

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: December 21, 2015
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	<u>Received</u>						
1	<u>Sent Time</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>Redactions</u>	<u>Reason for Redaction</u>
2	8:25 PM		All City Council	Cathy Tsadis		Email address	Privacy
3	9:52 PM		Chip Smith	Thomas Paluchniak		Email address	Privacy
4	10:17 PM		Zach Ackerman	Jane Klingsten		Email address	Privacy
5	10:24 PM		Sabra Briere	Jennifer Fike	James Ringold, Eva Forman, Norm Kerr, Tom Oldani, Jon Cioffi	Email addresses	Privacy
6	11:37 PM		Srijan Sen	Jane Lumm, Kirk Westphal		Email address	Privacy

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Cathy [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 8:25 PM
To: CityCouncil
Subject: Northeast Ann Arbor development

Hi,

I am hoping that you vote to postpone approval of the new housing along Nixon, Green, and Dhu Varen. It is already extremely difficult to take a left turn from Bluett Road onto Nixon. Furthermore, I have seen many close accidents on Nixon which is concerning since so many middle school and high school students cross Nixon on their way to and from school as well as to and from city bus stops on their way to and from school.

In addition, Clague Middle School is already overcrowded. My daughter's eighth grade French class had over 40 students as did her algebra 1AC class which is an accelerated ninth-grade class. There are so many students in middle school classes at Clague that not much teaching is occurring. The teachers have to consistently try to get the same students to behave. They also lose assignments partially due to having too many students in class.

I have seen way too many near misses with cars as well as a few accidents in this vicinity. Please postpone your vote until more studying is done about safety and the effect of the developments on our schools.

Thank you,

Cathy Tsadis

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Thomas Paluchniak [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 9:52 PM
To: Smith, Chip
Subject: Re: Deer cull

Yes, I am aware of the Counsel's previous vote to slaughter the deer. Nothing about the counsel's decision or subsequent decisions have had direction. The whole matter has been ill conceived.

For instance, the City has not told us how many deer are supposedly in Ann Arbor, has not set a target number for the desired number, and has failed to try alternate suggestions. They ignored biologists and professors at several City counsel meetings who refuted the assertions that the City has a deer problem. They essentially started from the proposition there was a problem, and they were going to address it by authorizing a slaughter no matter how unpopular it seemed.

I attended several counsel meetings on this issue. I elected not to attend tonight's meeting. It is clear our elected officials [excluding the mayor] simply do not care what the overwhelming majority of people in attendance at these meetings feel on the issue. Based on the response of the community, the counsel should have taken more time to more thoroughly think this issue out.

The whole thing stinks. The City has failed to inform voters the extent citizens are going to have to suffer for this poorly thought out endeavor. Specifically, my family and I walk daily in the many Ann Arbor parks after a long hard day at work. It is our source for family bonding, and exercise. We do this every day. To think the City is going to deny us three months of exercise in parks we pay for is something I never thought I'd see in Ann Arbor. This is supposed to go on for four years?

This issue will tear the City apart.

You guys should and can do better.

Best,

Thomas Paluchniak

> On Dec 19, 2015, at 12:36 PM, Smith, Chip <ChSmith@a2gov.org> wrote:

>

> Thomas,

>

> Thanks for writing.

> As I'm sure you're aware, the previous council voted to proceed with the deer cull in Ann Arbor Parks and Natural Areas (I was not yet on council and would have joined Mayor Taylor in voting against the cull). The resolutions and ordinance amendments necessary to proceed did not have direction about how to do the cull, only that staff is responsible for developing the methodology.

>

> It is with that direction that the plan to close 26 parks and natural areas between the hours of 4 pm and 7am beginning January 1st for a period not lasting longer than April 1st. Staff was directed to come up with a plan where safety is paramount, and they have done that.

> Though I did not support the idea of the cull, had I been on council at that point, it's important to note that my vote would not have changed the outcome of Council's decision.

