



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Tom Crawford, CFO
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Jen Grimes, Senior Infrastructure Lead
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Nick Hutchinson, City Engineer
Earl Kenzie, Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services
Keith Sanders, Wastewater Treatment Plant Assistant Manager
Heather Seyfarth, Systems Planning Analyst
Tom Shewchuk, IT Director
Colin Smith, Parks and Recreation Manager

SUBJECT: December 16 Council Agenda Responses

DATE: December 12, 2019

CA-4 – Resolution to Approve Fourth Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Bodman, PLC, for Legal Services Relative to 1,4-Dioxane from Gelman Sciences, Inc., dba Pall Life Sciences (\$55,000.00) and to Appropriate Funds (\$55,000.00)

Question: Please provide a year by year accounting of how much the City has spent under this \$480,000.00 contract. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Since the contracted legal services started in 2016, the City has paid invoices in the following amounts each year, for legal services through the end of September 2019 (invoiced at the end of October 2019). These amounts include minimal amounts for reimbursable expenses such as copying and, on occasion, travel. To tease out the actual reimbursable expenses paid would require a review of every invoice and a calculation of

the total per calendar year. Prior to the proposed 4th amendment, the total amount approved and available for legal services is \$425,000.00. The 4th amendment would increase that amount to \$480,000.00.

2016	\$ 82,286.35 (net amount after a 10% courtesy discount)
2017	\$156,820.37
2018	\$ 88,190.75
2019	\$ 99,196.66

Question: Please provide an accounting showing how much of the contract amount has been paid for legal services and how much has been paid as reimbursable expenses, including expert witness fees. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The above amounts do not include fees for expert witness services. Along with the other Intervenors, the City has paid \$12,000.00 into an account used by Bodman PLC to pay Larry Lemke after review and approval by counsel for the Intervenors. The City made two payments of \$6,000.00, one in May of 2017 and one in June of 2018. The City still has \$8,000.00 available under the contract for expert witness services, which can be used if and when the amount in the Bodman expert witness account is depleted.

Question: The contract provides for a legal services fee of \$300 per hour. Does this fee rate include work performed by partners, associates and paralegals being paid at the same billable rate? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The uniform rate of \$300.00/hour is a discounted rate that has not changed since the contract began. Although that is the rate for all attorneys, the usual billing rates for the two attorneys who have done virtually all the work under the contract (from 2016 through 2019) have been \$500.00 to \$525.00 for one, and \$300.00 to \$315.00 for the other. The legal services have not required any work by paralegals.

CA-5 – Resolution to Approve a Purchase Order to Dell Marketing L.P. for Replacing Server Equipment (\$97,036.12)

Question: Q. Regarding CA-5, the cover memo indicates this PO replaces seven servers – how many does the City have in total? Also, how many other devices (pc’s; laptops) does the city own and how often are those replaced? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City has 20 physical servers. Through VMware virtualization, we run an additional 168 servers inside of the physical servers. We own approximately 500 desktops (replaced every 5 years) and 350 portable computers (replaced every 4 years).

CA-6 - Resolution to Approve a Contract with Anlaan Corporation to Rehabilitate Four Park Bridges and Replace One (\$428,363.00)

Question: Regarding CA-6, I recognize the City tried, but only one bid was received and the cover memo indicated the amount was more than had been budgeted. Are we

comfortable the bid amount is reasonable/did we consider re-bidding? Also, the contingency is 15% on this and typically they're 10% - what's the reason for that? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: We considered these issues and ultimately believed that working with Anlaan Corporation to bring the project within budget was the best path forward. The City believes that the bid amount is reasonable based on a review by our City Engineers, our Engineering consultant, and past work that Anlaan Corporation has done with the City. Anlaan Corporation worked with City Engineering on the Huron Parkway reconstruction project, Geddes Avenue project, and provided technical expertise during the design phase of the Stadium Bridges project, and through their past work and interactions with City staff they have developed a reputation as a very competent, reasonable, and cooperative contractor.

The City did consider re-bidding the project but decided against it for the following reasons:

1. The project is urgent and rebidding the project would cause delays, likely by at least two months;
2. We believe the current construction market to be saturated with work, causing contractors to be more selective;
3. It is a difficult project and there was not much interest as only two firms attended the pre-bid meeting;
4. We believe the most probable outcome of rebidding would be that there wouldn't be more bidders and that the cost of the work would increase.

Therefore, due to the aforementioned reasons and Anlaan Corporation's good reputation, it was determined that the best course forward was to work with Anlaan Corporation to reduce the project scope in order to bring it within budget.

The reason for the 15% contingency was to account for the increased likelihood of encountering unforeseen issues when working on complex renovations. Projects which are new construction tend to have a reduced likelihood of encountering unforeseen issues, as opposed to renovations of existing structures where less is known.

CA-8 - Resolution to Authorize a Professional Services Agreement with Interface Studio LLC for Community Visioning and Master Land Use Plan Services (RFP19-06) (\$791,737.00)

Question: The current Land Use Element of the Master Plan is 135 pages. The staff memo states that a goal of this planning process is to achieve "the consolidation of master plans into a more concise paper and digital product." Will the new master plan include the kind of detailed land use recommendations currently included in the Land Use Elements of our current Master Plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, the proposed plan will include a future land use plan and the update will evaluate any site specific recommendations to evaluate whether they should be removed, retained, or altered, or approached in another method.

Question: In addition to the 2009 Land Use Element (incorporating the 1990 South Area Plan, the 1992 Central Area Plan, the 1995 West Area Plan, and the 2006 Northeast Area Plan), the 2013 South State Street Corridor Plan Amendment, and the 2009 Downtown Plan, what other elements of the master plan's 8 current plans and 18 "resource documents" will be replaced by the new Master Plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The resolution included an incorrect number, the City currently has 17 Resource Documents. The goal is to consolidate as many of the plans as possible into a single resource to precisely convey the City's vision for its future. This could result in plans being consolidated, referenced, or a determination could be made to keep resources separate. The existing plans and resource documents can be found at www.a2gov.org/masterplan.

Question: Will the new Master plan incorporate the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, the Natural Features Master Plan, and/or the 2017 Treeline Master Plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: At this point staff presumes that the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan could be included in the new plan by reference, with a greater likelihood of integration of the Treeline Master Plan and Natural Features Master Plan.

