



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Matt Kulhanek, Fleet & Facilities Manager
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director
Cresson Sloten, Systems Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: April 16, 2018

CA – 3 - Resolution to Approve Amendment Number 1 to Schedule 21 of the Interagency Agreement for Collaborative Technology and Services with the Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority (DDA) for Network Infrastructure Services

Question: Regarding CA-3, what is the basis for the roughly \$20K price the city charges the DDA for these networking services – is it cost based, or based on market rates for similar services in the private sector, or something else? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City of Ann Arbor provides network connectivity services to the DDA for all 8 parking garages under the terms of the Interagency Agreement for Collaborative Technology and Services Schedule 21, effective July 1, 2015. This agreement was updated per Amendment Number 1 on March 1, 2018 to reduce to 6 the number of parking structures using the network connectivity services. The annual cost under Amendment Number 1 is \$19,024.64.

It is cost based and lower than commercial market rates because it is older City fiber and is shared with other city locations and our Traffic Control System. The new fiber the DDA leases for the Maynard and Forest parking structures is dedicated and only for their use.

Question: Also on CA-3, the cover memo indicates the DDA recently paid the city for a pair of fiber to connect the Maynard and Forest structures. How much did the DDA pay the city for that and will the DDA also be paying for the subsequent migration of the remaining garages to the new city fiber (also referenced in the cover memo)? Q. Regarding CA-7, this Larcom Chiller replacement project was in the FY18 capital budget for \$280K. With this \$42K design/engineering services contract, do we still anticipate the \$280K will be adequate? Also, what project is funding the current renovations and office re-arrangements on the 3rd floor of Larcom and how much is that costing? Finally, what other Larcom projects are on the near to mid-term horizon (3 to 5 years)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The DDA paid \$72,862.00 for the initial construction to connect the Maynard and Forest parking structures. The annual cost for these connections is \$10,500. Yes, the DDA will pay the cost of connecting the remaining parking structures to the pair of fiber.

CA-4 – Resolution to Approve a Contract Agreement with the Michigan Department of Transportation for the Pauline Boulevard Water Main Replacement Project (\$658,233.00)

Question: CA-4 states: "The City wants to replace the pavement on Pauline Blvd. between Stadium Boulevard. In addition, the water main there is undersized and requires an upgrade to increase its capacity." It appears that a cross street is missing, which would be helpful to understand the extent of the project. (Councilmember Grand)

Response: The text has been revised to state the, "The City plans to replace the pavement on Pauline Blvd. between Stadium Boulevard and South Seventh Street."

Question: Regarding CA-4, the cover memo indicates that bumpouts will be installed along Pauline at strategic intersections. How many bumpouts are planned and at what intersections? Also how much does it cost to install/construct a new bumpout and what funding source is used for new bumpouts? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Two bumpouts are planned; one at Arbordale Street and one at Redeemer Avenue. These treatments will reduce crossing distances for pedestrians make them more visible to motor vehicles as they are attempting to cross the street. The total cost of both bumpouts is estimated to be approximately \$30,000. As these are participating items for the project, approximately 50% of the cost is paid for through Federal funding. The local share is paid for from the Street, Bridge, and Sidewalk Millage.

CA-7 - Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement between the City and DiClemente Siegel Design Inc. for Work Related to the Larcom City Hall Primary Chiller Replacement Project (\$42,100.00)

Question: Regarding CA-7, this Larcom Chiller replacement project was in the FY18 capital budget for \$280K. With this \$42K design/engineering services contract, do we still anticipate the \$280K will be adequate? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The \$280,000 included in the FY18 Capital Budget was reduced to \$194,500 per Council Resolution R-17-387 on October 16, 2017 to address the funding deficiency for the City Hall elevator modernization project. The remaining funds are not likely to be sufficient for the Larcom Chiller Replacement Project. It is difficult to determine the project costs at this time as the original project estimate included the use of an air-cooled chiller unit. With the approval of Council Resolution R-17-145 on May 1, 2017, the type of chiller technology is now uncertain. That Resolution requires that “all renovations of city facilities that are included in the Capital Improvements Plan comply with current Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) criteria for existing buildings...”. The engineering proposal on Council’s agenda this evening with DiClemente Siegel Design incorporates a review and analysis of current chiller technologies to help determine the best technology for our project. This additional review increased the engineering fees in the amount of \$6,300. Once the determination of the best chiller technology for the project is made, a more accurate project cost estimate can be provided.

