

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

ANN ARBOR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AUGUST 2, 2021
6:30 P.M.

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

* * *

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

* * *

>> Mayor Taylor: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the
August 2nd meeting of Ann Arbor City Council.
If you are able, please rise and join us if you are able, followed by the Pledge of
Allegiance.
>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the
republic for which it stands: One nation Indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.
>> Mayor Taylor: Would our clerk please call the roll of council.
>> Clerk Beaudry: And a reminder to let me know if you are not calling from Ann
Arbor, Michigan.
>> 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.
From Charlevoix.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Here.

In Ann Arbor.

>> 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.

In Ann Arbor.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Here.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Present.

>> Clerk Beaudry: We have a quorum.

Discussion of the agenda?

Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: I would like to move that we move DC-6 to the position right after DC-1.

>> Mayor Taylor: Would you repeat that?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

I think I had that right.

I want to move --

>> Mayor Taylor: You don't want to move DC-2 to prior to DC-6?

>> Councilmember Griswold: DC-6, directly after DC-2.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No, DC-6, immediately prior to DC-2.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I was going based on your email.

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

Seconded by grand.

Discussion?

Is there any objection to that?

Those are objections?

For my I would like to have the motion to reconsider moved to after DC-6.

I don't care where it goes in the agenda, but I would prefer to have the motion for reconsideration considered prior to DC-6.

I will be voting against that change.

Can I have a roll call vote on that change, agenda change?

With Councilmember Hayner, you are first.

So roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Nelson: This is for DC-6 to be after DC-1.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-6 to be DC-1.5.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.
>> Councilmember Song: Yes.
>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.
>> Councilmember Radina: No.
>> Mayor Taylor: No.
>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.
>> Councilmember Nelson: No.
>> Councilmember Briggs: No.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.
>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the agenda?
Councilmember Eyer, is that still you?
>> Councilmember Eyer: Okay.

I would like to move DC-6 to immediately after DC-2.

The reason being that we can sort of get -- the reason I'm doing this, by the way so we are not dealing with the most important issue on the agenda very last. That's -- that goes directly against the advice we were given by -- the wonderful gentleman who -- who did a session with us on meeting efficiency, if we recall just a mere couple of weeks ago.

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

Seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion of moving DC-6 to after DC-2.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, I appreciate that sentiment that was just expressed.

Unfortunately, I'm troubled with -- with the fact that this was initially going to be moved to prior to DC-2.

And it's unfortunate, that's the way this meeting is starting with essentially forgone conclusions on issues, but I will be supporting it now that it's in the proper order.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there further discussion?

Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thanks.

It's unfortunate that councilmembers want to bring back issues that we have already discussed extensively and cause further harm to the community.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion on the amendment to the agenda.

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.
>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.
>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.
>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the agenda as amended?
All in favor?

Opposed: Do we have anything from the city administrator, Ms. Praschan.
>> Nothing.

He.

>> Mayor Taylor: We have the chair Dr. Jackson, from the chair of the police oversight commission.

Dr. Jackson, you have the com.

>> Good evening, everyone.

Thank you for having me.

For those who don't know me, I'm Lisa Jackson, I'm the chair of the independent committee police oversight commission.

I would like to speak this evening about one challenge we all face, when it comes to creating the sparks of inspiration necessary to generate the political will required to change the way things work at scale.

As many of you know, and certainly those of you on council know this, fighting for change is daunting, because it requires that we personally bear the responsibility for every potential result of that change.

And when it's your neck on the line, the what ifs that loom naturally skew towards the worst case scenario in.

My line of work, those what ifs are particularly terrifying.

It's not lost on any of us on the independent community police oversight commission that the wrong policy recommendations could lead to the loss of livelihood or even life itself on the part of civilians or police.

Equally heavy, though is what gets lost when we allow ourselves to stop moving forward at the mere prospect of bad outcomes, what the ifs of not fighting for change are not just light efficiencies or vague often sanitized statistically outcomes like racial disparities and sentencing.

The prospect of the loss of these changes also include George Floyd, Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery.

At the end of the day, we are public servants.

Our job is to work for the people we serve, even if that sometimes means forsaking political expediencies or taking a stance that's personally inconvenient.

I share with you the deep frustration of having one's good faith efforts being taken out of context, or appropriated for reasons with which we don't agree, but I believe that fear of personal loss is no excuse to not be brave for public gain.

No matter what the frustrations we face, ICPOC feels a deep sense of responsibility to all of those who fought to get this far.

If nothing else, we owe our bravery to the task force, to past and present councilmembers and to the public, especially, for the blood, sweat and tears they

have invested into their vision of a better future of public safety in Ann Arbor. What continues to move us forward are the voices of the public, be it through activism or gathering the courage to come forward and make a formal complaint to our commission.

It's not always easy to do the right thing, but we implore council to spend time considering all that is at stake, as well as what voices inspire them to take brave action.

Thank you.

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

We now come to 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 to speak at public comment reserve time, one needs to have signed up in advance and contacting our city clerk.

Speakers at public comment reserve time 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, and when your time is expired.

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

Our first speaker is Bee Friedlander.

>> Caller with the phone number ending in 950, go ahead and speak.

Press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 950, if you press star six, you can unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

Caller 950, please go ahead.

>> Yes.

Good evening, councilmembers and Mayor Taylor.

My name is Bee Friedlander and I'm the president of the board of attorneys for animals incorporated, a Michigan-based nonprofit with attorney law students and advocates around state, including Washtenaw County and Ann Arbor.

In fact, I have had the opportunity to speak to several of our members who are Ann Arbor residents and who support this proposed ordinance.

Attorneys for animals board of directors also is voted to support the fur band ordinance.

We believe it is appropriate to extend Chapter 91, which currently regulates use of endangered species in businesses and trades to the sale of all animal products.

While it's crucial to recognize and protect endangered species, this proposed ordinance recognizes that all animals who are raised for their fur suffer, and that the industry which produces fur products for sale has other negative consequences regardless of the animal being used.

The proposed ordinance is a proper exercise of the city's authority to promote awareness of animal welfare, and foster a more humane environment in the city.

The intent and purpose Section 7.361 articulates the three prongs upon which the proposed ban is based.

Animal suffering, public health, particularly salient now with scientific evidence of links between the fur industry and the spread of viruses such as COVID-19, from mink fur farms to humans and third, environmental concerns.

Similar sales bans have been enacted in cities throughout the country, from San Francisco to Wellesley, Massachusetts and other.

A federal judge in March 2021 rejected a challenge to the San Francisco fur ban by a trade group that claimed it violated the U.S. constitution's commerce clause. Note that the San Francisco ban was passed in 2019, before COVID.

California was the first state to ban fur sales in 2019, to be effective from 2023, and similar bills have been introduced this year in Rhode Island, Oregon, Connecticut, Hawaii, and New York.

Israel became the first country to ban fur sales just this June.

There are many good reasons to pass this ban, and you to is --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> -- a really good time.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Molly Tamulevich.

>> The city's incredible restaurants.

I cannot tell you how happy I am that my Hometown is considering agenda item c-4 a prohibition on the sale of new fur products and I encourage all of you to support this important ordinance.

Fur has been a hot button issue and rightly so.

The animals killed for fur whether trapped in the wild are subjected to brutal treatment for no reason except human vanity.

Often through cruel methods such as electrocution.

Even in the U.S., there are no federal laws protecting animals on fur farms and fur bearing animals are not subject to humane slaughter laws.

71% of Americans oppose the killing of animals for their fur only which is why so many retailers and Nordstrom and Saks have switched.

In addition to the animal cruelty terns, the fur trade poses serious health concerns.

Mink farms across the world, including here in Michigan have revealed dangerous links between the industry and the further spread of the virus that causes COVID-19.

In 2020, mink on hundreds of fur factory farms in Denmark, the Netherlands, and in the U.S. in Utah, and Michigan and Utah, tested positive for SARS COVID-2.

They spread mutated to viruses to humans.

And it may reduce the efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines.

The fur industry is a threat to human health and safety, as well as animal welfare. It's an industry in decline.

Ann Arbor houses only one retail establishment that sells new fur products.

Jackets made by Canada goose.

Unfortunately this brand has chosen to eliminate new fur announcing it will cease buying new fur and stop using it.

It comes as part of Canada goose's strategy to become more environmentally friendly and --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Thank you.

With this transition in effect, passing this ordinance will have no impact on Ann Arbor's retail community, the in addition to turn your back on the if you are u -- fur industry is an important step for Ann Arbor and I really look to your vote of support.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Tanya Hilgendorf.

>> Caller with the phone number ending in 518, press star six to unmute yourself.

Ms. Hilgendorf, press star six to unmute your phone.

Press star six to unmute your phone, please.

Ms. Hilgendorf, the phone number ending in 518.

Press star six to unmute your phone to speak.

Mayor, caller has not unmuted her phone.

>> Mayor Taylor: Ms. Hilgendorf, if you enter star six, your phone will be unmuted.

We will wait a moment and --

>> Heard?

>> Mayor Taylor: Now we can.

>> Hi.

Sorry about that.

I'm not sure what happened there.

Thank you so much for your patience.

This is Tanya Hilgendorf, the C.E.O. of -- thank you for considering the man on the sale of fur.

I want to express this to Councilmember Briggs and Hayner.

This sends an important message, and serves as a model of compassion and I hope it will be a step towards the city to adopting more consistent values and policies around respecting animal life, including our wild neighbors.

As we have known for decades, fur is not a necessity, but a luxury item or a fashion accessory.

To make it, takes about 100 million wild animals a year that currently live in cramped dirty cages and killed in horrible ways.

Others are trapped in the wild, through cruel leg hole traps still perfectly legal in Michigan where they writhe in pain in fear and true at their own body parts to get free before someone violently puts an end to their misery.

We know that stressful housing just like factory farming a source of disease.

We saw the COVID outbreaks on fur farms and the culling of millions of minks to prevent disease spread.

A compassionate public was outraged about that killing unaware that those poor animals were already living tortured lives and destined for death.

The fur industry is one of dozens of outdated industries that causes needless suffering whose time has passed.

We know through science, that animals are genetic cousins, which share the same central nervous system and hormones and just like us, they feel pain, experience a range of emotions and can solve complex problems.

Just as you see with your pets, they have personalities, likes and dislikes and family and friends.

Animals are not products, numbers or taxonomies.

They are individuals.

The scourge in the fur trade will help cruel exploitation for financial gain or entertainment and the mass extinction upon us, it's our obligation to find ways to allow animals to live in peace, free from human exploitation, encroachment and meaningless killing.

Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Andrea Wotan.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 374.

Caller 374, if you want to press star six.

Go ahead.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Super.

Thank you so much.

Good evening Mayor Taylor and members of the city council.

My name is Andrea Wotan and I'm a member of -- I'm a resident of Ann Arbor, and owner of Wotan Nutrition LLC, I'm a registered dietitian, nutritionist, specializing in whole foods plant-based nutrition.

I received my degree in nutritional sciences at the University of Michigan, school of public health.

I'm deeply invested in this community, and the values that we promote, embody and share.

Over the past year, as COVID-19 has changed our entire world, I have spent hours ruminating about life's big questions.

How do I want to show up in the world?

How do I want to treat others?

How can I take steps to make sure that our global community is safe and how can I live in a way that's kinder, healthier and full of integrity?

I'm asking you to support agenda item, c-4, which would ban the sale of new fur products in our city.

The fur industry is emblematic of the selfish, short-sighted mindset that our world needs less of.

Needlessly cruel, producing pain so profound that the videos of fur farms requires content warning, fur served human vanity at the expense of our environment -- of our environment, public health and the lives of wild animals who are killed by bludgeoned, electrocution, and writhing after being skinned

while still alive.

The fur industry has contributed to the spread of the global pandemic, and to the mutation of the SARS COVID 2 status.

It would make me proud if my community took a stand and declared that we will turn our backs on an industry that is polluting our global community, and that likely runs completely counter to the values of many if not most residents of Ann Arbor and beyond.

Thank you very much for your consideration and for your vote.

And I want to just send a special thanks to councilmembers Briggs and Hayner for bringing this proposal to the city council.

Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Our next speaker is Molly Kleinman.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Molly Kleinman.

>> Hello, councilmembers and Mr. Mayor, my name is Molly Kleinman and I live in ward 4.

Rather than relitigate the decision about Tom Crawford I would like to look ahead at the implications of his removal.

Ann Arbor will be looking for another city administrator, our third in two years.

In the summer of 2020, the city of Ann Arbor made declarations supporting antiracism, equity and inclusion and began flying a Black Lives Matter flag, however, as several instances have demonstrated over the past several months, racism and sexism are alive and well in the Ann Arbor city government.

To live up to the stated values, we need to prioritize this in the new city administrator and the city staff.

It's critical that the hiring process take an explicitly, antiracist and anti-oppressive approach.

When Ann Arbor hires the new city administrator, I ask you to do so in a transparent process to ensure that they have the knowledge and the skills to help the city achieve their goals.

There should be a demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and antiracism, a record of recruiting, hiring and leading diverse teams and a commitment to transparency, actability within the community.

It is also crucial that the hiring process meaningfully includes and consults with members of historically excluded communities, including black Indigenous and other residents of color and LGBTQ plus residents.

If we hope to live up to our stated values of inclusion, equity, and justice, we must have an inclusive equity and injustice focused hiring process for the next city administrator.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ralph McKee.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mr. McKee, caller with the phone number 556.

Go ahead.

>> I had this is Ralph McKee.

Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> I'm calling from the 5th ward about DC-2, the Tom Crawford matter.

I think that the process used in this matter was badly flawed, and so the outcome is problematic, whether it's the right outcome or not, the process needs to be better the next time.

I sent you a very lengthy and detailed email which I can barely scratch the surface of in three minutes.

I will try outline the main points so the public can hear one.

The investigation was incomplete.

The report was imprecise and there were no follow-up questions which could have cured those flaws and the agenda response memo prepared misrepresented both the actual policy and past practice.

Finally and maybe worse, there's very little guidance for the future.

Let's start with the investigation.

There were nine complaints brought by five people.

All but one or two were one-on-one conversations.

But Mr. Crawford denied making almost all the comments alleged so the first task of the investigators is to try to determine whom to believe.

Here are some examples of what she didn't do.

One of the comments was made at a meeting.

Did she ask the witness who else was at the meeting so she could ask those people if they heard Mr. Crawford say what was alleged?

No.

The witnesses said that Crawford has bad memory problems.

Did she ask anyone else at the city whether that was true?

No.

One or more of the witnesses said Crawford used the phrase regularly?

Did she ask anyone else at the city if that was accurate?

Did they ask to provide relevant emails and text?

No.

Did she ask any of them whether they have been disciplined or criticized by Crawford or reviewed personnel file to determine if maybe any of them had an ax to grind?

Apparently not.

These are basic questions.

Compare this to Sheldon Stark investigation of the Wilkerson Lazarus issue.

He reviewed hundreds of emails and text and asked probing questions and wrote a report.

That's helpful to complaining witnesses.

Not just to the defendant or the person accused because doing a thorough investigation removes the doubts.

Next, report is very imprecise.

Mr. Stark numbered the witnesses.

His report said witness one said x, and this report didn't.

So maybe one witness or maybe two made all the problematic allegations.

You can't tell.

Then when the report bandied about words like multiple, several, corroborates, et cetera, those words are meaningless.

There's almost no corroboration of these items in the traditional sense.

No confirming witnesses who heard the same comment, similar doesn't really count.

No supporting documents except one email that the report doesn't even quote.

So the conclusions drawn by the investigators are not well supported.

You failed to ask any follow-up questions and rejected any further investigation that could have answered these.

The agenda response now most strongly implies that there's a zero tolerance policy means automatic termination.

Those policies don't say that.

The investigator terms that one policy was violated the agenda memo contradicts that.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> That involves way more than this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jim Pyke.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 403, press star six to unmute yourself.

Jim Pyke, go ahead.

>> I assume you can hear me now?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Jim Pyke and I want to speak regarding DC-2, a motion to reconsider resolution to conclude Tom Crawford employment, which motion I hope you will reject.

My remarks will be heavily quoted and paraphrased from a statement recently published online by one of my 5th ward representatives.

I cannot say it better myself, but I have tried to edit down some points it makes that are especially important to me, and that I think bear repeating before council in this comment period.

Following the report of independent investigation into Tom Crawford's alleged behavior by human resources attorney Jen Sabator, the H.R.-related considerations and recommendations from a confidential memo were summarized and made public in a communication in which the H.R. director shared the following advice, quote, if the report substantiated discriminatory comments or conduct, I would be concerned about policy violations, harm to individuals by such discriminatory or derogatory comments, damage to the city, as an organization for example, if the areas of morale, staff retention and recruiting, and other related issues.

My general practice concerning substantiated discriminatory comments would be to recommend to terminate employment immediately, end of quote.

A member of council has suggested that this communication was coauthored by

our assistant city administrator and insinuated that he wanted Mr. Crawford's job. There have been claims made by some -- some made by current and former councilmembers that the desire to part ways with Mr. Crawford stems from other issues, those claims are baseless and amount to conspiracy theories that may erode trust in local government and discourage staff from bringing forward concerns of conduct.

I would like to add that just today, a resident of Ann Arbor has entered a FOIA request that appears designed to acquire information that could be used to dox or harass the member of city staff who bravely came forward to try to improve their workplace culture.

The city --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> The city administrator must fulfill the responsibilities and duties of the position, including having the ability to inspire confidence and model behavior that positively influences the behavior of others.

The report indicates that Mr. Crawford not only violated city policies and values but lacks a key competency necessary to succeed in this position.

Acting -- acknowledging this truth does not invalidate the good work that he has done for the organization over the many years of service over the city or the other strengths as a leader.

Rather it recognizes the difficulty and critically important role of the city administrator.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Trische Duckworth.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Ms. Duckworth.

>> Good evening.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Go ahead.

>> My time will be a little bit longer than three minutes and because of the racist nature of these council meets, I would like the opportunity as an opportunity to finish my statement which is 45 seconds over.

I will start my time now.

Good evening, council.

Tonight my heart is saddened for the need to even speak to you all about this pressing matter.

I was going to call in and talk about the points of the report but we all know what was said and done and how extremely racist it was.

Let me say this, Tom Crawford needs to be fired.

Without the option to resign, he's operated with the city's affairs from extremely racist and privileged demeanor.

Again, he needs to go.

And anyone else who thinks otherwise, I guess you are not standing on the right side of history.

And it looks like the only supporter of bringing this back was Kathy Griswold.

That's very sick to me, sad, disheartening.

Let me say this, Tom Crawford does not end the city's problem with racism.

Tom Crawford was put in this position because of racism.

Let me explain.

Each and every one of you on the council, with all due respect and some of you I have relationships with and I truly respect, come from a privileged, racist land but you are not even clear on it.

Before the social unrest, which one of you was proactively leading the way to promote racial equity.

I'll wait.

But there's no need it wait because I can definitively say with none of you, maybe you think like Crawford because he's told people in conversations that hey, look.

The population of friends is only -- African Americans is only 10%.

That doesn't warrant us doing things specifically for African Americans.

And I'm paraphrasing.

And that's what you think and the lack.

When we asked the mayor to do something about Hayner, and the despicable comments, and the mayor said the people voted for him.

I don't feel comfortable about removing him.

Then he wanted to be careful about getting people out of seats that were elected seats.

The funny thing is you move to protect someone that is operating at high levels of racism and homophobe, yet you don't want to protect those would are truly being harmed, us as black people, and those from your LGBTQIA community.

Shame on you all!

To allow this harm to be continued on your watch.

What you allow, what you accept, it becomes your legacy.

Taylor, you will forever in my opinion go down as the one who won't stand up and protect and value black lives.

I say this to you all in my close.

We don't need your lip service.

We need action.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> We need you all to be proactive about making Ann Arbor inclusive.

The fact that there's only -- less than 10% Black population speaks very loudly.

If that's how you want to be remembered, then so be it.

I recommend that you get on the right side of history, and you were a part of the problem, and not the solution.

The choice is yours.

I yield the rest of my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is John Smith.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I don't see -- oh, I do have him here.

Caller with the number ending in 231, please unmute yourself.

>> Hello?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 231, go ahead.

>> Hello?

Hello?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Yes.

This is John Smith, ward 1, to mayor and council, in regards to DC-2, I would like to start off with an observation through various councilmembers of the so-called people who ran out Tom Crawford, were Judas.

It was open season on Tom and any Judas who wants to be protected.

Councilmembers have failed to mention that one of the five complainers at least one was directly in line to replace Tom and it's possible that others could be promoted as well.

I fail to see where there are any heroes here.

There are more important lessons that A2 citizens need to understand.

The beneath comments how Mayor Taylor -- how this mayor believes there are separate rules for him and members of the inner circle and a different set of rules.

He was following state law recording Jen Eyer's domestic violence case.

And Mayor Taylor publicly rebuked him for that.

Another lesson is that Mayor Taylor has constructed a method to dispatch political rivals and people simply in his way.

Launch an investigation, quote/unquote.

Anybody targeted is unlikely to survive.

The saboteur investigation did not recommend removal but this council has chosen to reject that advice.

That means the members of the inner circle can be protected by not having an investigation.

Who needs due process to get way of things.

And finally, we have Eyer, who -- several female employees being sexually harassed by T. buckle.

And I would ask where the Ann Arbor LGBTQ community has been in reaching out to this person.

That would be a direct question to Sam Radina.

It demands immediate removal, and the council majority expects rest us to, but Sam Eyer is on the mayor's team and different rules apply.

Great precedent, right?

This town was lucky to have Tom Crawford as his city manager and he will be hard to replace.

Given the way this council majority has treated Tom, any high quality candidate would be a tool to take this job.

The only people would be people who are awarded for loyalty to Mayor Taylor. I'm done.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Patrick Zabawa.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 127, do you have a

comment?