Question: Please provide a list of the 18 "resource documents" currently used by Planning staff and/or the Planning Commission with the date and official action taken to adopt the documents as "resource documents". (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The Resolution included incorrect total, the City has 17 Resource Documents. The 17 Resource documents with dates of adoption are as follows:

1. Current Fiscal Year Capital Improvements Plan (Adopted 2019)
2. Fuller/Geddes/Conrail Corridor Study (1994)
3. Miller/Maple/Newport Traffic and Circulation Study (1995)
4. Briarwood Subarea Plan (11/9/1995)
5. Downtown Vision and Policy Framework (2006)
6. Northeast Area Transportation Plan (2006)
7. Flood Mitigation Plan (2007)
8. Allen Creek Greenway Task Force Report (2007)
9. Washtenaw County Access Management Plan (2008)
10. Huron River and Impoundment Management Plan (2009)
11. Washtenaw Avenue Corridor Redevelopment Strategy (2010)
12. Downtown Design Guidelines (2011)
13. Connecting William Street Plan (2013)
14. Climate Action Plan (2013)

- (2013) 15. North Main Street/Huron River Corridor Vision for the Future Report
- (2014) 16. Reimagine Washtenaw Corridor Improvement Study
17. Washtenaw County Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis (2015)

Question: How much did the City spend to update the Northeast Area Plan in 2006? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: No consultant was hired for this work.

Question: How long did the 2006 Northeast Area Plan process take? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Approximately 7 ½ years.

Question: How much did the City spend on the 2013 South State Corridor Plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: No consultant was hired for the corridor plan, however the City subsequently hired a consultant for the transportation portion of the plan for \$365,000.

Question: How long did the South State Street Corridor Plan process take? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Approximately 1 ½ years.

Question: The City has contracted with a different consultant to develop a new transportation master plan to replace the 2009 Transportation Plan Update, the 2013 Non-motorized Plan, the 2007 Non-motorized Plan, and 2006 Northeast Area Transportation Plan. Will this consolidated master plan incorporate transportation elements of our master plan into the consolidated, concise master plan? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: This will be determined upon completion of the Transportation Plan and the final structure of the future land use plan. The proposed Interface Team includes Sam Schwartz Transportation Consultants to assist in ensuring this coordination happens.

Question: The \$791,737.00 expenditure for this planning process does not include funding for a statistically valid community survey. How can neighborhood meetings and stakeholder meetings possibly suffice as a replacement for the collection of valid data? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The City makes policy and ordinance decisions routinely without the use of statistical surveys. In the case of land use policy, the geographic span, variety of issues, and complexity breadth would make the reliance upon a statistical survey for all of the

components of a master plan difficult. The resulting master plan, which would ultimately be derived from neighborhood meetings, stakeholder meetings, and other input methods can provide an adequate basis for master plan policy, as has similarly been accomplished with the City's other planning efforts (e.g. Treeline Master Plan, Sustainability Framework).

Question: The Ward selected representatives to the Task Force released a 12-page document containing recommendations for this planning process. Has staff responded to those recommendations? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Some of the recommendations. The recommendations were provided to staff after the resolution was submitted for approval. Many of the scope changes that are proposed from the original proposal are consistent with the recommendations provided, as summarized here:

- Added public meetings to the original scope
- Added focus groups to the original scope
- Added additional project coordination tasks
- Added a requirement to log all public input received
- Removed Power Marketing Research from proposal, replaced with hiring local community members and training them to assist with outreach
- Added a request for additional funds to the Planning Services department for food at meetings, additional facilitation if necessary, marketing, publishing, postage, childcare at meetings, etc.

The Planning Manager has also communicated with the citizen evaluators the following: *"I have not recommended a statistical survey for inclusion in the project scope, however, I have included the task as an option on the proposal being provided to the City Council, as I know this was a significant focus during the evaluation process. My rationale is that a statistical survey is not a necessary addendum to for already extensive community engagement to be successful."*

Question: Can the City and this consultant agree on a joint resource plan before we approve this contract? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, this could be incorporated into the contract, but staff does not feel it is necessary.

Question: Has the consultant identified who will replace Deb Power of Power Marketing Research as their local public outreach person? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The consultant is proposing to hire and train local residents to assist in this role. Planning staff will provide assistance in this role as well.

Question: Will this planning process require additional funding to support training of volunteers, meeting site rentals, meeting site food, child care at meetings, audio visual

equipment, public engagement event promotion and outreach, and additional contractors or subcontractors? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Likely yes, this is why an additional allocation is requested to the Planning Services budget to support this work.

Question: The Ward representatives from the task force recommended that the final contract include a statement of work plan by which the contractor's performance can be measured. Considering the need to modify the end product of the solid waste plan consultant, should this contract include an express description of the process and end product? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Staff believes the proposed scope is adequate. It is likely through this significant community process that adjustments will be desired and made, and it would be difficult to detail every aspect at this point. The community engagement process will help to shape subsequent steps in the process.

Question: Will the end product produced under this \$766,737.00 include a record that allows the public to trace all changes made from the current Master Plan, including additions and omissions? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, the intent of this process is to provide a record of past work carried forward or removed.

Question: Will changes to the Master Plan require changes to our zoning code, the recently adopted Unified Development Code? If so, will those changes be proposed as part of this contract or will it require a subsequent process? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: UDC Amendments will be suggested and such ordinance amendments would be approached through a subsequent process, not through this contract as proposed.

Question: Q1. The cover memo indicates that several members of the evaluation team highly recommended a statistically-valid survey be included in the scope and the Interface proposal also referenced a survey. But staff is not recommending this task be included in the scope – please elaborate on why staff does not view a survey as “a productive cost benefit” and why it would not be value-added to obtain input from folks not inclined to attend (or speak out at) group meetings? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Staff believes that surveys will be valuable and will be utilized to gather input on the planning process. A statistically valid survey however, adds cost and constraints that staff does not believe will be a good value to the City in undertaking this work.

Question: Q2. The agreement contemplates (5) open houses with one in each ward. One open house per ward does not seem adequate to capture meaningful, actionable input from the many unique neighborhoods in each ward. Why wouldn't the

engagement process include pro-actively reaching out to specific neighborhood associations? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The intention is to undertake a significant amount of outreach, and neighborhood associations will absolutely be included and targeted for soliciting input.

Question: Q3. After the proposals were evaluated, and bids submitted, staff added work scope that increased the Interface cost by \$217K (about 40% from \$549K to \$766K). The cover memo includes a bullet-point list of the added scope items, but not detail on them – can you please provide more detail on these items and were these scope additions the result of recommendations from the council appointed team? Also, how was the amount to be paid to Interface for the added items determined? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The scope changes include the following:

- Adding twice monthly project coordination calls with a staff project leadership team.
- Added that the review of existing plans and proposals do so through the lens of the AARP Livable Communities lens, to start the process of ensuring the master plan supports an Ann Arbor for all ages.
- Increased the number of one on one stakeholder interviews from 25-30, to an estimated 80.
- Establish a steering committee prior to kicking off the survey and collaborative mapping process, to help shape these early task steps.
- Increased 3 community open houses to 5 community open houses.
- Added requirement to organize all public comment and materials into an appendix and database.
- Substitute a Neighborhood Outreach team for Power Marketing work. This will include hiring an estimated 4 local residents to coordinate with the planning team, conduct community engagement functions, help gather survey, meeting-in-a-box, and other activities.
- Adds the establishment of 5 working groups that will be organized around topics, areas, or issues that will help propel community feedback and ideas to the steering committee. These groups will meet approximately 3 times each over the course of the project.

