the home.

I don't want a mini hotel.

Please do not pass this.

Leave these homes to be sold or the owners can also Rend them as long-term rentals.

That is needed in town.

Please don't let the attorneys scare you and the owners bully you to approve this illegal use.

The courts will decide what is right and what is fair and what is the law.

Right now you are leaving yourselves open to more lawsuits in the future from those who come after this date.

If I had a crystal ball, I would expect that will know small into many hunts over the next decades.

It won't strengthen neighborhoods, you cannot say that you are for more housing

for people to live in if you vote for this tonight.

Do not believe the sob stories who put so much money into the property.

Hello!

They will get all of that back when they sell or like I said just have a long-term renter in the house still.

These are cash cow businesses.

There are plenty of hotels to house families of loved ones during u of m hospital stays.

It's a business, period.

Please vote no tonight and thank you, everybody.

Bye.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Marilyn Wedenoja.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 364.

You can press star six to unmute yourself.

Ms. Wedenoja.

Caller 364.

If you press star six, you can unmute.

>> Okay.

This is Marilyn Wedenoja.

And I'm representing the Ann Arbor citizens for the mental health and public safety millage and we want to thank you very much in support your idea and your plans for a public safety team that would go out especially for mental health situations.

We know that this has been tried in a number of different communities and has been very successfully operationalized and that it used to be so in Ann Arbor in 1970, there was a combination of community mental health and the u of m psychiatric emergency would go out on mental health emergencies and would call the police in needed but it wasn't automatic that the police would go out. That was a very successful team.

So I very much endorse your idea of setting up such a team again.

I think it's needed even more so at this point in time.

We would like to draw your attention to some of the youth initiatives that are needed and being discussed in this area as well.

We are finding that with early intervention.

Especially for youth with mental health issues that a great deal can be accomplished and can -- the intervention can help so that they are not turning into long-term mental health clients, and a lot of these can be done in the schools and COVID has made that even worse.

So we really look for you to take very seriously the youth initiatives that could be done with community mental health and the schools together.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Barbara Higman.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Higman, phone number 805, you can unmute yourself.

>> Hello?

Am I heard?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, you are, ma'am.

>> Hello.

And thank you.

My name is Barbara Higman.

I address you as someone with a mental illness.

I'm a member of the Washtenaw consumer advisory council, citizens for mental health and public safety.

I applaud the proposed resolution 2106-12 directing the city administrator to develop an unarmed public safety response program and the implementation of this program is successful and the program is sustainable.

I remember some of my friends who I also live with telling me of a situation some years ago when they knock on the door of one of our group who happened to be black and not doing so well at the time.

She opened the door brandishing a kitchen knife.

She slammed the door while my friend stood back.

They decided to call the community mental health public response team, instead of the police.

Although they were ill at ease, the situation was resolved and nobody was hurt and our friend got the help she needed.

I believe it is important to bring the wisdom of people who have mental health conditions and others who have experienced crisis situations to the table when planning programs that could affect their lives.

A collaborative planning team that draws from past and current experience, and also keep abreast of new developments so it plans for future that will exist rather than for a past that is outdated.

For example, the Federal Communications Commission plans to roll out 988 as a number to be used nationwide for mental health crisis in July of 2022.

And Washtenaw County community health is looking at the youth assessment center.

But in the end, developing an unharmed public safety, it has to deal with public issue.

This is what most people thought they were supporting when they approved the county millage.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And the unarmed public response system should be one of the new initiatives from the mental health and the public safety millage which currently are not being so is used.

Such reallocation would have the voter expectations and improve the likelihood of a successful renewal of the county millage with the current funding allocation to the city.

I urge you to pass the resolution and support it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.



Our next speaker is Paul Fleming.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. Fleming, phone number ending in 160.

Do you have a comment?

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Great.

Good evening, everyone and thank you so much for the opportunity to speak with you.

My name is Paul Fleming.

I live in the Lakewood and I work as a professor of public health at the U.

I'm speaking in regards to the resolution, on directing the city administrator to develop an unarmed public safety response program.

First, I would like to express my appreciation that Ann Arbor is anything about unarmed and nonpolice responses issues like mental health crises.

Rethinking how we approach public safety so we don't rely on police is in line with evidence-based public health best practices.

In fact, the American public health association has passed its own policy resolution detailing how current policing practices harm health and identifies alternatives on relying on the police.

Here's three key research findings.

First being killed by police is the sixth leading cause of death for young black men.

Second young people are injured by police at the same rate that pedestrians injured by cars.

Finally, current policing practices have spill over effects on the entire communities, particularly communities of color, making people who live in areas that are aggressively policed suffer mental health issues and have physical health ailments.

Simply put the current system of policing throughout the U.S. and including in our own area harms people's health and we need to envision alternatives that do not include firearm surveillance and harassment and take a more humane approach.

We need to reorient the public safety system away from community and violent policing and punishment systems and the social services.

I view this idea of an unarmed public safety response as a type of public health program.

And, in fact, I teach a course on best practices for developing public health programs and the number one thing I teach students is for any program to be successful, the community members who use the program need to be central in the design and the delivery of that program.

The initiative is not community led, it is much more likely to fail.

I encourage you to place community organizers and People of Color and people most impacted by police at the center of any planning process.

The other thing I teach my students about planning a program is that it is essential to identify innovative and evidence-based models elsewhere and learn from those experiences.

Programs like cahoots in Eugene, Oregon and parachute N.Y.C. does not replace funding for social services but diverts money away from the police budget into a separate program administered by a separate entity from the police like an N.G.O.

Ann Arbor can be a leader in this space but to do so, it will require treating public safety as a public health issue, to adequately fund the community-lead program to ensure success.

Thank you so much for your time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Are there communities today from council.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

I guess just real quick, just talking about the street closures that began this welcome for the downtown merchants and residents throughout our city to come downtown and enjoy what there is to offer.

It was nice to have some good weather and I'm looking to another successful year.

I have another question regarding the work session for next week that has been postponed.

I should have looked into this.

What -- what -- what were we supposed to discuss next Tuesday?

I'm concerned as to you would that affects the adoption of the budget.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, may I respond to that now?

>> Mayor Taylor: Please.

>> City Admin. Crawford: The items on the agenda were the review of the transportation master plan was coming back to you for review at a work session and the smart cities presentation.

That was the previously planned content.

I was going to add to that a brief presentation on the diversion and deflection program that attorney slay has been working on.

Those are the three items that we will have ready on May 10<sup>th</sup>.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate the opportunity to have that answered. Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Beaudry, can you give me lower hand authority?

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to thank city administrator for mentioning street lights.

Just before this email, I had an email from a constituent talking about a pedestrian cross and one of the contributing factors she described was the lack of appropriate illumination.

We are coming up to the budget cycle.

I haven't asked any specific budget questions but I think it goes without saying that illumination at our crosswalks.

We are a very wealthy, fortunate community.

There's absolutely no reason why we should have streetlights without illumination.

Streetlights like where we lost a life a young life just a few years ago. Yet we continue to upgrade and install crosswalks without illumination.

I don't understand, and I plead with the city to please end that practice and bring all of our crosswalks up to standard illumination.

Next, I want to mention that there will be a rally in Lansing next Tuesday, a week from tomorrow.

It is a grass roots effort by local community members requesting that the governor send a concurrence letter to the EPA.

Community members feel they must communicate directly with Lansing due to the lack of action on the part of governor and misinformation locally.

That rally will be held at 11:30.

The information will be out on social media.

We have had confirmation from some of our state representatives, including Representative Yousef Rabhi who will be joining us for a few minutes at that rally.

Last, I would like to ask for an item -- two minutes.

I forgot.

New rule.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Congress.

>> Councilmember Song: We have a session with Brett Lenart to discuss the new toll brothers housing development coming into our ward.

That will be with Brett Lenart from planning.

There's also an event here, a virtual event hosted by a nonprofit enterprise at work this Wednesday and it's a session featuring local Asian American and African American community leaders and speaking on solidarity and Civil Rights work.

If you checked the nonprofit website, you can register for that session.

It's this coming Wednesday.

And this week is national library week and national public health event.

I hope you are following the events following in the local library and then if you followed there was a session from -- at the national public health association that was really interesting on policing as a public health issue.

I encourage folks to look that up and hopefully we can discuss that later on today.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Just a couple of things.

First thing I would like to -- I have done it before.

I dedicate a moment of silence that we had to kind of our electronic brother Tim Baker who passed this weekend and I'm really sorry for him and his family and everybody in the music community.

He was a really great guide.

April is autism awareness month and world autism day was Friday, April 2<sup>nd</sup> and I know that -- I think I would suspect that by now everybody knows somebody who is on the autism spectrum even if they don't know it.

And it's parent thing to be aware where people are more isolated.

It's under the United Nations sustainability goals, it's under Section 8, it speaks to that pretty heavily by the need to have consideration for folks on the autism spectrum.

And April is recognized as the assistive psychotherapy month.

I think it's important to understand that there are alternative treatments and alternative approaches to therapy.

Finally, I would like to ask our administrator and our city attorney to take a look into the questionable practices around filling FOIAs.

It's come to my attention that there have been some FOIAs that have not been completely filled and the treatment for councilmembers has been unequal in the filling of those FOIAs.

I'm concerned about that and I will follow up with a written letter.

There's about exemptions made for privacy that don't exist in Michigan State law.

I'm concerned about that.

I think when FOIAs are requested, they should be filled to the full potential and the full -- without exception.

So we need to be as transparent and open as possible as the city government, and filling FOIAs is part of that.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand:

I wanted to recognize CC-1, which is on our agenda which I hope is an appointment to the green belt advisory commission at our next meeting and I believe it will be the first for the city of Ann Arbor that we will have a former city ornithologist that will be appointed to a board or commission.

So I'm looking forward to that.

Also want to just put out there that Councilmember Radina and I will have the virtual coffee hour on April 18<sup>th</sup>.

We will have links up on social media or you can email us the day of that meeting and we can second you the Zoom link then.

I want to encourage you in the community to avail themselves to the ample opportunities for COVID test thanks to the county and also today is day when anyone over the age of 16 can make an appointment for a vaccination.

So if you haven't done so, we can how do that in our own state and not have to take advantage like myself and so many did of the vaccine in Ohio.

So hopefully we can do that closer to home.

Thanks.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

I also saw and wanted to comment that the V.A. Ann Arbor healthcare system is also vaccinating all V.A. members and their spouses.

I hope they will at the advantage of that.

And do what they can to tie up and get an appointment and get vaccinated.

And I will remind everyone that we are not through this.

And so continue to mask up and make sure you are taking necessary safety precautions as we see a urge here in Michigan again, we want to make that we are doing our part to make sure that folks remain safe.

I wanted to highlight something that happened place on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, the anniversary of Kathy Kozachenko's election.

She was the first open lesbian or gay candidate in the state and with her election 47 years ago.

She cemented her place and Ann Arbor's place in LGBTQ community.

I hope we will do more to celebrate her legacy because obviously the groundbreaking election she had back 47 years ago certainly helped my ability to make it on to this council.

She was certainly -- she was the first but she was not the last and I hope others will follow.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communications from council.

I would like to request confirmation of the following appointment at the March 15, '21 regular session to the Ann Arbor housing commission, Dena Bower.

Moved by Councilmember Grand, and seconded by Ramlawi.

Discussion, please?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-6 to appoint Marti Praschan as the controller and chief financial officer.

Moved and seconded.

Mr. Crawford, do you want to say a few words?

>> City Mgr Crawford: Thank you, Mayor.

I'm pleased to bring you to a resolution to appoint Marti Praschan.

Marti has been with the city for over 20 years and worked her way up in the organization in finance and has most recently served as the chief of staff in the public services area.

This reflecting her outstanding abilities for not only finance but understanding the operations of the public works.

She -- she will, I believe do a great job, as your next C.F.O. and you have met her before but she's with us tonight.

I want to bring to you this recommendation for her official appointment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Praschan you have the misfortune of unmuting yourself.

Do you want to say a few words.

>> Thank you.

I'm very excited about my new role with the city and I'm looking forward to getting started.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm reluctant to speak for council but we're delighted to see your appointment and look forward to working with you.

So thank you for what you have done and thank you for what you will do.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

Welcome aboard!

>> Thank you.

We now have before us the consent agenda.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Seconded by Councilmember Disch.

Discussion of the consent agenda.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Just briefly, I would like to mention that CA-14 through 18 are acquisitions, land acquisitions as part of the green belt and so that program is moving along pretty good and I think we are getting some good value out of that.

It's appropriate as we see development really blowing up in the townships that we don't really have any say over.

I'm glad that this program moves forward and I appreciate and the taxpayers for continuing to -- to pay for that.

Secondly, I would like to ask to remove CA-24, just because I oppose a vote on that.

I don't know if it's appropriate to do, that but I would like to call it out for the voting purposes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I would like to pull ac-1.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I just wanted to briefly mention as I asked some questions ahead of time on CA-6, which we inadvertently didn't have answers for our responsible contractor policy during the contracting process -- or during the bidding process.

Personally, I was going to pull this but I have done some homework on this and I feel they will meet our cry tear yeah.

So -- criteria.

So I wanted to express that because I had raised some concerns prior to the meeting.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Further discussion of the consent agenda.

All in favor of the consent agenda with the exceptions of CA-1 and 24?

All in favor.

11 councilmembers present all voting in the affirmative.

That satisfies the 8 votes with respect to CA-7, CA-9, CA-14, CA-15, CA-16, CA-18, CA-20.

That is all.

CA-24, resolution to approve the February 19, 2021 recommendation of the insurance administration to deny the claim and subsequent appeal filed by climate Laurie Lounesbury for a sewer backup claim.

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you, I will be brief.

With all due respect to the insurance board and the administration around this issue, I find myself -- I have a difficult time consenting to the notion of governmental immunity.

I understand what it is.

But I think it's a cop out.

I would like to -- I'm not going to consent to this.

I wanted call for a separate vote.

That's all.

>> Mayor Taylor: My apologies.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: CA-1, resolution to appropriate and amend the FY21 general fund budget for technical support related to the Gelman litigation in the amount of \$10,000.

Moved by grand and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of CA-1.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, my first question is: Is this a supplemental for work that has already been done in November?

And in reading the details, this includes the theoretical review of an NPDES permit into the first charge into the first sister lake and I'm really confused and disturbed because I thought we assured the public that we would not discharge into the first sister lake.

I would like to know if this work was already done or this is some additional work being done or exactly what this is about.

Mr. Postema, you are on mute.

>> City Atty. Postema: Yes, I believe you sent information about this

Councilmember Griswold, and I would actually ask if Brian Steglitz has additional information on this.

I believe this is for prior work that was already done.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

I know some of it was controversial.

And this is what's available to the public and it's quite disturbing if they think that some type of discharge is still in play.

I see Brian has joined us.

>> Yes, this is for work that has already been completed at the request of the attorney's office.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Oh, okay.

Great.

That is great news.

All right.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

Approved with 11 councilmembers present, all voting in the affirmative, thus satisfying the eight vote requirement.

We now come to public hearings.

It's an opportunity for members of the public to speak to council and the community about a specific subject matter of that public hearing.

That is to say a specific item on the agenda.

To speak at a public hearing, you need not have signed up in advance, but your speech must relate to the specific subject matter of the public hearing.

That is to say, the jump on the agenda to me at a public hearing, please enter the number on your screen, 877-853-5247.

877-853-5247.

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

Once you are connected and it's time for the public hearing with respect to which you are interested, please press star nine to indicate that you wish to speak.

Our clerk will notify you by the last three digits of your telephone number when it is your turn to speak.

When it is your turn to speak, please press star six.

You have three minutes to speak.

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

When your time has expired, please conclude your remarks and cede the floor.

Public hearing number one, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 6.58 Acres from R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District), Oakwoods Nature Area Addition, 3382 Green Road.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone with their hand up for this hearing.



>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.  
Public hearing number two, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 8.48 Acres from R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District), Ruthven Nature Area Addition, 3301 Geddes Road.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, none of the callers on the line have their hand up for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Any callers wish to speak, please enter star nine.

Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number three, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning) of 1.55 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District), 2511 Newport Road.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: I don't see any callers for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number four.

An Ordinance to Add Chapter 122 (Fair Chance Access to Housing) to Title IX of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any callers for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number five, An Ordinance to Amend Section 9:46 of Chapter 107 (Animals - Dog Licenses) of Title IX of The Code of The City of Ann Arbor.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone on the line for this hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one this public hearing is closed.

Public hearing number six.

An Ordinance to Amend Section 4.60 of Chapter 47 (Streets) of Title IV of The Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see anyone on the call for this hearing.

Seeing no one, this public hearing is closed.

We have before us the work -- we have before us the minutes of the work sessions of March 8 and March 22 and the regular session meeting minute of March 15, 2021.

May I have a motion to approve these minutes.

Moved by Councilmember Griswold, and seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

The minutes are approved.

B-1, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 6.58 Acres from R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District), Oakwoods Nature Area Addition, 3382 Green Road.

Moved by Councilmember Song and seconded by Griswold.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

B-2, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 8.48 Acres from R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District), Ruthven Nature Area Addition, 3301 Geddes Road.

Moved by Councilmember Hayner and seconded by Griswold.

Discussion of B-2.

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: I realized that both of these areas of public land were gifted to the city with the agreement that they would be public land.

Given our crisis in affordable housing I hope that in the future we can try to negotiate to provide housing and more importantly affordable housing on land that is being given to us by developers.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to add, first of these, the Oakwoods nature, I think we purchased that from Al creek development, but it's ponds and wetlands.] That would be difficult to use for housing.

And the Ruthven nature area was purchased from the property owner with support from parks and recreation.

So I think the county parks and recreation.

We wouldn't have been able to afford it if -- I'm sorry, I'm distracted.

I think there were callers for the public hearings but they are telling us that the same might be broken.

So excuse me.

Anyway, we wouldn't have been able to afford the other one without the participation of portions and recreation.

And so it was designated as park land.

So I take Councilmember Griswold's point that we want to be mindful of whether we can use land for affordable housing whenever possible but I think in these two cases, that wouldn't have been applicable, but I really do think that that's a very good point that we need to be mindful of that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Just one related point, is that the land along geddes road, now that we are bringing it into the city will allow us to better maintain the public right-of-way and I know that's something that Brandon Dimcha has brought to our attention.