Caller with phone number ending in 127, press star six to unmute your phone.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> All right.

Awesome.

Good evening, Mayor Taylor and Ann Arbor city council.

I'm honored to speak with you.

I'm Patrick Zabawa and I would like to speak to you as a ward 1 resident.

My support for Councilmember Disch and Councilmember Grand's resolution to allow for referendum on ranked choice voting.

I wrote the council and committed and ecomment.

So I will be brief.

As we saw in the recent ranked choice New York City primary election in June, and throughout academic studies ranked choice voting increases voter engagement as reflected in New York and the higher democratic turnout than the previous two, and the most diverse city council in the city's history.

I didn't mention this in my email but Lansing, Michigan, Lansing Michigan city council unanimously approved a referendum rank choice voting for the November election last month in July as well.

Rank choice voting here in Michigan has a movement behind it, with an education -- and educational legal and professional support team of the ranked my vote organization for which I'm a volunteer.

And that's it.

Thank you for your service and for your time.

I yield the rest of my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Are there communications from council?

Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: The things coming up in the community are.

There's a government alliance and race and equity, it's August 12th, 3:30 to 5.

We are part of that membership through the county and there's a webinar on a public health approach to public safety, examples from the field.

That's August 11th at 2 p.m. and the examples include Denver, San Francisco, and Olympia.

And relatedly, a friend wrote an article that was headlines for Politico last week. It was how liberal Michigan town is putting mental illness at the center of police reform.

So that was on Ann Arbor.

The family we profiled Anthony Hamilton and his mother Cynthia Harrison are ward 1 residents.

And I just hope that my colleagues would take the time to read that and be -- I think it's a good reflection of who we are as a community and how we failed some folks.

Quote that really struck me is he's a tall, black young man and instead of seeing

him as a kid who is struggling, people are afraid of him.
Once he became a black man with a record, that justified it.
That was from his mother.

I'm heartened to hear that I was able to connect the author with some folks in the religious community who are writing in and supporting Anthony this week.
So if folks are interested in taking or supporting that, then please reach out to me.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Good evening.

I just wanted to say thanks to the staff from DTE for putting together a meeting with myself and councilmembers who wanted to attend and the city administrator about the popular substation improvements that will be happening in the next two years to align with our carbon neutrality goals and to increase reliable electricity to parts first ward and third ward.

I'm sorry the fifth ward.

Ward 5 work will begin in 2022.

And ward one will begin later this year, I believe.

Where they will be reconstructing 30,000 feet of overhead wire, putting in 200 new poles.

It was a good opportunity for me to ask some questions regarding the impact on our natural features when DTE does their tree trimming.

We have been told that these new poles that will be installed will be designed to minimize the impact of natural features and increase our capacity to go more electric by threefold.

So it's \$20 million investment we got to talk about burying wires and the challenges with that and the fact that it costs 10 times as much to bury wires as overheads.

New developments do try to bury wires whereas the ones that exist before 1970, it becomes extremely expensive.

So it was a good hour to be with D.T.E. to learn about what they are doing to meet our future challenges with trying to go all electric.

So thank you to them and staff for putting that together, and look out for some major work in water hill next year and in northern parts of downtown this year.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I would like to read a statement.

Based on my experience as a senior manager in a fortune 100 company, and the knowledge I gained in a three-day corporate education class on employment law, I can not participate in what I believe is outside the bounds of employment law.

Regardless of how we feel, we must act within the law.

I cannot comment further due to confidentiality rules.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I would -- without actually taking it off the consent

agenda, want to draw attention to CA-1, which is on filling some sidewalk gap, two of which are in ward 4.

I mentioned in my newsletter this weekend that staff tells us that one of them might have to be put off until the next construction season.

So Stimson sidewalk app is on the schedule to get filled this season, and it may happen that boardwalk is taken care of next construction season.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communications from council?

I would like to recommendation appointment at the July 20 meeting to the city planning commission, Donnell Wyche.

Do we have a motion?

>> Councilmember Radina.

Seconds by Disch?

Discussion?

All in favor.

It passes.

Consent agenda.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would like to pull CA-8, and if I may comment on CA-3, the increase in waste service pickup.

And I think that's important and I also think it's important that we keep an eye on what's going on down there in the alleys.

I've had a couple of situations with downtown businesses, ward one businesses where they for some reason their stuff did not get picked up.

You can only imagine what it's like when trash gets stuffed and stuffed and stuffed in these bins.

It's just a bad situation in our alleys.

What I have going is businesses asking me, hey, what happened to the organics collection pilot?

What happened to the consideration over looking at what's up with this trash?

And so as --

>> Grading?

>> But I'm fully in support of CA-3.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

Since it's been touched on, I will touch on CA-3, because I have been working closely with the merchant associations on the issue of trash pickup and offering Sunday service.

This does -- there's some savings with the transfer station as a result of this change in Sunday pickup, but not as a result but as contracts are being reorganized earlier this year.

And anyhow, this right now, there needs to be hopefully proactive communications with our associations and our -- our acting city administrator to make sure that this program of having 20 dumpsters deployed is a success so we don't have any problems and we fail to seize an opportunity to correct a long

standing solid waste issue in our alleys and downtown.
Hopefully we can get this fully filled up with participants before the students return.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thanks.

I don't want to pull CA-2, but I wanted to comment on it really quickly.

This is not first time that recently we have been having relatively large bids on our contract -- contracts on our consent agenda that are sole bid and I was just hoping that at some point, staff may be able to provide us more context about some of the challenges or reasons that we are seeing those situations.

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

>> Councilmember Nelson: I -- sorry, I thought hi my hand up.

I would like to pull CA-6, please.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor just a note that CA-4 was removed from the agenda.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Further discussion of the consent agenda with the exception of CA-6, and CA-8?
All in favor the consent agenda with the exception of CA-6 and CA-8, please say aye.

Opposed?

The consent agenda the exception of 4, 6, and 8 is approved with 11 councilmembers present, all voting in the affirmative thus satisfying the eight vote requirement with respect to CA-1, CA-16, CA-17, CA-18.

CA-8, resolution to prove the fuller park parking lot land lease with the University of Michigan.

Moved by grant and seconded by Hayner.

Discussion of CA-8, Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I wasn't privy to this discussion at parks -- or at the P.A. C. meeting.

So I'm not sure what went on there exactly.

You know, this happens every year, since I have been on council, we consider renewing this lease.

While this lease is second or third time.

So, you know, with he have a de facto situation here.

They have been leasing this at the end of this next renewal, first renewal, it will have been 30 years we have been leasing this park/parking lot to the university, and while the funds are needed in these troubling times, it's -- the most troubling thing about this is the extension of a -- of making it four one-year additional terms and that's been one in the past, it's been two in the past and now we are going up to four as a discretionary lease and I'm not so sure that our public lands should be under consideration nor that length of time.

I -- I would like to hear what -- you know what the logic was behind making it four additional one-year term by administrative discretion versus bringing it back to council.

It is a situation where it is public land.

It is park land, despite the parking lot that exists on it.

I think annual consideration is not -- should not be out of bounds for this body. That's the first thing I would like to say about it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Every time I get called on thank you, my screen moves.

Following on what Councilmember Hayner has talked about, this is something that we see every year.

We have yet to really put to go a long-term plan for this -- for this land.

And I think with everything that's going on right now, our organization is what I believe in a tail spin.

I propose the resolution that I just sent to Ms. Beaudry, that we would -- the last resolve clause would be changed so that the city administrator would be authorized to execute two one-year administrative renewals rather than four one-year administrative renewal.

We need a shorter leash on this.

We need to come back when the dust settles and hopefully this organization stabilizes, if ever, to get -- to get a handle on this situation and then what we will be doing with that parkland.

And, again, I think it's best to come back and review this within two years.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Briggs.

Discussion?

Is this friendly to the body?

On the amendment?

I'm going to pull --

>> Councilmember Grand: I would like to speak to it, if that's okay.

>> Mayor Taylor: Sure.

I will take off Briggs, Hayner and grand and then move on to the amendment.

Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

The idea that this has anything to do with stability is -- it just doesn't make sense.

If you look at how much stability we have in the parks department we have a manager who is retiring after I along service to our city, who has long standing relationships with the university in terms of this agreement.

This agreement was only brought forward to council every year.

We had certain members of council decided it was important for reasons unbeknownst to me that we need to discuss it every year.

This is very simple.

It's a parking lot that's used for parks parking and we can get really essential revenue for our parks department, by leasing it to the university when it's not being used for parks purposes.

This is a mutually beneficial agreement.

It's longstanding.

There was actually no discussion of this or very little at the park advisory commission, because there's a lot of stability on that commission and they are all in agreement that this is what is best for the parks department.

I will be voting in favor of this amendment.

It saved certain facilities at some points when things haven't been table.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: I would just add that -- to speak to the amendment directly, if we want to change the final resolve clause, we also have to change the one, two -- the seventh whereas clause that says with an option to administratively renew the lease for four additional one-year terms.

That would -- I'm not sure how that would jive with the second resolve clause if we want to say -- if we want to say two-year terms.

I just -- I don't think it's a big hassle to look at this every year and we don't know the dynamic in the city, what has changed and what is going on in the city.

This all crawled up out of the reauthorizing the uses of parkland you may recall to clear the way for a train station on this site.

And so, you know, that's -- that's where these uses came from.

I know it has been out there 28 years and they have been parking longer than the train station has been a notion.

When we made that change, to allow transportation uses in parks, it really sort of codified this parking lot.

And, you know, I just -- I will support this, this amendment but I'm not sure how it jives with the whereas clause.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I appreciate the staff's response and appreciate that we are finding a way to get a little extra revenue from this land, but one of the pieces that I was hoping Mr. Delacourt could just provide a little bit more feedback on, it looks like the cost per space for this -- for this -- for these lots is \$287.66 versus the Riverside park, is \$761 per space.

Less spaces but given the proximity to the university and the value of the land to the university, in terms of parking why is there such a discrepancy in those spaces and just a little more context in that.

>> Yes, this is a question we get asked every year when we bring this back.

Those spaces are 24/7, 365.

These are shared spaces with the city that the price per space is pro rated based on the amount of time that the university uses them, versus the amount of time that we do and based off the original price and that 3% escalator per year.

So there's a different amount in usage and different amount in starting value for the spaces as well.

So it's a combination of both.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Are there -- that's all for me for questions.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

You know, I do believe that this does belong still in council's purview.

There's a lot of policy issues that are intertwined with this lease on whether it's our parks or our environmental sustainability goals.

Mobility and transportation, there are a lots of intertwined policies that go in on these type of issues it should not be solely to the discretion of the administrator which is completely in flux at this point.

I think it's prudent to come back in a couple of years when the dust settles to better understand what our A2Zero needs and goals are and what our parks situation is.

We are looking at a system that's falling apart with its infrastructure.

And quite frankly, I think Councilmember Briggs alluded to it a little bit, the University of Michigan, even though this is a shared space, I believe, you know, makes a little money of this, you know, between what they charge and what they pay us.

So it becomes, you know -- you know, a little bit of a generator for them as well.

Yes, we are getting some money, but everybody is making money on this deal.

So I think it's important that we look at this again.

I'm disappointed because the last times that this was brought up, we talked about possibly incorporating like E.V. charging stations into these parking spaces.

I don't see anything to help us further advance our goals on A2Zero with this and I would like to see it come back with some things that actually address A2Zero.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: I just want to address Councilmember Ramlawi's remarks about making money off of this.

And a few years ago the parks readjusted the -- the fees that we pay to the university so that it would be -- because there was concern that they went from a yellow pass to a blue pass to an orange pass to a blue pass and so it was adjusted so that the fees went up pretty dramatically in terms of our reimbursement for university.

So Mr. Delacourt can, of course -- it looked like he wanted to jump in and say the same thing but that's just false.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Delacourt?

>> Yes, just a couple of things.

I have dealt with this for four or five years.

As we said before, the park system has come to rely on these parking spaces.

Whether u of m pays them for us or not, we need them to run the operations both at fuller an the special events that take care in that area.

The P.A.C. and the parks department, which u of m rents these spaces from us or not, recommends that they stay parking and not be utilized for anything else in the foreseeable future.

Two, the difference in space price is also based on the fact that Kellogg is a gold permit and these are blue and yellow permits.

One the questions we had in the past is how to change the -- the cost per permit if u of m arbitrarily changes the permit level in the lot.

We built into this lease the ability to raise the rate percentage-wise proportional to any increased charge u of m places on those parking spots and in the invert, we obviously have agreed to decrease what we charge proportionally as well. We have taken care of that adjustment within the spaces.

The revenue we generate off of these parking spaces now, seeing that it is our recommendation, you know, obviously that council could disagree that it should stay parking that should stay parking is extraordinarily important for all the reasons that I think Councilmember Ramlawi and others have stated.

We do I have a revenue issue.

We would like our partners in u of m to be able to depend on these spaces for quite sometime, hence the reason we are constantly looking for the extended lease.

So as u of m doesn't look to move their parking some place else, thus taking away our ability to generate that revenue for the park system.

I understand the lack of a desire to extend this over the year, but I have been here five years now and there's been little to no change in the actual substantive lease agreement but every year there's a question from u of m whether it will be renewed or not and for us in the park system, there's always a question if not renewed.

How are we going to replace that revenue?

In this day and age, where revenue is difficult to come by, we need the parking regardless of whether u of m pays for it or not.

And in a revenue deficient time, the longer we can extend this and more we can rely on u of m and that partnership, it's appreciated by the park system that we can do that.

Also there's outs every year for the city and the u of m to get out under criteria, all of which are critical if the council wants out of it.

I just thought I would put that out there as the substantive changes or the reasons we are looking for the four-year administrative renewals as opposed to less.

I will get off my soapbox now.

>> Mayor Taylor: For my part, I will step in and just observe that council could at any time in the four -- with respect to the four one-year renewals pass a resolution instructing the city administrator to not renew.

So this is not handing over the reins to the administrator, this is allowing the defaults to be -- to continue going forward but council always has the ability as Mr. Delacourt indicated to walk this back if it chooses.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, previously we talked about having E.V. chargers I believe on at least one of these parking structures and I'm wondering if there's any ongoing discussion about that or anything that relates to our sustainability initiatives.

I have an electric vehicle and one of the things I have noticed in many places there's for-profit chargers such as charge point, and so we not be paying for the electricity, but we would be providing a service to our community members.

And I'm wondering if that's a possibility, not connected with this contract, but moving forward.

>> I certainly think it's a possible.

Parks is in constant conversation with O.S.I., and Dr. Stults about where and how to charge these.

Whether the portion that are leased or fuller's improved lots are able and the infrastructure is there to handle the electric charging stations, I can assure those conversations either are or will be taking place.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thanks.

I serve on the environmental commission so I will add that to a future meeting agenda and O.S.I. as representative of the commission.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment.

Roll call vote starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion as amended.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved with 11 councilmembers present, and voting in the affirmative, thus satisfying the eight vote requirement.

CA-6, resolution to approve street closings for the 2020 taste of Ann Arbor special event, Sunday, September 19th, 2021, moved by Nelson and seconded.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I asked a few questions on the agenda about this.

I asked about which city specific areas were collaborating on this event, and every part of the answer was about county departments and so I guess I want to ask that question again, and I'm wondering if there's any city departments who are going to be overseeing the strategies around planning this.

>> Are you speaking for like police or --

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yeah, how the safety -- I mean, I will say straight out that my concerns are around the pandemic, and the fact that this event is presumably going to encourage people to have masks off and be eating.

I asked a question about whether or not there would be a designated area for eating, and if there would be any room for, like, potentially putting people with

masks off in a certain place versus wandering around with masks off eating. This is what I'm imagining as I think about this event happening.

>> Right.

There are no plans right now to have any separate areas for such because it is an outdoor event.

There's no current restrictions now, so it's pretty much going to be similar to like the outdoor restaurant closures that we have going now.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Okay.

So I guess -- I guess my question, based on the answers that I got, if -- are we looking to the county and we will be following guidance from the county?

There's not room for our community to make a different choice, just based on what's happening?

I mean this is going to be in the middle of September.

So university students will be back in town.

Our kids are supposed to be going back to AAPS live.

Is there any intersection for the city at that point, like in the middle of September to look around at the circumstances and say maybe this is not a good anymore or is it the county?

>> Are not duration of the pandemic, we sought -- we worked very closely with the county.

And then guided by their recommendations.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Are we still under a state of emergency locally that we would be empowered to make a different decision?

>> Mayor Taylor: I don't know the answer to that.

When you say make a -- make a difference decision?

>> Councilmember Nelson: Reverse the decision I mean to say.

I apologize for not being clear.

This is -- so this is a month and a half away, what, seven weeks away.

I'm -- and if we commit to doing this, and circumstances changed drastically in seven weeks at an unmasked event, attracting all ages to be walking up and down the streets eating, it seems like I wonder if approving it now we lose the power to reverse course and say that wasn't a good idea.

That's my question.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there someone on staff would can address this?

>> Mr. Delacourt, could you respond to that?

>> Yeah, I will -- I will do my best.

To try to understand the question.

We don't have a health department at the city.

So we have deferred to the county's health department and the CDC and the other regulatory agencies on best practice throughout the pandemic for almost everything we have done.

I'm sure there are minor exceptions.

When it comes to this, if the county or the state changes its guidance.

I don't think we have anyone from the county here today, I'm looking around, that guidance would prevail for event regardless of what the city does on a permit

issuance basis today.

It is their guidance that is enforceable, if you are asking if we have the ability to revoke this without a change in guidance from the county --

>> Councilmember Nelson: That's what I'm asking.

>> I don't know the answer to that.

I would defer to the city attorney if council can revoke the permit based on a change?

Circumstance.

>> City Atty. Postema: Yeah, I would -- I will have to provide additional advice on that.

I believe that we can.

You know, under health, safety and welfare, and so but I can provide more specific advice on that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Just as a restaurateur, I will say that we are all licensed by the county health department.

And we are subject to multiple inspections a year, more so even under COVID.

If things get ugly quick, and unfortunately, things are not trending in the right direction, I believe that -- and Sandra is on the line with her hand up, that the participants in this matter would fully comply with the county health department's orders and shut things down, but I will just assume that based on what we have done and what we have all had done throughout this pandemic is to comply with state and county dictates.

>> Yes, I will follow what Ali said.

Absolutely health and safety is number one.

We are working closely with the health department.

If things change, you know, the health and the safety is more important than anything, but as of right now, their guidance, you know, we're working together with different things like, being 15 to 20 feet apart for the booths and signage and vaccination.

We are working with them daily in the next week or two to make sure that we are doing the right thing and that's the best we can do.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Thank you.

I appreciate your patience with me.

I know I'm badgering this.

Is there any consequence for us to postpone this until the next meeting?

I actually would like clarification from Mr. Postema about if our community feels strongly about this event being a bad idea, whether or not the county provides guidance.

And I do appreciate that the vendors and will -- will reverse -- turn on a dime to comply with the county.

I'm curious about our own autonomy to make decisions around this event.

>> City Atty. Postema: I believe we can revoke it and I will provide an update on

that.

If not, you can bring it back.

You can bring it back on reconsideration at the next meeting.

So --

>> Councilmember Nelson: Okay.

All right.

That's fair enough.

Never mind.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I --

>> I was going to on the timing, it's close and I think it's decided -- I'm looking at Ms. Williams here.

I believe if it were pushed one meeting would the farthest back it could be pushed and still make the necessary time frames.

So if that's council's advice.

>> If we don't do it September 7th, the next meeting is not until the 20th.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I would like postpone it to the next meeting.

I would like to do that if it doesn't make a difference.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

I don't see a second.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner, are you seconding?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yeah, if only to speak to.

>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion on postponement.

I think people understand where they are on this.

Councilmember Song on the postponement.

>> Councilmember Song: Sandra, can you tell us what the impact would be to participants and planning?

If we postpone it.

>> Yes, August 16th is a really hard -- I mean, I would hope that there would be trust that we are working with the health department and we will do what's best, but not knowing if the city council is going to do -- like, it's just -- it's a little frustrating.

There's a lot that goes into it.

We partner with the Michigan theater bank of Ann Arbor.

There's a lot of volunteers.

There's advertising that I submit.

I'm ordering banners next week.

That's not to say that, like, we absolutely -- if guidelines change we wouldn't cancel it.

I just -- I guess the guidance, where it's coming from gets confusing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, I understand the concerns about postponement.

I wanted to give myself an opportunity to speak here.

I mean, I think it -- I mean -- as a body, we could have used some kind of overall guidance on this public health issue, right that we could have been acting with for

the last year or so, you know, year.

You know, something to understand what's going on here without us all doing our own research on it.

And so because we can always come back at any time, especially in the health department reaches out to us and says, this doesn't seem like a good idea, just like the -- oh, what was it called?

The -- you know, the thing back -- back in the spring -- the -- the little outdoor party we were going to have on main street that vacillated on and then it ended up being canceled because of health considerations.

If we can come back at any time and say no way because the health department says not a good idea folks, let's not do it.

I'm fine with doing that.

I don't know what the mechanism is for us to do that or withdraw this or if it would be withdrawn voluntarily by the participants or the health department to say shut it down.

And supersede whatever council said as far as street closings.

I'm happy with that.

I mean, I don't think that we need to postpone to withhold our right to say this is a bad idea, we are going to pull it and I'm sorry that, you know, if it costs these merchants, then we lose some signage and stuff.

So I mean, I don't -- I'm not going to support this postponement, even though I seconded it because I'm comfortable with the fact that we can come back at any time and say, nope, this just is not a good public safety and a health idea.

That's all.

>> City Atty. Postema: And just to confirm, it's our permit and we can revoke it under, health, safety and welfare.

I wanted to get confirmation and I was trying to get that quickly, but I -- I certainly if there's any change on that, you can -- you can certainly bring it back and reconsideration and stop it.