The scope changes were proposed by staff at the conclusion of the master plan selection process, though they now reflect many of the recommendations from citizen evaluators. The amounts resulted from Interface assessing these potential scope changes and the cost to accommodate them.

Question: Q4. Can you please elaborate on what specifically made Interface worth \$60K more than the second ranked proposal and who was the second ranked proposal? Also, give the significant added scope (increased cost by about 40%), did we consider re-bidding? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The resolution memo should have been more clear and accurate in this regard. After all consideration (written and interviews), the second ranked proposal was Clarion Associates which was approximately \$270,000 less than the Interface proposal. SmithGroup, the overall third place proposal (second place when only written proposals considered) was \$60.00 less than Interface. No re-bidding was considered, as the discussion and recommendation of the evaluation team concluded that Interface demonstrated the experience, ability, and scope to help the City successfully undertake this work.

Question: Q5. The council-appointed committee made recommendations (p. 18 of their report) on the Steering Committee including 18-20 members and specific recommendations on representatives/stakeholders including “neighborhood groups.” Is the plan to adopt those recommendations? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This has not yet been determined.

Question: Q6. The agreement with Interface reflects 5 working groups. What are the contemplated roles/responsibilities of these “working groups” and the “Advisory Committee”? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: These are envisioned to be groups focused on particular aspects of the Plan, that can provide a more detailed focus on particular aspects of the plan to the larger, overarching steering committee. Potential areas of focus could be housing, economic development, open space, or natural features.

Question: Q7. The cover memo indicates the UM was part of the evaluation team. What is the expected role/involvement of UM in the various stages of the process? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Sue Gott, Campus Planner participated in the review process, but primarily offered guidance and feedback, and did not provide any ranking or evaluation of proposals. The City aspires to ensure that the City’s master plan and campus plans are as coordinated as is possible.

Question: Q8. The agreement with Interface (II Duration) indicates a commencement date of February 1, 2020 and that the agreement will remain in effect for 2 years (with options to renew for (2) one-year terms). Does that mean the expectation is that the process will take approximately two years to complete? If not, and we expect the period to be longer, approximately how much longer and at what additional cost? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This is correct, it is anticipated that this will take approximately 2 years. The contract is structured to provide flexibility in the event that the City determines that there is value in extending the process. Any changes in cost, beyond the proposed contingency if necessary, would return to Council for consideration.

Question: Q9. The cover memo and report from the council-appointed committee both mention the removal of Power Marketing Research as the sub-consultant and the creation of a local “on-the-ground” outreach/communication team. What is the plan to do that? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The plan is to have the City suggest several local residents or individuals of which Interface will interview, select, hire and train to perform community engagement activities throughout the process.

Question: Q 10. I agree with the council-appointed team that “traceability” of changes is important, especially for folks interested in what’s changing for their neighborhoods and the likely impacts. Is the plan to trace changes and post them on the city website as recommended by the team? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The specific method of communicating or documenting the changes has not been determined yet, but it is likely to be referenced by appendix or provided online in some fashion.

Question: Q 11. I also agree with the council-appointed team that the “values framework” is critical in a successful Master Plan update and that once an initial set of values is established, that it is vetted with both council and the community. Is that also part of the plan and if so, how will the resident vetting be conducted? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This will be determined in conjunction with the steering committee.

Question: How are the recommendations from the ward task force included in the budget for the Interface contract? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Some of the recommendations have resulted in the scope of service changes referenced in the request.

Question: Do the recommendations get added to the contract, or sub-contracted through Interface, or contracted directly by the City? If additional funding is needed, how are these additions approved and does the City anticipate any changes in the scope or length of the contract? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The City has incorporated several, but not all of the proposed recommendations. The proposed contract scope and length is inclusive of these changes, and is the basis for the increase from the written proposal to proposed contract amount.

Question: May we see the original projected financials spreadsheet? The final spreadsheet totals \$250K more than what was included in the original Work Plan. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The cost estimate is attached.

Question: When will the comprehensive list of recommendations from the ward task force be included? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Please see responses above.

Question: Comparing the contract to the RFP Work Plan: Stakeholder group -- How will a diverse group of residents and demographics be included? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: It is desired that this group is very diverse. The City will seek to identify a diverse group of stakeholders for the team to interview. The proposed scope expands the number of stakeholder interviews to help accomplish this.

Question: Working committee -- Is it limited to six people? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The size of the steering committee has not yet been determined.

Question: Is there a mechanism for Councilmembers to nominate or appoint members to the stakeholder group and working committees? (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: The method for this process has not yet been determined, but staff anticipates soliciting feedback and suggestions from both City Council and the Planning Commission, to successfully assemble an effective steering committee, working groups, and stakeholders.

Question: My personal preference is for this vote to be postponed until the impact of the changes to the contract are better understood.

Response: No proposed changes to the contract are being proposed beyond the submitted item. If the item is to be postponed, staff would request that as many questions be raised or addressed at the meeting as possible, as Interface Studios has made arrangements to attend the meeting on 12/16.

CA-9 – Resolution to Approve the Local Brownfield Grant Agreement with the Washtenaw County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (\$535,438.00)

Question: Please provide any updates on testing and identification of other locations within the City for possible remediation work. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Staff is not aware of any other locations.

CA-10 – Resolution to Authorize a Grant Application to the USDA Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) for the Purchase of a Conservation Easement on the Kennedy Property in Northfield Township

Question: Regarding CA-10, perhaps I'm wrong, but my recollection is that these requests for approval of grant request typically have some mention of the request amount or value of the property. Approximately how much is this property worth? Also, do we expect the county and/or Northfield Township to participate in the purchase of the conservation easement? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Resolutions to apply to the USDA ACEP Program have not included projected costs or grant request amounts. Those are included in grant acceptance or purchase resolutions. The USDA ACEP Program requires an updated appraisal at the time the funds are awarded (typically 6-9 months after the application is submitted), and therefore a pre-application valuation may differ from the updated values at the time grant funds are awarded. The development rights for the Kennedy property were appraised at \$940,000.00 in October 2019. The ACEP grant, if awarded, would cover approximately 50% of that value. Staff intend to seek 25-30% matching funds from the Washtenaw County Natural Areas Preservation Program (NAPP). It is staff's understanding that Northfield Township may be working towards a ballot initiative to generate matching funds for future land preservation projects, but until then no funds will be forthcoming.