That's between Concordia Parkway and Geddes, there's a lot of non-motorized transportation there, but in some cases the vegetation grows over the shoulder and it's literally trimmed by the vehicles down there.

By owning a larger percentage of that property, I hope that we can make it safer

for pedestrians and cyclists.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It's approved.

Stepping back for a moment, Ms. Beaudry, we have a report that there are -- from Councilmember Disch just now, she indicated that there are folks trying to get in contact with her that were wishing to speak at the public hearing.

At least one of the public hearings.

Do we have any visibility into difficulties with C.T.N. or technical difficulties?

>> Clerk Beaudry: I'm not sure.

Maybe Councilmember Disch can -- is the issue that people are on the line and they are not able to raise their hand?

So the raised hand is star nine.

I think so.

Let me ask if they were able to raise their hand.

Excuse me for texting during meeting.

>> Mayor Taylor: If any speakers are listening who are wishing to speak --

>> Councilmember Disch: I'm sorry.

I went the wrong way.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Is this a need to wait for a delay for speakers at a public hearing.

>> Mayor Taylor: I tend to wait longer at the beginning so people catch up and --

>> Councilmember Disch: She said they hit star nine.

>> Mayor Taylor: Right now, there are folks who are called in, there's one that hit star nine.

We have one person who has raised hand after hitting star nine.

I'm going to assume with council's acquiescence, there are a number of people who are here now.

These folks who are here now, if any of them wish to speak, these raise their hand and they indicate what -- which public hearing they wish to speak at and I would propose we reopen the public hearing for the purpose of listening to that person.

Does anyone have a problem with that?

>> Councilmember Disch: Wait.

The host will be informed, is that happening Ms. Beaudry.

That's the message that they are getting.

>> Clerk Beaudry: The caller with phone number 883, the last three digits are 883 has raised their hand.

>> Councilmember Disch: Okay.

That's the one person who is --

>> Mayor Taylor: Would has been communicating with you?

>> Councilmember Disch: Yep.

So he should unmute.

>> Clerk Beaudry: I will have to give him permission but I see now that the hand

is up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Excellent.

Thank you.

So Ms. Beaudry, let's let that individual speak and they will indicate which public hearing they wish to speak at and then we will keep that open for the purposes of listening to that individual.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 883.

Did you have a comment for a public hearing?

>> Hi.

Yeah, I'm sorry about that.

I wonder if that was my misunderstanding.

I appreciate the time.

My name is Matt Statman and I'm calling in in favor of the fair housing ordinance.

I want to point out that the lack of affordable housing interacts with those with past criminal convictions and it contributes to the cycle of incarceration.

I'm a long-time Ann Arbor resident and I live in the first ward.

I attended Angel WCC, E of U and U of M.

When I was a teenager, I developed a substance use disorder, and some of the things that you can buy in the store now and others of which I heard are being used as therapies.

I went to prison and when I got out, I lived at my parent's house on the west side for a few months while working at Frog Holler Produce.

When I saved up enough money to move, I drove down Packard and looked at for rent signs and secured a one bedroom efficiency, no background check and \$325 a month, no problem.

All while on parole.

Throughout the late '80s and '90s, I lived in a variety of rental and it was relatively affordable.

If I got out of prison now, none of this would be possible.

I would have to move out of town to get a lease.

I worked in the addiction treatment and recovery field for more than the last 15 years and I currently work with students in recovery at the University of Michigan.

As you know Ann Arbor is full of people recovering from substance abuse.

They are incarcerated.

We have a great addiction treatment here in Ann Arbor, tons of recovery housing and access to helpful public transportation and more entry level employments than most places all of these things are essential to help our neighbors get back on their feet.

I often see people in recovery in this town get the help they need, start working and contributing to our community and then when they want to move out of recovery housing they can't live here due to landlord discrimination and lack of affordable housing.

It's horrible for them and a real bad look for us.

Additionally, the racist implications of allowing this type of discrimination to occur is self-evident.

We cannot claim to value inclusivity and continue to allow housing discrimination against people who have been convicted of criminal offenses.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Please affirm this ordinance and continue to work towards more affordable housing.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Is there anyone else on the line who wishes to speak but was unable to do so during the prior set of hearings?

If so, press star nine now.

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

>> Mayor Taylor: Seeing no one being I'm going to have us move on.

So that public hearing, which I believe was public hearing number four is again closed.

I believe we had a vote on b-2, but just to prevent us from having a foot fall.

All in favor of b-2, please say aye.

All opposed?

It's either approved or double approved.

B-3, an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning) of 1.55 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District), 2511 Newport Road. Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi, seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion of B-3?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

B-4, An Ordinance to Add Chapter 122 (Fair Chance Access to Housing) to Title IX of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi, seconded by Councilmember Nelson.

Discussion, please, of b-4?

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: My notes just disappeared.

Can I pass, or is no one else?

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

>> Councilmember Radina: I give Councilmember Hayner an option.

We spoke briefly about this quite a bit already.

I'm incredibly enthusiastic for this and grateful for the support it has received through the multiple versions here at the council table and I'm looking forward to getting it passed as we heard from the public hearing.

There are many in our community who I think will benefit from this and obviously, we also need to continue as the caller reminded us working towards our affordable housing goals so once this discrimination is discontinued there's affordable options for these individuals as well.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I went to echo the previous caller and just mention that according to social science that the formerly incarcerated are seven times more unlikely to be homeless.

It makes it difficult to get a job and reenter society.

So I think we are doing a good thing here.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Briggs: S?

>> Councilmember Briggs: I spoke on this last time and I would just ask to be added as a sponsor this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: As many of you know, we received correspondence from various renters, landlords, apartment owners and so on, rental house owners.

There were some concerned expressed that this was somehow taking them in a way that would create an unsafe condition.

I had several conversations on the phone with people about this.

The truth of the matter is like the caller and other callers have said that for us to suggest that this check is necessary, is to suggest that there is no hope that our prison system and incarceration system and our rehabilitation systems are never going to work.

That's a terrible thing to suggest by voting this down.

And so this is completely the right thing to do.

If someone has done a crime and they have done the time, then they have -- they should have the same access to housing that anybody else has.

And so I'm happy to see this before us.

And I just think it's another step forward in trying to support the notion that we do need reforms in these systems and doing all we can do on our end to make it so. Somebody comes out and they need a chance, they might need more of a chance than somebody else.

I think this is one step in a series of steps as a body to improve access to housing and I appreciate the opportunity to be a cosponsor of this, and I encourage everyone to vote for it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I just want to thank the significant amount of time that was spent on discussing this issue and crafting this ordinance by both the human rights commission and the legal staff.

This was an issue that was first brought to me, I think in 2019 by a ward four resident, Aaron Shiganama, and it feels to me like one of the best examples of how your local government works to reflect the interests and the concerns that might start with an individual, and then turn into a larger issue that will have a really positive impact on many, many more people.

And so I have just want to thank all the people would spent time and work on this ordinance to make it happen.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

I will simply echo my thanks those who worked on this and to staff.  
And I'm delighted that we will be moving forward on this, and this is for all the reasons articulated an area of discrimination that has real life sequences and by banning the box with respect to leases, we will be expanding housing opportunities and integrating the opportunities for returning community members to integrate fully back into our community and that is a that is a social good and I'm proud we are doing it.

Further discussion?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It is approved.

B-5, An Ordinance to Amend Section 9:46 of Chapter 107 (Animals - Dog Licenses) of Title IX of The Code of The City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Disch, seconded by Councilmember Briggs.

Discussion, please, of B-5.

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I just wanted to thank Ms. Beaudry for working to make our city more customer service friendly and efficient.

I had one quick question on it to make sure I understand fully.

It appears that folks can register for a dog license now at any time, but it would expire during the month that their rabies vaccination expires; is that correct?

>> Clerk Beaudry: That's correct.

We used to have a set month of the year that all licenses expired and it was confusing for customers because it didn't match the date on the rabies certificate. So now you can -- residents can still buy a one or three-year tag but it will coincide with the state that they already have the rabies.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, Ms. Beaudry, for bringing this forward. I have a question that relates to our leash laws and whether we can use this as an opportunity to educate our residents on the leash laws.

Do we provide it with the licenses of the city ordinances?

>> Clerk Beaudry: It's time of sale, we do not, but that's something I can certainly look into with the police department -- certainly look into with the police department but that is an enforcement issue but we can look at some type of communication or marketing material.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And let us know if you need direction from council but we have been receiving reports of many dogs that are not on leashes that make others fearful and incidents between dogs.

>> Clerk Beaudry: I think the communications office worked with police on some off-leash issues.

So I will reach out to that department as well as police and there might be some material available.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Again, I keep thinking it's a great opportunity and S.O.P.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion I want to note that Councilmember Eyer and I are working at the initiation of some residents and in conjunction with the advice of humane society on amendments to our ordinance which would deal with -- or which would address dangerous dogs and the -- the injuries that dogs do to other dogs right now.

Our dangerous dog ordinance only deals with dogs and humans, and not on dog on dog.

So look for that in an agenda packet here you.

Further discussion?

All in favor?

It's approved.

B-6, An Ordinance to Amend Section 4.60 of Chapter 47 (Streets) of Title IV of The Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Ramlawi, seconded by Disch.

Discussion, please of b-6.

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

I would like to thank Councilmember Ramlawi for bringing this forward and taking a look at to see if we can tweak it to make it more friendly to our residents.

I did ask a number of questions on the agenda response on this issue.

I wasn't sure where I stood on this issue of reducing the fine for first-time violators of this ordinance.

And one of the responses we received was that staff would find it helpful if we waited on this amendment until after they are able to provide us a comprehensive report that we requested in March around snow removal.

So I would like to move to -- I suspect that Councilmember Ramlawi would have some thoughts on this.

I would like to move to postpone this item until -- I'm open to discussion on, that to our second meeting in September so we have a chance to look at feedback to make that change which doesn't appear to be a big rush to make this change since we are moving into the summer months and we have an opportunity to get some staff response.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second on this?

Seconded by Disch.

Discussion?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate all the information we are trying to gather on everything that we discuss this is such a minuscule issue.

I'm dumb founded on the suggestion to postpone it for six months.

It's paralysis by analysis.

When I discussed this issue with staff and I had the staff help me prepare it, there was no issues raised or concerned.

I understand that we will be looking snow clearing issues and trying to find better ways to handle it.

We have it right here in front of us and if we have to go back in six months and



changes, we can do it, but I don't think handing out \$140 tickets is the motive of this council.

You know, I believe that council is more interested in education and inclusivity and affordability and I really don't see the need to postpone this.

I want to know where is the response that staff would caution us against adopting this because they need more information.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: It's not an issue that staff needs more information but we have a one size fits all fee structure which means the fine is the same, regardless whether the property is residential or commercial and regardless of its proximity to a transit corridor.

So staff indicated that they feel it would make sense to reevaluate the fee structure along with the other aspects of the city's snow removal policies and strategies.

So to me, we could vote to postpone as Councilmember Briggs has moved. We could also amend this proposal to read residential sidewalks and ramps, and thereby make it possible to pass along the reduction of the fine for residential sidewalks and ramp and invite staff to look at whether we want the fine be the same for a commercial property that takes up an entire city block, et cetera, et cetera.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

Ram I saw that part of the response and it says that community standards doesn't have the tools available to them when they are looking out and enforcing and issuing tickets to know the zoning of each particular parcel of land.

And I don't think we are going to have that information any time soon.

It seems to be a very time consuming resources intensive application to put our resources and efforts into.

All we are simply doing with this is reducing the fine given to folks who maybe were not home that snowstorm, maybe in the hospital, maybe unaware, new resident.

You know, a break on the first ticket.

All the other tickets still stay the same.

I really truly dumbfounded by this notion to postpone it.

We are simply giving folks a break.

I mean, people are struggling.

You know when you get hit with \$140 ticket, that stings!

You know, that means you got to make \$200 to pay that \$140 ticket.

That's a lot, folks!

That's a lot for people who are making -- barely making ends meet.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs on the postponement.

Folks have their own idea whether they are going to vote on their postponement, just go ahead and do it.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: While we will not be facing snow for another six months one would hope, I would like to move forward with and not postpone it

because I think it's related to the vegetation ordinance Chapter 40, and getting this out of the way could allow us to model a similar structure for vegetation and possibly provide a break.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Why I'm suggesting this again, beyond sort of staff suggesting they would like to consider this with -- when we are looking to revise our ordinances I want to know what problem it is that we are trying to solve.

Now we talked extensively about looking to make sure that our sidewalks are clearer in the winter, our first-time offense already provides a 24-hour kind of grace period where folks have the opportunity to clear their sidewalks.

There's also a hardship opportunity if folks can't afford to pay it.

What I have heard in terms of enforcement and what will be delivered back to us is that there are issues sometimes of the community standards maybe having a one size fits all approach to looking at these issues.

And so, folks may be frustrated sometimes with our level of enforcement but that may be something that we get some feedback on coming into this next winter.

I think there's a variety of different things.

I would hope that staff would come back to us with this report and one of the things we may find is we don't want to reduce these fees.

So since there is no urgent need to do this, since there's snow coming or a large demand from folks urging us to do it tonight, it seems like we have the opportunity to wait.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I'm going to oppose this postponement because I do have -- I have a lot of compassion for Councilmember Ramlawi because the last time he asked for us to look at -- take a really small step in looking at snow removal it was postponed until there was no more snow.

I do appreciate that we will not have snow for a few more months but I'm perfectly happy to move forward with this small step.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Roll call vote on the postponement, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would thank my colleagues for getting this enacted as soon as we did and not having it postponed.

I appreciate that there's been a lot of work put into this by myself and staff and hopefully if the recommendations come back in September, whenever they come back, we can look at the fee structure and everything else that's associated with it.

And if there needs to be more changes at that time, we can do it again.

So -- but I just want to say thanks to the members.

I hope that they will support this in the next round of voting.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It is approved with 11 councilmembers present, 10 voting in the affirmative and Councilmember Briggs in opposition.

C-1, An Ordinance to Amend Section 8:530 of Chapter 105 (Housing: Entry to Show Premises and Time for Rental Agreements) of Title VIII (Building Regulations) of the Ann Arbor City Code.

Moved by Nelson and seconded by Radina.

Discussion of c-1.

Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I actually need to postpone it.

I would like to postpone it to the second meeting in May, if that's possible.

I have been working with G.O. on this issue.

I have been talking to landlords and our legal staff, obviously and I recently made connections with the student legal services and we are working with G.O.

We are actually -- we realize that it's not enough to just substitute a number in this ordinance, and so we are trying to -- we are working on better enforcement procedures.

I would like to postpone it until May and hopefully we are a little further along then.

>> Mayor Taylor: Second by Radina.

Discussion postponement.

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm very supportive of the postponement.

I think there's a lot of issues that have come up and some stakeholders that we need to approach to.

The second meeting of May is a notable meeting for us, though.

I would suggest that maybe we move it to the first meeting in June instead.

>> Councilmember Nelson: That's fine.

Postponement to the first meeting in June.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is that amendment to the postponement friendly to the body?

I will assume that amendment to the postponement, moved by Grand and

seconded by Nelson S. that okay with everyone?

That Councilmember Ramlawi on postponement.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate members bringing this resolution forward and the members in our community who helped to spur that.

And the spirit of moving this to June when we have an opportunity to have more people under the tent to discuss the -- the reasons why we're choosing certain dates and times and having a better understanding of something that has a great impact on many people.

So -- and thanks to Councilmember Grand or pushing that to June.

Don't need to make that second meeting in May any longer than it's going to be.

So I -- I obviously will support that, and hopefully what -- what comes back at that point as well.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I assigned myself some homework on this and neglected to circle back to her on reaching out to the fair housing folks here.

And their feedback was that they are interested in more information too.

Especially in the ordinance impacts not just students but other renters.

And their renewals.

So thank you for doing the work.

I'm looking forward to see what comes in June.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I will support this for all of those reasons that I just -- I would encourage you to do the work between now and then and get to the table.

I have had -- you know the same folks.

It is more than moving date, and that is a big part of it.

I think it's important that we be prepared between now and then to bring something back or changes that are more in keeping with the considerations of all the stakeholders.

So that's all.

I just wanted to add that, but I will support this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I would like to thank G.O. for bringing this forward and their advocacy for this.

There's a need to be considering whether 70 days is really the appropriate time period that students should be -- I shouldn't say students that any renter might -- might be asked to renew their lease just two months after having signed it.

So I think there's a need to look at that.

I appreciate the strong advocacy on this and the desire to have this move to 240 days and also understand the desire to take a look at what sort of enforcement mechanisms there might be.

I would ask if Councilmember Nelson has some suggestions around how we might bring additional stakeholders to the table before it comes to us in June.

So we hear from more than G.O. and student government, other nonstudent renters, as well as other stakeholders, London lards and I know -- landlords and I know there's a number of concerns raised in emails of how this might benefit the larger for corporate landlords in town would have the ability to show at any time of year versus, you know, folks who are smaller operators in our city.

I don't know if she's been able to think how we can engage more stakeholders.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed in it's postponed to the first meeting in June.

C-2, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Rezoning of 1.1 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1A (Single Family Dwelling District), 3411 Geddes Road.

Moved by Ramlawi and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of c-2.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

C-3, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning) of 3.56 Acres from TWP (Township District) to R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District), 2260 Traver Road.

Moved by Councilmember Disch, seconded by Councilmember Hayner.

Discussion, please, of c-3?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It's approved.

C-5, An Ordinance to Amend Table 5.15-1, Table 5.15-2, Sections 5.33 5.37.2.P and 5.37.2.S, of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Short Term Rentals).

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Councilmember Song.

Discussion, please, the c-5.

Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: So since we switched the order, that's great.

We are talking first about amending the unified development code and this is really an important step for us to take because currently the UDC is silent on STRs.

And so what this piece of the puzzle that we have in front of us will do will clarify and put in our zoning code what is the status of short-term rentals.

And what it does tonight, I think as we all realize is that it permits non-principal residents rental of STRs and mixed use.

I'm worried I'm saying something wrong because Mr. Crawford has his hand up. It permits a mixed use zone only.

And then in residential and mixed use, you can do a principal residence home stay, and a principal residence STR whole house for 30 days max.

There will be no permission for -- for a residential STR -- commercial STR in residential zones, except for those that have been in operation before March 1<sup>st</sup>.