I think at any time you may be able to do this.

So --

>> Mayor Taylor: I suggest we are going to vote on postponement.

I have Ramlawi and Griswold on the queue.

Do you want to say anything about the postponement.

Councilmember Ramlawi, are we good?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would --

>> Mayor Taylor: Your hand is up and you are muted, councilmember.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I would like to speak on the matter.

I have a vested interest in this in many ways.

I believe that will we have a lot going on right now in the community.

You know, sonic lunch is going to start happening this week.

U of m football games are coming back.

It is good to have this conversation to put folks on notice that we are looking at, you know, dangerous conditions possibly returning.

So it's good to have this conversation, but I won't support the postponement.

We all know we have the right to change course at any time.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the postponement.
Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: No.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: The motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Discussion of the main motion.

>> Councilmember Griswold: A reconsideration of two weeks from now is a possibility.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

C-6 is approved.

We now come to a public hearing.

The public hearing is an opportunity for members of public to speak about a specific matter on the agenda.

Speakers to speak at public hearings need not have signed up in advance, but your speech must relate to the subject matter of the public hearing.

To speak at a public hearing, 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.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Did we take a roll call on all the ones that required eight votes or not will.

>> Mayor Taylor: I believe that we did.

Ms. Beaudry, do you concur?

>> Clerk Beaudry: We took a voice vote but you declared it was a unanimous vote that satisfied the eight vote requirement, if that's your question.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I wanted to make sure that we did things right with the eight vote requirements.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

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

Once you have connected further 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.

When it is your turn to speak, you will 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 and when your time is expired.

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

Public hearing number one.

An Ordinance to Amend Section 8:530 of Chapter 105 (Housing: Lease Agreements and Entry to Show Residential Premises) of Title VIII (Building Regulations) of the Ann Arbor City Code.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 632, do you have a comment?

Caller 632, go ahead.

>> Hey there.

My name is Amir.

I'm a ward 1 resident.

It's great that we finally arrived at the second meeting and -- the terrible rental cycle in Ann Arbor?

It's long overdue.

I will address the amendments that I understand that Ramlawi will be proposing. I believe strongly that this is a misguided ordinance that will create a loop hold that pernicious landlords.

An older version of A.L.O. had this type of waiver system and it doesn't work then.

This body voted to get the system because it was being abused to the detriment of renters.

We don't think that landlords will exploit this.

You may have heard that the protests are going on in Washington, D.C., asking for the critical pandemic eviction moratorium to be extended.

The eviction moratorium is necessary because pandemic evictions have been linked with increased COVID mortality rates.

Ann Arbor landlords have been doing their best to exploit land holds in the eviction moratoriums to put people out on the streets in the middle of the pandemic.

If landlords are getting around the federal eviction moratorium, putting our community at risk to make a quick buck, you better believe that they will exploit any loopholes this council creates in the ordinance.

I also want to comment on the public hearing two weeks ago on this topic.

This public hearing was the tale of two cities.

We heard land lords describe a rental paradise in Ann Arbor, with abundant

housing and responsive landlords making repairs.

We heard tenants describe the rental market that is worse than many major cities.

I hope it's clear that there's a crisis in this city.

Renters are being crushed under the boot heel of tyrannical landlords and city council has barely taken notice.

We heard lies and threats by landlords last week.

The renters in this town are too accustomed to being threatened by landlords.

The early leasing ordinance is a very modest reform, and yet land lords are acting like the sky is falling.

Less than one hour away in Ontario, they hardly live in a paradise.

They have rights, they have two months notice, automatic transition from month to month, and a ban on --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> We need all of these things in Ann Arbor.

I understand that Michigan is not Ontario, and that the state restricts what the city can do to protect to renters.

This should tell us that landlords will be just fine if they come into effect in Ann Arbor.

We cannot accept a spurious claims that their businesses will fail tenants are given rights if they cannot treat their tenants with basic respect, if they cannot abide by laws to protect tenants then they are in the wrong business.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> The majority of this town's residents are crying out for help.

Will you listen?

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 667, do you have a comment?

Caller 667, press start six to unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

>> Hi, good evening.

I hope you can hear me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Great.

I will introduce myself with my first name, but I will share that I work for the University of Michigan.

And I have lived in Ann Arbor for about ten months now.

I am strongly in favor expanding the renewing our leases far beyond 70 days and also feel that it's problematic to have some people waive the right to, you know, wait until 210s which is the proposed and much more favorable amendment.

I will stick to my own personal account here.

I received -- the city standard, I moved here October 29th, that I should renew -- sign up on my renewal on November 5th, otherwise someone else might sign a lease for my apartment and I will no longer have access to it, once my lease

lapses.

Now that -- to me effectively, that's 25, 26 days.

It's not even 70 days.

A great deal of information, you know, the property management company, when I was signing my lease that this would come up.

In any case, I could have, you know, go on ahead and signed it and hoped for the best, but the -- the problem is that I don't make enough money to have the resources to have the security deposit.

I -- in fact, my visa was unclear until March 30th.

So to actively start looking, this time -- and this is where I'm on the other side but I'm looking for housing and everything is gone potentially because others have been forced to sign -- renew their leases already.

What I'm left with for April and May is a bunch of underwhelming options and unaffordable.

I'm dependent on public transport.

It's not just a housing.

It's also public transport and access to other services, such as -- also healthcare and supermarkets for nutrition.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

So I would say that people who are not, you know, citizens of the United States, who have so much uncertainty.

And, yeah.

Please do not make this optional for tenants because so many of us don't even -- we miss out on the finer details Tau mention -- that you mentioned.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 256, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

>> Good evening, city council.

My name is Mike Zanto, I'm a 2016 graduate from the University of Michigan, a leasing agent, a three-year property own and landlord and taxpayer to the city.

I'm mostly against this proposal, because it hurts more people than it will help.

I worry about the economic impact of the proposal if it is passed.

I have a mortgage, student loans and a job that I heavily rely on to pay my bills and property taxes.

My employer will be furloughing me in September, and rehire me in if -- March if this proposal passes.

I'm against the proposed amendments because I will lose a substantial part of my income.

Others in our community will too.

If this proposal passes, I am excited for the influx of tenant inquiries on both the property I own and the properties I lease out day-to-day, and my job.

The majority of which traditionally rents to students.

The graduate students will now add to the pool of renters looking to lease for the next year, making a much more competitive market that will help to increase rents for landlords.

This will help to support my case my rental increase to the current and potential tenants.

Approval tonight will effectively accelerate market decisions in a 30-day window from to April, a month renting chaos before most leave for the summer: Increase rental rates.

I worry that this proposal focuses on student renters and completely ignores the needs and effect on nonstudent renters.

As a leasing agent I have the pleasure of helping individuals and families relocate here.

Many of these individuals and families are in properties far less than 150 days before a lease begins.

I will especially feel for the families who will not solidify their children's plans in schooling before relocating.

This is the single most important item that families tell me.

Unfortunately, I will not be answering the phone for four months and have to help them secure housing in a compromised time period.

It will hurt more people than it will help.

I ask for clarification on Section 1 item b and notification of tenants and tenants notifying landlords.

Current --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

--

>> Written and/or hand delivered.

I would like to have electronic requirement.

Let's reduce paper waste and greenhouse gases and allow for electronic communications to suffice for both.

I look forward to your decision.

It will help to increase represents and the AI view of properties -- and the value of properties.

The inevitable pushback from both nonstudent renters and renters that ensue if this passes will be a stark reminder that the market dictates market activity, not a small group of the outset individuals.

Thank you.

See you next year.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 379.

>> I'm from the tenants union and I'm from ward 5, so I would like to reiterate some of the points I had made last week, but I won't take long for that.

Once again, I would like to remind you that when the students are in a frenzy with others.

This if amendment happens, I think it's naive that that would not become the standard.

Obviously as you can tell from all the comments, all the property owners Ann Arbor have a vested interest in not only this not passing, but various amendments so they can leave it for 70 days to completely work around the ordinance.

So if you think that there's not going to be a coordinated effort to make it waiving the 210 day limit, if that doesn't become the standard, that's a bit of a silly assumption here.

And so once again, they are going to be forced into the same exact situation. I would like -- I agree that, you know, we have been focusing on student renters. That's a fair point.

I know a lot of people who are not student renters.

They are just regular people would live in Ann Arbor and they similarly hate the fact that they have to make the decision to, when I mention the 210-day ordinance, they are like, thank God!

In my experience here in Ann Arbor for the past several years, the land -- and the tenants union, talking to people who are renters in Ann Arbor, it's very clear that for the most part being landlords don't really have the interest of the community -- the best interest in mind.

Properties, the buildings that make up this town are a source of income and as you can see from, you know, the evictions that are happening during the pandemic, the pike of evictions -- spike of evictions now that moratorium has ended and the flooding, that's something that the tenants have been dealing. With the landlords are not taking care of that.

Landlords don't provide housing.

They just make sure that more people don't have it.

If they provide housing.

There are a lot of empty places in Ann Arbor and still a lot of people who don't have a place to call their own.

Because they can't afford it or simply afford it more accurately because the property managers decided it's not profitable for them to have a place of their own.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

So we are debating whether or not we should be, you know, letting landlords have this exploit completely take advantage of the people of Ann Arbor.

I would just like to remind the city council that the hard working people of Ann Arbor calling in are not demanding that we get our way.

We are asking you to protect us.

And so, please, please ask that you listen to us.

And take care of the people whose community -- make up the community that you represent.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 158, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Excellent.

My name is Rachel, and my husband is getting his post-Doc at u of m and that's what has brought us to Ann Arbor and the Ann Arbor area.

When we were moving here, it was difficult to find a property, not only because of the pandemic, but because we have been told by a friend who is a leasing agent that all the properties are snapped up already, and it's really difficult to find something if you are not going months and months in advance.

I think this is in large part due to the early leasing ordinance, and the 70 days.

I'm very glad to hear that this is going to be amended to 210 days.

Coming from a city like Chicago, I was completely shocked to hear and see that people are expected to resign their lease after 70 days.

It doesn't give anyone a chance to really get in and get settled into their apartment, especially if they are a student coming and feeding to unpack.

It just happens very rapidly.

And so people are being trapped into leases that they might not have resigned if they had a little bit more time to get used to the apartment.

So I'm very glad to see, again, that this is being brought out to about 210 days.

But this proposed amendment is going to really weaken renters' rights because they might not know what they are signing.

If they are a student coming in, being asked to sign this and maybe a landlord is offering them a discount or free cleanings or some type of incentive, they might not know what they are signing away.

They might end up in a situation where they are giving up their rights without understanding the implications.

This is not something I have come across in other cities that I have lived in.

If enough tenants are incentivized to waive this right of waiting until 210 days have passed, then that whole community of tenants is going to be negatively impacted as a result.

If enough people in one building, you know, waive that right, then the one person would doesn't, the landlord might single that person out and try to penalize them.

When this existing version was negotiated last time, this same loophole was struck down, because they thought that landlords would be abusing this loophole and I think that the same thing will happen again.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> So I'm in strong opposition of creating this loophole and I hope that you will listen to the renters that are calling in, because 55% of Ann Arbor citizens are renters.

And so those are the people who vote for you and elect you and we are calling in to ask you to protect us.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Go ahead.

>> Hi, everyone, my name is amber McCoy.

I'm a graduate student at the University of Michigan.

I have been a renter in Ann Arbor for the last six years, both as a student and as a nonstudent.

And I also just want to note that I moved to Ann Arbor in 2015, with a plan to stay for two years.

The length of my master's program.

And I have already said that I ended up staying for six and I will be here for at least another four.

So that's ten years total for those keeping track.

I say that because especially in the context of housing issues we tend to think of Ann Arbor as a transient town and students as temporary residents.

Both of these are true but if we consider student and short-term residents as potentially long-term residents or vital parts our community no matter their length of stay, I think we will foster a better community for everyone.

When I was asked to renew my lease in the fall of 2016, I didn't know what any future held and I didn't know that it would be in Ann Arbor, but in the summer of 2017, I ended up getting a job in town and I had an incredibly difficult time finding a place to live and I ultimately it to take over a lease as a sublet for the next entire year that was well above my price range.

The people I was subletting it from had to renew their lease way far in advance and had to move.

So I had to take it over.

The -- case, and for many people who just move and stay outside of the August to August cycle, these proposed early leasing terms that would move it from 70 to 210 days are not even long enough.

I wish we were here tonight discussing a scenario where they only this to their landlords 30 days notice, something that many cities across the world have.

It also means that a loophole to let graduating students or other tenants be an exception from the 200 days ordinance, it wouldn't necessarily be helpful as it seems on the surface.

I want to end with a simple statistic.

Over 60% of the people that did the G.E.O. caucus survey, they felt pressure to renew their lease.

Over 90% undergraduate students.

Let that sink in.

The changes on the table would be a significant step to shift power and balance away from landlords towards renters making the city a more equitable place to live.

I will want to add to the landlords listening that if your entire income is based on people's basic need to have a roof over their head and this ordinance that does not impact a tenant paying rent every single month means you can't pay your mortgage on time, you should get a new job.

Thanks again for Councilmember Nelson and Councilmember Radina for taking this on and working on this for now over eight months.

I look forward to hopefully seeing this finally pass tonight.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 137, do you have a comment?

Caller 137, press star 6 to unmute yourself.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> My name is August.

And I received my Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Michigan last year.

I came to u of m as an.

International graduate student in 2013 and never in my life before have I ever had no secure housing as early as in Ann Arbor.

My living situation in my first year was horrible.

I had to agree to live with three complete strangers in a ridiculously expensive Kerrytown apartment simply because there was nothing for me to choose from, because I ended in the end of summer.

Later I secured a nicer and more affordable place and I lived there throughout most of my grad school experience, however, towards the end of grad school, I lost my apartment due to being pressured to try to lease as early as December, even though I live in the same apartment for five years.

Most awards and scholarships at u of m for grad students are not decided until mid-March or so, and also, most academic job offers are not finalized until after March.

This meant that for almost two years, towards the end of my Ph.D., I was in the gray zone between securing funding and finishing my dissertation or finding a job elsewhere.

For two years in a row, I didn't know until March if I would be living in Ann Arbor or somewhere else, or if I had the funds to afford living in Ann Arbor if I'm still in my program.

It was extremely stressful to try to make sure that I would have a place to live, when they were so many other unknowns in my life.

I think amending the early lease ordinance is helping tenants have more control over their living situations, however, we all know that it is not enough.

When I lost my apartment in Ann Arbor, I had to move to Ypsilanti for the last two years of my Ph.D. because I could not afford living in Ann Arbor anymore.

There are slum lords are sucking blood because of how ignored tenant and housing rights are in Michigan.

I will say I'm in support of amending the early lease amendment.

We need more ongoing support for tenants rights and affordable housing in the area.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 371.

Caller 371.

Go ahead.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Hi.

My name is Scott and I'm a Ph.D. student and I live in ward 3.

I just wanted to voice my support for the early lease ordinance.

I think at this point, it's pretty much clear that the 210 days is what most renters want.

It's quite laughable that many landlords are coming here claiming to represent our interest.

For example, earlier, the landlords have --

[Inaudible]

All of whom support the early ordinance, the proposed amendment for it.

Not to mention, I think around 200 people who signed one of the early editions were not -- I think it's just really false of these students.

But right now, I want to focus on the potential loophole I heard Councilmember Ramlawi would propose.

As Amir earlier mentioned this was actually part of the early leasing ordinance in 2007 or 2008, and they unanimously voted to remove this clause as it was being removed.

It's baffling to me why anyone would bring this back on the table and set renter rights back for at least 15 years.

It's nothing that renters have done that even remotely that this amendment is something that you would welcome.

And we were not just something that would make everybody happy.

We are clearly thinking this -- this might take away our rights and make our lives harder so that the landlords can continue to have their way in the city.

You know, the landlords might offer us good incentives if we waive our rights.

We are talking about landlords, the same folks who increased our rents in the middle of a pandemic.

They are focused on waiving our rights.

>> Landlords and the pandemic has made obvious to us that landlords are ruthless and merciless.

I don't want this loophole in the amendment.

Shame on Ramlawi for even continuing to support this.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And after a time when we renters were getting extremely anxious due to the eviction moratorium.

I strongly urge you to vote against the amendment as -- the loan hole as it's proposed -- the loophole as proposed.

And we reconcile the differences between landlords and vendors.

It's merely to -- you know the G.E.O. proposed amendment.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Caller 468, do you have a comment?

>> Hey, can hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 468, press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 468, do you have a comment?

Caller 468, you need to press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 479, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 179, do you have a comment?

Caller 604, do you have a comment?

Caller 604, go ahead.

>> Hi, everybody.

This is Eric Lipson, on Rosewood Street.

I would like to say, first of all, I'm neither a landlord, nor a tenant.

However, when my first legal job as I said was working at the University of Michigan student services.

So I have seen a lot of landlord tenant situations although this was a long time ago.

It's not a surprise to anybody that in Ann Arbor, the housing situation, the rental housing situation in particular is an extremely uneven playing field.

Tenants, students, mostly, from out of town, are at a great disadvantage over the long entrenched real estate interests in this town and that's not to say that there is anything evil about it.

It's just the way it is.

It's a power imbalance.

I applaud the council for attempting to work on this.

Tenants speaking on their experiences.

It is extremely disruptive to make a decision in a premature fashion.

No one wants to do that, yet tenants do that over and over.

This is not just a tenants rights issue.

It's a human rights issue.

So I applaud you for doing that.

I think that making the starting law as strong as possible is a great idea.

It may need to be tweaked.

You may undoubtedly find unintended consequences.

I'm not sure that some of the right to renew sections or the right to renew section is actually constitutional or will pass legal muster.

I still say you have to take some action to try to even this playing field up.

I thank you for doing that and I encourage the council to vote on this -- in favor of the -- this law.

Or this ordinance.

Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with 179.

>> This is Kara Turnger.

I live on prospect street in Ann Arbor.

I loved start a grad program and now I live there and work full-time for the U.S. forest service.

My partner is a doctor at Michigan medicine, and the early leasing ordinance was really kind of a problem for both of us.

You know, somebody spoke earlier in this meeting about people who are moving to Ann Arbor were not connected with the university.

The problem with -- it's not really due to the early leasing.

It's because the entire rental market is tied to the academic calendar if you are like someone like myself or some others are students and it makes no sense for someone would is not in the academic system, such as my partner who is the doctor at Michigan medicine.

So you know, the earlier comments this early leasing ordinance for causing problems for people joining our community who are unaffiliated with the university and not students.

Really didn't make a ton of sense because what doesn't make a ton of sense is the majority of the housing market being swallowed up by leases that artificially start at a certain date, not because that's the date that works best for the renter, but because that is what the early leasing ordinance has decided is going to be the earliest start date for these leases.

So I think actually the problem for people who are moving to this community from elsewhere, for reasons other than being a student, is not the early leasing ordinance itself but, again the fact that the entire housing market is tied to the University of Michigan's academic calendar.

So I want to be very clear about that.

I also want to echo, I think ember's comments about how if your business model is so fragile, that a shift of, you know, 100 something days in the leasing time frame, you need to reconsider how you are operating that business.

It doesn't sound like a resilient or well-run business to me.

And finally, I wanted to make sure that I express opposition to the pros amendment to allow renters to opt out of the early leasing ordinance.

To me, that -- the only thing that will come of that is that landlords will abuse that clause.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> And that will weaken the ordinance and end up harming students and the other people who are in the -- who are rent in Ann Arbor.

So I support no opt out clause.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Adam Jeskevich.

>> I'm a homeowner and but I rented in the past and I support the early leasing options in general.

I don't support any carve out to get the recent seeking landlords.

Landlords hold all the cards in this scenario.

Listen to tenants.

Land lords have enough power.

Do the right thing.

Thank you and I yield my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 383, do you have a --

833, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Hello, my name is Elliott Brandon, I'm a member of the Ann Arbor friends meeting.

Although I'm not calling as a representative of quakers I thought that city council might appreciate hearing a perspective from a member of a faith community.

As part of my practice of faith, I try to be hesitant in supporting relationships that are hierarchical in nature and lead to harm in my community.

And in my opinion relationship in which one person is able to force another person out of their home is not a healthy relationship.

Systemically landlords hold power in terms of financial capital and social capital and currently it's clear that Ann Arbor city policies protect landlords over tenants.

We can change policies to protect tenants and reduce landlord power.

As part of this, we must realize that we are explicitly working together to reduce the capital that landlords hold because it's tied that power.

While this argument may not hold nuance in terms of small versus large landlords.

They throw out personal belongings while struggling to survive.

Who do you choose to protect?

The early leasing ordinance proposal is a start in reducing landlord power over me and my fellow renters and I completely support it.

We renters need more protection.

We needed more protection for years and our voices have not been heard.

Additionally, the amendment that Councilmember Ramlawi is going to propose has historical context that I encourage you to investigate as it will certainly erode protections that we are fighting for.

Furthermore, I encourage you to take a moment to reflect on why tenant voices have not been heard.

So much research has shown that humans tend to make decisions similar to those in their social circles.

I don't know y'all well but if you are not friends with renders, with houseless folks, this personal choice effects.

How can you be friends with someone who you hold power over, as a city councilmember or otherwise.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 468, do you have a comment?

Caller with the phone number ending in 468, do you have a comment?

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Hi, can you -- can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> Okay.

Hi.

My name is Sharon and I'm an undergrad student at the University of Michigan.

I would like to end the 70 day early leasing ordinance.

It should be 210 days, and there should be no -- it should not be --

[Inaudible]

Prior to this ask, I was a freshman and I was to Ann Arbor and I barely understood how to get my way around the city when landlords were already emailing me and messaging me dorm mates to sign their leases.

This means that everyone signed this on November and this wouldn't --

[Inaudible]

That my dorm mates and I would be homeless next year if we didn't sign the lease then and there.