Question: Also, what project is funding the current renovations and office re-arrangements on the 3rd floor of Larcom and how much is that costing? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Current renovations to the City Administrator/Mayor’s work area on the 3rd floor are not funded from a capital project but from the City Administrator and Safety Unit’s operating budgets. Earlier renovations to the City Attorney’s Office work area were funded from the City Attorney’s Office operating budget. The cost of the work for the renovations in the City Administrator/Mayor’s work areas, including the Mother’s room, is approximately \$55,000. This does not include any office furnishings or technology upgrades for the conference room. Renovations in the City Attorney’s Office work area was approximately \$5,000. This does not include any office furnishings. Below is a breakdown of the renovations.

3rd Floor Renovations - City Admin/Mayor Office Area

Architectural Fees	\$	9,940
Contractor - general renovations	\$	24,630
Contractor - asbestos abatement	\$	3,125
Environmental monitoring	\$	1,000 est.
Vendor - hallway doors	\$	8,116
IT Costs - Offices	\$	1,600 est.
Signage	\$	500 est.
Key Cores	\$	737
Lactation Room (includes furninshings)	\$	2,800
Contingency	\$	2,500 est.
Total:	\$	54,948

Optional:

Outfit Conference Room with technology for an EOC "situation" room	\$	15,400 est.
--	----	-------------

Question: Finally, what other Larcom projects are on the near to mid-term horizon (3 to 5 years)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: There are no additional capital improvement plan projects scheduled for the Larcom building for the next 3-5 years. Funding for a study to evaluate the Larcom building exterior shell for energy improvements will likely be requested in the next 3-5 years, but no large capital construction projects are anticipated.

CA-10 - Resolution to Approve a Services Agreement with Aptim Environmental and Infrastructure, Inc. (Aptim) for Solid Waste Resource Management Plan (2019-2023) (\$250,000.00)

Question: Q1. Aptim is not a name I've seen before and in looking at Aptim's website, it seems they are a fairly large international firm with headquarter's in The Woodlands, Texas and no offices in Michigan. Is that correct, and if so did any Michigan firms (or firms with offices in Michigan) respond to the RFP? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Aptim personnel have previously provided services to the City of Ann Arbor under their former company CB & I Environmental and Infrastructure, Inc. Aptim has a business license with the State of Michigan. Their offices are located in St. Charles, Illinois. The other firms that responded to the RFP were: Gersham, Brickner & Bratton,

Inc. (GBB) from McLean, Virginia; Resource Recycling Systems (RRS) from Ann Arbor, Michigan; and, Tetra Tech from Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Question: Q2. Aptim’s proposed work plan that’s attached indicates they provided previous services to the city in the organics plan – were they formerly CBI or affiliated with CBI? Also it appears they are proposing the same team as for the organics plan – Lake Research (surveys) and Project Innovations (engagement work). Is that also correct and if so, isn’t Project Innovations the engagement firm we had issues with previously? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: CB& I’s Capital Services business segment was acquired by Veritas Capital on July 1, 2017 and was rebranded as Aptim. Project Innovations has performed community engagement for several City projects, including the Organics Management Plan. The finding from the review of proposals and team interviews was that the Aptim proposal had the most extensive community engagement strategy, and the review committee feels that this is critical for this effort.

Question: Q3. The Aptim compensation page (p 26 of the attachment) indicates their \$250,000 fee reflects 1,299 hours of work – or almost \$200 an hour. I understand consultants are expensive, but this seems like a lot. Can you please speak to that and what were the fee proposals for the other four bids (in total and by hour)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The level of hours that each consultant proposed varied for the elements of their work plan, and is indicative of the level of effort that is anticipated by the firm complete the work. Staff reviews the number of hours proposed, including for the specific tasks in the work plan, to see if firms overestimate, underestimate, or are appropriate for the anticipated level of effort necessary to develop the quality of plan that the City is seeking. The breakdown of all of the proposals, is as follows:

FIRM	TOAL COST	TOTAL HOURS	GROSS AVG \$/HR
Aptim	\$250,000	1,299 hours	\$192.46
GBB	\$257,564	810 hours	\$317.98
RRS	\$99,986	633 hours	\$157.96
Tetra Tech	\$147,947	838 hours	\$176.55

Question: Q4. Aptim’s timeline (p. 24 of attachment) indicates the update will be completed mid-year next year (2019). Is the intent to hit pause on any strategic decisions in the meantime (e.g potential county collaborations, new collection strategies

etc)? If so, what actions (if any) will Council need to take to continue operations as they currently are structured in the meantime? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No. The plan will be developed within the context of the County's amended Solid Waste Management Plan and any potential regionalization efforts.