So this is good to have in the U.D.C.

Now that it's not there is what has led us to this place where something has happened that we don't like and we can't fix it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Crawford.

I see why your hand is raised and you told me prior to the meeting that there's a speaker that is -- that there are questions to be answered for our staff introduction and I had forgotten that.

So my apologies to all.

Mr. Crawford.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mr. Lenart is here to answer some questions that staff received earlier today from councilmembers.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much.

Apologies to all.

>> Not to me.

Good evening, mayor and council.

The questions that were received, I will provide some brief responses.

The first was an explanation of where the 120 reported nonowner occupied STRs are located in the city.

These are the properties that have so far indicated that they are interested in potentially being designated under the proposed ordinance amendment.

That map was provided to you via email this afternoon, as well as it did include some breakdown by ward as well.

Next question was, is it staff's plan to require an ongoing proof of the continued use of these properties as STRs as part of the licensing procedures?

Staff's plan is to rely on the licensing as a statement of intent about how that property owner is using the property.

So that means that a licensed property might be used extensively or less extensively.

We will rely on the licensing designation as a statement and registration with the city about how that property is being used.

There's a question regarding how quickly we will know the total number of these and as the 31<sup>st</sup> deadline sort of a hard deadline?

It is not.

We anticipate that we will know this answer sooner than later.

The majority of such instances of property owners who would be seeking this non-conforming designation are going to be doing so quickly and as time passes it will be more difficult for them to not only establish the use in conformance with the currently proposed ordinance changes but that use was continuing under the provisions of any non-conforming status of the U.D.C.

Similarly to the remaining two questions would a nonowner occupied short-term rental qualify for a legal non-conforming use if the owner failed to get a license in the next year?

It's possible but unlikely.

These circumstances whenever you are talking about a non-conforming status, they are dependent upon the certain facts of that case.

As the time passes and that property is not in compliance with all of our

ordinances, it is less likely that we are going to be able to establish that they have been continuing to operate that property in that manner, and maintaining that non-conforming status.

Is there a point where the property would be determined not to qualify for non-conforming status based on the length of time that it operated without a license?

Yes, for those same reasons.

I believe that it would be reasonable to provide some period of time at the outset, as these ordinances become effective and for people to register but going forward, that will absolutely be something that the city considers in its continuation or designation of those uses being non-conforming.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you Mr. Lenart.

Thank you.

My apologies.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor and thank you, staff, for being here tonight.

I don't think it's a secret where I stand on STRs by now.

My issue with this right now is that from what I understand and what was just said, we are not done collecting information on STRs.

We were real quick in the amount of time of how they registered show proof how they used that property prior to March 1<sup>st</sup> but we are not done collecting that information.

It's only April 5<sup>th</sup> today and we are putting forth some major legislation without having enough time to collect the information and understand it and make an informed decision, one that is a pretty big decision, bigger than anything that we have discussed so far tonight.

I move to postpone this to a later date and perhaps as late as our first meeting in June so we can come back with a much better set of data than we currently have to make this decision.

>> Mayor Taylor: Seconded by Councilmember Nelson.

Discussion, please of the postponement.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, was that to the first meeting in June?

>> Mayor Taylor: It was.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: To the postponement, I certainly understand pushing this off, because when we make these changes to the use tables, it seems like it -- you would go there and make this change and is it coordinated with other things coming before the council.

We say, hey, everything is missed use within a quarter mile of a bus stop or whatever, by such means are STRs allowed everywhere or the ADU. ordinance which I understand is rushing to council.

So I just -- I don't mind putting this off, because I think it needs to be coordinated with the other activities that are happening outside of the comprehensive land

use.

I'm happy to vote to put this off so I get a grip on what is happening on the zoning in our city.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

Yeah, I appreciate those words and hopefully one of these days we will be revisit our master plan and get all of our policies incorporated under hundred umbrella so it makes -- under one umbrella so it makes sense.

The direction given to council back in December regarding short-term rentals had to do more with perhaps the other resolution that we are going to discuss next.

But they are coming together because of that directive for the most part.

And that directive was under the intent in the motive to help folks who are caught in the middle.

Those individuals and not necessarily properties.

We have taken a turn here and we have to understand what the full ramifications are with that turn.

And I think in the meantime, as long as we are not enforcing this actively, we can take our time and do this in a very thoughtful way and I do believe an extra month or two, I would say sometime in May, I would push it back to June.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the postponement.

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion failed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion?

Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

At this point, I would like to have staff articulate if they could the impacts of this proposed ordinance change to the UDC.

If we could perhaps get an executive summary real quick as to what these changes really are for our viewing audience.

>> Sure an overview, what the proposed UDC changes do, it establishes the same receive in additions that were previously established by the city in Chapter 97 and carries them forward unified development code.

It identifies where those uses are appropriate in the use table, both based on the distinct types of uses and specifically provides for a non-conforming status for



those uses that meet the definition of a nonresident short-term rental in a residential zone that was established prior to March 1<sup>st</sup> to continue under the restrictions and limitations of the UDC's non-conforming use regulations.

So that --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate that.

Was very valuable.

So in passing this, I know this is only first reading -- in passing this if it passes during second reading, we are granting the non-conforming status to these STRs, that will stay with the property into perpetuity; is that correct?

>> The ordinance memorandums would cover those that meet non-conforming status and then they would continue under the ordinance in perpetuity, as long as they are not discontinued for a year and they are eliminated from certain expansion opportunities.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I appreciate.

That and I believe we deviated from the recommendation in December.

By giving them non-conforming status.

That is not the case here and that is not transparent enough to enough people to realize we are creating a class of commoditized properties that will benefit very few and exclude perhaps others.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

Err muted.

>> Councilmember Disch: I know.

Sorry.

My box moved.

I wanted to ask Mr. Lenart if he could qualify the resolution that we passed in December.

Was it not -- I mean, there is no distinction between grandfathering the owner of a property -- and granting non-conforming use.

The only choice is to grant non-conforming use to a property, is that not the case?

>> I would defer to Administrator Delacourt on that.

>> I was going to jump in and say, I don't have the resolution from December in front of me, but grandfathering is a generalized, usually and in most circumstances used to refer to granting non-conforming status.

It is not a -- it is not a technical term used in the zoning ordinance.

The way you grandfather something traditionally -- not in every circumstance, but most often -- is by granting it non-conforming status.

There are different criteria and different zoning ordinances for when a non-conforming status discontinues or ceases to exist and change of ownership is traditionally not one.

I would leave that to the city attorney's office to answer if it could be -- if the ordinance was so written, but the process to grandfather something in, within a zoning context, is almost always or exclusively granting the non-conforming status.

>> Councilmember Disch: May I ask that Mr. McDonald take the question that Mr. Delacourt just tossed his way?

>> That is correct.

I think -- I guess to answer it this way, the staff and the planning commission was asked to look at taking those uses in place now and allowing them to continue.

The most clearest way to do this is through the non-conforming status.

And you know, grandfathering is not a -- it's not a technical term.

That's what we are talking about.

We are talking about legal non-conforming use, and that's what was done here.

So I'm not sure that there was another way to do it.

I think there was kind of an in addition that there was some thought that it would be done in a different way.

At least the methodology, and what was done and what's in front of you today is responsive to that resolution.

In the sense that it does it in a way that's consistent with zoning ordinances.

>> Councilmember Disch: So would there be any way other than change of use.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember, that's three minutes.

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

So in the summary of the proposed amendments, the table Section 5:15-point, 21 want to understand this.

We're allowing -- it says to add short-term residents.

Principal whole house as permissible, accessory uses in both residential and mixed use zoning districts.

It would it enable any principal residents regardless of tenancy or ownership status to be eligible to license it to STR use.

So how -- ownership status.

It could be ape rental property, and somebody else lives there but it's their principal residence because they signed a one-year lease and then they can turn it into STR.

Is that correct?

Because it's a principal residence?

>> The definition in 97 and as proposed here would not distinguish -- it would not parse a primary resident from their ownership or tenancy structure.

The permanent residence in a residential zone or a mixed use if that's a place they call home in a common way, they would both have the availability to avail themselves of principal residents short-term rentals whether that be a long-term lease or the ownership of the property.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So it doesn't exclude residential -- nonowner occupied residential?

>> It excludes --

>> Councilmember Hayner: It includes them --

>> No, it excludes nonowners that are operating a short-term rental.

If they are conducting a long-term lease.

If you have a year long basis and we don't get into the parsing of any lease

restrictions on that.

You would have the availability of the home stay or the whole house as a principal resident of that structure.

If you are not present in structure.

The owner did not live there, they would not avail themselves of short-term rentals in the residential --

>> Councilmember Hayner: So I can rent a room in that house.

I can rent a whole house.

>> That's right.

As an accessory to the residential use of the property.

And I want to jump in to be clear.

>> This ordinance is not what is creating that circumstance.

This is repeating what was already approved by council in ordinance plan 7.

This does not grant or take away anything that done by that ordinance.

So it doesn't create or subtract any new circumstances other than the lawful conforming status.

This just reflects it.

>> Mayor Taylor: That's three minutes councilmembers.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I think that's --

>> Councilmember Eyer: I would like to follow up on the question that Councilmember Disch was trying to go get answered but ran out of time.

It's important to me as well.

McDonald, is change of ownership something that we could put in this as a -- as a reason to discontinue the non-conforming use?

Because, you know, I have to say, I thought that that was what we were looking at.

And I was surprised to learn this week that that was not the case.

>> Generally, no, not as a non-conforming use.

And that's what council -- that's what Derek Delacourt was mentioning.

We are doing this through zoning and it creates kind of legal non-conforming status and that's not something that I believe in this particular situation we can eliminate through a change of ownership.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Okay.

What I heard from Mr. Delacourt was not quite as affirmative that as that.

So Mr. Delacourt, are you both on the same page on this?

>> My question to Mr. McDonald was if council chose to put that in the ordinance as a criteria nor discontinuation of the non-conforming status, would that be enforceable is basically my question.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you.

And the answer to the question is?

>> I guess I will say preliminarily in this call, no, I'm happy to look into it further.

As -- similar to Derek, I never seen that as a qualification for a legal non-conforming status.

I'm happy to advise the council further on that issue.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I think for the benefit of nerve this meeting, I want to -- of everyone in this meeting, I want to repeat something that Mr. McDonald said to me earlier today.

I know he will correct me.

By putting it in the U.D.C. code tables that leads us to the legal non-conforming use that passes with the property.

That's what we're doing when this c-5, we are putting in the tables and that is what make it travel with the property because it becomes a zoning issue.

So we cannot make it end with the ownership.

That's the significance of what we are voting on right now.

I appreciate the generosity of our legal staff to take time to answer our questions.

I'm curious to know the only way to extinguish this legal non-conforming use is ceasing to use it, affirmatively deciding to stop using a highly profitable business model and the unlikelihood of that, I'm looking for circumstances when it would be extinguished for lack of use.

And the fact-specific situations that have been offered to me as well, we would have to decide it's time it would be case specific.

One of the examples was if you have a short-term rental business and you do a major renovation and it takes a year and a half and for a year and a half, you are unlicensed and not using for legal non-conforming.

Well, maybe we would make an excuse and let you continue it.

We aren't getting very clear answers about how long people could be illegal operating STR businesses without licensing them and then coming back later and said I wasn't getting straight answers.

Some of the straight answers that are a nuisance property can get its license revoked for bad behavior.

And all they have to do is transfer ownership for to somebody else for that to be picked right back up.

A neighborhood that is plagued with a bad actor.

A neighborhood that is plagued with a nuisance, it will not escape it or unlikely to escape it.

They just have to transfer ownership.

This is really concerning to me and I'm really disappointing that we are messing with this.

I know there are a lot of members of the community that are disappointed that we are messing with this.

This is an issue that we should be standing up for I'm just disappointed.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: So we understand if it was established before March 31<sup>st</sup>, that they have -- that current owners or operators of STRs can provide that prior to that date they were doing this.

So that's established them to seek this.

Is there a deadline for the city accepting that evidence.

I understand that there isn't.

Is there a consideration of what can constitute firm evidence?

Or are people going to get wind of this, I need to have this sitting on my property just in case I want to profit mightily into the future and take long-term rental housing off of the mark.

So my two questions are: What is the burden of proof?

And what is the deadline for submitting that?

That's a concern.

I can tell you right now, without direction as to if council wants to define what proof is right now.

We are asking for a -- an executed rental contract, some type of contract that's between the owner and the guest, as the two pieces of property that designated that they leased it for 30 days prior to March 1<sup>st</sup>.

As for a deadline and I will again punt to Kevin a little bit on this.

My understanding is -- we can certainly set one -- council can set one, staff can set one as to when this evidence has to be in.

I have never seen a circumstance where you create a lawful non-conformance but only if you prove it by a certain date.

Usually when it's created through non-conformance.

They usually prove that they are or they aren't.

And it's not subject to a deadline.

I will leave it to city attorney McDonald to answer if that's something that is defensible.

Or enforceable.

>> I want to point out that this is not an open ended group.

The universe of people who can claim that they are -- that they are a legal non-conforming use is the list of people who have been inspected under our rental program.

>> Correct.

>> If you haven't been inspected under our rental program, you can't all of a sudden argue that you are doing this because you wouldn't be lawful now. Because if you are a nonowner occupied rental unit, you are required to get inspected under the housing ordinance and so we have a list and that list is greater than the number of people doing short-term rental because if I was -- if you were renting out a condo let's say for a year, a year at a time, they would be on that list as well.

And so you kind of have a universe that you are taking from.

It's not sort of everyone out there.

Would you have to be on this list so qualify the way this is set up.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Anyone who has a rental C.O., I understand that. That's a large number of properties.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner, we are over three minutes. Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

Just, you know this being a first reading, I think we're raising some really excellent questions that staff can get back to us.

Also, just want to remind council that the term grandfathering is a voter suppression tactic that was used in the south that you had to be able to prove that you went three generations back in order to vote.

So there are other terms like legacy that we can use instead.

I know that certainly wouldn't have been -- I hope it wouldn't have been in a resolution that we passed a few months ago, understanding that.]

So I think we have raised some important questions for staff and legal to get back to us but I also have a lot of confidence based on Mr. Delacourt's answers that many of these things are not as severe as perhaps indicated and much of this can be handled administratively.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

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

My question, I think, goes back to what Councilmember Disch and Eyer were bringing up earlier.

I was under of a similar understanding that up with of our goals would be to potentially have this status end when the property was sold.

I know you have given us on on-the-fly answer here because we put you under some pressure, that we can get a clearer answer about our options how quickly do you think is a reasonable time frame for us to have an answer on that?

>> We will be able to provide advice in a couple of weeks.

Keep in mind this zoning ordinance, even if approved at first reading would require a 15-day notice it.

Wouldn't come before you until the second -- 30 days from today's meeting.

So the first meeting in May.

So we certainly would have it back to you before then bunt I think we could probably get an answer back to you in two weeks.

>> Councilmember Radina: My only follow-up.

I think there's a lawsuit related to this.

So there is some time issues if we got this back before a potential second reading but move it back to first reading with the same 30 day process be required again?

>> Mayor Taylor: I think the answer to that is yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: My question goes to the point if we can get an answer and potential remedy before the next meeting, that would potentially create a quicker time line if we were to postpone this vote.

>> Yes, we can get an answer to that question two weeks from tonight or around then, wherever that is.

I guess my general comment it would depend what the nature of the change to the zoning as to whether or not it would require an additional first reading but I wouldn't be able to provide that advice.

All of that could be provided, certainly, within the next couple of weeks.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I guess I wanted to speak a little bit to the frustration that hearing that I think is misdirected.

Land use law is frustrating but this is -- this is the process of creating a new distinction in our ordinances right now.

I mean this is what it going to happen.

We are creating something that's legally non-conforming.

This should have been known that this was happening last September.

Although we obviously didn't put in U.D.C. at that point.

We're beginning the process now.

I understand the frustration around that.

We can't escape it.

This is the problem with government, it moves slowly.

We are wrestling with how to appropriately regulate them in our community.

We are going to be addressing issuing like nuisance issues and maybe having to take a look at what our nuisance ordinances are and make adjustments to those to update them to make sure that they are in line with what we view is appropriate in our community I guess I will leave it at that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I'm sorry to say that I'm just disappointed that my motion to get this postponed was not supported based on all the unknowns we have been listening to and the legal advice that we are still waiting on.

I just -- prior to this, we just talked about the leasing ordinance and postponed that, and I think this deserves that same consideration.

So we have that sound legal advice before we take a vote on a matter when we know we have those issues to begin with.

I know government moves slow and purposefully.

When I ported this resolution back in December, I didn't support creating a class of non-conforming properties and I understand that's why staff has brought it back.

That's the cleanest, simplest way to regulate these, and that's why we have this chart.

But this chart includes now this new non-conforming class of properties.

And that's why I can't support it.

If it did respect the resolution passed in September, I would support it, but this is not a reflection of the resolution passed by council of September of 2020.

This has profound repercussions.

If you have a nuisance, you just transfer ownership.

People will have to pick up and leave if they have a chronic nuisance situation.

I believe we will invite a greater number of lawsuits by going this route than we would the alternative route and I know both of them are not pretty.

But I think there's more lawsuits that we are exposing ourselves to going this route because we are picking winners and losers here through the zoning ordinance.

I don't think that's good government.

>> Mayor Taylor: We will talk more at c-14.

I want to make one observation we are creating non-conforming use.

The proposal does not set out a non-conforming use.

It seeks to recognize an existing non-conforming use and that recognizing it is dealing with the reality before us and not reality is perfect and this is imperfect.

There are non-conforming uses and they have been operating legally.

That's the situation we find ourselves in and so we are not creating something.

This is recognizing the reality of the situation.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer:

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Negative.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Let's go with C-4, An Ordinance to Amend Sections 7:651 and 7:654 of Chapter 97 (Short-Term Rentals) of Title VII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Disch, seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion, please of c-4?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: It's not going to come as a surprise as to where I stand on this issue.

We talk a whole lot of bit about affordable housing, and then the profit motive comes and maybe affordable housing can take a back seat because there's this other competing interest.

And we do a whole lot of talking about affordable housing.

We spend a whole lot of money talking about trying to get the units that we need and we -- you know, we are talking hundreds of thousands of dollars per unit that we're paying, that we have asked taxpayers to pay for recently.