CA-12 – Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Conservation Easement on the Buesser Property in Northfield Township, Approve a Participation Agreement with Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, and Appropriate \$133,367.00 (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-12, the leverage of Greenbelt funds is poor in this conservation easement purchase with the City paying 61% of the purchase price and 71% of the all-in, total costs of \$186K including closing, due diligence and endowment. Why isn't Northfield Township participating at all in the purchase and given that they're not, why isn't the county share higher than 1/3 (at least equal to the city share? Also, did we apply for a federal grant on this one? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City's overall percentage of matching funds for Greenbelt purchases is approximately 53% of the purchase price - meaning the City has paid 47% of the purchase price for all Greenbelt properties. Matches for individual projects may be higher or lower. In this case, the City's share is higher because this property aligns with the City's local priorities, which include preserving smaller farmable parcels, rather than federal ACEP priorities, which favor funding for larger parcels. Based on the federal ACEP criteria, this property was highly unlikely to receive federal ACEP funding, therefore no application was made – this conserves funds budgeted for staff and contractor time that would otherwise be consumed developing and pursuing low-probability applications. However, in 2016, in partnership with Ducks Unlimited, the property was nominated in 2016 for North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Small Grants Program funding, which would have contributed 50% of the appraised development rights value up to \$100,000.00, however the application was unsuccessful.

The Greenbelt Program's strategic plan emphasizes preserving lands, both large and small, that provide the next generation of farmers access to affordable land, and

encourages local food production, which also reduces carbon emissions involved in food transport. New and beginning farmers are often seeking smaller parcels closer to their markets, and this property meets both of those criteria. Community input in the most recent Greenbelt strategic planning process clearly favored protecting smaller parcels to help increase affordable farmland for new and beginning farmers. This project is an example of how the Greenbelt Program can work to preserve lands that address local community priorities in the absence of federal funds.

As mentioned in response to a question about CA-10, it is staff's understanding that Northfield Township may be working towards a ballot initiative to generate matching funds for future land preservation projects, but until then no funds will be forthcoming.

The Washtenaw County Natural Areas Preservation Program (NAPP) funding is split between their Agricultural Land Preservation Committee and their Natural Areas Technical Advisory Committee. Given the high-quality wetlands complex on this site, the Natural Areas Technical Advisory Committee recommended a contribution of \$45,000.00 to this project. As well, given the high-quality natural features of the property, Legacy Land Conservancy also agreed to contribute \$8,000.00 to this project.

CA-13 - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of a Conservation Easement on the Stone Property in Lodi Township, Approve a Participation Agreement with Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission, and Appropriate \$115,367.00 (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-13, while the leverage of Greenbelt funds isn't as poor as it is in CA-12, when you consider the closing, due diligence and endowment costs the City is paying, the City's investment of \$115K represents almost 2/3 of the all-in, total costs of \$181K. Lodi Township – the direct beneficiary - is contributing just \$1K towards the purchase. Does Lodi Township have a protection program and if so, how much annual revenue does it generate? Also, given that the City absorbs the \$51K in extra costs, was the County asked to raise their funding amount? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: This property is similar to the Buesser property (CA-12), and therefore many of the same considerations apply (see the response to CA-12 in this memo). This is a smaller parcel that, if preserved, would increase the supply of more affordable, farmable parcels close to the City. This may enable new farmers to pursue farming close to markets and maintain or increase local food supply, which would be a benefit to the City as well as to surrounding communities. As discussed in the response to CA-12, protection of this type of land was identified as a community priority in the recent Greenbelt strategic planning process.

Lodi Township does not have a dedicated conservation millage. They typically contribute \$1,000.00 to each Greenbelt project within the township.

The County was not asked to raise its contribution. The other costs for due diligence, closing, and endowment are typically borne by the lead partner on a project. When other

partners lead, they also incur these costs. Matching funds vary depending on partner resources, but are generally determined based on a percentage of purchase price, excluding other costs.

CA-14 - Resolution to Approve an Agreement with The Conservation Fund for Administration of the City's Open Space and Parkland Preservation Program (up to \$710,998.20 over 3.5 years)

Question: Regarding CA-14, while I understand the contract amount for the additional two years increases by 3% a year (if extended), what isn't clear is how much this contract in year one increases (if at all) compared with what we are paying The Conservation Fund now. Can you please clarify? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The estimate for the first year reflects approximately a 14% increase from the previous contract (\$198,000 vs. 174,276), which was executed in 2016. The prior contract had no increases built in for the three years it was in effect.

Question: Also on CA-14, I appreciate that the City tried to bid this out, but with only one response, what gives us comfort the price is reasonable (for example, does The Conservation Fund itemize bills with hourly rates or is it just a fixed fee)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Conservation Fund submits invoices based on hourly rates for staff time.

Question: Will the City provide information on plans to assess and prioritize possible land acquisitions within the City, specifically for possible use with the \$6M in Greenbelt funds? This list would include 3365 Jackson, 2857 Packard, and others. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Staff is considering revisiting the parkland acquisition strategy in FY21. Any changes to the current process would be evaluated as part of that review.

CA-15 - Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 1 to the Collaboration Agreement with Community Action Network for the Management of Bryant and Northside Community Centers to Increase Funding from \$150,000.00 to \$168,150.00 for Fiscal Year 2020 (\$18,150.00)

Question: The memo notes that the Washtenaw County Office of Community and Economic Development reduced funding for CAN in FY2020 by \$18,150.00. Do we know the reason the County reduced its support for this organization? What is the County's Fiscal Year? When did we first learn of the County's reduced support? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The County was providing \$110,000 in funding prior to the reduction. The amount is now \$91,500. OCED administers HUD funds for all members of the Urban County, including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds that are referenced in your question. The City of Ann Arbor has generally provided the direction of using about half of the annual allocation of CDBG funds for Community Based Development Organizations (CBDDOs) and the other half for Affordable Housing rehabilitation. The City currently has two CBDDOs, entities that meet HUD requirements for providing specific social services in a targeted neighborhood. Those are Peace Neighborhood Center and Community Action Network – focused at Bryant Community Center.

Below is a history of that funding. Note that CDBG allocations are based on a federal formula and vary from year to year. The chart below shows the City’s CDBG allocation for CBDDOs and not the various affordable housing projects. To review the full urban county action plans for various years, please visit www.washtenaw.org/urbancounty

CBDDO Funding through portion of City of Ann Arbor CDBG allocation

2014/15	amount	2015/16	amount	2016/17	amount	2017/18	amount	2018/2019		2019/2020	
CAN	70,000	CAN	70000	CAN	110000	CAN	110000	CAN	110000	CAN	91500
PEACE	30,000	PEACE	44000	PEACE	84000	PEACE	84000	PEACE	84000	PEACE	88500
Total	100,000		114,000		194,000		194,000		194000		180000

Prior to the 2016-2017 funding year, there was a request for a one-time increase in funding to offset some expected reductions. Those increases continued, but were not connected to any criteria or other requirements around service levels, need, budget or programming. In 2019, OCED staff in coordination with City of Ann Arbor CSA staff, conducted an RFP for CBDDOs services, as is required by HUD, to effectively reset the annual award amounts to the CBDDOs and align them to the HUD requirements around eligible participants, types of programing and service provision.