Being a new freshman in town that I was, of course, I signed the lease.

But because I signed up for something, I can't barely afford, as a first generation student that comes from a family of a lower socioeconomic background, I work part-time jobs while attending classes and fearing that my family and I would not be able to afford the lease otherwise.

It was very exhausting and dehumanizing.

It's the same and not okay for landlords to be targeting students, especially those from a less privileged background.

We need the full 210 days to not only get acquainted with our new lives as freshmen, but also to gain the financial stability we can afford rent.

This would allow us to better understand the educational situation.

This should be stopped and should be 210 days instead and there should not be a waiver which acts a loophole.

Thank you.

I yield.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 254, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Hello, my name is Michael, I'm a graduate student at the University of Michigan and I'm a member of G.E.O. and I'm a renter.

I'm calling in support of the proposed changes to the E.L.O. which will prohibit landlords from showing a place until 210 days into the lease.

In public hearings you have heard from tenant after tenant supporting the extended early leasing ordinance and describing the detrimental impact of landlords being able to force us to renew our leases early on.

Extending the early leasing ordinance to 210 days would give landlords five full months to find new tenants which is more than enough time.

We need to extension to be able to prevent landlord abuse and make it so that we as renters in Ann Arbor aren't forced to make our housing decisions way before we're ready.

Finally, I want to say that I'm strongly opposed to any amendment to this proposal which would enable tenants to waive our rights under the ordinance.

This would just simply create a landlord to bully us to waive our rights and undo the progress of the proposal.

As I said, you have heard from tenants calling in.

We said time and time again how much power the landlords have in this town and if they have a chance to evade the purpose of the early leasing ordinance, they will take it.

Tenants are not asking for this amendment and I have not heard from any tenant calling in to support it.

If city council is considering this amendment, I hope you think about whether you want us to wind tenants or the landlords would pretend to speak with tenants.

I have been hearing about, you know some landlords who are suddenly so concerned about nonstudent renters and the impact it will have on them and they claim that these nonstudent renters opposed the E.L.O.

I hope that you recognize that tenants should be able to speak for ourselves and the landlords claiming that they know what tenants one, it's simply laughable.

They are not our friends and they don't share interests with tenants.

So I strongly urge you on city council to pass the 210 day leasing ordinance without amending it to create a loophole that landlords could easily abuse.

Thank you, I yield the rest of my time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Caller with the phone number ending in 400, do you have a comment?

Press star six to unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

Caller 400, go ahead.

>> Hello.

I just have two things that I wanted to discuss very fast.

One, my name is Jen Landberg, I'm a landlord here in town.

And I just want some things to be thought about when we are adjusting section ordinance.

One if u of m makes residents decide if they will be living in university housing by late October/November, under this new proposed timeline, to help protect prospective tenants make a sound decision.

There's 31,329 undergrad students enrolled of u of m per u of m's website in 2020.

We have yet to hear from this population of residents because this ordinance is being passed super fast while this population is not existing in Ann Arbor.

I think it would be great to also get their perspective on their leasing season and the reviews on this timeline.

When you look at the percentage of renters that are currently against this ordinance, it's small compared to that population.

What we also aren't hearing is the other vast population of renters that have no idea that this is taking place.

And I think that it needs to be talked about more with the general public and not just with student renters but with the entire population of Ann Arbor.

My other comment that I want to make is -- is going to create extreme hardship for prospective tenants and people that want to renew.

If I'm looking at actual data from my records, the amount of leads that have come

in from the time that I may begin leasing with the current ordinance until about April, I'm looking at -- I'm going to have to field 34,374 leads that come into an office.

Now, granted, that may seem like hmm, that's your problem to deal with, but that is also 34,374 people are remotely trying to find some form of housing in the city of Ann Arbor.

And so I think there's a general -- we really need to look at the really big picture because right now, how the ordinance lies, people put their stuff on to the market at different times, which allows for it to be taken by other renters and it allows for people to be able to evaluate, like, where they want to be able to live and so forth.

Same thing goes for the people that --

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> How do these people actually know that they will get housing when they are competing with that many people looking for housing at the same time?

Everything is one collaboration.

That's 34,374 leads and I'm more than happy to provide any of you with this data from my rent manager.

I appreciate your time.

Hope you have a great evening.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Clerk mayor, there are no more callers with their hands up at this time.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 736.

Phone number 736, go ahead.

Caller with 736, you can speak.

Caller 736, go ahead.

Caller with the phone number 736, you are unmuted but we don't hear you.

>> Hello.

>> Mayor Taylor: Hi, we can hear you now.

>> Okay.

Thank you.

So earlier when I looked at this, I didn't really have an opinion.

This is Deshava, of course.

I'm listening for these pleas to pay attention to the needs the community, people that could be inconvenienced.

You know, you all need to think about the decisions that you make.

You make these decisions privileged lens and you don't think about how it affects the lives of people that are not like you.

That is why Ann Arbor is less than 10% black people.

That's a shame!

But it's a decision that y'all make about housing.

It is about your buddies that are builders that come in and make all of this money.

You do these things to help people that are like you that have privilege, but it

negates other people would don't have those -- would don't have those same opportunities.

When we ask you about being part of our race, we wanted you to think about how racism is in the criminal justice system, within the healthcare system, it's in housing.

It's in so many different things that you all don't think about.

Because you are blessed.

Because God has blessed ex-and every one of you with a level of privilege so that you don't have to go through what people in disenfranchised communities do.

When you make decisions because you are so blessed, if you think about it from that lens and become more grateful and you humble yourself, you will make decisions that will fit everyone.

You will allow people to be blessed just like you but you will also think about those would aren't blessed like you and how you can help empower and restore and build racial equity and build social equity.

These things should be on your mind.

That should be on the mind of every liberal.

You cannot claim to be a liberal if you do not care about these things.

Liberal is not just a word that you can just toss around.

And just take authority over something if you don't have the actions to back it up.

Please start thinking about some of the privileged decisions that you make.

Privileged and racism are cousins.

They are in the same family.

Why?

Because many of your families built wealth off the backs of many black people, many Native Americans, and it's time for you all to start thinking about that.

How can you share that wealth since you claim to be so liberal.

Keep it real.

You want to continue to make more money, elect your friends off the backs of these students who need your help right now.

Do what's right for them.

Do what is right to help your black population in Ann Arbor.

Don't force people to live in Ypsi if they don't want to.

You have the power to do it through legislation.

If you want to build racial equity, how about some action.

Your words on paper mean nothing.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor, I have one more hand up.

According to my notes, the caller may have already spoken, unless they have the same ending phone numbers as another caller.

Do you want me to call on them?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, please.

Let's check it out.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Phone number 037, can you unmute yourself.

>> Mayor Taylor: Have you already spoken at this public hearing?

>> I have not.

>> Mayor Taylor: Sure enough.

My apologies for interrupting.

Please go ahead.

>> Thanks.

Hi, everyone my name is Eugenia, I live in ward 3.

I just want to express just sheer frustration because for a lot of people this is a life and death issue.

I don't know how it's possible for landlords in Ann Arbor to really just characterize themselves as victims, as if they are not getting profits off of the homelessness of others.

And to be honest, personally, like, I have lived here for three years.

I moved here to pursue a graduate degree and like so many people and benefit from the Ann Arbor community and this is a fantastic place to live but the reality is if you don't have family income or support or connections, and you get accepted here, and you try to make a life for yourself here, you are going to end up in subpar way to expensive housing and it is absurd.

I mean, yes, we have a union and yes, graduate students have great pay compared to other graduate students in other places but those rights are being chipped at all the time because of political decisions that happen in spaces like these and also at the state level.

Honestly, I moved from Florida, of all places, experiencing a winter in an apartment where I didn't even know if the heating was sufficient through the winter, right?

I was told within 24 hours that there was going to be somebody seeing my apartment and I had to call Cabrio and tell them, hey, you can't do this.

I don't know whether I will renew or not, and at the same time, these are entities that hold so much sway over the quality of housing.

It's ridiculous that people who can move to cities 23 minutes out can pay a sufficient amount for rent and receive vastly better living qualities and just, like better responsiveness from the landlords.

Tenants don't have any power here and at this point for them to call in and characterize themselves as people that hold equivalent power to renters is absurd.

Obviously I'm in full support of leasing ordinance, that it's 210 days.

I vehemently oppose that gives leeway or, you know, some sort of leverage to renters.

I know that the previous landlord called in and said that 18-year-olds or undergrads, some of them are not representative or maybe they haven't called in and I honestly think that's false.

Many of them signed the petition that we sent in.

A lot of them are out ever town getting summer jobs and trying to work and many of them stay in Ann Arbor over the summer.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> I know I have to wrap up, but I just hope that you all reflect on the power that you have over people's material living conditions and recognize that you have a responsibility to the people here and not just the landlords and that you put yourself in the shoes of a renter who has to figure out very quickly where they will live in the next year with no foresight in the future.

Thank you so much, and I hope you make the right decision here.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 072, press star six to unmute yourself.

>> I will make this quick.

A lot of really good points here.

I was a student.

I have been a landlord.

I'm a property owner.

And looking at show me the rent.com right now, there are 1,000 -- not an exaggeration, there are 1,000 available units for rent today, August 2nd in Ann Arbor.

The -- this artificial shortage of housing does not exist.

There's no shortage of housing.

One bedrooms, check, two bedrooms, check.

Three bedrooms, check.

There's anything you want within the city limits of Ann Arbor is available today, right now.

There's been a tremendous amount of good points made.

I'm a landlord.

I was very opposed to this at the start.

I thought 70 days was appropriate, and now I think 150 days is appropriate.

210 days doesn't work.

210 days creates an artificial incredible.

We have to rent thousands.

Tens of thousands of units in a week.

In a single week.

They think the rent is going down.

It is not going to go down.

You are not going to be able to see a property because it's going to be first come, first serve, ship me a certified check and it's yours.

We already can't exclude or preclude anyone on felonies, on criminal charges because that's been gone.

I just put a 65-year-old gentlemen with a felonious background in a group of five co-Eds because you guys said it's appropriate.

My prediction is that this passes, and we recircle -- we circle back on this next year.

And we have the students fighting because they can't secure housing, because there's not enough time to secure that housing within the limits that we have set them to.

So at this point, I'm just -- I'm watching.

I'm fascinated to see how this goes.
And, you know, I wish you guys luck.

So thank you.

Good luck to the city council with this one.

We appreciate what you are doing.

Good night.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: There are no other callers on the line with their hands up.
Caller with the phone number ending in 906, do you have a comment?

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Press star six to unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

Just go ahead.

>> Hello?

The ordinance --

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller 908, go ahead.

>> Hi.

Can you hear me right now.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

You are all good.

Now it appears that you are not, ma'am.

[garbled audio]

>> Mayor Taylor: Now we can hear you.

>> Great.

Thank you.

My name is Melissa.

I'm a -- I live in ward 5 and I would like to call in support of 200 day amendment
to the leasing ordinance.

We have seen in previous sessions that mid-March is the right time.

We have seen students as well as a number of other renter policies that this is
what we want.

We have 1200 signatories, 20% of whom were non-Michigan students.

You can say that this is what renters want.

[Garbled audio]

I found the behavior of the landlords abhorrent.

It's blatant fear mongering.

I'm from Boston.

I lived there for 20 years.

We have a for mar complicated rental market.

And a lot of it is based on universities as well.

Land lords have about a three month window there and they have no problem
renting their units in that time frame and in a much more difficult market and in
the land lords say they can't do, then they can't do their jobs.

They are incompetent.

So I think we really careful about the fear mongering.

The landlords already pressure us even before the 70 days of the ordinance, current ordinance has expired and as we have seen on all of these call-ins a lot of threatening language from them and the fear mongering that continues with raising rents and going semester to semester leasing and there's nothing to prevent them using the same underhanded manipulative tactics on their tenants and they absolutely will do it.

I also think we need to kind of zoom out for a second and think how much of the market, specifically in Ann Arbor favors the landlords over the renters.

University of Michigan has thousands of students a lot of whom are renters and Ann Arbor's -- the prepandemic vacancy rate was 2 to 3% and it's about 6% right now and that's half of what it is across the U.S. and Michigan.

And if you are looking for affordable housing -- 30% or more of their income.

It's so hard to finance housing and even harder in the 70-day window.

I personally have been affected.

My roommate and I have serious differences and we will risk losing thousands of dollars and moving somewhere that takes 50% of our income because of this timeline.

So I really -- implore you please pass this ordinance, extending the leasing cycle so that it is 210 days without member Ramlawi's amendment.

Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: I think the remain --

>> Clerk Beaudry: I think the remaining callers have already spoken.

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

Seeing no up with, this public hearing is closed.

We have before us the minutes of the work session of July 12 and regular session meeting minutes of July to, 2021.

Moved by Griswold and seconded by Briggs.

Discussion, please of a-1?

All in favor?

Opposed?

They are approved.

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

Moved by Councilmember Nelson being seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion, please, of B-1.

Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I think that we heard from callers anticipating an amendment to this, and I just wanted to summarize and highlight the most significant points that needed to be noted.

First, that making a loophole was actually contemplated and rejected in 2008 by both renters and landlords and secondly, it's just recreating the same conversation that we are trying to prevent in first place, which is pressure to

renew a lease.

We are just reversing it and making it a conversation around pressure to sign away that right.

And I do want to reiterate what the mayor said about 95% of the respondents to a survey around rental housing described these conversations around feeling pressure and so I -- this is really been a long journey.

I would really like to see this pass at second reading.

I asked my colleagues to support it.

-- I ask my colleagues to support it.

We need to move forward with this.

That's basically my point.

We had a lot of public hearings to hear what is really going on in our community and support 55% of the residents in this town.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I guess the cat's out of the bag, that there has been a lot of discussion and conversation on this proposed ordinance change, and it's -- it's been brought to second reading, kicked back down to first read, at least once.

And we were running against the clock and putting something in place.

I would hope that something if it was to be passed today to protect the renters coming in, but based on a quick calculation of the calendar, I don't think that's possible.

That notwithstanding, I will be putting forward an amendment.

I have sent it to Ms. Beaudry, if you can pass it around to my colleagues.

It will provide an additional exception to this ordinance change that would be under Section 5.

Please ignore a couple of the text, perhaps maybe that confuse you, but this would be in addition to the other exceptions that will be made for this ordinance, and quite frankly, I think there's obviously a lot of people who called in and emailed us, met with us, on all sides of this issue, and I think we need to apply common sense to this.

I think government has a role to protect the ones that are vulnerable who don't have a voice but also have common sense as a part of its policy making.

And I will let people read this, and cut me off, mayor if you would like.

I though it's going to be over three minutes.

I will have to talk twice.

But there are many exemptions already stipulated with this change.

First of all, University of Michigan is statutorily ex -- exempt from this.

We have high-rises that dominate the skylines these days that would effectively be exempt for what this does.

I think if the mutual parties agree to something, then they can amend the contract at any time.

I mean, I'm not a contract attorney and I have been involved in a lot of contracts but the contracts can be amended at any time.

That being said this amendment would allow tenants and landlords to amend the agreement and allow for early showing if at the sole discretion of the tenant and all of those who are party to the lease agree to it without any undo pressure or incentives to do such.

And by doing this, I don't think we have gutted the benefit that this ordinance change brings to tenants, we still have the protections.

Folks who are to go school here are highly educated, are signing contracts that have lots of life bearing consequences to them.

And I think they should -- I think this just falls in line with everything else.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember, is there a second to this amendment?

Councilmember Grand on the amendment.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I won't be supporting this amendment.

I do agree with Councilmember Ramlawi, that we have to think about common sense and this doesn't make sense to me at all.

I don't really see how this benefits our tenants at all.

Really, I guess I have a question.

I don't know where this even came from.

We haven't had a landlord that's come forward that's asked for this.

We certainly had a tenant that's come forward that has asked for this so it seems to have sort of come out of nowhere and I find it really perplexing.

So I won't be supporting it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I hope you can hear me.

I apologize for my Internet issues tonight.

I have a number of concerns.

The first of which is my fear that with a single line inclusion in every single lease of Ann Arbor waiving this right, this will immediately set the entire ordinance back again.

And I also even if landlords don't do it.

I would imagine 70 days or sooner or maybe a little bit later, we start seeing notes appearing on doors and reminding people that they need to come and let us know and I don't know that that would rise to the level of legally exerting pressure out and ultimately creating that they need to find apartments or in I renters in town but particularly among the student community we know this is prevalent.

I hope my colleagues join me in voting this down so we can make some changes for tenants in this town.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I don't know if folks have been following how the eviction moratorium ended at midnight on Saturday.

And that the Biden administration is asking local and state governments to get funds through.

So we are trying -- state and local governments to help support renters -- funding is not going out quick enough.

So this crisis continues and I hate to think that we would be -- if we didn't hear the folks calling in tonight, or if we can't even, you know, call on the experiences of folks in this ward, then you know, it's unfortunate.

I was thinking about how my own parents talk about when we're lucky to get a landlord growing up.

So I hope we would consider just being empathic to the folks in our community.

So I will be voting against the amendment.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: We haven't heard or seen this before.

In fact it was at our last council meeting that I had asked questions on this, and I think telegraphed that I would be bringing something forward to this council meeting, to address this concern.

When you have tenants who are leaving town, and know they are not going to be returning, landlords who have good relationships with those tenants, and who want to help ease the crunch that will happen in that five-month time frame for everything to turn over to allow them to lease it to somebody else.

It's just to me seems punitive to force landlords to not show their property, knowing full well in -- and the tenants knowing full well that no one will be returning with that current lease for the following year.

It just doesn't make much sense.

I think, you know, this is going to benefit, you know, the luxury high-rise, the -- the property owners who have even bigger pockets than the mom and pop landlords because they can show models at any time of the year.

I think this is a more balanced approach.

And I urge my colleagues to subscribe to a more balanced approach of governing and policy making.

If they are signing an agreement, signing a contract, I think they will have the capacity to understand their rights and their protections and they still have their rights and protections and this does allow it with the wording that has to be signed by all parties to the lease.

That's all.

It's pretty straightforward.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yeah.

I appreciate where Councilmember Ramlawi is coming from with this amendment.

But I too am worried that this getting the in order Nance, trying -- ordinance, but trying to find a more balance with the order.

I think we have heard pretty clearly at the table that there's not even support for kind of slightly shifting on the time frame of this.

I can imagine as Councilmember Radina mentioned that it will be written in every lease and certainly any savvy -- it would be possible for somebody to strike that out, but I think that a lot of our newer renters would not have that knowledge to do so.

I would like to mention that I think a lot of issues that we have heard in these multiple hearings point to the real need for a renters commission.

I'm glad that we are working on that.

Because I think that there's a lot of issues that are getting caught up in this ordinance change that are much broader and touch on a lot of different issues and it's important that we start addressing those multiple other issues.

I do get concerned with we hear the us versus them language.

And I think what we have in our community is a variety of different types of renters and different types of landlords and I think that I'm worried about what some of the unintended consequences are of this.

I think that we really need to evaluate the ordinance very clearly and I hope the ordinance sponsors, I'm happy to work with them and staff to figure out how we do that.

I don't think we want to see rents go up.

I think we don't -- we want to make sure that we are evaluating this carefully and we don't have unintended consequences but overall, we are clearly headed in the right direction with this -- these amendments and I'm thankful for Councilmember Nelson and Radina for working on this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson on the amendment.

>> Councilmember Nelson: At the risk of extending this conversation even longer, I do want to point out that one of the challenges when we talk about people coming to the table to negotiate terms.

All of that is put in context, and so we do need to talk seriously about the position that renters are in versus landlords and so -- and I appreciate what others have said that Councilmember Radina's point that this just becomes a line in the contract.

I don't know that if I'm really desperate to find an apartment and I find the apartment that I need, do I -- how much -- how much leverage do I have to ask the landlord to please remove that line?

Maybe they will find someone who will waive the right to the provision.

This is hugely problem lick.

If -- problematic.

If we understand anything about the rental market.

It should be the disparity in power in this -- in this interaction.

The person who desperately needs a place to live and the person would has it can rent to any of five different people.

I appreciate my colleague's resistance to accepting this amendment.

I don't think it's a good idea.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I have no doubt that this will be voted down but there is some truth to the consideration that as the ordinance is written now without these waivers it highly favors the University of Michigan housing and large commercial landlords who have sample units or units that are typical of other units that are for rent and happen to be in empty or transitional periods and

being worked on or whatever.

And so by putting this in here, it's -- I view this as an effort to create a little bit of balance at the option of tenant.

Not every landlord is antagonistic.

I know that capitalism is not working nor most of us.

But -- landlords do provide housing.

We are in the middle of a self-declared housing crisis, and I don't think these additional regulations are going to dissuade people from continuing to provide housing, but, you know, as they said and there's been threats on both sides of this for some reason.

We really need to work together on this solve our issues but I think it's -- I don't think it's unreasonable to allow the tenants to do this.

Now we have seen with all sorts of other tenants allowed to choose access.

Especially hey, I will not live here again.

Show my apartment.

I don't care.

We have seen with everything, when you click yes, when you agree to something online who goes through and reads all of those?

Well, that's a life lesson.

You should go through and read your contracts you are signing.

I don't know that this are being slipped in there by landlords.

I tend to give everybody the benefit of the doubt, but, you know, I don't think that this is unreasonable.

I will support it and, you know, we will see what happens here.

I have think on the whole, we are headed in the right direction.

Tenants do have needs for better protections in our community and indeed everywhere.

And a lot of those protections won't come from messing with landlord tenant relationships.

They are going to come from things like advocating for a federal minimum wage and other aspects where we actually empower people to get ahead in life.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

On the amendment, roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: The amendment?

No.

