



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Milton Dohoney Jr., City Administrator

CC: John Fournier, Deputy City Administrator  
Nick Hutchinson,, City Engineer  
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager  
Molly Maciejewski, Public Works Manager  
Brian Steglitz, Interim Public Services Area Administrator  
Missy Stults, Sustainability & Innovations Manager

SUBJECT: August 15, 2022 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: August 11, 2022

---

**CA-1 – Resolution to Close Streets for the Mayor’s Autumnal Green Fair, Friday, October 7, 2022**

**Question:** Is this the first “Mayor’s Autumnal Green Fair”? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** This will be the second Autumnal Green Fair. The first took place last year, in the fall, due to timing related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Question:** How is this event expected to be different from the Green Fair that occurred this summer? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** Given the success and positive feedback from the fall Green Fair, the City is proposing moving to a twice a year Green Fair, one in June and one in the fall.

**Question:** This resolution says that it is sponsored by the Mayor’s Office—procedurally, what is the difference between a resolution sponsored individually by the Mayor and one sponsored by the “office”? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The Mayor's Autumnal Green Fair event is sponsored and being hosted by the Mayor's Office. The Mayor's city staff, as well as staff across multiple departments, will coordinate event activities and necessary preparations.

A resolution sponsored by the Mayor, is sponsored by the Mayor in their role as an elected official.

**Question:** Is there a plan for the "Mayor's Office" to sponsor a Mayor's Green Fair for every season moving forward? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The plan is to run two Green Fairs a year, one in June and one in the fall.

**CA-8 - Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with Ecology Center, Inc. for Resource Recovery Education, Outreach, Engagement, and Marketing for \$853,211.00 over Five (5) Years**

**Question:** How does the cost of this contract compare with previous contracts with the Ecology Center to do public education? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** The City has held contracts with the Ecology Center for MRF tours and school-based education for more than 10 years. Most recently the value of these two contracts was \$114,881.25. The cost of this contract is a not-to-exceed contract both by year and over the 5-year term. The not to exceed cost per year is \$154,785.00, \$255,977.00, \$269,052.00, \$84,408.00 and \$88,989.00, respectively. The average annual cost of this 5-year contract is higher than in previous years because the scope of the contract is much broader than previous contracts.

**Question:** Is it correct to say that this new public education contract is more far-reaching than previous contracts? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Yes, that is correct. One of the recommendations in the City's Solid Waste Resource Management Plan (SWRMP) is for expanded education and outreach to meet the broader needs of the community. Previous City contracts with Ecology Center, Inc. focused on in-classroom programming and field trips for early elementary school aged children. In addition to education, the new contract includes:

- Community-Based Social Marketing.
- Commercial Sector Education.
- Education and Outreach at Community Events.
- Multi-family Education and Outreach.
- Youth Education.

The new contract will support three Resource Recovery goals of the City: (1) increase the recycling rate in the commercial sector; (2) move towards a more circular economy reducing waste generated; (3) raise community awareness about appropriate handling of recyclable, compostable, and trash materials to influence behavior change.

**Question:** Is it correct to say that some of the most significant new elements include: 1) in-school education efforts will reach older students in addition to younger students; 2) we will see broader community education efforts targeting commercial and multi-family recycling; 3) education will focus not only on end-of-life strategies (e.g. recycling) but on “circular economy” practices as well—meaning reducing consumption through strategies that extend the useful life of a good such as swapping, refurbishing, repurposing? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Yes, that is correct.

- Ecology Center youth education programs will include a second-grade field trip to the Freeman Center (where students will work in small groups and rotate through a variety of hands-on and problem-solving activity stations to learn about material cycles and the benefits and methods for reducing waste) and a seventh-grade field trip to Ann Arbor’s Resource Recovery Station on Platt Road (where students will participate in a bus tour to learn about Ann Arbor’s history and current waste recovery activities, the climate-waste connection, and the circular economy).
- Ecology Center will prepare and deliver a solid waste outreach program to the commercial sector industry that focuses on priority messages about reducing waste, recycling, composting, and contributing to the circular economy.
- Ecology Center will prepare and deliver a solid waste outreach program and facilitate resident-led action to address priority solid waste issues at four low-income, multi-family properties in the City of Ann Arbor. Ecology Center will leverage existing relationships within the multi-family community to disseminate solid waste information and produce materials and methods for further outreach and sustained multi-family housing education. This ties in with the City’s goals of centering historically underserved populations.
- As stated above, this contract with the Ecology Center will allow the City to move towards a more circular economy of reducing waste generated. Each of the Ecology Center’s five defined work areas include the circular economy as priority messaging.