The funding reduction was based on the results of the RFP, and results were communicated to City staff as well as Bryant Community center and Peace Neighborhood Center in the spring of 2019.

Question: Regarding CA-15, it's disappointing the County reduced their funding and the City needs to make up the difference. Do we know why the County reduced the funding and how much was the County providing in funding before the reduction? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Please see response above.

Question: Please provide any preliminary plans to create a Resilience Hub at these locations. (Councilmember Bannister)

Response: Bryant Community Center is an excellent location for a resilience hub as it is already an established community center with deep ties to the neighborhood. Staff from Community Action Network, Parks, and the Office of Sustainability and Innovation will be meeting in the next few months to discuss options for outfitting Bryant Community Center with the necessary infrastructure (e.g., a battery powered generator, food storage) to become a location where residents are able to shelter in a disaster situation.

CA-16 - Resolution to Approve Change Order No. 2 with Doan Construction Company for the 2019 Annual Sidewalk Repair Project (\$312,141.00)

Question: Regarding CA-16, the cover memo indicates this change order relates to the 2019 sidewalk repair program. I'm assuming the work is completed for the year under this contract and can you please confirm if that's correct? If so, why is council seeing a very large (\$312K) change order after the fact (a change order that's 43% of the amount previously approved)? If not, how can Doan really do \$312K worth of work between now and the end of the year? Am I missing something? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, the work on this contract is complete. This change order is coming to Council late for approval. This was an oversight on the part of staff. Staff is taking steps to make sure that such instances do not occur again in future years, which will include monthly reviews of the status of construction contracts.

Question: Also on CA-16, with this change order, what are the actual spending amounts (for streets and sidewalks) from the Street and Sidewalk millage? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Through the Sidewalk Repair Program, the City tries to repair about 20% of public sidewalks on a 5-year cycle which includes cutting, leveling, and replacing concrete slabs. With this contract modification, the entire 2019 Sidewalk Repair Program will have a total cost of approximately \$1.6 Million. The following is a breakdown of costs by funding source:

Street, Bridge, and Sidewalk Millage	\$1,194,000
Michigan Department of Transportation	\$ 36,000
Washtenaw County Road Millage	\$ 136,000
Major & Local Street Funds	\$ 61,000
Other City owned properties; and other outside funds)	\$ 184,000 (other City funds for

CA-17 - Resolution No. 1 - Prepare Plans and Specifications for the Proposed Jackson Avenue Sidewalk Gap Elimination Project - Westover Avenue to Parklake Avenue - Special Assessment (District #61) and Appropriate \$56,000.00 from the General Fund Balance for the Design of the Project (8 Votes Required)

Question: Regarding CA-17, will this sidewalk gap project be eligible under the new “resident-driven” sidewalk gap program? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Staff is starting to work on creating a Resident-Driven Sidewalk Program to implement Resolution R-19-525. A full schedule for when this program is expected to be ready for implementation has not been determined yet, however it will most likely not be ready before this project is implemented. Also, this project is a planned project from the City’s Capital Improvements Plan, and would not necessarily automatically meet the criteria for the resident-driven program outlined in Resolution R-19-525.

CA-18 - Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 2 to the Professional Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Michigan, Inc. for Construction Inspection Services (\$1,000,000.00)

Question: Regarding CA-18, \$1.0M is a huge amount to approve via an amendment regardless of the fact that the original contract contemplated an extension. Would it be possible to conduct an RFP process for inspection services before the 2020 construction season begins (rather than wait and bid the work starting in 2021)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: As indicated in the memo, this contract was always intended to be a renewable contract to cover two or three construction seasons. The contract locks in the unit rates charged by the contractor, with an allowance for small cost of living increase tied to the Consumer Price Index. If a new RFP process was started now there is a high likelihood that it would result in higher prices for the same services. In addition, if a new RFP process were started now, it would most likely not be possible to have executed contracts in place before the services are needed. Finally, this is intended to be the last year using these as-needed contracts. Staff will be preparing a new RFP for these services in advance of the 2021 construction season.

CA-20 - Resolution to Approve an Agreement with the Regents of the University of Michigan for the South University Pavement and Utility Improvements Project (\$2,980,000.00)

Question: Regarding CA-20, the cover memo indicates UM is lead on this project, but the City must approve the construction contract and all other construction-related contracts. I’m assuming that means any change orders or additions – correct? Also, in terms of the cost sharing, is this consistent with prior joint City-UM contracts and if there are any disagreements on cost sharing of changes, is OHM the arbitrator? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Agreement between the City and University requires that any contract change orders or amendments over \$25,000 be approved by the City. With regard to the cost sharing, it is consistent with past projects on which the City and UM have shared costs. Exhibit B of the Agreement, which details the cost sharing for all aspects of the project related to each of the features of work, will be used as the basis for determining each party's proportionate cost share throughout the life of the project including any contract change orders or amendments.

Question: Why are we choosing to use the County Health Millage to help fund this project? Correct me if I am wrong, this area falls in the DDA boundary and hence seems to make sense for it to be paid for by TIF capture instead. (Councilmember Ramlawi)

Response: This project provided an opportunity to upgrade lighting and improve safety at the crosswalks within the project boundaries. Funding for pedestrian safety related improvements of this nature, were specifically allocated and budgeted within the County Mental Health Millage budget.

CA-22 - Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc. to Design the Headworks Improvement Project at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, RFP No. 19-12 (\$477,420.53)

Question: Regarding CA-21 and CA-22, neither of these awards were to the low bidder and I appreciate the cover memo's providing the bid amounts for all qualified bidders. In CA-21, the cover memo's explanation of the benefits of spending the extra money on OHM were clear, but it's not as clear why staff is recommending HRC on CA-22. Can you please elaborate on why paying the extra \$50K makes sense? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has ongoing issues with grit bypassing the current WWTP Headworks grit removal system. HRC's work plan included a higher level of effort for the investigation and characterization of our WWTP grit. We believe that the added effort on grit evaluation HRC proposed will result in a system that better removes grit and therefore, provides additional protection to downstream equipment from premature grit wear.

C-1 – An Ordinance to Add a New Chapter 122 (Historic Entertainment Sound District) to Title IX of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: What prompted this proposed district? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Councilmembers Eaton and Ramlawi approached the City Administrator and staff regarding the issue. They were contacted by several business owners in the area about their concerns. The Councilmembers requested the Administrator and staff prepare an amendment to resolve the issue.

Question: How many recent noise complaints are known to have occurred in this area of the city? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: There have been 31 total noise complaints in the area in 2019, no citations were issued.

Question: Did this proposal follow the process of introduction described to me by our planning department (i.e. application and fees paid by the resident/business requesting consideration of the change)? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: No, that process is for amendments to the UDC. The noise ordinance is not a component of the UDC. This was initiated at the request of the Councilmembers.