>> Councilmember Griswold: No.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion.
Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I will support this motion because it comes from a good place where we want to help tenants out and we need to start doing something to create a little equity and parity for folks who seek housing in our community.

I mean, we really have kicked the can down the road.

You know, I rented, I don't know, what, 13, 15 years I rented here in Ann Arbor before I sort of lucked into a -- a modest house.

And so, you know, I'm -- I've had relationships that are good and I've had relationships that are bad in the landlord tenant relationship.

And so I'm very sympathetic to tenants.

I will support this.

I think it will get shaken out in the courts somehow, though, because I think that some of the considerations that we have heard, some folks who have written us who have knowledge well in excess of any that we all could have collectively hope to have about this have spoken to fundamental flaws with this ordinance. I'm still willing to pass it forward and we'll let it get shaken out in the courts, I think.

Thanks for bringing this forward and I think the spirit of it is completely proper.

I'm not sure that technically it's -- it's wholly -- wholly right where we want to be, but, you know, we have to do something right.

So I will support this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

Just as my colleague was saying.

I will be supporting this even -- I do believe that it has some problems to it.

One that I tried to address earlier with amendment that failed to get support I believe it will have some unintended consequences that are to the detriment of the folks that we are trying to help in passing it.

I think too often in government, we have pendulum swings and we overcorrect matters rather than take an incremental approach to solving problems.

We want to be aggressive in some forms and perhaps overly aggressive.

I believe that there's some unintended consequences that may result in lawsuits that will change this in one form or another.

I won't be standing in the way tonight.

Obviously we had a problem to begin with.

We fixed one problem or a couple of them, but I think we have created a few others.

So perhaps this is how it's supposed to work.

But that's just not the way the cookie is crumbling.

Thank you.

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

For my part, I'm very excited that this is moving forward and I wish to thank the

sponsors and the many community members who have worked together in order to make it happen.

It's been a long road, but it is important and crucial that we do what we can to support -- to support renters in our community.

So many people in Ann Arbor do, indeed, rent and every single one of them is just as important as any homeowner, and it's crucial that when we have an opportunity to do so, that we -- we try to help them out.

Further discussion?

I have you as already having spoken twice on the main motion.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I wanted to thank the city attorney's office and directly thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Further discussion of the main motion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

C-1 -- let's try to do this one -- an Ordinance to Amend Sections 5.25, 5.33, 5.37.2.B, 5.37.2.C, 5.37.2.F, 5.37.2.G, 5.37.2.I, 5.37.2.L, 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.

Proved by --

>> Excuse me, mayor, we have staff available for an introduction on this item to address some questions that were raised.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you for the interruption.

I appreciate it.

To whom do we have the pleasure of listening?

>> We will be speaking with planning manager Brett Lenart this evening.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Good evening mayor and council.

We have a question regarding c-1.

How do the rules affect the marquee at the Michigan theater.

It's likely this would not meet the proposed ordinance requirement standards, however, it could be determined exempt under the proposed ordinance language that is proposed.

That language is any light installation determined by the historic district commission to contribute to the historic character of a property listed in a local state historic district or national register of historic places.

Independent of that, any existing non-conforming lights would be able to be maintained in the event that they are replaced, they would have to be made compliant.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

I just wanted to briefly just say thanks to everybody who has tried to get this here.

This has been a long road.

Many thanks to Mr. Lenart and planning staff.

There was a long subcommittee -- received emails on this.

The astronomer at the u of m with Michigan dark skies has been leading this to improve our dark skies ordinance and leading the city in making the changes, between the subcommittee of energy and planning commission, it was formed a couple of years ago and a lot of them have proposed amendments.

If anyone is interested in seeing them, we went out with light meters and I can give you the light readings for the Michigan theater between now and second reading.

I hope this -- I'm sure this will move forward tonight and we can talk about it more at second reading.

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, I think this is really a team effort.

I would like to be listed as a cosponsor.

I actually reviewed a draft of this ordinance before I was on council.

And I would like to mention that while it's called dark skies, it really is about efficient lighting, getting the light where it's needed and reducing light pollution and in one of the issues is how the retina responds.

When there's too much light it's actually more difficult to see in darker areas.

So adding light frequently reduces visibility and we need to understand that.

Also, this was passed unanimously by the environmental commission and the resolution included the statement that advises council to implement educational efforts for the public to voluntarily implement the actions.

That the ordinance specifies for site plans.

So education is something that we have been talking about at recent meetings and we would like a component of education attached to this -- this ordinance as well.

I'm not recommending anything -- any amendment to the ordinance, but just the awareness of the importance.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: I want to join the chorus of people who are thanking people for their work on this long awaited amendment.

I want to specifically thank John Mersky, who also championed this ordinance, as well as professor Sally Ohi, we have changed the fundamental nature of the night and at a recent presentation to the environmental commission, I learned from professor ohi that 80% of people in the world live in a light-filled night environment that is both the source of stress and as Councilmember Griswold mentioned, an inefficient use of energy.

Michigan is actually one of the few places east of the Mississippi that have pristine natural darkness.

And that's in the U.P. and northern Michigan.

Our state is designated six state parks as dark sky reserves.

So there's another tourist attraction come to the dark.

It sounds a little weird.

But perhaps people will be doing that.

But this is not just about humans and our frayed nerves.

Artificial light at night interferes with wildlife migration, and mating and sleeping.

Birds are especially sensitive and I learned from professor ohi that buildings are second only to cats as the leading cause of bird deaths.

So these -- one ever these great effects.

So I'm very excited to be able to vote for this ordinance.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks, Mr. mayor.

Typically I don't ask to be added as a cosponsor.

This came up in the energy commission and I wholly support this mission of darkening the skies.

You can tell when the Michigan theater marquee is on from my house up here on the north side -- or not.

You can actually see the difference when you look downtown.

It's extraordinarily bright.

And, you know -- I guess I say I kind of complained for years about the car lights and the townships being terrible cause of light pollution and so that's on the townships to take care of that or the county.

Thanks to everybody who put in for this and it's wholly easy to support something that will hopefully improve our community, and -- and it will be nice to see this have an effect on new buildings in the future, hopefully, and those dark sky preserves, we had the pleasure of visiting one before it actually had -- it became listed as such, but they were making an effort to get it listed as such at Thompson's harbor and it is incredible.

I got to say to be in one of those places and it shows you a world that we are all missing right now because of our rapidly increasing urban environment.

So thanks to everybody who put the work in on this and let's move this forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: The screens keep moving.

Thank you.

I got a question for staff and while -- about the university's obligation to these new rules and the ordinance, will they be -- I believe that they are exempt, and are they doing anything to parallel what we are doing as a city currently?

Do we know of any action taken by the university that correlates and compliments this change?

>> This would not apply to the university.

We have no authority over them.

As to the second, I don't know the answer no, that but I'm happy to find out what I can and report that back with the second reading, with information for you.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: If you could, Brett.

I would appreciate hearing back before the second reading.

And thanks for everybody's work involved in this.

I know it's been going on for quite sometime.

I concur with all the comments that have been made by my colleagues as it

refers to this.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

It's approved.

Let's take a short break, it's 9:55.

Let's reconvene at 10:05.

Thank you.

[Break]

>> Mayor Taylor: I should have checked, are you both ready?

My apologies.

We are back after a short break.

C-2.

An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.16.6 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of The Code of The City of Ann Arbor (Home Occupations).

Moved by --

>> Once again, mayor, I need to interrupt and let you know that we have staff available again for a late question on this item.

>> Mayor Taylor: Excellent.

That would be Mr. Lenart, I would assume.

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Taylor: So let me get a move and second.

Moved by Councilmember Disch and seconded by Hayner.

Discussion, please.

Mr. Lenart, the floor is yours.

>> Great.

The question was in k1a, does this include a lemonade stand?

>> Outdoor sales, temporarily, it's uptaken by the business owner or others.

Lemonade stands and garage sales in residential areas is not covered by.

This it's simply included as a component to the section that's being modified.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you, Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to say a couple of things about the planning commission debate on this ordinance.

I will offer two small changes which I believe I circulated to you all this weekend.

So we have the home occupation ordinance to provide the opportunity for cottage industries, as they are called.

But we want to limit and regulate them so that they don't have adverse impacts on the neighborhoods in they are located.

Planning commission deliberated one version of this ordinance in April.

And in that version, we had special and prohibited kinds of in-home commercial activities.

We passed that version, voted to reconsider it and then an extensive community feedback about the type of home occupations that make Ann Arbor a unique place to live.

Really the economy because people do things that enable you to fix tools and build stuff, you would never imagine.

The version you see before you, which has shifted entirely away from specifying prohibited and permitted uses reflects that very bold work and listening and responsiveness.

It stands in the way of some uses that could reasonably take place outside in a residential neighborhood.

So imagine doing a small yoga class in your instructor's backyard or having someone fix your bike in their driveway.

So before we discuss further as I emailed to you all this weekend, I would like to propose two changes to the ordinance language that planning commission approved.

So you should be able to find an email from me, and if you need me to resend it and I might have made a mistake in not sending this to Ms. Beaudry.

Mr. Lenart, do I need to do it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, send it.

>> Clerk Beaudry: I don't have it.

>> Councilmember Disch: Okay.

I will do that right now.

Here it comes.

I have just hit send.

So under home occupation performance standards, small letter b.

The current sentence reads: The use shall be conducted entirely within the interior of a building, including all storage of goods, materials and equipment.

I would replace that with, any storage of goods, materials, and equipment shall be entirely within the interior of a building.

This change would enable home occupations to be conducted outside, without committing --

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, is there a second.

Councilmember Griswold seconds.

Briefly.

>> Councilmember Disch: I have one more tiny change.

This would let the home occupation be conducted outside but outdoor storage would not be permitted.

We didn't change that.

And in home occupations, performance standards h, I would remove the word "noise."

>> Mayor Taylor: Can we take these separately?

>> Councilmember Disch: Pardon?

>> Mayor Taylor: These are operable amendments.

>> Councilmember Disch: They are.

Okay.

Let's do that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is this amendment friendly to the body?

Not friendly.

Discussion of the amendment.

Hayner and Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I support this amendment.

I was going to speak broadly.

I think that's perfectly fine.

People -- I know people who work at home.

They store everything inside.

They roll it up because they need to work on it, and they roll it back in.

I think nuisance ordinance can take care of that if that is a problem and generally,

I think the nuisance ordinance can take care of all it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I have some questions.

Within the interior of a building.

Would that have to be four sides and a roof, a source with three sides?

How complete a building would these goods need to be stored under or in?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Lenart.

>> Whether it's a shed or a garage, it would have to be something with walls and a roof intended for occupancy or storing of materials.

So to meet that requirement, it would have to be in some building that was fully enclosed.

So a three-sided structure that was open to the elements on one side, technically would not meet that requirement, nor would a carport or an open on the sides structure of some nature.

>> Mayor Taylor: If you have one of these tool sheds that you buy at Home Depot, I would say, that is enclosed.

That doesn't have a footer.

>> That's fully enclosed and so that would be permissible.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I remember hearing about this back in April and hearing from residents when it allowed and didn't allow certain activities.

I'm trying to understand how this was not contemplated at planning.

It seems strange for the liaison to planning to be bringing it and proposing changes immediately.

Can we have more background in how it was none contemplated.

A neighbor up the street from me taught swimming lessons.

I less Councilmember Disch, I would like to hear more about how it happened that this didn't come up before.

I'm inclined to send it back to planning and let that body talk about this amendment.

>> Councilmember Disch: We can certainly do that.

The direction and the substance of our discussions on planning, it was meant to move away electric talking about permitted and prohibited uses in order to be as liberal as possible with -- with what a home occupation is and try to may a more form-based approach.

If it doesn't violate these other things, then it can be done.

I think that really, we thought of a whole lot of things, that I didn't think that I would be talking about for 20 whole minutes at a meeting.

I think what I have noticed is how many people -- for example, there's a personal trainer who lives in my neighborhood, and she has had personal training classes in her driveway.

And that's partly COVID motivated -- or it's still COVID motivated because it she started it in the spring.

I think it just didn't fully occur -- you know, not everything occurred to us.

But the desire was to liberalize this as much as possible, while not creating a nuisance.

So there's a limit to how many people, and how many clients you can have at once which would impose a limit that isn't use specific.

And I would invite Mr. Lenart.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch, you have the floor in your own rights on the amendment now.

>> Councilmember Disch: If there's anything you want to add.

>> I can't speak for the planning commission but I would speculate that I don't -- I wouldn't foresee that they would object to the amendments.

I think that -- our current home occupation has a certain handful of uses that may be appropriate or not appropriate, as sort of a proxy of types of home occupations that may be appropriate.

As indicated, the initial draft was to try to be much more clear so we can find a list of uses that are clearly allowed or not allowed.

And shifting to the use-based standards, it is the current regulations do require that there could be no exterior evidence that home occupation exists.

So it's -- I think it's just quite logical that that was continued as a way of measuring potentially adverse impacts in neighborhoods.

But I don't think making those changes would be inconsistent with a lot of other flexibility that the ordinance includes that was forwarded by the planning commission.

But as indicated, whether council chooses to amend that here or any event, I would be happy to follow that up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment.

Roll call vote starting with Councilmember Hayner.

On the amendment.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Nelson, you still have the floor with regards to your amendment.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Not me.

>> Mayor Taylor: I'm sorry, Councilmember Disch.

>> Councilmember Disch: It recognizes what Councilmember Hayner mentioned, we do have nuisance ordinances and we would remove the word "noise" from the following sentence, no generation of dust, odors, vibration or electrical interference or fluctuation should be perceptible beyond the property line.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a second?

Seconded by Councilmember Hayner.

Is this friendly to the body?

Councilmember Ramlawi -- Councilmember Disch you have the floor still if you wish, otherwise --

>> Councilmember Disch: I cede.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

On this one, I believe there should be something to address noise. Excessive noise unreasonable level of noise, something that some complimentary and consistent with our other noise ordinances. I don't know if -- if that is unnecessary, because it is -- it is stated in other parts of our ordinances.

But here I think it's important to at least bring it up and ask about it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I have a question.

Forgive my own ignorance of the exiting noise ordinance under which this would fall.

I am thinking of a scenario in which someone is in construction or carpentry or something like that in home, and is sawing and things like that throughout the day.

Is that something that the existing noise ordinance would contemplate during the okay time?

I could imagine where we're suddenly somebody is doing that type of business, it -- next door, and they are sawing and hammering and construction year round constantly now, that the existing noise ordinance may not cover that.

I'm looking for direction from staff.

>> I think it would.

The noise ordinance specifies certain decibel limits.

It provides some exceptions, on the property.

It would be noise generated by the property itself, most likely.

So in -- and proposing the proposed -- I did work with Councilmember Disch on just providing that language for her consideration, and from my perspective, it seems logical just to rely on the noise ordinance and in this case that would

apply to the use of dwelling unit generally, in addition to these, the dwelling unit with an accessory use.

And particularly rely on that without establishing any higher standard at the property line if adding outdoor -- the ability to conduct home occupations outdoors.

I think in the example of a personal fitness class or a yoga class, while it might be quite unobtrusive, I think it could be perceived as a sound at the property line and I think it would be appropriate to remove that and, again, rely on more extreme levels of noise generated that would be in conflict with our noise and nuisance ordinance.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you, Travis.

I was trying to get an answer, but I didn't get one with my question.

Now if the current noise ordinance -- in my current experience, it's unenforceable. It -- it relies on what is reasonable and reasonableness has been argued all over the map as to what that could be.

So to rely on our current noise ordinance for me gives me no comfort, because when I try to apply it in the past, it has failed and failed miserably.

There is no empirical level that we're measuring decibels at to enforce the noise ordinance.

I'm not comfortable with striking noise completely out.

I feel that we need to have some level of protections when it comes to that, other than our current noise ordinance, because it's quite, frankly, ineffective.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks for asking.

My Internet is super slow over here.

I'm trying to pull up the noise ordinance.

It's -- the violation at the property -- at the measure of the property line I think is 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. and that's outside of business hours and some of it is time based and decibel based.

And the one thing we are getting into, this gray area here and I'm not -- I'm tempted to vote this down and leave noise in there, just so it's a reminder when people say, hey, I'm thinking about building a home, they say, hey, the noise can't be a problem with this business because we are in this gray area of it's a residential area but a commercial aspect.

If it's a business, it's commerce, right?

If I had somebody who is running a shaper all day next to me, and they were making, you know, window moldings all day and they are super loud.

You wear ear muffs and dust control and it can be a real problem, day in and day out.

All of a sudden you have a molding shop next door to you.

That's the kind of thing that we want to encourage where people can work from home and have neighborhoods that are diverse, that can be a problem.

So I -- I'm -- it doesn't exactly tie in with a regulatory -- you know, penalty or a way to do it.

But I think it's -- I think it's legit to leave noise in here in this case.

I think you folks have brought up some good points.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Briggs: S?

>> Councilmember Briggs: I think the current language is overly restrictive and -- but it feels like our current noise ordinance is underlying -- under -- doesn't protect folks in the same sort of way that we might hope for this to use this sort of exercise this class example, continuing with that, any exercise class that I have been to has often had music playing or even if it's a yoga class, there's often music playing in the background.

And even that, you know, if that was going on all day in your neighbor's yard, after a while, you might lose a little bit of tolerance for that, even if it was not up past the noise ordinance level.

So I would rather keep this in and find out if we are having some issues with this and if it's limiting the type of home occupations and revisiting it if we need to.

If it's really sort of limitation and I know that our noise ordinance, we have been -- I think it's on the back burner right now, but it's in the process of being revised and so maybe that's an opportunity also to start looking at this issue as well.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I'm looking at the noise ordinance now and I'm seeing that under the exceptions, we have construction, drilling, wood cutting, between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. Mondays through Saturdays and 9 to 6 p.m.

I share the concerns that Councilmember Briggs brought up and I think my comfort level at this stage is to include noise and maybe make a modification at a later date.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes this noise ordinance as some have referred to describes activities that would occur for home improvements and construction and additions and that kind of remodeling, not every day business.

And I also would like to just remind ourselves that not everybody works 9 to 5.

And there are some people who work in the hospital and work third shift who leap during the day.

-- who sleep during the day.

People are coming home and needing some rest at times of the day where many of us are at work and doing other activities.

So, yes, we -- we want to be open to these changes to allow people to work more from home and to incorporate work style and lifestyle together.

But we need to be mindful that there are people who have all sorts of different schedules and it's not just a 9 to 5.

I won't be supporting this, because it is unclear and I'm uncomfortable relying on our current noise ordinance.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner and Griswold.

I suggest people know where they are going on this and move it along.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I think this is going to -- this change generally is going to call into play further down the line of reexamination of our noise ordinance, when we talk about 67 decibels at the property line for like a trumpet practice, you can get away with that for an hour but 105-decibels for wood cutting.

67 is not too loud.

105 is pretty loud.

And so I think -- I'm going to vote against this change, to leave it -- which will leave it in there.

But I think we need to come back and take a look at our noise ordinance, generally, because in some ways we have heard from constituents, I'm sure all of us that it's sort of failed us in some ways.

So I think it's something to think about in the future, we should maybe revisit it and take a look at it, and that's all.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: I want to thank Scott Trudeau for his very thoughtful and informative email.

We're actually discussing some of his recommendations here.

And I want to thank Councilmember Disch but my recommendation would be to send it back to the planning commission.

Based on this discussion and the time of night, I think that it would be -- it would benefit from a discussion at the planning commission, unless there are any time constraints.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the amendment.

Starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion of the main motion as amended.

Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Thanks.

I would like to make an amendment of a single word in Section 2e, It says maximum of to four clients to a time.

I would like to amend that to six.

Let's say you have a four-part band plus a producer and that's five people, plus

the homeowner.

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

>> Councilmember Nelson: What was the amendment?

>> Councilmember Hayner: To four to six clients at a time.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Hmm.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further -- it is friendly to the body.

Further discussion of the main motion as amended.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Just real quickly.

I appreciate the work.

I don't know what spurred this in the first place to have it come out of planning commission.

I want to thank councilwoman Disch and the folks on planning commission for, you know, rethinking it.

I have to confess, I had people raise objections to this and to their Celt, they listened to that and there's a lot of makers musicians and mechanics in this town and they make a decent living and they try to -- a lot of innovation comes from that, right?

And so that's all.

Just thanks for listening to those changes.

I appreciate it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi on the main motion.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes thank you.

A question whether if we could address if we were to address this, would it kick it down to first reading now or the next time it comes up for a vote that was to be brought forward, would it refer this back to first reading again?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema?

>> City Atty. Postema: I don't believe so.

Within the whole context, it's a limitation.

It sounds like it would be -- I would have to see the exact language but my inclination is not, councilmember.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion the main motion.

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: C-3, An Ordinance to Add Chapter 123 (Prohibition of Conversion Therapy on Minors) to Title IX Of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor. Moved by Radina and seconded by grand.

Councilmember Radina.

>> My interruption again, mayor.

We have staff here to address some last-minute questions on this item.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you very much, Ms. Praschan.

Who?

>> From the attorney's office, we Margaret Radabaugh and John Reiser.

>> Mayor Taylor: My apologies.

The floor is yours.

>> Sorry, I just signed on.

But for the staff introduction, so this is an ordinance that would prevent licensed providers to perform conversion therapy on minors.

We asked a question if this was being performed in the city.

We were not aware of any conversion therapy or the sexual practices.

But this is something that is often not advertised.

>> I want to thank the staff for this.

This revision is the outcome of a lot of hard work, probably taking a lot longer than many of us would have liked.

I know it was originally being worked on when I was a LGBTQ liaison, working with the human rights commission and Mayor Taylor, I think after members of his class, actually, requested that we begin looking at this.

So-called conversion therapy is a dangerous and discredited practice that promises to alter an individual's sexual orientation or expression.