Question: Q5. The fourth whereas clause indicates that this update was specifically included in the FY18 Solid Waste Operating Budget. Last year in reviewing the proposed budget, I asked whether (given all that was going on in Solid Waste) it may make sense to defer the update. The response was "it is agreed that a deferral for a year to FY19 is an excellent suggestion" so I had assumed it was not in the FY18 budget. Can you please point to where in the adopted budget book this plan update was referenced? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: As indicated, the Solid Waste Resource Management Plan was included in the FY 18 Approved Solid Waste Operating Budget in line item: 0072-046-8500-1000-2100. The line item consisted of the following operational items:

\$ 10,000	Downtown Alley Support
\$ 25,000	General Consulting Needs - Solid Waste
<u>\$250,000</u>	Solid Waste Master Plan
\$285,000	

Line item detail is not available for reference in the budget book; therefore, the detail is attached for your reference.

Question: Q6. The downtown alley trash collection issue recently came to a head, and as you know, the concern extends beyond just the immediate area around Sava's. Can you please indicate what specific near term actions are being considered to address the issue city-wide? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City has recently hired a Solid Waste and Recycling Compliance Outreach Specialist who will become the point person for concerns and issues faced by downtown alley users, as well as other customers. The DDA staff will provide this new staff person with a tour of the alleys to highlight issues and make introductions to key stakeholders. In addition, staff is gathering 12 months of data to provide an analysis of missed tips in the downtown alleys. It is anticipated that this data will include the frequency, location, and reason for each missed pick-up (tip). This information will allow the City and users to more clearly identify problems and solutions. Also, the City has confirmed that though costly the City's contract with Waste Management includes an ability to provide 7-day a week trash pick-up to the commercial community. The DDA will be helping to communicate this information to businesses.

Question: The memo notes "the planning horizon for the last plan, the Solid Waste Resource Plan Update, went through 2017, which has now passed."

Why didn't the City begin planning for the next phase before the prior plan ended?
(Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Funding for this work was not included in the Solid Waste operating budget until FY18. Staff's efforts at the beginning of the fiscal year were focused on the transfer of operations at the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) from Waste Management to Recycle Ann Arbor and then on the various safety related projects that were an outcome of the fire at the MRF on August 8, 2017. The RFP process was undertaken and performed as soon as it could be within staff's workload as it developed.

Question: Did the City hire a consultant to perform a study and draft the last solid waste resource management plan? If yes, what did the City pay for that consultant?
(Councilmember Eaton)

Response: No.

Question: Is it true that the City has been hiring temporary employees for solid waste positions in anticipation of contracting out solid waste services? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The City has been hiring temporary employees for solid waste positions while it evaluates the best path forward to provide responsive and cost effective services.

Question: Has the City administration had any discussion with staff and the unions representing staff in our solid waste services and staff of Recycle Ann Arbor in anticipation of updating the solid waste resource management plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes.

Question: I am glad to see the focus on engaging stakeholders early in the process. Does the contract envision ongoing engagement with stakeholders? Will community stakeholders be invited to serve on the plan advisory committee? If so, what will the process be for evaluating who will be invited? Will stakeholders such as labor and contractors be involved in the process of developing the cost model? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The contract work plan contains a robust community engagement process that includes establishment of a Plan Advisory Committee, Stakeholder Focus Groups and individual Stakeholder Interviews. The Stakeholders list will be generated by staff and the consultant team at the beginning of the project. The Stakeholder interviews will take place before the formation of the Plan Advisory Committee to allow for Stakeholders to be invited to be a member of the Committee. The development of the financial model will be performed as a separate analytical task with its findings being incorporated into the work of the Plan Advisory Committee and the development of the plan's recommendations.