Question: How many and what size entertainment/performance venues exist within the boundaries of this district? Please describe how each qualifies as “historic”? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Additional research to determine the number of facilities within the district will need to be done. These facilities are not historic in the context of an established historic districts per the city code or National Register. The intent of using the word historic is that the area has historically had a concentration of entertainment uses/buildings.

Question: Is the impacted housing within this district more or less “historic” than the venues within it? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: They are no more or less historic. They term in this context is used to describe the historic concentration of entertainment venues. Not in the sense that the uses or structures are historically significant.

Question: Would zoning within this district allow for growth, i.e. a potential INCREASE in the number of entertainment/performance venues in this area? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Yes, zoning within the district allows for these uses.

Question: How does the concentration of entertainment/performance venues in this area compare to the concentration of similar venues in other parts of the city? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Additional research will need to be conducted and an answer provided under separate cover.

Question: Do we anticipate use of this new district in the future in other areas of town? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: If there are other areas in town that noise levels historically exceed the allowance of City regulation it may be considered. Staff is currently not looking at other areas of the City.

Question: What was the standard for determining appropriateness here and what would be the standard determining its application elsewhere? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Current sound levels referenced with comparable levels identified in the report were used to determine proposed levels. If considered elsewhere staff recommends the same criteria.

Question: I'm told that venues can sound dampening improvements that significantly reduce the amount of noise that escapes. Do we have reason to think that efforts like this (rather than shifting the standards) are not feasible in this particular district? (Councilmember Nelson)

Response: Current property owners have explored and implemented sound dampening and other improvements to lessen the sound that leaves the site. As currently structure the ordinance does not allow any sound to leave the site. The proposed changes only regulate those levels to what currently exist, they do not increase the levels over what has been associated with this area historically.

Question: Q1. Creating an entertainment district with specific noise standards seems to make a lot of sense. Does staff see any issues with what's proposed and can AAPD please confirm the ordinance make it easier for them in terms of enforcement? Also, have we run this past the business owners in the district and if so, what was their feedback? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Yes, under the current requirements no sound is allowed to leave the property which is a difficult standard to enforce. Adopting reasonable levels based on historic and like uses create an enforceable standard and one business owners can understand and work to maintain. It was the business owners, through the council sponsors, who approached the City about correcting the situation.

Question: Q2. It appears what we're proposing is similar to what exists in Austin. Can Mr. Lazarus please speak to how well it's worked there and if there's been any issues or problems? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: My experience is that the issues in Austin were similar to those we are now experiencing in downtown Ann Arbor. In the majority of cases, residential neighbors and live music venues were able to co-exist within the noise levels specified. As a point of information, noise complaints in downtown Austin were more related to construction than to live music venues.

Question: Q3. In the new ordinance, there are 3 time categories with different maximums – 7AM-11PM; 11PM-2AM; 2AM-7AM. Does the existing noise ordinance also have these 3 time periods? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No.

DC-1 - Resolution to Support Center of the City Interim Use and Long Term Planning for the Center of the City/Library Lot Property

Question: Regarding DC-1, this was postponed for the purpose of obtaining input from the Center of the City Task Force. If that occurred, can you please share the feedback? If not, when do we expect feedback from the Task Force? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: At their December 11, 2019 meeting the Center of the City Task Force passed the motion “To give thanks to Council for providing the Task Force the time to discuss the resolution and encourage City Council to not make significant investment in infrastructure on the site prior to the final Task Force report and with that ask being considered, the Task Force is not opposed to the resolution.”

DC- 2- Resolution Stating the City of Ann Arbor’s Consent to Refugee Settlement

Question: Regarding DC-2, does this consent declaration obligate the City to do anything other than accept refugees? Also, are any problems created if the City formally states our consent, but the State doesn’t? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Both the governor and a local official must consent to the resettlement of refugees in a local municipality for it to be permitted. If the City consents to resettlement but the governor does not, then resettlement of refugees will not be permitted. This action does not obligate the City to do anything other than accept the local resettlement of refugees.

DC-3 - Resolution to Endorse HB 4738 and the Creation of a Statewide Crosswalk Law

Question: What are the advantages and disadvantages of a statewide crosswalk law for Michigan residents? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: There are pros and cons to adopting a statewide crosswalk law. Such a law does constitute an act of municipal pre-emption. If a statewide crosswalk law were adopted, Ann Arbor would lose the power to implement its own crosswalk law or to make changes to our crosswalk laws in the name of pedestrian safety. We would be locked into a state standard. To wit, HB 4738 proposes a statewide crosswalk law that is different than Ann Arbor’s current crosswalk law. HB 4738 requires vehicles to stop if there is a pedestrian in the half of the roadway in which the vehicle is travelling. Our local ordinance requires vehicles to stop in that instance and also when a pedestrian is stopped at the curb, curb line, or ramp leading to a crosswalk. It also requires vehicles to stop if a

pedestrian is on their half of the road, or approaching from the opposite half of the road. So the local ordinance requires stopping in more instances than the proposed statewide ordinance, and therefore may promote a safer pedestrian experience.

On the other hand a statewide crosswalk law would be advantageous for Michigan pedestrians to ensure their rights are standardized across the state when crossing the road. It would also be advantageous for Michigan motorists so that a similar understanding of rights can be established, taught and enforced consistently. Pedestrian safety is generally ensured by having adequate infrastructure, strong education on local laws, and effective enforcement. A statewide standard may help with education and enforcement, and therefore promote pedestrian safety.

The above analysis is provided without recommendation. Staff stands ready to implement whatever direction Council may give on this issue.

Question: Grand Rapids adopted a local ordinance in early 2018 that is the same language as the proposed crosswalk law. Are there any lessons to be learned or crash data to support this language? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: Staff has not followed developments in Grand Rapids related to their crosswalk law. Staff was not able to find information online about lessons learned – just the original announcement (<https://www.grandrapidsmi.gov/Shortcut-Content/News-Media/New-ordinance-requires-drivers-to-stop-at-crosswalks-for-pedestrians>). However, one year of experience is likely not enough data to draw meaningful conclusions regarding the effectiveness of pedestrian safety laws in Grand Rapids.

Question: The Michigan Department of Transportation approved the proposed crosswalk law language after six years of negotiations facilitated by our local state representatives. Is the city involved in any ongoing negotiations to revise the language, including the definition of a crosswalk, which is defined at the national level? (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: City staff is not involved in any ongoing negotiations related to this effort.

Question: What are the advantages and disadvantage of a statewide crosswalk law for Ann Arbor residents? Please consider the conditions of our existing crosswalks, especially the lack of positive contrast lighting; our problems with maintaining functioning streetlighting at crosswalks; the language on the posted signage; the number of visitors to Ann Arbor; the fact that UM is governed by state law; and the fact that business route infrastructure, with the exception of lighting, is under state control. (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: This analysis is provided above. Further analysis would require a much longer term study and potentially assistance from a consultant. However, generally speaking pedestrian safety is most influenced by the design of infrastructure, education, and enforcement. Regardless of what the city's pedestrian crosswalk law is, city staff will

continue to create an environment where pedestrian safety excellence is promoted and achieved. We are confident that we can effectively enforce whatever pedestrian crosswalk law we are subject to, whether it is our current local ordinance or the proposed standard in HB4738.