It's especially harmful to minors and can lead to increases of depression, anxiety, drug use, homelessness, self-loathing and self-harm among a community that experiences many of these challenges at higher rates.

This inhumane and abusive practice has been rejected by main stream medical and mental health organizations for years if not decades and 20 states and 70 cities and towns.

I applaud Governor Whitmer to ban the use of state and federal funds for conversion therapy, which is likely the limit of they are authority without action from the republican authority.

Which refused a vote on a statewide ban.

So with the ongoing complicity in this abuse of LGBTQ minors by republican leadership in Lansing, this requires progressive communities like ours to lead.

So please support a ban on conversion therapy here in Ann Arbor and a call that you pass Felicia Brabec's practice statewide.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: A question for the sponsors or the legal staff.

Why did we make this narrowly applicable to providers?

Why don't we -- I heard on NPR, they talked about a clergy who practiced this

and regretted the practice.

Why do we say provider.

We are reaching into the states -- I mean, I know attorney riser and I spoke about this a little bit on the phone but I'm curious as to why this is not broader to kind of just ban it outright.

>> Margie, you or me.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Maybe Councilmember Radina knows.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina or staff.

>> I'm happy to defer to Councilmember Radabaugh who has been working on this before I came on council.

They extensively talked about extending this as far as we possibly thought we could under our ability to enforce this, and so I know attorney Radabaugh has tried to make this as expansive as we thought legally permissible.

>> Mayor Taylor: Do you want to add?

>> Sure.

So council always has the authority to expand it.

This, you know, separation of church and state and so we stuck with a more broad -- or an application that would just be all providers regardless of whether they are a practitioner and part of a clergy or just a doctor.

So we are not just targeting religious provider snooze and I would refer to you to pages 4 and 5 of the legal memo to council for the specifics of that, Councilmember Hayner.

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

I would like to, myself, thank the sponsors.

The attorneys and staff very much for having worked on this for quite sometime. And as Councilmember Radina indicated, thanks to members of my law school class who made the observation that Ann Arbor lacks this and got the ball rolling back then.

Conversion therapy, so-called conversion therapy is an abhorrent practice that tries to teach people that there's somebody besides the beautiful selves that they are.

And it's just wrong and armful and it ought not to be inflicted upon anyone and I'm glad we will do what we can to prevent it here in Ann Arbor.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

>> Mayor Taylor: C-4, An Ordinance to Amend Sections -- sorry I'm not doing very well on these.

C-4, An Ordinance to Amend Sections 7:360, 7:361 and 7:362 and to Amend By Adding New Sections Which Sections Shall Be Designated as 7:363, 7:364 and 7:365 of Chapter 91 (Endangered Species) of Title VII (Businesses and Trades) of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor.

Moved by Councilmember Hayner, seconded by Councilmember Radina.

Discussion of c-4.

Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, thanks Mr. Mayor.

I want to thank some of the folks who worked on this, Attorney Reiser and the folks from the national and local humane societies who provided excellent advice on this topic.

I -- when I sent it out to comments earlier in the week, I think it's clear that, you know, maybe 100 years ago, we had a need for this kind of thing.

The times have changed.

Our environment has changed.

Our relationships with the environment need to change.

And that's why I'm proposing this -- the ban on sale of commercial fur here on the city of Ann Arbor.

I want to thank the retailers who -- but a handful, less than a handful who do still sell fur for speaking up and suggesting some changes and I believe that the proper and latest version has been attached to the agenda, but I got to double check that.

And I have different agendas going on different screen shots.

Hopefully it has been.

It has extended their ability for one year to sell out everything they had in stock and fill the orders they already had committed to.

We're talking about Canada goose products and Canada goose themselves as a manufacturer has made the move away from fur trimmed products and so it -- it's sweeping the fashion industry, long since and it's just another opportunity for us to provide the kind of protections for our animal friends that we would provide for our human friends.

I would like your support on this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I want to thank the sponsors for bringing this order and Attorney Reiser and the impact this would have on them if they were not able to continue to sell out the remaining stock they had already purchased.

I appreciate Attorney Reiser to work on this to get changes throughout the weekend and I want to call attention to the humane society of the Huron valley and of the United States for their activism and work on this and clerk Beaudry, if you could include me as a cosponsor, I would appreciate it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I just wanted to clarify some of the comments and suggestions and changes that have been made to this regarding existing inventory and allowing the many errands to sell what they have -- merchants to sell what they have.

The initial version was six months.

I read this quickly.

I didn't see where this had been changed from one year from the adoption of this ordinance.

I apologize, but a lot of last-minute correspondence here today.

And then I got another question or statement to make.

Mr. Reiser is that correct, this version we are looking at now gives a full 12 months?

>> That's correct.

I'm looking at Legistar right now and clerk Beaudry sometime shortly after 5:06 p.m. uploaded it to Legistar.

So if you go to the agenda, and click on DC- -- wherever we are -- I'm sorry. It's on there.

C-4, 21-1404, if you click on that and revised ordinance to amendment, Chapter 91 of city code.pdf, you will see it in its entirety.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: All right.

Thank you.

I do appreciate the work the sponsors and the staff in bringing this resolution forward.

It does help align our community values to our policy setting.

So it's good to see that our policy setting is catching up with our community values.

Unfortunately, with the online commerce, I -- I don't think we're going to stamp out all of this trade of real fur unfortunately because of eCommerce, people are still going to be able to purchase these kind of things but at least here at this level, we have made our position clear.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember are a Tina.

>> Councilmember Radina: Just in Councilmember Ramlawi's question.

It's the final line being Section 8, amendments to this chapter will say one year after passage and publication.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: For folks watching at home when this idea got floated a few months ago.

I got a lot of correspondence from the folks who are involved in the sport trapping industry and various outdoor sports and I got a lot of phone calls and frankly some not so pleasant emails and phone calls from people.

And, you will note that Section 6 exemptions, we allow individual use, secondhand store and so on.

Uses by cultural, spiritual purposes, native people uses and any activity that's authorized by state or federal law.

So we're not outlawing trapping but you will note that Washtenaw County earlier this year, not too long ago, they banned these group hunts and things like that and so this is the way the world is headed.

We are headed into a direction of more compassion and with the threat of extinction, it's the right thing to do.

Thank you, everybody, for your support.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: A few things that hadn't been mentioned yet.

Many thanks to the humane society, U.S., would is very responsive over the to -- to Councilmember Radina reaching out to them and asking for clarification on a

few things.

They were really a wealth of information on this, and I just think it's important for everybody to realize that this is -- this is really important legislation for the Midwest.

It's important for the humane society to have -- to have cities stepping forward and bringing legislation like this -- bans like, we don't have them in the Midwest, and so this model legislation for other communities to look to as well and so we're really -- we're really leading here on an important issue that's -- that's around the animal welfare and I have heard kind of one question in the community around process and whether or not, you know, something like this might be able to go through one of our commissions.

I think it points to the fact that we don't really have an appropriate commission for something like animal welfare to go through.

We have sometimes something like that might come through environment, but in this case that wouldn't really necessarily be appropriate and so -- and human rights, obviously deals with human rights, not sort of more broadly welfare issues. So as we sort of work on animal welfare issues which is a -- a side passion of mine, just seeing them come to the council a little bit through different channels.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

All in favor?

Opposed?

It is approved.

DC-1 Resolution to Approve Amendments to the Council Rules.

moved by Ramlawi and seconded by Griswold.

Discussion of DC-1.

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I think these are pretty simple changes whereas we're just encouraging public speakers to identify themselves when they -- when they address council.

As I said previously, this does help us as individuals pay attention to issues that are ward specific, it helps us solve some of the problems and items that we are elected to face and address them in ways that are more prescribed.

I don't really see anything else here.

Of course, we have made to remote meetings.

And I know Mr. Postema is here to answer any questions but that part of our rules is ongoing evolving matter, which still hasn't been settled.

>> City Atty. Postema: And councilmember thank you.

We did get a question on this related to remote -- the rule itself was just adding to, you know, right now the -- the rule talked about everybody speaking from a podium.

Well, obviously, there's no podium and so it just reflects what we currently have.

It is not intended by this rule for the council to make a determination whether or not you will have a hybrid whether or not you have a remote.

That leaves that decision for another day.

I wanted to clarify that because there was a question, could these rules be

interpreted to allow remote speakers even when we are meeting in person and that answer -- the answer is no.

That will need to come from the direction from the council.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I guess the only point of clarification, all public speakers are encouraged them by name and ward.

I guess the -- we can't require somebody to state their name, I reached out to Ms. Beaudry earlier today around an issue of -- we have a speaker who is often calling in under a -- a pseudonym, and so not using their -- their actual identity.

I assume this is to sort of allow that scenario to still happen.

Is that correct, Mr. Postema?

>> City Atty. Postema: Well, I think it was within the admin committee, it was a compromise, recognizing that they don't want to have a requirement and enforcing the requirement would be near impossible.

I think that's why the language -- I don't want to speak for the councilmembers but I think that's why it came forward was that it would be helpful to the council, the council, at least in the admin committee, I don't think wanted to have it be a requirement.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: There's situations where persons for their own personal safety reasons don't want to list their name and address.

So that's -- yeah.

It was not just that it's not possible to require it, but that we did not feel it was appropriate to require it.

But, yet encourage so that we can follow up as necessary with people when they raise issues.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, I agree in terms of following up.

We assume that most people who contact councilmembers have an issue and I also believe whether they give their legal name or some other name just the act of introducing themselves creates some rapport and reduces the chance of someone just signing in and spewing inappropriate language immediately because they do go through that greeting process that Walmart has made famous.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

Approved.

DC-2, Motion to Reconsider the July 20, 2021 Vote that Approved the Resolution to Direct Actions to Conclude Mr. Crawford's Employment as the City Administrator.

Moved by Councilmember Griswold, and seconded by Councilmember Ramlawi.

Discussion of DC-2.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I would like the opportunity to change my vote. I voted on the prevailing side at the last meeting and more importantly, if we had not had this item open the agenda, there would be no opportunity for people to sign up and get priority to speak based on speaking on agenda item, because there wasn't one, and DC-6 was not added until mid-afternoon, after the sign-up for speaking time.

Further discussion?

>> Councilmember Hayner: I support your notion to bring this back for conversation, Councilmember Griswold.

I had the same situation with a similar go-around with another administrator where I hoped to do same, but it was not allowed under the terms of agreement that had been prepared for his departure.

I'm happy to discuss it publicly.

And, you know frankly, they don't -- it is really remarkable to me how much folks seem to think they know about what's going on at city hall, you know?

And so I'm happy to have a public conversation about what's going on here, and I would like everyone to join me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

I will echo some to the sentiments.

The prior resolution was placed 24 hours ahead of a vote with even going to the admin committee to have it discussed among the admin committee and I will thought being on that committee, that that's where these kind of matters would funnel to and from to the body and in this case, it was not.

We were not privy to the conversations with the attorney's office and the others who negotiated deals -- I don't want to call them deals but arrangements, agreements.

This was done without many members of the body knowing.

And that being said, the public.

I believe that an action as great as this was should have had greater transparency and more inclusion, and quite frankly that did not happen with that vote, or that resolution.

Much of what I wanted to say and I will say I didn't get to say out of respect for the organization and for Mr. Crawford most importantly.

And I have a lot to say and I will say it in this meeting and I will say it in subsequent meetings because much could not be said last time.

Further discussion of the motion.

Starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Yes.

>> Councilmember Disch: No.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: No.

>> Councilmember Grand: No.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: No.

>> Councilmember Eyer: No.

>> Councilmember Nelson: No.

>> Councilmember Briggs: No.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion fails.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-6, Resolution to adopt separation agreement with Mr. Crawford.

Moved by, Councilmember Grand and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DC-6.

>> Councilmember Nelson: I appreciate that these terms were negotiated.

I think we are treating them abominably.

We are saying good-bye to a city administrator who worked to preserve and increase the diversity of our organization.

We have increased the diversity of our upper level management due to Mr. Crawford.

I'm grateful for how Mr. Crawford has worked to support our police chief when his leadership was targeted.

I'm grateful for how Mr. Crawford has supported our independent community police oversight commission.

He has recognized the importance of that commission's independence.

Mr. Crawford has used his position to make a positive difference within our organization and in our city.

I'm sorry to say good-bye to a work colleague who has consistently listened to my point of view, offered alternative perspectives to help my own understanding, and encouraged all of us to respect each other.

As a woman, I have particularly appreciated being treated as an equal and a peer during the time that Mr. Crawford has been city administrator.

This is a sad day for our organization and an enormous loss to our organization.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, thanks for those nice words.

I think you are right on target with that.

That's exactly what Mr. Crawford brought in.

It was -- it was -- you know, when he would call me about something, I knew it was something important, that he needed to talk about and needed to inform me about something, show me different options, different ways to do things and it was -- it was a very decent relationship I had from a very professional relationship.

And while this was negotiated, I have no way of -- I mean all of this came as quite a surprise to some of us on this body.

I have no way of knowing that it was negotiated wholly in good faith and because I would prefer to not see him depart the city, and leave the city's service and take his great talents and tremendous amount of knowledge about the structure of the city and the structure of our city's finances and the corporate structure.

It will be a great loss if he leaves and takes that with him.

And another great loss is the cleverness that he applied to desperately trying to get us out of this financial crisis that we find ourselves in, despite great wealth in

our community, we are still running a structural deficit in our budget.
And it would be much worse without him being here.

My biggest question is who is going to overlook the tens of millions of dollars in federal aid that are about to flow to the city in the COVID relief act.

I explicitly would trust Tom Crawford with that, with those decisions.

Now I'm not so sure.

I won't support this even though it was negotiated because I cannot convince myself that it was negotiated fully in good faith by both parties.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

As I stated earlier today, I believe that action is outside the bounds of employment law.

It's definitely outside the bounds of best practices.

There were multiple times when our city attorney had to caution members of the council on their statements.

And that happened in closed session.

So I won't go further.

And also, this is the first time in my history with council that a reconsideration had as no the been accepted.

It's really meaningless, other than to allow public commentary previously, and to not allow me to change my vote.

But I will vote no on this.

What I don't want to say is the city administrator is an at-will employee and per his contract, his operation is simply a nine-month salary, and what -- his separation is simply a nine-month salary and what we are offering in the separation agreement is more valuable to our city administrator than the nine months.

So we could have easily had a respectful parting of ways.

And we chose to do something very, very evil, very, very disrespectful, and much has been said by councilmembers who were not there, did not have the information, and simply created a narrative to support their wishes, whatever they might be.

So our city attorney cautioned us about talking about this.

But that was ignored.

I'm sorry about that.

I probably exceeded my time.

So I will be quiet but this is a dark day for the city of Ann Arbor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: We can call it a dark year.

In the backdrop of spreading dioxane plume threatening our drinking water, PFAS in our drinking water and failing infrastructure in our parks, our water service, our roads, trying to achieve carbon neutrality in less than ten years, and ongoing affordable housing crisis, fractured police community relationships, a concerning real estate market, "post-COVID world with a D.D.A. that didn't have a director, and falling revenue, and ongoing city attorney search, an ongoing

D.D.A. directors search, continuing threats of the COVID spreading, rising rates of crime, solid waste pickup that continues to plague the downtown, failed public services, structural deficits.

This council has chosen to fire, forcibly make somebody resign after 17 years of service and what has been described a tumultuous and toxic process.

I won't put my fingerprints on such interrupt legislation.

You have decided to end the employment with Mr. Crawford without a complete and thorough investigation that was -- that was suggested both by the investigator and by our human resources director.

The last time we met as a body, in closed session, we were under the assumption that there would be further review and further investigation as to what the problems and how far the problems persisted within the organization. We never got the opportunity to meet once more.

We left that meeting, thinking there would be further investigations on this matter. We were not given that, nor was the public.

We don't know how bad the problem is, if it really does exist.

Furthermore this comes to us with no succession plan.

Or thought to be put in place.

This throws this organization in turmoil, uncertainty, chaos and I don't think anybody in their right mind will apply for this job who has fly high-functioning capabilities:

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: I would like to start by saying thank you to Mr. Crawford for his many years of service to the city.

I think he has been -- he's truly a public servant.

And I would also -- I think it's -- you know, it is sad that we are at this moment.

I know it is sad for staff, for the organization, for the community, and it's -- I would also like to thank the brave members of staff that came forward, and were willing to -- to state issues, concerns that they had with their employer.

That was a difficult step for folks to take in our organization.

And I appreciate the work of the investigator who found -- who did a diligent job in terms of identifying that these were -- these claims were substantiated, and they were credible.

We have values that our organization lives by.

And we have policies and we have them in place for a reason.

And I think that for our organization, it is important -- it is most important that that person at the top of our organization is able to common strait the type of leader -- demonstrate the type of leadership on D.E.I. that -- that gives confidence to everybody in the organization that they belong.

So tonight doesn't fill me with any satisfaction at all.

It's sadness for everybody involved in this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: I would like to say that Mr. Crawford excelled during a very, very difficult time and if there's any blame to be had, it's blame of this council for not supporting a person that we promoted to city administrator,

and then did into the provide some of the basic supports that were needed. What we are basing this on tonight, this decision, is allegations, allegations that were not substantiated beyond a doubt.

Allegations that would probably would not stand up in court per a legal analysis, and what disturbs me is our mayor promised disruption a few months ago.

He's charged against due process rounding Councilmember Hayner, and I reminded the mayor and the council more than once that democracy --

>> Councilmember Briggs: Point of order.

This is an attack --

>> Councilmember Griswold: No, it's a reminder about what democracy is about. Just because you are in the majority, whether you are the republicans in the U.S. house or you are in Ann Arbor, you can't --

[overlapping speakers]

>> Mayor Taylor: The description of minority and majority rights relationships is consistent with the councilmember's thrust of her statements, the suggestion and I have argued against due process is, of course an attack.

I'm sorry.

I was explaining the Jeff Hayner discussion in the administration committee, and that was in written documentation which I can provide upon request, but I'm done.

I don't want to belabor this.

I will just say that many people have compared what we're doing here to how Howard Lazarus was treated and Howard Lazarus was treated with respect compared to what we have done with the excellent employee and the fear we have instilled in our organization.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

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

I want to take a moment since we are hearing members of this council, irresponsibly and disappointingly question the legitimacy of the accusations that were investigated in the report.

They were substantiated and I think frankly, it is -- it's incredibly disappointing and sets an incredibly bad precedent for staff to hear the leaders of this city expressing that when they come forward with credible allegations of misconduct, and inappropriate statements, that when independent investigations by respected attorneys confirm that those statements were credible, that this body would continue to question the integrity of members of staff would had courage to come forward.

I find that incredibly disappointing.

I think it's irresponsible and I think it has a chilling effect on the ability for staff to come forward when incidents like this occur.

And so I think we need to stop.

It's -- it's damaging.

And it's -- it's demoralizing.

And so I don't think anybody is happy to be in this position tonight.

I want to second everything that Councilmember Briggs said.

This is not a position that I expected or wanted to be in when I was elected eight months ago but we have a responsibility and I appreciate the work that Mr. Postema put into negotiating this with Mr. Crawford.

It's interesting that a member of this body would point out that this agreement is actually providing Mr. Crawford with a -- a more comfortable departure than if we were to simply fire him, which is not what's happening here tonight.

And so thank you, Mr. Postema for your work on this, and I hope that we can end this constant questioning of staff that had the courage to come forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I don't think anybody is questioning folks who came forward.

I think we are questioning the incomplete investigation that was recommended by both the investigator and the H.R. director.

Both recommended further investigation to -- to try to corroborate the allegations and substantiate the claims.

And to this point, that to my level of understanding, that has not been done.

This council has no hesitation on being judge, jury and executioner of everything, really.

It is quite dysfunctional.

It is opposite of what the community was told in the election of last year how the new members of council would bring in an era of inclusive and diversity and such.

I think, yeah, it's going to have a chilling effect.

It will have a chilling effect on people would want to participate in public service.

It's going to have a chilling effect on people would want to -- and be involved in government conversations.

We already hear that from our constituents.

This town is polarized.

The political discussion is toxic.

This council is toxic.

This workplace is hostile.

This council has only exacerbated the problem.

Going forward, we are not going to find a good candidate.

We are going to find somebody would be doing things for different reasons, which I don't think are the right reasons.

I think Mr. Crawford was a type of person who came in to this situation, knowing the dynamics and thought he could actually make a difference in the world and in this community for the better.

But off goes his head.

And so I think it's going to have a chilling effect on many people.

And I will be opposed to this.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

This is, you know, one of the hardest things that I have ever had to experience

on council, both because of my relationship with Mr. Crawford and also because of my concerns about staff, and I -- if you do this for long enough, you know, I have an increasingly deeper understanding of the crisis of morale on staff and the role that council plays in it.

I think we saw it here tonight.

And this is -- this speaks to why we're making this incredibly difficult decision. Because we need to put the health of the organization first, and let people feel safe and be able to recruit staff into the future that feel safe and welcomed in this organization.

And when I hear things like -- that this -- that this agreement that was negotiated by our incredibly skillful city attorney was not done in good faith, or when we have -- I'm sorry for calling you out because you drew the short straw tonight, but that who is -- who is going to bring us through with these federal funds, we have a really good C.F.O. in case you didn't notice.

I'm so glad.

Thank you for your service.

Thank you to all of our staff for their service so -- including Mr. Crawford.

You know, I don't want to relitigate what happened with the prior city administrator other than to say I heard a heck of a lot of revision of history tonight in terms of -- in terms of how we was treated by members of this body.

We need to -- you know, to say that we're a toxic body and not look at the mirror and understand your responsibility in contributing to that toxicity.

It is so -- I just don't even have words.

I just don't even have words.

And I just --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Point of order.

>> Councilmember Grand: I want to send a message to staff --

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Point of order.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: She's alleging that I'm creating toxicity. She's accusing me of forming toxicity.