\$6 million a year.

For affordable housing to get us how many units?

150 a year?

And I don't know how much housing we will lose because we don't have the information yet but we are asked to make a vote and we are denying others the consideration of this postponement, so we can get more information, make a better informed decision and legal advice, and we are not being given that consideration right now taking on a very profound policy.

So I'm very perplexed and I would like to hear the affordable housing proponents in our community to speak up!



This is your time to speak up right now because you are going to be losing hundreds and hundreds of affordable housing that we are asking taxpayers to pay for on the other end instead.

So we are subsidizing profits vis-a-vis these kind of policies.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

I didn't support any regulation way back when.

I thought it was heavy handed and I was leery to step in and try to regulate a market.

And I was on the losing side of that.

The regulations were supposed to go into March and I was perfectly willing to how that played out and see how many people came forward and now I find myself having spoken with affordable housing advocates and others in our community, not supporting this notion that we create winners and losers here. I don't think this is the appropriate just as I didn't think the previous resolution. I don't think it's important to put this in U.D.C. and I don't think it's appropriate to create a small group or, you know, potentially a hutch larger group of winners who happen to get in under the wire.

I won't support this in deference to our genuine need that was stated back in September for keeping high profit.

And it's improved it over long-term renders which I discussed at previous meetings.

I don't think this is an appropriate course of action and I won't support this tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I think there's a false equivalency that has been presented here in terms the assumption that all of these units were affordable that they were all -- well, really, that at false equivalency.

There's some legal reasons and it doesn't feel great to me personally to be supporting all of these changes to promote STRs.

It's not a super high priority to me, compared to some the other important steps that we need to take to build housing that's both affordable housing that we will use through our millage funds on city-owned properties and housing units that will come in through the private market, through changes that I anticipate us seeing in terms of trans or entered development and ADUs coming up at the next meeting that are on the horizon.

So if this seemed profound, buckle up your seatbelt.

We have some things that are coming on the horizon that will have a much greater impact on the availability of housing in our community, looking at what is the observation at the national level about inclusionary and exclusionary zoning and this may be tied to funding from the federal government.

Some of these policies if you look at what the Biden administration has to say. So really overstate the impact on our housing, they are proposed developments coming up that will provide the double the number of units and triple the number of units that you would be taking off the market just from this STR ordinance.

So I think it's important to make every decision carefully, but at the same time not overstate and I -- you know, and to really -- some of the language and some of the accusations that have been made I think have been abhorrent around intent and so, I don't appreciate that.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Thank you.

A question came up last night [ Garbled audio ]

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I'm having trouble hearing Councilmember Griswold.

>> Mayor Taylor: I am as well.

Thank you.

>> Councilmember Griswold: As part of the enforcement.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember, much of what you said did not come through.

Do you want to roll that again and I will start your time?

Mr. Lenart?

>> Councilmember, Griswold may be referring to a question that was --

>> Councilmember Griswold: Can anyone hear what I'm saying?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember, Griswold, we did not hear basically all of --

Mr. Lenart believes he understood the question based on his review of caucus.

If you are okay with that, I will give Mr. Lenart the floor.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Say.

>> So on this item, a question was posed from Councilmember Griswold to describe the enforcement process that would be in place for short-term rentals.

So this would be enforced very similarly to other city codes and regulations.

We do a lot on the front end to make sure all the work is permitted in an appropriate way.

When we are alerted either from a zoning or rental housing perspective of a potential violation they come in a variety of ways.

Sometimes they come from tenants and sometimes from neighbors and sometimes from inspectors.

We conduct an investigation through a warning to the property owner.

The ultimate goal is to seek compliance.

So we provide a period and an opportunity for hopefully voluntary compliance with all the applicable regulations if we are unable to meet that compliance then that could result ultimately in the issuance of a citation and the corresponding court action to ensure that those ordinances are maintained.

There was a question as to it relates to a2fixit.

While we are in the process of rolling out a super cool software and the community services division, we will be looking at a potential module that might provide more zoning and rental housing through that mechanism as well.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thank you.

I'm looking at from the user interface how we can provide one-stop shopping rather than totally under the system to report a complaint.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I was going to take to my colleague, but I think I have to address to you.

I would like to speak to the representative in ward one, and say that you mentioned mixed use and worrying about with t1 coming up should we not permit, noncommercial STRs in mixed use.

And I think that is exactly the next step that we need to take and I don't necessarily want us to amend this piece of legislation because it's complicated enough, but as we move forward, with tc1 zoning, I think we should either figure out some caps for mixed use zones or prohibit the development of STRs in those.

And the planning commission asked us to think about the ramifications for affordable housing and I think that would be one way of doing that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: So my comments tack on to Councilmember Disch's. I hear a lot of grand standing around affordable housing and I find it to be quite insincere.

I think those of us who recall --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Call of order.

>> Councilmember Briggs: How this call to short-term rentals began.

And that was around concerns around just how short-term rentals fit into the character of our neighborhoods.

The reality is if we were concerned about protecting our --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Chair, can I have an explanation on my call to order, when my motives were --

>> Mayor Taylor: Do you mean -- there has been no --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Point of order.

Point of order.

My motives are being questioned at this moment.

>> Mayor Taylor: There was a reference to insincerity.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: So I take it there's no violation there?

>> Mayor Taylor: I looked to Councilmember Briggs to rephrase.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I will attempt to rephrase my comment.

I'm concerned with some of the characterizations that have been made tonight.

The reality is if council had been concerned in September about protecting housing supply, there would have been a ban on short-term rentals operating in every district in our community.

The reality is it was only within residential zones not mixed use.

We have short-term rentals operating in every district of our community.

And housing supply matters whether it's in our mixed use districts or residential zones.

So I don't -- the reality is we probably do need to get a handle on how many short-term rentals are operating in our community and figure out what is the appropriate number that we're comfortable with in our community but these

changes are about making sure that we pass --

>> Councilmember Griswold: I can't hear it.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Make sure that our ordinances are legally defensible and appropriate.

I'm losing a little track of my thoughts considering how often I was interrupted during that conversation.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

And I will try to be relatively brief because a few of my points have been made.

I wanted to push back that on the assertion that somehow we would lose hundreds of units of affordable housing.

We have all seen the map now that was provided.

I would speculate that the vast majority based on where they are are likely unaffordable in any sense of the word based on where they are located here in our city.

But more importantly, we are looking at as of right now, I think just over 100 units that have been identified.

I think it's unlikely that we will see a massive surge in that number any time soon but more importantly, these units were lost long ago when they were not regulated initially they were allowed to completely operate under illegal non-conforming use, essentially.

Here in the city and we are acknowledging that point to, in some sense, protect the city from litigation, lawsuits also in my view protect the other -- the rest of the regulations that were passed.

I would hate for the rest of our regulations to be struck down because we didn't acknowledge that we allowed exceptions to operate here in the city.

And that's what this is meant to address.

And I would reiterate what Councilmember Briggs said.

I think in we want to be serious about truly regulating STR expansion here in the city, we need to look at it more holistically and not just look at it from a, you know, protecting single family neighborhoods perspective.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I want to speak to the housing crisis.

We lost over 1700 units to market rate.

This is ongoing problem, well before we thought about regulating S.T.R.s and I hope that we take that in consideration.

I don't think we should be comparing, you know, 100 units, 100 units of STRs and using that as an example of addressing our affordable housing.

Hundreds went to market rate throughout the county we have a new dashboard.

And Councilmember Radina and I have and it a look at it and you can see the disparities throughout the county on where we stand on the crisis and so nowhere is STRs mentioned?

This is not the issue that folks are not rallying behind the STRS, but hope we can plan for what we can manage and control.

>> Mayor Taylor: For my part, I will support this.  
We are in an imperfect and complicated world.  
Nonowner occupied STRs take units off the mark for long-term residents.  
This has happened.  
This is a reality and it's not a good thing.  
But it's not novel.  
And I can imagine if it were novel that we would take action.  
But it is not.  
For several years now, we have had last count 120 or so STRs operating in residential areas in a manner entirely consistent with law and practice.  
Registered as rentals, inspected as rentals, taxed as rentals, compete with certificate of compliance issued by the city.  
This is the real world, and we can't pretend that it's otherwise.  
In September, we got an ordinance that would prohibit nonowner occupied STRs.  
This was taken despite recommendation and despite observation from STR owners and their council, observations that I have concluded to be persuasive.  
But the owners of existing STR properties in this district have as a matter of fact and law, existing property rights and their ability to operate their properties as STRs and that's a September ordinance would damage them.  
And they would have to defend an expensive lawsuit that we would be tied up to lose.  
I'm generally skeptical about the third-party attorneys and there's all sorts of reasons to accept the risk of lawsuits but where the arguments of third-party counsel in my view are sound or have little opportunity for success and no ancillary benefit of fighting a losing fight, I would prefer to -- the wise thing to do is to recognize the situation, cut our losses and just move on to more important things.  
Further, I will say these properties have been purchased by many Ann Arborites in good faith, who have been operating them as STRs for years and they purchased and improved and maintained, and they were made in reliance and I believe reasonable reliance that nonowner occupied and residential areas have been legal and operated in accordance with state and local law.  
Simply put, there's something unfair about changing the rules on these folks after they made life-alter decisions in reliance on existing law.  
I will support the resolution because it supports a losing lawsuit.  
It will affect STRs, preexisting STRs for one reason or time ceases to operate.  
In connection with the prior matter, it's not ideal, but it is a reasonable solution, in the midst of an imperfect reality.  
Councilmember Hayner.  
>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, thanks for sharing that Mr. Mayor.  
I agree with some of what you said.  
Some I don't and some I do.  
I believe we were on the same side of not supporting.  
This and the truth of the matter is just recognize that they exist and just let it happen.  
I mean, we have said we had 120 come forward.

There's 300 active listings on Airbnb for Ann Arbor right now and I believe that back in August or wherever it was, when we were looking at the host platforms, I scraped up an order of magnitude more than 120.

I found 1200 to 1500 operating between the four major host platforms.

And so here tilting at things that we have no idea of the scale out there.

We have to real sense of the effect it's having on affordability in our community, slight or great and so I would prefer not carving out a tiny niche as I said before but not doing any of this.

And so for that reason, I will say no to this.

I have no doubt it will pass.

But these notions that we're claiming some -- some people are claiming that it's some kind of loss after forwardable housing that.

That's under the constant barrage that supply and demand is the result arbiter of affordability in our community when we know that it's not factual.

It plays some role in it, but not -- it's not the basis for all affordable or unaffordability in our community.

So I don't think that anybody is suggesting that Airbnb is affordable housing come off the mark but I will suggest and even in the article in the observer this month it said someone is making so much money on this that they moved to another apartment just to make it a full-time situation.

And so I think we see that, yes, indeed they are not affordable.

So I don't support this.

I don't think we should have any of this.

And if the idea is that these are just going to operate willy-nilly, then let them do so.

I mean, I know for a fact -- I know for a fact that there are Airbnb, super host Airbnbs, that were not on that map.

We are missing a lot in our community is what I will say and I don't think this is going to really affect it one way or another and I prefer not to complicate our law. Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: When we did contemplate this, we were surprised when staff came back and banned them completely from single familiar zoning. When they said this is why we recommend this.

So to answer the question as to why it's not in all of our zoning cat Gore it was because of that recommendation by staff and interpreting out single family zoning ordinance the way it is why they came back to prohibit them from those areas.

So that's coming from that angle.

No one has been under more attack than the political minority right now for not doing enough for affordable housing and yet we have done a considerable amount.

When we first joined council, our values were under attack.

And if we didn't allow exceptional things to happen, we were against development.

We were against affordable housing.

That's why we have all of this scar tissue when this conversation comes up and every unit of housing is important.

Talk to those people who are being bid by 40, 50, \$60,000.

This is only 50 units or 200 units.

Tell it to those folks who can't afford to live in our community any longer.

We don't know how many units exist.

We have not captures the data and given enough time to staff to know how many units we're actually losing.

We are guessing.

This is a guessing game.

We got a map just a few hours ago and most of them are in ward five, by a two-to-one margin.

But this does affect people's ability to live and be a part of our community.

And this is something we can control as a local municipality.

We can't have inclusionary zoning.

This is something we can actually do.

So that's why I will not support it and I'm sure you will hear more as second reading comes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: A silver lining of all of this discussion and despite for me is just the recognition that is it seems on every councilmembers' part that supply matters.

And that we need every housing unit we can get in this city.

I know there are some pretty large developments that are going to be coming up for a vote.

One of them is going to be in the fourth ward.

And, you know, I look forward to everybody -- to council voting unanimously to support those big new housing developments because as has been said, we need every new unit we can get.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Negative.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Take a short break.

10:02.

Let's meet back at 10:12.

[ Break ]

>> Mayor Taylor: A short break, DC-1, Resolution to Appoint Mark Perry to the Airport Advisory Committee.

Moved by Councilmember Hayner, seconded by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Discussion, please, the DC-1.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I know this is sort of a rote thing that we do appointing these folks.

When Mr. Perry was serving as our interim assessor, I had a fantastic hour-long conversation with him about the airport and the role the airport plays in federal funding and so on.

I frankly, met very few people in my life who know as much about airports as this guy does.

I was excited to see him apply to be part of this and I encourage everyone to support this nomination.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved with --

>> Councilmember Nelson: Are we all here?

Do we have a quorum.

>> Mayor Taylor: Oh, gosh, yes, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven.

It satisfies the seven vote requirement.

Yes, we're all here.

DC-2, Resolution in Support of the University of Michigan President's Commission on Carbon Neutrality's (PCCN) Recommendations.

Moved by Councilmember Ramlawi and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DC-2?

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor Dr. Stults has a few introductory comments.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much.

>> Thank you and thank you all for your patience as we figure out how to do this.

Three questions came in versus what is the definition of technical carbon neutrality?

In the case of U.N. commission report and the city itself, it means no greenhouse gas emissions occurs for that sector.

In this case, it would mean store scope one emissions direct one emissions happening within the university on the physical site.

It would not exist.

There are zero emissions whatsoever, which is counter to the offsets.

Second question, why does the city not have this as part of its goal?

And the answer there is the council set the goal of carbon neutrality by 2030 inclusive of offsets however, working with the public, staff worked really hard based on the extensive public input to minimize the use of carbon offsets but the reason they were included is that the city doesn't have all of the leverage in our



disposal to remove all gas stations or all natural gas connections that exist within homes or businesses and so offsets became part of the conversation from more rational standpoint interpreting our goal.

And what would it take to reach technical carbon neutrality for the city, it's a good question and it would require a lot more detail.

We are working to get as close as possible to technical carbon neutrality but it would mean no more gasoline or diesel powered vehicles and it means no more natural gas combustion.

We have to scale up the work we did to not only prevent new things from coming online but to remove things like their water heaters and furnaces and ranges.

Thank you for the questions.

>> Mayor Taylor: Excellent.

Thank you, Dr. Stults.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: You know, there's a lot to this, about 140, 150 pages, something like that, and, you know, it's a lot no go through and I tried to read through it.

I don't understand everything that's in there.

I don't think any of us -- I would be shocked if any of us did.

There were some things that were a surprise.

Even in the -- we look at scope one and two emissions trajectories and the vast majority of the post-2025 emissions are made up with the offsetting activities so the carbon credit, or these offset purchases and so on.

And, you know -- so then when I look at virtual power purchase agreements and various techniques that they are using to offset this, and buying into Michigan green power and so on, I guess this might be a question for Dr. Stults -- two questions.

Is there -- do you feel this is synchronous with our plans as a city that it offers enough opportunities for us to partner with our biggest energy consumer here in the city, the university, to do enough outside of the carbon credits that u of m can afford but we can't as a community.

And I guess my second question is there -- is the consideration of use validating this their plan, are there any potential ramifications of us saying yes to us.

And they can come back and say, well, the city said we can do and we find ourselves stuck in a position.

They mentioned in the scope three, they talk about it's scope one and two.

We know university can get away with things like the electrification ordinance, right?

And so do you feel that this goes far enough in leveraging the university's unique university to build in a way that we can't as a city compel others to do?

Is this enough for us?

>> That's a really good question.

The answer is probably know from the way you framed it.

You know, no it's not staff enough, far enough, deep enough, cross cutting enough.

Is it more than they had before?

He is and focusing on the charge of the commission was not Sacramento as city. We were looking at governance structures and how to institutionalize it.

The commission was charged with figuring out how to get to Ann Arbor neutrality within the systems and all the rest of the stuff that allows us to move forward as city was not in the charge of the commission.

If I understood your question correctly, it's more the ecosystem of how this will get done, when and what it will look like that I feel so ill equipped to answer because we weren't charged with it.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Sure.

So the 350 folks have been reaching out to me, saying please don't say yes to this because we don't feel that -- we don't feel it's strong enough and we don't know enough about their solutions.

And it puts me in a strange position where I have to trust everybody else who has gone through this and read through this and been on these committees to say yes or no to this, and I don't think it will do us any harm to say yes to this.

But I don't want them to say, hey, city council said this was good enough, you know?

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I will try to be really brief to give you as much time as possible Dr. Stults, but I was essentially hoping could you potentially explain -- I know you served as one member of this commission, could you more about the charge of the commission.

I heard from some residents about how this maybe doesn't go star enough or particularly around the concerns of the power plant on campus and the fact that that would still be operational and I guess I was wondering if could you speak to the charge of the commission and whether or not this is trued as an end or if this is -- viewed as the end or if this is the beginning of progress to be made?

>> Excellent question.

The charge to the commission was to, un, identify a goal for the university around carbon neutrality.

It was explicitly stated that they were not to take on an issue of divestment hoar not to take on the issue of closing the central power station, power plant.

If anyone has read this, first of all, thank you.

You will note, however, that we did address that.

We said we believe that both of those things need to be identified in a world-class institution, tackling climate change but that was as far as we could go.

And the call not to take on the power plant came directly from the president.

That was off the table.

I was happy to get involved.

Some of the things that were tricky was we weren't able to do financial planning.

We could look at what should be done and technical teams that included factuality and founded, and I think we did come up with good recommendations

to move forward, and there are opportunities for collaboration with the city that I see.

The devil is in the detail.

This is a plan.

How it's implemented will be determined by the president and the regents.

There are calls for staffing that are really critical.