Question: Please describe the ongoing communications in support of a state crosswalk law from the mayor, city council and the city staff. (Councilmember Griswold)

Response: City staff is only aware of communication undertaken by city staff. To that end, Mr. Lazarus shared a letter with our legislation delegation in October regarding HB 4837. Other than that there has been no ongoing communication of any variety with state lawmakers or staff regarding HB 4837 or any other proposed statewide crosswalk law.

DB-1 - Resolution to Approve Hideaway Lane Planned Project Site Plan and Development Agreement at 2000 Traver Road.

Question: The Planned Project standards from the UDC allow a planned project if the development provides certain features such as the preservation of Natural Features, greater minimum Open Space, greater Setback Lines, energy conserving design, preservation of historic or architectural features, higher quality design, expansion of the supply of Affordable Housing for Lower Income Households or a beneficial arrangement of Buildings. This project offers a tiny increase in open space and some increase and some decrease in building setbacks. I cannot recall any proposed planned project that has offered so little benefit for the requested modifications of the area, height, placement, and design requirements. Can you provide a few examples of recent Planned Projects and the benefits offered in exchange for modification of zoning requirements? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: This recollection is accurate, this site plan proposes modest setback adjustments and a slight open space increase. Here are a few examples of recent planned project proposals:

- 616 E. Washington: 28 extra feet of height (which accommodates 3 additional floors) for solar orientation (rooftop solar panels) and energy conserving design (LEED Silver)
- 615 S. Main (now called, "The Yard"): an extra 15 feet of height (which accommodated an additional floor) for pedestrian orientation (a pedestrian pathway and access easement to accommodate a segment of the Treeline trail and wider sidewalk along S. Main Street) and preservation of an architectural feature (west and south façade of 19th century building on SW corner).
- 143 Hill: decreased front setback (to 18 feet) in exchange for additional open space (40% required; 54% provided)
- 441 S. Ashley: exceeded 3 story streetwall height requirement by 2 stories in exchange for by providing 22% landscaped open space (floodplain area)

Question: Q1. The cover memo indicates that two wetlands are to be enhanced and the staff report indicates there are 4 wetlands on site. What happens (if anything) to the other 2 wetlands, and what are the wetland enhancements being proposed? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The wetlands are being enhanced to mitigate for disturbance (grading) within the boundaries of those wetlands. The wetlands not being enhanced are to remain protected as they are and undisturbed, meaning they do not require mitigation.

The two wetlands to be enhanced will have the following occur:

Wetland Area A: “Clear and grub all existing ground vegetation. Seed with proposed native upland buffer seed mix as specified on the original wetland mitigation drawings (sheet WM-2).”

Wetland Area F: “Clear and grub all existing ground vegetation and honeysuckle. Seed with proposed emergent wetland seed mix as specified on original wetland mitigation drawings (sheet WM-1).” This wetland has invasive species that will be removed as part of the mitigation enhancement.

Question: Q2. It does not appear the developer is offering much in exchange for the planned project modifications – just fractionally more open space. Is that a fair assessment and if so, why should council grant the modifications? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: It’s true that the petitioner is providing only slightly more open space than code requires. Staff recommended approval of the Planned Project for two reasons: 1) the petitioner is providing a fire truck turn-around area at the south side of the site which uses pervious concrete. This turn-around area is not counted as open space but is likely to be used recreationally (basketball court, etc.) since vehicles won’t be able to park there, and 2) staff seeks public benefits that are generally commensurate with proposed developer benefits. In this case, the petitioner is proposing that a small portion of one of the duplexes encroaches into the 30’ rear setback. The rear property line abuts an embankment of a railroad corridor so no adjoining resident will be impacted by this encroachment. Secondly, the petitioner is proposing side building separations of 10 feet instead of 20 feet that is required of multiple family zoning districts. The 20 foot building separation requirement is intended to provide adequate separation for large apartment buildings, not for a small duplex neighborhood. The side setback requirement of the R2A (two-family) zoning district is 5 feet which would result in homes being as close as 10 feet apart. Required side setbacks in some of the single family zoning districts can also result in homes being as close as 10 feet apart or less (5’ side setbacks in R1C and 3’ side setbacks in R1D and R1E).

Question: Q3. Have any objections to this project been raised at the citizen participation meeting, Planning Commission public hearing, or directly to staff? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Some members of the public expressed opposition to the proposed project at the Planning Commission hearings. Comments included concerns that the site is too wet to develop, the project will generate too much traffic, area stormwater systems will be negatively affected, and erosion will occur along Traver Creek. Planning Commission members asked questions about how stormwater will work, wetland enhancement, proximity of the railroad tracks, traffic analysis, bicycle parking, and the potential for additional public engagement.