>> Councilmember Grand: Right back at you.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: You are assailing my character.

You are violating council rules.

>> Mayor Taylor: There's been no names -- no names have been mentioned councilmember.

It's --

>> Councilmember Grand: Funny how that works when it comes back at you.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Point of order.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Funny out the mayor is on your side, and the rules work the way you want them to work.

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm so used you interrupting me that it's not a problem.

I just want to say to staff we continue to have your backs and I appreciate the work that you do for this organization.

And while I'm here, I will do everything to help you succeed.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I want to address the suggestion that, you know, we have had -- we have had conversations around this table where people have had said how do I know that -- how can I be assured that something is gone this way or that way?

Well, I'm perfectly allowed to say, I have -- I have no way of knowing the good faith around this negotiation.

Because I wasn't in the room.

I'm allowed to say that.

I'm allowed to say that our administrator had a keen financial sense and had also, I will point out, had the financial sense to retain and train good people in his department so that we could be in a situation now where Mr. Praschan is ably and -- Ms. Praschan is ably and willing to serve us.

I want to share something.

I had a conversation with Mr. Crawford about, you know, discussing one of our many budgets and this was back when he was in his previous role.

And the concern was that we have a department here in the city, the O.S.I., under Dr. Stults would be doing a lot of good work but the essence was that, you know, he was being asked to create a mature department in a few years that has no revenue outside of essentially chasing grants, right?

And that's a big challenge with a huge amount of staffing and so on.

And I was really leaning into Mr. Crawford and saying, how are we going to do this?

How will we put this together, a two-year plan, a four-year plan and so on?

And I know I have told this to other staff folks.

But he said to me, I will not put the city in financial jeopardy.

I will never let this city be in financial jeopardy and I thought, that is exactly what you want to hear, because there's a lot of policy chat and a lot of chat.

We're the board of a half a billion dollars corporation and we sure don't act like it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Aim I'm look -- and I'm looking in my own mirror and admitting that we don't act like it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to very quickly express my understanding of the separation agreement, which I believe shows respect for Mr. Crawford in at least two ways.

One is in extending him the opportunity to resign and second is the provision in the contract that grants him retiree health benefits when his pension kicks in or when his cobra runs out should he not have found another job by then.

He's not entitled to retiree health benefits because though he has worked for the city for a long time, he's not retiring from the city after the number of years that would enable those benefits to stem in.

It would have been less expensive to term gate Mr. Crawford.

That's correct.

If we were corrupt and motivated by venal motives we would have determined Mr. Crawford on the evidence of the investigator's report which found a cause for firing, which means that the investigator's report found that there was a violation of city policy.

Had we terminated Mr. Crawford for the violation of city policy, we would have paid him nothing.

That's not what we wanted to do and so -- well, that's it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thanks.

I -- I just have a couple of comments.

First, I want to clarify a couple of things that were said.

One relates to the second investigation.

The discussion and the -- the -- the thrust of the second investigation was never about trying to corroborate or verify the determinations of the first investigation.

Those were -- the first investigation was done.

And it -- and it found that the allegations were credible and substantiated.

The second investigation was merely to -- and is still merely to find whether there was greater harm within the organization than we currently are aware of.

So again, that first investigation found that great harm had been done to the organization already.

And I think that's what we really need to remember here, when we -- when we talk about inclusivity and diversity and what we ran on, and what I ran on, yeah, I ran on supporting inclusivity and diversity throughout the organization.

And this -- what the investigation found is that we have several staff members who had been so harmed by these comments that were made that they didn't think they could work with Mr. Crawford any longer.

So we are supporting inclusivity and diversity by supporting staff who came forward very bravely to raise their concerns about the harm that had been done in the workplace.

The workplace that we oversee.

I guess I would conclude with thanking Mr. Crawford for his many years' served, as our C.F.O., and for the work that he did as our city administrator.

And I -- you know, the sky is falling rhetoric about going forward, I'm not buying because we have a very talented city staff.

Up and down the line.

We have leaders who are going to get us through this.

We are a city that would be an amazing opportunity for our next city administrator and -- and, again, I just want staff to know that when issues of harm --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Eyer: When issues of harm are occurring in the workplace, it's safe to come forward.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Mr. Postema, has this separation agreement been accepted or considered by Mr. Crawford's attorney?

>> City Atty. Postema: I've had -- just no go back, you asked me by resolution to

bring you forward a separation agreement tonight.

And I take that charge seriously.

Mr. Crawford had an attorney would I worked with on this, and ultimately it had to be a separation that was -- some sponsors would sponsor and I worked with sponsors on that.

Ultimately, I worked with Mr. Crawford's attorney because it was his wish to be -- have a voluntary resignation and to have other conditions that would assist him in this transition.

So that's what was done.

And yes, it was done in good faith.

I can assure you that when you give me a charge, I have negotiated many things over the 18 years that you have asked me to do, and I have done them.

This is no exception.

So it's a separation agreement that you asked for, and it was based under the circumstances that you are presented with.

So that's been done.

And the attorney did indicate to me today that Mr. Crawford has every intention to -- to sign this agreement tomorrow.

And so it was done with extensive discussions not only with his attorney, but also with the attorney discussing this with Mr. Crawford himself.

That's how these things go and that's what happened in this case.

You asked me to do it.

I did it.

>> Councilmember Song: Thank you.

So I just -- I just want to -- if I may, if I can be added to this resolution.

I will explain I didn't.

After the investigation became public, I did my due diligence and shared this with community members who do this work at the university.

Do this work, meaning what is the D.E.I. work, the antiracism work.

And I had this conversation with school folks and folks salt schools.

So -- folks at schools.

If Dr. Swift had this judgment, I don't think we would be surprised with how we came to this position -- how we came to this decision.

You know, stopping racism is not up to the victim's tolerance and I will say that again.

Stopping racism is not up to the victim's tolerance.

Now, either, we have become a body and a city that likes to --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmembers?

>> Councilmember Song: That they are supportive of diversity or we have become supportive of racism.

I hope this closes one chapter and opens another for the future of Ann Arbor.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

No matter -- no matter what the rational corrosive nonsense you read or hear, the separation is the exclusive, proper and unavoidable result of the employee's inappropriate statements.

A leader is permitted to be fallible and grow.

The leader also must be held to the highest standard and to be accountable for damage they cause to employees and the workplace.

These important truths are attention and after reviewing the report, and considering the organization's policies and practice and weigh professional judgment of those who advise us in these matters, I concluded that the statements complex separation.

The report concludes that the employee may made pervasive in hiring, race and sexual orientation, statements that are values of the workplace and simply entirely unacceptable.

It communicated that several of them expressed serious reservations about their ability to work with the employee or for the city in light of the comments.

We have public data from the city's H.R. director to the effect and I'm quoting that my general practice concerning substantiated discriminatory comments and that's distinct from conduct would be to recommend to terminate employment immediately though this could be affected by resignation.

This communication was affirmed in open session last meeting and we have received more fact-specific advice in private with the colleagues who do not view the statements as warrant separation, I ask you to look at page 4 of the July 12 memo.

In my view, failure to effect this separation would give rise to a number of harms, including loss of organization morale and lasting recruiting damage and substantial diminished to effect employee discipline, and response to future conduct and an incredible undercutting of crucial internal and external D.E.I. initiatives.

A C.E.O. that creates these conditions no matter their contrition, their interpersonal kindnesses or their prior services, that person just can't leave the organization.

We need an effective C.E.O. to lead.

The workplace statements have been reported simply render Mr. Crawford's leadership as untenable.

It's as simple as that.

In closing, the experience of the employees and the others who have now learned the statements as centered in my analysis, the employees who came forward is difficult to do that with D.

I.s about a -- D.E.I. about a supervisor.

I'm grateful that they did so and they have my thanks and respect.

Mr. Crawford will resign.

The terms of separation find the right balance in light of the separation circumstances and his years of service for which I thank him.

I'm going to vote yes tonight.

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> 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: No.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.
>> Mayor Taylor: DC-3, Resolution to Order Election and To Determine Ballot Question for Charter Amendment to Allow for Ranked Choice Voting.
Moved by Disch and seconded by Grand.
Discussion?
Councilmember Disch?
>> Councilmember Disch: I would like to say a couple of things about rank choice voting which is something I have been interested in a couple of decades.
Rank choice voting is legal in Michigan.
It doesn't require state legislation to authorize, it although changes to state law regarding the form and handling of ballots will be necessary in order for us to use it in Ann Arbor.
Why did Councilmember Grand and I want to put this up for consideration both before this body and before the voters?
As a rank choice voting benefits voters, we sponsored this resolution because we want Ann Arbor voters to decide whether they want it.
That is actually, whether they want it back again.
Rank choice voting is not a new idea in Ann Arbor.
Ann Arborites used this to vote the first and only African American mayor.
He did not get a majority of votes on the first round of counting, but picked up the support he needed from the second choices of people would supported the Civil Rights candidate.
Let me backtrack and tell you will exactly how it works.
Rank choice voting lets you take a skill that you use every day ranking and apply it to politics.
Vote your heart on the first round and if no candidate gets the majority support, we keep on counting.
Your second choice will come into play if your first choice falls off because it didn't have enough support.
This is great thing about rank choice voting.
There's no more worries about wasting your vote, because in a multi-candidate race, it is highly unlikely that on the first round any single one will get a majority.
So if yours doesn't have -- your first choice doesn't have big support, your second preference likely will make it to the final.
Cities all over the U.S. are using it today and research shows that now as in 1975, in Ann Arbor, more candidates of color are running and winning local

elections than in cities that use traditional plurality voting.

And if that is not enough to sell you on why we should put this on the ballot and let the voters decide if they want it back in Ann Arbor, let me say that our city recognizes something that we all know but our current two-party system cannot register.

People's preferences and beliefs do not fit into simple binary boxes that divide us between right and left what actually divides us between right and left are elites who paint these pictures of cities and nations.

The picture that makes me sick to my stomach because I'm a democrat and I want this experiment to succeed and it doesn't look to me like it is.

Survey research finds that there could be as many as five political parties in the United States if our winner take all political system didn't get in the way.

Rank choice voting allows those differences to --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Disch: To come out and register and be effective.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I don't have a tremendous amount to add.

When I tried to bring this forward in the previous council and it failed to be put on the ballot, I was heartened by the fact that we would have Dr. Disch joining us on council, who is an expert and also a real partner in a statewide movement to make our voting more democratic.

We hear a lot from residents about wanting comments and voting reforms, things that will help residents stay more engaged -- help residents stay more engaged and help us diversify our candidates and I believe that rank choice voting does all of that.

That's my own personal belief.

I also believe that -- that decisions about elections rightly should go to the voters and I think our voters deserve a chance to weigh in on whether or not they would like to see this kind of election reform back in our community.

So I hope you will join me in supporting it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: You know, I have a question as to how this will be applicable here in the state of Michigan, if it does pass.

The -- the comment about binary boxes struck a nerve with me, Councilmember Disch made, which I wish that this was coming with nonpartisan elections.

We frankly, have an oligarchy currently in the city of Ann Arbor running local government.

Just look at how much was raised in the last election by councilmembers who won their seats.

They have astronomical amounts of money being poured into the council seats in the city of Ann Arbor.

If this was 20, 30, 40 years ago, that would have raised quite a few eyebrows as no how much money is now being poured into local politics.

I will support this and hopefully see the day of nonpartisan elections in Ann

Arbor.

Hopefully we can break the stranglehold and the dominance that's here and on display that the community witnesses every other Monday.

Where might makes right and might brings big money.

Hopefully it allows for perspectives to be part of the policy making, but I -- I would ask -- this didn't get my support the first time because frankly what I understood the first time, the state of Michigan doesn't allow for this is this getting us shovel ready if state does change the -- the voting laws that pertain to this if

Ms. Beaudry you can answer that or someone on the call.

Thank you.

>> I did send a memorandum out that we can discuss.

I can tell you outside the memorandum when the city of Lansing voted a couple of weeks to place the rank choice voting on their ballot, they received a letter from the state of Michigan indicating that it's the state's position that they can't run -- currently can't run a rank choice -- run an election under rank choice voting rules in accordance with state law.

To more specifically answer your question, nothing has changed from when it was brought last summer until now.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Hayner?

>> Councilmember Hayner: So does that mean we're going to -- if this goes to the ballot and then the voters say yeah, we want to do this, we just can't anyway?

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Thomas?

>> The language in the -- the language would amend the chart to say until such time as it's allowed under city law and until the city is able to obtain voting equipment that is -- that is approved by state and can handle the range choice voting, we will stick with -- the highest vote is the person would wins or is nominated will receive the highest number of votes.

>> Councilmember Hayner: When I read that, I was sort of like, you know why are we doing it then?

So, you know, I agree with some of the things that my work colleagues said about people's preferences and absolutely people's preferences and beliefs don't fit into boxes.

I think we have known that but in no way will this let five parties be on the ballot if we still have partisan ballots.

We will rank choice the republicans, the democrats and the greens and D.S.A., whatever.

So there's no crossing over or opening up of third party, fourth parties under this provision, whatsoever.

It's ranking democrats is what we will be doing here in the city of Ann Arbor.

And we know that ranking democrats comes with large amounts of money.

Many of those sitting here come with that --

>> Councilmember Grand: I'm sorry.

Point of order.

This is the second time that we have council colleagues accuse councilmembers who are sitting here of having been here by virtue of raising money.

>> Councilmember Hayner: I merely commented that large amounts of money were spent in the last election.

Is that not factual?

>> Councilmember Grand: You said the result of people being here was because of the amount of money raised.

That's different.

>> Mayor Taylor: It's a fine point.

For my part, you know, I think the allegation is off key, but it's also sufficiently opaque that I will let it go.

>> Councilmember Hayner: Well, my point being.

I don't see how this will clear up a situation where the most money spent wins which has always been the case in the city of Ann Arbor and while I certainly agree it would be fantastic if we had five parties running and all of their beliefs were represented on the ballot, it won't happen without nonpartisan being a part of this.

Why this is coming forward without nonpartisan, I don't know.

But I won't support it.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: I was actually elected in a nonpartisan race for the library board.

We spent about \$700 each and covered a wider geography than the individual wards and that covered the city and the townships.

So if we look at nonpartisan elections as always, look at the A.A.D.L.

I want to thank Councilmember Disch for working on this, when I-Cam pained, I referenced mayor wheeler's campaign and had long conversations with Conan Smith in town and learned more about what ranked choice voting can bring, and it brought us our first and only black mayor in 1975.

I didn't realize the timing behind this when he put his first bid for election was April 1975, which is coincidentally, as my father was escaping as a medevac in a Huey to this country.

If we tie together democratic party ideals, if we tie together access to campaigning so we have more diverse candidates coming forward, and we see that actually tested out in other elections, I would look forward to seeing that kind of impact here in our city.

I did take the opportunity to speak about this extensively with community members and although there's a little bit of confusion on what the ballot might look like.

I think there's some eagerness, especially if it comes to including diverse candidates who have never thought that they would be -- that this would be an opportunity for them to run and represent their own communities.

So I look forward to more details and thank you for all the work.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Griswold.

Councilmember, you are inaudible.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

I thanked everyone on the screen, and I won't repeat that.

But what you want to say is I think that this -- this takes us halfway to where we want to be.

I also ran in a nonpartisan district-wide election a couple -- about three of them tore school board.

And I would like to see nonpartisan -- I think it's most important that we have November elections so that we can engage the students.

We're not doing that.

August elections don't do that and whether it's partisan or not, my preference is for nonpartisan.

I would like to see this move to November and the top voter through the ranked choice voting process wins.

I don't see the need to have two elections.

I will support this tonight and we can work on more improvements as we move along.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

>> Councilmember Disch: I wanted to very quickly answer two specific questions that were asked.

Councilmember Ramlawi asked essentially does RCV need to be authorized by state before the city can use it.

There is -- I have a document dated May 22nd, 2019, written by the board of elections lawyer, Lori Bubonae and what she says this the cover letter is this document lays out the issues and the steps needed that we see moving forward to implementing RCV in mission.

And what she says is under Michigan law, RCV is authorized for use by a home rule city -- excuse me -- which has enacted the preferential balance lot, that would on RCV, in the city charter or an amendment to the city charter in consultation with the Governor and the approval of the city's electors.

So it's authorized for use.

Does that mean we can go out and do it right now?

No.

Because our ballots are designed for plurality voter.

That's the traditional winner take all way of moving and our tabulating machines can to the tabulate a ranked choice election on site.

So those are things that will have to be worked out and they were worked out in order for East Point to old its RCV election which did elect an African American woman to the city council.

How does it open up choices Councilmember Hayner?

Independence could run -- well, first of all, you might actually get republicans holding primaries for municipal office and putting people on the ballot in November.

And people who want to vote for them could vote for them and then make a second choice of another, you know, an independent or make a democrat but not rank a second choice.

It does encourage people to run who can't win.

>> Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Thank you for your passion on this issue for bringing this forward and for -- and -- and also for educating me.

On my many questions that I had about it.

I'm excited to support this going forward and, you know, I just -- there's been a lot of talk about money in politics in local politics.

So, you know, I want to address those issues as part of this conversation because I really think it's a red herring, when we are talking about this change that we are making.

Somebody pointed out that oftentimes the person who -- would raises the most money tends to win.

Think any our local elections, you know, money tends to be a sign of support.

When I ran, I was, you know, blessed with a lot of support from the community, 250 individual donors donated to my campaign and the incumbent I ran against had 45 donors.

And one of those, you know, whats \$10,000 from his own pocket.

Of the \$16,000 that he raised.

So, you know, you talk about money and donors and, you no he, you really have to dig a little bit deeper.

There is no question that there's a lot of really bad -- you know, it is state and the national and I guess it could happen at the local level too of money and politics.

When you look at the campaign finance report of our local politics, it's filled with people, your neighbors, your coworkers, just writing a check out of the blue to somebody that they think will make a difference for their city.

So I really think -- I wish we could go, you know, a little deeper and get away from this narrative that -- that councilmembers are bought because it's just not true.

Anyway, I would like to be added as a cosponsor to this wonderful resolution and that's it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

We won't agree on many of those comments that were just last made.

I won't at least agree with them.

We are seeing a proliferation of P.A.C. money.

You know, we have P.A. C. money now that's being raised and given to candidates and in my opinion, toxic, the people behind these contributions have only led to the downward spiral of civil engagement.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Point of order.

Does this have to deal with the correct agenda item?

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I will not be supporting this.

We are talking about campaign.

We are talking about campaign finances.

Yes, I think it does.

I will let the chair rule on it.

>> Mayor Taylor: The campaign finances is tangentially related to this the conversation as a whole has veered in this direction.

I will allow it but maybe we should move on.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: And it would be nice -- I think this is a step in the right direction, once we have, you know, nonpartisan elections and then we can have a real diverse and inclusive set of candidates who can vie for position in government.

But my concern is -- and I raised it last year that this will allow concentrations of power and health to game the system to make sure that their candidates are the ones who hold these seats and it will be harder and harder for individuals like myself and others here who are not in the majority to garner the resources in order to overcome the vast amounts of money poured in to local elections as we are seeing.

The last election we had \$250,000 spent and I think that money will just get higher.

I'm not sure those are the ones -- those folks that are donating are the ones that are underrepresented.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Song.

>> Councilmember Song: Can I ask Mr. Thomas, what would -- in Ann Arbor passes this, how would this look if there were city, county on the same ballot.

>> If you are asking if we do run a ranked choice voting ballot?

>> Councilmember Song: Right.

>> It's only city offices and so councilmembers and mayor.

>> Councilmember Song: Okay.

Okay.

I think sometimes we forget that we have -- we are within a larger entity with -- that also has elections.

It would be interesting to see where the county lies in all of that.

Are any counties looking into this.

>> The home rule cities only applies to city.

>> Councilmember Song: The cities.

>> The only ones I know of -- Lansing has their charter amendment that they are considering to put on and Ferndale has one that's been sitting dormant since 2004.

>> Councilmember Song: Right.

Okay.

Great.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Briggs.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Thank you.

And thank you to member Disch and grand to bring this forward.

I think it's exciting to be bringing this conversation to our community to the ballot question.

I think it -- as I think about how it might have played out in my most recent campaign, I -- I think it -- you know, if I was -- assuming I had still moved forward,

I think it allows those of us that come to this table to be able to lead more effectively, because we are able to really understand how folks are voting and where their preferences are and to understand where the community -- what their issues are and not -- and not pigeon holing them as much.

So even if candidates are not able to move forward, hopefully we as leaders in this community can take more issues forward, I know I would be more cognizant. Campaign finance.

I agree with Councilmember Eyer's statements on.

This I think that I had two folks at least who were formerly homeless who donated to my campaign and there are a variety of different issues and people who donates to that.

I don't think it's the amount of money that folks raised.

As a group of democrats at a table that we are lobbying so hard to make sure that republicans have a stronger -- that that label is no longer on the ballot.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

For my part, I'm excited to move this forward.

I think that rank choice voting will in its -- in the form we are able to deploy when we deploy it, will ensure that the council more fully reflects the will of the voters.

I'm very pleased that this is consistent with partisan voting.

I'm a proud democrat and I believe that the values of democratic party are entirely relevant to the administration of local government and it's highly consistent with the Ann Arbor electorate and the candidate's value set and it's critical, I think that voters know as much as they can about the candidates before them.

Further discussion?

Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Just very briefly on that point.

Y'all -- after 25 years of being a journalist and not being able to be involved in politicked or even share my views, the fact that I can now, you are going to have to rest the democratic party label from my cold, dead hands.

I will never vote to give that up.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Roll call vote, please, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Yes.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-4 Resolution to Order Election and to Determine Ballot Question for Amendment to Section 14.2 of the City Charter Related to Emergency Purchases.

Moved by Radina and seconded by grand.

Discussion of DC-4?

Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Thank you.

I have a question here.

I apologize I didn't get any questions in.