Question: Please share the bid tabulation for the four submissions. If other factors beyond price were an element in vendor selection please indicate what factors set APTIM apart. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Below is the compiled scoring following the proposal reviews and interviews:

Proposer	Total Composite Score
APTIM Environmental and Infrastructure, Inc. (APTIM)	86
Tetra Tech of Michigan, P.C. (Tetra Tech)	76
Resource Recycling Systems (RRS)	70
Gershman, Brickner, and Bratton, Inc.(GBB)	61

Key aspects of APTIM's work plan include:

- A complete and robust community engagement process including a Plan Advisory Committee, Stakeholder Focus Groups and individual Stakeholder Interviews
- Engaging and involving the Environmental Commission body at three key points during the plan development process:
 - an initial visioning session at the beginning of the project;
 - following the third meeting of the Plan Advisory Committee to present an update on progress and obtain input from the Commission; and,
 - presenting the final draft Solid Waste Resource Management Plan for review and comment
- Utilizing a scientific resident survey to obtain customer-based input on current and future programs which will be utilized by the Plan Advisory Committee
- Developing a Financial Cost of Service Model which will segregate costs across the program areas so that changes to budget, programs or productivity can be examined as part of the plan development, as well as in future years as the Model will be delivered to the City at project completion

CA-11 - Resolution to Approve the Professional Services Agreement with StructureTec Corporation (“StructureTec”), for the Water Treatment Plant Architectural and Structural Repairs Project Engineering Services (\$133,950.00)

Question: Regarding CA-11, I recognize there's a benefit in having the same firm that did the evaluation do the engineering work on the repairs, but their fees should be competitive. How did Structure Tec's fees compare with the other two fee proposals received? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: StructureTec's base proposal fee was \$110,950. The other two fee proposals were \$110,000 and \$259,577. StructureTec received the highest overall evaluation score based upon Qualifications, Similar Project Experience, Work Plan and Fee. StructureTec's proposal offered some alternate items that enhanced their scope of work and added value to the project (additional testing, etc). These alternate items brought their final total fee to \$133,950 which is included in the Resolution.

CA-12 - Resolution to Appoint Mike Kennedy as the City of Ann Arbor Fire Chief

CA-13 - Resolution to Appoint Michael Gonzales as the City of Ann Arbor Interim City Assessor

CA-14 - Resolution to Appoint Robert Pfannes as the City of Ann Arbor Interim Police Chief

Question: Regarding CA-12 through CA-13 (staff appointments), all of these involve current employees serving in deputy positions, but it's not clear why two are being appointed as Interims and one (Fire Chief) as permanent. Can you please explain the rationale for the different treatment? Also, why did we decide not to conduct an external search for the Fire Chief? (I know we did a search for Fire Deputies recently, but it would seem we'd get a different and perhaps stronger pool for a Chief). Also, is it your plan to conduct a national search for the permanent Police chief and if not, why not? Finally, can you please clarify what is meant by "a recruiting process has been initiated" for the permanent assessor? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The questions has multiple parts, which are responded to as follows:

- The Fire Chief, the Police Chief, and the Assessor are defined under Chapter 12 of the City Charter as appointive officers. The Charter requires that these positions be filled within 30 days (60 days with Council approval) "in the manner provided for making the original appointment". In the case of the Fire Chief, the position will become vacant on May 1st. Appointment of Mr. Kennedy on that date will meet the Charter requirement. In the instances of the Police Chief and Assessor, the process to recruit and hire new persons for those offices will exceed the timeframes cited in the Charter. The City Attorney and the City Administrator agree that having Council approve the interim officers is the most transparent and responsible action to take.
- With the retirement of Assistant Fire Chief Brow, the City initiated a search for her replacement. This search produced an excellent field of candidates, with Mike Kennedy and Marc Tyler emerging as the best. After interviews were concluded, Chief Collins recommended that both candidates be hired as a succession planning initiative. With Chief Collins upcoming retirement, all three Assistant Fire Chiefs (including Assistant Chief Taylor) were offered the opportunity to complete for Chief's position. The City Administrator felt this approach provided an exceptional

field, and Assistant Chief Kennedy emerged as the recommended candidate to fill the Chief's position.

- Our plan is to conduct a wide-ranging search to identify our next Police Chief. The process will provide for meaningful community participation, including the engagement of the Community Policing Commission once it is formed. We have decided to defer starting the formal recruitment plan until after the Commission is in place to provide for its input and to allow potential candidates to better understand the operating environment.
- The expression "a recruiting process has been initiated" in relation means that the position has been posted and a recruiting brochure has been prepared.