>

> So we find ourselves moving ahead with the cull and, based on the volume and tone of the correspondence I've received, the implementation of the cull is creating hardships for residents. To be clear, it is not council's role to determine how the policy is carried out - our role is to establish the policy and then for staff to find the best way to carry it out. Staff was directed to develop a cull in which safety to residents is paramount. They have done exactly that. However, the tradeoff is reduced access to 26 parks and natural areas from January 1st- March 31st.

>

> When I learned of the closures, I had many questions and many concerns. Our parks are a vital part of Ann Arbor's quality of life and to lose access, even for a few hours every day, has a direct impact on people. The trails connecting parks, schools, and neighborhoods are also vital transportation corridors. I was alarmed when I first read of the closures and started reaching out to colleagues to see if there was a way to provide more direction to staff that would result in fewer or less lengthy closures.

>

> Council Member Sabra Briere and I have submitted a resolution that will prohibit the cull from occurring in parks through which the border to border trail runs, that certain parks shall not be used for a cull because of their value to the community for unduplicatable transit and recreation (Olson dog park; Argo park and Argo cascades; Bandemer Park; Furstenberg Park). I advocated stepping back from the cull, but was not able to garner support from my colleagues for that decision.

>

> Though I'm not satisfied with the limitations on the public use of our park land, this resolution appears to have enough support to pass on Monday night. I understand your frustration, your fears and your concerns. I will continue to work to lessen the impact of this action on the community and to get access to all of our parks restored as quickly as possible.

>

> Best regards,

>

> _____

> Chip Smith

> Ann Arbor City Council - Ward 5

> 734-709-2022

>

> Emails sent or received may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

> ♻️Think Green! Don't print this e-mail unless you need to.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Thomas Paluchniak [mailto:████████████████████]

> Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 3:59 PM

> To: CityCouncil

> Subject: Deer cull

>

> The deer cull is silly enough. Now I can't use the park everyday in the hours I'd normally use them for three month? This us going to make a lot of evening park dwellers quite unhappy.

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Jane Klingsten [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 10:17 PM
To: Ackerman, Zach
Subject: Nixon Farms

The issue is not density, it is what the land itself can support.

No matter what happens, the plan itself needs to be fixed. We could use the time to do this better.

This would be so different if it was high density in a less ecologically sensitive area.

Losing the quality of the proposed parkland is a reality.

-Jane

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Jennifer Fike [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 10:24 PM
To: Briere, Sabra
Cc: James Ringold; Eva Forman; Norm Kerr (TEMA TTC); [REDACTED] Tom Oldani; [REDACTED] Jon Cioffi
Subject: Re: deer cull

Thanks for your response, Sabra.

Jennifer

On Mon, Dec 21, 2015 at 10:45 AM, Briere, Sabra <SBriere@a2gov.org> wrote:
Dear Jennifer,

Council did not weigh in on the implementation plan. The first time we saw any details was in the press release. I still have not (no Council member has) seen the plan.

I've attached the background document I prepared as part of my newsletter. If you get my newsletter, you may have already seen this. If you don't, I hope you will forgive me for cluttering your mailbox.

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council member
Ann Arbor, MI

[REDACTED]
(734)995-3518

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

From: Jennifer Fike [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 10:21 AM
To: Briere, Sabra
Cc: James Ringold; Eva Forman; Norm Kerr (TEMA TTC); [REDACTED] Tom Oldani; [REDACTED] Jon Cioffi
Subject: Re: deer cull

Dear Sabra,

Thanks for weighing in on what is happening.

Did Council vote on how this would be implemented? Can Council adjust the implementation plan and if so, are there plans to limit the amount of time the parks will be closed?

Jennifer Fike
1627 Harbal

On Mon, Dec 21, 2015 at 9:12 AM, Briere, Sabra <SBriere@a2gov.org> wrote:
Dear Jim,

I stand corrected. Of course porcine zonopellucida is a protein. It's early, and this remains not my area of expertise.