My 9 to 5 or my 9 to 9 is quite busy these days.

With regards to this, it uncaps the \$25,000 cap to no limit?

Is that correct?

What is the limit on purchases without council approval?

Under these emergency power.

>> I think you are asking a question about DC-5, councilmember.

>> I'm sorry, do I have these mixed up?

The emergency purchases.

Does this allow the city administrator unlimited buying power using the emergency powers?

To enter contracts with no cap?

>> Yes, that's correct.

There's no limitation to what the city administrator could approve on an emergency basis with the requirement that they follow-up at the next council meeting with item to council for their approval.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, that's quite an awesome power to delegate, that I think is irresponsible of us to do.

I think we can call a council meeting within 18 hours of being noticed with the mayor and three councilmembers.

I think we should be ready to convene on a moment's notice when it comes to emergencies as.

Of our responsibilities as elected officials.

We are constantly on call and I cannot support this adjudicating our responsibility of spending unlimited amounts of money without prior consent.

That's just not going to nigh with me.

-- fly with me.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Eyer?

>> Councilmember Eyer: Ms. Praschan, could you sort of give us the staff -- at administration perspective on why this was suggested and why -- why it's felt to be necessary?

>> This really just cleans up the charter language to align with the afore matter.

In cases of emergency, there's quite often not suffer time and we have an immediate reaction that necessities staff reaction that immediately, for instance, recently we had the water main break on maple and Jackson avenue that required immediate staff and contractor intervention for a payment that ex --

exceeded the \$25,000 threshold.

>> Councilmember Eyer: You did do that because it was necessary.

>> We followed a policy that allowed them to do a memorandum and it was followed up with council at the next meeting.

>> Councilmember Eyer: How does this change it?

>> It cleans up the charter language to align with that process.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Okay.

So this really is not a change.

It's not a change.

It's just cleaning up charter language and putting into the charter what is already city policy?

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: Well, you know as the old adage goes, if it's not broke, why bother trying to fix it?

Was there any instances where the city administrator was precluded from taking care of business?

Because of this?

The two instances that come to mind that the administrator needed to act in a very quick way was the water main break and in the Leslie science center contamination that was discovered.

And in both cases the city administrator acted immediately to correct those issues I'm wondering what are we trying to fix here if there's nothing broken.

To me, we are opening up ourselves and adjudicating our responsibility and the instances that are being put forward have been resolved with the current language that's in place.

So I'm just trying to -- if you can maybe point to an instance where the administrator was kept from taking action.

Maybe that would help me better understand why this change is needed.

That is a question.

>> Mayor Taylor: Is there a staff response to it?

>> Gentleman indicate a point in time when the -- I can't indicate a point in time when the city administrator could not act.

The current charter doesn't have an emergency provision.

This cleans up that language to allow that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Councilmember Grand?

>> Councilmember Grand: I would try to take a stab at that.

The fact that Councilmember Ramlawi -- that he thought this was a change, and not reflective of our current practice speaks to the need to putting the existing practice in the starter and when hear from staff that they want us to help align the current practice with the charter so that everything is on the up and up and aligned.

I'm happy to support that.

I think it just makes it more -- it makes our practices more transparent and known

to the public if they care to know that.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Councilmember Griswold.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Just a quick question.

To clarify we haven't been constrained by the \$25,000 limit because we haven't been following the \$25,000 limit?

And so that hasn't been our practice so we're simply updating now to agree with our practice, to be consistent with our practice; is that true?

>> The own thing we're updating in this particular circumstance is the emergency provision that allows the city administrator to grant contracts or services in excess of \$25,000 during an emergency situation.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Correct and previously we were not constrained by the \$25,000.

>> Correct.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Okay.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Disch?

Further discussion?

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: Yes.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson: Yes.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: DC-5, Resolution to Order Election and To Determine Ballot Question for Amendment to Section 14.2 of the City Charter Related to the \$25,000 Limit.

moved by Eyer and seconded by Disch.

Discussion of DC-5, Councilmember Eyer.

>> Councilmember Eyer: This one came to me from administration what I started talking about the best value charter amendment.

Which we decided at our last meeting to put on the November ballot.

This one, I'm wondering if I could call on you Ms. Praschan, because you put together the great statistics from 2020.

That illustrated how this can help our staff in terms of efficiency.

>> Certainly.

The data that we polled as Councilmember Eyer mentioned was electric the fiscal year 2020.

Council considered 106 items that required a spending authorization.

30% of those items were under \$75,000.

And 60% were over the \$75,000 threshold.

By changing the threshold to the \$75,000 limit, we would see approximately 60% of the items and 96% of the Val sue that was approves.

>> Councilmember Eyer: So that was what was compelling to me that staff is spending so much time preparing these items that only represent 4% for spending 40% of their time preparing items to come before council, that represents 4% of our spending on contracts.

To me, this -- that coupled with the fact that when this was first passed and into the charter, there was no increase for inflation but if there had been, we would be near that \$75,000 by now anyways.

Means that \$75,000 is in the spirit of what is in the charter part in terms of buying power.

The other thing I would say, I want to stress that this is only for council approval.

Items between \$25,000 and \$75,000 will still be bid.

They will not be noted contracts.

That's very important to me.

And I did ask Mr. Fournier about daylighting, putting on our website, all the contracts regardless of --

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yep, regardless of the limit of the cost so we can provide oversight that way as well.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Radina.

>> Councilmember Radina: I'm in the awkward position of having cosponsored this but I will not be supporting it tonight.

I cosponsored it as a courtesy to ensure we could talk about it and I want to call attention to and mention my appreciation for the work that staff puts in to preparing some of these items for us but I can at least think of -- there are times when -- when this may still -- the lower threshold may still have value and I can think of one instance when I joined council, where initially we were considering purchasing some Teslas.

And after conversations with councilmembers that was pulled and reconsidered and we waited to put forward a fourth mach-e instead.

There are sometimes when council has provided some discretion on these things and I -- I'm just not prepared at this stage to raise that threshold and so I will not be supporting this tonight.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion?

Councilmember Song?

>> Councilmember Song: If I can, just a point of reference that I know at the library, the library director had a \$33,000 spending cap.

She was allowed to spend \$33,000 before coming to trustees for approvals and votes.

And I understand the library is different than the city.

There are other entities that do these things.

All right.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

Roll call vote, starting with Councilmember Hayner.

>> Councilmember Hayner: No.

>> Councilmember Disch: Yes.

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes.

>> Councilmember Song: Yes.

>> Councilmember Grand: Yes.

>> Councilmember Radina: No.

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes.

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes.

>> Councilmember Nelson no.

>> Councilmember Briggs: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: No.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Motion carries.

>> Mayor Taylor: Mr. Postema, do we have a closed session today?

>> City Atty. Postema: We do not.

>> Mayor Taylor: You have before us the clerk's report for of communications, petitions and referrals moved by Griswold and seconded by Disch.

Discussion?

All in favor?

Opposed?

The clerk's report is approved.

Are there communications today from the city attorney?

>> City Atty. Postema: No, mayor.

>> Mayor Taylor: We now come to public comment general time.

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

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

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

Once you are connected further please enter star nine.

Star nine to indicate that you wish to speak.

Our clerk will identify you by the first three digits of your telephone number.

When it's your turn to speak, you will 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 and when your time is expired.

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

Is there anyone who would like to speak at public comment?

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 941.

Go ahead.

>> This is Blaine Coleman.

Councilmember Jen Eyer is drenched in campaign contributions of old friends of

the Israel I.D.F.

And eyer dares to brag about her campaign contributions?

Look at the behavior of the Ann Arbor city council in trying to smother any type of ordinance that talks about Palestinian rights.

Ann Arbor is one big dog for the Israeli defense forces in my opinion.

And there's new evidence this week on what an incredibly low opinion the whole Ann Arbor city council is displaying for Palestinian life.

In my opinion, this is a viciously racist city council which is getting ready to rank dogs higher on their agenda than Palestinians.

Yes, city council is about to bring the full force of the law down on dogs behaving badly against other dogs and this comes years after throwing their weight against any type of Palestinian human rights resolution.

Do you see the problem here?

City council is getting ready to punish dog violence against dogs.

Can you read the article in the Ann Arbor observer?

Read all about it!

City council is going to flex its money on that issue, the taxpayer supported violence against the Palestinian people think council is not going near that.

In fact, they are smothering the resolution on military aid to Israel.

They seem to feel the taxpayer supported violence against Palestinians is sacrosanct.

After going everything they could the Ann Arbor city council voted almost unanimously to smother the wildest resolution mentioning Palestinian.

When it comes to taxpayer supported genocide against the Palestinian people, city council plays dead, but boy do they feel powerful when it comes to controlling dog on dog violence.

In my opinion, city council has become one big dog for the Israel defense forces.

I say vote every one of them out before Israel launches another massacre with their help.

That's my opinion.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Mayor I don't see anyone else with their hands up.

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

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending with 496.

Go ahead.

>> I had there.

My name is petal sandcastle ward one.

I kind of decided I would not really think about what I was going to say until it came time to speak and then I would look at all of you and how you all made me feel.

We are all on our very own special journeys and being in Ann Arbor we the words woke and consciousness patted around and we have some understanding of what these words mean.

The fact is getting woke and getting conscious, it's a never ending process.

And so the more conscious you get, the more aware you are of everyone, every

virtually it goes into little ants and inclusiveness is more inclusiveness.
The more you start to really get frustrated and it makes it difficult to make space for people would are not even looking and I hear a hear Councilmember Ramlawi and I hear Councilmember Hayner, and it's not just you guys.

It's a mentality that is pervasive in Ann Arbor and it's that I don't have to look because we built the system where we don't have to look and we have the B.L.M. signs in our windows and we say the right things sometimes and we are the lesser of evils and it becomes so exhausting to be here and we are closing up our nonprofit and our business here because the looks and the gawks and the faux -- the faux unity, the faux melting pot, it's not a space for queers or marginalized people.

75% is white and Asian and 75% of the people incarcerated are African Americans.

This you have to see that's something to unpack.

This is a personal invitation to the entire body if you want to come to your studio and express your yes and get it out and see the humanity if it exists within each other and across the aisle and really I don't know, see each other in a different way that is not always the same, which is as a member of city council.

Maybe you need to play chess with each other.

If you are not a blueprint to the larger conversation of the nation.

One of the consistently top ranked universities in town, its got to be up to us.

We have to create some different narratives.

It's becoming very frustrating.

I mean, compost.

There's so much to unpack, people.

Okay.

Thank you so much.

If you are interested express your yes.com and we will do it for free and live stream it friends, consciousness is all inclusive.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

Clerk caller with the phone number ending in 941, press star six to unmute yourself.

Caller 941.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Taylor: Yes, we can.

>> My name is Mozhgan Savabieasfahani.

One thing that really strikes anyone watching you guys at each other's throats is the decline of American liberal democracy.

You are in big trouble because the mayor and his slate represent big money, developers, big money!

And the rest of you are trying hard to protect the interests of weaklings in this town and you cannot because you yourself are not clear in your head.

This town still does not have \$15 minimum wage.

People of this town do not come into your discussion.

Their needs are totally ignored.
We don't have public housing.
We don't have \$15 minimum wage.
We don't have clean water.
PFAS is all over our water.
Dioxane is everywhere, but you don't have time for any of that.
You have to sit and discuss in a very phony way finance reports and finance elections -- elections financing.
Anybody, a big body in the world, knows that money buys a political seat in the American political system.
Ms. Eyer, read some stuff.
Everybody knows that money pushes officials into their offices across the board in the United States of America.
This is why many are fighting it.
They are saying money cannot decide who gets into the positions of power.
In Ann Arbor, like everywhere else this holds true.
Money brings people into positions of power, political power.
And then you implement decisions that would serve specific groups, not the public.
Look at yourselves.
You are not serving the public in this town.
You are not serving the public.
>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.
>> I'm calling to just say it is disturbing that you still pretend to be antiracist when you, all of you show that you have no respect for Palestinian human rights.
Ms. Songs your actions describe you as a racist.
You have put every -- every power you have against any resolution to protect people of Palestine.
You cannot pretend you are an antiracist.
Ms. Eyer, stop talking about safety at workplace.
You are implicated on all kinds of stuff and I believe those allegations.
You can't talk about safety in the workplace.
You don't mean it.
You have been implicated in charges and I believe those.
So you can see what a reck you are.
Do something about it.
>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 556, do you have a comment?
Go ahead.
>> Hello, Ralph McKee.
I wanted to follow up on your discussion of Mr. Crawford's termination.
I think the majority needs to consider more carefully what some of the words.
Were the witnesses that came forward from staff credible?
I have no problem with Ms. Salvatore's initial description of the witnesses as appearing credible, but it's a long way from there to concluding that they were

more credible than Mr. Crawford.

What she was saying was ultimately his denials were incorrect based on one, that there were multiple similar comments and Crawford's bad memory.

There were not two witnesses on any comment, not one.

She failed to interview a single person other than the complaining witnesses on any points and reviewed no documents.

And the imprecision of the report leaves open the possibility that made one of the allegations is most problematic.

You may know more via the closed session or some private source but what I just said is that is shown in the public report.

What does substantiated mean?

One person, one person who failed to do obvious due diligence.

Compare this compared to the stark report on 2019 on the Wilkerson affair.

One person decided that Mr. Crawford didn't remember accurately.

It's substantiation, and it's very skinning.

I'm not disrespecting the staff who came forward.

Maybe they were all telling the truth and Mr. Crawford's memory is shot.

But the incomplete and the imprecise report disrespects the staff by leaving that doubt there.

Next, what do you consider discriminatory comments.

I think the three that Ms. Salvatore found most problematic.

Should employees have to worry that they are disappointed saying that women have a disproportionate care of child bearing.

How about the question about how to refer to the person who recently came out?

How about the comment about the haircut?

What if someone says Juneteenth should not be a holiday?

Is that a fireable offense?

You are touting a zero tolerance policy.

You really need to give some real guidance.

And if we are talking about credible, I will echo what the doctor just said on this -- on her call.

If those -- if our staff is credible, what about the Vanguard employees?

They came out.

They talked to the press.

They actually used their real names, specific charges against Ms. Eyer.

Aren't they credible?

Oh, no, Lisa Disch says oh, they are unsubstantiated.

How about asking Ms. Salvatore to interview them.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Time.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 340.

Go ahead.

>> Yes, greetings.

Mr. Mayor and city council, this is Luis Vasquez from the first ward.

Speaking as a member of a minority group, my father came from Puerto Rico to

New York City.

I grew up in New York City, and experienced discrimination just because of my very name.

I -- I'm this was all I had to see, this one comment from Mr. Crawford that kind of sealed the deal for me.

He said, this is why you have to be careful hiring minorities, because you can't fire them or let them go.

Forgive me, I'm having a very difficult time wondering why Councilmembers Nelson and Hayner and Ramlawi and Griswold, why they're apparently okay with that kind of language coming from the city administrator, one of the highest level people in all of Ann Arbor.

I think this makes those four councilmembers not fit to serve in office anymore and I really wish you guys would take a look at yourselves and what it is that you are saying in defense of racially and sexually insensitive speech, including that speech which comes out of Mr. Hayner's -- well, the stuff that comes out of Hayner's pen or keyboard.

Which are also racially and sexually insensitive.

Please change your behavior.

I can't wait until next year so that we have the opportunity to make our voices heard once and again -- and get those who are not fit to serve off of council once and for all.

Thank you.

Have a good night.

>> Clerk Beaudry: Caller with the phone number ending in 736, do you have a comment?

Go ahead.

>> Yes, this is Trische Duckworth.

Excuse me, I'm yawning because it's really late.

So much has happened in this meeting.

It's embarrassing to watch you argue back and forth.

I want to say it was very hard to watch you raise the employee for coming forward and then on top of that thank come Crawford for his amazing work.

That amazing work includes racial comments.

What if that amazing work includes sexist comments?

Like how, do you thank someone who does that.

Racism is an atrocity.

You don't thank them.

You don't give them a slap on the wrist and give them nine months to find another job while you pay them.

You don't give them access to retirement benefits!

And you call this antiracism work.

This was just more fluff because if you meant it, you would have fired him for the atrocity that was committed.

You harped, all of you that voted yes, sir and perpetuated racism.

Why understand you all.

Why don't you look in the mirror and say maybe I'm operating under racist principles.

You must admit and become self-aware about it.

You can't continue to operate, thinking that you are a liberal and that your Black Lives Matter sign means something if you don't back it up with the real work.

The real work is in the trenches where none of you are hardly.

And that's where you need to be to find out what disenfranchised people.

You revictimized employees with what you did.

You should have fired that man but you can't because you operate under racist principles as well.

>> Clerk Beaudry: 30 seconds.

>> Mayor Taylor: Thank you have.

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

>> Mayor Taylor: Anyone else who would like to speak at public comment?

Seeing no one, public comment is closed.

Are there communications from council?

Councilmember Griswold?

>> Councilmember Griswold: Yes, I just want to summarize some of what has been said tonight, and if we were striving to be antiracist, anti-homophobic, when we had five members of staff come forward with claims and then we did somewhat of a superficial investigation and there were allegations that were denied by some, agreed to by some.

Antiracism would have been to have a robust investigation.]

That would have honored the staff that came forward, a robust investigation that would have then led to either termination or restorative justice but we didn't do that.

What we did is we had a superficial investigation of five employees.

That were simply allegations.

There was no serious investigation of multiple people trying to verify the results and so now, that has turned into the term that I used before, but nothing more than a toxic political tornado where people are using this for their own political advantage, and I'm sorry and I want to apologize to the five members who came forward because we have not treated you with the respect that you deserved.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further communication from council?

May I have a motion to adjourn, please.

Moved by -- I'm sorry, Councilmember Song.

My apologies.

I didn't see your hand up.

>> Councilmember Song: There was an email that was sent into council earlier today explaining what restorative justice is to interrupt cycles of imprisonment.

We are not talking about criminalization and imprisonment, and I would really encourage folks to read this amazing statement by Ryan Henyard who works in D.E.I. at the university and explaining how restorative practice is to repair the harm done, but it's those most impacted by the harm in question.

I'm sure we love to have folks follow up with him.

I'm sure we can dedicate ourselves in a similar fashion.

The gist of that message is to underline the point where the power dynamic means the responsibility is held to create safe work receive for whistle-blowers. That's my takeaway.

Thanks.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Ramlawi.

>> Councilmember Ramlawi: I think it's time to look into getting an emergency manager for the city of Ann Arbor.

I think this council has proven itself incapability of leadership.

The mayor, the mayor Pro Tem have decided to lead in a way that does not bring people together.

The new council majority has filled on the promises to bring this council together.

This community is more divided than it was before and it continues to be divided.

Nothing will be setted until the next election but it's become quite clear to me that this town needs new leadership.

This town definitely needs new leadership.

We are on a destructive path.

We are on a toxic path.

We're on a past with not much hope going forward and I don't think we will find a competent high functioning administrator who will come into this and jeopardize what they have going for them otherwise.

I think it's time that Ann Arbor gets its own emergency manager.

>> Mayor Taylor: Councilmember Grand.

>> Councilmember Grand: Thank you.

I feel the need to respond to that.

I vehemently disagree.

I think getting along means that everyone has to be willing to come together.

It doesn't mean that people who were elected compromise their principles.

And capitulate.

There's a difference.

From my perspective, I will continue to say I will always vote for an idea that I think is good for the city, no matter where this comes from.

One thing that I admire about our mayor is his optimistic tendencies and making sure that we see what's so great about our city.

It can be hard when you do this, because you see the really, really good and the really, really not so good.

But I'm going to continue to believe that being in this role means that I think we have great things ahead of us for our city and the people would live here and that want to make it a more inclusive community.

And provide opportunities for everyone who wants to -- or as many people who would like to be here to contribute.

To our betterment.

It's not all doom and gloom to me.

If you think it's a terrible place to work and someone wouldn't want to come here, you can leave.

That's fine.

And then if you think you can run for mayor.

>> Councilmember Hayner: That is charming.

Wow!

>> Councilmember Eyer: Yes, the idea of appointing an emergency manager, thereby usurping every voter, refer resident, taking away our right to self-rule, it is just crazy.

I think any councilmember who doesn't want to do this work any more can step down.

If it's too much and it's a lot -- it is a lot.

These are tough things that we have been dealing with, but I would not -- the idea of calling upon the state to take over our city because you don't want to do work anymore is just absolutely shocking.

I think it speaks to the lateness of hour perhaps.

Maybe we can blame it on that.

Perhaps it's time for us to adjourn.

>> Mayor Taylor: Further discussion.

You know, it's been suggested that this is a place where folks might not want to come to work and I think that people vote with their feet and the feet of so many or coming straight to Ann Arbor and they come here for a wide variety of reasons.

They do because the quality of life in this city is amazing, because the community is amazing, because although imperfect like all human endeavors, I wouldn't trade our problems to anyone's.

We are looking for ourselves to be better.

I would say in terms of a -- a -- someone coming to apply to serve as city attorney or city administrator or any other position in -- in city hall, what they know, they will be working in a community that values them and people appreciate the services that city hall provides and know that they will be working with a workforce that is outstanding and committed to do the work.

Committed to doing the work for the residents, for themselves and committing to support each other.

All endeavors are imperfect and ours is certainly so, but fundamentally, this is a great place.

It's a place where anyone would want to be.

As to, you know, meetings here on Monday fights.

I'm going to say I don't believe that this is a toxic council.

I think there's toxicity on council.

There's a lot more conversation about us that there ought to be.

We are not the focus here.

Our focus is on getting work ton for community members.

That should be our task.

Not to drag down and talk about each other, in ways that are corrosive and unproductive.

Further discussion?

Rather further communication from council.

Adjournment?

Moved by Griswold and Radina.

All in favor?

All opposed?

We are adjourned, everyone.