ANN ARBOR COMMUNITY VISION AND MASTER LAND USE PLAN COST ESTIMATE

TITLE	INTERFACE STUDIO					POWER MARKETING RESEARCH		NINIGRET PARTNERS			SAM SCHWARZ ENGINEERING			BUROHAPPOLD					Fee per Task	
	Lead Consultant Planning		and Urban Design			Engagement and Communications		Economic Development and Housing			Mobility			Sustainability						
	Principal	Project Manager	Associate	Designer	Designer		President		President	Planner		Principal	Sr. Planner		Associate	Associate Principal	Graduate Consultant	Senior Consultant		Engineer
HOURLY RATE	\$140	\$120	\$110	\$85	\$85		\$200		\$175	\$150		\$195	\$114		\$280	\$235	\$190	\$145	\$135	
TASK 1: PROJECT MANAGEMENT & GETTING STARTED																				
Task 1.1: ESTABLISH AN INTERNAL COMMUNICATION PLAN		4				\$ 480		\$ -			\$ -			\$ -		2			\$ 470	\$ 950
Task 1.2: INVENTORY WISHLIST		4				\$ 480		\$ -			\$ -			\$ -		2			\$ 470	\$ 950
Task 1.3: GATHER & SUMMARIZE EXISTING PLANS & PROPOSALS	4	16	16			\$ 4,240	2	\$ 400	2		\$ 350	4		\$ 456	2	4	4	8	\$ 3,420	\$ 8,866
Task 1.4: CREATION OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE	2	4				\$ 760	2	\$ 400			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 1,160
Task 1.5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN	4	8				\$ 1,520	4	\$ 900			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 2,320
Task 1.6: ONE ON ONE STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS	24	32				\$ 7,200	8	\$ 1,600	24		\$ 4,200	4		\$ 456		8	8		\$ 3,400	\$ 16,856
Task 1.7: ESTABLISH GRAPHIC STANDARDS AND INITIAL MARKETING MATERIALS	2	8		24	4	\$ 3,620		\$ -			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 3,620
Task 1.8: SOCIAL MEDIA LAUNCH	2	8		16		\$ 2,600	16	\$ 3,200			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 5,800
Task 1.9: KICK-OFF MEETINGS	16	16	16	16		\$ 7,280	8	\$ 1,300	16		\$ 2,800	8		\$ 912		8	8		\$ 3,400	\$ 15,992
Task 1.10: STUDY AREA TOURS	16	16	16	16		\$ 7,280	8	\$ 1,600	16		\$ 2,800	8		\$ 912		8	8		\$ 3,400	\$ 15,992
Total Hours	70	116		72	4		48		58			24		2	32	28	8			
Task 1 Cost Estimate						\$ 35,480		\$ 9,800			\$ 10,150			\$ 2,735					\$ 14,560	\$ 72,505
TASK 2: INVENTORY & ANALYSIS																				
Task 2.1: DIGESTING THE DATA	8	24	40	80	24	\$ 17,240		\$ -	16	16	\$ 5,200	8		\$ 912		4	8	24	\$ 5,940	\$ 29,292
Task 2.2: POLICY REVIEW	8	24	16	8		\$ 6,440		\$ -	24		\$ 4,200	8		\$ 912		4	12	12	\$ 4,960	\$ 16,512
Task 2.3: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL AND REGIONAL ECONOMY	4	4		8		\$ 1,720		\$ -	40	80	\$ 19,000			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 20,720
Task 2.4: SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS	4	4		8		\$ 1,720		\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	4	8	40	40	\$ 16,400	\$ 18,120
Task 2.5: HOUSING ANALYSIS	4	32	16	16		\$ 7,520		\$ -	24	8	\$ 5,400			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 12,920
Task 2.6: BUDGET REVIEW	2	2	2			\$ 740		\$ -	16		\$ 2,800	4		\$ 456					\$ -	\$ 3,996
Task 2.7: TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVIEW	2	2	2	16		\$ 2,100		\$ -			\$ -	24		\$ 2,735					\$ -	\$ 4,835
Task 2.8: SURVEY OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS	2	16	16			\$ 3,960		\$ -			\$ -	4		\$ 456		2	2		\$ 850	\$ 5,266
Task 2.9: COLLABORATIVE MAP	1	8			24	\$ 3,140	4	\$ 800			\$ -			\$ -		2	2		\$ 850	\$ 4,790
Task 2.10: ROVING OPEN HOUSES	8	40	24	120	80	\$ 25,560	40	\$ 8,000			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 33,560
Task 2.11: NEIGHBORLY ROUNDTABLES / MEETINGS IN A BOX	8	40	16	40		\$ 11,080	40	\$ 8,000			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 19,080
Task 2.12: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANALYSIS / SUMMARIZING THE THEMES	4	8	16	24		\$ 5,320	4	\$ 800			\$ -	8		\$ 912		2	2		\$ 850	\$ 7,882
Task 2.13: COORDINATION MEETINGS	24	32				\$ 7,200	16	\$ 3,200			\$ -	4		\$ 456			8		\$ 1,520	\$ 12,376
Total Hours	79	236		320	128		104		120	104		60		4	22	74	76			
Task 2 Cost Estimate						\$ 93,740		\$ 20,800			\$ 36,600			\$ 6,836					\$ 31,370	\$ 189,346
TASK 3: VISION & RECOMMENDATIONS																				
Task 3.1: STATEMENT OF VISION, GOALS & OBJECTIVES	4	16	8			\$ 3,360		\$ -	1		\$ 175	12		\$ 1,367	1	2	4		\$ 1,510	\$ 6,412
Task 3.2: LAND USE ALTERNATIVES & ZONING CONCEPTS	8	24	40	8		\$ 9,080		\$ -	1		\$ 175	8		\$ 912		4	8	16	\$ 4,780	\$ 14,947
Task 3.3: DESIGN GUIDELINES	8	24	24	40		\$ 10,040		\$ -			\$ -	16		\$ 1,823	1	4	8	16	\$ 5,060	\$ 16,923
Task 3.4: FOCUS GROUPS	24	32	24	8		\$ 9,840	32	\$ 6,400	16		\$ 2,800	8		\$ 912		8	16	16	\$ 7,240	\$ 27,192
Task 3.5: HOUSING PLAN	24	24	8	8		\$ 7,800		\$ -	24		\$ 4,200			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 12,000
Task 3.6: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN	24	24	8	8		\$ 7,800		\$ -	24	16	\$ 6,600			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 14,400
Task 3.7: SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK	4	4	4			\$ 1,480		\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	2	8	24	48	\$ 13,960	\$ 15,440
Task 3.8: STRATEGY TO ADDRESS COMMUNITY EQUITY	16	16	4	4		\$ 4,940		\$ -	1		\$ 175	4		\$ 456		4	8		\$ 2,460	\$ 8,031
Task 3.9: FOCUS AREAS	16	24	32	32		\$ 11,360		\$ -	1		\$ 175	4		\$ 456		4	8		\$ 2,460	\$ 14,451
Task 3.10: COORDINATION MEETINGS	24	32				\$ 7,200	8	\$ 1,600			\$ -			\$ -			8		\$ 1,520	\$ 10,320
Total Hours	152	220		100			40		68	16		52		4	34					
Task 3 Cost Estimate						\$ 72,900		\$ 6,000			\$ 14,300			\$ 5,925					\$ 38,990	\$ 140,115
TASK 4: IMPLEMENTATION																				
Task 4.1: IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	8	16				\$ 3,040	4	\$ 800	24		\$ 4,200	2	10	\$ 1,530		4	4		\$ 1,700	\$ 11,270
Task 4.2: PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLANS	40	120	40	40		\$ 27,800	16	\$ 3,200	24		\$ 4,200	4	40	\$ 5,339	1	2	8	24	\$ 5,750	\$ 48,289
Task 4.3: WRAP UP & MARKETING THE PLAN	16	16				\$ 4,160		\$ -	8		\$ 1,400	8		\$ 912					\$ -	\$ 6,472
Total Hours	64	152		40			20		56		6	58		1	6					
Task 4 Cost Estimate						\$ 35,000		\$ 4,000			\$ 9,800			\$ 7,781					\$ 7,450	\$ 64,031
DIRECT EXPENSES: TRAVEL / PRINTING						\$ 52,000		\$ 500			\$ -			\$ 2,550					\$ 8,400	\$ 63,450
INCENTIVES / MEETING NEEDS						\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000			\$ -			\$ -					\$ -	\$ 10,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED FEES						\$ 289,100		\$ 42,900			\$ 70,850			\$ 25,827					\$ 100,770	\$ 549,447

The incentives / meeting needs includes food, prizes and other materials for the roundtables and open houses