The presentation from the humane society - and my own three hours spent with the wildlife biologist, looking at potential sites - affects my response. The national humane society uses bait and does the contraceptive darting only at a specific time of the year (I believe it precedes mating season, but I can be wrong). She described the process she uses thoroughly - she baits the deer in order to bring the largest number together and deal with the tagging et al at once. Limited time, limited staff, needs to be efficient.

No mention of the parks closing? That's because there was no implementation plan. We were told we needed to authorize the cull before there would be an implementation plan.

I appreciate your view that there ought to be a moratorium.

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council
Ann Arbor
734-995-3518
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 21, 2015, at 8:57 AM, James Ringold [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Sabra for your thoughtful response. If I may respectfully comment on a few of your statements:

* The deer are not injected with a hormone, they are darted with a protein which causes an immune response.

* The deer can be directly approached and darted over time. No need to do it all at once, with bait.

* Newer techniques do not require tranquilizing.

* Yes it will take a year to get a permit from DNR, which has been done in other states. We are not in an emergency situation. This is the first year we have considered doing anything. So a year is reasonable.

If I may ask, why was no mention of the park closings made before the vote? I'm not blaming you; I assume that you didn't know either. In that case council did not understand the details and this is a perfect reason for a moratorium.

Best,

-Jim

On Mon, Dec 21, 2015 at 8:20 AM, Briere, Sabra <SBriere@a2gov.org> wrote:

Dear neighbors,

I'm sorry to chime in on a political issue, but I do want to make certain we all have the same information.

First, I support working toward a program that uses immunocontraceptives to control the deer population. I also know that no such program has worked in an open community such as Ann Arbor, and that many doubt that the population growth would actually be controlled through annual or biannual treatments.

It is important to remember that all deer are under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. Right now, the state of Michigan does not allow programs that use immunocontraceptives. It also does not permit sterilization or relocation - two additional ideas that keep being mentioned.

Right now, the only solution to deer population growth in Michigan is to kill the deer.

It's true that the DNR might consider immunocontraceptives programs. In order to learn whether they will, Ann Arbor's City Council approved a deer management plan that also requires staff to develop such a plan - in collaboration with the national humane society, among other partners - and appeal to the DNR for permission to implement that plan. There is no way for this process to work quickly; it will take at least another 12 months, and possibly another 24 months, before the DNR grants a permit. If it does at all.

Both culling and immunocontraceptives programs use the same general tools - they build bait piles, convince deer that they are safe, and then shoot them. Immunocontraceptive programs shoot with tranquilizer darts (some few deer die from the tranquilizers), they tag the deer, they give them a shot of a hormone that prevents successful conception, and they let them go. Some deer die from the stress.

Both programs need to continue for the foreseeable future. Neither will 'accomplish' anything in one year - and accomplishment can only be measured by how many fewer deer are seen.

Thank you for letting me butt in.

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council
Ann Arbor
734-995-3518
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 21, 2015, at 8:02 AM, Eva Forman [REDACTED] wrote:

Thank you James for getting to the point! This is definitely the best solution and a win win situation. It has become very clear that some do not like the deer and are not open to look at some other solutions. What a shame for the council not at least to have attended the meeting. It is the saddest act in this Holiday season. Let's hope for that miracle.
Eva Forman

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 19, 2015, at 10:40 AM, James Ringold [REDACTED] wrote:

Norm,

While respectfully agreeing with your goals, I believe that they can be accomplished using non-lethal methods. I attended a lengthy presentation at the humane society on the newer technique of Immunocontraception. This is not spaying or birth control pills. The deer are darted with a protein which causes an antibody response that blocks fertilization. Within 5 years the herd is reduced 50%. Since deer are matriarchal and does hold their territory, new deer do not move in. The deer coats look healthier and the deer cease coming out during the day. The only member of council to attend this presentation was the only member of council to vote against the cull (the mayor.) To those who have somehow concluded that it "doesn't work", I say let's give it a try. It's more humane, way cheaper and doesn't require us to close the parks. More info. at:

<http://www.humanesociety.org/animals/deer/tips/deer-humane-control.html>

<http://stoptheshoot.org>

<http://www.faawn.org>


BTW no Lyme's disease has been reported in Ann Arbor and culls have not been shown to reduce Lyme's disease.