C-1: An Ordinance to Repeal Sections 4:16 through 4:20 and Section 4:30 of Chapter 47 (Streets and Curb Cuts) of Title IV; and Chapter 55 (Zoning), Chapter 56 (Prohibited Land Uses), Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control), Chapter 59 (Off-Street Parking), Chapter 60 (Wetlands), Chapter 61 (Signs and Outdoor Advertising), Chapter 62 (Landscaping and Screening), Chapter 63 (Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control), of Title V; and Chapter 104 (Fences) of Title VIII of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor and to Amend the Code of the City of Ann Arbor with a New Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of Said Code (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Question: Q1. In the staff report for Planning Commission, it indicates that a major discussion item was how to calculate floor area. It appears the original recommendation was to not exclude stairwells, elevators, escalators etc in the calculation, but that was changed to exclude them in the calculation . Can you please summarize the rationale for including originally and why that was revised? Also, can you please provide a sense of the impact (for example, for the Library Lot, how many sq ft would be excluded in the calculation)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The original intent was to more clearly combine current definitions of both residential and non-residential floor area into a single definition, which is appropriate to the numerous mixed-use zoning districts that the City has created. Additionally, the current definition for non-residential relies upon the interpretative qualifier "[can be made] fit for occupancy."

The original drafted UDC definition, created by the ZORO Technical Working Group, and Planning Commission Ordinance Revisions Committee, was intended to create be simple and unambiguous. After hearing public testimony, the Planning Commission directed staff to instead modify the definition to reflect the City's current interpretation of the existing definition, with the goal being to maintain the same level of FAR, with less reliance on ambiguous, or arguable standards.

It is speculative to determine what the impact would be on any specific building, but in short, consider the square feet of stairwells, elevator shafts, and vertical chases in any building. Without the revisions to the draft, these would be included within the FAR calculation of a project. With this proposed amendment, they are not counted, effectively increasing the FAR by an equal amount. This amendment results in little change to the size of buildings from current to proposed definition.

Question: Q2. The cover memo indicates that one of the substantive changes is that “natural features guidelines are codified”. Can you please elaborate on what the actually means and what impact (if any) it has on natural feature requirements and remediation actions? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Guidelines for the Protection and Mitigation of Natural Features are in effect by resolution of City Council. They are referenced by Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control) but are not officially part of the City Code. The Unified Development Code, which will become part of the City Code, includes the process for identification, the required protections, and the required mitigation for impacts, to all seven of the natural features exactly as provided in the existing Guidelines. The codification is a substantive change in the legislative status of the natural features protections and mitigation but is not a functional change.

Question: Q3. The staff report indicates that there has not been a lot of public comment and that what’s been received has largely been positive which makes sense given that this is primarily a re-organization of the code with technical changes. Have there been any concerns expressed about substantive items or impacts and if so, can you please summarize them including the rationale for what is proposed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Concern has either been a preference for the current layout and organization of the document, or have been requests for additional, further work. Most who came to a public meeting or office hours with general critiques said they understood the organization of the document and agreed the format was easier to use when they left. Anyone with requests for additional, further work has been advised to communicate their suggestions to the Ordinance Revisions Committee for prioritization as a text amendment to be considered after the UDC is adopted. The ORC has already met once to start formulating a prioritization list of “ZORO 2.0” tasks and the Planning Commission is expected to devote some time at their upcoming annual retreat to a priority list as well.

Question: Q4. The cover memo indicates that one of the substantive changes is to “re-write site plan submittal requirements to match current practice.” Can you please elaborate on what those specific changes are? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The required site plan information section has two main differences. First, it now prescribes how site plans should be organized and what information needs to go on which page. All site plans will start with a cover sheet and then progress through existing conditions, dimensional layouts, natural features plans, natural features overlay

plans, landscape plans, utility plans, grading and soil erosion control and storm water management plans, massing and architectural plans, and traffic impact analysis. Past site plans contain all of this information but the submittal requirements do not specify how plans are organized. As a result, plan sets vary wildly depending on who prepares them and when. Establishing consistency across every plan set will be more efficient to review and will be easier to reference or research.