Someone would keep track of that at a new executive level at the university itself and more staffing around equity and justice were explicitly called out in this. And how it manifested from recommendations to action is determined and that's probably what we care more about.

>> Councilmember Radina: And do you see this as the end of these conversations or is more of a million.

>> I can't imagine that they are the end.

We meet with the university every month and then the university is part carbon neutrality coordinating committee which is part of the governments of the a2zero and we are exploring ways to deeply collaborate.

I can't imagine that this was the end.

That would be a failure on our part if it were.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you Dr. Stults for being here and explaining thing and succinctly as you do.

And my colleagues for the great questions.

I don't have as much in terms of that.

In terms of what you are next steps are on what are we doing here in locking in ourselves into something perhaps in ways which we might say, well, we could have been more aggressive or should have waited for something more.

But I believe this -- with our own plan, we are going to constantly be revisited and updated, as policies change on all levels, on technology changes, and so I guess to piggyback on council Radina's points, when will we be -- be seeing more -- not just recommendations but actual steps?

>> I wish I was able to answer that, right now the charge of the commission, we disbanded because we met our charge which is drafting the recommendations.

At this point, they are in the hands of the president, and I believe they have also been shared with the regents to do as they well.

And it's hard to tell in the regents and the president will formally adopt them, if they will edit them and what they will collect if they pick certain things out to move forward but we're -- it's now in a totally different institution that I don't know what will move, when it will move.

I'm sorry.

That's probably --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No, that's fine.

It's an honest answer and I appreciate the work that you and others have done in this.

We are lucky to have the people and the resources right now in place with your office, and the university to be tackling what is, you know, in the existential threat,

and it's something that obviously many of us are paying close attention to, and we are real close to, you know, the conversations that are being had to thwart it. Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Last question.

When they speak to demand side, reduction and management strategies, those of us who worked and didn't go home over spring break or holiday breaks, we used to call it the annual freeze and go blind program because they would turn off the light and the heat in the buildings at the university during break.

When they do building standards analysis and speak to off campus rentals because we know the university rents a lot of space off campus as well, do you -- is it your understanding in here that when they do these analyses, it will affect the rental markets off campus for the office space and so on that the university leases?

If they find that the building standards that the rental properties failed their analysis, are they going to free up money to support the efforts for private property to upgrade their -- you know, upgrade their building standards or will private property owners come to the city and ask for that?

Do you have any notion of how that dynamic is going to work?

>> Really interesting question.

We only discussed it from the lens of commercial property that the university is leasing and how that might -- you know how that would send a signal through the market to upgrade, and the university is looking for assets that are high quality and lowering energy demand.

And I could see that lockstep with the disclosure.

I don't think that's out of step with the city there.

Wasn't any discussion that I recollect about explicit recommendations for rental as in housing rental.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I was referring to that like the office spaces off campus.

Obviously it's a great opportunity to drive that kind of innovation or renovation, I guess it would be in this case, outside of null construction, right?

So if the university demands a certain type of construction all electrification or whatever, and we as, you know, the private industry can't provide it because we can't require it, they can only provide it out of their own free will, right?

We can't demand that they build to electrification.

So how are we going to get around that or is that going to drive the electrification unit?

>> It's a high possibility that it will send a market signal that if you want to do business with the largest employer you will need to line up.

I think it's not just the electrification, but the efficiency work and how tight are your buildings and what type of on-site renewable energy are you investing?

>> Those are set through the market based on the work that I have done on the commission.

I think it could actually be a very positive kind of boost to our efforts.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Okay.  
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thanks.

And Dr. Stults, I want to thank you for your service on the commission on behalf of the city.

I think based on our conversations, I am comfortable in saying that I think the commission did the best they could in pushing forward an aggressive plan within the scope that they were provided, and I just want to make sure, you know, I'm comfortable supporting this tonight to demonstrate that the city thinks that there's urgency and -- and necessity around making some real moves toward carbon neutrality, but I think what I heard you say and I want to clarify, it's likely in the hands of the president's office and the board of regents.

And to the extent that community members and others going forward than what the commission was given -- if the commission is disbanded, they should take those concerns to the board of regents at this stage?

>> That would be correct.

Or to the president directly.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

For mill part, I would like to echo my thanks to Dr. Stults for your participation in the commission.

You know, certainly if we had you drafting this, it would -- there would, perhaps be alternate provisions and that might be said for -- for any plan we all put together but the fact is that the university of -- that this is a plan -- a plan -- recommendations that would move the university forward decisively.

The fact is that with respect to our achievement, A2Zero, that the University of Michigan is an indispensable partner and it's of absolute necessity that we work with the University of Michigan closely to achieve our common goal.

We ourselves don't have as presently constituted the resources or the ability to get there but it's necessary that we do so.

And so, I'm looking forward to passing this tonight.

And to working with, you know, all members of the community and the university to help achieve our carbon neutrality goals.

Further discussion?

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Crawford.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Could you clarify the clerk and I were trying to identify if --

>> Mayor Taylor: Oh.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Did we start that --

>> Mayor Taylor: I forget a second time.

If she says I didn't or if she questions whether I did, I would put my money on didn't.

And so is there anyone who would like to move the motion, please?

Moved by Councilmember Disch, seconded by Ramlawi.

We will deem our prior discussion having related to that now moved motion?

>> Councilmember Nelson: DC-2 was never moved?

>> Mayor Taylor: That is the inquiry.

We don't have the tape rolling, but it's possible that it was not -- Ms. Beaudry questions whether it was moved and if she questions it, then my suspicion is it was not.

So it was now just moved.

Disch and Ramlawi.

Thank you.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

DC-3, Resolution Directing the City Administrator to Develop an Unarmed Public Safety Response Program.

Moved by Councilmember Song, seconded by Councilmember Eyer.

Discussion, please, of DC-3.

I would like to get this started with saying I'm delighted that we are going to be moving this forward.

I think we have all heard time and time again that we ask our police to do too much in our community, that they are called upon to do things that -- where they do not have expertise and yet there are subject matter experts among us.

There are mental health experts and staff among us that are human services experts among us.

There are public health experts among us.

They tend not to -- they tend not to work at the city.

You know, these are not functions that the city provides.

These are provided outside of the city, most directly in the county.

And it's -- nevertheless, it's my belief that the residents of Ann Arbor demand that we expand the set of public safety services here in the city and so what this resolution proposes to do is to ask the city administrator to work with these indispensable partners to work with community health and to work with the Washtenaw County sheriff who runs metro dispatch, in order to develop a -- a -- develop an unarmed public safety response program.

The functions will largely be outside of current city infrastructure, administrations I would imagine, but, you know, we look to the administrator and -- and his designees to put together a program that meets -- meets what I believe to be an important goal, and I would look forward to further conversation and our discussion of it.

Mr. Crawford?

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, this is an item that there were also some questions that were sent --

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much.

This will clearly take me a little bit of time.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mr. Fournier is here to address the questions.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Fournier, the floor is yours.

>> Thank you.

My apology.

My Zoom crashed when the clerk tried to add me to the meeting.

>> Mayor Taylor: You are so kind to take the blame.

>> What are the examples of nonprofit organizations referenced in this resolution?

I will start by saying it's important to remember that this resolution is coming at the very beginning of this process.

So I couldn't speculate on the entire universe of who might be involved, but nonprofits who are involved in nonviolent public safety response activities might be the Delonis Center, providers like that, might be asked to participate in some way in this effort.

A potential professional services agreement is mentioned in this resolution, in anticipating this plan, what is the likelihood that an outside consultant will be needed to assist.

Again, because we're at the beginning of this process, I probably couldn't assign a probability, but staff will attempt to do the work in the most cost effective way possible, and so we are not committed to bringing on any professional services support.

But it is mentioned in the resolution because if we arrive at the point where we think it might be necessary, we wanted council to be aware that it is a possibility in advance of that moment.

But I want to reiterate we are not committed to bringing on professional services support.

Next question, have the sponsors proposed the specific consultant who would be professionally qualified to assist with this work?

No.

And last question is it likely that the subject matter agencies would be paid to consult in this work?

No.

It is very much not likely that they would be paid to consult.

And that's the questions.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: I was really pleased to be invited to cosponsor this work, and spent some time having conversations with Dr. Jackson, ICPOC, and bringing to the table Dr. Paul Fleming who you heard from earlier in public comments would is a professor in public health, and whose research is -- specializes in policing as public health issue.

And I will thought that was really, really important to bring up -- especially how his research speaks to policing and its impacts on BIPOC communities and seeing how, you know, the demand for this resolution or for the service is in part coming out of, you know, what we are seeing around the country.

And a community that's, you know, looking for needs -- services to match actual

needs.

I'm really excited to see what can come from this.

And, you know, as Mr. Fournier had mentioned this is really early on, but we did do the work in reaching out to community members.

Especially those who are most impacted.

Conversations with Avalon housing.

I was really pleased to hear from other folks who are public health professionals and researchers too who are following this, who have assigned this to their classes, to see what this -- what might come out of Ann Arbor we have a lot of potential to do progressive work here and we are lucky to have the county mental health and the sheriff's office as potential partners.

And I was really happy to hear from county commissioners too who are excited about this.

Commissioner Justin Hodges is really excited.

I have heard from a couple of other commissioners.

So we have done a little bit of background work, the reach, the reaching out to communities.

Of course, the conversation will be ongoing and I trust administrator Crawford and John, our chief to really figure out the details on this, especially when it comes to funding and I encourage everyone to vote and support this.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Council member Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Thank you.

I would like to be added as a cosponsor.

I mentioned this before, I worked as a social worker back in 1970s in Detroit, and that's when we had more support for mental health patients and hospitals that we no longer have.

And so I am very impressed by the group that's been assembled to work on this.

I just wanted to caution that frequently we talk about messy processes and we don't really have a methodology in place for most of our decision making.

We have very passionate, engaged community members.

But we need to make sure that we have a process that's going to allow them to participate in a positive way and also to protect the people that we are going to be working with our patients in some cases, and these are real people and we don't have the luxury of learning as we go.

I will just refer to tonight's discussion about short-term rental.

This is a process where we need to get it right first time.

I believe we can do that, but we have to be more methodical than we normal are.

And the last thing I want to say, maybe there's an opportunity to pilot this process with community standards.

That's an area that is lower risk, but what if our members of the community standards department looked more like park rangers than police officers and they focused more on education.

I'm thinking about regarding overgrown vegetation.

They focused more on the benefits of pollination, the benefits of not having a



manicured lawn, and so I see that -- I know that's sort of far fetched but it's an opportunity to maybe introduce this nonpolice officer concept.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

I appreciate the work that's gone into this so far.

I do have some concerns that have been applied by our constituents and residents.

I know we received perhaps a couple dozen emails in the last couple of days regarding the inclusivity of the stakeholders and the experts involved in establishing a program like this.

This program is far overdue.

And it has serious needs and consequences.

A call to the police should not be the last call you make when you are calling for help.

And unfortunately for a lot of people it is for people with mental illness or something that they are struggling with something that they could be helped.

With my concerned with this begin with the first resolve clause where we are directing the city administrator by December of this year, the end of this year to facilitate a program of subject matter experts.

I think that's a very aggressive timetable to putting on a program and having it from what I understand reading that, up and running in nine months or less.

And how do we engage those folks who want to be part of this and not just the institutional powers who have the ability to do it?

We need to find some outside folks with some fresh ideas and in crafting this, type of program, and my question then right now go be to Mr. Crawford and you had your hand in this, whether it's pragmatic to suggest that by the end of this year, we will have a program up and running, when we don't even know what that program looks like today, and we're adopting our budget in 45 days from today. This has a resolve clause asking for this to be put in a budget that we are set to adopt in two months time and we don't know what it looks like yet.

Or who is involved.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Okay that I interpret that to be hey, let's hurry up and make this a priority.

I think it also says in the resolve clause that if you are not able to achieve something at that time, at least provide a report with the constraints.

When I look at that and particularly -- so that gives flexibility for get moving but let's see where we are.

It's a touch base if not implementation by December.

We'll, of course, work towards something with the partners to have it stood up, but from a financial budget standpoint, I would say, you know, you have got a partial year at that point, while some funds may be allocated in the budget, which you will hear about in a week or two, I would not expect a full year.

I have -- a full year.

I really have no idea what that may look like from a resource perspective.

As said before, this is not a core skill set that the city has.  
We need to rely on partners here heavily, and plan to do so as we learn.  
This area.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

And apologize, I cut out at the end of the last vote and for the beginning of this and so if this was brought up already, I also want to address a piece that was, I think, being brought up by the emails we have been receiving and just get some clarification also from staff about their understanding as well.

My understanding as a sponsor of this resolution, we have not identified a particular funding source for this effort and I know that -- I think there's maybe a little bit of confusion based on some of the budget presentations we have received.

That would be part of the recommendation that you would ultimately come back with, correct?

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Okay.

And then second, I guess I also want to echo some of the comments that some of my fellow councilmembers have made, I think about the importance of having a robust community engagement process with this, and my expectation is that was -- that is something that staff would also expect.

I would expect that staff would want to do that as well in having these conversations with stakeholders.

Is that something we should specify or is that something that would happen as a normal part of this process?

Well, we have a community engagement toolkit that we generally rely on for or community engagement activities when we have large initiatives like that.

If council wants to include something in the resolution, you may.

The utilization of that toolkit is standard practice with staff.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

Much of what I was going to say has been said.

I do want to recognize that this issue is so important to the community that we got scores of emails telling us not to take it out of the police budget.

Please take it out of the police budget.

I think it speaks to the excitement and the passion of this issue before we have even gotten to understand what the issue, everyone is telling us where the money should come from.

I'm trying to look at that as really just indicative of the passion that people have and the importance of this.

And I do want to just circle back to something that Dr. Fleming said at the beginning of our meeting in public comment when he said what makes a good program and one was the engagement by really looking to use this new training that staff has to reach out to community members that would be most impacted

but also, I think he was pointing out that we're not necessarily having to re-invent everything, that there are best practices in other communities, that that this is not completely novel and we even heard from community members that this was happening decades ago.

So I think we have old models and we have new models, more recent ones that we can look to in this process.

So I'm optimistic that we're not going to necessarily change the way that response is done in every situation, but that we can start to make some positive changes in the near future.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes thank you.

Councilmember Grand spoke to many of the issues I wanted to raise.

We have a resolve clause about using unique step forward for our community and we have heard a lot from the community about really wanting to be engaged thoughtfully and having this not be a top down sort of program that gets developed that we really need to engage folks from -- who are going to be using the services to help in the development of it, and I think that's a real different in some ways than how we think about community engagement sometimes.

So -- but we have some great resources in the community like Dr. Fleming to be able to draw on as we move forward and some of the speakers that called in.

I would like to mention and I am obviously a sponsor in this and really supportive of us in the police response.

I think we have seen across the nation, it's important to have this mental health response.

I would also like to mention that I really respect and thank the work of our police department and our police officers.

I have a son who is going into policing and I know that there are a lot of people who really are doing good work in the field, and working hard every day.

And I thank them for that service.

However, there are -- just as we have seen Chief Cox mention recently, they are not always the best ones suited to go to the calls.

That having -- having the subject matter experts and a strong program that we can draw on is really essential for developing a stronger public safety response system in our community.

So I'm excited to see us working on this, and -- and hope that folks in the community realize that this is really the beginning of the discussion.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes thank you, Mr. Mayor.

A couple of quick comments and a question.

So we had been asked by many forecasts in the community through email and other means to separate this from 911 and police department.

I'm not talking about funding but the response.

I think we recognize that it's generally recognized that if there's some kind of emergency, that you call 911.

But the caller -- one of our public callers said there is a 988 coming in next July.

Maybe we should put ourselves in a position to take advantage of that nationally -- hopefully nationally recognized alternative number.

I know there's been other ones in other states that are 933 or whatever it was. And so I'm just wondering if that's something that we are going to take advantage of it and I wanted to mention it again so that one think about that, Mr. Crawford. And then when it speaks to the -- putting place holders into the fiscal '22 budget for this, I will make the assumption that it will include consideration of the resolution 2105-22, which also suggested -- offered up some the marijuana rebate money for this.

And so I just -- I assume that because these resolutions build on each other, that that will be taken into consideration.

I don't -- I don't -- I'm not as eager to take money away from our police and put it to this.

I will trust you, Mr. Crawford to look at that and work with the chief on that when he does his budget.

But I wanted to mention out loud to the community that it will be difficult to separate this from the county dispatch because that's just how it works and maybe we can come up with a clever way to work around that in building this program, maybe there's local alternatives or county alternatives to call 911 or 988.

But I think it would behoove to us to look at what's happening in other communities and also not try and recreate the wheel if there's an impetus around a certain call number.

I fully support this idea and I made -- the last couple of years, I made a handful of 911 calls for folks passed out on the pavement or clearly having some type of difficulty.

It's worth it.

I wish I had some place else to call.

The first thing I do is say no armed response, please, and I would love to be over that hum top where we don't have to do that any more.

So I look forward to supporting this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Mayor, may I respond?

Just briefly Councilmember Hayner, yes on the budget side.

I had to actually had to finish the budget development since you are getting it in two weeks.

It's an indeterminate amount at this time because there's no plan.

So that is a challenge.

But for clarity, for the community's sake, we don't budget in a method where we take from one department and give to another.

The general fund is where we have to make larger reductions in.

We make the reductions and apply the resources where you have an identified need at that time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I appreciate the comments being made.

I do have a couple of amendments I would like to make and I gave them to Ms. Beaudry earlier this evening and hopefully she can circulate two resolve clauses I would like to amend this with.

One is a completely new resolve clause that's been talked about already here, about funding sources, and then another resolve clause into replacing the last resolve clause and I will just wait until everybody has that and just let me know when they do.

Thank you.

If I make a motion -- I don't know if you want me to separate these in two separate motions.

>> Mayor Taylor: Let's roll with the let's roll them separately.

Let's roll with the first.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: The first one states that the city administrator will identify the funding sources and the goals set forth in this resolution.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Nelson.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: We have received dozens of emails take it out of the police department, no don't take it out of the police budget.

It's my understanding that the police budget set part of the general fund and as we heard from Tom Crawford that's where the source of this most likely will be, but in the event that we could perhaps identify it differently that's great but to alleviate and address that concern that the community has on the funding source, I think would be nice.