In my opinion this proposal just keeps getting worse. No mention of these park closings was made before the city council votes. I say let us vote on it. If there was not a majority against the cull already, there certainly is now after these park closures have been made public.

Best,

-Jim

On Sat, Dec 19, 2015 at 10:11 AM, Norm Kerr (TEMA TTC)

 wrote:

Isn't the main reason for the cull the prevention of malnourishment/starvation of deer caused by overpopulation, and related disease their malnutrition will cause? Since there are no predators we (humans) are solely responsible for their population control.

Other communities which have engaged in deer population control have done so because of Lyme disease in humans, and sick deer in the wild. When those two things get bad enough, the majority agree to proceed then ask themselves why they let it get so bad (and had let so many deer suffer in the depths of winter by slow starvation) before they did something about it.

A recent study in Yosemite showed an overall improvement in the vitality of the whole ecosystem when the deer overpopulation was brought under control.

Garden plant damage is pretty minor of a consideration compared with these other things.

Norm Kerr

On Dec 19, 2015, at 9:59 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

There seems to be a consensus among neighbors of concern for vegetation & accidents involving the deer population. I too, have experienced hosta leaves & other vegetation destruction by deer, which is not bothersome, as there is plenty of vegetation in my yard that they do not fancy. In late summer, deer trampled bushes dividing my property with 1309 Jones. It is difficult to imagine that they escaped unscathed. However, it is embarrassing & unfortunate to learn that a city considered to be one of the most intelligent cities in the country, chose the inhumane option to cull the deer population. A forthcoming project for me will be to remove the dead/decaying/trampled brush on my property to allow room to roam for the deer that are left.

Margaret Wayne
1307 Jones Drive

From: "Tom Oldani" [REDACTED]
To: "Jennifer Fike" [REDACTED]
Cc: "broadwayhood"

[REDACTED] "Jon Cioffi"

Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 4:31:21 PM
Subject: Re: deer cull

Don't get me started Jen. This is just a ridiculous poorly planned and shameful process.

Sent from me! To you.

On Dec 18, 2015, at 2:10 PM, Jennifer Fike [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Neighbors,

Just wondering if you are aware that the deer cull will take place in our neighborhood in the Cedar Bend Nature area? The parks where the cull is taking place will be closed for **3 months** -- daily from 4 pm to 7 am beginning on 1/1/16.

As a runner who uses this park & many of the others identified as part of the cull, I find this excessive and am also concerned about the student population that is adjacent to Cedar Bend Nature Area as there are many unofficial trail entrances to this park.

http://www.mlive.com/news/ann-arbor/index.ssf/2015/12/26_parks_and_nature_areas_to_c.html

Jennifer Fike


--

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message, including any attachments, is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated addressee(s). If you are not an addressee, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return message, telephone, or facsimile transmission.
Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

--

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message, including any attachments, is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated addressee(s). If you are not an addressee, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return message, telephone, or facsimile transmission. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Srijan Sen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 11:37 PM
To: Lumm, Jane; Westphal, Kirk
Subject: Deer Cull

Dear Ms. Lumm and Mr. Westphal,

Beyond voting, I have not very involved in city politics. But I have been following the debate about the deer cull and believe it is a mistake. I have lived in Ann Arbor for 14 years and throughout the debate, the prospect of systematically shooting deer within our city limits seemed out of step with the ethos and the values of the town. The recent plans for closing so many parks through the winter evenings struck me as a dramatic step and convinced me to write. This is a solution that seems out of proportion to the problem. It will force many of us who use the park daily to change our routines. And if something does go wrong with the shoot, the consequences would be dramatic. I would urge you to postpone this plan.

best,
Srijan

Srijan Sen MD PhD
Associate Professor
Associate Chair for Research and Faculty Development
Department of Psychiatry
Molecular and Behavioral Neuroscience Institute
1066 MBNI
University of Michigan
(734) 395 8319
[Lab website](#)