Second, information that currently verbally directed to designers during pre-submittal meetings or asked for it through written review comments is now listed in Code, including: perspective sketches of building showing streetwall height and offset, a specific survey, natural features overlay plans, fire hydrant radii and hose lay measurements, dimensioned floor plans indicating defined floor area, perspective renderings, and specific components of traffic impact analyses. Some of these items correspond to new regulations recently adopted. Outdated requirements were also dropped, for example: the requirement to submit 10 copies was eliminated because plans must be submitted electronically.

DC-3 – Resolution to Direct That the City Administrator and City Planning Commission Evaluate Requiring Additional Citizen Participation for Special Exception Uses

Question: Please provide a summary of special exemption use petitions heard by Planning Commission over the past year and the outcome of the petitions.
(Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Since January 1, 2017, the following Special Exception Use Permits have been heard by the Planning Commission:

Approved:

- 2600 Nixon Road, Rainbow Child Care
- 220 Felch, Ann Arbor Distillery Private Rental Hall
- 338 S. Ashley, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center
- 2793 Plymouth, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center
- 111 S. Main, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center

Approved with Conditions:

- 214 E. Madison, Temporary Cellular Facility
- 321 E. Liberty, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center
- 2730-2734 Jackson, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center
- 1818 Packard, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center
- 2460 W. Stadium, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center

Denied:

- 1202 Packard, Medical Marijuana Provisioning Center

Question: In staff's judgement, have there historically been complaints about special exception uses that have been granted? If so, what types of uses have these been? (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: No, there have not been numerous complaints about special exception use that have been granted.

DC-4 - Resolution to Direct That Planning Staff and City Planning Commission Evaluate Increasing the Minimum Distance between Medical Marijuana Provisioning Centers

Question: Please the amount of staff time and the cost of that time for performing the evaluation of changing the minimum distance between facilities. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: For Planning staff, this would take an estimated 20 hours of staff time, approximately \$1,600 in cost, and would take approximately four months to complete.

Question: During staff or planning commission discussions, was there consideration of changing allowed dispensary density according to population density? Such as a lower distance requirement in the downtown vs outside the downtown? (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: This was discussed briefly during the Planning Commission deliberation, but more extensively during City Council adoption of the proposed zoning ordinance changes. This discussion considered typical downtown block length and whether a smaller buffer in the downtown could be considered.

DC- 6 - Resolution to Authorize the Mayor to Submit an Application to the Bloomberg Philanthropies Public Art Challenge for the Art Project "Float" by Wonderfool Productions

Question: Would it be possible to have a public presentation of the winning entry, "Float," for the Bloomberg art challenge (DC-6, 18-0635, page 6)? Please also provide a list of all entries submitted, if possible. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: If this entry is selected as a grant recipient, staff would plan to prepare a resolution to Council to accept the grant and request that the recipient present as an introduction item at that time. A list of entries is as follows:

Shary Brown -Float
Xue & Zach Dietrich -AAATA Bus Shelter art

Heidi Kraepel -Hope for the Homeless
Laura Earle -Dear Womanhouse
Jeffrey Hayner -Perimeter outline of Gelman Plume
Donna Fisher -“Keep Calm and Carry On scream booths”
Mary Thiefels -Ann Arbor Mural Arts Program
Bob Miller -Mobile A2 Art
Patti Smith -Words On Walls
Mark Tucker -Rag Tag Theatre
Stephen Ranzini –A3 Project

DC-7 - Resolution to Direct Staff to Prepare an Ordinance Amendment that Limits the Number of Medical Marijuana Facilities within the City and to Impose a Temporary Moratorium On the Issuance of Provisioning Center Permits With Exceptions

Question: Please the amount of staff time and the cost of that time to prepare an ordinance limiting the number of facilities permitted. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: If Planning staff were directed to lead this work, it would take an estimated 15 hours of staff time and approximately \$1,200 in cost.

Question: What criteria will be used to determine the appropriate number of facilities? Will the City use the experience of other communities in determining that number? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Planning would research other communities to compare any limits on facilities, would consider petitions that are approved and/or under review, and remaining areas of the City zoned for such use, as starting points for evaluation.

Question: Please provide a map of in-queue or approved provisioning center applications showing the 1000 buffer around them and any uses that also require a buffer (eg schools). For the land remaining, please highlight which areas of the city still are eligible for a provisioning center to be located. (Councilmember Westphal)

Response: Here is a link to a map that shows approved provisioning centers, with the option of a 600 and 1,000 foot buffer from each other. The map also features those zoning districts, showing which areas of the City are eligible from a land use perspective.