**Question:** Are there other new elements that staff would like to highlight? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Yes, there are several other elements in this contract that will be beneficial to the community.

- Community-Based Social Marketing: Ecology Center will develop and implement a comprehensive outreach campaign and strategy that includes audience identification, message development, media type and frequency for advertising, branding and creative development, and rollout strategy that defines future tasks, implementation steps, and costs. This will help the City to achieve the education and outreach recommendations in its Solid Waste Resources Management Plan (SWRMP).

- Education and Outreach at Community Events: Ecology Center will provide tabling, educational presentations, and door-to-door campaigns to teach the public about reducing trash, recycling, composting, and the circular economy. Audiences that don't typically receive this information will be targeted.

**Question:** I notice that the Ecology Center will partner with CAN—has this been done in the past? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** This has not been done in the past. We believe this partnership will benefit the entire community by creating and delivering a solid waste education program that is tailored to the needs and challenges of specific communities.

**Question:** Were previous contracts for this service as long as 5 years? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** Yes, the 2010 school education contract was a 5-year contract. The 2013 MRF educational tour contract was also a 5-year contract.

**Question:** If not, how long were previous contracts with the Ecology Center for these services? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** Not applicable based on above response.

**CA-9 – Resolution to Approve a Contract with Margolis Companies, Inc. for the Purchase, Delivery and Planting of Trees along City Street Rights-of-Way (\$474,075.00; RFP 22-56)**

**Question:** This past January, MLIVE reported that a Ward 5 resident found 62% of the trees planted in that Ward are “not thriving.” Have City Staff looked into the claims reported in that story? Does Staff concur with the 62% figure? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Staff has analyzed the data provided by Mr. Maier but have not yet field verified his condition ratings. We would note that trees in categorized in fair condition were included in the 62% not thriving. The Fair condition class is an industry term for trees with “minor structural problems and/or mechanical damage, significant damage from non-fatal or disfiguring diseases, minor crown imbalance or thin crown, or stunted growth compared to adjacent trees. This condition is for trees that show reasonable vitality and show no obvious signs of decay.” Most trees in urban forests fall into the Fair condition rating and are thriving, but we do agree that we have trees that are not thriving.

**Question:** Does Staff judge that any changes to the program (some things mentioned in the story were better education of residents re: how to care for trees; selection of more drought-tolerant species?) are warranted? Why or why not? (Councilmember Disch)

**Response:** Staff is analyzing the data to look at which planting times, which species, and which contractors had the highest mortality to look at adjusting our planting program. Tree planting and after-care maintenance programs like watering are being evaluated as part of the Urban Forest Management Plan update. The recommendations from this effort will be incorporated into our final plan.

**Question:** Is the City primarily identifying locations that have no trees or Is there a process for residents to identify sickly trees and request replacement of those? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** We do both. Staff identify planting sites and take resident request for tree planting. Residents also call city offices or utilize SeeClickFix to report sick/dying trees for removal and those are placed on the replacement list for the next planting season.

**Question:** Is there any room in this contract for maintenance and/or other strategies to prevent these trees from dying after planting? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The current contract includes watering for the first year and a one year warranty to replace any trees that die, or are dying, within the first year. It should also be noted that the City is also evaluating its planting practices as part of our Urban Forest Management Plan update.

**CA-14 – Resolution to Approve a Construction Contract with P.K. Contracting, LLC for Pavement Marking Maintenance & A2 Vision Zero Quick Build Project - FY2023 (\$698,808.92, RFP No. 22-38)**

**Question:** Are any of these locations in the DDA area? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** A detailed list is not available at this time, but this work is generally done City-wide, so it is likely that at least some of the work will be within the DDA boundary.

**Question:** If so, is there any reason why DDA is not contributing to some of the cost of these improvements? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The City typically pays for 100% of street resurfacing and pavement marking costs. Exceptions to this include projects led by the DDA that advance walkability, safety, and downtown operations and access. In these cases, the DDA pays a larger share to help the project proceed and to cover costs related to/resulting from DDA work.

**B-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Section 5.16.3.G, 5.20.10 and 5.30.1 of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Marijuana Licenses, Trees in the Right-of-Way, Landscape Modifications) (ORD-22-12)**

**Question:** Does this cluster of amendments include the proposal from a previous meeting to remove the requirement that marijuana business activities happen indoors? (Councilmember Nelson)

**Response:** The requirement generally remains, however the amendment adds the exception to allow curbside delivery to occur for sales.