And in relation to the marijuana excise tax, I don't know if that's a good funding source.

A program like this should have funding that's not whimsical.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Crawford.

>> City Admin. Crawford: If I could clarify the prior comments.

We -- I did not mean to suggest that the police department is where this would come from.

When we know what the size of the problem is, and how much would be an obligation of the city, versus part of the mission of other departments -- it's just I don't know enough to suggest how we solve it, and when we do, the general fund in total looks at solving all of its problems.

This is not a situation that -- well, we just -- we just don't take one department and give it to another.

It is -- it's a broader evaluation of the source of the funds.

>> Mayor Taylor: If I can -- Councilmember Griswold.

I don't know whether you were on the amendment or your hand was up previously.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: I will take you down and please remind me in I don't put you up first.

I will try to observe -- is it not correct, Mr. Crawford, you identify funding sources

when putting funds in a budget?

That is to say it's a general fund matter or what have you?

>> City Admin. Crawford: I'm not sure of your question.

>> Mayor Taylor: If you read the resolution it strikes me as consistent with your ordinary practice.

>> City Admin. Crawford: I read the resolution to say once you determine what your needs are financially, identify a source that may be from the general fund, I would not say a department, I would say the general fund or a combination of other areas that -- or, you know, new source that would all come out at that time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Based upon that, let me suggest that it's friendly to the body. Does anyone object to it?

Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes, thank you.

In thinking this out right now, it sounds like there's other partnerships and those partnerships, perhaps, could be listed as donors of sorts to the funding sources of this -- the goal set in this resolution, Mr. Crawford, perhaps maybe we'll find other folks to help.

>> City Admin. Crawford: Yes, one possibility.

Realizing that this occurs from the systemic underinvestment in mental health that's happened in this country and what you have seen is the -- the problem is filtering down tort local level, and in this case, the police department has been forced to respond to something that they have not really been equipped to do. So how we solve that financially will likely involve those trains of funding unless we as a community choose to take on a whole kind of perspective of service that we were never envisioned to have.

And so this is not just from my initial thinking of this, this is not just an initiative, right.

I mean this is a pretty serious program that needs to be put in place with people who really understand this business well and we will be trying to make sure that it addresses our particular community needs and constituents' needs, but how we get there is really open to really discussion with the community.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Sorry.

I want to make sure I understand it correctly as we received this, the first -- this first is an addition.

It is not a replacement, and the next -- okay.

And so just for the -- also for the sake of public who -- because I don't think we read this out loud the new resolve clause we would be adding is resolve the city administrator will identify the funding sources and the goals achieved set forth.

As long as that's an addition, I have no objection.

>> Mayor Taylor: All right.

Is that friendly to the body?

It's friendly.

Councilmember Ramlawi, you have the floor for the next amendment.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor.

The second one, based on -- you know, we just heard from the city administrator, he's pretty much done with the budget there's not a whole lot of cushion this year.

The -- we don't even have a plan yet.

We don't know what is going to be in that plan once we get it.

We're going to adopt our budget here soon, you know, in a -- in a tight financial time for the city.

I think it would be prudent for us to not put this in the fiscal year '22 budget.

If anything, if you are going to call it out any fiscal year budget, it would be '23, and then in the meantime, we can always come back and have a budget amendment once we have a plan, and we know how much it will cost.

We can approve a budget amendment any time during calendar year with eight votes.

So I feel that there's a lot of support on this body and a lot of support in the community.

I feel it would be fiduciary our responsibility to first have a plan and know what that plan is and how much it will cost before we just say put it in the budget, especially at a time when we are cutting budgets of other departments right now. I think again putting forth that resolve clause to replace the current one to put this in the fiscal year '23 budget and hopefully we get a program before that and we can have a budget amendment before we adopt fiscal year '23.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconds by Councilmember Nelson.

Further discussion?

For my part, I don't think that the city administrator is going to -- I'm not -- I don't support the change.

I don't believe that the city administrator is going to put in the fiscal year '22 budget a fully -- a full budget for a stand up program that does not yet have a structure.

The goals of the resolution are to devise the plan, and to facilitate it and I'm expecting the budget to reflect that instruction.

And when and if during the fiscal year '22, we do have the ability to participate in a plan and it requires additional budget, I would expect the administrator to come back with that.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I just will push back a little bit.

I don't think it's financially responsible to put something in the budget that we don't have a plan or a price -- budget that we don't have a plan or a price tag for it.

We make budget changes throughout the year.

I think it's more responsible for us as a body and as folks spend taxpayer dollars to be telling the people, telling the public this is how we do business.

First, we get a plan, first we -- you know, identify how much it's going to cost, before we put it in the budget.

We are going to adopt a budget that's already been put together for the most

part.

I just don't think it's good government practice to be putting this in there right now a month before adopting a \$450 million budget.

I just -- I know we're going to have the opportunity and I believe that the support will be there for a budget amendment during the course of the year.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm not going to support this amendment.

I think it's overly prescriptive for both budget years, '22 and '23.

I understand the place where it's coming from in terms of fiscal responsibility, and having a fiduciary duty, like supporting governmental immunity, but knowing that this was coming down the pike already in our work sessions, I don't anticipate that this is going to be a large amount of money that may be in the budget based on what Mr. Crawford said but I do trust his judgment on this and -- but then don't want to be, you know, given the timeline of being really prescriptive about 2023.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I understand Councilmember Ramlawi's concerns and thoughts around this.

I do think I would expect that in terms of the preparation of the budget that we are only adopting fiscal year '22 budget but this is the next year, it's a carryover, I would assume there's consideration being -- going into thinking about the fiscal '23 budget and what the impacts are.

My desire to see something in the fiscal '22 year budget around this, this is real work that needs to be done and to get us there is -- there's a cost associated with that.

Even just in the planning component of this and I think we need to see something in the budget to demonstrate that we are really moving towards this.

I think this is a huge effort that we're undertaking and to -- we need to be thinking about what those costs are right now and there should be something in our budget that we are adopting if we are serious about this.

There may very well be a budget amendment that -- that Mr. Crawford comes back to us with to suggest if the man gets more developed, more money is needed.

That seems entirely appropriate as well but I would like to see something in this coming budget.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I can be very brief because Councilmember Briggs said most of what I was going to say my reason for opposing this, I think similarly, we can amend the budget at a later time if we need to make adjustments, but from my own perspective from fiscal responsibility point, I think we all expect that there be a cost associated with this in the next year and I would rather see the city planning for this cost rather than not including it and adding something in later that was not included initially.

And I also will not be supporting this.

Are.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.



>> Councilmember Song: I would encourage folks to consider the cost savings. If you look at cahoots and the budget implications of that. Cahoots had E.M.S. savings of \$14 million a year in saving in emergency medical costs.

When we think of budgeting this year and next, I hope we can think about that. These programs save folks from -- with emergency room diversion, incarceration. So there's savings to this as well.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment.

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: -- this is a vote on --

>> Mayor Taylor: Pardon me.

This is a vote on the amendment to replace the last whereas -- the last resolve clause with reference to fiscal year '23 rather than fiscal year '22.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: My apologies.

Thank you.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main amendment as amended.

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: I think it's very important that we understand the environment here and as Councilmember Song alluded to, there is going to be significant savings in we can avoid jail time as a result of someone having a mental health crisis.

And there's to place to put the patient except in the jail.

I think it's important to understand the amount of the population that is there because of a mental health situation.

A jail person is released when they agree to taking a medication.

I don't want to get into all the details but I want to say this is extremely complex and nonpolice response is one piece of it, and we have to ensure that mental health services are provided, otherwise we have a very idealistic view of mental health problems in this community and we are going to be endangering not only the patients but the responders if we don't have a good program from beginning to end.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi, you have spoken twice on the main motion.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Was that on the amendments or the main motion?

>> Mayor Taylor: The main motion.

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: To the larger point, there is a huge development in unarmed police response around mental health.

I think we will see that there are many benefits to having an armed response, even in nonmental health related issues.

One of our challenges as we all know, there's the silos of the governmental funding and so the cost savings that may be achieved, are not ones we may achieve ourselves.

The think in the early stages of developing this, I think what we will see is our cost increase quite honestly.

However, what I hope is that as we move forward with the programs like this, that we are able to adjust how our police respond and recognize the benefits in our own -- hopefully savings within our own police department, as we develop this and move forward and move forward within the community.

But I think it will take some time for us to develop a strong system in our county, but I'm glad that we are taking the steps.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Ramlawi -- oh, sorry.

I would like to wrap up by thanking my colleagues with whom I worked on this and primarily the cosponsors.

And then too many of our count I representatives who -- as has been indicated expressed enthusiasm about this.

Also to the good folks at community mental health, they do a great deal of work in our community and do presently work alongside our police officers to assist people in need but it's important that they take -- they be front and center in providing services to folks in a way that is safe and effective for people in need but also of course safe and effect five for their personnel.

I would like to thank the sheriff.

The sheriff has long been interested in reforming the provision of safety services, and he reviewed the resolution provided some modifications to it which were incorporated and expressed his enthusiasm for the project.

And so he has offered his personal expertise and his work with veteran 911 dispatch is another in dispensable partner and echoing Commissioner Briggs' statements, I would like to thank the chief and the A.P.D. for their, you know, willingness to move forward in this area.

They do work on behalf of all of us every day in our communicate, the individual officers come to work, you know, trying to make sure the community is safe and they are asked to do a lot and if we are successful in our goals and our work, they will -- they will have a little extra help and they will have extra help from people who are experts in the field and that will make everybody, I think more satisfied with the provision of safety services here in the community.

And by that I mean Ann Arbor and Washtenaw County.

Further discussions?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It's approved.

DC-4, Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes, Hateful Rhetoric, and Hateful Acts Against Asians and Asian Americans, Encouraging Ann Arbor Residents To Report Hate Crimes and Harassment to the Proper Authorities.

Moved by song, and seconded by Radina.

Discussion of DC-4, Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: This resolution recognizes this year that many communities members have expressed since the massacre in Atlanta, six of whom were Asian women.

It follows a year of anti-Asian hate from the former president, to a former Michigan senator, and it's dangerous and as a Congresswoman, it puts a bull's eye on the backs of Asian Americans.

This has been documented by those who have experienced hate incidents since the pandemic and started -- since the pandemic started, but only a fraction of which was reported to law enforcement.

I hear these experiences here in Ann Arbor too from residents who have been told to go back to China, adults and children.

Spat upon and blamed for COVID.

I hope council will join me in affirming state confirming antiAsian hate and make sure that we ourselves do not traffic in stereotypes such as the model minority myth and Asians being forever foreigners.

Please note that this is a mere resolution that was presented by state senator Stephanie Chang and that was adopted by both the state house and the senate, a version is also being proposed by county commissioner Justin Hodge.

The resolution has been reviewed by HRC and the state's MAPAC.

They support resolution and thanks Ann Arbor for its efforts given that we have one of the largest Asian American populations in the state.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Briggs?

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes, I would like to be added as a cosponsor on this and I would like to thank Councilmember Song for her leadership.

They worked hard in bringing forth this resolution, but really supporting the community and working through a number of town halls, certainly over last month on this issue.

And the weight of this issue should not be on her shoulders but it should be on all of ours.

Thank you for your leadership and this is an issue that we need to stand in solidarity with.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

Yes, thanks for bringing this forward.

I had the pleasure of meeting Ms. Grace Magnut when I was campaigning.

And she's really stepped up.

I appreciate that mention.

I really like what she's been doing and she's been a great role model for governance, generally.

You know, the second resolve clause is a little odd -- it's not inappropriate.

It's not to say these things, but it's a little odd, we condemn white terrorism and white supremacy in all forms.

I think it could be acknowledged without too much argument that anti-Asian hate crimes cross all racial and ethnic lines.

I'm not so certain this belongs in here.

I find it to be almost stereo typical and so, I mean it would be just as well to say we condemn terrorism and supremacy in all forms.

I think when you look at the statistics there's no -- you know, there's no racial limit on hate.

People hate -- people hate everywhere, unfortunately and so it's the right thing to do to say these things but I just wanted to -- I wanted to call that out that it seemed a little odd to me.

I think it's pretty clear that anti-Asian hate crimes cross all racial lines.

Thanks for bringing this forward.

I will support it.

I hope the folks here in Ann Arbor and in the greater Washtenaw County community can feel a little safer.

I don't know how we can encourage them to reach out if they feel these fears when they feel these fears but we need to do.

So thank you for this and I support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: I would like to be listed as a cosponsor and simply echo the statements of Councilmember Briggs.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thank you.

I also just want to, you know, thank Councilmember Song for her work on this.

I know we had several conversations over the last, you know, several weeks and months and even predating some of the recent attacks and I really appreciate your leadership and I -- I echo Councilmember Briggs' comments that this falls on all of us and thank you for bringing it forward but I hope that we can all, you know, carry this work forward together, and to help confront hate here in our community but also do what we can to prevent it.

I also just want to make sure that community members are aware of resources that exist.

So if they -- if any member of our community is a victim of a crime motivated by hate, they should definitely consider reporting that to the department of attorney general hate crimes unit.

Those can be reported by email at [hatecrimes@michigan.gov](mailto:hatecrimes@michigan.gov) or 313-456-0200.

You can also file a complaint of unlawful discrimination with both the Michigan department of Civil Rights and our local Ann Arbor human rights commission.

I want to make sure those resources are available for those who may be

personally experiencing instances of hate or discrimination here in our community.

It should not be tolerated and please make sure that you can report it so that not only can we get a better handle of how wide spread this problem is but also that there are efforts to -- to remedy it and confront it.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

And thanks for Councilmember Song for bringing this forward for discussion.

I do have an issue with the second resolve clause condemning white supremacy in all forms.

I don't -- I think as Councilmember Hayner said, the ignorance that fuels those two issues are intolerant to many folks and so I don't know -- I really have a hard time when you single it out, white terrorism and white supremacism, I think it's a very charged issue, obviously.

So you have to be very careful with what you are saying, and here I just don't know.

I just don't know -- I just don't feel comfortable with that terminology necessarily.

And I could be putting my foot in my mouth right now, but it does seem a little strange and I will leave it at that.

But it -- I have been victims of hate crimes.

I was a victim of hate crime last year, and growing up.

It's not just from white people.

It's from all sorts of people.

And I know the white supremacism is a problem in America and trump fueled those flames.

I will leave it there.

I will leave it there.

There's just so -- there's lot of intolerance all over the place in the world today.

And I'm not here to say that there are good folks on both sides, please folks on social media, keep that -- I'm not here to suggest that.

But I'm saying intolerance and supremacism comes in all forms.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes, I almost can't believe that we are debating whether white supremacism is bad.

Bad enough to condemn.

The Department of Homeland Security has determined that white supremacy groups are the deadliest U.S. terrorist threat.

They are the most persistent and lethal threat that we face as a nation.

And, you know, the idea that this councilmember couldn't come together to condemn white supremacy and white terrorism is shocking to me.

I absolutely will be supporting this.

This resolution and every single word and thank you, Councilmember Song for putting it together and please add me as a cosponsor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I will echo what Councilmember Eyer said.

-- it's -- there are few words but I will try to come up with some.

You know, in part -- I mean this was modeled after bipartisan legislation in Lansing.

That's a pretty low bar in terms of groups that will condemn white terrorism, because there's some white supremacists that probably still supported these words.

So it's a little unfathomable after the year that we had that we are saying that we -- that we have an issue with it, just calling out white people, like, that's kind of point.

And if we look even to the specific incident that happened in Atlanta, that's what that was.

And we see it -- we see it way too often.

I do want to speak to some positive things as well.

I'm really glad that Councilmember Song is on this council.

I think she's done some incredible work both publicly to elucidate the fear from many in our community about reporting what they see.

I think she's given it words and tells stories that have been incredibly powerful for me that help to facilitate the conversations that Councilmember Radina and I have had in the first monthly meeting with the chief and the police leadership about outreach that we can do in the community to help make people feel more comfortable I think it speaks to the importance of our last resolution and our response and it's not just about mental health, that there are other times where unarmed responders may be most appropriate, and response to hate crimes could certainly be one of those examples.

I want to thank Councilmember Song for her leadership and to.

Comfort and the sage advice she's given to many members the community who are -- who are scared.

And would have had to have really awful conversations when I think about the kinds of conversations that people have had, especially with their daughters.

It's horrifying and thank you for trying to turn something into a positive and to help us contribute to the statewide conversation.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

It is important that we condemn white terrorism and white supremacism.

We need to acknowledge the roots of hatred and intolerance in our society, and the strong ties to white terrorism and white supremacism in our society.

It's essential.

I will just leave it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Thanks.

I mean, I echo the comments that have come meetly before me.

I think also I just want to point out this is a standalone resolve clause that

resolves that we condemn white terrorism.

It's two very real problems that are quite frankly the root of a lot of the hate that we see in this country.

I have no discomfort in supporting that resolve clause.

I want to point out that this is a relatively low bar and, antiracist work is sometimes going to require us to be uncomfortable, and I really hope that this is not the thing that makes us most uncomfortable.

For me, this is absolutely -- this is one of the simplest votes that we will take and so I just -- I don't quite understand this discomfort.

>> Mayor Taylor: I haven't stepped in yet on this and I think I will take this opportunity.

Bottom line is that -- [ No audio ]

I think that we absolutely have an obligation and a duty to condemn white terrorism and white supremacy.

I think we have it in this context and that obligation in every context in which it's passingly relevant and here it is more than passingly relevant.

It is foundational.

The acts of bigotry and hatred and violence that we have seen over the past centuries but of late, they are not an accident.

They are the direct result of white supremacy.

And they are totally wrong and unacceptable.

And it's our duty to say so.

You know, for Asian and Asian Americans in our community, whether, you know, you have been here for generations or you showed up yesterday, you know, what has been happening in our country has given rise to the reasonable concern about whether this is the right place for you, whether this is the right place to be and to live and work and to have a family and retire.

I think it's our job at this table to tell these -- these men and these women and these children who are wondering that the fact that is that no matter who you are or where you came from or how long you have been here, whether it's generations or yesterday that you really do belong here.

You are a part of our community at large.

And that you are not merely welcome.

You are not -- you are not a guest here.

You are a blessing.

You are a part of us.

And that Ann Arbor is going to do absolutely everything we can to help you in the fight to live your lives without fear.