<https://a2-mi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=c5998369ae184577b63538f92defa3bb>

DS-1 - Resolution to Approve the Third Thursday of July Annually as the Opening Day of the Ann Arbor Art Fair, to Approve Street Closings for the Annual Ann Arbor Art Fair, to Affirm the Requirements for Temporary Outdoor Sales, Service and Consumption of Alcohol and the Standards For Temporary Outdoor Sales on Private Property, and to Affirm the Allocation of Fees Among the Art Fair Organizations

Question: The resolution states “Streets must be barricaded using AAPD-approved barricades and designated locations to insure restriction of traffic;” Have the water-filled barriers such as the ones used by the construction on S. Fourth Ave been evaluated as options for traffic restriction to provide a potentially lower-cost barrier option than the concrete barricades? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Ann Arbor Police are in the process of developing a specific set of specifications/standards for what type of portable barriers we will approve. I anticipate using the federal OSHA standards for portable barrier as our starting point. Portable barriers are designed to prevent vehicles from penetrating the area behind the barrier while minimizing occupational injuries. Generally, these barriers are made of concrete, metal, or any material that can physically prevent vehicle penetration. We do not believe that most types of water-filled barriers are capable of stopping a vehicle.

Question: Would this resolution affect charitable solicitation permits under Chapter 81 of City code? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: No.

Question: Please list the activities affected by the “City Council rescinds all previous resolutions regarding temporary outdoor sales or displays” provision. (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: This would only impact those vendors that are not covered as property owners selling like items on their own private property.

Question: How would the resolution affect non-commercial displays and sidewalk occupancy other than that provided by the 5 organization (e.g. some years the Denali building has allowed nonprofits to set up displays in front of their property on Liberty). (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: Non-profits are generally covered under the Non-Profit Art Fair. There have been Zoning Compliance permits issued for this location in the past however, all permits indicate that they are for the sale of merchandise not non-profit activity. If the proposed use is related to non-profit information sharing only, not sales, staff is confident there are other avenues to allow them to continue.



Budget Performance Report

Fiscal Year to Date 04/16/18

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Object

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	Budget - YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd	Prior Year Total
Fund 0072 - Solid Waste										
EXPENSE										
Agency 046 - Systems Planning										
Organization 8500 - System Planning										
Activity 1000 - Administration										
2100	Professional Services	285,000.00	10,129.00	295,129.00	.00	970.00	10,110.00	284,049.00	4	225,427.43
	Activity 1000 - Administration Totals	\$285,000.00	\$10,129.00	\$295,129.00	\$0.00	\$970.00	\$10,110.00	\$284,049.00	4%	\$225,427.43
	Organization 8500 - System Planning Totals	\$285,000.00	\$10,129.00	\$295,129.00	\$0.00	\$970.00	\$10,110.00	\$284,049.00	4%	\$225,427.43
	Agency 046 - Systems Planning Totals	\$285,000.00	\$10,129.00	\$295,129.00	\$0.00	\$970.00	\$10,110.00	\$284,049.00	4%	\$225,427.43
	EXPENSE TOTALS	\$285,000.00	\$10,129.00	\$295,129.00	\$0.00	\$970.00	\$10,110.00	\$284,049.00	4%	\$225,427.43
Fund 0072 - Solid Waste Totals										
	REVENUE TOTALS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
	EXPENSE TOTALS	285,000.00	10,129.00	295,129.00	.00	970.00	10,110.00	284,049.00	4%	225,427.43
	Fund 0072 - Solid Waste Totals	(\$285,000.00)	(\$10,129.00)	(\$295,129.00)	\$0.00	(\$970.00)	(\$10,110.00)	(\$284,049.00)		(\$225,427.43)
Grand Totals										
	REVENUE TOTALS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	+++	.00
	EXPENSE TOTALS	285,000.00	10,129.00	295,129.00	.00	970.00	10,110.00	284,049.00	4%	225,427.43
	Grand Totals	(\$285,000.00)	(\$10,129.00)	(\$295,129.00)	\$0.00	(\$970.00)	(\$10,110.00)	(\$284,049.00)		(\$225,427.43)