And it's not a privilege to be safe and respected.

And it's your right.

And that we will back it up every chance we get.

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: So racism at its core stems from white supremacy.

We have a long history of white supremacy and nationalism in this country.

And if folks can embrace Asian, Asian American people, immigrants, People of

Color, as neighbors, as colleagues, as people who are foundational to the building of this country, then we can recognize the struggles that mill community has endured in partnership, in solidarity with other groups with white allies. So too white supremacy and terrorism, it's not to condemn white people. It's to put a mirror to what has happened in this country and a value that remains and racism is a value that's held at all levels of government. So tonight we talked about a number of issues that our community is tackling from unarmed police work, you know, we had Dr. Jackson speak to, you know, what we need to learn when it comes to police oversight and the history of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I'm glad.

I'm glad we live in a community lives in a progressive community, but action is different.

This is action.

This not even a budgeted item.

It's supposed to give comfort to a community that calls me with legitimate concerns and fears wondering if they need to arm themselves.

Wondering if they need to walk their elders to the store, and what happens in other communities with similar size of Asian Americans what they need to do to be safe.

So the very least that we can the bare minimum that this elected body can do is pass this and recognize that white supremacy exists and it's still manifested.

If I can have this conversation with my children, so that they can tackle this, so this they are prepared -- they have to practice how to respond to racist attacks.

They have already had racist attacks as children, same with their peers.

I'm sharing with you as a relative.

I'm asking you to give comfort to a community.

That's not going anywhere.

So I appreciate the sentiment here.

I sent everyone emails, and the numbers that Councilmember Radina shared.

I hope you are communicating that with your constituents as well.

The state has organized calls with the FBI and the state attorney general.

And all you have to do is vote yes tonight.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I apologize if some of my thoughts were taken the wrong way.

I don't condone white supremacy, or white terrorism.

Yes, this is an easy vote to take and it will be unanimous.

[ No audio ]

But I would like to go a little bit further and condemn it all.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No one is suggesting that white supremacy or white terrorism doesn't exist or that we don't -- we're not willing to condemn it or that we don't support this resolution.



Despite the gleeful mischaracterizations about how this language came to be in this.

No one is saying that.

When we are not let in on these processes -- I will be frank here.

We had a bunch of stuff that came on the agenda, including the next item before us, this stuff happens off in a group somewhere.

We are not asked to review these things before they come to the body.

One the previous ones came to us saying all the sponsorship is full.

Sorry.

Here's something that's happening.

There's not a lot of coordination and communication among this body.

And so when somebody says how did this get in, there I think it's a legitimate question that should not be ridiculed and it shouldn't be fodder for social media teams to jump on people and you know, do whatever they do.

Of course we recognize that this is a source of a lot of anguish in our society, I would say most people in our society.

And it's something that we have to look at and it's something we have to face up to.

Of course it is.

So just -- let's get to the vote on this and recognize that, you know, the sponsor and the author feel strongly that this belongs in here.

Great.

I agree.

So when we go other things let's make sure that we are consistent in our application of these contemplations.

That's all.

-- condemnations.

I want us to be consistent.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I would like to be added as a cosponsor and I want to thank Councilmember Song for bringing this to us.

I feel like across the board there are often special opportunities to hear each other and listen for perspectives that we're never going to feel ourselves.

I have never been the victim of a hate crime and I appreciate the perspective Councilmember Ramlawi brings to the table and I appreciate the perspective that Councilmember Song brings to the table and the experience of raising children and just all of it.

I just -- we have a special opportunity to hear each other and listen and I hope we take advantage of that, we do live in a commercial community but we can't convince ourselves that we are immune to these things.

It's another opportunity for us to speak to what we believe in and make statements that are important.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Without going into great detail, I want to respond to something that Councilmember Hayner brought up.

In this case, it was not true that there was not any reaching out.

There was at least one councilmember to my knowledge who refused to be listed as a cosponsor, when the opportunity was provided to them.

So I don't want to make it seem that Councilmember Song was not reaching out. We do have violations the open meetings act and there are times for example in the unarmed response.

That's something that I'm interested in and only five people can talk about that.

That's the way that works sometimes.

But I think it's untrue in this case that that's the way the process has happened.

As we move forward and talk about our processes, and we will be able to provide more detail in how we arrive at something, that that will encourage more of that cross pollinization.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I just want to say my interpretation of calling out two groups of, quote, "the enemy," weaken the argument but at the same time, give than it's been approved by many other groups I'm willing to accept it as it is. But as a foster parent of many biracial children, some of the world behavior is not from the white supremacist.

It's not white racism.

It's more well-intentioned comments that are extremely hurtful and.

And so I almost think we need to expand and be careful because when we simply identify a couple ever these classes that we're supposed to be watching out for then we're letting our guard down for some of the every day threats to our community and -- and to many different groups of people.

And so that was my immediate take on it.

It was not that I was not agreeing with those statements.

It was almost like it would have been more powerful if we included additional classes or didn't include any special classes at all.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

I'm getting a little bit of feedback.

People can do whatever it is that people do to drop the feedback.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-5, Resolution Directing the City Attorney to Review City Ordinances Relating to Police Enforcement.

Moved by Councilmember Radina and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DC-5.

I'm delighted to have this brought forward.

I think it expands upon a lot and seeks to give council to the outstanding work that's already being done in our city attorney's office to make sure that our

ordinances, our criminal ordinances and practices are -- you know, are consistent with -- consistent with the state law and consistent with themselves and perhaps most importantly, consistent with their values.

You know, one way to improve equity in our community is to reduce engagement with the criminal justice system, to make sure that our -- that our criminal justice system promotes true public safety and does not do harm along the way.

Governor Whitmer signed this past year a number of laws into -- signed a number of bills into laws, which, you know, reduced mandatory minimums, encouraged alternatives and revised parole and probation and so forth.

And -- and in the course of these changes, there are some of our ordinances which require technical fixing and that's a part of the package of what is going on here.

But also, we will have the opportunity, I hope with respect to the foreign project to expand options for ticketing in case of nonviolent infractions.

To reduce potential, and we also have to remember that crime does occur and that -- so we do have improvements of victim notice provisions and things along those lines.

The bottom line here is that there's a lot of good work has been done already by our city attorney's office and, again I would like to identify Ms. Slay as the leader in this.

But then too, to give council's encouragement that we move forward and that we make sure that the ordinances, the laws over which we have authority reflect our values of professionalism, and -- and progressive reform.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks Mayor Taylor for bringing this one forward.

I think it was early 2018, when Ms. Slay brought forward changes to the trespassing, that really opened my eyes to the considerations that we might have as a body to, you know, work and modify our laws -- laws that are consistent with the best practices and progressive practices and as the laws change we need to change those laws around, society to facilitate the kind of growth we want as a community, right?

So I really appreciated that happening and it gave me an opportunity to speak with Ms. Slay and let her know I want to be a part of this scamming own revising our law on the book.

Every time we make a law or designation or ticketable offense, we create another class of people, and the fewer laws we have the better, in my consideration.

They say that, you know it's been said flippantly, I don't know if it's statistically accurate but that, you know, every day people are in constant violations of all sorts of laws we don't know that are on the book and so the fewer we have the better, and the more able our city attorney's office is to modify these things, to reflect changes in our understanding of policing and rehabilitation and society the better and so I'm happy to support this.

I was happy to be offered the opportunity to.

And I want to thank Ms. Slay for reminding everybody that we're interested in the

criminal reform and I encourage my colleagues to do same and really give our office the free reign to clean up the books as it were.

No doubt long overdue.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, mayor: Just to echo some of the statements and sents made by my colleague regarding this.

I appreciate the work that the city attorney's office has put into cleaning up our books to reflect the new reality, our new values.

We are seeing, you know, criminal justice reform up and down the government structures, whether it's federal, state, and here locally.

So this is one area where we do have bipartisan support, and an area that's getting a lot of -- having a lot of changes progressive changes brought forth to reflect the new realities and the new value system that we have.

And I would just like to be added as a cosponsor to this, thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I too would like to be added as a cosponsor and I would like to note that his rare and wonderful to be in a position where we are not straining against the constraints the broader state law, but we have an example of a set of state provisions that align with our values and enable us to implement and facilitate them.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

All opposed?

It is approved.

Do with have a closed session today, Mr. Postema?

>> City Atty. Postema: We do not, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: We have before us the clerk's report communications, petitions and referrals.

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Radina.

Discussion, please?

All in favor?

All opposed?

The clerk's report is approved.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Most pa, do you have some communications from the indomitable attorney?

>> City Atty. Postema: I do have some.

I appreciate the council approving the last resolution, on horizon issues that this is something that attorney slay has been tracking for sometime and, in fact, some of the changes in Lansing reflect things that we have been doing here for smile.

So this big project that is really a culmination of things that she has identified over the course of a period of time, and it fitted in with the state changes and there's 808 laws being changed and to do this at time, I appreciate the interests of all the councilmembers who have talked about and to reinforce important work that she's been lining up since she got here.

And it's a cull me nation of that and to have the ratification of the council of the importance of that work is -- is quite meaningful, I though to her but also important for really the whole residents and the citizens of Ann Arbor for an understanding of the criminal justice, not only reform, but criminal justice policies and procedures.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: We now come to public comment general time.

It's an opportunity for members the public to speak to council and the community about matters of municipal interest.

To speak at public comment general time, one need not have signed up in advance.

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

877-853-5247.

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

94212732148.

Once you are connected, please enter star nine.

Star nine to indicate that you wish to speak.

When it is your turn to speak, our clerk will identify you by the last three digits of your telephone number.

At that time, please enter star six.

Star six in order to unmute yourself.

At that point, you will have three minutes to speak.

You will be notified when there are 30 seconds left and when your time has expired.

Is there anyone who would like to speak at public comment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 766.

>> Hi, this is Michelle Hughes and I condemn hatred against Asian people and I condemn white supremacy.

We have to continue calling it out when we see it, whatever form it happens to take.

I also want to talk about unarmed responders program.

I was excited to see this and I was excited to see it pass.

Sometimes when I talk to some of these councilmembers, I hear people talk about that the community mental health is where the knowledge is that we need for unarmed response or that the city doesn't provide social services and this is a count responsibility and I wants to tell us to take the opportunity to take the responsibility to lead on this, and -- because I think that there are a lot of calls that the police respond to, that are not crimes in progress, which require an armed response, but are also not people in mental health crisis.

A lot of times people will call the police because they got into an amicable car crash and they need someone to write down the insurance information for their insurance.

Sometimes people call the police because their neighbors are having a loud argument.

People call the police for all kinds of reasons and it's not always someone in mental health crisis.

If we treat this as a thing that only community mental health should deal with and only mental health response is necessary, I think that we are missing some opportunities to keep people safer by reducing contact with the police who are a dangerous element.

You know, a call might not be a mental health crisis, but it might involve someone with autism and if they don't respond the way the police expect, it could lead to a dangerous situation, and so I think we should -- we should be prepared to respond to a variety of circumstances in a variety of weighing and if calling CMH is the thing to do, then that's the way to do that.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> When say that -- I don't want to say that only the county should deal with this because, you know, we already have an armed response program.

We could have that type of response but it would be unarmed and they respond to all sorts of situations yes, let's keep it open and let's take keep open the possibility that we might need to lead or pay for some of these services.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

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

>> Yes, this is Joe Spalding.

I have a few things I wanted to go over, first off, it was really embarrassing to see the stutter step from a couple of councilmembers when it came to condemning white supremacy.

I think that needs to be spelled out a little more clearly in that white supremacy is the pervasive force pushing racism both overt and systemic in America and I understand that we came around full circle after hearing Councilmember Song give some words there, but that's, you know, frankly not enough.

It was really not great that she had to spend any many of her time in that discussion talking about that and, you know, also, I'm embarrassed for Dr. Lisa Jackson because of what she said, and having to hear that the embarrassing stutter step on white supremacy which meant a lot of her important words were falling on deaf ears which is unfortunate.

Beyond that, the reason I called was actually because I wanted to call everybody's attention to a "Wall Street Journal" article that came out yesterday. It's called "If You Sell a House These Days, the Buyer Might Be a Pension Fund" and it talks about yield chasing investors that are snapping up single family homes to compete with other ordinary Americans and they are driving up prices. Now one of these companies that does this is a subsidiary of blackstone.

It's indication homes in.

Their official documentation that they post for their shareholders they are explicit, they say, and we could be adversely affected by overbuilding or high vacancy rates in our mark which could result in an excess supply of home in reduce occupancy.

Continuing development of apartment buildings and condominium units in many

of or markets willable crease the supply of housing and exasperate competition for residence.

If the cities build apartments or condos then the vulture capitalisms cannot keep up.

It's the only way to stop them from sucking up all the single family housing stock and jacking up rents.

That's the game they are playing and they are buying up stock in Ann Arbor because they target places where supply is pinched.

And clearly the housing crisis is there.

So the last thing I want to say is I want to invite folks to go to [mivotersrights.com](http://mivotersrights.com).

And I have 1300 Michigananders and we are fighting back on the republicans suppressing our right to vote.

That's all.

Thank you for giving me three minutes to speak.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 556, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, this is Ralph McKey for the second time tonight.

I guess it's very disappointing to provide a careful legal analysis and not hear any of this discussed and instead listen to the same talking points as if that had not even been provided.

It's one thing to discuss something and decide that there's a better view.

It's another thing to just completely ignore it and say exactly what you were going to say before the analysis was provided.

And because the city attorney's advice is under privilege screen.

I can't tell if you are getting great advice or not so great advice or councilmembers are just playing lawyer.

It's infuriating to hear jeopardy of an expensive lawsuit, which all you have to do is have one simple test case and ask for summary judgment about whether it barred STRs.

Zero risk and very low cost.

So that's just a complete phantom trumped up straw man.

It's the same thing with respect to what Councilmember Radina said that we had this risk of knocking the whole ordinance down by this.

That's absurd, frankly!

If that was true, every time you changed zoning, someone who had a legal non-conforming use that if the city tried to prevent them, they could strike the ordinance down.

That would happen every time.

None of those comments make any sense at all.

And until you actually start thinking we are going to continue to have this problem, you have to look at the ordinance and you have to read the case law.

Unless you have done that or it's been provided to you by the city attorney's office, you just don't frankly know what you are talking about.

And you should really know what you are talking about when you are voting on

something that that's that important.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: McCoy, do you have a comment.

>> My name is amber McCoy.

I'm a renter at 441 south first and I'm one the graduate students working with some of you on the early leasing ordinance, and I just wanted to call in for you all and for those who may still be awake listening and push back on what some of the landlords said earlier.

I'm really sick of hearing landlords speak on behalf of the students.

Claiming that this 240-day ordinance change would be bad for students when students who are crafting and pushing this clang in the first place, and it's not just graduate students.

We have over 1,000 signatures on our position.

A sizable amount of them are undergraduate students and we have support from central student.

And landlords saying this is an issue for students and students themselves are not.

I think we need to recognize that students are not the only renters in Ann Arbor and while I'm a student now, I'm someone who lived in Ann Arbor as a nonstudent.

It's frustrating to move, leave or find new housing here outside of the academic cycle and I think this ordinance change can do a lot to help alleviate problems for nonstudents too and it's well beyond the time to stop acting like students are the only renters in Ann Arbor, when we know the university's presence is perpetuating this in the first place.

I want to make it known that in the hours since you discussed this, landlords have already begun, send fear mongering.

These are the predatory and manipulative tactics that we deal with every day.

I hope you can see who holds the power and use your positions to flip what the tenants are asking for which is something that I know many of you say you care a lot about.

Yes, I'm happy to hear about the tabling tonight.

And especially to craft an effective enforcement mechanism.

I urge you to take the time to reach out to renters to graduate students, undergraduate students and nonstudents alike to hear our stories about this horrific ordinance instead of listening to our landlords speaking on behalf of us, while they siphon half of our monthly salaries into Arthur pocket.

We continue to foster, this and ask you to listen to us.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 867, do you have a comment?

>> Yes.

This is Blaine Coleman.



Look how far Ann Arbor city council has fallen since 1975.

In 1975, city councilmember Kathy Kozachenko fought for Palestinian human rights in city council.

Travis, all of us ought to honor Cathy for that.

Honor her for the full range of her human rights activism.

Now look at we are today.

Today, we are stuck with Councilmember Jen Eyer.

Who took contributions from old friends of the Israel defense forces.

The Israel defense forces is a violent, racist, white supremacist force which has killed thousands of Palestinians.

Eyer also took endorsements from old friends of the I.D.F. for her campaign to get into city council.

I believe the many women would have accused Jen Eyer of enabling sexual harassment against them.

I believe those women.

I believe Mlive when it says eyer claimed to be claimed to be something she was not.

She made that false claim to thousands of voters.

Councilmember Eyer should resign now, tonight, for all of those reasons and I believe the rest of you should sign the humanitarian position against military aid to Israel.

Thousands of Palestinian lives depend on it.

Travis, don't erase Councilmember Kozachenko's fights for Palestinian rights.

You ought to honor her for all that she was and is and you ought to try to rise to her level.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> If you really are for human rights, you have to be for human rights across the board.

You can never, ever support a white supremacist state like Israel which has inflicted death on so many Palestinians.

I'm done.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller ending in 179, do you have a comment?

>> Hello.

My name is Terra Trenter and I'm a renter on prospect street and I'm calling for some comments on the early leasing ordinance that was discussed earlier.

Some that really disturbed me was to hear landlords claiming to have tenants' best interests at heart when, you know, my landlord only really ever contacts me to raise my rent and they ignore me when I inform that my 50-year-old stove is broken and my faucet is not working.

I think it's very disingenuous to say that they have the interest of their tenants at heart that they so very rarely are making any substantive contact with those tenants.

So further more the 70 day leasing ordinance, that is not enough to know what you need to know about an apartment to determine whether or not you want to stay there for another year.

If you start your lease in September as many leases do in Ann Arbor, have you not yet spent a winter in that apartment.

You don't know how well the windows will retain heat.

You don't know how much you will be spending is on heating and cooling costs.

I think it's really unfair to expect renters to make a decision so quickly.

I also think, you know, my experiences with Ann Arbor landlords are among the worst I have ever been.

It disappointing to see how broadly the city of Ann Arbor failed tenants and therefore, I think we need to a very strong enforcement mechanism in addition to extending the 70 days out much further into the future.

A possible strong enforcement mechanism that we could consider is the penalty that the landlords would pay for violating a revised ordinance would be paid directly to tenants.

I have think that's really important because that ensures that, you know, tenants are actually being compensated when they are armed by their landlord.

I want to echo amber's point that students are not the only renters.

Ann Arbor attracts all sorts of highly skilled and incredibly intelligent community members.

I think it's unfortunate that we allow our rental housing network to be exclusively oriented for students.

My partner who is with the Michigan program was matched in March and had to be here in June.

It was incredibly hard to find housing in that time.

And I think the 70-day housing is the reason.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 941, do you have a comment?

>> Yes.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: We can hear you.

>> Okay.

I see that Jen Eyer perpetual liar is still occupying a seat at our city council.

Shouldn't you expel her from your midst.

She did lie to thousands of voters when she said she was a small business owner at election time last year.

Now she says she was not.

Would those thousands of Ann Arborites vote for her if they knew she was lying.

Lying is a dishonorable character trait, a known liar should be shunned from political office.

Ms. Eyer should be forced to resign tonight!

Ann Arbor city council should demand eyer's resignation.

I am sorry Ms. Eyer was abused by her second husband Mitcher win.

I'm sorry Ms. eyer Irwin did not call the police herself and put her daughter in awkward position of having to call the police for her.

Ms. Eyer should not remain silent when she was abused herself and she should not have enabled sexual abuse of other women.

Multiple women accuse Ms. Eyer of creating a toxic atmosphere of sexual abuse at Vanguard public affairs.

I believe those women.

Women do not lie about such things.

If Ann Arbor city council is serious about protecting women from sexual harassment, if Ann Arbor city council is serious about human rights, if Ann Arbor city council is serious that they are against white supremacy, and if city council honors Kathy Kozachenko, then they first should expel Eyer from their midst and sign my petition against military aid to Israel.

And white supremacy.

She should never have accepted campaign funds from the mother of white supremacists or white organizations, or the Israeli defense forces.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> I.D.F., which Ms. Eyer accepted campaign funds from old friends of I.D.F.

If you condemn terrorism, be consistent.

Condemn them all.

When you don't, it means you are lying.

I am Mozghan Savabehsaz and that is my opinion.

Thank you.

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

>> Hello, this is Tom Stulberg.

I'm a landlord.

I want to support the students who have called in.

We are a small management firm.

We are starting our new renewal season and new leases the last week of March and the beginning of April.

I think the 240 days is awkward because of the timing for a lot of leases but pretty darn close to that would be fine, you know, maybe 210.

The students have the right concept.

The large landlords have the interests.

I will speak for myself and my small company, we are fine with this concept, and the students are a large part of our city.

I went to undergrad and grad here.

I have grad students and I have undergrad students and I have people who are not students who are tenants and it works out just fine to not lease the short amount of time that is given right now in the ordinance.

So I support you in making this change and perhaps we can work on the 240 number but not significantly, not a ton.

So then I want to also talk about the STRs.

I was kind of surprised that council members acknowledged that they didn't get what they really wanted from staff.

They did not expect staff to be in perpetuity giving STR rights to the property that

they wanted it, you know, grandfathering to use an unfortunate word, for the person and not the property.

It backs us into the property, by using the U.D.C.

And all of a sudden we have the solution that doesn't match what councilmembers wanted.

So I'm kind of surprised they voted for it rather than postponing it or voting it down and say staff think of something else.

Find a different solution, because this solution doesn't really give you what you want.

So don't approve it when it comes back.

There are other ways to achieve this and Ralph McKey mentioned one.

And I also want to mention the stuff that's coming, as mentioned, the A.D.U. revisions that are coming are abhorrent to use Councilmember Grand's word. They are not A.D.U.s.

They are A.D. U.s on steroids and they are targeted to give us a small number of units approximately the same as the STR number, but they shut out homebuyers from the mark and that relates to the "Wall Street Journal" article that was mentioned too.

So we will talk about that more in the days to come but I'm really the A.D.U. ordinance that coming to you is absolutely abhorrent.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Despite what you want to do in terms of affordable housing.

Thank you, bye.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 326, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> My name is Jeff Crockett and I live 506 east Kingsley.

By any standard the Kerrytown public plaza is a great success.

If you stop midday, on most days, you will see the tables and the benches are occupied.

It's getting more so now that the warm weather is returning and in my opinion, the secret to the Kerrytown success is the positioning of a number of tables and benches near a deli, a food market and a coffee shop and restaurant.

In contrast, we have a large public space in the future community commons site that is being used as a parking lot for about four to five cars.

It is a huge waste of a public space and it subverts the will of the people expressed through the Proposition A.

Two years ago, they vote approved that this site should become a park and a community meeting site what has been done to the site in the past two years? Nothing!

And it is a disgrace and an example of how personal egos have interfered with the will of the people.

A committee has been selected but it could take considerable time to develop the site.

I understand some of the members of the community commons mysteriously want to work on liberty plaza.

It's a blatant delay tactic.

It's time to stop delaying and it's time to act.

Please direct Mr. Crawford to remove the marking in time for the earth day -- parking in time for the Earth Day celebrations planned for April 22<sup>nd</sup> and direct Mr. Crawford to permanently remove parking from that location and install temporary tables and benches so the public may experience the commons in the way the voters intended.

Moving the parking is consistent with A2Zero to encourage people to walk to the commons rather than walking.

You will help to satisfy the demands the public gathering place that is evident into the Kerrytown marketplace and will support the five local restaurants in close proximity to the community commons.

For the longer term the new plans for the 144 affordable housing units and 2560 market rate, apply additional incentive to move forward to the park and a meeting place on the community commons site.

What better amenity for the residents of close to 400 units and a well defined park and gathering place.

Mr. Mayor, all councilmembers, it's time for you to act in the interest of the great community good and remove the parking in the communicate council site.

Thank you for your consideration.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ken Kerrpat, do you have a comment?

>> Yes, thank you.

My name is Dr. Kevin Karpiack, I I'm a resident of the fifth ward and I want to first thank Ann Arbor city council for your forward thinking and ambitious decisions today on the two decisions I'm rethinking public safety here in Ann Arbor.

They are very exciting initiatives.

I'm really excited by the will to go do something about that.

I would like to just, I guess, suggest a couple of reminders as we move forward in this process.

One is that even as we rethink public safety and I supported both bills tonight, myself.

But even as we rethink public safety and hopefully reallocating the work of policing through other institutions, hopefully unarmed institutions, many of the same problems follow.

There's still issues of racism and the production of social inequality, including famously mental and public health.

And so any new effort, I would want to make sure that we also continue to work to be transparent, to hold the institution publicly accountable and to think about ways that the institution cannot just -- can be antiracist.

So for example, in fact, I would hope that any kind of new body would have an oversight body just like we have created for our police department here.

I hope ICPOC is involved in both thinking through this process, and if not ICPOC

itself, a similar body having a forum for which the public can offer their opinion and offer a counterweight to such a powerful institution.

Similarly in this -- going over of the city ordinances and how it might relate to the changes in state law, I hope that ICPOC is involved in that process as well, in that on one level, sometimes it can seem cut and dry but there's levels of interpretation and evaluation and I hope there's opportunities for public engagement there as well.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> That's all I have for tonight.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 864, do you have a comment?

Caller 684, if you press star six to unmute your phone.

>> Yes, hello, this is Eric Sturgis.

I'm keep it quick as it looks like Councilmember Griswold is ready to fall asleep. A couple of things.

I just wanted to bring about that the Ann Arbor citizens academy, which I am a part of, I don't know if I will stay a part of it.

I was very disappointed that of the 30 people, there was one Person of Color. We had one person would ran for council, who was a Person of Color, who wanted to be on there who was not selected in northern.

To me -- Ann Arbor.

To me, that's not acceptable.

We have 29 essentially white people on something like this.

So I would hope that we would look into this.

I brought it up to a couple of councilmembers.

Second, I want to condemn white supremacy and I'm glad that the resolution passed tonight.

I also want to reach out and empathize with women who have experienced sexual harassment.

And I think it's a terrible thing and we need to empathize with those.

So thank you.

Have a good night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 464, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Hi.

Thank you.

I work for 21 third street.

I support the two students who just spoke about listening to renters and renters in general as opposed to landlords about early leasing commitments.

In my opinion we need to listen to the people affected, not the people would

stand to benefit financially from any ordinance change.

In the April observer argue, they go to the previous STR ordinance as a mess. It was not a mess.

It was very clear.

What was a mess was the majority to get some direction in December, I believe -- for the planning commission to allow the non-conforming use for properties, operating as nonowner occupied STRs in residential areas prior to March 1<sup>st</sup>.

That was a mess.

And remains a mess.

Because it's clear from tonight's discussion that many of you voted for that, without even knowing that non-conforming use applies to the property and not the owner.

I believe councilmember are a Tina and higher when they state they did not understand that when they voted to give planning commission that direction.

I'm less confident that Mayor Taylor didn't understand that when directing the planning commission and when he interviewed with Jim Leonard for the observer.

I hope that's not true, but I'm not confident.

That was a max -- now you know the truth.

From Brett Lenart.

Those of you who supported this original direction to planning commission under the assumption that the non-conforming status would go to the property and not enthusiasm have the courage to reverse your decision.

It's like they would be unable to be unwilling to devise a way to make it adhere only to the current owner.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> It's probably not legal to do that.

So you have the opportunity to vote against this.

Mayor Taylor impassioned cry is grocery exacerbated.

They are not legally before the STR ordinance.

As a friend of mine holding a conversation, it's unregulated because it's new is not legal.

It is under duress in the law, that's an important distinction.

We have been given information, how can you compare -- don't let yourselves be bull Id or threatened by lawsuits.

Please heed the advice you have given.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't have any other caller with their hands up.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number 083, do you have a comment?

Caller 083, press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Hello.

Do I get to go?

They're still talking?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Haber, you are live.

>> Okay.

Thank you.

Yes, I'm Allen Haber.

And there was a reference to the Earth Day not too long ago in your conversations I listened to this meeting, I really appreciate the attention that's given to all of these questions.

So on the Earth Day, from April 22 to the weekend we're trying to have a green road to restoring the earth, whether the elements are really necessary from solar cars to A2Zero for 2030.

So exhibits along the way of various elements and you are invited to come and check out had the commons.

And be part of making your presence there and sharing the -- the news of the this place actually beginning to take shape.

So I hope that you will see the Earth Day as a time to put your green road to restoring the earth.

That's part of the theme.

Ann Arbor city Earth Day that's going on on the -- to the video and hopefully we will have a part of that video showing the steps along the green brick road.

So many organizations are -- and good ideas put up an exhibit and we hope the A2Zero will have such also.

And it's a way to just walk along and get some ideas and begin to deal with the presence as we develop the gardens on the commons and they will find a way of understanding of how to get the cars out and how to begin to make this a welcoming, safe, exciting downtown destination.

So the council of the commons is beginning the initiating committee, and initiating the garden, is beginning do grow and the relationships with the D.D.A. and the police and the shelter and all the parts that are part of the future.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> So I'm encouraging you to have a bright view of what is going on and walk the green brick road on Earth Day to restoring the earth and see what all we can do together.

So that's about it and thank you for the opportunity to listen to your meeting.

Bye-bye.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see any other callers who have their hands up. I think most of them on the line have already spoken.

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

Seeing no one.

Public council is closes.

Is there communications from the council?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I really need to clear the record here because my



comments are misconstrued when I clumsily tried to explain myself with resolution 210617, it's not that I condone white terrorism or white supremacism, I was trying to broaden the conversation to include all forms.

I apologize that it didn't come out very clear.

It was an opportunity for some of my political foes to misrepresent the intent and the meaning behind my words.

It's unfortunate but it's a pattern at this table and it's a dangerous one when we do it with topics that what -- that I'm talking about.

So I just want to apologize to people in the public and whoever else I may have offended.

By in the selecting my words more coherently.

I would like to move on to the FOIA requests regarding the 911 calls from councilmember's homes, and the omission of the call made from Councilmember Eyer's house on January 13<sup>th</sup>.

I will be interested to see the -- what's released, but I'm concerned that -- that the complete omission of that record is troubling.

And I know they could have been completely redacted to the point to protect the privacy, but I feel --

>> Mayor Taylor: That's two minutes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I feel like there's something there that needs to be looked at.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Thank you.

I want to talk about the Gelman plume and I sent an email earlier today to the mayor to the city administrator and to the city attorney asking that a working paper be released, since the time that I requested that, that working paper has been retracted.

Scio township hired a consultant for the Gelman plume and the request for an EPA superfund site.

They hired a consultant.

Many experts took a look at it and found numerous errors in it and so it is being corrected.

It is being redacted.

The reason I'm mentioning, this for two reasons.

One is Scio Township's elected officials have taken the lead and working very hard.

That makes sense because the Gelman plume originates in Scio Township and if a superfund is designated, it will be in Scio Township and not in Ann Arbor.

It will be in Scio Township.

And my second point is that we have an excellent employee in Brian Steglitz but to ask him to write technical statements about the Gelman plume is both inappropriate and unfair.

He is a very, very important responsibility in ensuring clean water, safe water for our community.

And so to pull him into this political gain is not appropriate.

I guess that's all I will say.

I have been going to every meeting possible regarding the Gelman plume.

I have been working with people at all levels the government.

We have not had any time in the working session or update on the Gelman plume other than from a legal standpoint and so if anyone wants information, please let me know.

Sorry for going over time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: Just two points.

One is that there aren't really other forms of supremacism, it's only white.

And I don't want to chill the free speech of people who call into our meetings but I would have to say that -- bearing someone's private life and telling the stories that should be allowed to be in a household between the members of that household, bearing those for the public is simply not fair.

It's abusive and I wish that Jen didn't have to sit through that and I feel very bad for what you had to listen to tonight.

I thought it was atrocious.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I completely agree with Councilmember Disch's statement.

And I will use the word abhorrent again because it's appropriate in this case.

And I'm really sorry.

And I think we have seen a couple of cases tonight where people who are trying to do the right thing, are facing really abusive behavior and it shouldn't come from the public.

It also shouldn't come from our colleagues and I think it's important to note as well, I will try to exhibit the same behavior that we can have a disagreement and call it out and it doesn't mean that we're doing it to gain points on social media or because it's politically motivated.

It's just that actually in my case, I will use an I statement, I can speak for myself and disagree and I'm not trying to store points.

I just have an upon that is different.

And -- an opinion that is different, and that shouldn't be taken as politically motivated.

That should be taken as a policy difference and we are allowed to have those.

And every time someone disagrees, there shouldn't be thrown around this accusation that we are trying to score points on social media.

It doesn't make sense.

So I would hope that we can actually have disagreements about issues that are at the table and I will just say from my own perspective that these concerns about FOIA in this case, I won't speak to the motivations of who -- of why someone would bring that up, but it's really troubling to me.

And I'm sorry that one of our colleagues has to sit through that discussion.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I would like to make a request for folks to read --

there's amazing work out there on Asian American history and justice, the murder of Vincent Chin, which was compelling for me as a young person growing up here in Michigan, that defined the Asian American Civil Rights movement, Gracely Boggs was an activist and author and a quote that is compelling to me in the past year has been a revolution that is based on the people their creativity and in this devastation is one of the great historical contributions of human kind. I'm asking everyone to exercise your creativity here in compassion and just try a little bit to maybe understand when I tell you what experiences are coming from in the community, to be empathic.

And I'm -- I would be grateful for that and I think community members to, but I also want to point out that there are young people who watch this, children who watch this, and who look to their elected leaders, I would hope that we would invite their -- I think you will be hearing from them and their thoughts on what they want this community to look like and how we respond to racism and the hurt that's experienced here.

We talk about racism.

We talk about public safety and we talk about policing and public health.

That's supposed to mean -- that's supposed to mean a better -- a better ideal for our community.

The other thing about Jen, about Councilmember Eyer, I have been that minor who has called the police on a parent.

It's traumatic.

And it's difficult, and if I had ever thought as a child that it would be public like that for whatever means that would have been terrible to have -- to bear that additional weight.

So I hope you would listen to that experience too.

Because you never forget.

You never forget that conversation of calling the police on your parent.

Because another parent is being hurt.

So try to tap into your compassion, please.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I wanted to thank the couple of callers we had speaking about the early leasing ordinance, hearing their articulate explanations, I regretted not saying more before our postponement.

I wanted to reiterate that the goals of the listing ordinance, the conversations that I'm having with landlords, graduate students, other people who care about housing issues, they really are talking about issues of equity and the significance of the space of time when people have to have two deposits out of pocket and the significance of making that time period shorter because right now it is a very significant length of time and so I'm looking for -- I'm looking ahead to a lot more conversations of how to address the concerns of the people who are actually hurt by the policies that are in practice now in this town and, yeah, just -- I thank -- I'm glad that this meeting didn't go so far late that we didn't hear those callers because as I was listening to our first ten reserve time speakers, I was hoping that there might be a counterbalance.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

One of the things that I have been most impressed by as I started this new role on council is the incredible expertise that our city staff has and every week I'm demonstrated that in a new way and I know we take our time to thank them and take our turns but I have been continually impressed by the publication water quality matters, and the work that staff puts into that.

I would caution us against doing that.

They are doing hard work for the city and they are trying to present information fairly and succinctly for folks.

So I thank them for that hard work.

And how they support us every week.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communications from council?

For my part, I would like to what Councilmember Briggs said with the work of the staff, and the notion that there's political gains by staff is mind boggling to my perspective.

They are doing their best to serve the public and to serve council.

They have no interests but to do their job.

Also, we have -- we have heard a little built here at the table about, you know -- we heard efforts here today to embarrass and to victim shame and it's just -- it's heartless.

Any interest in this video, it's just mind boggling.

It's politically prurient.

It's repulsive and the notion that anybody should -- should wish to see it for -- in order to embarrass someone at a moment of vulnerability, on an issue where you know very well that -- you know, they are in charge of their own healing.

They are this charge of their expressions of -- of how they survived a -- you know, a crime of that nature.

You know, it's bringing up the topic in any sort of public way, it's simply repulsive.

It's heartless.

It's cruel.

It's malicious and that's what's going on here and it mystifies me that people should act so.

Further communication from council?

May I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Disch, Councilmember Briggs?

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

We are adjourned.